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Abstract

Background

In 2006 the Theewaterskloof (TWK) Project started in the Theewaterskloof Municipality. This project allows students from the HAN University in the Netherlands to do their internship in Grabouw, Caledon or Genadendal. The students help developing the Theewaterskloof area with their knowledge and skills. One of the projects within the TWK project is the Sports for All (SFA) project. The aim of this project is making sports available for everyone in the TWK area. The courses Sports, Health & Management and ALO send students each half year to work in this project.

Problem statement

In interviews with the TWK Municipality and the Village of Hope (welfare organization in Grabouw and stakeholder in this project) it became clear that the situation regarding the sport facilities in Grabouw was poor. The existing sport facilities were in a bad condition through a lack of proper maintenance. Furthermore, the sport facilities were often used as a rubbish dump for the community. To summarize, there is a lack of safe and sustainable sport facilities in Grabouw.

Objective

The main problem regarding sports in Grabouw is the lack of safe and sustainable sport facilities. The Municipality wants to create an artificial turf pitch in the Rooidakke/Iraq area. At the moment the TWK Municipality is responsible for the maintenance of the sport facilities. In terms of sustainability, the Municipality likes to the local sport forum or the community to take responsibility for managing the field. In conclusion the following research objective has been formulated:

Advise the Theewaterskloof Municipality on creating a sustainable sport facility in the Rooidakke/Iraq area where children and sport teams can exercise safely, and discuss who should take responsibility for maintaining sport facilities.

Method

The research strategy used in this thesis is the case study strategy. Half structured interviews with the Town Manager of Grabouw, the Sports & Recreation administrator of the TWK Municipality, Tim Walker and Daz Muir from the Village of Hope, and the Ward Committees are used to discover the needs of these stakeholders. Furthermore, interviews are held with experts to discover their view on the situation regarding the sport facilities in Grabouw. Finally, an observation of two best practices in Khayelitsha, Cape Town is made.

Results and conclusion

What are the needs of the stakeholders regarding the sport facilities in Grabouw?

The stakeholders want safe and sustainable sport facilities in the community. Both the Municipality and the Village of Hope consider an artificial turf pitch in the Rooidakke/Iraq area as the ideal situation. Because the Municipality does not have enough funding for creating and maintaining sport facilities, funding from the outside is necessary.
What are the standards for a safe sport facility?

In order to guarantee the safety for the users of the sport facility, an artificial turf is considered as the ideal facility. Because of the flat surface, injuries are less likely to occur. Furthermore, fostering a sense of ownership, using vandalism proof materials and surveillance are considered effective interventions to handle crime related issues like vandalism and alcohol and drug abuse. Finally the facility has to be fenced to protect users of the facility from traffic. Before using the field, inspection by a government body and/or local authority inspectors is necessary.

Which steps are necessary to make the sport facilities in Grabouw sustainable?

To ensure the sustainability of the field, community participation and –ownership are crucial. However, throughout a lack of capacity in the Grabouw community, capacity building is necessary. The partnership approach is the best way to develop locals into leaders. The VOH is suitable partner for this project.

In which way new sport facilities can be funded?

The VOH is willing to use their network to collect funding for paying local leaders and the creation and maintenance of the artificial turf pitch.

Recommendations

Safety requirements sport facility

As said before, an artificial turf pitch in the Rooidakke/Iraq area is the ideal situation. This sort of field meets up with international standards of FIFA and national standards from the KNVB and SAFA. However, to prevent vandalism and alcohol- and drug abuse on and around the field, some actions have to be taken. First, the sport facility has to be build on a central position in the community. This way, community members can look after the facility and its users. In this way, vandalism and alcohol- and drug abuse are less likely to occur. The TWK Municipality must take this in consideration in their zoning plan for Rooidakke and Iraq. Secondly, the facility has to be fenced in order to protect children from traffic. Finally responsible people have to guard the facility day and night. In order to motivate this people, they have to be paid.

Community participation under the supervision of the Village of Hope

The community is not ready to take ownership over the sport facilities all by themselves. Including an organization from the outside that knows the community on a ground level, can be used to tackle this problem. The Village of Hope is going to function as supervisor over the young role models who are going to manage the sport facilities. This process is going to be evaluated by the TWK Municipality.

Capacity building

The young role models who are going to manage the sport facilities are identified on their passion, not their skills or knowledge. Workshops by the Village of Hope should help them retrieving these skills so they are capable of managing the sport facilities.

Fundraising throughout volunteer network

Brochures and a platform for introduction have to be created by business students who have knowledge about this, so this project can be introduced to companies who are willing to spend money on development projects. These companies should be identified throughout the volunteer network of the Village of Hope.
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Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIFA</td>
<td>World Football Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAN</td>
<td>Hogeschool van Arnhem en Nijmegen, HAN University of Applied Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD</td>
<td>Human Recourse Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Integrated Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Institutional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISBS</td>
<td>Institute for Sport and Movement Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNVB</td>
<td>Koninklijke Nederlandse Voetbal Bond, Dutch Football Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD</td>
<td>Organizational Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>Organizational Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Psychological Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDT</td>
<td>Self Determination Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFA</td>
<td>South African Football Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFA</td>
<td>Sports For All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRSA</td>
<td>Department of Sport and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHM</td>
<td>Sports, Health and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWK</td>
<td>Theewaterskloof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWC</td>
<td>University of the Western Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAR</td>
<td>South African Rand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOH</td>
<td>Village of Hope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Terms

Artificial turf: A synthetic (fibres) sports playing surface made to resemble grass.
Community: Refers to all people living in Grabouw.
Exercise: Playing matches and practicing, but also social (sports-) games that children play.
Integrated Development Plan: The Integrated Development Plan consists out of a institutional framework for the implementation of the IDP, investment and development initiatives in the Municipality, key performance indicators and other important statistical information, a financial plan and a spatial development framework (Theewaterskloof Municipality, 2010).
Public open spaces: Any land that is owned by a local Municipal council and reserved in terms of town planning scheme for use of community sport, recreation and play.
Sports forum: Project group which represents the sports community in Grabouw. Each sport code has a representative, and they discuss sport related issues with the TWK Municipality.
Village of Hope (VOH): A welfare organization in Grabouw which organizes afterschool sport activities in the community and on the Kathleen Murray Primer and Pineview Primer, in order to teach the children from Grabouw life-skills and keep them off the street.
Ward Committee: A Ward Committee is the appropriate channel through which communities can lodge their complaints and it is obliged to forward such complaints to council in the most effective manner (The DPLG & GTZ South Africa, 2005).
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1 Introduction

The introduction contains a description of the project background, the research objective, the research questions, the research model, relevance for the course Sports, Health and Management (SHM) and a reading manual. The first paragraph of this thesis contains background information of the Theewaterskloof (TWK) project in order to give an overview of the history and the current situation of the Sports For All (SFA) project. The second paragraph presents the problem statement of this thesis. In the third and fourth paragraph the research objective and the research questions which are necessary to accomplish this research objective, will be formulated. In the fifth paragraph the research setting of this thesis is presented. The sixth paragraph describes the relevance of this research for the course SHM and the TWK project. The last paragraph presents a reading manual for this thesis.

1.1 Project background

Since 1993 there has been an effective collaboration between the University of Western Cape (UWC) and the Hogeschool van Arnhem and Nijmegen (HAN). Students and lecturers from both institutes get the opportunity to gain an international experience.

In 2002, the UWC and HAN started a project for the development of rural communities in South Africa. It was the ‘Municipality of the Theewaterskloof’, part of the ‘Overberg District’ ‘In the’ ‘Western Cape Province’, that asked the UWC and the HAN to help them with the implementation of their ‘Integrated Development Plan’ (IDP). The question was to facilitate and support a five-year project with staff and students. The idea behind this project is that students from both institutions are placed in a learning environment in which they can gain work experience. At the same time the TWK project contributes to the development projects of the region and the community. In this way a win-win situation for all three parties is created.

In May 2004, after visits to the UWC and the TWK area, members of the HAN decided that the project could start in August 2006 with a limited number of activities. The main objective of the project is to implement sustainable social- and economic development projects in poor communities of the TWK region, thereby improving the welfare. Involving people from the community is an important point of the project. Only active involvement and participation of the community members can ensure long-term results (Driessen, van Egmond, van Kesteren, Nijenhuis, te Rietstap, Salden, Trutmans & Vervuurt, 2006).

One of the projects within this TWK project is the SFA project. The Institute for Sport and Movement Studies (ISBS) of the HAN are running this project. Every half year, six to eight students from the departments SHM and ALO (Education for sport instructor) are sent to Genadendal and Grabouw to work on this project. The project focuses on sports and health related problems. In 2006 the following objective was formulated:

‘Within five years a sports infrastructure will be implemented within the Grabouw community, which guarantees access for everyone and which contributes to economic- and social development.’ (Driessen, et al, 2006)

Five years later, in order of the ISBS of the HAN, the SFA project was evaluated. This evaluation was conducted by Laurens Steenbekkers, an employee of the HAN. In his evaluation Steenbekkers (2009) raised the question what has been achieved in the past couple of years and what are the possibilities for this project in the future. The conclusion of the evaluation was:
'The objectives that are stated in the ‘Sports for All project plan 2006-2010’ have not been achieved and targets must be adjusted to the current situation and especially to areas where successes can be achieved.'

After the evaluation of Steenbekkers (2009), the ISBS decided that the SFA had to continue. Luuk Janssen, SHM student in Grabouw in February 2010, set up a new project plan for the SFA project. Janssen (2010) concluded that projects within the SFA project should be consistent with local needs. Janssen says that there was a need for structured after-school activities for children. However, projects should not only be focused on children. Projects should also contribute to Human Resource Development, Organizational Development and Institutional Development. Janssen also suggests that there’s a need for large multi-disciplinary projects. Furthermore, students should have knowledge and experience to carry out their role as a development worker. The addition of South African students into the SFA project would also add value, because they know the country, its culture and its structures. Furthermore, the right partners must be selected within the project. These organizations should be anchored by strong local knowledge and financial possibilities. The addition of role models from the community is also a key recommendation of Janssen, because they know the community and had to deal with the same conditions as the children where the projects focus on. They may therefore serve as role models for younger children. Finally, empowerment and motivation are very important for creating a successful project. Building trust with the local population is an important opportunity. The content of projects, in most cases, should focus on transferring knowledge and experience to the local population.

Janssen recommends that two major projects within the SFA project should continue, knowing the Skop ‘n Goal project and the Lifestyle project (formerly known as the ‘Skoon’ project). The Skop ‘n Goal project focuses on providing after-school sports activities to children in Grabouw and the Lifestyle project teaches the children at primary schools about personal hygiene and wound care. The smaller projects, which students have previously set up, will not be continued. The focus is on two major projects, in order to make the SFA project more sustainable.

1.2 Problem statement

The TWK Municipality (2010) made an analysis of the community priorities for the period 2010-2011. These issues were identified by the broader community of the Grabouw town and prioritised in order of importance by both the Ward Committees as well as the Town advisory forum. The top priority in Grabouw is the construction of new houses, in order to give everybody a adequate home. The South African constitution says everyone has the right to have access to adequate housing (South African Constitution, no. 26).

The first issue regarding sports named in the analysis of the Municipality, is the creation of a mini sport field in Rooidakke. Another issue is the upgrading of the Pineview sport field and –facilities. Pineview Park is the only sport facility in Grabouw where league games are played for football- and rugby in Grabouw. Pineview Park is playable, unfortunately, this sport ground is not properly managed and that is why this sport facility is in a poor condition.

The TWK Municipality (2008) thinks that sports and sport activities play an important role in the development of the community of Grabouw. Sport is seen as a medium to teach life-skills and to develop all community members. The Department of Sport and Recreation (SRSA) (2009) shares the same vision. Over the medium term, the Department of Sport and Recreation focuses on initiatives to create an enabling environmental to ensure that as many South Africans as possible have access to sport and recreation activities and facilities, especially those from disadvantaged communities. One of the key stumbling blocks that hamper the delivery of sport and recreation remains the backlog in sport and recreation facilities.
From different orientating interviews (Appendix II) with stakeholders, it became clear Grabouw struggles with the same problems which are addressed by the Department of Sport and Recreation in their Sport Strategic Plan 2009-2013. In a discussion with the Sport and Recreation administrator of the TWK Municipality and the Town Manager of Grabouw, it became clear that are not enough decent sport facilities where children and sport teams can exercise safely. Most of the existing sport facilities in the Grabouw community consist from sand, or are filled with rocks and holes. Many of these pitches are used as rubbish dump and are filled with glass. The presence of cars is also dangerous for the children who are playing on these facilities. The need from the community is a qualitative good sport facility where children and sport teams can exercise safely.

Another issue which has been discussed in the meeting with the Municipality is the maintenance of the sport facilities in Grabouw. As said before, the existing sport facilities - like Pineview Park - are not properly maintained and are therefore in a poor condition. It is not clear who needs to take ownership of the sport facilities and who has to take care of the maintenance of the sport facilities. Sport teams think this is a task of the Municipality, and the Municipality wants the sport teams to take responsibility for the maintenance. Out of the interviews with the Municipality it became clear that the absence of a good working sports forum and the lack of responsibility and ownership by the community are the main reasons for the poorly maintained sport facilities in Grabouw.

The Municipality like to see at least one artificial turf pitch in Grabouw in the next three years. In cooperation with Town Manager Anton Liebenberg several public open spaces have been identified which should be turned into sport facilities in the future (appendix III Open spaces). The first field has to be build in the Rooidakke/Iraq area. The Municipality and the Village of Hope (VOH) state that these facilities must meet the following three standards; (1) a safe environment; (2) a qualitative good sport facility in the form of an artificial turf pitch; and (3) regular maintenance.

First, it is important that the sport facilities are not exposed to environmental threats like traffic and crime. The Playing Park in Rooidakke is next to a big road which leads to the Rooidakke area and the VOH. The children from Rooidakke, however, don’t have to cross the street to get on the field. Furthermore Rooidakke is one of the problem area’s in Grabouw. A lot of people live in poverty and poverty leads to crime. In Rooidakke alone there is a waiting list for 517 houses (TWK Municipality, 2010). The TWK Municipality (2010) states that social crime prevention in Rooidakke is a problem because there is no Municipal facility available in the area of Rooidakke. In a meeting with Town Manager Anton Liebenberg, it became clear that the Playing Park in Rooidakke has been a target of vandalism and theft in the past.

The quality of the sport facilities is directly linked to the quality of the playing surface. Many facilities do not have a equal surface and are filled with rocks, glass, and rubbish. Town Manager Anton Liebenberg discusses that the installation of an artificial turf pitch should overcome these problems.

The last point of analyse is the maintenance of the sport facility. In the past the TWK Municipality took care of the maintenance of the facility. In a discussion with Anton Liebenberg, it became clear that the Municipality stopped with the maintenance of several sport facilities because of vandalism on and theft. The main reason for these problems - according to Anton Liebenberg - is the lack of commitment from the community.

*In summary, there is lack of safe and sustainable sport facilities in Grabouw.*
1.3 Research objective

As named in the previous section, the main problem regarding sports in Grabouw is the lack of safe and sustainable sport facilities. The Municipality wants to create an artificial turf pitch in the Rooidakke/Iraq area. At the moment the TWK Municipality is responsible for the maintenance of the sport facilities. In terms of sustainability, the view of the Municipality is that the local sports forum or the community should take responsibility of managing the field operationally. In conclusion the following research objective has been formulated:

*Advise the Theewaterskloof Municipality on creating a sustainable sport facility in the Rooidakke/Iraq area where children and sport teams can exercise safely, and discuss who should take responsibility for maintaining sport facilities.*

1.4 Research question

In order to collect the knowledge that is necessary for my research, I will define one main research question. To complete the research question, the following main research question has to be answered:

*How can safe and sustainable sport facilities be created in Grabouw?*

The main research question is broad and covers the whole research. To specify my research and give guidance to the research, several sub questions have been formulated:

- What are the needs of the stakeholders regarding the sport facilities in Grabouw?
- What are the standards for a safe sport facility?
- Which steps are necessary to make the sport facilities in Grabouw sustainable?
- In which way can new sport facilities be funded?

1.5 Research setting

In order to give an answer to the main research question - and through this realising the main research objective of this thesis - a research setting has been developed. The research setting is shown in figure 1.

Desk research will be done to collect theories about sustainability and funding. Sustainability is essential to ensure the project will continue. Theories about funding are important to find out in which way the new sport facility in the Rooidakke/Iraq area can be financed.

The research is a qualitative research. In qualitative research, the research question focuses on topics related to the way people give meaning to their social environment and how they behave in this environment (Boeije, 2006). As a starting point for the field research, the stakeholders will be interviewed on the current situation regarding the sport facilities in Grabouw. From there, the stakeholders will be asked about their needs and their view on how the sport facilities should be maintained. Finally, I will also make use of a best practice.

The findings of the desk research in combination with the findings of the field research, will be used to give an advice about creating a sustainable sport facility in the Rooidakke/Iraq area and make clear who should take responsibility and take care of the maintenance of this facility.
1.6 Relevance

This research is highly relevant for the field of sport management. The course SHM has a number of professional tasks, namely Management & Policy, Management & Organization, Business & Commerce, Advice & Consultancy, Inform & Communication and Coaching & Counselling. Among these tasks are a number of competences. This research covers three areas of competence. Firstly, this research falls within the competence area ‘Advising’. Verhees (2010) states that the SHM’er systematically influences clients focused on changes that lead to promote health, performance and/or welfare, without actually being qualified to support the implementation of these processes. As a result of this research, I will advise the Municipality on the creation of new sport facilities in order to give the children and sport teams in Grabouw a safe place to exercise. The motto of the Municipality is ‘a child into sports, is a child out of court’. Sport facilities are therefore necessary to give the children an opportunity to exercise sport.

Secondly, this research falls within the competence area ‘Knowledge’. The SHM’er signals the need for change and develops on the basis of concepts and practical experiences, impulses aimed at renewing and solving problems in the society and in professions. Through interviews and observation, I collect the vision and needs of the different stakeholders. In combination with my literate research I will come to reasoned advice for the Municipality regarding the sport facilities in Grabouw.

The final competence area where this research relates to is ‘Working on quality’. The SHM’er provides a continuous contribution to quality monitoring and development aimed at improving processes. I will advise the Municipality on the maintenance and management of sport facilities in Grabouw.
This research can help the TWK Municipality creating a safe and qualitative good sport facility in the Rooidakke/Iraq area, which can be used as a pilot for creating more sport facilities in the Grabouw community. The other challenge is about the management and maintenance of the sport facilities. The existing sport facilities are in a poor condition throughout a lack of proper maintenance. I will provide the Municipality with an advice about the management of the sport facilities. This research also connects with the IDP from the TWK Municipality. One of the top priorities in sports is creating a mini sport facility in Rooidakke and the Municipality is also busy with a service level agreement that appoints to the maintenance of the sport facilities in Grabouw.

1.7 Reading manual

In order to help the reader of this thesis, I will provide a reading manual. The thesis is divided into seven chapters. This first chapter contains a description of background of the research, the research objective, -questions and -setting. The second chapter - the theoretical framework - contains theories about sustainability and funding. The third chapter explains the research methodology, the data collection methods and in which way the results are going to be analyzed. The fourth chapter indicates the results of the research. The fifth chapter summarizes the most important findings of the research and displays the conclusion of the thesis. The sixth chapter discusses the conclusion of this research and compares the findings of the case study with the presented theories in the theoretical framework. Moreover, the limitations, the practical and theoretical relevance of the research are displayed. At the end of the chapter, advice for further research is given. Finally, the last chapter will summarize the recommendations that arise from the research.
2 Theoretical framework

The problem regarding sports in Grabouw is the lack of safe and sustainable sport facilities. As a result of my research I will advise the TWK Municipality about creating a multi-purpose facility in the Rooidakke/Iraq area. This theoretical framework first discusses what the norms and standards are for safe sport facilities. In addition the critical factors for sustainability will be discussed in the second paragraph. Furthermore, theories about fundraising and sponsoring have been described in the third paragraph. Finally, an analytical framework will summarize the most important theories which will be used in this research.

2.1 Safe sport facilities

The sport facilities struggle with a number of issues that compromise the safety of these facilities. First, the sport facilities are not safe due to the playing surface. These surfaces are not flat and are often filled with rubbish and glass. In addition, the facilities are not safe through crime related activities. The people from the community steal and break down these community resources for their own expenses (M. Abrahams, personal statement, November 17, 2010). The sport facilities are also a gathering place for children and therefore interesting for drug dealers. Finally the sport facilities are not safe from the outside threat of traffic which can harm or even kill children who are playing on the field or spectators who are watching.

‘Sport is healthy’ is a statement that is generally accepted. However, sport can also lead to injuries like cuts or muscle- and articular injuries. The first question is ‘who is liable for the facility’? If a facility is used by outside users, such as the children from Grabouw, the determination of liability lies within the parameter ‘whether the injury was related to the premises or related to the particular activity’ (van der Smissen, 1990). If the cause of the injury was directly related to the facility premises, the facility owner would be liable. In this case, the Municipality would be liable because they are the actual owner of the facility. If, however, the injury was activity related and the owner of the facility has no control over the activity, then the facility owner would not be liable (van der Smissen, 1990).

The Municipality should therefore try to exclude all possible risks that relate to the facility. However, it is difficult to find general standards for sport facilities. International and national sport federations often pay little attention to safety of sport facilities. These standards are often not mentioned in the game rules or –regulations. The Dutch football federation (KNVB) says that the surface of sport facilities should not be slippery, unequal or extremely hard (KNVB, 2009a). A surface which meets this conditions is an artificial turf surface. FIFA (World Football Federation) (2004) states that an artificial turf pitch has several benefits compared to natural grass. Artificial turf pitches can resist difficult climatic conditions, have low maintenance costs, have longer playing hours, and are multi usable. In addition the FIFA (2004) states that have improved playing conditions which mirror the playing conditions of real grass. Ekstrand, Timpka & Hägglund (2006) state that artificial turf is just as safe as natural grass. The incidence of injury during training and match play did not differ between surfaces for the teams in the artificial turf cohort: 2.42 v 2.94 injuries/1000 training hours and 19.60 v 21.48 injuries/1000 match hours for artificial turf and grass respectively. Ekstrand et al (2006) also state that injuries which occur on artificial turf are not worse than injuries occurred on natural grass.

Besides the playing surface, different sport federations pay attention to the goals. The goals must be anchored securely to the ground, so they cannot fall down on players. Portable goals may only be used if they satisfy this requirement (FIFA, 2010b; KNVB, 2009a; SAFA, 2005)

In addition, the KNVB states - in their regulations for futsal (indoor football) – that an obstacle-free space of two meters to the field must be taken into account (KNVB, 2009b). In this way players cannot hurt themselves on obstacles, or the walls and fences around the field. The SRSA states that multi-
Purpose facilities in the community should be fenced and gated to protect users of the field for environmental threats and to prevent vandalism and theft (SRSA, 2009).

Finally, the Department of Sports and Recreation of South Africa (SRSA) states that pitches and courts have to be examined and approved by the governing body and/or local authority inspectors before using or hiring the facility (SRSA, 2009).

As said, facilities should be fenced and gated to protect the field against vandalism and theft (SRSA, 2009). There are different reasons why people engage in vandalism, like rage or frustration, boredom or to state a message. Geason (1989) adds another category to vandalism: acquisitive vandalism. This means that damage is done to acquire money or property.

Damage to property and burglary at non-residential premises are also a big problem in Grabouw. From April 2009 till March 2010, 142 cases of damage to property and 80 cases of burglary at non-residential premises were reported with the local police (see figure 2). While vandalism is a big problem in Grabouw, actions have to be taken to reduce the change on vandalism.

**Figure 2. Crime in Grabouw for April 2009 to March 2010 (relative number)**

Geason (1989) states that prevention of vandalism comes down to fostering a sense of ownership, using the best vandal-proof materials affordable, and maximising natural and formal surveillance of vulnerable sites. Surveillance would also tackle the problem of drugs- and alcohol abuse provided that the guard is responsible.

Another safety risk for the children using the sport facility is traffic. Most of the accidents in South Africa occur with pedestrians (44.8% in 2007/2008) (Road Traffic Management Corporation, 2008). Many of these pedestrians are children (figure 3).

The AA Monitoring Trust (2003) states that nearly two in three road accidents happen when children are walking or playing. In order to keep children safe, adults should set a good example and supervise at dangerous sides.
2.2 Sustainability

Many sport facilities in Grabouw are in a bad condition, throughout a lack of proper maintenance and otherwise through vandalism or crime. These facilities were therefore not sustainable. This section will describe what sustainability and sustainable development are about.

The United Nations (1987) defines sustainable development as a development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Sustainable development seeks to reconcile the socio-economic aspirations of society with the ability of the natural environment and its resources to accommodate those aspirations, to ensure that development is within the carrying capacity of the environment (Department of Environment and Local Government, 2001).

In the use of this concept, Harris (2000) recognized three aspects of sustainable development: economic, environmental and social. An economically sustainable system must be able to produce goods and services on a continuing basis, to maintain manageable levels of government and external debt, and to avoid extreme sectoral imbalances which damage agricultural or industrial production (Harris, 2000). An environmentally sustainable system includes maintenance of biodiversity, atmospheric stability, and other ecosystem functions not ordinarily classified as economic resources (Harris, 2000). Finally, a socially sustainable system must achieve distributional equity, adequate provision of social services including health and education, gender equity, and political accountability and participation (Harris, 2000). Pearce, Barbier and Markandya (2000) also recognize these three aspects and define sustainability as social, environmental and economic development with particular attention on the disposable recourses.

Some critical factors of sustainable community development in development countries are described in the literature. One of the key factors for community development projects are local ownership of the projects and partnerships between organizations. Coalter (2002) states that involvement of community members in projects can reduce possible resentments of the community regarding development projects. Coalter (2002) also added that the participation of the community ensures community ownership of a project which can contribute to the sustainability and success of community...
development programs. Rifkin et al (1988) define community participation as a social process whereby specific groups with shared needs living in a defined geographic area actively pursue identification of their needs, take decisions and establish mechanisms to meet these needs. Community participation will be explained in paragraph 2.2.1 Empowerment and participation, and local ownership will be discussed in paragraph 2.2.2 Ownership. Another critical success factor of realising sustainable community development programs is capacity building. Grindle and Hildebrand (1995) defined capacity building as the strengthening of people and organizations in developing countries. The principle of capacity building will be further explained in paragraph 2.2.3 Capacity building.

Finally, fundraising is mentioned as another critical success factor within sustainable projects in less developed countries. Morse (2004) argues that investing right the first time is a crucial key issue to create successful and sustainable communities. This success factor will be discussed in paragraph 2.3 Funding.

Understanding the conditions under which programs are most likely to continue is required to move from a passive approach of sustainability towards active attempts to modify conditions to maximize the potential for long-term sustainability (Shediac-Rizkallah & Bone, 1998). Shediac-Rizkallah and Bone (1998) present a framework for conceptualizing program sustainability (figure 4).

**Figure 4. Framework for conceptualizing program sustainability**

This framework lists three major groups of factors as potential influences on sustainability, knowing (1) project design and implementation; (2) factors within the organizational setting; (3) and factors in the broader community environment. The first group of factors relates broadly to the resources available to the project, and the implementation activities determining the use of these resources. Factors considered within the organizational setting include organizational and managerial structures and processes, such as the organizational location of the program, its administrative structure as well as political processes within the organization that inhibit or support program continuation. The final group of factors are those in the broader community development. A program does not operate in a vacuum. The relationship of the program with the larger environment must be considered. The political and economic environment, and the depth and range of involvement of target community members will influence program impact and endurance (Shediac-Rizkallah & Bone, 1998).
Naym Daniels (2010), an employee at the Elgin Learning Foundation which gives workshops on community development, developed a cycle for sustainable community development (see figure 5). First, an assessment of sustainable development issues must be made and these issues have to be prioritized. Secondly, a vision and goals must be formulated in order to work on the prioritized issues. When there is consensus about the vision and the goals, plans must be made for the project. The next step in the cycle is to create empowerment and capacity building. After putting the project in practice, the project should be monitored and - where necessary - adopted to a new situation.

**Figure 5. Sustainable community development cycle**

### 2.2.1 Participation and empowerment

Empowerment has become a vital construct for understanding the development of individuals, organizations and communities (Perkins & Zimmerman, 1995).

Freire, one of the founders of the phenomenon empowerment (Wallerstein & Bernstein, 1988), states that they key issue in empowerment is the involvement of the community; discussing with citizens in order to retrieve social knowledge. Since then many definitions have been developed. Rappaport (1984) sees empowerment as a process: the mechanism by which people, organizations, and communities gain mastery over their lives. The WHO (1998) describes empowerment as a process through which people gain greater control over decisions and actions affecting their health. Empowerment is the ability of individuals to gain control socially, politically, economically and psychologically through access to information, knowledge and skills; decision making; and individual self-efficacy, community participation and perceived control (Rappaport, 1987; Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988). Alsop & Heinsohn (2005) see empowerment as a person’s capacity to make effective choices, that is as the capacity to transform choices into desired actions and outcomes. Israel
et al (1994) describe psychological empowerment of individuals as the process through which people gain control over their life and participate in the life of their community. Swift & Levin (1987) define empowerment at the individual level as a process by which individuals gain mastery and control over their lives and a critical understanding of their environment. Finally, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (2002) define empowerment as the expansion of assets and capabilities of poor people to participate in, negotiate with, influence, control, and hold accountable institutions that affect their lives.

What is used in almost every definition, is that local manpower and commitment are crucial for the success of development projects. Local partner organizations are very important, if they are well organized, have a clear structure and are strongly involved in the local community (NCDO, 2006). Most of the literature also associates empowerment with personal control. Rappaport (1987) points out that the aim in empowerment is to enhance the possibilities for people to control their own lives. Empowerment is collective action. It is a collective activity in that a group of people sharing a mutual interest, sentiment or concern, act together and in concert (Swanepoel, 1997). According to Clark (1991), that keyword is collective. Collective action which may lead to small successes, but such minor successes can instil great confidence which leads to ambitions of tackling bigger problems. Empowerment creates self awareness which in turn addresses abstract development needs (Swanepoel, 1997).

Empowerment can be begin to be understand by examine the concepts of power and powerlessness (Moscovitz and Drover, 1981). The Cornell Empowerment Group (1989) define power as the capacity of some persons and organizations to produce, intended, foreseen and unforeseen effects on others. There are many sources of power. The important sources that Galbraith (1983) describes are personality, property/wealth, and influence. At the individual level, powerlessness can be seen as the expectation of the person that his/her action will be ineffective in influencing the outcome of life events (Reiffer, 1984). Lerner (1986) makes a distinction between real and surplus powerlessness. Real powerlessness results from economic inequities and oppressive control exercised by systems and other people. Surplus powerlessness, on the other hand, is the belief that change cannot occur, a belief which results in apathy and an unwillingness of the person to struggle for more control and influence. The World Bank (2002) indicates a couple of factors that motivate communities to support and sustain development projects. The community members want to witness visible changes and they want to contribute throughout community empowerment. Disincentives are an unclear role and expectations and if the needs of the community are not taken in account.

The term empowerment depends on the context of the project, therefore it is a dynamic concept (Jacobs, 2005). Before working with such a complex term, it is important to define empowerment and concretize the concept through two dimensions (Jacobs, 2005); level of empowerment and whether empowerment is seen as a process or a outcome.

In the literature, empowerment is divided in three levels: individual level, organizational level and community level. Empowerment at the individual level is a process by which individuals gain mastery and control over their lives, and a critical understanding of their environment (Zimmerman, Israel, Schulz & Checkoway, 1992). The individual level, often called psychological empowerment (PE), exists out of the trust that people have in their selves and the feeling of competence and control. Furthermore, psychological empowerment is about the way a person is aware of his own goals and the way to accomplish these goals. Finally, individual empowerment consists out of behavioural elements, such as active involvement in the community (Zimmerman, 1995). PE can be conceptualized to include intrapersonal, interactional, and behavioural components (Zimmerman et al, 1992). The intrapersonal component refers to how people think about their capacity to influence social and political systems important to them. The interactional component refers to the transaction between persons and environments that enable one to successfully master social or potential problems. The behavioural components of PE refers to the specific actions one takes to exercise influence on the
social and political environment through participation in community organizations and activities (Paulhus, 1983).

Spreitzer (1995) separates the intrapersonal component of Zimmerman et al (1992) in four dimensions. The first dimension is the sense in which the individual believes in achieving its goals. The second dimension is competence, in which the faith and competence of an individual in their own knowledge and skills to accomplish their tasks is important. The third dimension is autonomy, the sense of causal responsibility of their tasks. The fourth and final dimension is impact. This is the extent in which the individual feels he can influence the outcome of its work. Spreitzer’s approach is a psychological approach to empowerment. Zimmerman et al (1992) focus more on the complete process of empowerment: individuals must trust in their own abilities, which they can use in an organization or in the community. Next to the four dimensions, Spreitzer (1995) appoints four antecedents: focus of control, access to information, belief in their own abilities and reward. Locus of control implies that people feel the need to control their own lives. Spreitzer (1995) states that individuals with an internal locus of control, access to information, belief in itself, and a satisfactory reward will be empowered.

The second level of empowerment appoints to the organization. On this level a conceptual separation is made into an empowered organization and an empowering organization. An empowering organization gives its people an opportunity to develop their skills. These organizations allow their people to empower themselves as an individual. Organizations with shared responsibilities, a participating corporate culture and social activities are more likely empowering organizations than hierarchic organizations (Prestby et al, 1990). But empowerment on organization level goes further than the stimulation of psychological empowerment, it is also important that through organizational effectiveness the corporate objectives are accomplished. Empowered organizations influence the bigger system from which they are part of. Hardiman & Segal (2003) also define organizational empowerment (OE) as individual empowerment derived within organizational contexts. This conceptualization however, fails to incorporate organizational-level constructs that are separate and distinct from individual members. Organizational characteristics should, therefore, been taken in consideration.

The third and last level is empowerment of the community. Community empowerment references to individuals who work together to get more influence and more control over determinants of health and the quality of life in their community (Nutbeam, 1998). Community empowerment is the key to community development. Laverack (2005) defined nine domains of community development knowing: participation, community based organizations, local ownership, mobilisation of sources, critical awareness, identification of problems, development of rational bands (humans and organizations), transfer of power (role of outside agents) and program management. These domains play a part in the development of individuals and groups to organize and mobilize themselves better to make social and political change possible.

Ownership will be discussed further on, while participation will be discussed briefly in this section. In the literature participation is always connected to the actions of communities, groups or individuals related to the development, improvement or change of an existing situation (Moser, 1989; Kellerman, 1988). Coalter (2002) adds that participation of the community ensures community ownership of a project which can contribute to the sustainability and success of community development programs. De Beer (1997) separates two types of participation, knowing participation as cheap labour and involvement. Cheap labour is often used by government agencies. In South Africa this way of participation was used in the construction of housing. It’s a typical example of top down, co-opted involvement of people which left very little room for their own initiative and empowerment. People from the community only submit their own labour within the process of development and nothing more. Turner & Fichter (1972) find that labour forms a minor (and sometimes an incidental) part of what is needed to give the poor power and control over the development process.
In 1989 Munguti did a case study in Kenya about a rural water management program. Munguti (1989) argues the case for participation as a process in which communities not only provide labour but also plan, take decisions and accept responsibility for the maintenance of the project. Turner and Fichter (1972) therefore think this way of participation entails the ability, to enter into reciprocal relationships, to exercise both control over essential life needs and discretion in the trade-offs which establish priorities. This brings us to the second form of participation, knowing involvement. Involvement revolves around making communities or groups realize the benefits of becoming part of a development project or program predetermined by an outside agency.

Empowering poor people, requires the removal of formal and informal institutional barriers that prevent them from taking action to improve their wellbeing – individually or collectively – and limit their choices (The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, 2002). Therefore, four key elements of empowerment must be taken in consideration. The first key element is inclusion and participation. An empowering approach to participation treats poor people as co-producers, with authority and control over decisions and resources devolved to the lowest appropriate private level. Inclusion of poor people and other excluded groups in decision making is critical to ensure that limited public resources build on local knowledge and priorities, and brings about commitment to change. However, in order to sustain inclusion and informed participation, it is unusually necessary to change rules and processes to create space for people to debate issues, participate in and national priority setting and budget formation, and access basic and financial services. Secondly, access to information is crucial; information is power. There should be a two-way information flow between citizens and other government. Informed citizens are better equipped to take advantage of opportunity, access services, exercise their rights, and hold state and non-state actors accountable. Furthermore, accountability is important in empowerment. State officials, public employees, private providers, employers, and politicians must be held to account, making them answerable for their policies and actions that affect the wellbeing of citizens.

The last element of empowerment that should be taken in consideration is local organizational capacity. This refers to the ability of people to work together, organize themselves, and mobilize resources to solve problems of common interest. Organized groups and communities are more likely to have their voices heard and their demands met. Racelis (1986) states that assistance from the outside in terms of skills and organizational training, credit, income, generating schemes, appropriate technology, education and access to basic services is important regarding to this last element.

Although empowerment does provide the field with a useful approach for working in communities, it is not the only approach nor it is a panacea. Efforts to exert control in some contexts may actually create, rather than solve, problems in a person’s life (Zimmerman et al, 1992). Malcolm Abrahams, founder of the OTC in Grabouw, agrees with this statement. He states it is not recommendable to empower a community when they are not capable of doing this. Abrahams states that the poverty in Grabouw comes with social challenges like crime and drugs and alcohol abuse. When empowering people in this situation, the individuals will break down a community resource. Abrahams discusses that projects controlled by the community in Grabouw never worked, and will never work in the future.

### 2.2.2 Ownership

Laverack (2005) defined nine domains of community development. These domains play a part in the development of individuals and groups to organize and mobilize themselves better to make social and political change possible. One of these domains was ownership. The NCDO (2006) states that in many sport development projects, there is no local ownership. Many sport development projects are run by Western institutes, while the experience tells us that this is less effective. Before starting a project, a partnership should be set up with a local organization. Reigh (2006) agrees that activities are unsustainable if they are conceptualized entirely by outsiders and merely implemented locally.
Usually, ownership is considered to have exclusive access to, and control over a property. This property may be intellectual, land or buildings or any kind of other objects. Since ownership also is related to control, there is a psychological aspect in having ownership as well (Vestbø 2003).

Saxeby (2003) states that the term ownership in the development discourse, does not have the conventional meaning given by Vestbø (2003). Instead, it may refer to relations among stakeholders in development, and especially their capacity, power or influence to set and take responsibility for a development agenda. Singh (2002) defines ownership as the acceptance of responsibility through the process of stakeholders participation, empowerment and consensus. Fukuyama (2005) states that the key issue in community-driven development is that people can access their own needs and then take responsibility for implementation of a project that they themselves have designed. Fukuyama (2005) also uses a statement of former US treasury secretary Larry Summers as an good example, “no one ever washes a rented car”.

As the NCDO (2006) stated, local ownership is essential in development projects. Edomwony (2003) agrees with this statement. He states that local actors should be involved in development projects and the process of decision making. The integration of local actors into the project and decision making is crucial for the long-term sustainability. Edomwony (2003) not only states that local actors should be involved in the process of gathering information and strategy development, but they should also have the possibility to decide on the agenda, strategy and financial management. Reigh (2006) agrees and states that local actors should not only have the feeling that they are involved in projects, but that they have control over project management and development of the project. Reigh (2006) suggests that the decision-making process, budgetary allocations and restrictions, and proposals to alter or modify project implementation are key issues in terms of relationships and power.

Reigh (2006) states that local ownership should not be seen as a concrete project objective. But, rather, it could be seen as a shift towards ultimate local ownership of the project and the program in the long-run. To attain this longer-term objective, and to provide a constructive and realistic approach, Reigh (2006) proposes to work on the relationships between insiders and outsiders. Understanding the cultural backgrounds of the relations involved is an important issue in this process.

Ambro (2006) created a model of local ownership. In his research, Ambro discovered that there were certain patterns emerging and certain codes that re-occurred more often than others. The model was based on the preliminary categories he had developed, and contained the following; investments, internal negotiations, exit strategies, fulfilling community needs, respect and property rights (figure 6).

**Figure 6. Emerging model for local development**
The category ‘Investments’ represented the feeling that investments, in the form of materials, labour at a reduced pay, time spent in meetings, giving up common or private land free for a project. Ambro (2006) refers to the fact that people had invested in projects, and that this increased responsibility and belonging. The concept ‘Internal Negotiations’ relates to the processes of having internal negotiations in the village. The third concept which Ambro (2006) discusses is ‘Exit Strategies’. This concept is related to the community stating that they are willing to terminate any cooperation with external organizations if there are disagreements due to lack of respect, project implementation or culture. The concept ‘Fulfilling Community Needs’ relates to the necessity to listen to the communities defining their own needs, and that the needs are important in order for projects to be sustainable and lasting, and that the village is going to maintain it. Without being defined by the community, and without fulfilling needs, the project will not be successful. ‘Respect for Gender, Elders, Village, Religion and Culture’ relates to having respect for these four factors in all aspects of interacting with the communities. The last concept is ‘Property Rights’. In Ambro’s research, the sentiment among the respondents from villages was strong regarding property rights and projects. The traditional property rights, as well as private property rights are strong, and this came out as a strong sense of identification with any type of projects.

As discussed, local ownership can be an important key issue towards sustainable community projects. There are, on the other hand, a few drawbacks to letting locals take the lead. Fukuyama (2005) argue that locals may make bad choices. Locals interested in involvement in projects may not understand the full range of possibilities available to them or may fail to anticipate the consequences of certain rules. Shinoda (2008) agrees and state that even if local people are willing to exercise ownership according to the needs of the community, the lack of political, economic and social capacity in terms of human, institutional, material and financial recourses to execute necessary roles could hinder the process of community development. Reigh (2006) state that this lack of capacity can be solved by including outside This is only possible for someone who is well-placed in the community and knows about the possibilities. For smaller or more informal community initiatives or a network of actors, this is often not possible at all. Given the modest salaries of most civil servants, foreign funded project work is a possibility to supplement their income sources (Anderson & Spelten, 2000). Another critical issue, is that locals often are motivated to create institutions that embed their own particular interests and protect their own power.

### 2.2.1 Capacity building

Another critical factor in sustainable development is capacity building. Capacity building is a broad term which is often used as an objective for development programs. The literature suggests several definitions of capacity building. Jones (2001) states that capacity building focuses on the enhancement of knowledge, skills and abilities of persons and organizations for solving problems, defining and achieving objectives and understanding and dealing with the requirements needed to manage these matters sustainably. Shediac-Rizkallah and Bone (1998) argue that community participation, ownership and capacity building relate to each other. Robertson and Minkler (1994) state that high-level community participation increases capacity on individual and community levels. When putting these definitions together, Grindle and Hildebrand (1995) define capacity building as the strengthening of people and organizations in developing countries.

Elsendoorn, van Kempen, Rijnen and Teeuwen (2006) state that working on capacity building of local organizations and networks of organizations means investing in at least one of the following three levels; (1) Human Resource Development (HRD); (2) Organizational Development (OD); and/or (3) Institutional Development (ID).
HRD concerns the improvement and maintenance of quality of human resources of an organization. This means that people develop knowledge, skills, attitude and motivation and bring these features in practice. OD is the sustainable improvement and strengthening of the internal capacity of an organization to enable the accomplishment of its goals and fulfilling its mission. ID suggests that organizations do not only exist for itself, but have relationships with the wider environment (Elsendoorn et al, 2006). Elsendoorn et al (2006) suggest that capacity building should focus on an overall program which focuses on each one of these levels.

Potter and Brough (2004) argue that capacity building consists out of nine components that can be addressed systematically. To create a practical approach to capacity building, Potter and Brough (2004) defined nine components which can be organized hierarchically (figure 7):

1. Performance capacity: are the tools, money, equipment, consumables, etc. available to do the job?
2. Personal capacity: are the staff sufficiently knowledgeable, skilled and confident to perform properly? Do they need training, experience, or motivation?
3. Workload capacity: are there enough staff with broad enough skills to cope with the workload?
4. Supervisory capacity: are there reporting and monitoring systems in place? Are there clear lines of accountability? Can supervisors physically monitor the staff under them?
5. Facility capacity: are training centres big enough, with the right staff in sufficient numbers?
6. Support service capacity: is the project supported by other organizations?
7. Systems capacity: Do the flows of information, money and managerial decisions function in a timely and effective manner?
8. Structural capacity: Are there decision-making forums where discussion may occur and corporate decisions are made.
9. Role capacity: This applies to individuals, to teams and to structure such as Committees. Have they been given the authority and responsibility to make the decisions essential to effective performance, whether regarding schedules, money, staff appointments, etc?

**Figure 7. Pyramid of effective capacity building**

![Pyramid of effective capacity building](image-url)
Crisp et al (2000) define four approaches in capacity building, knowing; top-down approach; bottom-up approach; partnership approach; and the community approach. The top-down approach focuses on the strategy, structure and planning of the organization. The bottom-up approach focuses on training people within an organization to improve their knowledge and skills, which they can use in the organization or community. The partnership approach focuses on strengthening cooperation with other (partnership) organizations. Finally, the community approach focuses on the local population which join or set up an organization to initiate development projects.

However, there are a few pitfalls which should be taken into account. Elsendoorn et al (2006) state that foreign (Western) organizations often do not have enough insight in the systems and culture of the local community. In addition, the knowledge and skills which these organizations posses can scare off local organizations or individuals which lead to cooperation on an unequal level. Another mistake often made, is only focussing on developing people instead of also paying attention to the organizations itself and their infrastructure.

Finally, Elsendoorn et al (2006) state that there are several elements a partner organization in capacity building should posses. First, the organization should have a clear structure in which mission, vision and strategy are clearly set. The employees of the partner organization must be aware of this structure and it is clear what their tasks are. In addition, the partner organization should pursue a social purpose. An open attitude towards capacity building is essential. Furthermore, the organization may not have a political preference. Finally, there must be sufficient support for the particular organization. The partner organization has to be broadly accepted in the local community.

2.2.4 Motivation

One of the most critical success factors of keeping the existing and new sport facilities in good condition, is proper maintenance on regular basis. One of the main issues regarding community development projects are local ownership of the projects and partnerships between organizations. Coalter (2002) argues that the involvement of community members in projects can reduce possible resentments of the community regarding development projects. Coalter (2002) added that the participation of the community ensures community ownership of a project which can contribute to the sustainability and success of community development programs.

*Figure 8. Hierarchy of needs by Maslow*
Grabouw has a poor community with a high rate of unemployment. There should be enough motivation to take ownership over the sport facilities. It will require a lot of planning and managing and therefore a lot of time. Dr. Abraham Maslow did research about the human needs. Maslow (1954) hypothesized that people are motivated by a hierarchy of needs. The hierarchy he described is displayed in figure 8. The pyramid is divided into five levels, determining the motivation of human beings. Physiological needs like water, food, health, sleep, exercise, etc. form the lowest motivation level. The second level of needs are the safety needs. This level is about physical safety, economic security, freedom from threats, comfort and peace. The third level of the hierarchy is about the social needs like acceptance, group membership, association with a successful team and love and affection. The need for self esteem forms the following level. Achieving important projects, recognition of strength and intelligence and prestige and status are forming the fourth level. In the highest level of the hierarchy of needs, people will have the need for self actualization. They look for challenging projects, opportunities for innovation and creativity and they search for learning at a high level. Each individual needs must be satisfied at the lower levels before they progress to the higher, more complex levels. When low-level needs are satisfied, individuals are no longer motivated by them. As each level of needs is met, individual’s progress to higher-level motivators. Benell and Akyeampong (2007) state that the motivation theory of Maslow can be used in development countries. From their research on teachers motivation in Sub-Saharan Africa and Asia. They concluded that work and motivation from teachers cannot be met as long as basic needs as nutrition and safety are not met. Teachers who live in these circumstances are less motivated to invest in the development of children.

Frederick Herzberg had close links with Maslow and believed in a two-factor theory of motivation. He argued that there were certain factors that a organization could introduce that would directly motivate employees to work harder, these were the ‘Motivators’. However, there were also factors that would de-motivate an employee if not present but would not in themselves actually motivate employees to work harder, these were the ‘Hygiene factors’. Motivators are more concerned with the actual job itself, such as how interesting the work is and how much opportunity it gives for extra responsibility, recognition and promotion. Hygiene factors are factors which surround the job, rather than the job itself. For example a worker will only turn up to work if a organization provide a reasonable level of pay and safe working conditions, but these factors will not make the employee work harder. Herzberg states that some of the methods managers could use to motivate their employees are job enlargement, job enrichment and empowerment. Empowerment has already been discussed in one of the previous paragraphs. Job enlargement is about giving workers a greater variety of tasks to perform which should make the work more interesting. This not means that the tasks are necessarily more challenging. In the concept job enrichment, workers being given a wider range of more complex, interesting and challenging tasks surrounding a complete unit of work. This should give a greater sense of achievement (GCSE Business Studies).

Taylor developed another motivation theory. Taylor puts forward the idea that workers are motivated mainly by pay, in comparison to Herzberg who believed that the type of work and the influence of the employee was more important. Taylor’s theory of Scientific Management argued that workers do not naturally enjoy work and so need close supervision and control. Workers would get paid according to the number of items they produce in a set period. As a result, Taylor believes, that workers are encouraged to work hard and maximise their productivity (GCSE Business Studies).

The theories of Taylor and Herzberg show similarities to the theory of McGregor. Douglas McGregor examined theories on behaviour of individuals. He separates two models, knowing the X- and the Y-theory (Keuning, 2003). First, theory X assumes that human beings do not like to work and avoid work if possible. Because of this attitude, people have to be controlled and threatened in order to get them work. Punishments or remunerations are factors which motivate people to work (Keuning, 2003). On the other hand, theory Y assumes that human beings are willing to work if they are committed to the aims and objectives of an organization. Furthermore, job satisfaction increases commitment and motivation of people. The intrinsic motivation is what drives people to work, punishments and
remunerations are, therefore, not necessary (Keuning, 2003). Theory Y shows similarities with the theory of Herzberg, while theory X has more in common with the theory of Taylor.

Another motivation theory, based on the needs of human beings, is the self-determination theory (SDT) developed by Ryan and Deci (2000). This theory assumes that people’s inherent growth tendencies and innate psychological needs are the basis for their self motivation and personality integration, as well as for the conditions that foster those positive processes. These natural development tendencies do not operate automatically but require ongoing social nutriments and support. Within this theory, three needs are identified which, if satisfied, lead to intrinsic motivation, knowing: competence, relatedness and autonomy. Competence refers to being effective in dealing with his own environment. Relatedness is the need to interact and be connected with others. Autonomy, on the other hand, is the urge to be agent of his own life and act in harmony with our integrated self (Gagne & Deci, 2005). Besides intrinsic motivation, motivation depends on a-motivation and extrinsic motivation. Ryan and Deci (2000) stated that a-motivation means not having the intention to act at all. The term extrinsic motivation refers to doing an activity for the inherent satisfaction of the activity itself.

Because of the limited funding out of the Municipality for maintaining and managing the sport facilities, volunteering could be an important issue. Wilson (2000) defines volunteering as any activity in which time is given freely to benefit another person, group or organization. Fox, Machtmes, Tassin & Hebert (2008) did research on volunteer motivation among youth participating in service-learning projects. Fox et al (2008) state that the number of youth engaged in volunteering projects increases at a rapid rate. Volunteering among older teenagers, ages 16 till 19, has been doubled since 1989. According to motivational theories, volunteering persists depending on the extent to which the experience fulfils relevant motives and needs (Clary et al, 1998). Understanding a volunteers’ reason for volunteering may increase retention by fostering a volunteer role identity (Grube & Piliavin, 2000). The study of Fox et al (2008) found that youth serve out of a motivation to make a difference in the lives of others, reinforcing other volunteer motivation studies that indicate that young people donate their time to organizations and causes because of humanitarian motives. Given the motive of humanistic value, Fox et al (2008) state that youth organizations should promote service as an avenue to make a difference in the lives of others. With indirect service, youth organizations should pay special attention to helping youth recognize the difference they are making as a result of their service-learning project. In order to support successful experiences, it is important that youth development organizations understand what motivates youth to be involved in service-learning experiences. Gillespie and King (1985) found volunteer motives focused on gaining skills, building one’s resume and exploring career options. As educational and community-based organizations engage in service learning, it’s important to build in opportunities for career exploration, job shadowing and building transferable skills.

According to Pearce (1993), volunteers do not have obvious reasons for volunteering. He states that the reasons for volunteers’ work vary significantly from person to person. Clary and Snyder (1999) developed a functional analysis entitled ‘The Voluntary Function Inventory’, which examines the scope of volunteer motivations as it relates to different psychological factors for individuals. Its basic tenets are that people engage in the same volunteer activity but do so to fulfill different motives. The Voluntary Function Inventory identified six factors including; (1) a value factor, by allowing one to express altruistic and humanitarian values; (2) an understanding factor, by offering learning experiences; (3) a social factor, by providing opportunities for social interaction and approval; (4) a career factor - by providing beneficial career leading experiences; (5) a protective factor - by offering escape from negative feelings of self; and (6) an esteem factor - by promoting positive feelings of self. This approach supports that individuals can be persuaded to volunteer through relevant psychological factors. Doherty (2005) identified core- and secondary motives in volunteering. At the top level, volunteers want to help a cause. According to Doherty (2005) this is common for all volunteers. This motive is similar to the values function in Clary and Snyder’s (1999) model. In sport volunteering, Doherty (2005) identified ‘personal needs and interests’ as a primary motive. At the bottom level,
Doherty (2005) described secondary motives. These comprise ‘social’ and ‘personal development’ motives. These show overlap with the social, enhancement, and career functions in Clary and Snyder’s (1999) model.

A research by Finger (1999) about African community based development programs showed that people who get paid perform better than volunteers. Finger (1999) concludes that when workers get paid, programs can be implemented rapidly and service quality can be maintained.

### 2.3 Funding

The creation of a new mini soccer pitch in the Rooidakke area, will take a big financial investment. Especially when the choice falls on an artificial turf pitch. The transformation of the existing Play Park in Rooidakke into a mini soccer pitch is one of the priorities that one of the Ward Committees in Grabouw have listed. A Ward Committee is the appropriate channel through which communities can lodge their complaints and it is obliged to forward such complaints to council in the most effective manner (The DPLG & GTZ South Africa, 2005).

There are twelve Wards within the Theewaterskloof Municipal area. These twelve Wards are broken down into five areas. The bigger towns have more Wards because their problematic is bigger and more complex. Ward 1 is active in Riviersonderend, Greyton and Genadendal have Ward 2. Ward 3, 4 and 7 are active in Caledon. Wards 5 and 6 work in Villiersdorp. Grabouw has the most Wards, knowing Ward 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12. In towns such as Grabouw, Villiersdorp and Caledon where there is more than one Ward Committee within the town, a Town Advisory Forum has been established. The Town Advisory Forum comprises of Ward Councillors, PR Councillors, Ward Committee members and the Town Manager of the respective town (TWK Municipality, 2010). Each of the twelve Ward Committees in the TWK Municipal area get a ZAR 125.000,00 budget from the national government to spend on problems they prioritized from the community.

Ward 12 listed the transformation of the Rooidakke Playing Park into a mini sport facility, as the eighth priority in Grabouw. This is the highest listed priority regarding sports in Grabouw. Ward 12 puts in ZAR 75.000,00 from their ZAR 125.000,00 budget in this project, which falls under the restriction of the Department of Sport & Recreation of the Theewaterskloof Municipality. This budget is listed for the period 2010-2011. This means the budget must be spend before March 2011, otherwise it can’t be spend on the Rooidakke project. The budgets for the IDP are presented in April of each years, this means the spending time for a budget lays between April and March the next year (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010).

The listed budget of ZAR 75.000,00 for the Rooidakke project is probably just enough to level up the place and plant some grass. Installing goals or upgrade the field in any other way is not possible with this small budget (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010). Therefore it is necessary to get money for the project out of sponsoring and/or funding. This paragraph will list some theories behind sponsoring and funding that may help determine the important aspects for collecting money for the project.

#### 2.3.1 Sponsoring

Finally, fundraising is mentioned as another critical success factor within sustainable projects in less developed countries. Verstegen (2009) names two types of raising money, knowing fundraising and sponsoring.
Verstegen (2009) and Westerbeek et al (2003) use the following definition for sponsorship which involves three characteristics: ‘sponsorship is a business agreement, which results in a profit for both parties, where one party (the sponsor), person, institute or event makes financial or financial appreciated activities available for the other party (the sponsored, who in addition helps the sponsor with a precise compensation to accomplish its objectives.

The compensation, as said, is not always about financial support. The sponsor can also make his knowledge or his services available, as well as material or accommodation. In many cases, a non-financial sponsorship creates more commitment from the sponsor because of the personal relation in addition to the business like relation (Verstegen, 2009).

In a sponsorship are always a number of parties involved. These are of course primarily the sponsor and the sponsored. They put their relationship into a sponsorship agreement in which the mutual rights and obligations are described. But there are also other stakeholders involved. In the Handbook sponsorship (Lokerman, 1989) the following relationship diagram is given (figure 9).

**Figure 9: The relation between the different stakeholders and sponsoring.**

![Figure 9](image)

First the government: its role is an facilitating or stimulating, and a supervisory one. Sponsorship is primarily a matter of the ‘field’. The media plays a big role. This is most valid for those types of sponsorship in which the communicative aspects are important. This is particularly the case in sports. Involvement of the media is often a determining factor for success. The intermediaries refer mainly to sponsor- and advisory agencies. Finally the public: this is ultimately perhaps the most important group. Influencing this group is ultimately the objective of the sponsor. It depends on the reaction of that group whether the sponsorship is successful.

When talking about sponsorship, the terms sport sponsoring, art- and culture sponsoring, recreation sponsorship, community sponsoring and television sponsoring are being divided. This study will focus on community- and sport sponsoring. Creating a new sport facility in Roodakke has mainly a social function: ‘a kid into sports is a kid out of court’, as the TWK Municipality states. But, of course, this project is also a form of sport sponsoring: different goals are met by letting children participate in sports. Westerbeek et al (2003) listed the five top industries which are involved in sport sponsoring in the Netherlands (figure 10). Verstegen (2009) says that the citizens of and the companies in the Netherlands, belong to the biggest donators in the world, and in this light there are big opportunities for charity organizations to retrieve funding from this country.
Figure 10. Relative percentage (%) of the top industries which are involved in sponsoring

The community benefit is an important reason for sponsorship in the non-profit sector. Terms like community sponsoring or social sponsoring are, therefore, often used. Sponsorship in the non-profit sector is by the business sector often seen as a strange phenomenon: they often have no desire or dare to ask for a compensation of their (financial) services. Pure sponsoring, in terms of business like, structural-, long-term contracts, with financial performance and described (communicative) compensations are still rare. Most institutions are not ready for company sponsorship. The mentality for corporate sponsorships is still missing, as well the necessary professionalism. Especially on the short term, sponsoring in the non-profit sector is hardly possible.

Westerbeek et al (2003) argue that sport sponsoring is, indeed, possible, unless the expectations of both the sponsor and the sponsored are met. Verstegen (2009) agrees with this statement: ‘there should be a mutual advantage for both the sponsor as the sponsored.’ Westerbeek et al (2003), therefore, listed the goals of both the sponsor as the sponsored (Table 1).

Table 1. Goals of both the sponsor and the sponsored

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals sponsors</th>
<th>Goals sponsored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve or forming an image</td>
<td>Attracting funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business-relation marketing</td>
<td>Attracting resources (goods)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media-relation marketing</td>
<td>Attracting services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee-relation marketing</td>
<td>Increasing awareness (exposure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities-relation marketing</td>
<td>Brand positioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business development</td>
<td>Enhancing credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales promotion</td>
<td>Improve or forming an image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand positioning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing awareness (exposure)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Westerbeek (2003) argue that certain advantages will accomplish certain goals. These advantages can only be given by an entity from outside the own organization. If two entities, both searching for advantages to accomplish their goals, are capable of fulfilling the other entity’s goals, than they can switch advantages and a win-win situation is created.

A win-win situation for both the sponsor as the sponsored is crucial. Westerbeek et al (2003) discuss a couple of trends in the sport sponsorship field. The first trends is the shift of motives (see figure 4) for sponsoring. These are often shifted from an emotional decision to a rational decision. Sponsors are increasingly demanding return on investment: the sponsorship must help achieving the intended business purpose.

An emerging trend is the shift from commercial sponsoring to charity sponsoring. This trend can be seen in the light of ethics and corporate social responsibility. Large companies are increasingly looking for opportunities to show their costumers that they are socially active. The public demands that companies prove that the business is ethical and that they give something back to the communities they receive so much from. A good example of this, is the Football4Hope project in Khayelitsha, Western Cape, South Africa. As a part of the legacy of hosting the FIFA World Cup, the World Football Federation (FIFA) are building 20 Football4Hope centres across Africa, which will provide an opportunity to improve education and health services for young people. The first centre opened in the beginning of 2010 in Khayelitsha, one of the squatter camps in the Cape Town metropolis. This project has an community centre and an artificial turf pitch which charity organizations and schools can use for their programs and activities. FIFA spends 20% of its expenditure (172 Million US Dollars) on developing projects (FIFA, 2010a).

### 2.3.2 Fundraising

The term fundraising focuses on all activities with the purpose to retrieve many, in most cases, smaller donations (Verbeek, 2009). The objective of fundraising is to recruit supporters. The aspects ‘business deal’ and ‘benefit for both parties’ separates sponsorship from donations. In fundraising no compensation is expected. There can be some kind of compensation, but this is seen as a afterthought and is not decisive for the donation. A donation costs the giver something. Another form of fundraising is funding from the government. Of course, funding from the government can only be retrieved under certain conditions, but these conditions cannot be regarded as a compensation.

Fundraising is about asking for money. There are two groups of supporters: the ‘small’ and the ‘big’ givers (Verbeek, 2009). These givers can both be individuals and companies. When approaching a company, it is not always exclusively about sponsorship. Many companies have discovered that a gift in the context of fundraising, if surrounded by enough advertising, can affect the corporate image of the company significantly.

Verbeek (2009) argues that Individuals can enter different motives for donating money to charity. Guilt is the first one, the giver has any regrets and wants to make up for it. The second one is opportunism or self interest: the object which the giver supports can also benefit himself. The third one is sympathy and commitment to the purpose or the organization. Good experiences with the organization or institution can also be a reason for donating money. A giver can also donate money out of a business interest: the giver wants to get something done by the institution. The last motive is the good felling the giver gets throughout a donation.

Companies can have, in addition to the reasons that apply to individuals, more specific business motives, such as brand awareness, improving the corporate image, carrying out a social responsibility, relations management, the hope of retrieving new contracts and an internal motivation of its employees.
Rosso (2003) gives three major keys to determining if a company or individual will give and how much. First of all, the linkage of the potential donor with the organization plays a crucial role. If the individual or company has a linkage, it is important to know if the person or company is able to make the gift the charity is seeking. Finally, the interest plays an important role. What does the person or company know about the charity and are they committed to mission and goals of this charity.

Community sponsorship and social entrepreneurship is rapidly gaining ground in the business world. This development gives the non-profit sector more opportunities (Verbeek, 2009). Nevertheless, Rosso (2003) states that fundraising should never be undertaken simply to raise money; it must serve a larger cause. This lays the foundation for trust and hence a long term partnership.

2.3.3 Steps to Success in Sponsoring and Fundraising


- **Step 1:** Formulating a vision and policy on sponsorship. It is about how the institution wants to deal with sponsorship and fundraising. Choices are made about the type of sponsorship (structural or incidental), the sponsoring objective, how funds are used, which sponsors are aiming at, the compensation, and the management of the sponsoring (part of the regular organization or move it to a separate entity). It is also important to create support within the organization. Employees have to accept and support the vision and the policy.

- **Step 2:** At this stage a decision is made about wherefore you are raising funds, in other words, what are the goals of the sponsoring actions.

- **Step 3:** The list of ideas as a result of the previous step, should be shortened; a selection of targets has to be made. The selection criteria are already given in the first step. The result of this step is a small number of targets, preferable not more than three to four. These targets should be made more concrete.

- **Step 4:** Carry out a feasibility study. This does not guarantee in advance, but it is important to know whether the campaign has a reasonable chance of success. A feasibility study can be conducted through interviews and surveys.

- **Step 5:** Determine the objective and its strategy. After step 4 follows a go or no-go moment. If the campaign seems achievable, then the objectives from step 3 will have to become more detailed. In a no-go situation, you go back to step 2 and adjust the campaign.

- **Step 6:** Determining the nature and structure of the campaign. At this stage one must consider the nature of the campaign: is it going to be a major gifts campaign, or will be chosen for a big number of smaller sponsors? In addition, this step will make the structure clear and appoints persons to perform the various tasks.

- **Step 7:** The actual preparation of the campaign. Communication between all stakeholders should be good. Verstegen (2009) suggest to set up a communication plan. Furthermore, a time plan should be written, the prospects should be identified (sponsors which should be approached) and get to know the prospects so that expectations can be shared. The compensation should also be considered, so a win-win situation takes place for both parties. This will ultimately result in a clear and concrete sponsorship proposal. Finally, volunteers, if necessary, should be recruited, the legal and tax aspects should be kept in consideration and campaign materials should be collected.

- **Step 8:** The start of the campaign. The start of the campaign is a good time to get attention and publicity. Attention must be paid to an eye-catching and creative kick-off in which as many potential sponsors and supporters should be invited.
Step 9: the implementation of the campaign. In advance, there should be paid attention in which way the prospects will be approached. This can be both by writing or personal. In order to see the sponsorship from both angles and make sure the compensation is good for both parties, one must get in the shoes of the sponsor.

Step 10: after sales and evaluation. Sponsorship does not end when the contract is concluded. After sales is very important and is essential to campaigns with a continuous character. Giving the sponsor attention and participation in the project offers a better relationship and lays the basis for further partnership.

In the search for funding, Rosso (2003) states that it is important to prepare yourself properly. First the internal case should be described. The internal case is a database, a compilation of information that will support the preparation of various documents and publications that will explain the organization’s work. First the mission should be described: who are you and why does the organization exist? Then goals and objectives and the programs and services to accomplish these goals and objectives must be described. Furthermore, there must be stated who led the fundraising campaign and which employees or volunteers are involved. Then all financial information about the organization, such as budgets, current financial statements, annual reports, expected income reports, etc. should be described. Also a statement should be made what is needed to run the programs of the organization in the future. The internal case ends up with a evaluation method and information from the past so the organization can learn from and remember these things.

After the internal case is described, the external case should be described. The external case tells the story to your constituency. A primary purpose for giving, as said before in this framework, is the strong believe in the organization and its mission, goals and accomplishments. The external case is therefore the expression of the case in a brochure, speech, letter, annual report or presentation. First of all the charity organization should identify and validate the needs, focussing on human and societal needs that reflect to the organization’s mission. These needs should also be supported by other institutes such as the government, the society, planning agencies, etc. Then programs and strategies should be indentified to address these needs. Then the competence of the organization and staff should be discussed; how are they trained and what experience do they have? Then the recourses that are needed to fund the programs should be identified. Finally the external case must describe why the prospects should give, how they can give and what is in it for the donor.

2.4 Analatic framework

In this section I will summarize the terms out of the theoretical framework which are important for this research, and operationalize them. This theoretical framework discussed norms and standards for safe sport facilities, and theories about sustainability and funding.

The sport facilities struggle with a number of issues that compromise the safety of these facilities. First, the sport facilities are not safe due to the playing surface. These surfaces are not flat and are often filled with rubbish and glass. The KNVB (2009a), FIFA (2010b) and SAFA (2005) state that sport facilities are safe when the surface is not slippery, unequal and extremely hard; the goals are anchored; there is free space of two meters around the field. An artificial turf pitch meets this requirements. Research from Ekstrand et al (2006) shows that artificial turf is just as safe as natural grass. The incidence of injury during training and match play did not differ between surfaces for the teams in the artificial turf. The SRSA (2009) adds that the facility should be fenced and gated and that the facility is inspected by the (local) government and authority inspectors. In addition, the facilities are not safe through crime related activities, such as vandalism and exposure for kids to drugs and alcohol. These issues can be solved by fostering a sense of ownership, using vandal-proof materials, and maximising natural and formal surveillance at vulnerable sites (Geason, 1989). Finally the sport
facilities are not safe from the outside threat of traffic which can harm or even kill children who are playing on the field or spectators who are watching.

In order to make the sport facilities in Grabouw sustainable, some critical success factors should be taken into consideration. Participation and empowerment, local ownership and partnerships (Coalter, 2002), capacity building, and fundraising (Morse, 2004) are essential for long-term sustainability. In addition, Laverack (2005) recognize nine domains of community development: participation, community based organizations, local ownership, mobilisation of sources, critical awareness, identification of problems, development of rational bands (humans and organizations), transfer of power (role of outside agents) and program management. These domains play a part in the development of individuals and groups to organize and mobilize themselves better to make social and political change possible.

Empowerment is the process through which people gain control over their life and participate in the life of the community (Israel et al, 1994). Empowerment can take place on individual level, organizational level and community level. Empowerment on individual level – in this research – relates to make people responsible for the maintenance of sport facilities. Empowering the community is important to make them responsible for the state and safety of the sport facility. Empowerment and participation in development projects requires the removal of formal and informal institutional barriers that prevent people from taking action to improve their wellbeing (The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, 2002); access to information; and making policymakers accountable for their actions and policies.

Participation is thus essential for sustainability. In fact, the integration of local actors into the project and decision making is crucial for long-term sustainability. Ambro (2006) states that projects which are not defined by the community, and do not meet their needs, will be unsuccessful. Reigh (2006) agrees and state that projects are unsustainable when they are conceptualized entirely by outsiders. Local ownership is essential for sustainable development. However, Fukuyama (2005) argues that locals may make bad choices through a lack of political-, social-, and economic capacity. Shinoda (2009) adds that even if locals are willing to exercise ownership, the lack of potential, economic and social capacity, in terms of human, institutional, material and financial resources can hinder the process of community development. Reigh (2006) states that this lack of capacity can be solved by including outside organizations.

Another way to circumvent the lack of capacity is capacity building. Shedian-Rizkallah and Bone (1998) argue that community participation, ownership and capacity building relate to each other. Capacity building focuses on the enhancement of knowledge, skills and abilities of persons and organizations in development projects. For success in capacity building, investment on three levels is necessary: (1) Human Resource Development (HRD); (2) Organizational Development (OD); and/or (3) Institutional Development (ID) (Elsendoorn et al, 2006). In Grabouw a bottom-up approach - where people within an organization receive training to improve their skills and knowledge - in combination with a partnership approach should be helpful. The partnership approach focuses on strengthening cooperation with other (partnership) organizations (Crisp et al, 2000). Elsendoorn et al (2006) state that there are several elements a partner organization in capacity building should posses. First, the organization should have a clear structure. In addition, the partner organization should pursue a social purpose. An open attitude towards capacity building is essential. Furthermore, the organization may not have a political preference. Finally, there must be sufficient support for the particular organization. The partner organization has to be broadly accepted in the local community.
Adding locals to the project requires insight in the motivation of community members to participate on development projects. Maslow (1954) states that people are motivated by a hierarchy of needs. Maslow distinguishes the following levels: physiological-, safety-, social-, esteem needs, and self-actualization. Each individual needs must be satisfied at the lower levels before they progress to the higher, more complex levels. Grabouw is a poor community. Because Grabouw has a poor population, one will take into account that the needs on the lower levels should be met first, in order to involve locals into the sport facilities project. Research on African community based development programs shows that people who get paid perform better than volunteers (Finger, 1999). This relates closely to the theory of Taylor and the X-theory of McGregor.

The last critical factor for sustainability is funding. Funding is necessary for creating and maintaining the facility, as well as for paying locals. The Ward Committee in Rooidakke reserved R75,000.00 for creating a sport facility in Rooidakke. This is hardly enough to create a grass pitch (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010). Therefore more money can be raised out of sponsoring and fundraising. Sponsoring is about creating a win-win situation, while fundraising is receiving money without anything in return. An emerging trend is the shift from commercial to charity sponsoring. The top industries in sponsoring and fundraising are internet/ICT, automotive, consultancy/advice and financial services (Verstegen, 2009; Westerbeek et al, 2003).
3 Methodology

This chapter describes the research strategy, the method for data collection and the validity and reliability of the research. Finally, figure 9 gives a summary of the research method.

3.1 Research strategy

I chose for a qualitative research strategy. In qualitative research, the researcher studies things in their natural setting, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). Qualitative research gives insight in the perspective of the research population, because it studies them in their everyday environment. Qualitative research is an open research in which the research deploys himself as an research instrument (Boeije, 2006).

I chose for the qualitative research strategy because the research situation is complex and variable, which requires a open method and the study focuses on actually change the behaviour of the research population (Boeije, 2006). Verschuren and Doorewaard (2007) state that qualitative research has a narrow domain, existing from a small number of research units. This research has a relatively small group of research objects, knowing the TWK Municipality, the Ward Committees, and the VOH. Secondly this research has a labour-intensive approach because interviews are used to collect information. This is more labour intensive than for example the use of questionnaires or retrieving information from data or statistics. Furthermore the research is more deepening than broadening. Therefore a selection has been made in the research population. In a survey (quantitative research), random participants are being asked. Furthermore this research has a holistic approach, this means a qualitative and non-structured, open way of collecting data. Examples of this approach are interviews, (participative) observation and interpretation of textual and audiovisual material.

3.2 Data collection

I chose two ways of collecting data to answer the main question of this research: observation of a best practice and half-structured interviews.

3.2.1 Interviews

An interview is a conversation in which one person - the interviewer - asks questions about behaviour, beliefs, attitudes, and experiences regarding certain social phenomena, to one or more others - the participants - who will mainly focus on giving answers to these questions (Boeije, 2006). Interviews can be classified into three types; (1) structured or standardized; (2) half-structured; and (3) non-structured. The main criterion to distinguish an interview into one of these three types, is the degree of structure beforehand. The more pre-structuring the interview, the more the interviewer determines the direction of the interview. Structure relates to the content, wording and the order in which the questions are asked, and the answer choice. I will use a half-structured interview which is structured by an topic list (Table 2). This is a checklist with the topics that have to be discussed. The topic list is based on the research question and the analytic framework (2.4 Analytic framework). The order of topics, types of questions and answers are not pre-determined. For this research it is important to find out what is the desired situation regarding the sport facilities in Grabouw. It is important that the respondent can talk openly about what he or she thinks is ‘going on’ and how they feel about this. The interviewer decides during the interview what kind of questions he will ask, depending on the progression of the interview. These questions are open, so the respondent can answer in any way he or she likes. They should not feel pushed into a certain direction (Verschuren & Doorewaard, 2007).
### Table 2. Topic list interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>◆ Current situation/safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆ Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆ Participation and empowerment of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆ Willingness to take ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆ Readiness to take ownership (capacity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆ Options for funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆ Desired situation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stakeholders that have been identified in the sport facilities project are Town Manager Anton Liebenberg, Sports and Recreation Administrator of the TWK Municipality Edwin Marthinus, and Tim Walker and Daz Muir from the Village of Hope. The Ward Committees - as a representative of the community - will also be interviewed.

To give an answer to the question which steps are necessary to make sport facilities in Grabouw sustainable, expert interviews will be held. Malcolm Abrahams - founder of the OTC (a NGO in Grabouw) - and Ulanda Christians - social development coordinator of ELF (a NGO in Grabouw) - have been identified as experts on sustainable development. They will be asked to give their view on the situation regarding sport facilities in Grabouw.

**3.2.2 Observation**

The second method of data collection is observing a best practice which can be copied to the situation in Grabouw. Bertrams (1999) states that a best practice should give an accurate description of the process, the reasons for the success of the project, and the methods which were used to tackle the problem(s). I will observe two NGO’s in Khayelitsha: Grassroot Soccer and Amandla Edufootball. Both organizations manage an artificial turf pitch in the squatter camps of Cape Town. These pitches meet the norms and standards of the KNVB, FIFA and SAFA. Both organizations use a successful management model for their pitches. My contact for Grassroot Soccer is senior program director James Donalds, while founder of Amandla Edufootball Florian Zech is my contact in the other organization (Appendix I).

During the observation I will focus on which way both organizations take care of the maintenance of their sport facilities, how they create support within their local communities, and how the facilities are funded. Besides half-structured interviews with my two contacts within the two organizations, I will make notes.

**3.2.3. Analysis of results**

Analysis of the results concerns the splitting of the data on a particular topic into categories, naming these categories, and the application and testing of relationships between these categories regarding the problem statement (Boeije, 2006). To analyse the outcomes of my research, I will encode the answers of the interviews and the notes of my observation. The coding will be done in three steps.
The first step is open coding. Boeije (2006) describes open coding as the process of breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualizing and categorizing data. Boeije (2006) describes different steps in open coding: close reading, asking questions, compare fragments, and coding of fragments. The result of the first step is a list with codes.

The second step is axial coding. Axial coding refers to a set of procedures whereby data are put back together in new ways after open coding, by making connections between categories (Boeije, 2006). Boeije (2006) describes the following activities for this step: make an inventory and compare fragments by each code, categorizing the different codes, and interpretation of new categories.

The third step of coding is selective coding, which means selecting the core category, systematically relating it to other categories, and filling in categories that need further refinement and development (Boeije, 2006). Steps in selective coding are: defining concepts, defining the relationship between concepts, interpretation of the outcomes with the literature, and answering the research (sub) questions (Boeije, 2006).

3.3 Validity and reliability

Reliability refers to influence of perceptions through random and unsystematic errors. Usually, reliability is closely linked to the precision of the data collection methods. When repeating the study, the same outcomes must emerge (Boeije, 2006). Increasing the reliability is possible throughout standardization of the methods used for data collection. Baarda, de Goede and Teunissen (2005) state that this is not possible in qualitative research. Furthermore, a large research population is desirable, so the results of the study to a lesser extent, depend on individuals. I tackled this problem by interviewing different stakeholders within an organization. Within the TWK Municipality I interviewed the Town Manager of Grabouw and the Sports & Recreation administrator, and within the Village of Hope I interviewed Tim Walker and Daz Muir. To check if the results of the interviews with the stakeholders were valid for Grabouw, I interviewed two experts on sustainable development. Because the researcher is also the research instrument in qualitative research, the skills of the researcher have a major impact on the reliability of the study.

Validity refers to the influence on the study through systematic errors. When the researcher measures whether states what he actually wants to measure of explain, this is understood as validity (Boeije, 2006). Treats to validity are: unwillingness of a (part of) the research population to cooperate, wrong research method which does not reflect what you want to measure, and a misinterpretation of the results by the researcher. To circumvent these problems, the researcher has to be involved in the research population and understand its dynamics (Baarda et al, 2005). In my research I have close contact with all the stakeholders and I discuss my findings with them. Furthermore, the researcher can demonstrate the validity of his research by providing a accurate description of the research method.
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4 Results

The fourth chapter of this thesis describes the results of the research. The sub research questions that are formulated in the Introduction section will be answered with the results from the interviews and observation of the best practices in Khayelitsha. Appendix V displays the connection between the codes and the research questions.

4.1 What are the needs of the stakeholders regarding the sport facilities in Grabouw?

The stakeholders which have been identified in this research are the TWK Municipality, the community, and the Village of Hope. From the Municipality, Town Manager Anton Liebenberg and Sports and Recreation Administrator Edwin Marthinus were interviewed. The Ward Committees 8, 11 and 12 were the representatives for the Grabouw community and Tim Walker and Daz Muir from the VOH were interviewed.

First of all, the stakeholders agree that the situation regarding the sport facilities in Grabouw is not up to standards, some even call it shocking. Pineview Park should is seen as the only decent sport facility in Grabouw (D. Muir, personal statement, December 7, 2010). This facility, however is overused. Eleven soccer teams and a handful of rugby teams play their league games on this field. Besides Pineview Park there are simply not enough good and safe sport facilities where children can plan on (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010; E. Marthinus, personal statement, December 6, 2010; D. Muir, personal statement, December 7, 2010). There is also a big imbalance in the Grabouw community. The black community have far more worse sport grounds than the coloured and the white community. For example, Groenberg High school has a big decent sport ground where they can practice on while the Xhosa school has only one tiny netball court in the middle of the classrooms (T. Walker, personal statement, December 2, 2010). The existing places get vandalized by the local community and are also filled with rubbish and glass (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010). In addition, the existing sport facilities are dangerous throughout the presence of cars nearby the sport facilities (T. Walker, personal statement, December 2, 2010). The objective of the SFA project and the Municipality - making sports available for everyone - fails in this case.

The lack of proper maintenance is seen as one of the main reasons for the poor standard of the sport facilities in Grabouw. As the actual owner of the sport facilities, the TWK Municipality provides the maintenance for the current sport facilities. However, at some venues the Municipality decided to stop maintaining the sport grounds because of the ongoing vandalism and theft. In addition, maintaining the sport facilities is too expensive for the Municipality. The Municipality does not have the funding nor the manpower to do this, mainly because they do not recognize the maintenance of the sport facilities as a key function of the Municipality (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010; E. Marthinus, personal statement, December 6, 2010).

In order to provide sports on a local level in Grabouw, safe and sustainable sport facilities are necessary according to the Municipality. After a visit to an artificial turf pitch with a community centre in Khayelitsha, both the TWK Municipality and the VOH became enthusiastic about creating an artificial turf pitch. They see the creation of such a field in Grabouw as a solution for the current safety problems. In addition, the maintenance of artificial turf pitches is cheaper than maintenance of the current (grass) fields. However, the Municipality still feels that maintaining the sport facilities is not a key function of the Municipality. The TWK Municipality feels that the sports forums should take responsibility for maintaining the sport facilities (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010; E. Marthinus, personal statement, December 6, 2010). Since the sports forum has been established in 2004, the sports forum never operated well (D. Muir, personal statement, December 7, 2010; M. Abrahams, personal statement, November 17, 2010). The meetings were not visited well,
most people did not show up (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010). The second reason for the dysfunction of the sports forum is that there are a lot of internal politics involved. Everybody only cares for their own sport instead of working together to lift sport in Grabouw to a higher level (M. Abrahams, personal statement, November 17, 2010). Considering this, the TWK Municipality still feels that the sports forum should take ownership and take responsibility for the maintenance and the management of the sport facilities (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010; E. Marthinus, personal statement, December 6, 2010). However, the Town Manager of Grabouw states that in the absence of a functioning sports forum, the community should take ownership, supported by the Municipality and a NGO. As an objective for this project, the Municipality likes to see an artificial turf pitch created in the Rooidakke/Iraq area in the next five years (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010).

The VOH is a important stakeholder, because of their sports outreach program in the community. The VOH insists that safe and sustainable sport facilities should be created in order to make their sports activities sustainable (T. Walker, personal statement, December 2, 2010). In order to realize a sustainable sport facility, the VOH sees the importance of community ownership. As long as people do not consider the sport facilities as their own, they will break down the facility for their own expense (D. Muir, personal statement, December 7, 2010). The VOH states that a multi-purpose centre - like the Soccer4Hope centre in Khayelitsha - with a community centre and an artificial turf pitch in the Rooidakke/Iraq area would be fantastic (T. Walker, personal statement, December 2, 2010; D. Muir, personal statement, December 7, 2010). In addition, the VOH likes to see more of these centres build within the Grabouw community (D. Muir, personal statement, December 7, 2010). The centre in Rooidakke/Iraq should be a pilot for others in the future. Finally, the VOH likes to use the artificial turf pitch as a highlight practice ground for their sports outreach program (T. Walker, personal statement, December 2, 2010; D. Muir, personal statement, December 7, 2010).

The last important stakeholder is the Grabouw community. The TWK Municipality and the VOH like to see the community taking ownership, However, the community of Grabouw has other priorities. First, people have to be met in their basic needs like clothing, food/water and a house (E. Marthinus, personal statement, December 6, 2010). The Municipality states that if you pay the locals they automatically become more responsible for the pitch. If there is no money available, a plan has to be made to meet the locals in their basic needs (E. Marthinus, personal statement, December 6, 2010). The Ward Committees - which represent the community - are enthusiastic on creating new sport facilities in Grabouw and they are willing to take responsibility (Ward 8, personal statement, January 6, 2011; Ward 11, personal statement, January 6, 2011; Ward 12, personal statement, January 6, 2011). Malcolm Abrahams of the OTC in Grabouw is not convinced that the community can take ownership. He states that the mental emotional make-up of the community is wrong. The culture of the community doesn’t allow sustainability. In addition, Mr. Abrahams states that Apartheid is still visible in sports. The white, black and coloured people are all fighting about who should get the best recourses. Therefore, Mr. Abrahams concludes that nor the community nor the sports forum is ready to take ownership. The community should not be involved in the project at all. Mr. Abrahams states that consulting with a community is not possible, at least not in Grabouw. Grabouw is a poor city. With poverty come social challenges. The people will steal and break down a community recourse to use it for their own expenses (M. Abrahams, personal statement, November 17, 2010).

The Town Manager suggests that establishing a working group to discuss a management and maintenance strategy is the right way to continue the sports facilities project. Involving passionate people from the community is therefore important (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010).
4.2 What are the standards for a safe sport facility?

As said, both the VOH and the TWK Municipality are enthusiastic about creating an artificial turf pitch in the Roodakkie/Iraq area. Many of the existing playing areas in the community are filled with glass and rubbish or are dangerous throughout cars. The stakeholders state that it would be fantastic for every area within the Grabouw community to have their own space without glass and rubbish where children can play safely (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010; E. Marthinus, personal statement, December 6, 2010; T. Walker, personal statement, December 2, 2010; D. Muir, personal statement, December 7, 2010). In addition, the existing sport facilities are struggling with vandalism and theft. People steal and break down community resources for their own expenses (M. Abrahams, personal statement, November 17, 2010). Some use materials to build a home, while others steal and sell material to buy Tic (a cheap drug).

As a result of the observation of two best practices in Khayelitsha a number of conditions for a safe sport facility emerged. First, the surface of the facility has to be flat and free from rubbish. An uneven surface can lead to muscle- or articular injuries, while rubbish such as glass can lead to dangerous cuts and wounds. Secondly, both best practices were far away from roads and fenced. This reduces the danger from cars, because children are not directly exposed to traffic. Many accidents occur when little children kick the ball out of the field and want to get it, while they do not pay attention to the upcoming traffic. Furthermore the location of sport facility is important. Both sport facilities in Khayelitsha were built in the middle of the community, in contrast to Grabouw where most fields are located on the edge of the community. In addition, the windows of the surrounding houses at the FIFA Football4Hope pitch are directed towards the field, so the residents can keep an eye on the playing children. The field has also two community members who guard the place at night, they do this on a voluntary basis. At daytime there are always people at the field to supervise (J. Donalds, personal statement, November 24, 2010). Therefore, crime related issues like vandalism and drug abuse are less likely to occur.

4.3 Which steps are necessary to make the sport facilities in Grabouw sustainable?

The first step towards sustainable sport facilities is to create support. Both James Donalds as Florian Zech state that community participation from the start is essential for sustainability on the long term. Amandla EduFootball discussed their ideas for creating an artificial turf pitch in Khayelitsha with the Ward Committees, but also with the lower layer of the community (J. Donalds, personal statement, November 24, 2010; F. Zech, personal statement, November 9, 2010). Florian Zech thinks this is the reason why the pitch still is in a good shape. The CTC10 pitch does not have to deal with vandalism or theft (F. Zech, personal statement, November 9, 2010). James Donalds agrees and states that recruiting young people was the key to get the buy-in from the community. Grassroot Soccer identifies young people from the community - not necessary soccer players - and learn them about AIDS and social skills in order to teach the children. As long as they are passionate. James Donalds thinks, that involving young role models is the best way to run these programs and the sport facility. Children from the community look up to these youngsters and therefore respect the field. The community in general is proud of the field and the young role models who are taking care of it (J. Donalds, personal statement, November 24, 2010). Florian Zech agrees and adds that making the community understand the advantages of such a field is crucial to get the buy-in from the locals (F. Zech, personal statement, November 9, 2010). In Grabouw there is no clear communication between the Municipality and the community about the sport facilities, which results in the lack of proper maintenance (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010; E. Marthinus, personal statement, December 6, 2010).
In the CTC10 project Amandla EduFootball created a sense of local ownership by making the community aware of the advantages and purpose of the pitch. An artificial turf pitch has several advantages over a normal grass field (F. Zech, personal statement, November 9, 2010). First, there is a constant quality and the maintenance costs are low. Secondly, the children are from the street and they can play in a controlled way, where they learn about life skills and HIV. In the long term, children will get more responsible and are less likely to go into crime related activities. Playing on an artificial turf pitch gets children excited and something to look forward to. Therefore, there is a bigger outreach for after school activities (J. Donalds, personal statement, November 24, 2010; F. Zech, personal statement, November 9, 2010). According to Grassroot Soccer and Amandla EduFootball, making the community realize the benefits of an artificial turf pitch will prevent vandalism and theft (J. Donalds, personal statement, November 24, 2010; F. Zech, personal statement, November 9, 2010). The TWK Municipality states that it wants to bridge the gap between the Municipality and the community (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010).

The stakeholders agree that the key to sustainability is local ownership (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010; E. Marthinus, personal statement, December 6, 2010; T. Walker, personal statement, December 2, 2010; D. Muir, personal statement, December 7, 2010). The best practices in Khayelitsha support this statement. Florian Zech states that the fact the facility is ran by locals, creates more respect for the pitch. The parents and friends of the leaders are proud and happy that these youngsters get the opportunity to earn money and mean something for the community (F. Zech, personal statement, November 9, 2010). James Donalds adds that the community must consider the field as their own. The Soccer4Hope centre is in the middle of the community which allow people to keep a close eye on the pitch (J. Donalds, personal statement, November 24, 2010). Ulanda Christians from ELF states that involving community members in the sport facilities project is crucial. Ulanda states that local ownership is a key issue for long term sustainability. Making locals part of the project is important, so they have the feeling they own the facility (U. Christians, personal statement, November 29, 2010). Malcolm Abrahams is less optimistic. He states that the Grabouw community is not able to take control over the sport facilities. He states involving a NGO is a good idea, under the condition that the organization is well established and broadly accepted by the local community (M. Abrahams, personal statement, November 17, 2010). Grassroot Soccer and Amandla EduFootball are good examples of NGOs that are accepted by the local community.

When giving control to locals, the Municipality has ensure that these locals posses knowledge and skills which are necessary to maintain and manage the sport facility. The Ward Committees of Grabouw state that the community is willing to take ownership (Ward 8, personal statement, January 6, 2011; Ward 11, personal statement, January 6, 2011; Ward 12, personal statement, January 6, 2011). However, there is a lack of knowledge to manage the facilities, especially in the less development Roodadke/Iraq area. The locals do not know what has to be done in terms of sustainability. Therefore, investing in local community members is therefore crucial. Guidance and training of local managers by a local NGO can be successful (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010; T. Walker, personal statement, December 2, 2010). The best practices in Khayelitsha also invested in capacity building. Besides the payment, the locals receive extra opportunities from Grassroot Soccer and Amandla EduFootball (J. Donalds, personal statement, November 24, 2010; F. Zech, personal statement, November 9, 2010). These organizations helped their young role models with school, job appliances, drivers licences, etc. These youngsters have a voluntary contract, which describes their rights and obligations.
4.4 In which way can new sport facilities be funded?

To give an answer to the question in which way new sport facilities can be funded, an accurate estimation of the price for creating and maintain an artificial turf pitch has to be made. Throughout the FIFA I made contact with Synsport, a supplier of artificial turf, which provided me with a detailed price list for the installation of a artificial turf pitch of 800 square metres. The total price of ZAR 703,691,22 includes the supply and installation of 800m2 dynamic soccer base with drainage system, the supply and installation of 800m2 FT40 synthetic grass soccer pitch, and the supply and installation of 2x20x4m angled catch nets and 2x40x3m side nets (see Appendix VI).

In interviews with Mr. Donalds from Grassroot Soccer and Mr. Zech from Amandla EduFootball, it became clear what the operational costs look like for an artificial turf pitch. Grassroot Soccer employs a couple of coaches which manage the pitch. These coaches are youngsters from the local community. They get paid ZAR 50,00 for halve a day, and ZAR 80,00 for a whole day work (J. Donalds, personal statement, November 24, 2010). Amandla EduFootball employs a local community member to clean the pitch each day. He get paid ZAR 2,000,00 a month. Amandla EduFootball also has a contract with an organization responsible for the maintenance of the CTC10 pitch once a month. The costs for this maintenance are ZAR 2,000,00 a month. Mr. Zech from Amandla EduFootball states that the creation of an artificial turf pitch is a huge investment, but in the long term the investment will pay off because of reduced maintenance costs and the constant good quality of the field (F. Zech, personal statement, November 9, 2010).

The TWK Municipality does not have enough funds to create new sport facilities. Creating and maintaining is not a key function of the TWK Municipality. The Municipality states that other issues deserve priority, housing for example. External sponsorships, like funding from NGOs or companies abroad, would therefore the ideal situation (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010; E. Marthinus, personal statement, December 6, 2010). However, the Municipality will be strongly involved in the sport facilities project and is willing to assist in any way possible (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010).

In a discussion with Tim Walker it became clear that the Village of Hope also does not have enough funding for this project. However, the Village of Hope is prepared to lead the search for funding for this sport facilities project. Tim Walker states that it is therefore important that the Village of Hope has the support of the Municipality and they are sure the project is working. Tim Walker wants to see that the community is ready to take ownership and take care of the management of the pitch. Tim Walker suggests that the Village of Hope uses the network of their volunteers. Every two weeks or each month new volunteers are coming in at the Village of Hope. Some of the volunteers work for or know a high representative of a big company which is willing to spend money on development projects (T. Walker, personal statement, December 2, 2010).

Malcolm Abrahams proposes another solution. He thinks the sport facilities in Grabouw should be privatized. Mr. Abrahams thinks companies are very interested in taking over sport facilities. These companies can hire the facility to the community and other companies in the Grabouw area (M. Abrahams, personal statement, November 17, 2010). Grassroot Soccer also hires the community centre and the artificial turf pitch to companies in Cape Town (J. Donalds, personal statement, November 24, 2010). Sport facilities can therefore be profitable themselves.
5 Conclusion

In the previous chapter the results of the case study have been presented. This chapter will give an answer to the main research question: *How can safe and sustainable sport facilities be created in Grabouw?* The findings of the case study will be compared with the results of the desk research. Before answering the main research question, first the sub questions will be answered.

5.1 What are the needs of the stakeholders regarding the sport facilities in Grabouw?

The stakeholders in this research are the TWK Municipality, the community and the Village of Hope. Town Manager Anton Liebenberg and Sports and Recreation Administrator Edwin Marthinus from the Municipality, Tim Walker and Daz Muir from the VOH, and the Ward Committees 8, 11 and 12 were selected as representatives for the respective stakeholders.

The stakeholders agree that the current sport facilities are not safe. The sport fields get vandalized by the local community, are used as rubbish dumps (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010), and are dangerous throughout traffic (T. Walker, personal statement, December 2, 2010).

The existing facilities are also not sustainable throughout a lack of proper maintenance. The TWK Municipality does not have the manpower nor the financial capacity to take care of the sport facilities. In addition, there is miscommunication between the Municipality and the community about who should take care for the maintenance (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010; E. Marthinus, personal statement, December 6, 2010). The Municipality states that the sports forum should take responsibility and take care for the maintenance. However, the sports forum does not work properly because of internal politics and a low attendance at meetings. In this case, the community should take ownership. The Ward Committees state that the Grabouw community is ready to take ownership (Ward 8, personal statement, January 6, 2011; Ward 11, personal statement, January 6, 2011; Ward 12, personal statement, January 6, 2011). However, interaction from the community in development projects is difficult throughout motivational problems. Maslow (1954) hypothesized that people are motivated by a hierarchy of needs. Maslow (1954) states that people have to be satisfied in their basic needs like safety and water and food, before they are willing to commit to community development. Finger (1999) states that paying people in development countries leads to more commitment to development projects.

After a visit to Khayelitsha, both the TWK Municipality and the VOH became enthusiastic about creating an artificial turf pitch in the Rooidakke/Iraq area in Grabouw. The ideal situation would be if the community takes ownership (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010; E. Marthinus, personal statement, December 6, 2010; T. Walker, personal statement, December 2, 2010; D. Muir, personal statement, December 7, 2010), where necessary under the guidance of a NGO, and enough funding to create and maintain the sport facilities in Grabouw.

5.2 What are the standards for a safe sport facility?

The sport facilities struggle with a number of issues that compromise the safety of these facilities. Many of the existing playing areas in the community are filled with glass and rubbish or are dangerous throughout cars. The stakeholders state that it would be fantastic for every area within the Grabouw community to have their own space without glass and rubbish where children can play safely (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010; E. Marthinus, personal statement, December 6, 2010; T. Walker, personal statement, December 2, 2010; D. Muir, personal statement, December 7, 2010). First, the sport facilities are not safe due to the playing surface. These surfaces are not flat and
are often filled with rubbish and glass. The risk of incurring muscle and articular injuries as well as cuts, is high. However, sport can also lead to injuries like cuts or muscle- and articular injuries. The first question is ‘who is liable for the facility?’ If a facility is used by outside users, such as the children from Grabouw, the determination of liability lies within the parameter ‘whether the injury was related to the premises or related to the particular activity’ (van der Smissen, 1990). If the cause of the injury was directly related to the facility premises, the facility owner would be liable. In this case, the Municipality would be liable because they are the actual owner of the facility. Therefore, have to made. The KNVB (2009a), FIFA (2010b) and SAFA (2005) state that sport facilities are safe when the surface is not slippery, unequal and extremely hard; the goals are anchored so they won’t fall down on players; and there is free space of two meters around the field so people cannot hurt themselves on the fence. An artificial turf pitch can be the ideal solution for the issues regarding the playing surface. As said, both the TWK Municipality and the VOB are enthusiastic about creating an artificial turf pitch in the Rooidakke/Iraq area in Grabouw. Research from Ekstrand et al (2006) shows that artificial turf is just as safe as natural grass. The incidence of injury during training and match play did not differ between surfaces for the teams in the artificial turf.

In addition, the existing sport facilities are struggling with vandalism and theft. From April 2009 till March 2010, 142 cases of damage to property and 80 cases of burglary at non-residential premises were reported with the local police in Grabouw. Mr Abrahams (personal statement, November 17, 2010) agrees and states that people in Grabouw steal and break down community recourses for their own expenses. Geason (1989) states that damage done to acquire money or property is one of the reasons for vandalism. In addition, the facilities are also not safe throughout the presence of alcohol and drugs. Sport facilities are gathering places for children and therefore also for people with bad intentions, such as drug dealers. Geason (1989) states that these issues can be solved by fostering a sense of ownership, using vandal-proof materials, and maximising natural and formal surveillance at vulnerable sites. Both best practices in Khayelitsha were build in the middle of the community, in contrast to Grabouw where most fields are located on the edge of the community. In addition, the windows of the surrounding houses at the FIFA Football4Hope pitch are directed towards the field, so the residents can keep an eye on the playing children. The field has also two community members who guard the place at night, they do this on a voluntary basis. At daytime there are always people at the field to supervise (J. Donalds, personal statement, November 24, 2010). Therefore, crime related issues like vandalism and drug abuse are less likely to occur.

Finally, there is a safety risk throughout the presence of traffic. Playing children and spectators at the facility can get hurt or even killed. Most of the accidents in South Africa occur with pedestrians (44.8% in 2007/2008) (Road Traffic Management Corporation, 2008). Many of these pedestrians are children. The AA Monitoring Trust (2003) states that nearly two in three road accidents happen when children are walking or playing. In order to keep children safe, adults should set a good example and supervise at dangerous sides. Fencing the sport facility can also protect the children. Many accidents occur when children loose a ball and they go out to retrieve it. Fencing also protects the children from cars crashing into the facility.

Finally, the SRSA states that pitches and courts have to be examined and approved by the governing body and/or local authority inspectors before using or hiring the facility (SRSA, 2009).
5.3 Which steps are necessary to make the sport facilities in Grabouw sustainable?

The literature suggests that participation, empowerment, local ownership, partnerships (Coalter, 2002), capacity building, and fundraising (Morse, 2004) are crucial for creating long-term sustainability. The case study suggests the same. Laverack (2005) agrees and states that there are nine domains of community development: (1) community participation, (2) community based organizations, (3) local ownership, (4) mobilisation of sources, (5) critical awareness, (6) identification of problems, (7) development of rational tends, (8) transfer of power, and (9) program management.

The best practices in Khayelitsha learn that participation from the start is crucial for long-term sustainability. Grassroot Soccer and Amandla EduFootball recruit young people from the community to get the buy-in from the community. Children look up to these youngsters and therefore respect the field. The community in general is proud on these youngsters (J. Donalds, personal statement, November 24, 2010; F. Zech, personal statement, November 9, 2010). This matches with the theory. Coalter (2002) states that involvement of community members in projects can reduce possible resentments of the community regarding the project. Especially in this sport facilities project, the community should be involved. Besides participation, empowerment is important for long-term sustainability. Empowerment is the process through which people gain control over their life and participate in the life of the community (Isreal et al, 1994). Empowerment can take place on individual level, organizational level and community level. Empowerment on individual level – in this research – relates to make people responsible for the maintenance of sport facilities. Empowering the community is important to make them responsible for the state and safety of the sport facility. Empowerment and participation in development projects requires the removal of formal and informal institutional barriers that prevent people from taking action to improve their wellbeing (The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, 2002); access to information; and making policymakers accountable for their actions and policies. The Municipality likes the sports forum to take control over the sport facilities (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010; E. Marthinus, personal statement, December 6, 2010). The sports forum, however, is not ready to take on this responsibility: there are too much internal politics involved that prevent the sports forum from working together and lift the sports in Grabouw to a higher level (M. Abrahams, personal statement, November 17, 2010). The people of the sports forum act in their own interests. Anderson & Spelten (2000) state that locals often are motivated to create institutions that embed their own particular interests. This is the case with the sports forum.

In the absence of a good working sports forum, the Municipality likes the community to take ownership (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010). The first step in community participation and ownership is to make them understand the advantages of a artificial turf facility (F. Zech, personal statement, November 9, 2010). First, there is a constant quality and there are low maintenance costs. Secondly, children can play in a controlled way where they learn about life skills and HIV and finally they have something to look forward. Playing on an artificial turf pitch is something special for children in townships (J. Donalds, personal statement, November 24, 2010). Besides this, they are also kept from the streets where they can encounter drugs or alcohol or get involved in criminal activities. Coalter (2002) agrees that involving the community ensures community ownership which can contribute to sustainability and success of community development programs. Ulanda Christians from ELF states that ownership by the Grabouw community is a key issue for sustainability (U. Christians, personal statement, November 29, 2010). Reigh (2006) agrees and states that activities are unsustainable if they are conceptualized entirely by outsiders and merely implemented locally. In his research, Ambro (2006) refers to the fact that people had invested in projects, and that this increased responsibility and belonging. Local actors should therefore be involved in the decision making and the implementation of the sport facilities project. The Ward Committees, which represent the different communities in Grabouw, state that the Grabouw community is ready to take ownership (Ward 8, personal statement, January 6, 2011; Ward 11, personal statement, January 6, 2011; Ward 12, personal statement, January 6, 2011).
However, the community cannot run the sport facilities project on their own. There are no examples of resources or projects in Grabouw which are effectively run by the community (M. Abrahams, personal statement, November 17, 2010). Community ownership should not be a purpose itself. It has to be a method for creating sustainability. Fukuyama (2005) agrees and states that there can be downsides on letting the community take ownership. Locals may make bad choices and may not understand the full range of responsibilities. Shinoda (2009) adds that even if locals are willing to exercise ownership, the lack of potential, economic and social capacity, in terms of human, institutional, material and financial resources can hinder the process of community development.

To circumvent the lack of capacity, capacity building can be a solution. Shediac-Rizkallah and Bone (1998) state that community participation, ownership and capacity building relate to each other. Capacity building focuses on the enhancement of knowledge, skills and abilities of persons and organizations in development projects. For success in capacity building, investment on three levels is necessary: (1) Human Resource Development (HRD); (2) Organizational Development (OD); and/or (3) Institutional Development (ID) (Elsendoorn et al, 2006). In Grabouw a bottom-up approach - where people within an organization receive training to improve their skills and knowledge - in combination with a partnership approach could be helpful. Racelis (1986) agrees and states that an outside organization can assist the community in terms of skills- and organizational training. The partnership approach focuses on strengthening cooperation with other (partnership) organizations (Crisp et al, 2000). Elsendoorn et al (2006) state that there are several elements a partner organization in capacity building should posses. First, the organization should have a clear structure. In addition, the partner organization should pursue a social purpose. An open attitude towards capacity building is essential. Furthermore, the organization may not have a political preference. Finally, there must be sufficient support for the particular organization. The partner organization has to be broadly accepted in the local community. As an important stakeholder and a good representative of the community, the VOH is suited for this role. The TWK Municipality states that community participation is important provided that locals are under the supervision of a NGO like the VOH (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010).

Involving community members is also a matter of motivation. People have to be motivated to work on this project. Maslow (1954) states that people are motivated by a hierarchy of needs. The pyramid is divided into five levels, determining the motivation of human beings. Each individual needs must be satisfied at the lower levels before they progress to the higher more complex level. Grabouw is a poor community with a lot of social challenges. Including this community means that these locals should be met in their basic needs. An income can help local people with satisfying these needs. Finger (1999) concludes out of his research on African community based development projects, that people who get paid also perform better than people who don’t. Grassroot Soccer and Amandla EduFootball therefore pay their local leaders. On the other hand, people are not only motivated by money. The theory from Mayo explains that people also want to develop themselves while working. The Ward Committees state that they are up to the task (Ward 8, personal statement, January 6, 2011; Ward 11, personal statement, January 6, 2011; Ward 12, personal statement, January 6, 2011).

The last critical factor for sustainability is funding. Funding is necessary for creating and maintaining the facility, as well as for paying locals. The Ward Committee in Rooidakke reserved R75,000,00 for creating a sport facility in Rooidakke (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010). This is hardly enough to create a grass pitch. The question in which way the new sport facilities can be funded will be answered in the following paragraph.
5.4 In which way can new sport facilities be funded?

Paying the community members for their work in this sport facilities project will cost money, as well as capacity building and creating an artificial turf pitch in the Rooidakke area. The TWK Municipality does not have the financial capacity to fund this project (A. Liebenberg, personal statement, December 2, 2010; E. Marthinus, personal statement, December 6, 2010). They are, however, prepared to help with the maintenance of the sport facilities in Grabouw. These sport facilities will remain property of the TWK Municipality and they therefore have the responsibility to give this support. For creating an artificial turf pitch in Rooidakke, funding from outside the Municipality is necessary. The Village of Hope is willing to assist in the search for funding (T. Walker, personal statement, December 2, 2010). Every two weeks or month, new volunteers are coming in who help the Village of Hope in the baby unit or with their work in the community. This volunteers network should be used to come in contact with companies and potential sponsors. Two methods can be used to retrieve money from these potential sponsors: sponsoring and fundraising. Both methods gain popularity in collecting money for development projects. Verstegen (2009) states that community development is an important reason for sponsoring in the non-profit sector. An emerging trend is the shift in commercial sponsoring to charity sponsoring. This trend can be seen in the light of ethics and corporate social responsibility.

5.5 How can safe and sustainable sport facilities be created in Grabouw?

Some critical issues jeopardize the safety of the sport facility and its users. First, the current facilities in Grabouw are not equal and are filled with rubbish and glass. Secondly, crime related activities such as vandalism and alcohol- and drug abuse are causing problems. Finally, the presence of traffic can hurt or even kill playing children and/or spectators. In order to tackle these issues the following actions have to be kept in mind. First, the surface of the facility has to be flat, free from rubbish, not extremely hard and not slippery. The TWK Municipality sees an artificial turf pitch as the ideal situation. This pitch meets the named criteria for the playing surface. Secondly, the vandalism issue can be solved by fostering a sense of ownership within the community. In addition, the sport facility has to be build in a central position so the community can look after the facility and its users. Surveillance is also considered as a possible intervention. Responsible people have to look after the facility and its users to prevent vandalism and alcohol- and drug abuse. Finally, the facility has to be fenced in order to protect children from traffic. Fencing the facility prevents children from losing the ball and getting hurt when they try to get the ball back. In addition, adults have to set a good example and make the children aware of the danger of traffic.

To ensure the sustainability of the field, community participation and ownership are crucial. However, throughout a lack of capacity in the Grabouw community, capacity building is necessary. The partnership approach is the best way to develop locals into leaders. These leaders are responsible for managing the facility and look after its users. The VOH is a suitable partner organization for this project. The VOH is willing to use their network to collect funding for paying local leaders and the creation of the artificial turf pitch.

Chapter 7 will transfer the answer on this main question into concrete recommendations for the TWK Municipality.
6 Discussion

After showing the conclusion of the research of this thesis in the previous chapter, the sixth chapter provides the discussion of these results. The first paragraph shows the potency and limitations of the research and the results from this research. In the second paragraph the practical relevance of the findings of this research are discussed. In the third paragraph, suggestions are made for further research.

6.1 Potency and limitations

The research of this thesis showed a few potencies and limitations. The research strategy used for this thesis was the case study strategy. Qualitative research methods such as observations and expert interviews were used for data generation. Experts interviews are a valid instrument for qualitative data generation, as long as multiple experts (triangulation of sources) are interviewed (Dorussen, Lenz & Blavoukos, 2005). Two experts were asked to give their opinion on community participation and – ownership in Grabouw. Also an observation is made on two similar projects in Khayelitsha, which provided an integrated view on the factors for sustainability regarding the sport facilities in Grabouw. Furthermore, interviewed stakeholders of this research got the possibility to check the answers they gave in the interviews, and may add or erase information if they thought this was necessary (member validation) (University of Wageningen, 2009). By closely involving the stakeholders in the research, the outcome of the research will be easier accepted and supported by those stakeholders. Finally the commitment of Town Manager Anton Liebenberg and Tim Walker from the Village of Hope is crucial for the continuation of this project. They will be the constant factor in this long term project. In a discussion with Anton Liebenberg it became clear that the TWK Municipality wants to create an artificial turf pitch in Rooidakke within the next five years. This thesis will be a work document for the next students which will be involved in this project. The commitment of these stakeholders ensures that this research will be an ongoing project.

Besides the potency of this research, several limitations have been identified. Lack of objective information had a significant role in the outcome of this research. Qualitative researches make use of subjective information which means that repeated examination hardly produce similar observations (Stenbecka, 2001). Making as much use of open and non-suggestive questions in the interviews as possible, made the qualitative research as objective as possible. The abilities and skills of the researcher can be a reliability in a case study research, while I have little experience with conducting interviews. The qualitative research and choice for having open half structured interviews, could have influenced the research. The researcher could have influenced the research by asking the wrong type of questions (suggestive or closed questions). The interviews were never the same and resulted in various types of input. Furthermore, the qualitative research was executed on a small scale. Only a small percentage of the stakeholders have been interviewed. The Ward Committees only represent a small part of the community. Out of interviews with Florian Zech from Amandla EduFootball, it became clear that the unofficial channels of a community should be included in the research, in order to get the buy-in from the ‘ordinary people’ on the streets. Throughout a lack of time, only a small part of the community could be asked for their opinion on the situation regarding the sport facilities.
6.2 Practical relevance

The result of this research and thesis is relevant for both the TWK Municipality as well as the other stakeholders. This outcome of this research can help the TWK Municipality with creating a sustainable sport facility in the Rooidakke area. This sport facility can function as a pilot for creating more sport facilities in the Grabouw community. The other challenge is regards to the management and maintenance of the sport facilities in Grabouw. The existing sport facilities are in a poor condition, throughout a lack of proper maintenance. This working document will provide the TWK Municipality with an advice regarding the management and maintenance of the sport facilities.

This research fits in with the objectives of the TWK Municipality, the Department of Sports and Recreation and the SFA project. First this research connects with the IDP from the TWK Municipality. One of the priorities regarding sports in Grabouw, is the creation of a mini sport facility in Rooidakke. Besides that, the Municipality is also busy with a service level agreement that appoints to the maintenance and management of the sport facilities in Grabouw. Furthermore, the TWK Municipality, the Department of Sports and Recreation and the SFA Project, want to make sport available for everyone. By realizing sustainable sport facilities a platform will be created which allows the community to exercise and play in a safe way.

Finally, sustainable sport facilities will come to a benefit for the community. Sport facilities are not only places where kids can play and sport teams can practice. These sport facilities create an environment where children can learn about life skills and HIV. Besides this, they are also kept from the streets where they can encounter drugs or alcohol or get involved in criminal activities.

6.3 Suggestions for further research

This research is only a first concept towards sustainable sport facilities. Within five years Town Manager Anton Liebenberg wants to create an artificial turf pitch in the Rooidakke/Iraq area. Further research is necessary to accomplish this objective.

First, an implementation plan for the recommendations in this research must be set up. Secondly, other courses which could benefit this project should be identified. In the longer term other studies have to be involved in the sport facilities project. Business students could think about a fundraising strategy and civil engineer students have to be involved in the actual creation of the sport facility. Finally, a management structure has to be created in which the TWK Municipality, the Village of Hope and the community work together to keep the sport facilities in Grabouw sustainable.
7 Recommendations

The objective of this research was to advise the TWK Municipality about creating a sustainable and safe side field in Rooidakke where children and sport teams can exercise safely and discuss who should take responsibility for maintaining this facility. The findings described in the conclusion section, will be transferred into concrete recommendations in this section. The recommendations will be divided into safety- and sustainability actions.

7.1 Recommendations regarding safety

7.1.1 Facility requirements
As said before, an artificial turf pitch in the Rooidakke/Iraq area is the ideal situation. Artificial turf has a number of benefits: it is cheap in maintenance, can handle different climates, is equal and soft, and attracts children through its exclusivity. However, to prevent vandalism and alcohol- and drug abuse on and around the field, some actions have to be taken. First, the sport facility has to be build on a central position in the community. This way, community members can look after the facility and its users. In this way, vandalism and alcohol- and drug abuse are less likely to occur. The TWK Municipality must take this in consideration in their zoning plan for Rooidakke and Iraq. Secondly, the facility has to be fenced in order to protect children from traffic. Finally responsible people have to guard the facility day and night. In order to motivate this people, they have to be paid. This form of community participation will be elaborated in section 7.2.1.

7.2 Recommendations regarding sustainability

7.2.1 Community participation under the supervision of the Village of Hope
Community participation is identified as one of the major issues for creating sustainability in this project. Involving young leaders from the community creates acceptance and respect for the sport facility by other community members. These young role models can develop themselves and have the opportunity to turn their passion for sports into a occupation.

Young role models have to be identified for the different areas in Grabouw. The Municipality (as owner of the sport facilities), the Village of Hope (as supervisor of the young role models), and the Ward Committees (know the community on a ground level) should work together to appoint these leaders. Potential candidates identified by this working group should be invited for an interview to see if these people have the skills and the potential to fit in this role. However, passion will be the key work. These young role models do not have to be the best football or rugby players in the community, but they have to be enthusiastic to lift the situation regarding the sport facilities in Grabouw to a higher level.

The young role models who fit in this profile, should work under the supervision of the Village of Hope with a contract which describes the expectations and responsibilities. These young role models should get paid for their work. Research shows that people who get paid, work better. This income should also help these youngsters to satisfy basic needs as food, water and safety (house). The Football4Hope project in Khayelitsha pays their young leaders ZAR 50,00 for a half day of work (J. Donalds, personal statement, November 17, 2010). This money should cover the basic needs of the youngsters. As owner of the sport facilities in Grabouw, this cooperation between the Village of Hope and the community members, should be evaluated by the Municipality on a regular basis.
Further research is necessary to design a management structure in which the Municipality, the Village of Hope, and the young role models can work together effectively.

7.2.2 Capacity building
As said in the previous paragraph, the young role models should be selected for their passion for the project and not only skills. Capacity building is an important method to teach this youngsters about the skills which are necessary to run the sport facilities. Capacity building can be defined as the strengthening of people and organizations in development countries (Grindle & Hildebrand, 1995). Capacity building focuses on the enhancement of the knowledge, skills and abilities of persons and organizations for solving problems. Reigh (2006) states that the lack of capacity can be solved by including the outside. This is only possible for an organization which is well-placed in the community and works on a ground level. The Village of Hope is an organization which is well-placed in the community because of their work in the community. For several years, they successfully managed and ran developing projects in the Grabouw. The Village of Hope is part of Thembalisha, which run all kinds of development projects in the Western Cape. The knowledge and skills of these organizations should be used to pass on to the young role models in order to teach them the skills which are necessary to run the sport facilities. Knowledge and skills can be transferred in workshops organized by the Village of Hope.

7.2.3 Fundraising throughout volunteer network
Finally, funding is crucial for creating sustainable projects. The sport facilities project needs funding for creating an artificial turf pitch in Rooidakke, payment of the young leaders, and the workshops necessary for capacity building. As a partner and important stakeholder of this project, the Village of Hope is willing to help in the search for funding. Every two weeks or month, new volunteers are coming in who help the Village of Hope in the baby unit or with their work in the community. This volunteers network should be used to come in contact with companies and potential sponsors. Two methods can be used to retrieve money from these potential sponsors: sponsoring and fundraising. Both methods gain popularity in collecting money for development projects. Verstegen (2009) states that community development is an important reason for sponsoring in the non-profit sector. An emerging trend is the shift in commercial sponsoring to charity sponsoring. This trend can be seen in the light of ethics and corporate social responsibility. A brochure should be created in order to inform these companies. The creation of a platform on which this project can introduce itself is also necessary.

Further research is necessary to create a funding strategy. SHM is not the study who should design this strategy. Business- and Marketing/PR students, who can think outside of the box and can come up with fresh and creative ideas, should be involved in this project to create a plan for collecting funds.
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### Appendix II Stakeholders interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent:</strong> Anton Liebenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong> December 2, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Venue:</strong> Theewaterskloof Municipality Office, Grabouw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interview questions**

1. **What do you think of the current situation regarding sport facilities in Grabouw?**
   The current situation regarding sport facilities in Grabouw is not up to standards. There is still a lot to be done. Besides Pineview Park, there are too less good and safe sport facilities where children and sport teams can exercise and play their social games. The places are filled with rubbish and glass and get vandalized by the local community. In addition, there are simply not enough sport facilities. Thousands of kids in Grabouw haven’t got a space to play or they are not allowed to use a particular sport ground.

   One of our priorities is the creation of a new sport facility in Rooidakke. We have a budget of ZAR 7,500,00 to create a side-field. We are also busy setting up a service level agreement form for the sport facilities in Grabouw. As you probably already noticed, the Pineview Park is in a poor condition. The reason of this poor condition, is the lack of good maintenance. The agreement which we are busy with has a few targets regarding the sport facilities in Grabouw. The first objective is to improve the communication between the Municipality and the sports forum and sport codes. The second objective is the provision of sport facilities by making land available which can be utilized as play parks. The last objective of this agreement is to set up an effective maintenance plan for recreational facilities.

2. **You mention ownership as a key issue for sustainable sport facilities. Do you think it is possible for the Grabouw community to take ownership?**
   Yes, I do think it is possible and necessary. It is too expensive for the Municipality to maintain and look after all the sport facilities in Grabouw. We want to upgrade Pineview Park, but we cannot afford to look after the other facilities. Therefore, I think the sports forum - as a NGO - should take ownership. The sports forum represents the sports community in Grabouw. The Municipality can assist them with the maintenance of the facilities. Furthermore, we should make the community realize that they should be proud of what they got in terms of sport facilities and let them see the advantages for them. This will discourage them to vandalize the place. We should also show the community that the Municipality is involved in getting the sports running. We are willing to take the first step, and set an example. From thereon, the community should take the second step. We should bridge the gap between the Municipality and the community by informing them better.

3. **In a previous meeting you mentioned that the absence of a good functioning sports forum is a big problem. How do you see them taking ownership?**
   It is a difficult problem. It is very complicated through internal politics because everybody only looks after his own sport and are not willing to work together. The meetings are also attended badly, but I still think we should give it a try. The sports
Ownership

forum can take ownership. However, in the absence of a good working sports forum, it would be good to start a collaboration with a NGO like the Village of Hope, to create an environment to make sport possible for everyone. It is crucial for a partner organization to be well known in the community so they can interact with the community.

4 What possibilities does the Municipality got regarding funding?
The Municipality will be strongly involved in this project but is not spending anything on the pitches itself. We do not have the funding for this. Other issues in Grabouw have priority, housing for example. We should look for funding from NGOs or companies abroad.

5 Finally, what is the desired situation regarding the sport facilities in Grabouw? What are the needs of the Municipality?
It would be fantastic to create an artificial turf pitch in Rooidakke with a community centre and link sports to HIV awareness, like the FIFA project we visited in Khayelitsha. We also want to improve Pineview Park, so the rugby, soccer and cricket league games can be played here. Pineview Park will only be for the league games and not for training sessions of social games. The training and social games should be played on the open spaces we identified in the community. We want to identify more open spaces which can be turned into sport facilities for social games and where kids can play. We do not identified open spaces in Waterworks yet, for example.

2 Municipality

Respondent: Edwin Marthinus
Date: December 6, 2010
Venue: Theewaterskloof Municipality Office, Caledon

Purpose interview

Edwin Marthinus is the Sports & Recreation administrator of the TWK Municipality. In this function, Edwin is closely involved in the sport facilities project. The purpose of this interview is to learn more about the current situation regarding sport facilities in Grabouw, the needs of the Municipality, the view on the current situation, and funding possibilities of the Municipality.

Interview questions

1 What do you think about the current situation regarding the sport facilities in Grabouw?
I think there is a lack of safe and good sport facilities, we simply do not have enough facilities in Grabouw. The current ones are of poor standard. Besides that, there is no sense of ownership by the community. They do not take care of the sport facilities while they are making use of it. One of the reasons for the poor state of the facilities is the misunderstanding about the maintenance of these sport grounds. The sport clubs think the Municipality should take care of the maintenance, while the Municipality likes to see that the sport teams and community take their responsibility. Lack of funding is another problem. It is not a key function of the Municipality to take care of the sport facilities, or to maintain and improve them. The Municipality does not have the people to take care of the sport facilities. Again, this is not the core issue for the Municipality.

2 So there are no possibilities for funding from the Municipality to create or maintain sport facilities?
No, the Municipality has other priorities. We also do not have enough manpower to do the maintenance ourselves.
| Desired situation | Funding
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Ownership Needs/priorities | **3 How would you like to see the situation develop regarding the sport facilities in Grabouw?**
| | The ideal situation is basically the opposite of the current situation. There has to be for funds to create proper fields in Grabouw. External sponsorships would be the desired situation, as well as ownership by the community. |
| Ownership | **4 You mention ownership by the community as an crucial issue for making the sport facilities sustainable. Do you think this is possible in Grabouw?**
| | It will take a good effort to get the community to take ownership. I personally don’t think it is possible because people have other needs than sport facilities. People first have to be met in their basic needs like clothing and food. If you pay the people they automatically become more responsible for the pitch. If you don’t have money to pay these people, you have to make a plan, but first people have to be met in their basic needs. |
| Ownership | The situation in Grabouw is very difficult if you compare it to the situation here in Caledon, the two are complete opposites. My point of view is that the people living in Grabouw, don’t experience Grabouw as their hometown. Therefore, it’s difficult to create ownership. |
| Ownership | **5 Do you think involving an outside organization in this project can be solution?**
| | I think the sports forum must take ownership. If they don’t own it, they won’t manage the place. But the members of the sports forum also have other needs than managing the sport grounds. They don’t get paid to do this, not that they should, and so they don’t worry about it. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents: Wards 8, 11 and 12 (Ward Committees in Grabouw except the farms), Anton Liebenberg, Tim Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: January 6, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue: Theewaterskloof Municipality Office, Grabouw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose interview**

The theoretical framework makes clear that community ownership and participation is crucial for realizing sustainable projects, The Ward Committees represent the community, and therefore it is necessary to ask them about their view on sport facilities in Grabouw.

**Interview questions**

**Ownership**

Ward 12: I think the community is ready to take ownership. You will see that what they got, they will protect. I think it will be the same with the sport facilities. If the community has the feeling that the sport facility belongs to them, they will look after the place. If you look at the sport facilities in Ward 12, nothing gets stolen or vandalized. However, the people cannot do this at their own, they need the help of the Municipality. Anton: The Municipality remains the actual owner of the pitch, and is therefore obliged to assist in the maintenance of the fields. However, the Municipality has other priorities so it is necessary that the community takes ownership.

**Ownership**

Ward 8: People around the pitch can take ownership and responsibility. They should keep an eye out for the pitch so that it will not be vandalized. There are also a lot of young people playing on the Rooidakke field. They should take ownership because they make use of the field.

Ward 12: Two young people in Ward 12 are interested to set up a sports program for the children. These youngsters can be involved in the management of the fields.
### Community participation

**Tim:** It is a good idea to involve young role models from the community. When we visited the projects in Khayelitsha, involving young locals was the key to success.

#### 2 Does the community have enough capacity to take ownership?

**Ward 8:** I think people who are passionate about sports, like the youngsters who organize sport activities, have enough skills and connections within the community to take care of the management of the pitches. However, in terms of finance we still need the help of the Municipality.

**Ward 12:** I think there is not enough sense of ownership within the community and people don’t have the knowledge to manage a sport facility. They don’t know what has to be done in terms of sustainability.

#### 3 Do you think involving a NGO - like the VOH – as a partner organization can help in terms of capacity building?

**Ward 11:** I think the VOH is a well known organization in Grabouw and - more important - they are accepted within the community. In addition, they have the knowledge on how to run an organization or in this case a sport facility.

**Tim:** I think involving the VOH is a good idea. Through our work in the community we know the community on a personal level. I think the VOH in cooperation with the students from Holland, can assist the community members and teach them skills. In our sport outreach program we identified some young students from Groenberg who help us with the after school activities. In return we help them with jobs, drivers licenses, schoolwork, etc.

#### 4 Do you think the people are motivated to do this? Pineview Park and the Rooidakke Playing Park were vandalized over the years and a lot of materials got stolen.

**Anton:** The people who take materials from Pineview, are coloured drug addicts. They want to sell the materials to buy Tic.

**Ward 11:** I think we should involve the community, but many initiatives are not well organized. The Ward Committees should plan a meeting to appoint this problem. The whole house should be on board.

**Tim:** Involving young people is a good idea. We can establish a business opportunity for them so they can earn little money. This is the way they do it with the Grassroot Soccer project in Khayelitsha.

**Anton:** We should establish a working group to discuss these issues. We should involve passionate people from all sports to set-up this working group. The focus is not on sports only. We have to create a spirit that persons have passion for what they are doing. It is not a goal to create football superstars. Sport is a medium to teach kids about life-skills and HIV.

**Tim:** This is a good idea, because we do not know the people in the community that are passionate about this.

**Wards 8, 11, and 12:** We agree this is a good idea.

**Ward 8:** There are some young leaders which are playing with our kids. They should be invited.

**Anton:** We should involve a NGO to make it legal. Passion is the key word. Sports brings people together. We have to let the community see that there is something good happening, that there is a good vibe. Tim will set up a meeting to discuss this working group.

---

### Village of Hope

**Respondent:** Tim Walker  
**Date:** December 2, 2010  
**Venue:** Village of Hope, Grabouw

**Purpose interview**
Tim is the founder of the VOH. The VOH is an important stakeholder as they organize after school activities in which they teach the children life-skills in a controlled way. Therefore it is important to discover what the needs of the VOH are and what they think about empowering the local community to take ownership.

**Interview questions**

1. **What do you think about the current situation regarding the sport facilities in Grabouw?**
   From the Village of Hope point of view, we think that you are doing fantastic research that comes as a benefit for the community. We think the students working with the Municipality and the Village of Hope is a good step to sustainability. The situation regarding sport facilities in Grabouw is poor. Many playing areas in the community are filled with glass and rubbish or are dangerous throughout cars. Other sport facilities, like Pineview Park, are badly maintained and not well utilized. The community has not got the idea that they can use this sport ground. 90 per cent of the week this field is not used. We also have to make more use of the sport facilities that the schools have. A school is a government project and it should be accessible for more activities. The community should feel that they can use these facilities. Why can’t they share? We must raise people’s awareness of the sport facilities we have and that they can use it.
   There is also a big imbalance between the different sides in the community. The Applewood school, a private school for richer people, invests millions in a sport field that will only be used by hundred fifty kids, while the Xhosa school only has a tiny netball court. Groenberg, which have mainly coloured students, also have a nice big field to play on.

2. **How would you like to see the situation develop regarding the sport facilities in Grabouw?**
   We will always have our sport clubs in the community, on the schools and the farms, but it would be fantastic if we can develop an astroturf pitch in Rooidakke. There is never going to be an astroturf pitch in each side of the community. But it would be fantastic for every area to have their own space without glass and rubbish where the children can play safely. A astroturf pitch in Rooidakke can be used as a highlight practice ground. If we work four weeks with the same kids in Waterworks, we can take them the fifth week to the astroturf pitch. The children have something to look forward to, they get thrilled when they get to play on a different field as their sand field. To create one astroturf pitch in Rooidakke is a vocal point, creating one in every area is too expensive.

3. **What are the possibilities for the Village of Hope to fund this project?**
   We are willing to help with the funding of the project, but it is important that we have the support of the Municipality and that we are sure the project is working. We want to see if the community is ready to take ownership and take care of the management of the pitch. We can maybe use the network of our volunteers coming in each two weeks or each month. Some of them work for or know big companies which are willing to spend money on development projects.

4. **What do you think about involving the local community in the planning and maintenance of the sport facilities, just like in Khayelitsha?**
   We should also encourage the community like we did last week with Anton. Let them see what is possible. **We should invest in the community so they can take ownership.** The community has to be convinced that creating an astroturf pitch in Rooidakke is a benefit for them. Parents should be happy that a park is build outside their door. The children have something to play on so they are of the streets, and it always provide us with a nice structure where we can teach the kids. They will learn about responsibility, life-skills, health and this will create better behaviour among the kids in the neighbourhood. On the long term less children will go in crime and vandalism. If people don’t see this benefit and don’t own the thing, they will trash it. I am convinced that having a sport field is a benefit for the community, and not having one is a
| Capacity | disadvantage. But I think this is going to be difficult. A lot of the communities in the case studies in your research are entirely black or white. Grabouw is a mixed community with blacks and coloured people living together. This comes with social challenges. Getting the support of a community for building an astroturf is much more complicated than the watering project in Kenya you mentioned in your thesis. The community in Kenya will take ownership over the watering project because the purpose and the benefit for them is clear. This is not the case with an astroturf pitch. The community can never afford to put an astroturf pitch in their selves, therefore there is no confidence to take ownership. It is too huge for them. They don’t have the worldview and the mentality to see the benefit for themselves. The pitch will work if we invest in local managers under a local organization. We need an over viewing organization with responsible people. The local people cannot manage the pitch without outside help.

5 In Khayelitsha, locals take care of the management and planning with Grassroot Soccer as an over viewing organization. What do you think about involving a NGO into this project?

Ownership | Yes, I think this is crucial for success of this project. We as Village of Hope are willing to commit to this project. I think we have enough support within the community and most people are familiar with our work in the community.

Further research

6 Do you have something else to add?
Nor the Village of Hope nor the Municipality have got the manpower to take this research to the next stage. Previous students identified a problem, wrote their thesis’s and graduated, but there was nobody who was taking over the project. Sometimes the projects did more harm than good. When the students left, there was a black hole. They raised expectations with the community and when they left everything stopped and the people would get disappointed. I think it is very important to take your research to the next level. The next student should be well informed and prepared so he has not have to deal with the same problems you experienced.

5 Village of Hope

Respondent: Daz Muir
Date: December 7, 2010
Venue: Village of Hope, Grabouw

Purpose interview

Daz Muir organizes after school activities in cooperation with the Sport Management students of the HAN University. The Village of Hope is an important stakeholder as they organize after school activities in which they teach the children life-skills in a controlled way. Therefore it is important to discover what the needs of the Village of Hope are and what they think about empowering the local community to take ownership.

Interview questions

1 What do you think about the current situation regarding the sport facilities in Grabouw?
Not good. Shocking to say the least. The only decent sport facility should be Pineview. Also the play fields of the school are in a bad condition. Nobody manages the sport facilities, so the sport facilities are going to the drain again. The grass that is available are taken by the older guys and the little children get chased of, they have nowhere to play on. Elgin Timbers is privately owned, but that is a nice field. There is a huge imbalance. There aren’t enough open grounds for the youth to play on.
| Capacity | 2 How would you like to see the situation develop regarding the sport facilities in Grabouw? Similar to what Khayelitsha have. Not only the sports ground but also a multipurpose centre. One of more of those. Grabouw could do with at least three. Include a clubhouse with a clinic, a preschool, sporting facilities, decent toilets, in the middle point of the community so they can manage it. One in Roodakke, one in Pineview, and one closer to Waterworks. The Municipality should consider Job creation by using the locals to build, manage and secure the place. |
| Ownership | 3 Do you think it is possible for the locals to take ownership? Yeah, I thinks it is definitely possible in Grabouw. You have to identify people who are thrust worthy. Through our work in the community we know the community at a ground level. The community members should use training and have to be mentored. At every side you have to need a sports facilitator, maintenance coordinator, and security. We should use all the agencies in Grabouw, not only the Village of Hope. It would be fantastic to create a multi-purpose centre like the one in Khayelitsha. |
| Capacity | The Municipality should evaluate the process and keep an over view. There should also be a neutral NGO which has not direct advantage with the facility, to run the sport facility. The people in the sports forum all have their own sports and their own interests. It will not work to put it on the shoulders of the sports forum. The old saying goes: ‘If you do what you always done, you will get what you always got.’ |
Malcolm Abrahams is the founder of the OTC in Grabouw. In September he gave a workshop about sustainability for the Dutch students involved in the TWK project. The purpose of this interview is to learn more about sustainability, and what the vision of Malcolm is on the situation regarding sport facilities in Grabouw.

**Interview questions**

1. **On which way can the sport facilities in Grabouw become sustainable?**

   My opinion is that the Grabouw community is not able to take care of the sport facilities, because of the politics. Grabouw is not a unified community. Religion is very important. If you look at how many churches there are; if you don't like a church, you simply build a new one. People keep blaming the Apartheid for this. We have the same conflict with jobs. As well as people don't want to share their churches, they don't want to share their jobs or let people work in their area. The mental emotional make-up of the community is wrong. The culture of the community don't let sustainability be possible. Apartheid is still visible in sports, it is still an issue of race. The black people love football, the coloured love their rugby and the white people play cricket and rugby. The rugby, and especially the cricket clubs have the best recourses. If you look at the fields in Waterworks or Iraq, it is shocking. Also the sports forum isn't working through these politics. They all fight about who is getting the best recourses as they should work together.

   There are no recourses or projects in Grabouw that are effectively ran by the community. The Gerald Wright Memorial Hall, for example, is handed over to the community. At first this building, was state of the art. But through a lack of maintenance and local ownership this place changed in its current state. When I started the OTC in 2003, I did this out of my own ideas, not the ones from the community. I handled out of what I thought was good for the community.

   If you ask the community, you get divided interests and divided outcomes. Therefore, you cannot consult with the community, at least not in Grabouw. I don't even want to call Grabouw a community, cause a community takes care of its environment and works together. This is not the case in Grabouw. Nobody takes ownership, and protects these places. Grabouw is a poor city. With poverty come social challenges. The people will steal and break down a community recourse to use it for their own expenses.

2. **If you don't think the community is ready to take ownership, what approach seems right to you?**

   I think privatizing the sport facilities can be good solution. The Municipality should give the control over the sport facilities to NGOs or companies. They should run the facilities and make up their own funding. They can hire the pitches to the community and other companies. If you hire the pitch to a sport team, for example, they have to pay rent and a deposit for using the pitch. When they leave the pitch in the same condition as when they went on, they will get their deposit back. Therefore, they have to look after the pitch. The Municipality can review the process once a year, looking at security, maintenance, etc. I think companies are very interested to take over sport facilities, because you can make money out of it. I think if you place an advertisement, companies will apply to manage these sport facilities. I think this is the best solution. Companies can look after the field better, because they have more funding than the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Municipality. It is all about control. Companies can take care of security and, therefore, reduce vandalism and alcohol- and drugs abuse up and around the sport facilities. Another option is that a NGO takes control of the field. In the future, a new college of the Elgin Learning Foundation will be build on the other side of the road. Maybe, they are interested to adopt the new sports field in Roodakke. Finally, I think it is also good for you to talk with Ulanda Christians. She is the coordinator for social development at the Elgin Learning Foundation. You should ask her for ideas about the community taking control of the sport facilities in Grabouw. The office number of the Elgin Learning Foundation is 021-8489417</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Identify stakeholders | 1 Elgin Learning Foundation  
Respondent: Ulanda Christians  
Date: November 29, 2010  
Venue: ELF Office, Grabouw  
Purpose interview  
Ulanda Christians is the Social Development Coordinator of the Elgin Learning Foundation. The purpose of the interview is to find out if the Grabouw community is ready to take ownership and which steps are necessary to empower locals.  
Interview questions  
1 What is your opinion on empowering community members to take ownership over the sport facilities in Grabouw?  
You should first find out who the stakeholders are. Think about the police, community leaders, the Town Manager, NGOs and the Ward Committees. There is a monthly community meeting, you can find out who represents the community there. If you want to involve young people into this project, you should look who represents this group. This can be church- or youth groups. You can also contact the Youth centre in town. The launched three weeks ago. Maybe they can assist you with funding and they have relationships with the community on ground level. Furthermore, you should investigate who the influential people in the community are. You should have the buy-in from those people. You should have a talk with the Ward Committees and hear what they have to say.  
I think involving community members in the project is a good idea. Local ownership is a key issue for creating sustainability. You should make them part of the project, so they have the feeling they own the thing. A couple of years ago I wrote my thesis on local ownership. We turned a old container in a community centre and we involved youth from the community in decorating the place, for instance with graffiti. In this way they can live out their creativity in a controlled way. Because it was meant as a temporary project, we had to break down the community centre. The youth from the community were strongly against this. They put in so much work that they felt as the place was of their own. Therefore, I think you have to involve the community from the very beginning. You have to have open dialogues with the community and involve as much stakeholders as possible in the process.  
2 Malcolm Abrahams disagrees in letting community members own the sport facility. What are your thoughts about involving an over viewing organization?  
I think involving NGOs is a good idea, but you have to make sure the organization is a good representative of the project and the community. In contrast with Malcolm, I think involving ‘ordinary’ community members still is the key for success. Furthermore, you have to install enthusiasm by as much community members as possible. For example, make the parents believe that this sport facility has advantages. The children are from the street and can play in a controlled way, were they learn about life. In the long term, children get more responsible and are less likely to go into crime related activities. |
Appendix IV Best practice interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Participation</th>
<th>1 Grassroot Soccer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent: James Donalds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: November 24, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue: FIFA Soccer4Hope Centre, Khayelitsha, Cape Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Donalds is the Senior Program Director of Grassroot Soccer, the organization which the FIFA selected to manage the FIFA Soccer 4 Hope pitch in Khayelitsha. This artificial turf pitch is one of the twenty pitches that will be build throughout Africa as a legacy of the 2010 World Cup in South Africa. The purpose of this interview is to learn more about how Grassroot Soccer manages and maintain the pitch, and what the costs for this pitch are.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you give a brief introduction of your organization?</td>
<td>I'm James and I am the Senior Program Director of Grassroot Soccer. Our organization runs programs to create HIV awareness by children through sport activities. We want to teach the children through doing, not talking. We work throughout three key issues: (1) challenge – what is the problem; (2) who can help you?; and (3) what can you do yourself? We identify young people from the community, not necessary soccer players, and learn them about AIDS and social skills in order to teach the children. As long as they are passionate. We think, that involving young role models is the best way to run these programs. Children from the community look up to these youngsters and therefore, they can come through to the minds of the children easier. Furthermore, we run holiday programs and organize tournaments. The children can earn points throughout fair play soccer, and HIV awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you tell me some more about the facility that the FIFA created here?</td>
<td>The facility belongs to the City of Cape Town and is one of the twenty centres in the Soccer 4 Hope project. The FIFA wants to create twenty centres, like this one, through whole Africa in order to learn the kids about HIV and life throughout sports. The FIFA raises money for this project and identify the hosts. The FIFA selected Grassroot Soccer as the host of this facility in Khayelitsha. The community centre were we are now had a budget of ZAR 900.000,00. The sub base for the artificial turf pitch outside was constructed by the City of Cape Town and the actual pitch is donated by Greenfields BV: a company in Holland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On which way does Grassroot Soccer run this facility?</td>
<td>We have several members out of the community that take care of the planning and the managing of the pitch. They do this in this community centre, in the office. We have a management contract with the city in which we evaluate four times a year how we manage the facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you cover the operational costs?</td>
<td>Our operational costs are ZAR 1.500.000,00 a year. This includes the maintenance of the community centre and the soccer field, and the salaries of the people from our organization. The FIFA sponsors USD 20.000,00 a year. Besides this, we also have a lot of partners who sponsor our project. We have to pay ZAR 50.000,00 a year for ourselves. The City of Cape Town will pay everything that is over this amount. We also hire the place to organizations and persons who are interested in using our facility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose/objective
| Community participation | We struggle with issues like vandalism and theft with our sport facilities in Grabouw. This pitch is in one of the problem areas in Khayelitsha. How do you manage to keep this field in a good condition? When they came up with the idea to build an artificial turf pitch here in Khayelitsha, they immediately started with involving the community. They set up meetings and actively involved the community in setting out the idea. We tried to make the community aware of the advantages and the purpose of this pitch. I think we created a sense of local ownership with the local community. | 
| Advantages | Recruiting young people was the key to get the buy-in from the community. We pay these youngsters ZAR 80.00 for a whole day, or ZAR 50.00 for a half day. We have a six week program to identify these young role models. We do this throughout group interviews. Besides the payment they receive we also give them extra opportunities: help them with school, job appliances, drivers licence, etc. We have a volunteers agreement with these youngsters. | 
| Community participation | Also the placement of the field is important in keeping the field in a good condition. It is in the middle of the community with no fencing. The community considers the field as something of their own. If you look at the houses around the pitch, you can see that the doors and windows all face towards the pitch. On this way the people from the neighbourhood can keep an eye on the pitch. Besides this we also have at least two people at the community centre during the whole day. At night two volunteers keep an eye on the facility. We don't pay these people, but keep the opportunity open for them to get a paid job at our organization. | 
| Capacity | Why do you think an artificial turf pitch works here in Khayelitsha? What are the advantages in comparison with a normal grass pitch? I think we can give the children a good and safe field to play on. If you look at other pitches in the area, you will see that they are full with rubbish and glass. Also the idea to play on a artificial turf pitch gets the children exited. They come over from all parts of Khayelitsha. Some of them walk for a half hour to get here. I think on this way we can attract far more children than with a normal grass pitch. | 
| Ownership | | 
| Safety | | 
| Objective/purpose | | 

---

**2 Amandla EduFootball**

Respondent: Florian Zech  
Date: November 9, 2010  
Venue: Ikhusi Primary School, Khayelitsha, Cape Town  

**Purpose interview**

Florian Zech is the founder of the German charity organization Amandla EduFootball, the host of the CTC10 pitch in Khayelitsha. This pitch is funded by an American company called CTC10. The purpose of this interview is to learn more about the management, maintenance and funding of the CTC10 pitch.

**Interview questions**

**Can you give me a brief introduction of your organization?**  
We are a German charity and we’re mainly active in Khayelitsha. We want to develop children who grow up separated from their families in residential facilities and disadvantaged communities through development football leagues, life skill programs, leadership training and crime prevention programs. On the pitch here in Khayelitsha we work with a number of 2.500 youngsters each week.

**On which way is the pitch created?**  
We came up with the idea for an artificial turf pitch a couple of years ago. We asked the police and NGOs in Khayelitsha, which was the area with the highest crime rate and the biggest problems. This was the U-section in which this pitch is build. We approached an organization for the construction of an artificial turf pitch in this area. On the same moment an American company, CTC10, approached the same company with
Advantages

What are the advantages of an artificial turf pitch?
The creation of such a pitch costs a lot of money but in the long term the pitch will repay this investment. It takes a lot less maintenance. We have one member from the community that cleans the pitch every day. He gets R2,000.00 a month. We also have a company who does the maintenance of the field once a month: they repair the grass if it is necessary. This also costs R2,000.00 a month. In addition I think this field is safe for the children. There are no injuries and the pitch is free from garbage. A couple of years ago this pitch was a garbage dump for the community. Playing was not possible because of the garbage and glass. The last advantage is that children come from all over the community because such a field is something special. Kids look forward to play at this pitch. Therefore we have a bigger outreach for our programs.

Which stakeholders are involved?
CTC10 is involved because they funded the pitch. Also the school is an important stakeholder because the pitch is built on school property. Therefore they can use the pitch for free every day till 14.00 o'clock for their lessons and activities. The last and maybe most important stakeholder is the community. I think involving the community in the construction of the pitch was crucial for the success of our programs. We discussed our ideas for an artificial pitch with the Ward Committees, but also with the lower layer of the community. They had the idea they were involved and I think this is the reason why the pitch still is in a good condition. We have no vandalism or materials stolen. For your project, it is important to do the same. Not only ask the official channels of the community but also ask the regular people in the streets what they think about creating such a pitch. If you can make them understand the advantages of such a field, they will stand behind it and take care of the facility with the whole community.

How does AMADLA EduFootball manage the pitch?
We employ some people from the community to manage the pitch. A couple of years ago, when we started our programs, we selected some role models from the community in which we saw leaders. We invested in them, and gave them the opportunity to work for us. The fact the facility is run by locals, creates more respect for the pitch. The parents and friends of our leaders are proud and happy that these youngsters get the opportunity to earn money and mean something for the community. These leaders take care of the planning and assist with our programs. Till 14.00 o'clock the school can use this facility for their lessons or activities. After this our life-skill programs and soccer matches come in. Our programs run till 19.00 o'clock. After this time the pitch will be closed and nobody can make use of it.

Do you have people to guard the pitch at night?
No. It is not necessary because the community look after the pitch.

You have a big field of 80 by 40 meters which you can divide into four smaller fields? Would you rather had a couple of smaller fields spread out through the Khayelitsha area?
Both ideas have a couple of ups- and downsides. I think one big field is good because you have a good overview of the children and you can control them better. We also have enough space to welcome a lot of children. With a smaller pitch it wouldn't be possible to welcome all of the children at once. The upside of different smaller pitches is that you can also get children from other areas. But I don’t think this problem count for us. Some children walk 4 kilometres to play on this field.
## Appendix V List of codes

**List of codes**

1. Advantages
2. Capacity
3. Community participation
4. Crime/vandalism
5. Desired situation
6. Funding
7. Further research
8. Identify stakeholders
9. Management/maintenance
10. Needs/priorities
11. Ownership
12. Purpose/objective
13. Safety
14. Social challenges
15. Working group

**Codes in relation to research questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the needs of the stakeholders regarding the sport facilities in Grabouw?</td>
<td>5,10,11,12,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the standards for a safe sport facility?</td>
<td>4,5,13,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which steps are necessary to make the sport facilities in Grabouw sustainable?</td>
<td>1,2,3,7,8,9,11,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In which way can new sport facilities be funded?</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUPPLY & INSTALLATION OF SYNTHETIC GRASS SOCCER PITCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>TOTAL EXCL VAT</th>
<th>TOTAL INCLUDING VAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R 287.043,00</td>
<td>R 327.299,02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R 204.399,00</td>
<td>R 244.014,86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R 222.066,00</td>
<td>R 0,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R 125.831,00</td>
<td>R 143.447,34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R 9.500,00</td>
<td>R 0,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL INCLUDING VAT**  
R 703.691,22