

**THINKING SAFETY: MAKING THE FAMILIAR STRANGE AND THE STRANGE
FAMILIAR**

Body/Space Investigations of Women's Safety in Cape Town

**ABUL OYAY DENG AJAK
AJKABU001**

a research essay submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree
Master of Arts in Documentary Arts by Course Work and Creative Research Project

In the Centre for Film and Media Studies

Faculty of Humanities

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN

AUGUST 2021

Supervisor: Dr Julia Cain

COMPULSORY DECLARATION

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works, of other people have been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.

Signed by candidate

Signature: _____

Date: 18/08/2021

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

While it has been a long journey to completing this thesis, film project and degree, I would like here to acknowledge everyone who has been a part of my journey, and contributed to my progress and to the successful completion of this project in large and small ways.

Firstly I would love to thank my family, my parents Oyay Deng Ajak and Apajok Yaak Dut, for their continuous support towards all my endeavors, and for insisting on my education, for showing me the value of courage, persistence and consistence. My auntie and uncle Adhieu Elizabeth Yaak and Peter Bior Alier, for making it possible for me to be here, and attend and study, for giving me a sense of home here, and for all that you have done to sustain me. My uncle Marol Deng, for going beyond the call of duty to make sure I had all the tools I needed to get this work done, and to my lovely siblings, Nyakomi, Yor, Yaak, Big-bull and Ajak for all the therapeutic phones calls and banter.

I would also to extend my deep gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Julia Cain, for your patience encouragement, and guidance throughout this process. It has been such a joy working with you and learning from you. Thank you for challenging and pushing my creativity and helping me create this work. I would also love to extend this gratitude to my course convener Liani Maasdorp, for the opportunity to study this course, and for constantly showing and demanding excellence, that pushed me to constantly improve my skills. Also all the teachers and staff I have met studied with since February 2019, who have opened up my perception of films and what they could be.

Also to my MODA family, Annie Nisenson, Kaylee Simmers, Madeline Bazil, Matimu Rikhotso and Thaakirah Behardien, for your constant feedback, support and for being a safe space to ask all the stupid questions many times over, for being my teachers as well as my therapy circle.

Finally to the Centre for Film and Media Studies, for your generous loan that allowed me to continue this program into 2021, which gave me more time to ensure that this project could be fully actualized to its greatest potential.

Thank you all so tremendously!

**Thinking Safety: Making the Familiar Strange and The Strange Familiar.
Body/Space Investigations of Women's Safety in Cape town.**

Researcher: Abul Ajak.

Student No: AJKABU001.

Supervisor: Dr. Julia Cain.

Program: Master of Documentary Arts, University of Cape Town, 2021.

Abstract:

In this mini-dissertation, I investigate the manifestation of the political is personal, or rather the structural as personal, by examining what women's experiences within the city of Cape Town reveals about structural, social, and political structures as they relate to safety. This is done through critically reflecting upon both the participatory creation process and conducting a qualitative content analysis of each episode of the web series *Thinking Safety* that I produced as the creative research component of this masters dissertation. The creation of this series used an interdisciplinary design-based ethnographic research methodology to prompt actionable discussions around the physical manifestations of the lack of structural safety. This paper explores the ways in which this methodology renders women's experiences more perceptible in its exploration of the tangible aspects of how safety and unsafety is experienced.

The creative research explores the space between participants' realities and an imagined space of absolute safety and deliberates upon their responses that frame their experiences in relation to social, structural constructs, and spaces. Participants answer specific pre-researched questions that inquire upon safety, spatial navigation, responsibility and design and these responses are creatively compiled in the experimental web-series *Thinking Safety* which is reflected upon in this paper.

This research reveals how the lack of structural safety has led to a distortion of the notion of responsibility as both patriarchal culture and state neglect has exacerbated the unsafety of women in Cape Town. Structural constructs are also viewed as being deliberately created, through the existence of harmful social-cultural norms and this neglect of structural responsibility. Safety mechanisms are then derived from the participant's responses, which deliberate upon imagination, responsibility, visibility, and ethical interdependency as mechanisms for safety creation.

This conceptual imagination of safety co-creation is then presented as a purposeful idealisation of democratised and co-developed futures. This paper therefore explores the democratic potential of participatory design-based ethnographic filmmaking, in its expressions of the suppressed aspects of our experiences and the potentials for their transformation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	5
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	7
Gender Based Violence and the need for Safety Concerns	8
Visual Research Approaches and the examination of Safety/Unsafety	9
Body/Space/Culture explorations in Feminist Inquiry	12
Feminist Assemblage Films and the Confrontations of Patriarchal Cultures	14
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	16
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND ANALYSIS	19
Episode 1: Safety/Defining Safety	21
Episode 2: Responsibility	24
Episode 3: Space/ Space and Mobility.....	26
Episode 4: Design	29
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION	31
FILMOGRAPHY	36
REFERENCES	33
ADDENDUM	36

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

I have lived in Cape Town since 07th February 2019, and ever since I moved here, I quickly realized the anxieties of living within this city space. Constant reports of violence, street harassment, robbery, gang violence, gender-based violence (GBV) and even stories I heard from friends created an understanding of an environment in which one's personal safety is always negotiated based on space and place. It is through living with these anxieties that makes writing and creating a film about these lived experiences personal. I cannot deny my own or any of my participants' experiences of space and through combining these experiences into a narrative story structure, our varied experiences of the space encourage more examination of our relationships to spaces, how they have been constructed, as well as our expectations of these spaces. This personal, structural, and experiential knowledge is therefore foundational in the development of the web series *Thinking Safety*, which one would also consider to be a research assemblage. The web series is viewed as a research assemblage, which is defined by Fox and Allred (2014) as a research process that comprises human and non-human elements, and includes, events, humans, researchers, and social contexts in its constructions of knowledge.

The aim of this research assemblage is to explore the possibility of using film as a tool for democratization and development by using an interdisciplinary participatory design-based ethnographic research methodology to examine women in Cape Town's lived experiences of safety. To explore the use of film as a tool for democratization, one is investigating how multiple character's experiences can contribute to some actionable ideas on how to construct safety through understanding the material mechanisms of this phenomenon. This is done in the world of the series through an application of the sentiment "*Making the familiar strange and the strange familiar.*" The origin of this phrase is attributed to the German romantic poet Novalis and reads as follows:

"To romanticize the world, is to make us aware of the magic, mystery and wonder of the world; is to educate the senses, to see the ordinary as extraordinary, the familiar as strange, the mundane as sacred, the finite as infinite." (cited in Rorty, 2006, 294)

Sensory education and awareness, an examination of the daily, the ordinary, the familiar and the mundane aspects of women's daily lives are studied in *Thinking Safety*, as a device for illuminating the notion of safety. As film is the medium used to portray these research inquiries of women's safety, these aspects of romanticization, mystery, wonder, sensory education are all elements visually incorporated in the web-series. This rendering of the familiar as strange and the mundane as sacred functions as a device to express the absurdity of the illusiveness of safety, and attempts at attaining safety, as it is perceptible in the participants' lived experiences. The absurdity of this experience is highlighted to reflect the disjunction between safety as a human right and imperative social requirement, and the environment within which this safety is very illusive, and constantly threatened.

In this thesis, I question how women in Cape Town experience their personal safety, and what these personal experiences reveal about the embodiment of the social, structural, physical, and interpersonal mechanisms of safety and unsafety.

This thesis is primarily a critical reflection of the creative research undertaken for this degree and its end product - the *Thinking Safety* web series. This research was undertaken using a combination of participatory, design-based and ethnographic research methodologies, with various women living in Cape Town who express their bodily, spatial and cultural experiences of safety and unsafety. The creative process, and outcome of *Thinking Safety*, or rather the research queries, production and editing processes therefore discussed as the series has deliberately aimed to express these tangible and intangible knowledges in its examinations of personal safety. *Thinking Safety*, including its intention, process and outcome are critically reflected upon as the basis of this thesis.

In the literature review of this paper, I explore the how the high rates of GBV and femicide, which are prevalent in South Africa, have led to women's negotiations of safety and unsafety. These explorations contextualize social and structural experiences as they relate to the research and analysis frameworks which I have used in the creation of this web series as well as in this written research. This is done to support the visual research methodology and to illustrate how it informs the final series outcome. In the methodology section, I exemplify how the participatory design-based

ethnographic research is applied to the creation process and data collection of *Thinking Safety*. In the results and analysis section I analyze the web series episodes and discuss how safety is experienced in the context of body, space, tools and culture. I also expound on how the final series edit process aimed to link the experimental visual sequences, which offer an aesthetic and interpretive assessment of women's safety in Cape Town. In this paper, I will therefore reflect upon how *Thinking Safety* concentrates on the mundane daily aspects of women's lives to reveal our relationships to built physical and social structures and to express possibilities for the transformation of these structures.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section, I discuss the prevalence of gender-based violence in South Africa, to provide a contextual overview of the environment which creates personal anxieties about safety. Exploring these histories, contexts and landscapes substantiates the probes that I am making in *Thinking Safety*, as well as social and political landscapes that are being interrogated and challenged. This is arrived at by examining the participatory design-based ethnographic research methodology, and how it frames and embodies these probes within the series. Specific aspects of the methodology, specifically design-based methodologies and mobile phone-implemented participatory approaches are discussed. This is done to reference how this creation process allows for the translation of “*the familiar as strange, the ordinary as extra-ordinary and the mundane as sacred.*” (Novalis, cited in Rorty, 2006, 294). As this approach is concerned with sensory education, I also explore how these structural inanimate constructs relate to personal animate experiences through an examination of neo-materialism and metaphysics. These narrative techniques have historically been employed in feminist films to explore women's lives on the margins of patriarchal society. These approaches are imperative frameworks through which *Thinking Safety* has been constructed as a research assemblage, and a web-series therefore requiring explicit examination.

Gender Based Violence and the need for Safety Concerns

South Africa is a country with various complexities and these complexities are a result of the country's history of structural violence. Structural violence was defined by Gultang (1969) as the root cause of the difference between people's potential reality and their lived circumstances. Structural violence is exerted systematically, based on historical constructs and social orders which are indirectly enforced by those belonging to certain social orders, specifically gender, race, and social inequality (Farmer, 2004). The context of this violence within South Africa, is rooted in interpersonal and collective environments and has its historical context in apartheid and colonialism. Saferspaces.org.za, an anti-violence resource website, categorizes violence as self-directed violence, interpersonal violence, and collective violence, and through this framework, the complex patterns of violence can be understood (What is violence?, 2021). Gender-based violence (GBV) falls within these multiple and varied forms of violence, specifically direct, interpersonal, and collective violences. These violences are interlinked, and all forms of violence, have psychological dimensions. Violence is categorized as direct, which are interpersonal and collective violences, or indirect, which is structural violence, built into social, political, and economic systems governing lives (What is violence? 2021). As much as violence is interpersonal, it also exists within structures that are already in place, preceding its perpetrators and victims. In the context of the imperialist, racist, apartheid-colonial history of South Africa, physical violence, military control, and economic structural violence were employed as a control mechanism (Gqola, 2007). The resistance and self-defense in the face of this apartheid-colonial state also found expression through violence and taking up arms. These structures, in both black and white societies were patriarchal, and this militarization therefore took on gendered forms which manifested along these sharply gendered lines (Gqola, 2007). As such this gendered violence has become entrenched in the social and spatial fabric, and its various manifestations play out predominantly in physical and psychological realms.

Gender-based violence occurs because of the unequal power relationships between genders in a society (SAHRC, 2018). These power relationships are rooted in patriarchy, which treats men as superior to women and excludes women from participating fully in society, meeting their basic needs, and where violence is

perpetrated against women with impunity (saferspaces.org.za, 2020). Within the context of South Africa, this violence coincides with other multiple structural constructs, steeped in histories of patriarchy, colonialism, racism, inequality, spatial apartheid and even in town planning, all which impact women, differently, according to class and race. The intersections of these violences are noticeable in the reasons that women experience violence, whether they can escape it, and what form of access they may have to seek justice. Lack of access to basic amenities like water and electricity for example, becomes unsafe, as in rural areas and informal settlements, women and girls have been raped in their attempts to access these basic amenities (SAHRC, 2018). Examining how these intersections of how race, class, and access affects women differently is therefore imperative in recognizing the varied psychological dimensions of gender-based violence and studying safety. In *Thinking Safety* these structures are examined by posing questions to the participants which inquire upon their daily activities, encounters and their spatial navigations within the city.

Visual Research Approaches and the examination of Safety/Unsafety

Thinking Safety, the web-series, is an expansion of a 10-minute ethnographic film assignment of an honors visual anthropology module, AXL 4405S that I undertook at the University of Cape Town in 2019. The original ethnographic film, and accompanying essay, which were foundational to this web series, also employed a mobile phone participatory approach to explore how women approached their safety in public spaces. This project was developed in response to the traumatic brutal rape and murder of Uyinene Mwertwana at a post office in Claremont, Cape town in August 2019 (Raborife, 2021). This event served as a stark reminder of the extreme violence that lurks in daily encounters within this space and how pervasive patriarchal violence and gender-based violence are in our society. After this event, my own anxieties about safety peaked dramatically, which led me to question how other women experienced these constructs and spaces. The short film was titled “Thinking Safety,” a name which I have maintained in the creation of this web-series, and the essay was titled “Thinking Safety: Demystifying. Collective Safety Anxieties Amongst Female Students in Cape Town.”

In a class discussion where all student's films were critiqued, some of the comments made by other students about the short film version of "Thinking Safety" expressed how the film created an affect within them, as their relationality to the experiences of the participants that they were watching made them think of how they approached safety in their own lives. Affect, the Spinozist notion that examines capacity to be affected, is defined as a "becoming" that represents a change of states of an entity be it in physical, psychological, emotional or social ways (Fox and Alldred, 2015). To be affected by something is to resonate with it such that the sensation of whatever is being viewed is brought into physical and emotional consciousness. In viewing the original ten-minute iteration of "Thinking Safety", I realized that for many of the viewers, the negotiations that were made by my original participants around their safety, highlighted the extent to which the structural was personally experienced and negotiated. While indeed "Thinking Safety's" focus on tools and space might possibly aid with safety design concepts, the design-centered approach utilized allowed the film to simultaneously study the larger structural design implications and women's individual relationships to the social and structural design of the space. The second iteration of this written research – this essay - not only explores the concept of personal safety, but also how this methodology constructs a narrative in which the familiar is made strange and vice-versa. In expanding this film into the web series, important considerations for me were to chart out the structural and experiential terrain of safety, hence adapting a format that could render safety into observable blocs. The web-series episodes therefore become the blocs through which safety can be examined. [Note that all references to *Thinking Safety* from herein refer to the web series, and not the original ethnographic film assignment.]

Under the premise of an ethnographic film, participatory filmmaking can be seen as a research method and as a means of representation (Zoettl, 2012). It can be a means of promoting reflexive and shared anthropology, through its collaborative approach to knowledge construction and representation (Zoettl, 2012). Through sharing the means and tools for filmmaking with communities, a filmmaker's control and perception on a narrative is abstracted, and transferred or shared with the participants. These relationships that exist between filmmaker are usually defined through the lens of subject-object relationship, where the filmed become objects of inquiry (Zoettl, 2012). The subject and object is morphed by applying a design-based ethnography to

Thinking Safety as what is being examined is the phenomenon of safety, the city space and tools, hence they become the object of this research. The participants and their examination of safety within the space are the subjects, as they examine and express their subjective experiences in relation to the objects and the space. The combined applications of participatory and design-based methodologies not only blurs objective space and the subjective experience of the participants, it emphasizes their position as credible examiners of the spaces and objects. In this case, participants, who collaborate in the filmmaking process, do become anthropologists, making sense of our incomprehension of the relationship between themselves and the city space, hence becoming a locus through which we can study the gendered implications of space and place.

While application of this methodology expresses some fundamental aspects of the structural implications of gender-based violence, it is also limited in its ability to confront the individual actions of persons that enact and uphold gender-based violence. In examining safety and GBV, the perpetrators of the violences that cause these anxieties are men, and the patriarchal structures enforced by men, under which we exist. For example, as Dr. Pumla Gqola deliberates on the crisis of rape in South Africa, she expresses how rarely rapists are spoken about in these conversations, almost as if rape happens independently of any deliberate actions taken by those who commit these atrocities (2019). Unfortunately, this is one of the many facets of GBV that cannot be effectively explored in this research. What, however, can be explored through this research inquiry is the manifestation of what Gqola terms as “female fear factories” or rather the manufacture of female fear, which relies on quick, effective, transfer of meaning (2019). In manufacturing female fear, the fear of rape, violence and physical wounding are mythologised, and they do take up public physical space, requiring many bodies and different components (Gqola, 2019). This female fear is already an established facet of existence with the city space and the state. It is already a component of the affect economy in South Africa. Focusing on questions of how safety is embodied and then representing it in a coherent narrative demystifies the experience for us, which may then resonate with the audiences, allowing us to experience both its embodied personal affect and the collective socio-spatial affects.

Body/Space/Culture explorations in Feminist Inquiry

While *Thinking Safety* attempts to vitalize these physical and structural manifestations of safety, it also attempts to recognize the metaphysical experiential elements and desires which exist beyond the known and perceived reality. Applying a multifaceted approach to a multifaceted problem extends these multiplicities to the viewer who examines their material and immaterial relationships with themselves, the social environment, and the space. The participant's responses, which centre the primacy of their body as a site from which their partial perspectives are enunciated provides ground for "political definition and self-definition" (Hinton, 2014). Feminist scholars have long contested for the exploration of embodied, engendered, and embedded knowledge and its epistemological implications (Duncan, 1996). This emplacement is derived from Douglas' theory that the body is a medium of communication, through which the relationships with social structure and spatial arrangements can be explored (1971). Low views this understanding of body/space/culture as fundamental in our recognition of the body as a living cultural space within itself, and through its moving and speaking, is a microcosm through which social and political forces can be analyzed (2003). By emphasising the historical and political substance of the female experience, we can better account for the sexual, cultural, and historical determinations which inform knowledge (Hinton, 2014).

In this body/space/culture examination, one would argue that *Thinking Safety* engages with affects, neo-materialism, and metaphysics. Affect, is the Spinozist notion which examines capacity to be affected, defined as a "becoming" that represents a change of states of an entity be it in physical, psychological, emotional or social ways (Fox and Alldred, 2015). Neo-materialism when applied to empirical research, extends analysis beyond the traditional concerns of structural and macro level social phenomena, as it addresses how desires, feeling and meanings contribute to social production (Fox and Alldred, 2015). Metaphysics is defined as the science which studies consciousness and the relationship between mind and matter (Coen et. al, 2020). These approaches, all break through the "mind/matter, culture-nature divide of transcendental human thought" in their ability to intersect a range of dualisms within social theory such as the structure/agency, reason/emotion, human/non-human, animate/inanimate and inside/outside (Fox and Alldred, 2015). These approaches

therefore become a means of examining how the relationships between animate and inanimate are influenced as the social inquiry is approached from humans and their bodies within space (Fox and Allred, 2015).

These social and political forces, however, have been constructed over time as discussed in the exploration of GBV, and the histories of patriarchy, colonialism, apartheid, class, and racism. Elaine Salo has also argued that in the mainstream, feminist theorists working within African contexts have not been specifically concerned with issues of temporality and gender (2019). Temporality is concerned with the concept of time, and is defined as a present that is always stretching between the past and future, as it contracts those experiences that contribute to the sense of the moment and expects those yet to come (Fox and Allred, 2015). Contextualising the histories of colonialism, apartheid and patriarchy in this paper, therefore becomes a way to engage with the histories which have a material impact on the present. *Thinking Safety* is developed with the aim of understanding how safety is experienced in the participants' realities and imaginations, influenced by the past and present in an attempt to imagine a future with more material solutions proposed towards these issues of safety. As such I contend that it is also engaged with issues of temporality.

The living present becomes the basis of which to imagine new futures, as a reflexive study of the present can allow us to imagine alternative social and political configurations (Walker, 2014). The everyday activities in a place can be a way to demystify the intricacies of negotiating identities within space as they have been executed by anthropologists in the global south (Salo, 2009). To extrapolate the gendered conceptions of citizenship in Brasilia province, for example, examining women's struggles for housing in the province becomes a way to provide an ethnographic analysis of women's quotidian engagement with the state (Salo, 2009). In *Thinking Safety*, women's engagement with their own safety and how they try to attain it can therefore become a way to provide an ethnographic analysis of women's quotidian engagement with the city space, and inadvertently, the state. Once again, in perceiving the Novalis sentiment of *making the familiar strange and the strange familiar*, our subconscious knowledge of the experience is made visible, and we confront this knowledge in the representations of safety in the web series.

Feminist Assemblage Films and the Confrontations of Patriarchal Cultures

Using film to question and discuss safety, in the context of *Thinking Safety*, has required the series to be approached as a research assemblage as well as a form of experimentation. While the idea of wholesomeness is evasive in films and other forms of communication, this quality might be achieved using collective or community narratives. Such narratives can create accounts of personal, spatial and structural knowledge. These varied and expansive knowledges all demand a narrative and visual language that allows for a perceptible comprehension. In the series, these elements are verbally expressed in the participatory self-filmed footage. They are also visually represented by incorporating experimental sequences within the world of the series, which play upon the animate and inanimate, the known and unknown, the felt and unseen, the familiar and the unfamiliar. These experimental expressions have historically and frequently been adapted by feminist filmmakers to depict the surreal disassociations of women's lives within an overwhelmingly patriarchal culture (Blaetz, 2007). The filmmaker's experiential perceptions and film history are interwoven into the narrative, through layering, fragmentation, and creative techniques, which are used to illustrate these degrees of surrealism (Blaetz, 2007).

In reviewing films that combine ethnographic filmmaking and experimental techniques, Ja'Tovia Gary's *The Giverny Document* stands out as an experimental research assemblage that centers on the experience of bodily safety in the public arena. In this film, she asks black women on the streets of New York the same question: "Do you feel safe in your body?" These cinema-verité style interviews are intercut with poetic, psychedelic visuals and sounds which delve between the past and present, natural spaces and constructed spaces, while showing bodily autonomy sensuously, without objectifying the body. She uses the montage editing techniques in her film "to explore the creative virtuosity of Black femme performance figures while interrogating the histories of those bodies as spaces of forced labor and commodified production" (www.jatovia.com, 2021). In this case Ja'Tovia uses a highly stimulating visual language to express these gendered socio-political temporal histories, and the tangible/intangible presences and absences that lend themselves to the responses the women come to in the moment of their interviews.

This sort of experimentation is reminiscent of the feminist postcolonial experimental film tradition which asserts aesthetic activity to relinquish the objectifying power of the camera (Blaetz, 2007). This aesthetic tradition and visual language have historically been used in film to express essential ethnographic framing for film (Blaetz, 2007). Chick Strand's filmmaking techniques for, example, stand out in this regard as her films combine her personal visions in a bid to deconstruct fixed notions of female sensuality, objectivity, narrative, and identity, as she views ethnographic films as "...works of art, symphonies about the fabric of a people" (Blaetz, 2007, p. 189). Indeed, Chick Strand's films, similarly to *The Giverny Document* and *Thinking Safety* are anthropological inquiries on the human condition that draw upon the real world and transforms the world at the same time. This avant-garde experimental tradition fuses research assemblages with experimental techniques that borrow on trance, disparate and metaphoric imagery to create subjective psychological states to evoke sensual and emotional experiences (Blaetz, 2007).

This experimental tradition is one I employ in *Thinking Safety* in very specific moments, to amalgamate the ethnographic research responses, and allow for deeper contemplative, imaginative, sensual, and emotional attendance to the series. Indeed, subverting the objectifying gaze of the camera is a narrative technique employed in *Thinking Safety* as I embody the female gaze in the experimental sequences. These experimental sequences distort spaces in a bid to express the disjunction between the experience of feminized bodies within spaces that we occupy and move through. Exploring these feminist experimental traditions, as they have been used by filmmakers who have been concerned with feminist ethnographic filmmaking such as Ja'Tovia Gary and Chick Strand, allows one to contextualize how these gendered experiences have been framed in films. These experimental techniques are applied to the editing of *Thinking Safety* to expresses the surreal associations that women have to the patriarchy, physical and social structures, and the animate/inanimate relationships that are part of our societies and experiences.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

While I use this research to engage with questions of safety, the creative utilisation of participatory research methodologies is central to how the series is developed. Participatory filmmaking is practiced in *Thinking Safety* by employing mobile phones as a device for self-filming. Indeed this film is majorly shot by phone as a device to democratise and share the tools of filmmaking with communities and participants, as phones are highly accessible and a significant part of our daily lives. This series is indeed an experiment in interaction and connectivity with this virtual world and with mobile devices, which has rapidly changed our means of communication in the past two decades. As I intend to distribute the series on social media and on mobile phone apps such as Instagram and YouTube, the use of mobile phones as a medium to create and to view the series therefore becomes a full circle experience. Mobile phones and the virtual worlds we encounter through the use of phones becomes the world of the series.

This virtual communication cycle, in the case of *Thinking Safety* is also deeply entrenched in the participants' daily existential worlds. Indeed Rábová (2014) has stated that due to accessibility in terms of skills required, mobile filmmaking can increase participation in the physical and social environment. These gadgets are now a daily life tool, and as a result of their omnipresence users can film spontaneously (Rábová, 2014). Their ease of use and the possibilities of distribution and sharing are broader than conventional filmmaking (Rábová, 2014). As a gadget we normatively interact with, they too make up part of our world, our interactions and our daily lived experience, and so it is only fitting that this device, which is now an extension of ourselves, is used as a tool for our own self exploration and self-expression.

A significant aspect of this methodology is how design-based methodologies and participatory visual methods are interconnected. To apply a design-based ethnography requires participation as it is a collaborative process that requires involving people in defining user-needs and identifying design opportunities (Smith and Kjærsgaard, 2014). This intervention, and the application of ethnography in design is where design and anthropology collaborate, as anthropology studies societies and cultures based on empirical research in concrete social contexts (Otto and Smith,

2014). The application of ethnography as a form of inquiry requires the immersion into a social context to understand it and produce theoretically informed arguments about it (Otto and Smith, 2014). This is applied to *Thinking Safety* by asking questions that define the social context but also describe the experience, with an emphasis on the showing and telling, describing a tool, a space, and an experience within this space. This then allows us to develop an academically informed understanding of how we are interconnected with the tools and space around us. Smith and Kjærsgaard view design anthropology as a cultural critique, which allows for the creation of a critical theoretically informed distance through which to understand these complex relationships (2014). I ask questions to illuminate certain aspects of the space and women's interactions within the city, that I also live in. I also participate in this series as my psycho-spatial experience led me to this research undertaking. *Thinking Safety* is indeed presented as a research-assemblage and web-series, as a means of reflecting and communicating how these design aspects also influence our lives and safety within these structures as related to our daily tools. In this paper, I apply design-based critiques to the participatory responses and discuss design concepts, based on the qualitative results of these research queries.

As this series is heavily engaged with mobile participatory film making, participants were sourced through a call for participants shared on Instagram. Various participants did respond, and I initially had over 15 respondents. Not all the initial respondents were able to complete the research process and hence the final series has featured nine respondents, myself included. I participate in answering questions, but also to contextualize certain important aspects of this research methodology and its application. Indeed, it should be noted that while a lot of initial respondents seemed interested and wanted to engage in the series, a practical undertaking of participation and self-filming could not be undertaken by all respondents. One assumes it might have been difficult as some participants stated that answering the questions did require a lot of prior thoughtful self-reflection, making it a challenge for some. I made concessions on the filmmaking process as requested by specific participants. Hannah's interview, for example, is one that I shot myself as she stated that she did indeed have difficulties self-filming because of personal issues.

All my participants, except for one, received the question sheets Sections 1&2 as presented in the addendum below. Section 1 interrogates the social and structural make up of safety and unsafety, while Section 2 explores the design-based elements of this research. These question sheets also featured very specific instructions on what to shoot and how to shoot oneself.

All participants received the questions above except for Khensani de Klerk, whose architectural research and praxis puts some of the fundamental questions that I ask about safety in perspective. Khensani also conducts participatory design-based ethnographic research applied to structural and architectural inquiries. Khensani's research explores how architectural approaches may help to rethink the status quo of violence maintained by public infrastructure as she also speculates on the reshaping of public life to encourage safety (<https://khensanideklerk.com/public-aGender>, 2022). This indeed reflects how participatory design-based research is used to influence our structured lives, and how its application can be implemented to generate a democratic restructuring of society. Khensani received a slightly different set of questions that are in the addendum below. As Khensani has been concerned with the practical application of participatory ethnographic research in architecture, I believed that she would straightforwardly link these characteristics of personal and structural relationships. Within the context of this series, Khensani is also able to express the relevance of interrogating these design aspects to viewers who may not be able to immediately recognize or acknowledge these links.

Throughout the editing process, I was regularly in dialogue with participants who received updates about the progress of the series and any important information regarding the web series. Participants were also engaged in the editing process, as I regularly shared cuts of the film with them, with the expectation that they would critique any aspects of the series, or their representation within the series, that they may have been uncomfortable with.

As *Thinking Safety* is a web series and a research assemblage, in this written analysis I have adopted a qualitative content analysis to extract the results and meanings presented in this research assemblage. Bengtsson explains two levels of analysis that researchers can use such as a manifest analysis, where researchers describe what

informants say and is visible and obvious in the text, and the other being a latent analysis which is interpretive, where researchers seek to find the underlying meaning of the text (2016). This paper uses both analysis methods as the participatory responses are in themselves results which delve between being self-explanatory, while also revealing themes that require further analysis. Of course, this assemblage has gone through extensive editing to extract a narrative and conversational storyline, which can represent the bulk of relevant information that the participants articulate.

In the context of this research paper, however, the qualitative results assembled into the web series are further analyzed to express the underlying meanings such that we may attend to the personal affects as well as the collective affects that are expressed within this assemblage. I also apply this analysis to determine the extent to which the use of this methodology renders visible the “*familiar, unordinary, strange and mundane*” aspects of women’s safety experiences. The ensuing results and the discussion sections of this paper are therefore concerned with the interpretation of these results by applying my personal affective resonance to discern the personal affects presented in the series. By personal affective resonance, I am referring to the way in which my emotional and psychological states are influenced by the participatory responses. The academic investigations outlined in the literature review of this paper are also used to interpret personal and collective affects which may be derived from this research. This then allows one to examine the extent to which the research methodology, the editing process and the series extracts meaningful layers of understanding and recognition of embodied experiences, personal, collective and structural affects.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

In this section, I reflect upon the final edited *Thinking Safety* web series and how the research probes and methodologies applied have influenced the outcome of the series. The research queries used in this paper develop a symbiosis between the web series as a research assemblage and this critical reflection. This web series has been concerned with making the real world more perceptible through the lens of Novalis’ sentiment of “*making the familiar strange and the strange familiar*” (Rorty, 2006, 294).

Through the research inquiries, the links between the personal and structural, the animate and inanimate, mind and matter are used to expound upon how structural and designed life become a deeply personal aspect of our experiential lives. Within this experiential overview of safety, our personal lives, feelings, desires, presences, and absences exist within our personal understandings of this concept. In the web series however, these are deeply perceptible and openly expressed in the dialogues that were created in response to these questions.

In this section, I analyze the series episodes as observable blocs, liable to an analysis centered on the themes and aspects of safety explored in these episodes. An aspect of this series that can be read cohesively is how the use of mobile phones for participation influences the visual construction of the film. The use of mobile phones as a device to self-film, which facilitates the participatory filmmaking process, creates a highly personalised conversation with the participants. Influencing participant's line of sight is a narrative device which has used by filmmakers to create affect, sometimes in very ingenious ways, for example, Errol Morris' *interrotron*. This *interrotron* is used to create what is termed as the true first person, as cameras are fitted with screens to make it seem that respondents look directly at the viewer (www.errolmorris.com, 2004). In this series, the participant's line of sight is defined by their intimacy in their spaces, as they are the sole speakers in a room, with no interviewer present looking at their reflection on the phone screen. A lot of these interviews therefore feature a very close up and medium close up, distance from the participant, hence occupying an intimate space. Indeed, in Hannah's interview, which I filmed, the distance between the screen and herself as a participant is not as intimate. One would therefore claim that self-filming does facilitate filming from an intimate space, hence creating a sort of personal conversation with the participants, as would occur in an online video conversation. It should also be noted that facing oneself speaking to a phone screen might create complex feelings of self-consciousness in ways that are both comfortable and uncomfortable as one looks at their own image.

The intimacy of these interviews is highlighted using a black border to distinguish the participatory interviews from the director's own filmed sequences. This border represents the personal limits, the space in a sense between the world and individual, their personal space, and boundaries, which in the case of safety, need to be

respected and maintained. This reflection of personal space and boundaries is a directorial choice that I use as an emphasis on personal space, and as a device to ensure that the audience focuses on the participant as they speak about their experiences. These responses, after all, are the narrative glue of the film, which elucidates the experience of safety, with words and participants that demand and require our full attention. The distinction in framing between the participatory interviews, and the other filmed sequences within the series delineates the personal internal worlds of the participants, and the structural external worlds of urban spaces.

The visual treatment of this film contrasts the framed narrative interviews and experimental sequences, which features footage I filmed while moving through spaces in Cape Town. This footage is from personal archives and from different formative events that have happened within the city such as Uyinene's memorial service held at UCT, the #Aminext protests held at the wake of her funeral at the Cape Town parliament in August 2019, and the anti-GBV protest also held in Cape Town in August 2020. Footage of the city space and movement through the city, are used to elucidate emplacement in these spaces that we occupy, where all sorts of social, spatial, and structural encounters happen. These sequences are meant to undergird the participatory conversations, as well as to express other imperceptible aspects of safety, which may require our perceptions to be altered within these imaginations. These sequences do indeed make the familiar strange, as an audience must examine the space in the context of women's experiences within it, which is supported by these participatory responses. The very detailed attendance to daily normative experiences and actions, which we may rarely question unless we are forced to due to their familiarity, realigns us with our own experience within these spaces, and the detailed descriptions in the interviews make us question these experiences in our own lives even further. The series then fragments and abstracts the experiences of safety and shares it between the participants and the audience.

Episode 1: Safety/Defining Safety

Episode 1 is concerned with trying to define what safety means and the scope of this experience. This episode begins with a visual sequence that emplaces the series in the city of Cape town, with images that show the structural city space, and women and

people within the space. The first question the respondents answer to is “What do you think safety means?” Defining safety seemed like a difficult venture for participants, as the responses point to them knowing it partially, however, not wholly, as something that is continuously under threat. In this case, safety is being defined a lot in a sense of what is lacking as opposed to what is. The responses also define safety in terms of social and economic risks that are present in our environment, and how our lives are deliberated around mitigating risk. Respondents also explain safety as a proximity to social and economic privileges, and the need for defensiveness and constantly safeguarding oneself suggests a lack of pure safety. In fact, safety seems to be described largely as an absence of certain worries, risks, precautions, reservations, and limitations, but also, albeit less so, as the presence of freedom, exploration, and feelings of comfort. Presences and absences become a theme that informs the experimental visual act that plays after these definitions of safety are stated.

This experimental visual act is contrasted with an interview excerpt from a participant who speaks about the Kantian concept of Noumena (Kant, 2000). This aspect of Kantian philosophy elaborates on the limitations of imagination in experiencing things that are unknowable realities. This definition is expressed by the participant who states “...it’s difficult for someone to imagine what the fourth dimension, for example, looks like because we are so used to our space-time reality...that we cannot conceive what something from another dimension looks like” Layered visuals of natural and public spaces, reflections of objects that we know and engage with are distorted in a bid to try and express these unknowable elements. A Kantian lens is also applied in the edit through the creation of a sublime aesthetic development through this imagery. As described by Kant, the sublime is a force within nature that is completely powerful that creates overwhelming feelings within the viewer (Sorensen, 2014,). While Kant’s view of the sublime is deeply misogynistic as he stated that women lack the intellectual capacity to truly appreciate aesthetic beauty, a feminine sublime rendering of this subject is applied (Sorensen, 2014). Barbara Freeman views this feminine sublime as a response to the incalculable otherness that exists due to the othered nature of the feminine within the constraints of the patriarchal structure (Sorensen, 2014, p.5). This is the battle that is contended with in this section as the constraints of existing patriarchal culture have made a world without it difficult to imagine, and this opposition

plays out in the symbolic imagery which reflects a desire to imagine that reality from within a vastly patriarchal culture.

This dilemma of limited imagination also become further interrogated as the participants answer the next questions. The next question asks “How differently do women approach safety as opposed to men?” In this section, the participants highlight how women and queer people’s bodies are often a site for danger, and this creates more risks, defenses, and more considerations for women in their approaches to safety. These responses emphasize the freedoms and autonomies that women and queer people are excluded from, and how this body/space/cultural experience is deeply culturally entrenched beyond and within structural spaces. This marginalization is so fragmented that it is only understood through the bodily experience of those on the margins of this hierarchical patriarchal structure (Sorensen, 2014). In this section the reason for this project becomes emphasized, and that is the exploration of possibilities for the creation of women’s structural safety. So, when a participant states, “When it comes to safety, of course women are going to be needing structural safety because we are always being seen as abstracted” it reinforces the need to imagine, and demand, a different space time reality where women’s safety can be actualized.

After this question is answered, another visual sequence that suggests aspects of the COVID 19 pandemic impact on our social lives plays. This sequence shows people wearing masks in public spaces and the public information posters that remind us of the safety mechanisms that we may use to lessen the spread of the virus. The next question asks, “How has the COVID 19 pandemic affected your personal safety?” Ultimately, while COVID is this overwhelming, chaotic, and challenging experience, within the context of this series, it is discussed to understand its personal impacts on our lives and how it has reconfigured our current society. Participants express how being within their homes has helped them feel safer, while also speaking of the vulnerability of those who bear the brunt of structural violence, and how gendered, racial, social, and economic risks had been multiplied by the pandemic. Recurring events have highlighted just how much it has impacted and exacerbated issues of safety, poverty, and vulnerability within this structure, all of which my participants speak about in the series. In the context of South Africa, and globally, gender-based violence, specifically intimate partner violence, physical and sexual violence has

increased to alarming rates that it is now considered to be the second or shadow pandemic.

Episode 2: Responsibility

This episode explores responsibility as a mechanism for creating safety, but also to investigate where this responsibility lies. In research I conducted prior to filming, I realized how growing up female meant that I had been taught certain ways of being to shoulder my own responsibility with regards to my safety. These were taught to me in how I should dress, who I may speak to, and how I may sit, to avoid any unwarranted attention on myself and my body. These shifts in responsibilities are a defining aspect of rape culture, which excuses and normalizes violence against women and does not hold men accountable for their actions. Indeed, as one interrogates rape culture, the use of the term culture rightfully presents these violent realities as a pervasive social and cultural norm.

This therefore led to the questions: “Who is responsible for your safety?” and “Who is not responsible for your safety?” These questions were possibly the ones with which the participant visibly seemed to grapple with their responses the most. Watching the participants directly encountering the limits of their responsibility creates that same effect on the audience who in turn reflects upon the limits of their responsibilities in relation to perpetrators and social institutions. Discussing responsibility also exposes the defective structural and political confrontations with the affront on our bodies, and the huge disparity between our needs and our abilities to protect ourselves. Participants state:

“God, it would be really nice if the government was responsible for my safety, or the police, but I don’t really feel like anyone is responsible for my safety except for me.”

‘I don’t think I could ever fully attain my safety regardless of how responsible I am being for myself, or for my safety.’

“Who is responsible for my safety is... I don’t even wanna say it, it’s probably, the police, the government, our justice system. Am I feeling protected, no.”

“I should not be responsible for my safety, but I am because of the world that we are living, I am forced to be... and this is a shift in responsibility, a burden in shifting what is called responsibility but is actually a very fearful existence.”

“I think it’s up to everyone as well as myself to consider my safety, and that’s not a job to do, it’s part of being human, ... you look at the environment and its an ecological thing and there is safety involved.”

“In terms of crime prevention, the police are not really there to fulfill that need, I see them more as a reactionary thing, they’ll often act in reaction to a crime”

The responses to these questions in fact overarchingly delve between personal, social, and structural responsibilities. Indeed, these responses and the shifting perceptions of responsibility, reflect its nuanced nature as well as its personal, social, and structural dimensions. One participant’s response reminds us of other aspects of our safety beyond the personal, the environmental. This is one that I had not necessarily anticipated and therefore had to replicate in the edit. In this regard, an abrupt experimental play of the environmental aspects, nature, water and the recent fires that engulfed Cape Town is intercut within the interviews over an echo of the participant stating, “The environment is fucked.” The point of this, is to remind us of and shock us into the realization of the bodies that we are responsible for. Our personal bodies, humanity, as well as the earth, and the natural environment, as the true essences of life, human life, and biological life. The introduction of this environmental aspect of our social experience is one that is not essentially the prime focus of this series, but a fundamental aspect to consider within this framework of responsibility. This is done to highlight and to stress the division, or rather hierarchy, of responsibilities.

In terms of representing this responsibility visibly, the confrontations that societies have to institutional bodies is conveyed in the juxta-positioning of the participatory interview footage and protest footage. These archives were from the #AmINext and #AntiGBV protests in Cape town 2019 and 2020 respectively. This protest footage shows the unbridled frustration, personal agonies, social frustrations and structural

limitations, to the affront to our bodies in the cathartic expressions of frustration from the protestors. These moments of catharsis are a warranted outburst against the many violent cultural encounters women experience in relation to perpetrators, mostly men, and the patriarchal culture that engulfs our society. This is further meditated upon in the final clips of this episode which features archival footage from Uyinene Mwertiyana's memorial service held at the University of Cape town in 2019. In this meditation, names and images of women who have lost their lives to gender-based violence reminds us of the dangerous situation that we are in, and the human cost of perpetrator's actions, and neglect of institutional responsibility.

If society collectively was able to share responsibility and place it on the rightful bearers of certain responsibilities, we would better navigate crime prevention and justice. If instead of questioning women of what they did or wore that got them raped, we shifted that responsibility to the perpetrators of the crime, we would be better able to navigate justice by holding perpetrators solely responsible for their actions. Navigating responsibility effectively could therefore be a cultural mechanism, that holds humans, institutions, and society at large accountable for the protection of the most vulnerable among us.

Episode 3: Space/ Space and Mobility

This episode focuses on the physical structural built environment and how it influences feelings of safety. In this body/space/culture, the city of Cape Town is a microcosm for exploring the social and personal affects of safety and unsafety, and the implications of design, space, and the built environment. Our lives and mobility within this constructed space are influenced by the temporal histories and architectural construction of this space. In trying to establish the space, its histories, its construction and its social functionality, this episode begins with a poetic introduction featuring a voice over from a participant who explores the impact of temporal histories on space as it is today. She states, "I think about what was promised to people, when apartheid was ending, and I think about how slow everything has been and how frustrating it must be, to be constantly working and living, and coming into a space that just continuously does not recognize you, and that is just continuously not for you." Over this explication, experimental footage of the space plays on themes of inequality,

movement, and glaringly bright distractions. These images are aimed at contextualizing and summarizing this history. Given the social political history that encompasses both the globe and this space, it is important to confront who designed the space, for who, for what purpose, and who is excluded from the space. This history is indeed not limited to Cape Town but a global systemic ordering that bell hooks names as “Imperialist, White-supremacist, Capitalist, Racist, Patriarchy” in her rejection of the term Intersectionality, which she views as a neutral phrase (2013). In the context of Cape Town and South Africa at large, the apartheid spatial construction violently marginalized people based on race and class where the city is demarcated along these sharply racial and economic divisions. Patriarchal violence in South Africa also exists in all races and classes in South Africa, with distinctive implications for all which are exacerbated by other risks and exclusions such as poverty, spatial exclusion, gender, sexuality and disability.

Participants are asked to respond to the question “Tell me about places where you feel safe and spaces where you feel unsafe and why?” In this section, participants reflect on bodily and psychological feelings of safety in reference to their knowledge of the spaces they occupy. Through these responses, and in the context of the design-based ethnographic research, the collective affects are highlighted as we begin to uncover the reasons people feel safe, and the specific spaces that heighten these feelings of unsafety. For all my participants, home is a space of safety, which majorly becomes negotiated in public spaces and public arenas. This notion is represented by intercutting an image sequence that shows eclipsed images of women in homes, looking outside windows where the outside spaces are also visible. The personal/inside/outside denotes the dynamic between the individual and the space, to emphasize yet again personal space, personal boundaries, and social spaces.

Participants also answer the question “What activities do you have to do that put your safety at risk?” In my pre-question research, I uncovered how privilege and safety are very intertwined as in some spaces, access to things like bathrooms or charging stations becomes very unsafe for people who live in townships and are experiencing all sorts of spatial exclusion and otherness. This is a direct result of the apartheid structural spatial design of the city of Cape Town. Unsafety therefore exists within spaces in relation to unavoidable personal and social activities. The response to this

question reveals mobility, as a moment of unsafety, within the public realm. A participant speaks of her experiences going through an underpass at a train station as she traveled to school every morning, and how that was particularly dangerous for her as it was a moment where she was not visible. Her explication is juxtaposed with images of underpasses that are a feature of various train stations. Another participant also explains her journey to work, and how the combination of distance, using public transport, and having to leave in the early darker hours of the morning was a risk that she needed to take daily. These statements show that access to spaces is majorly mediated by socio-economic, ethnic, hetero sexualised and gendered arrangements of how spaces are imagined (Mohammad, 2013, p. 1804). Distance, spatial structure, and design elements are therefore a means to developing a social spatial cultural critique of space, and activities within the space. Mechanisms to create structural safety can also be constructed through these spatial cultural critiques.

“Visibility and invisibility become an aspect to your safety being maintained or at risk,” Khensani states, and adds, “As black women, I can confidently say that I feel space in spaces where community is created.” This point for example, personally led me to imagine a sort of mechanism for reducing risk within spaces. I also state in the episode that “I feel safe in more crowded spaces.” The underpass that I did the interview in felt safer because of the economic activity that occurs at the entrance and exit of that underpass as “I assume that someone would be able to stop a situation if it got out of hand.” In the converse, as a sort of social solution, I propose that spaces such as tunnels have some sort of sustained human activity around them to create a social security around these spaces. Having kiosks at the entrances and exits of these tunnels for example, perhaps selling food items from urban community gardens could possibly tackle unemployment and reduce the risks that are multiplied by the lack of visibility within some of these spaces. These sorts of design critiques and insights are a direct result of these participatory design-based ethnographic research. These examinations and critiques therefore inform the possibilities of using film and these methodologies to explore more means of democratization through film.

Episode 4: Design

The design-based aspect of this series as per this episode focuses on micro-design as opposed to macro-spatial structural design. In this part, people's daily engagement with their safety through tools, as well as their developed knowledge of navigation based on social factors is studied. Tools, items, spaces, safety hacks, and the actions taken to attain safety are the deliberations in this episode. This episode links the micro-experience of safety and design to daily actions, navigations, interactions, habits, developed behaviors and mechanisms that people adapt to navigate in ways that allow them to attain a physical or psychological sense of safety. While this episode questions women on what they do to keep themselves safe, this is not aimed at transferring and reflecting safety as a woman's responsibility. Indeed, this responsibility has been established earlier as belonging to potential perpetrators, governments, justice systems, and society at large. This episode approaches design within the context of safeguarding, as it is an implication of the unsafe environment that we exist within. Our mediation with space, is contextualized for the audience, with an introduction that reflects these daily negotiations with doors locked, entrances and exits, leaving parking lots at home, closing gates, and moving into the world. These interactions and their function are therefore intrinsically connected to our lives and are part of our daily engagements and needs.

Participants are asked "How do you navigate public spaces with your safety in mind? (If you can show me, please do, and if not, an explanation will do. Do not put yourself at risk trying to collect this footage)." The responses to this question vary from items to social interaction hacks and social transformation suggestions. Certain responses were expected such as pepper spray, holding keys between knuckles and the use of rape alarms. Beyond the expected responses that show tools and items that women utilize for safety, participants also show design aspects of items such like phone covers, bags and earphones and what aspects of these items may allow safety to occur for them. A participant shows her fanny pack and her earphones, which do not have a long string attached to her phone, as a design element that she personally considers and uses to maintain safety. Her fanny pack as well allows her to keep her items hidden, while another participant keeps her phone hidden in her pocket. This is

reminiscent of conversations regarding the lack of pockets in women's clothing and echoes the intricate extents to which design and patriarchal culture influence our lives.

One participant states, "I have a knife that I use, it makes sure that I have my safety." She states this while gesturing to her head and with her hands. Another participant also emphasizes this aspect of psychological safety when she says that "I am not sure if it helps, but for me psychologically it helps." This denotes that through these tools and techniques, safety might not be physically attained, we do have a psychological need to feel safe, to feel as if we have control regardless of our limitations in successfully achieving this. A participant emphasizes this by stating that, "You can do all these things ... but I don't think it actually really matters because in that situation, there are so many variables that could play a role, and I don't think you can ever be fully prepared for the moment." This statement is meant to once again, reflect the limits of responsibility and relieve the participants from a responsibility that they try to take, which does not fall on them.

The final question that participants respond to in this series is "Do you think we can attain safety for women in this country?" This question is meant to illuminate desire and imagination within this violent space. Gender-based violence is so deeply entrenched that almost all the participants state: "Not in my lifetime." In this series, I deliberately attempt to express personal and collective experiences of safety, to create empathy, provoke thought and demand an imagination of new worlds, realities, and tools that we can use to transcend these limitations to safety. I am using the series to imagine the creation of a more deliberate user experience of space that can allow for a structural progression and the creation of women's safety. The focus on women is not to further burden women with the responsibility of creating this safety, but to realize the structural needs of women as they relate to the personal. Within patriarchal culture, the onus is on men to change their behavior as participants state:

"The problem of GBV is so deeply rooted and necessarily intertwined with the trauma men have faced in being men."

"This would mean that men would need to change and realize that the reason we are afraid is because of men... because statistically it is most likely going to be a man."

While we all exist within different pockets of the same structural violence, economic, spatial, and structural divisions may exclude some from experiencing the full breadth of this violence, yet it still manifests in insidious ways. Khensani deliberates on “an ethos of interdependency” and Hannah states that “... a part of this is realizing that we are all part of a humanitarian situation that is asking us to protect the space, and progress the space, and allow it to reach its full potential...” Through cinema, through art, through creativity, through design, through our collective will and desire, this series aims at reflecting collective aspirations, prospects, and possibilities. The last interview is intercut with a creative re-imagination of space as represented in collages where people appear larger in the built physical environment. This is done to stress that structures should favor humans, and our needs within them, with specific considerations for the most vulnerable amongst us. This is the end-goal of the series, to use participatory design-based ethnographic research as a conduit for the democratic development of our society as we collectively imagine new futures. While this imagination is reflected within the world of the film, my hope is that can transcend this world and influence these imaginations in the physical realm.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

In this thesis, I have explored the possibilities of using film as a tool for education, democratization, and development, through the purposeful use of visual research methods to intimately scrutinize women’s social and spatial engagements. The use of the participatory design-based ethnographic research methodology in *Thinking Safety*, creates a narrative that allows a more expansive personal attendance to safety and its links to our material world. In this series, body, space, and culture links are a means of extracting social needs and desires that potentially have the potential to impact development in our physical realm. The visceral realizations of risks associated with feminized bodies highlights the importance of protecting individuals and their bodies from institutions and cultures that harm them, and the need for their structural safety. Indeed one acknowledges that structural safety should be deliberately created, as structural violence has been. While *Thinking Safety* has indeed made these normative experiences of safety more perceptible and more visible, there are still various aspects

of safety within the social space that require interrogation as we have established that all these structural and individual experiences are interlinked. Reflecting on Gqola's (2019) analysis of rapists rarely being spoken about in these conversations makes one think of how men circumnavigate toxic patriarchal masculinity within this space. I also contemplate about communities that experience multiple forms of violence, such as gang violence, gender-based violence, intimate partner violence, racial and socio-economic violence. Safety can also potentially be interrogated within a community/space/culture perspective. There are multiple dimensions of safety and unsafety that still require interrogation, and there are a multitude of interventions that can be applied to create safety.

In reflecting upon the multiple design-based research approaches and interventions, Smith et. al (2013) outlined many processes of design research some of which involve working with designers from the conception of a design, all the way to the creation of a final product. In terms of democratization and development, one can only imagine the possibilities of using these methodologies to challenge the multitude prevalent social economic conditions we face. I reflect upon Khensani's closing remarks, who states "I think that design has a huge role to play but really in close arms with other disciplines like this." This series has therefore served as a conduit for illuminating the body/space/ cultural realities of safety and encouraging participation in the development of multiplicated challenges to these issues. Through sharing this series publicly, one hopes that deliberations that audiences and communities have with these investigations of safety can influence safety creation, through design or any other methods that we may collaboratively and collectively begin to imagine.

REFERENCES

Bengtsson, M., 2016. How to Plan and Perform a Qualitative Study using Content Analysis. *Nursing Plus Open*, 2, pp.8-14.

Blaetz, R., 2007. *Women's Experimental Cinema*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Coen, M., C. D. C., R. and Zalta, E., 2020. *Aristotle's Metaphysics* (*Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*). [online] Plato.stanford.edu. Available at: <<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aristotle-metaphysics/>> [Accessed 1 August 2021].

De Klerk, K., 2022. public aGender — K.. [online] Khensanideklerk.com. Available at: <<https://khensanideklerk.com/public-aGender>> [Accessed 18 January 2022].

Duncan, N., 1996. *Bodyspace. Destabilising Geographies of Gender and Sexuality*. 1st ed. London: Routledge.

Soloway, J. and hooks, b. 2021 *Ending Domination: The Personal is Political*. [video] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fw6Fd87PhjU>: The New School.

Errolmorris.com. 2022. *Errol Morris*. [online] Available at: <<http://www.errolmorris.com/>> [Accessed 18 January 2022].

Farmer, P., 2004. An Anthropology of Structural Violence. *Current Anthropology*, 45(3), pp.305-325.

Fox, N. and Alldred, P., 2014. New Materialist Social Inquiry: Designs, Methods and the Research-assemblage. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 18(4), pp.399-414.

Galtung, J., 1969. Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), pp.167-191.

Gary, J., 2021. *Home - Ja'Tovia Gary*. [online] Ja'Tovia Gary. Available at: <<https://www.jatovia.com/>> [Accessed 1 August 2021].

Gqola, P., 2007. How the 'Cult of Femininity' and Violent Masculinities Support Endemic Gender-Based Violence in Contemporary South Africa. *African Identities*, 5(1), pp.111-124.

Gqola, P., 2015. *Rape*. 1st ed. Cape Town: MFBooks Joburg, Jacana Media.

Kant, I., 2000. *Critique Of Pure Reason, The*. South Bend: Infomotions, Inc.

Kjaersgaard, M. and Smith, R., 2014. Valuable Connections: Design Anthropology and Co-creation in Digital Innovation. *Ethnographic Praxis in Industry Conference Proceedings*, 2014(1), pp.267-281.

Loewen Walker, R., 2014. The Living Present as a Materialist Feminist Temporality. *Women: A Cultural Review*, 25(1), pp.46-61.

Low, S., 2003. Embodied Space(s). *Space and Culture*, 6(1), pp.9-18.

Mannay, D., 2010. Making the Familiar Strange: Can Visual Research Methods Render the Familiar setting more Perceptible?. *Qualitative Research*, 10(1), pp.91-111.

Mohammad, Robina. "Making Gender Ma(R)King Place: Youthful British Pakistani Muslim Women's Narratives Of Urban Space." *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 45.8 (2013): 1802-1822. Web.

Raborife, M., 2021. *Femicide | Uyinene Mrwetyana's mother: We are gripped by hurt, sadness, anger and frustration | News24*. [online] News24. Available at: <<https://www.news24.com/news24/southafrica/news/femicide-uyinene-mrwetyanas-mother-we-are-gripped-by-hurt-sadness-anger-and-frustration-20200810>> [Accessed 9 August 2021].

Rábová, M., 2014. *Mobile phone Filmmaking as a Participatory Medium: The case study of 24 Frames 24 Hours*. Masters. Lund University.

Rorty, A., 2006. *Philosophers on education*. London: Routledge.

SaferSpaces. 2021. *What is Violence?*. [online] Available at: <<https://www.saferspaces.org.za/understand/entry/what-is-violence>> [Accessed 1 August 2021].

Saló, Elaine. "Coconuts Do Not Live In Townships: Cosmopolitanism And Its Failures In The Urban Peripheries Of Cape Town." *Feminist Africa* 13.4 (2009): n. pag. Print.

Smith, R., Otto, T. and Gunn, W., 2013. *Design Anthropology: A Distinct Style of Knowing*. London: Bloomsbury.

Sorensen, A., 2016. *The Feminine Sublime in 21st Century Surrealist Cinema*. Masters. Wright State University.

South African Human Rights Commission, 2018. *Unpacking the gaps and challenges in addressing gender-based violence in South Africa*. [online] Johannesburg: South African Human Rights Commission. Available at: <<https://www.sahrc.org.za/home/21/files/SAHRC%20GBV%20Research%20Brief%20Publication.pdf>> [Accessed 1 August 2021].

Zoetl, P., 2012. Creating images, creating identity. *Journal des Anthropologues*, (130-131), pp.53-78.

FILMOGRAPHY

The Giverny Document. 2019. [video] Directed by Ja'Tovia Gary. Harlem, USA:

www.ja'tovia.com.

Thinking Safety Visual Anthropology AXL4405S 2019 Class Project by Abul Ajak.

University of Cape Town.

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1oJ5zulYdIX6aDasadZ6WsKcQ-pM2ISil/view?usp=sharing>

Thinking Safety Web Series 2021, Masters of Documentary Arts Final Creative Production by Abul Ajak. University of Cape Town.

Episode 1/Safety:

https://uctcloud-my.sharepoint.com/:v:/g/personal/ajkabu001_myuct_ac_za/EUBWZ1mOFJtCq3ekZDddZasBa-JEysxpJSa2kTc6n4slmw?e=bQu1S6

Episode 2/ Responsibility:

https://uctcloud-my.sharepoint.com/:v:/g/personal/ajkabu001_myuct_ac_za/Ee4TcXd2h7NFjcAeXGJeyeMBk-4_tz9V6MpcfP-NSXiA-g?e=4O6Cfo

Episode 3/Space:

https://uctcloud-my.sharepoint.com/:v:/g/personal/ajkabu001_myuct_ac_za/EVbG8LafdEBCiCIREWw6kvsBc1TfoaWbiaO8RtBtKbHevw?e=oUsFsd

Episode 4/Design:

https://uctcloud-my.sharepoint.com/:v:/g/personal/ajkabu001_myuct_ac_za/EUrB2YGf_tNMI-5ltJdyYHUBiaryjmB2cgRV8u9vrwrfFw?e=d9gtei

ADDENDUM

THINKING SAFETY PARTICIPATORY QUESTIONS.

Firstly, thank you for agreeing to take part in this participatory research. Your participation is very much appreciated. By taking part in this research project, you consent to having your video shared publicly, whenever the project is completed. A consent form has also been attached to these questions that, if you do agree with the terms of the consent form, you can sign it, and send it back to me.

This research has two parts and will be conducted in two sections. You will receive the first set of questions, and once I have the responses you will get a second set of questions. You will need a smartphone to take videos of yourself and follow the instructions of each section carefully. Whatever you do, your safety is paramount, therefore do not take videos in places where your safety might be at risk. When you have completed the first set of questions, you will send me back the videos, and then a second set of questions will be sent back to you. Your consent is negotiable and if at all there are aspects of this shoot, as well as the resulting video that you are not comfortable with, it can be discussed and changed accordingly.

Section one requires a lot of dialogue, while section 2 emphasizes showing and telling. You will receive the second set of questions after you complete the first set. There is no particular order to how you will receive the questions, some participants will receive section 2 first, and others will receive section 1 first.

- *Please remember while shooting to shoot your videos on a landscape mode as opposed to a portrait mode. This means that you hold the phone horizontally as opposed to vertically.
- *Also make sure that the environment you are in is as quiet as possible when you are shooting as background noise will affect the quality of the sound.
- *Hold the camera/your phone as steadily as possible and include yourself properly in the frame.
- *Make sure that everything you need to show is within the frame.
- *State your name at the beginning of the video.
- *Read the question out loud before you answer it.
- *State your name at the beginning of the video.
- *Please try to explain your answers with as much detail as possible.
- *I have attached a consent form along with these questions which you must sign and return to me as well.
- *When done, you can send me the videos via WhatsApp on my phone, or via my email address as a drive link or via We-transfer. My email address is: maxineoyay@gmail.com.

Section 1: Questions about safety: (This section may require participants to answer questions in an expository way as I assume that there is not much to show in this section. If indeed you have anything to show, please do so).

What do you think safety means?

Do you ever not think about your safety? Explain.

What would you do or how would you act if you did not have to think about your safety?

How differently do you think women approach safety as opposed to men?

Do you think we can attain safety for women in this country?

Who do think is responsible for your safety? Why?

What makes you most afraid when it comes to your personal safety?
Who do you think is not responsible for your safety? Why?
How have the COVID-19 pandemic affected your personal safety?

Section 2: Questions about safety precautions: (Emphasis on telling and showing. Speak as you show me things that you do to make you feel safe, if it is your items or precautionary steps you take, please show me. If you are unable to do all the above try to act out what you would do, use hand gestures, and try to explain in detail the dimensions of these spaces and how you are within those spaces).

Tell me about spaces where you feel safe, and spaces where you feel unsafe and why?
What is it about you that makes you the most afraid?
What activities do you have to do that put your safety at risk?
What do you think about while moving through the city?
How different do you navigate spaces during the day versus when it gets dark?
What do you do to keep yourself safe? (Please talk me through your safety precaution process and while showing me what you do to attain this aim?)
How do you navigate public spaces with your safety in mind? (If you can show me, please do, and if not, an explanation will do. Do not put yourself at risk trying to collect this footage).

Thank you all for your support and participation! 😊

Questions for Participant A:

Introduce yourself, your identity, your praxis and motives, how you define your purpose?
Tell us about Matri-Archi?
What do you think safety means?
Who do you think is responsible for your safety?
Who do you think is not responsible for your safety?
How does space and design influence safety?
What ways beyond design can we influence safety?
How can we collectively/individually work towards safety?
How can we respond to this issue via design?
Do you have any thoughts on this issue that you would like to add, that I may not have asked you?