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Scope
Cultural studies provides an analytical toolbox for both making sense of educational practice and extending the insights of educational professionals into their labors. In this context Transgressions: Cultural Studies and Education provides a collection of books in the domain that specify this assertion. Crafted for an audience of teachers, teacher educators, scholars and students of cultural studies and others interested in cultural studies and pedagogy, the series documents both the possibilities of and the controversies surrounding the intersection of cultural studies and education. The editors and the authors of this series do not assume that the interaction of cultural studies and education devalues other types of knowledge and analytical forms. Rather the intersection of these knowledge disciplines offers a rejuvenating, optimistic, and positive perspective on education and educational institutions. Some might describe its contribution as democratic, emancipatory, and transformative. The editors and authors maintain that cultural studies helps free educators from sterile, monolithic analyses that have for too long undermined efforts to think of educational practices by providing other words, new languages, and fresh metaphors. Operating in an interdisciplinary cosmos, Transgressions: Cultural Studies and Education is dedicated to exploring the ways cultural studies enhances the study and practice of education. With this in mind the series focuses on a non-exclusive way on popular culture as well as other dimensions of cultural studies including social theory, social justice and positionality, cultural dimensions of technological innovation, new media and media literacy, new forms of oppression emerging in an electronic hyperreality, and postcolonial global concerns. With these concerns in mind cultural studies scholars often argue that the realm of popular culture is the most powerful educational force in contemporary culture. Indeed, in the twenty-first century this pedagogical dynamic is sweeping through the entire world. Educators, they believe, must understand these emerging realities in order to gain an important voice in the pedagogical conversation.

Without an understanding of cultural pedagogy’s (education that takes place outside of formal schooling) role in the shaping of individual identity—youth identity in particular—the role educators play in the lives of their students will continue to fade. Why do so many of our students feel that life is incomprehensible and devoid of meaning? What does it mean, teachers wonder, when young people are unable to describe their moods, their affective affiliation to the society around them. Meanings provided young people by mainstream institutions often do little to help them deal with their affective complexity, their difficulty negotiating the rift between meaning and affect. School knowledge and educational expectations seem as anachronistic as a ditto machine, not that learning ways of rational thought and making sense of the world are unimportant.

But school knowledge and educational expectations often have little to offer students about making sense of the way they feel, the way their affective lives are shaped. In no way do we argue that analysis of the production of youth in an electronic mediated world demands some “touchy-feely” educational superficiality. What is needed in this context is a rigorous analysis of the interrelationship between pedagogy, popular culture, meaning making, and youth subjectivity. In an era marked by youth depression, violence, and suicide such insights become extremely important, even life saving. Pessimism about the future is the common sense of many contemporary youth with its concomitant feeling that no one can make a difference.

If affective production can be shaped to reflect these perspectives, then it can be reshaped to lay the groundwork for optimism, passionate commitment, and transformative educational and political activity. In these ways cultural studies adds a dimension to the work of education unfulfilled by any other sub-discipline. This is what Transgressions: Cultural Studies and Education seeks to produce—literature on these issues that makes a difference. It seeks to publish studies that help those who work with young people, those individuals involved in the disciplines that study children and youth, and young people themselves improve their lives in these bizarre times.
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INTRODUCTION

Girls have long been considered a rich feminist memory-site for examining the genesis of women’s sense of self in the developed world. ‘Girlhood studies’ is now recognised in what is known as the developed North as an area of scholarship in and of itself, particularly as it is represented in the range of conferences focusing exclusively on girlhood: Girlhood: A New Feminist Order? (Monash Institute of Education, 2001); Transforming Girlhood: Girls, Agency, and Power (McGill-Concordia, 2003); The New Girlhood Studies (University of Florida, 2005). While studies focusing on girls and girlhood have increased tremendously in the last decade, many of the existing works, including the research methodologies texts, are produced in the United States, England, Australia, and Canada. Studies of girls in developing countries, and Southern Africa in particular, are scarce and rarely take account of the unique situation of girls in these contexts. For example, studies of or about girls heading up families at a very early age, girls forced into transactional sex and early marriages, as well as the position and role of girls in diverse cultural contexts, girls’ vulnerability in the context of Aids, and so on, are virtually non-existent. While these are critical areas of girlhood studies that offer unique perspectives to the international literature on girlhood, to understand how these interact and have an impact on girls and girlhood a more considered study of girlhood is necessary. In addition, methodologies that assist in carrying out such studies need to be identified, developed, and strengthened. This book promises to be a path-breaking one in the sense that it will place on the map of girlhood studies methodological and theoretical approaches and issues related to the study of girlhood in the context of HIV and Aids in Southern Africa.

As is obvious in the range of methodological issues mapped out in this volume and in other studies of girlhood, the notions embedded in ideologies of working with girls, for girls, and about girls are complex. They are ones that cross age, cultural contexts, and disciplinary boundaries, and which interrogate power relationships between the researcher and the researched. In particular, they contest feminist ideals of participation and ‘girls’ voices’ (our sisters/ourselves or our daughters/ourselves) and the challenges to accurate representations of girls’ perspectives on issues that are key to their lives now and in the future. This book has been motivated by our observation that even though the literature on girlhood is replete with references to participation and the need for girl-centredness, there remains a limited body of literature that attends to methodologies for work with girls or for facilitating research by girls themselves particularly in a Southern African context.
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ABOUT GIRLHOOD STUDIES


This literature from the so-called North indicates that some advances have been made to fill the gap in the methodologies for studying girlhood. The work by Mitchell and Reid-Walsh (2007) on *girl-method* responds to an emerging body of ‘method work’ that attests to new field sites for knowing—using one’s self in studying professional practices (Mitchell, Weber, & O’Reilly-Scanlon, 2005) for example, or clothing-as-method (Weber & Mitchell, 2004). Even though there has been a rich body of work and a long history of research that speaks to the nuances of women researching women (see, for example, Anne Oakley’s now-classic article, “Interviewing women: A contradiction in terms”, 1981), there is still a gap within feminist discourses in relation to a framework to name the kind of method work that adult women might engage in with girls, for girls, and about girlhood. Thus, the book aims to take this agenda forward and to investigate a range of methodological and theoretical approaches that can be adapted to study girls and girlhood in Southern Africa. These include policy research, memory work, participatory research, arts-based methods, and others, to be used as analytical tools that should, can, and have been used to examine girls’ situations, particularly in the age of HIV and Aids in Southern Africa.

To date, however, only a few scholars have focused on Southern African girlhoods (for example, Mitchell & Blaeser, 2000; Leclerc-Madlala, 2001, 2003; Flockemann, 2005; Mitchell, 2005; Moletsane, 2000, 2005b, 2007). Even fewer
focus particularly on methodologies for researching girlhood (for example, Moletsane, 2000 and 2005b on the use of writing). This is despite the particular vulnerability of girls to gender-based violence and HIV and Aids, and the relative complexity of doing research with girls in diverse cultural contexts in the context of HIV and Aids in this region. This book grows directly out of a conference on Gender and Education held in Cape Town in May 2004 that brought together people from government, research, and civil society in South Africa to reflect on change in the sphere of gender equity since 1994 (see Chisholm & September, 2005). One of the key features of the conference was a discussion around the seeming backlash that has occurred as a response to women’s legal and constitutional empowerment by the post-apartheid dispensation. The conference expressed the need for a great deal more research on gender and gender equity in a wide variety of spheres including a focus on girlhood itself. Following on from that conference, though, was a recognition that girlhood studies is a burgeoning area of scholarship within the developed world (also known as the North), driven in part by human rights and the girls’ agenda within development contexts, by, for example, the United Nations (UN), the World Bank, etcetera. At the same time, it is an area that, to date has attracted little sustained and scholarly dialogue in the so-called South outside of the body of grey literature of donor reports and commissioned studies on such targeted development areas as girls’ education, gender-based violence, vulnerability in the context of HIV and Aids, the digital divide, and other issues. We believe that, to a large extent, what is behind the relative silence in the research literature on girlhood are the various social, cultural, economic, and ethical barriers to doing research with girls, for girls, and about girlhood in this region. Added to these is the lack of understanding of, and the absence of, any sustained focus on methodological and theoretical approaches to studying girls and girlhood. This is a gap this book is intended to address.

WHY MAPPING?

Mapping, by forcing us to think in terms of discrete entities occupying specific spaces, makes us aware of the spaces we inhabit and the positions we take relative to others. (Stromquist, 1997, p. 242)

A few years ago, a small group of researchers (Mitchell, Reid-Walsh, Blaeser, & Smith, 1998) embarked upon a mapping project within girlhood studies that argued for the need to work across disciplinary borders, and to interrogate such work for its potential to speak across generations, geographic spaces, and so on. The purpose of mapping was to ascertain possible points of convergence in terms of who was doing work on girlhood, and to discover what we could learn when we cross disciplinary borders (and also what we might lose). In so doing, the researchers argued for the need for a discourse community that does not ‘cut up’ girls’ lives, but for one that seeks, rather, to establish a framework for common understandings. Since it is important to remain cognisant of the patriarchal and colonial implications of the term ‘mapping’, Mitchell, Reid-Walsh, Blaeser, & Smith (1998) were using the term in a figurative sense to interrogate the limitations of our
conceptual tools and ask a set of questions. What can we learn when we cross the borders? How can the work in one area inform the work in the other areas? How can we avoid unnecessary duplication? Is there any practical value to working with comparable areas (such as, for example, history, education, and developmental psychology, to name only three)? This is a particularly significant point when we think about the urgency for change in the lives of girls and women in sub-Saharan Africa where the issues of HIV and Aids, gender-based violence, and poverty remain critical. In particular, what might we learn from imagining a ‘community’ of scholars, practitioners, and activists interested in doing research about, with, and for girls? While such a community might be well-developed in the so-called North (including North America, the United Kingdom, and, interestingly, Australia), in countries such as those in sub-Saharan Africa, a part of what is known as the South (in opposition to that well-developed North), it is still in its infancy. Very few writers in this region focus on girlhood studies as an area of study, and virtually none focus specifically on research methodologies for work about, with and for girls. This book aims to address this gap.

OVERVIEW OF THE BOOK

Chapter 1, “Girls and Development: New methodological frameworks for researching Southern African girlhoods in the era of Aids”, locates the book within the broad framework of girlhood and development. The chapter highlights tensions between international, national, and local arenas of activity. It first provides an overview of how priorities related to girls’ education have been framed in development discourses since the 1970s culminating in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the rationale for such a focus, strategic projects, and recent assessments. It then shifts focus to South Africa, using this as a case study to examine the relationship between these commitments and local gender dynamics that shape girls’ lives. It concludes with questions about target-setting processes for the lives of young girls trapped in poverty, rightlessness, and violence as driving research and the need for more intensive engagement with new methodologies for researching girls’ lives.

The book is then divided into three main sections, each corresponding to the three general methodological contexts for girlhood research: research with girls, research about girls and girlhood, and research for girls and girlhood. In the first section, “Research with girls”, we look at various methods and methodological issues that arise as a result of taking participatory approaches within girl-method. The notion of ‘girls’ voices’ is a critical one in Girlhood Studies. Many of us want to claim that the research we conduct and the development projects we develop from them take the voices of the girls with whom we work (of whatever age) seriously. Studying the participation of those who are usually marginalised is quickly emerging as a niche area of research both in terms of appropriate methodologies, but also in terms of the sheer fraughtness there is in relation to ethical issues, levels of participation, tokenism, privileging or romancing the voices of participants, putting our own interpretations on the words of our participants,
and so on. If we acknowledge the power differentials between adult researchers and children as ‘participants’, how do we reflect this in the way we minimise the challenges and maximise the advantages of using participatory methodologies in doing research with girls? Are there specific issues that pertain to working with girls that we need to take into account in the context of gender-based violence and the Aids pandemic? The importance of the interrelatedness of these two questions lies in our belief that participation—hearing the voices of girls—should not be separated from ‘taking action’. Ethically, it may not always be possible to involve girls directly in taking action and, indeed, we have to make sure that we do not put them in a more dangerous position as a result of our research and/or interventions. At the same time, we must also adhere to a code of conduct where we do not simply ‘hear’ the voices of girls for the purposes of our own research without ensuring that we take appropriate steps to improve their lives and to influence policy in their favour. It is here that we run the risk of devaluing girls’ voices and experiences, not to mention putting their safety and security at risk (we re-visit the question of the ethics of doing participatory research with girls in Chapter 8).

Chapter 2, “Negotiating cultural spaces in researching girlhood in the context of Aids in Southern Africa”, the first chapter in this section, examines the various ways in which the diverse cultural contexts in which girls grow up in the region require particular methodological and theoretical approaches to doing research with them, particularly in the context of HIV and Aids. The chapter asks important questions, such as: In what ways do existing notions of culture, and in particular, the existing and emerging gendered cultural norms in communities as well as among children and the youth, inform beliefs and ways of relating to each other across various boundaries, including gender, age, sex, race, ethnicity, and other identities? What implications might these have for research methods for understanding the realities of girls in the context of gender inequality, gender-based violence and HIV and Aids? In particular, what methodological approaches can be identified and developed to investigate the ways in which the various cultural contexts, and in particular, girls’ positions and roles in these contexts (for example, early marriages, transactional sex, unequal gender relations), have an impact on their vulnerability to HIV infection?

Chapter 3, “Pinky Pinky and toilets: Disrupting the silences around sexual violence in and around schools through photo-voice” looks at issues of both place and geography (toilets) and method (photo-voice). Drawing on studies of work with children in Swaziland and rural South Africa in which children were given cameras to represent ‘safe’ and ‘unsafe’ spaces, the chapter highlights the ways in which a ‘through the eyes of children’ approach offers a critical insider view to issues of safety and security in schools. We use Penny Siopis’ visual representations of Pinky Pinky, the mythical beast who is reported to occupy girls’ toilets in South Africa, as a way of framing fieldwork in Southern Africa on gender-based violence in and around schools. Using the visual, in this case, the photographs of 12 and 13 year old girls and boys in schools in South Africa and Swaziland, we explore the powerful images of toilets that young people produced in relation to ‘safe’ and ‘unsafe’ spaces in and around their schools. The chapter is divided into three
sections. In the first section, we briefly map out some of the key areas that inform a critical reading on girls and toilets in schools. In the second section, we focus on the actual data on school toilets —data which come out of the use of photography and drawings as visual approaches to studying ‘safe’ and ‘unsafe’ spaces in schools. We contrast some of this work with data from boys produced in response to the same prompts on safe and unsafe spaces. In the final section of the chapter, we consider the implications of this work within the idea of ‘remapping’, returning to the mythical Pinky Pinky as symbolic of a new critical space for social change.

In Chapter 4, “Speaking the unspeakable: Working with girls through participatory video to uncover issues of incest”, we focus on collaborative and participatory video work. The chapter takes its cue from Pippa Stein’s article titled, “Drawing the unsayable: Cannibals, sexuality and multimodality in a Johannesburg Classroom” (1999) as well as Gerry Bloustien’s (2003) work on ‘girl-making’ in her video project with aboriginal girls in Australia. In the first part of the chapter, we describe a video intervention involving girls in a rural district of KwaZulu-Natal and offer a reading of one of the short video documentaries produced by the girls. In the second part of the chapter, we explore in some depth why ‘youth/girls as knowledge producers’ offers a radical approach to working with girls particularly in the context of engaging in what anthropologist Clifford Geertz (1973) describes as ‘going thick and deep’. Finally, we consider some of the ways that this kind of work, which, while relying on access to video equipment, digital technology, and some technical expertise, nonetheless speaks to the possibilities for social change.

The second section, “Research about girls and girlhood”, looks at methodologies for studying girlhood that rest on adult women’s memories and representations of girlhood. In the same way that Ann Oakley’s (1981) ‘Interviewing women: A contradiction in terms’ formulation has a particular place in women’s research with other women, we think that methods for addressing intergenerationality have a particular place in our work with girls of various ages. While there may be a number of ways of thinking about what intergenerationality might mean in the context of girl-method, here we highlight the significance of retrospective accounts through memoir and literary texts. The first chapter in this section, Chapter 5, “Writing girlhood in the context of Aids”, explores the possible use of writing by adult women looking back at their own girlhood and their experiences of violence in families and the wider community. These narratives are used to understand girlhood issues that would otherwise be painful and controversial, and therefore, difficult for girls to voice in the conventional research methodologies they are often asked to participate in, such as interviews. It explores the potential for the use of such writing to examine, retrospectively, experiences of childhood (girlhood in particular) not only to understand but to “re-vision hegemonic discourses in ways that affirm, challenge, or subvert” (Griffiths, 1995, p. 130) the gendered and violent regimes of families and communities. The chapter explores the complex nature of South African families and the (often hidden) violence, mostly, but not exclusively, against girls and its lasting impact on their
lives. This is done using texts by two South African women, one an autobiography (*Never been at home* by Zazah Khuzwayo, 2004) and the other a ‘biographical’ work of fiction (*A daughter’s legacy* by Pamphilia Hlapha, 2006), which both deal with issues of family and community violence, particularly against girl-children.

Chapter 6, “Girl power in *Nervous conditions*: Girls and girlhood in fictional practice”, explores possibilities for the use of a novel or fictional space, in this case, Tsitsi Dangarembga’s *Nervous conditions*, which deals with the interconnection between colonialism, education, and pathology in educational research. While we acknowledge that the representation of adolescence occurs in *Nervous conditions* as a literary space of personal narration, in this chapter we argue that it can also be seen as an exploratory space in which very specific issues of childhood and adolescence in relation to education can be investigated and understood, not only to the readers of this text as a work of fiction, but also by researchers (educationists and feminists) researching such issues.

Section Three of the book, “Research for girls and girlhood”, considers the ways in which policy research is critical to improving the landscape for girls and young women in Southern Africa. Chapter 7, “Policy frameworks on gender-based violence in schools and communities”, locates issues of policy and social change within global discourses around girlhood. Using the education system as a case study, this chapter aims to identify and reflect on possible strategies for developing a policy framework and interventions that might work to address gender inequality and gender-based violence against vulnerable individuals and groups in general, and women and girl-children in particular. To do this, using the South African education system as a case study, the chapter first briefly re-looks at the policy context informing programming for girls and gender equality in education (addressed in Chapter 1 in this book) and possible reasons for its failure to achieve its goals. The chapter then moves on to the gendered and unequal socio-cultural context in which girls experience their childhood in schools and communities. From this analysis, the chapter identifies implications for possible strategies for developing a policy framework for interventions against gender-based violence against girl-children. Specifically, the chapter focuses on the potential for research for social change (Schratz & Walker, 1995) on behalf of girl-children, in the context of gender-based violence and other social practices that act to violate and silence them as well as those who seek to act on their behalf, asking some significant questions: What kinds of research are needed to effect social change on behalf of girl-children in the context of gender-based violence in South Africa? What should we be asking policy makers, analysts, and programmes about girls and girlhood for example, in the context of the Beijing Platform for Action (BPFA) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)? What methodologies might elicit useful data and analysis for such a research agenda?

Chapter 8, “Least harm: Ethical considerations in researching Southern African girlhoods” focuses on the ethical issues surrounding participatory research with, about and for girls. In this book, while we have focused on highlighting the use of participatory methodologies as a way of giving voice to this often marginalised group, we also acknowledge the complexities and fraughtness of working with this
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group, particularly in the context of gender-based violence and Aids. We agree with scholars and activists who argue that listening to children, girls in particular, cannot be guaranteed to result in significant changes for them in patriarchal and violent societies. In this context, we take seriously, the charge that involving girls should not be at the expense of their safety, autonomy, and anonymity where the latter is necessary (for example in relation to HIV-related stigma). As such, this chapter examines the ways in which researchers using participatory methodologies can adhere to a code of conduct in which they do not simply ‘hear’ the voices of girls for the purposes of research alone, but take appropriate steps to ensure that no harm is done in the conduct of such research. Specifically, the chapter focuses on the ethical considerations for researching girlhood in the context of gender-based violence and Aids, particularly using participatory methodologies discussed in the preceding sections in this book.

The book concludes with Chapter 9, “Girlhood matters and African feminisms: Towards an agenda for research with, about, and for girls”. This chapter looks back (on previous chapters) in order to look forward (and beyond this book). In particular, it serves to map out key features of a feminist agenda for conducting research within girlhood studies in Southern Africa. These include an understanding that to effectively conduct research with, about, and for girls requires that researchers start with their experiences, positionalities, and power in relation to our participants, in this case, girls, whose voices are often marginalised and silenced in the context of culturally based taboos, gender-based violence and HIV and Aids. This must be in tandem with a view that girls (and women) are active agents in the constructions of their own social experiences and development. As such, feminist researchers need to use approaches that allow them to speak out, in their own words, about their experiences, particularly those that involve sexuality, and especially with adult researchers and caregivers. This is particularly important if such research is to uncover the girls’ authentic experiences of the various culturally based taboos and the related gender-based violence in the context of the Aids pandemic.
CHAPTER 1

GI�RLS AND DEVELOPMENT: NEW METHODOLOGIES FOR RESEARCHING SOUTHERN AFRICAN GIRLHOODS IN THE ERA OF AIDS

INTRODUCTION

As the world’s attention increasingly shifts towards the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), education, particularly of girls and women continues to be seen as key to reducing poverty and achieving development goals. The Task Force on Education and Gender Equality, among others, has asserted that a good education is key to economic and social development and therefore to ending poverty (Birdsall, Levine, & Ibrahim, 2005). However, while the significance of educating girls and women as a way of addressing the development needs of communities seems undisputed in many cultural and geopolitical contexts, gender inequalities in families, communities, and educational institutions remain endemic and the desired achievement of the development goals elusive (Moletsane, 2005a).

In the Southern African context, gender disparities, gender-based violence, and HIV and Aids, as well as poverty act as barriers to achieving these goals. In particular, for countries in this region, which are ravaged by HIV and Aids, and where the rates of infection and impacts of the pandemic are negatively skewed against young girls, child-headed households, gender-based violence and teenage pregnancy, among others, are the crux of the concern.

This chapter is concerned with the ways in which researchers and practitioners might study such issues within a policy studies framework. The chapter addresses this question and locates the book within the broad framework of girlhood and development. It highlights tensions between international, national, and local arenas of activity. It first provides an overview of how priorities related to girls’ education have been framed in development discourses since the 1970s culminating in the MDGs, the rationale for such a focus, strategic projects, and recent assessments. It then shifts focus to South Africa, using this as a case study to examine the relationship between these commitments and local gender dynamics that shape girls’ lives. It concludes with questions about target-setting processes for the lives of young girls trapped in poverty, rightlessness, and violence as driving research and looks at the need for more intensive engagement with new methodologies for researching girls’ lives.
Girls’ education grows out of a development discourse on women, gender, and development that had its roots in the 1970s and that has moved through various phases. Consistent in all phases has been the connection of the development discourse to trends and changes in feminist theory and practice in the industrialised world. Both theory and practice have been central to all phases. The first phase is usually categorised as exemplifying the Women in Development (WID) approach, and is seen to have flowed from liberal feminist and liberal modernisation approaches then dominant in the developed world. Characteristic of such approaches was an emphasis on making visible women’s role in production and support for women-only projects and initiatives. For the early proponents of women’s education in Africa, an analysis of women’s role in economic development thus emerged alongside efforts to promote women’s organisations, ministries, units, and policies to facilitate women’s involvement in development (Leach, 2003, p. 9). The work of Ester Boserup (1970) was particularly influential in emphasising women’s contribution to development. Her work focused on highlighting the role (and neglect) of women in development, and it provided a powerful rationale for prioritising the education of women in development. The emphasis was primarily on women amongst the rural poor, and the effects of women’s involvement in agricultural production.

During the 1980s and 1990s, liberal feminist and modernisation approaches were subjected to strenuous critique, first from socialist feminists and then from feminists, influenced by post-modernism, who saw little change in the position of women. This was also the period when dependency theory explained continuing poverty in developing countries as an effect of the unequal relationships between first and third world countries and when radical political economists were drawing attention to the impact of inequalities within countries for perpetuating poverty.

Socialist feminists criticised the limitations of a WID approach for its focus on women only without looking more broadly at gender relations and household decision-making processes that underpin continued inequality, or the socially constructed relationships between men and women and how these change and differ over time and space. The issue is not just to understand women’s specific subordination and how women can be brought into modern institutions. Rather, for the so-called gender and development (GAD) proponents, the issue is to understand development in terms of the relationships between men and women and how masculinity and femininity are constructed in ways that maintain social inequalities. Critiques of the state and development as gendered processes existed side-by-side, however, with approaches to the use of the state and development institutions to promote the interests of women.

These approaches were dominant when the Jomtien Conference on Education for All was held in 1990. The Jomtien Conference committed all donors and agencies to universalising access to basic education and to promoting equity in education: “the most urgent priority,” its declaration’s article 3.3 states, “is to ensure access to, and improve the quality of, education for girls and women, and to remove every obstacle that hampers their active participation. All gender
stereotyping in education should be eliminated” (World declaration on education for all). The Fourth International Women’s Conference held in Beijing in 1995 provided a fresh stimulus to such efforts and with the concept of ‘gender mainstreaming’, gender development activists sought to ensure the centrality of women’s and men’s interests and concerns in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of all legislation, policies and programmes (Leach, 2003, p. 11).

But the Jomtien conference was also held at a very significant moment in geopolitical and international relations. The ending of the Cold War led to a new global dynamic that saw the creation of regional power blocs, the strengthening and growing influence of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank in many countries as well as the reorientation of world institutions to foster a new world order (Stromquist & Monkman, 2000, p. 6). This process was accompanied by an intensification of market-led development processes and perspectives. It signalled the start of a new world order whose economic orthodoxies were to sweep through all previously more radical agendas focusing on changing structural as well as conceptual conditions of inequality. It was also the highpoint of the implementation of structural adjustment programmes and fiscal austerity regimes in developing countries. Insofar as these affected spending on, and therefore access to, and quality of, education, the gender gap widened and girls were negatively affected (Stromquist, 1999). WID and GAD approaches were initially unsettled as new development agendas emanating from the increasingly powerful World Bank demanded ‘efficiency’ and ‘effectiveness’ in policy analysis and programming and turned what feminists would have seen as political issues into “technical, administrative or managerial concerns” (Samoff, in press, p. 8). New analyses of the complexities of gender relations emerged, making power relations the focus of analysis, highlighting differences among women and drawing attention to factors other than gender through which groups have access to resources (Heward, 1999). Agendas to empower women through emphasising women’s voice and agency were, however, weakened by a number of difficulties including the different meanings of empowerment, and how to bring women’s strategic interests into a conversation with those in power (Unterhalter, 2003b, p. 7).

Girls’ education emerged in this context in 1994 at an international conference on population as a compromise between the Vatican and certain Islamic states, and the United States of America over birth control, and as “a policy that all could support as a means of reducing population” (Heward, 1999, p. 5). It rapidly became part of a World Bank discourse on gender and development (Samoff, in press, p. 13). But even though sector-wide Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) insisted upon gender analysis, Leach (2003, p. 14) maintains that “foregrounding gender issues in national policy frameworks remains a considerable challenge.” Studies of PRSPs for Bolivia, Malawi, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Yemen found that strategies were fragmented and piecemeal. Girls’ education was included under gender or education in so general a manner that its inclusion was almost meaningless (as cited in UNESCO, 2004, box 6.4, p. 247.) Ten years after the Jomtien conference, girls’ education and gender mainstreaming had become
central components of a development discourse that spanned international organisations, national governments and NGOs. But there was also widespread recognition that the goals set at Jomtien had not been met. Rallying around the MDGs, international agencies, donors, governments, and NGOs recommitted themselves at the World Education Forum in Dakar in 2000 to a Programme of Action to implement the Jomtien Declaration. The most significant partners at international level include UNICEF, UNESCO, the Department for International Development (DFID), SIDA, NORAD, DANIDA, and the Global Campaign for Education. The Millennium Summit of the UN set two targets for education, both with implications for girls:

Goal 2: Ensuring that by 2015 all children, particularly girls, children in difficult circumstances and those belonging to ethnic minorities, have access to and complete free and compulsory primary education of good quality.

Goal 5. Eliminating gender disparities in primary and secondary education by 2005, and achieving gender equality in education by 2015, with a focus on ensuring girls’ full and equal access to and achievement in basic education of good quality. (UN Millennium development goals)

Not surprisingly, neither of the targets set for 2005 had been achieved by 2005, nor is it likely that the targets set for 2015 will be met (Colelough, 2007). What the target-setting process did achieve, however, was a massive international mobilisation around improving the quality and availability of girls’ education and the measurement of achievements and progress towards meeting the goals.

There is a remarkable unanimity amongst girls’ education proponents about the rationale for doing something about girls’ education, and what to do about it. Amongst international agencies, the rationale is usually expressed in terms of the economic and social benefits that girls’ education will bring. For the World Bank, girls’ education is important because it is said to reduce women’s fertility rates, lower infant and child as well as maternal mortality rates, protect against HIV infection, increase women’s participation in the labour force, enhance their earnings, and improve the life chances for other generations (World Bank, n.d.). Numerous studies have demonstrated the flaws in this approach to ‘girls’ education as contraception’ showing that the relationship of fertility to girls’ education is mediated by the social, political, and cultural context of their lives (Heward, 1999, pp. 5-8). Summarising these studies, Heward has pointed out that education appears to reduce fertility “in countries with higher levels of development and more egalitarian regimes” (Heward, 1999, p. 7) and that recent evidence from sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia shows that

the regions where gender gaps in schooling are large and fertility rates high, suggests that an expansion of girls’ schooling alone in the poorest countries with the most marked gender gaps and highest fertility rates is unlikely to succeed in reducing fertility there (Heward, 1999, p. 9).

In addition, however, the UN and linked bodies have also added the human rights argument that girls’ education is important because its lack signals the
continuing prevalence of educational inequality and this is a major infringement of the rights of women and girls (UNESCO, 2004, p. 24). Many governments are signatories to international covenants and conventions such as the Convention on the Elimination on all Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW, 1979) and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC, 1989). These are more often honoured in the breach than in the observance. But the rationale for girls’ education is thus both economic and social. Early critics of an emphasis on access alone have led to the inclusion of quality and content as equally important dimensions.

Strategies and activities have also become increasingly coordinated and targeted in the last decade. The United Nation’s Girls’ Education Initiative (UNGEI) has five strategic objectives: building political and resource commitments; ending the gender gap; ending gender bias and discrimination within education systems; helping girls’ education in crisis, conflict, and post-conflict situations; and eliminating ingrained gender bias that limits the demand for girls’ education. It supports four different kinds of activities: engagement with governments to ensure integration of girls’ education into Poverty Reduction Strategic Papers (PRSPs) and Sector-Wide Approaches (SWAPs), advise and provide training; advocacy and mobilisation to create supportive environments at country level for girls’ education (UNGEI, n.d.). Activities of the World Bank focus on “analytical, advisory, knowledge-sharing, and capacity-building initiatives” in countries with significant gender disparities in educational enrolments in primary and secondary levels (UNGEI, n.d.). Like the UNGEI, it also commissions research, conducts workshops, disseminates information, and subscribes to gender mainstreaming.

The focus on girls’ education concentrates on achieving the goals of Education for All in targeted countries where discrimination against girls is manifested in poor access to, and quality of, education. There is an emphasis on achieving improved enrolment, repetition, and completion rates in school by reducing the direct and indirect costs of schooling. These include fee waivers, subsidies, scholarships, free books, and uniforms; flexible school times to enable girls to meet family responsibilities; pre-school education; and improving the safety and security of schools. Special attention is also to be paid to family and community education to change perceptions of the value of girls’ education, their role in maths and science, and the labour market. UNICEF, as well as other development partners, has undertaken infrastructural initiatives to make schools ‘girl friendly’ through improved water and sanitation facilities, emphasis on health and hygiene, and school feeding. In addition, there are efforts by others to address the quality of teacher training and the values and attitudes in textbooks.

One of the most comprehensive assessments made in 2004 (UNGEI, n.d.) provided not only a framework for analysing the achievement of these girls, but also the data that showed why an emphasis on girls’ education remains important in many countries. The report distinguished between achieving parity (in numbers) and equality (of opportunity, in the learning process, of outcomes and of external results or job opportunities). It analysed whether rights to, within, and through education, were being met. It showed that more than 40% (54 out of 128) of the
countries with suitable data were at risk of not achieving gender parity either in primary (9) or secondary education (33) or at both levels (12), even by 2015. These countries were mostly from sub-Saharan Africa (16), East Asia and the Pacific (11) and the Arab States (7) (UNESCO, 2004, p. 110). The report provided a comprehensive analysis of why girls were still being held back, examining issues outside of, and inside schools. Those outside school included household decision-making processes, child labour, and traditional social and cultural norms and practices. Hardest hit were foster children, girls living in households suffering from the effects and strains of civil war and HIV and Aids, disabled girls, girls in rural areas and girls who are part of indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities. Those issues inside schools included gender-based violence, teachers’ everyday practices and prejudices and sexism in textbooks and curricula. The report shows that when one looks at outcomes, parity does not necessarily result in equality.

Addressing the question of the growing moral panic about underperformance of boys relative to girls, the report notes that “careful interpretation of the evidence is required to establish which girls are outperforming which boys, in what institutional context this occurs, and whether there are wider socio-cultural factors that affect these outcomes” (UNESCO, 2004, p. 149). It points out that evidence that girls are outperforming boys does not always indicate a reversal of gender inequality; rather, it suggests changes in patterns of gender differentiation. This approach is further nuanced by (Colclough, 2007) who concludes that reduction in boys’ enrolments in many parts of Africa in the 1990s was the consequence of recession and adjustment rather than the impact of programmes to enhance girls’ education.

A recent reassessment of approaches to girls’ education and gender mainstreaming from the perspective of global social justice (Unterhalter, 2007) has distinguished between interventionist (bringing the girls in), institutionalising (gender mainstreaming), and interactive (dialogic) approaches and has examined the strengths and weaknesses of each of these approaches as they have played out in development projects. The main weaknesses of interventionist approaches to ‘getting the girls into schools’ projects are seen, on the one hand, to be “the non-interference with substantive issues of national policy” and resistance within national governments that may block the realisation both of these narrowed, access-related objectives as well as, broader goals associated with them (Unterhalter, 2007, p. 114). The failures of institutionalising approaches focused on mainstreaming, on the other hand, are related to the failure “to tackle the networks of power within institutions” (Unterhalter, 2007, p. 131). The main challenge for this approach is the identity and roles of strategic partners. The third interactive approach emphasises the role of these partnership relationships to “plan their own actions and interventions, promote dialogue, and support capacity development” (Unterhalter, 2007, p. 143). Despite its rich potential for promoting civil society participation in discussions of rights and capabilities at global and local level, it “remains...largely unrealized...submerged in the urgency to deliver places in school and institutionalise the global alliances through the Fast Track Initiative (FTI)” (Unterhalter, 2007, p. 153). We explore these issues further in subsequent
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chapters, first as a rationale for re-imagining new methodologies for doing research with, about and for girls, but also what approaches might work best to address the related imbalances.

New work within the development paradigm focused on the capability approach of Amartya Sen debunks the notion that capabilities can be equated to a narrow definition of outcomes, qualities, or competencies and it provides a framework for evaluating gender justice that values freedoms and affirms rights as ethical obligations of each person to another (Unterhalter, 2007; Walker & Unterhalter, 2007). Within this framework, girls’ education and the MDGs provide a strategic opportunity to reflect on the nature and content of rights in education and the improvement and achievement of gender equality (Unterhalter, 2005b).

The capabilities approach has methodological strengths and limitations. Unterhalter’s work has argued that while it provides a valuable way to move beyond human capital theorising, the approach fails to take account of the complex contexts within which schooling takes place. Political and social analyses are critical complements to this approach (Unterhalter, 2003a). Furthermore, while participatory action research could be seen as a way of implementing and evaluating capabilities and enacting principles of fairness and justice in education (Walker, 2005), the approach also lends itself to statistical evaluation. This is in spite of the fact that the range of technical issues to be overcome in arriving at a Gender Development or Education Development Index through the use of this approach is formidable (Colcough, 2007). Nonetheless, it does provide a new approach that recognizes the significance of girlhood studies within a broader development framework.

Knowledge and research within the three approaches identified by Unterhalter have been concerned mainly with monitoring girls’ enrolment, participation, and progression in school. Grappling with the limitations of existing measurement and participatory tools used on their own to provide an approach that monitors empowerment more fully, Unterhalter expresses hope that it is possible and necessary to develop further existing monitoring and empowerment measures “as a moral compass to assess the operations of existing institutions” (2007, p. 147). Critical as these measures are, it is important to recognise the role of methodologies that draw not only on the social sciences, but also on the humanities (history, literature, anthropology, and philosophy). These have the potential to provide bottom up accounts of lived histories and realities, beliefs, and practices both on their own terms and as they shape the meanings, successes, and failures of development projects at local level. However, there are more histories of development theory than of teachers and teaching, or of communities that have experienced centuries-long exposure to project experimentation focused on gender practices. There are likewise more assessments of contemporary development instruments than of the life histories of women and girls and how these may or may not intersect with such instruments. The insights to be gleaned from detailed studies, such as those provided by Coe (2005), Vavrus (2003), and Unterhalter (2002) are rare. While we recognise that both types of research are necessary, and that the balance is currently decidedly on the side of developmentally-oriented
social science research rather than on the interpretive humanities, rather than
address it, this volume only aims to signal this imbalance.

Using South Africa as a case study, the next section examines the relationship
between the policy framework (for example, that informing girls’ education) and
local gender dynamics that shape girls’ lives. The section raises questions about
target-setting processes for the lives of young girls trapped in poverty,
rightlessness, and violence, as driving research, and instead explores the need for
more intensive engagement with new methodologies for researching girls’ lives,
particularly in the context of Aids.

GIRLS’ EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

South Africa subscribes to most international conventions relating to gender and
girls. Its Constitution commits it to gender equality. As a result, an impressive
array of initiatives exists testifying to the impact and purchase of gender priorities
at the national level intersecting at the local level. All three approaches that
Unterhalter (2007) identifies are evident in the history of these initiatives since
1994, although the focus has been less on getting girls in (since girls are already in
school to a higher degree than in other developing countries), than on gender
mainstreaming and building partnerships to build capacity and address gender-
based violence in schools. The Department of Education established the Girls’
Education Movement (GEM) in 2003 with the support of UNICEF, NGOs, and the
Department of Arts, Culture, Science, and Technology. GEM targets girls between
12 and 16 years of age and aims to eliminate discrimination and violence against
girls. To this effect it works with the South African Girl Child Alliance (SAGCA)
and in partnership with Women’s Net (Chala, 2003a) in the Eastern Cape,
Mpumulanga, KwaZulu-Natal, and Limpopo. Indicating a focus not only on ending
gender-based violence but also on developing leadership, some GEM programmes
include the high-profile ‘Take a Girl-child to Work’ days, where adults from all
walks of life, including parliamentarians and the President of South Africa have
taken girls to work. Of particular relevance to us in this book, at the launch of
GEM in KwaZulu-Natal, one of the young girls who addressed the audience
highlighted the need for action against sexual abuse of girls by schoolteachers
(Grey, 2003). Similarly, at a weekend workshop held in Gauteng, 180 learners
addressed issues related to teenage pregnancy, violence against women, and gender
and the media (Chala, 2003b).

These initiatives contrast strongly with, and are intended to address the ongoing
 legitimation of everyday violence in gender politics and relationships. Respect and
dignity in relation to girls and women, trumpeted in official discourse, is easily
sacrificed, for example, when it comes to preserving the delicate balance of power
between men, as the Jacob Zuma trial in South Africa too clearly demonstrated.
Accused of rape by a lesbian HIV-positive woman, no holds were barred as
Zuma’s supporters gave vent to extreme misogyny. The powerful support given to
Zuma by the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) and the South
African Communist Party (SACP) declared the trial’s result (acquittal) a foregone
conclusion. The rape complainant’s trauma became Zuma’s public pleasure as he declared, while on trial, that “she was delicious” (The Star, 2006). Men in the leadership and women in traditional clothing carried placards with the message, “Burn this Bitch!” (Sowetan, 2006). Men and women alike, supporters of Zuma, burnt his accuser’s photograph. The message here was clear, simple yet powerful: girls and women who speak out against rape need to be prepared for vilification, silencing, and even further violence in some quarters of society.

In a public climate such as this, what does achieving MDG targets of access and quality actually mean? How have the interventionist approaches such as GEM been articulated in the South African context? As far as gender enrolment and achievement is concerned, South Africa does at first glance appear to be an exceptional case in Africa, its issues more like those in middle-and high-income than those in low-income countries. Girls in sub-Saharan African countries generally have less access to schooling than boys—enrolment and completion rates are lower. However, the Monitoring Learning Achievement project (UNESCO, UNICEF, 2001) concludes that, with the exception of francophone countries, gender differences in performance are either small or insignificant in sub-Saharan Africa. Later studies conducted by the Southern African Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SACMEQ) also found relatively small gender disparities in reading, slightly favouring girls in some instances and boys in others (UNESCO, 2004, p. 104).

In South Africa, much of the debate, resulting from monitoring access and performance, has focused on girls’ relative advantage compared with boys. Evidence has consistently been presented over the last twenty years that “girls have equal if not slightly better opportunities than boys with regard to being enrolled in education, and this despite high levels of teenage pregnancy” (Unterhalter, 2004, p. 83). However, South Africa is exceptional only insofar as girls’ enrolment is higher than that of boys when compared to other African countries. While more girls than boys pass on to secondary school, in 2000 data for survival seemed to show more girls than boys out of school (Unterhalter, 2004). In addition, analyses of matric (Grade 12) results for 2003 showed that girls performed better than boys, but only if and when they were not poor and African (Kahn, 2006; Perry & Fleisch, 2006). The gender differences between boys and girls were not significant except at the upper end of achievement. At the bottom of the class, the quality of outcomes is exceptionally poor for both boys and girls. Moreover, an analysis of mathematics and science test results from the TIMSS study shows that there are no significant differences in performance between boys and girls, for example, from 1999 to 2003 (Reddy, 2006). The most important issue to consider when examining performance is the necessary disaggregation of data by race and class. For example, amongst the more affluent, and those attending historically better-endowed schools, the gender gap seems to be closing, as in many Northern contexts (Arnot, David and Weiner, 1999). Amongst the poorer schools, the trends are very similar to those in large parts of Africa. More importantly, it is also necessary to weigh these educational achievements against labour market realities. Despite South African girls’ educational success, more women are unemployed than are men. Since 2001, when it
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was first conducted, the Labour Force Survey (LFS) has consistently recorded a higher unemployment rate among women, compared to men. The most recent data, recorded in the September 2006 LFS, reports an official unemployment rate of 21.2% for men, compared to 30.7% for women.

The big picture of access and quality in South Africa seems to suggest less of a need for a gender or girls’ education policy and campaign, than one focused on improving the general conditions of schooling overall, and within this, focusing on poverty-related measures and more importantly, the creation of safe school environments. Stories of girls’ sexual abuse and rape, heightened by unsafe passages to school as well as spaces within schools, are legion (Mitchell, 2005). In the context of the HIV and Aids pandemic, itself gendered and negatively skewed against poor African girls and women, such gender-based violence has become endemic. It is accordingly the main issue for much of the work of international and local NGOS. We are not suggesting that this is a new issue. For example, when a Gender Equity Task Team conducted its work in 1996, “the huge amount of sexual abuse of some form or another, generated both by pupils and teachers…[was] constantly raised” (Wolpe, 2005, pp. 128-129).

Despite a recommendation by the Gender Equity Task Team for the introduction of ‘vicarious liability’ that would make the head of every institution responsible for the violence occurring inside their institution, nothing as decisive as this has ever been introduced. Explaining similar phenomena, Stromquist (1997) makes the useful distinction between policies that are coercive—enacted to prevent sexual discrimination from taking place—or supportive—creating bodies to promote or implement new practices—or constructive—that provide incentives or new practices. In South Africa, policy seems to focus on the supportive aspects. There are many guidelines and workbooks—on how to deal with sexual abuse in the curriculum, on signposts for safe schools, sexual harassment, teenage pregnancy, gender equity, gender resources, and drug abuse (Ramagoshi, 2005, p. 129). Thus, for example, in the context of growing allegations that young girls in poverty are falling pregnant in order to secure a child support grant, the Department of Education has brought into being new pregnancy prevention and management measures. These measures encourage teenagers to abstain from sex, but they also provide a framework for the management of schoolgirl pregnancies. They emphasise that pregnant schoolgirls have a right to education and cannot be expelled from school because they are pregnant, but they also set out guidelines for managing pregnancies so that the learning environment for other learners is not compromised. Unfortunately, there has to date, been a relatively ineffectual ‘gender machinery’ in the national and provincial Departments of Education to enforce such policy and provide support to girls and schools.

Improving access and quality has been conjoined in South Africa to gender mainstreaming approaches, promoted both in national and specifically Education Department approaches since 1994 (Chisholm & September, 2005; Odora-Hoppers, 2005; Ramagoshi, 2005; Wolpe, 2005). These approaches have not met with success, largely, Unterhalter (2007, p. 133) argues, because of entrenched power networks within the bureaucracy and limited links between institutionalisation...
and popular mobilisation initiatives. Links between and among international, national, and local civil society initiatives are poor and constrain what can and has been achieved.

From the analysis in this section, we conclude that knowledge and research in the field is, as in the international domain, focused more on monitoring enrolment, progression, and performance than on the lives of girls, the histories of their teachers and communities, how they understand, imagine and negotiate their past, present and future, as individuals, as members of families, as citizens, and as workers. However, the possibilities that each approach can bring is forcefully demonstrated in recent work exploring girls’ experiences under apartheid, and what contemporary statistics and stories show about how their lives have changed (Morrell & Moletsane, 2002; Unterhalter, 2005a; Mitchell, 2005).

CONCLUSION

The rest of the chapters in this book illustrate how methodological debates on researching girls, particularly in the context of gender-based violence and HIV and Aids in Southern Africa, are both complex and challenging. They take up the various approaches that might assist researchers and others working with, and for girls to better understand the lives of girls in South Africa and the rest of the region. This chapter has shown that within the framework of development policy and practice, methodological debates are located within ‘getting girls into school’ approaches that focus mainly on monitoring enrolment and achievement. Here the methodological issues are not so much about how to engender measurement tools as the need for these tools themselves. Measurement and participatory approaches vie for attention in an unsatisfactory conflict that fails on the one hand to recognise the importance of holding governments to account and, on the other, of going beyond simple instrumentalist measures. The ways in which we might refine measurement tools while reconciling the apparently irreconcilable is at the heart of methodological debate in this field. Using the South African Girls Education Movement as a case study in which there is little methodological debate, in this chapter we have explored the strengths and limitations of these approaches. As in the international context, such debate is more often internal to either the measurement or to participatory approaches. In this book, we attempt to illustrate the development and use of new methodologies for understanding the lives of Southern African girls in the context of gender-based violence and HIV and Aids. We illustrate how and why it is important to go beyond the measurement or to participatory approaches, and instead, to attempt to bring into conversation and dialogue the possibilities that multi-, cross- and interdisciplinary approaches can bring in deepening understanding of the relationships of poverty, inequality, gender-based violence, HIV and Aids, and justice.
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RESEARCH WITH GIRLS
CHAPTER 2

NEGOTIATING CULTURAL SPACES IN RESEARCHING GIRLHOOD IN THE CONTEXT OF AIDS IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

INTRODUCTION

In Chapter 1 we have argued that in many cultural and geopolitical contexts in Southern Africa, gender inequalities in families, communities, and educational institutions remain endemic and the desired achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) elusive. This is in spite of the undisputed significant strides made in educating girls and women as a way of addressing the development needs of communities. Reasons for this are complex and varied. Some scholars contend that the resurgence of culture and tradition as a basis for individuals and groups to construct and perform their identities is among the most significant of these factors. In the context of HIV and Aids in particular, culture is often “superimposed on many aspects of society, particularly those that deal with [girls’ and] women’s rights [and sexuality], even in contexts that one would not expect the culture discourse to be prominent in” (Magwaza, 2006, p. 2). Going back to ‘our culture’, for example, is seen by some as a way of addressing the spiralling HIV infection rates among the youth, particularly young women and girls. This is evidenced by, among other practices, the revival of old traditions like virginity testing for girls in some rural communities. For example, Leclerc-Madlala (2003) writes of the growing popularity of programmes that purport to protect girls’ virginity as a strategy for managing the alarming increases in HIV infections. According to her, many African communities tend to direct a “strong symbolic and cultural value to virginity and virgin girls…[who] represent health, vigour, fertility, and the future, not only as embodied in the individual but as embodied in communities and wider society” (p. 23). The practice is also informed by the belief that the many social ills that have befallen communities such as HIV infections and Aids-related deaths, teenage pregnancies, and other ills are a result of women’s (and girls’) moral transgressions and that controlling this group’s sexuality constitutes a solution for reducing such problems.

In this context, notions of ‘our culture’ are often used to justify the oppression of girls and women by regulating what they may or may not do. Unfortunately, individuals and groups do not always have the same understandings of what ‘culture’ and in particular, what the notion of ‘our culture’ means. This is because as Magwaza (2006) notes, conceptually, there exist numerous and varied
definitions of culture. For example, citing a 2002 UNESCO definition, Magwaza (2006, p. 2) lists “art, literature, lifestyles, value systems, beliefs, spiritual, material, intellectual, and emotional features of society” as constituting culture. The varied understandings of culture obviously impact in different ways on the performed ‘culture’, and in particular, on how people construct and perform their cultural (and other) identities. Within this context, various ethnic, racial, religious, and other groups claim some cultural space and identity. This produces a diversity of co-existing and often competing ‘cultures’ in communities. Furthermore, schools and other social institutions (such as cultural and religious institutions), as well as globalisation and the mobility of people and ideas across societies also inform the ways in which people, particularly young people, construct and perform their identities. Together, these local and global cultures produce multiple identities informed by a variety of contexts and sources. So, what one individual or group regards as their ‘culture’ is different from what the next individual or group refers to. It may also be that when individuals and groups perform their ‘culture’, they are informed by different identities at different times and in different locations. For women and girls, these conceptual and practical differences in the definitions of culture tend to have particularly conflicting and contradictory meanings (Clark, 2006) and the ways in which they respond to them, and perform them, becomes complex. We consider these to be a critical area of girlhood studies that offers unique perspectives to the international (and particularly Southern African) literature on girlhood. However, to understand how these interact with and have an impact on girls and girlhood, methodologies that assist in carrying out such studies need to be identified, developed, and strengthened.

In this book we illustrate how girls who live in these present particular challenges for conducting research that is useful in informing interventions that work to improve their lives. Thus, this chapter examines the various ways in which the diverse cultural contexts in which Southern African girls grow up, and the varied cultural identities they have, require particular methodological and theoretical approaches to doing research with, for and about girls and girlhood, particularly in the context of HIV and Aids. The chapter asks about the ways in which existing notions of culture, and in particular, the existing and emerging gendered cultural norms among children and youth, inform beliefs and ways of relating to each other across various boundaries, including gender, age, sex, race, ethnicity, and other identities. It examines the possible implications this might have for research methods for understanding the realities of girls in the context of gender inequality, gender-based violence, and HIV and Aids. In particular, it explores the methodological approaches that can be identified and developed to investigate the ways in which the various cultural contexts, and in particular, girls’ positions and roles in these contexts (for example, early marriages, transactional sex, unequal gender relations), exposes them to gender-based violence and have an impact on their vulnerability to HIV infection. Informed by the notion that it is only when such interventions are premised on the authentic voices of this group that they can succeed, to address these challenges, we explore the possible use of participatory
approaches to research and development as a way to address these complex challenges facing girls in various social and cultural contexts in the region.

GIRLS AND GIRLHOOD IN THE CONTEXT OF GENDERED CULTURAL NORMS IN COMMUNITIES

All known human societies make social distinctions based on gender, and virtually all allocate more power and higher status to men (Strebel et al., 2006, p. 517).

Our analysis in this chapter is premised on the notion that in many communities, gender roles are culturally sanctioned and in the current context, tend to be linked to both gender-based violence and the risk of HIV infection. In particular, this section of the chapter addresses the question posed above related to the impact of existing gendered notions of culture. We ask: In what ways do existing notions of culture, and in particular, the existing and emerging gendered cultural norms among children and the youth inform beliefs and ways of relating to each other across various boundaries, including gender, age, sex, race, ethnicity, and other identities?

As stated above, many individuals and groups often use the notion of ‘culture’ to regulate girls’ and women’s behaviour. This is done through taboos determined and normalised as custom and ‘culture’ by, and for, specific social contexts in the family, the community, and the wider society. One such taboo, related to patriarchy, is participating in decision-making and other forums aimed at discussing important issues affecting the family or the community, a responsibility usually reserved for men (and boys) in family and community contexts. This renders girls and women perpetual minors and silences their voices as inconsequential. As such, having learnt to be silent and to defer to boys and men, and sometimes to adult women to speak on their behalf, women and girls do not readily respond to research in development contexts which require them to voice their views on issues that affect their lives. In the context of the AIDS pandemic, fears linked to the possibility of having to suffer HIV-related stigma and related forms of gender-based violence tend to exacerbate these silences.

A second and related taboo bars girls from speaking about sex in general, and specifically from speaking about sex and sexuality to adults, including their own parents. In turn, such social taboos also prohibit adults, including mothers, from speaking to their daughters about such issues. What is particularly complex in this scenario is the fact that in the context of our cultural understandings and enactments of masculinity and femininity, there exist contradictions around discussions of sex and sexual relationships with and among children (both boys and girls) in particular. So, for example, on the one hand, boys tend to understand the need to project ‘a real man’ image, and for them, this often means proving their sexual prowess with the opposite sex. This might mean that in research situations, it becomes easy for them to voice their views regarding these, possibly making it easy for researchers and practitioners to identify interventions that might work to
address issues that affect them. On the other hand, in these cultural contexts, girls tend to understand a need to perform a ‘proper/good woman’ identity, particularly a proper African woman who ‘respects’ males (for example, father, brother, husband, boyfriend) and refrains from speaking openly to certain groups (men, adults, et cetera) about particular topics, including sex and sexuality. This might act to silence them on these and other issues and to render research that requires their authentic voices difficult to carry out. As literature in the field suggests (see for example, Magwaza, 2006), adequate and appropriate understandings of what a proper African masculinity or femininity is remain limited and uneven. Therefore, without a revised understanding amongst boys and girls (and men and women) of what it means to be a (real) man or woman, it would be impossible to enact new forms of masculinities and femininities that benefit both sexes. It is only when we study these states of being, boyhood and girlhood, masculinity and femininity, as scholars and activists that we can hope to intervene effectively against the adverse and oppressive conditions of girlhood in Southern Africa. However, without any creative strategies for obtaining the authentic voices of girls on these issues in particular, so as to overcome these taboos, such a research agenda remains impossible.

A third barrier to conducting research with girls in cultural contexts is the fact that, to enforce the many taboos placed on girls and women, individuals and groups, both male and female appointed or self appointed as guardians of ‘culture’, actively seek to sanction women and girls’ behaviours. For example, a few communities in the Southern African region have revived some so-called ‘culturally appropriate strategies’ (Leclerc-Madlala, 2003, p. 16) for managing the HIV and Aids pandemic. Among these is the practice of testing girls for virginity, which some traditionalists are promoting as a way of reducing the escalating rates of HIV infection among the youth in particular as well as teenage pregnancy. Virginity testing is also being promoted as a strategy for detecting which children are being sexually abused by adults (Le Roux, 2006). According to Leclerc-Madlala (2003), this “monitoring and controlling of [girls’] sexuality” as it is being currently practised in countries experiencing high HIV infection rates is usually put into effect through “regimes of pledging, testing, and publicly asserting virgin status” (p. 16). The public nature of the custom enables adult members of communities to assert control over girls. It is through such control and expectations that they are able to justify violence (as punishment) against those who transgress the family and community expectations for women in general to remain moral, and for girls in particular to remain pure and virginal. Within this context, contradictions regarding, on the one hand, a belief in protecting girls’ virginity, and, on the other, a belief in the myth perpetuated by some traditional healers that sexual intercourse with a virgin can cure HIV and Aids abound. Such contradictions are believed to be producing the many cases of child sexual abuse, incest, and the rape of young girls in many communities in the region (Mistry, 2001) in what Leclerc-Madlala (2003) refers to as a matter of life and death. So, the very practice aimed at protecting girls’ virginity tends to put them at risk of sexual violence, including rape. The latter, in turn, puts them at risk of HIV
infection. In research contexts, attempts to get the voices of such children, who, because they have suffered sexual abuse, are experiencing pain, shame, fear, and confusion (Howe, 2005), are often met with silence, so the authentic voices of these girls are missing from data meant to inform programs that target them.

A related contradiction is linked to the perception by parents and guardians that in addition to bringing them lobola (bride price), marrying their daughters off, even at too early an age, will protect the girls’ virginity until marriage, thereby protecting the family honour and, by implication, the size of the bride price. In addition, contrary to research which suggests that married women are not necessarily safe from HIV infection, most parents and guardians believe that marriage will protect the girls from HIV and Aids. Again, in most cases, these early marriages only serve to expose the girls to more gender-based violence, and place them at risk of HIV infection as well as other health problems. After all, as we indicate in Chapter 1 (for example, regarding the Jacob Zuma rape trial in South Africa), while girls and women are expected to keep their virginity and honour, boys and men are expected, and often taught/encouraged to freely and, if necessary, violently express their sexuality. Therefore, a direct and devastating impact of sexual violence against girls in communities is the increasingly gendered HIV infection rates among girls and young women. To illustrate, Moletsane (2005c) points to research findings which have concluded that one-third of all HIV infections happen during the school years, while another third occur within two years of leaving school, suggesting the young age at which girls get infected. (See, for example, Badcock-Walters, 2002.) Many of these infections have been found to occur among girls from poor and marginalised groups, with the ratio of young men to women between the ages of 15 and 24 years infected with HIV in the country standing at 1:4 (Dorrington, Bradshaw, & Budlender, 2002).

The gendered nature of the Aids pandemic is further complicated by HIV-related stigma. Campbell, Foulis, Maimane, and Sibiya (2005) have concluded that people tend to cope by projecting their fears (for example, of being infected by HIV) and by othering individuals and groups associated with the source of fear. Informed by Strong’s notion of the epidemic psychology (as cited in Haour-Knipe, 1993), which identifies different reactions towards epidemics such as HIV and Aids, the authors argue that stigmatisation often reflects wider social tendencies and trends and serves to justify them. As Moletsane, de Lange, Mitchell, Stuart, Buthelezi, and Taylor (2007) observe, reflecting the prejudices and social inequalities in the wider society, in many communities, women, particularly poor African women, are often regarded as carriers and vectors of HIV and Aids. (See also Epstein, Morrell, Moletsane, & Unterhalter, 2004; Moletsane 2004b; Sarthiparsad & Taylor, 2006.) In this vein, Campbell, Foulis, Maimane, and Sibiya (2005) conclude that the social taboos against sex in these communities might explain the stigmatisation of those infected with HIV, particularly women. For example, the othering of those women and girls who are perceived to be promiscuous might be used to justify the stigmatisation and even violence against those who are seen to be potential vectors of the virus. This might explain why communities in general, and girls in particular, find it difficult to address issues of
sexuality and its role in HIV infections in research and intervention projects, rendering current intervention efforts ineffective (Moletsane, de Lange, Mitchell, Stuart, Buthelezi, and Taylor, 2007).

This is not to say that girls in the region are completely helpless and that they have no agency in their own lives. On the contrary, some sexual relationships between older males and young women and girls are with the latter’s consent as transactional sexual relations such as for example, in the ‘sugar daddy’ phenomenon (Moletsane, 2003). However, as Gupta (2002) observes, the unequal balance of power that characterises most of these cross-generational sexual relationships tends to put girls at risk of gender-based violence, HIV infection, and other sexually transmitted infections. Because of the fear of sexual coercion and violence in such relationships, girls are unable to negotiate safe sex and protection against HIV.

Thus, our discussion of girls and girlhood in this chapter focuses specifically on those made vulnerable by gender-based violence to HIV infection, and acknowledges the fact that, like other social identities, girlhood is socially constructed and performed within certain local and global cultural contexts (Mitchell, 2005). Taking Mitchell’s advice, in this chapter we argue that research about, with and for girls must, of necessity, disaggregate data on girlhood, for instance, according to age, for example, toddler or teenager, and experience, for example, from vulnerable girl to empowered successful girl. In the context of HIV and Aids, such differentiation might identify those girls who are orphans, or who are heading households, or those who are themselves infected. This could provide a useful lens for understanding the realities of girls in each category and the ways in which the cultural contexts in which they live negatively or positively affect them.

As illustrated above, the socially determined taboos and the related violent sanctioning of women and girls’ behaviour function to silence both adults and children (women and girls, in particular) and to limit their ability to control their own lives. Conversely, they serve to enable men and society to justify the gender-based violence often perpetrated against girls and women in communities and to absolve the former of any direct responsibility in placing the latter at risk of violence and HIV infection, blaming them, instead, for going against ‘our culture’. We can see, therefore, that for women and girls, any work, including research, which involves speaking about these issues places them at further risk of violating the social taboos aimed at regulating their behaviour as ‘moral’ girls and women and particularly as ‘good Africans’, the consequences of which often include various forms of violence against them. Obviously, in the context of the gendered HIV and Aids pandemic, to attempt to break the silences that surround issues of gender-based violence, as well as sex and sexuality, and to address the vulnerability of girls and women, scholars need to adopt approaches that go beyond the traditional research strategies. Instead, creative ways of obtaining the necessary authentic voices of girls (and women) to inform our understanding of, and interventions against, the negative impacts of gender-based violence and HIV and Aids are needed. This is particularly urgent in the context of Aids, since, according to Henderson (2003), “[the pandemic is potentially forcing] adults to re-
conceptualise the ways in which children and childhood have thus far been described, and may force a space where children’s power is recognized” (p. 8). This, according to her, is because as the pandemic matures, adult men and women will die in large numbers, leaving young people as the surviving majority and responsible for “devising ways of constituting forms of sociability, responsibility and the protection of young children” (p. 8).

Unfortunately, a research agenda that aims to understand girls’ positions and roles in communities and families in the context of unequal gender relations in the home, community, and society, as well as the gendered HIV and Aids pandemic, can be challenging. In such contexts, barriers to really ‘hearing’ girls’ voices, and a tendency to perpetuate the silences, oppression, and neglect of girls (and women) dominate. In particular, in the context of the diverse cultural spaces that most girls in Southern Africa inhabit, especially in this context of Aids and HIV-related stigma, specific methodological and theoretical approaches to doing research with, for, and on, girls and girlhood are needed. As scholars and activists, we need to find creative strategies to excavate the silences (Brink, as cited by Stein, 1999) that often surround issues involving sexuality, HIV and Aids, and sexual abuse among girls, and to skilfully and sensitively negotiate these spaces so as to have the authentic voices of those we target (girls) play important roles in the research and interventions we implement.

GIRL-METHOD FOR TRADITIONAL CULTURAL CONTEXTS

As illustrated in the sections above, the peculiar cultural contexts that characterise girls’ lives in Southern Africa and the complexity of the issues that have a negative impact on them tend to render girlhood a complex and very challenging phenomenon to study. Exacerbating the situation are the gendered nature of HIV and Aids and the reality of HIV-related stigma, as well as the endemic sexual abuse experienced by girls in the region (see, for example, Mitchell, 2004a.) If such research is aimed at achieving social change, including change in the social conditions of girls (for example, through the reduction or eradication of poverty, prevention of HIV infections, the establishment of gender equality in the family and community, and so on ), research on girlhood and girls requires identification, development, and the use of approaches that are particularly nuanced. Thus, in this section, we consider the ways in which girls themselves might identify and/or contribute to the development of methodological approaches that may be used to examine the ways in which the various cultural contexts, and in particular, their positions and roles in these contexts, have an impact on their vulnerability to HIV infection. We advocate the use of participatory approaches to achieving this.

Factors such as gender inequality, gender-based violence, poverty, and HIV infection, among others, tend to interact in ways that have a negative impact on the lives of girl-children more than on the lives of boy-children in many communities (Moletsane, 2007). It is for this reason that those working on research and interventions that target girls should identify and/or develop strategies that aim to protect girls from such factors (Gresh, 2007). In particular, for scholars working in
traditional cultural contexts in African communities, understanding girls and
girlhood in general as a complex and multifaceted identity (because of differences
in race, social class, sexual orientation for example), which tends to be developed
and enacted in often difficult circumstances which are influenced by, most
importantly, gender-based violence and HIV and Aids, is essential. From this
understanding, developing interventions aimed at addressing the cultural norms
that make girls vulnerable to the many social ills plaguing communities might
emerge (Moletsane, 2007). Mitchell and Reid-Walsh’s (2005b) girl-methods might
be employed to negotiate such traditional cultural contexts to not only speak on
behalf of girls, but to enable them to speak on their own behalf and to obtain their
authentic voices in describing their lives and what might work in addressing the
barriers that face them. Such girl-methods must of necessity, involve creative
strategies that aim to understand girls’ issues from their own perspectives by:
– uncovering the silences and gaps that often surround issues that face girls such
  as sexual abuse, rape, and HIV infection, and skilfully and sensitively negotiating
  these spaces so as to have girls’ voices play important roles in the research and
  intervention processes;
– reducing and ultimately eradicating the barriers to hearing the authentic voices
  of girls in these contexts so as not to perpetuate the silences, oppression, and
  neglect around girls’ (and women’s) issues in our society; and
– moving from a focus on the individual girl to a focus on the environment or the
  socio-cultural context within which people live (Marcus, 2002), particularly in
  the context of HIV and Aids.

As we contend later on in Chapter 8, it is important to note that the nature of this
research context and the unequal power relations inherent in it require that we
prioritise ethical approaches to conducting such studies. (We address ethical issues
to doing research with girls in Chapter 8 of this book).

The following section explores the use of participatory methodologies in
researching Southern African girls and girlhood.

*Can Participatory Methodologies Enable Research on, with, and for Girls in these
Cultural Contexts?*

We believe that in the context of gender-based violence, HIV infection, early
marriages, and transactional sex, and the consequent relegation of girls to the
margins of society (Moletsane, 2007) it is essential that we develop a good
understanding of what it is like to be a girl in the various Southern African cultural
contexts. To do so, we need to listen and really hear the authentic voices of girls
living in such contexts. As indicated above, the methods we adopt need to ensure
that the girls’ anonymity and autonomy are protected throughout any research
process in which we involve them. Considering the oppressive and violent nature
of some of the cultural contexts they inhabit, and the taboos often placed on them,
particularly their inability to freely express their views on important issues that
affect them, research methodologies must take into account the situated
knowledges of these girls and their communities (Stuart & Moletsane, 2005). To
achieve this, such methodologies must invite girls to participate actively in research aimed at changing their social condition. This is premised on the notion that research participants, in this case girls and women, are active and knowing agents in their own lives. As such, methodologies that take into account and value the perspectives of those operating in the context of their own situation, and actively involve research participants throughout the research process, are essential. Following James and Prout’s (1995, p. 78) suggestion, we believe that “through focusing on [girls] as competent, individual social actors, we might learn more about the ways in which ‘society’ and ‘social structure’ shape their social experiences and are themselves refashioned through the social action of members [including children and adults].”

We ponder a question asked by the sociologist Ann Oakley (1994, p. 25), “What would it really mean to study the world from the standpoint of children [girls] both as knowers and as actors?” Related to the rights of children generally, Oakley’s question refers to a global context. However, we think that it particularly captures the kind of world girls in the various traditional cultural contexts inhabit in the age of Aids and it provides a window of opportunity for addressing the research issues that have an impact on them. Thus, for us, participatory research methodologies and interventions—with their built-in ‘research as a social change’ orientation (Schratz and Walker, 1995) by engaging girls and women as active participants and agents of change in their own lives—seem best placed to address the many negative impacts of culturally-informed taboos and violence against girls (and women) in gendered cultural contexts. As Mitchell (2004a) points out, we believe that these approaches to research not only improve accessibility to the research process and findings, but they also tend to democratise the research process for participants who often find themselves on the margins of society. This is particularly so in cultural contexts where power relations between adults and children, between boys and girls, and between men and women (and girls), as well as between researchers and the girls as subjects are largely unequal.

A variety of participatory methodologies has long been in existence. This includes, among others, photo-voice (Wang, 1999), drawings (Chung, Hallman, & Bray, 2005), and writing (Moletsane, 2000; 2005b). Since they transcend linguistic ability and background, and are highly generative and economical (they require no special equipment besides paper and writing instruments) (Chung, Hallman, & Bray, 2005), drawings have been identified as a well established methodology within participatory research with children and young people. For example, they have been used to study a variety of issues ranging from children’s perceptions of teachers (Weber & Mitchell, 1995), to their images of illness (Martin, 1998), as well as their images of violence in refugee situations (Clatcherty, 2005), and of childhood sexuality (Mitchell, Walsh, & Moletsane, 2007). We suggest that, in the context of the gendered HIV and Aids pandemic and the related gender-based violence (see for example, Mak & Mitchell, 2001), researchers might use drawings (by the girls themselves) to prompt them to talk about painful (or embarrassing) memories such as rape, incest, and HIV-related stigma. Because of the distance and safety the drawings provide, they become a useful strategy for circumventing the
taboos against speaking out about these issues, and the possible violence that might be meted out against those who dare to break the silence. For example, in Chapter 1, we refer to the ways in which the woman who accused Jacob Zuma (the ex-Deputy President of South Africa) of rape was shunned, threatened, and subsequently silenced by his supporters who staged violent protests outside the court and elsewhere in the country throughout the hearings. These conditions are fertile grounds not only for perpetuating the continuing violence and inequalities against women and girls, but also for inhibiting scholars and activists from gathering research data for analysis for understanding their plight as well as for informing policy and practice that might effectively address the challenges. Thus, for girls in similar situations, drawings can be used to prompt them to map spaces that they experience as problematic, such as unsafe violent spaces in the home, the community, or the school (see Mitchell, Walsh, & Moletsane, 2006).

The second illustrative method that could be used to study girls and girlhood is their writing. Through writing, we might engage the girls in a mental activity, to uncover their silences around their lived realities and responses to them, particularly within the context of the unequal power relations that favour boys in the school, the community, and the home. Writing could also enable the girls to construct their own representations of their lived experiences, such as those of violence and crime and the girls’ responses to them (e.g., Moletsane, 2000; 2005b). Alternatively, as we show in Chapter 5, published writing by adult women looking back at their own girlhoods can be used to understand this group and the various issues that impact their lives.

Of particular significance in the context of gender-based violence and HIV and Aids in the Southern African cultural context is the ability of these methods to provide safe spaces for girls’ voices which are otherwise often marginalised and/or silenced in research and intervention contexts in favour of boys’, men’s, and adult’s voices. The fact that the girls would be able to produce their own narratives (through photographs, drawings, or stories) would mean that researchers would have authentic evidence (from the perspectives of the victims themselves) to inform their analyses and, ultimately, their interventions. We discuss some of these approaches in Chapter 3 (photo-voice), Chapter 4 (participatory video), and Chapters 5 and 6 (writing).

But as we argue in Chapter 8, the nature of this research context and the position of girls therein require that we prioritise ethical approaches to conducting research. We take seriously Moletsane and Mitchell’s (2007) question on what children might expect from participating in research projects and what the consequences are if researchers cannot deliver on these expectations. We also take cognisance of Ennew’s (1994; 1998) caution that researchers must ensure that the projects they implement do not promise more than they can deliver. We acknowledge that listening to children cannot always result in significant changes for girls and women in these patriarchal societies. It may, at best, result in good policies, as is the case in South Africa (see Chapter 1), but the implementation of such policies might remain a dream (Roberts, 2003). In contexts characterised by an insistence on obeying cultural norms and culturally-determined taboos, as we have discussed
in this chapter, girls’ (and women’s) safety, and by implication, autonomy, and anonymity must be ensured.

CONCLUSION

The diverse cultural contexts in which Southern African girls grow up require particular methodological approaches to doing research with, for, and about girls and girlhood in the context of HIV and Aids. As such, approaches for investigating the ways in which such cultural contexts, and in particular, girls’ positions and roles in them (such as, for instance, the impact of early marriages, transactional sex, unequal gender relations, gender-based violence and HIV and Aids), might shape their vulnerability to HIV infection, for example, are needed. Moreover, existing notions of culture, and in particular, the gendered cultural norms in communities in the region tend to inform beliefs and ways of relating between girls and boys (and women and men) and possibly across various other boundaries, including age, race, ethnicity, and other identities. Obviously, this has implications for research methods for understanding the lived experiences of girls, particularly in the context of gender inequality, gender-based violence, and HIV and Aids. Participatory methodologies, including drawings, writing, photo-voice, and others offer one possibility for addressing these challenges. Such methods have been particularly useful in obtaining the authentic voices of groups that are often marginalised and silenced, such as poor women (for example, Wang, 1999) and girl-children (for example, Stein, 1999). Even so, we caution that the use of these methodologies should not be at the expense of ethical considerations that aim to protect the girls against secondary violence and abuse, for example, in being asked to relive painful memories without informed consent, autonomy, and anonymity where necessary. In the context of HIV-related stigma and the related gender-based violence, such ethical considerations are particularly significant; otherwise researchers may jeopardise and reverse the intended impacts of research as social change targeted by participatory methodologies.