

DIGITAL DOORWAY: SOCIAL-TECHNICAL INNOVATION FOR HIGH-NEEDS COMMUNITIES

Larry Stillman¹; Marlien Herselman²; Mario Marais²; Mmamakanye Pitse Boshomane²; Paul Plantinga³;
Sheelagh Walton³

¹CCNR, Monash University, Australia; ²Meraka, CSIR, South Africa; ³ School of IT, Monash South Africa

ABSTRACT

The application of the Living Lab (LL) approach to social-technical innovation to the Digital Doorway Initiative in Zandspruit near Johannesburg is outlined in the context of the initiative's evolution from an educational project to a broader community innovation initiative. The relationship between different stakeholders is explored in a theoretical and practical sense as a future research and practice challenge for both the study of ICTs in society (in this case, a poor community), and the fostering of community-driven innovation. The activity also offers a research challenge for understanding the cultural transformations that are necessary for bringing about more effective integration between technical and social-technical viewpoints about design and research in a social context. Current and projected community-based research activity is also outlined.

INTRODUCTION

Technologists are often ill-equipped to deal with research that involves people and cannot be expected to be able to have the expertise or experience to deal with it, hence leading to the need to partner with social experts in doing research projects (Gush 2008).

This paper focuses on practical challenges for the design, implementation, research, and community ownership of an Information and Communication Technology (ICT) project, centred on the Digital Doorway computer kiosk, in Zandspruit, an informal settlement on the fringes of Johannesburg, South Africa. The project is a partnership between community stakeholders, the Meraka Institute of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), the South African Department of Science and Technology (original funder of the Digital Doorway project) and Monash University. The paper is also anticipated as the first of a series of interdisciplinary papers between Meraka, Monash University and community stakeholders in which a particular, reflective approach to research, implementation and study of social-technical initiatives in a development context will be presented.

The paper adopts a social-political viewpoint which argues that knowledge about community dynamics and structures must be consciously incorporated into community-oriented social-technical interventions. In adopting a community-based research approach, social-technology projects are ethically engaged with interested parties for community problem-solving. This can be best perceived through the incorporation of community-based action research techniques into social-technical projects (Stillman and Stoecker 2008).

The application of the Living Lab (LL) approach to social-technical innovation (Pitse-Boshomane, Marais et al. 2008) to the Digital Doorway Initiative (DDI) in Zandspruit is discussed in the context of the DDI's evolution from an educational project to a broader community development initiative. A Living Lab is a concept which refers to a research and development methodology where innovations are created and verified in collaborative, multi-contextual real-world settings. The paper details the development of a research philosophy and research plan amongst social researchers, technical designers, and community stakeholders in Zandspruit, South Africa, in which a broader conception of technology in the community than that originally adopted by the Digital Doorway (DD) designers has been developed. The quote which introduces the paper was written by one of the DD's technical designers and is indicative of the recognition that another set of skills is required in socially oriented research and development projects such as the DD, which is both a community 'intervention' and a research platform for discovery about user and community ICT needs and impacts in a particular context.

We argue that such joint community-oriented research and action results in evidence to support the proposition that it is not the isolated agency of a technology or artifact that makes a difference in social-technical projects but rather, its instantiation or enactment (Orlikowski 1999), embedded in a social-technical web (Lamb and Kling 2003), or network (Callon 1991; Law 1992; Law 2001), within the larger framework of a complex and influencing social and political order (Giddens 1976: 102). Conscious or tacit human agency in this context, influenced in a variety of directions, sets in place conditions for the adoption and appropriation of particular ICTs. A key proposition which therefore emerges from this position is that technology structures are emergent, enacted, and dependent upon agency, rather than being simply embodied through the technology (Orlikowski 2000). Analytically and practically, it is vital to observe and learn from this 'emergence' in community settings in order to maximise community benefits such as the improvement of life chances for the very poor. As part of this, we are concerned that the agency of the traditionally disempowered (such as those in poverty and without material resources such as personal ICTs) should be brought to the foreground and influence design and implementation, and this is a principle that has come to the fore in the Capability Approach of Amartya Sen and his followers in international development (Sen 2001; Sen 2009).

With an understanding that 'technical things have political qualities' (Winner 1980) in the larger context of particular social-economic formations, DDI can be understood as a purposed social-technical system in which the Digital Doorway is a key technical agent supported through direct engagement with a community for communication, knowledge, and innovation in the context of providing opportunity to a disadvantaged community. The Zandspruit community research project is seen as an opportunity to plan, from the start, for a community-based Living Lab approach to the development of the DD, in which the community stakeholders are effective research partners and integrated with the planning and implementation of technical and social impact studies. This is the first occasion on which an upfront form of research planning within an identified community has been conducted for the DD, rather than post-fact planning for evaluative research and action.

The research method results in a community-focused approach which acknowledges the multi-disciplinary nature of a collaboration in which artifact or system design is only part of a comprehensive approach to problem solving, innovation, and strong community engagement that can lead to positive impacts (Stillman 2008). The research partnership is also important because it will permit the development of insights into non-traditional areas of Information Systems research and practice, as suggested by Orlikowski, a leading researcher and theorist whose work derives from Giddens, a social theorist who has been influential in social-technical studies (Giddens 1968; Jones and Karsten 2008). Orlikowski has called for further research into 'the meanings and emotional attachments that users develop for the technologies they use' (Orlikowski 2000: 423), and this is as relevant to the life of people in townships or other marginalized and minority groups (Stillman and Craig 2006) as it is in corporate studies. The LL process is thus also intended for self-reflection and conceptual theory-building about the relationship between technology and grounded social intervention decisions, benefits, and impact. Research and action in conjunction with the communities is also a significant opportunity for original research and activity that supports social justice and an opportunity for previously 'unheard voices' (Stoecker and Tryon 2009) to be heard as part of Monash University's social justice mission. Such research also supports Meraka's mandate to support the communities of South Africa through ICT research, development and innovation.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT

The population of South Africa was close to 50 million at the last estimate in 2009, though many refugees are undocumented (United Nations Development Program 2008). It also has a very large young population with 52% of the population under the age of 25¹. At least 45-50% of the population is considered to be living in real poverty, and at least 7.5 million adults are illiterate. According to the UN Human Development Index (United Nations Development Program 2008), which looks at factors such as life expectancy, income, and school enrolment, all the lowest-ranking countries are African and about 14.5% of South Africa's population lives on less than \$US2 per day. The poorest households in South Africa are typically those headed by black women in rural areas. Thus privately owned ICTs beyond the widely-used mobile phone are not a proposition, and even in that case, phones are often a shared device used by people with limited literacy. There are approximately 30,000 schools in the country, perhaps only 20% having more than one computer (Gush, Cambridge et al. 2004).

THE DIGITAL DOORWAY INITIATIVE AND KIOSK AS A RESPONSE TO THE DIGITAL DIVIDE

The digital divide between those who have access to skills, knowledge and technological infrastructure and those who do not have access, skills, or knowledge is one of greatest challenges to the uptake of ICTs in the developing world (Loader, Keeble et al. 2004; Steyn 2007). While the term digital divide has been replaced in policy discourse by terms such as digital opportunity, or digital/ e-inclusion, the fact remains that whatever the favoured terminology, there is a huge gap between the haves- and have-nots in the opportunity to access and use ICTs. As a 'developmental state', a continuing challenge in South Africa is to provide low-cost access,

exposure, skills, content, and opportunity for innovation to the poorest of communities, alongside market-based solutions (Terreblanche 2009).

The DDI, representing a particular approach to the design and implementation of ICTs in poor communities was initiated by Meraka as part of the Government of South Africa's strategic mandate for ICT development, articulated by President Thabo Mbeki in 2002. Mbeki specifically referred to 'technological literacy [being] key to the country's future in an increasingly globalised world', and he called for local solutions to solve the digital divide challenge, with the intent also to lead Africa on the issue. There are now well over 200 DD installations throughout the country (Gush 2008), as well as terminals in Ethiopia, Uganda and Lesotho, and a demonstration unit at Monash University in Australia, where there is interest in its adaptation for use by indigenous communities.

In response to the challenge of developing a public Internet where basic utilities such as electricity cannot be assured, the Meraka Institute developed robust single or multi-user Digital Doorway terminals to provide both cached and direct internet experiences in public locations to underserved, poor populations, based on similar principles of informal learning as demonstrated through the Hole in the Wall project in India, the first well-known public technology project intended to provide informal youth in a slum setting (Mitra, Dangwal et al. 2005). Comparison with the One Laptop per Child (OLPC) project is beyond the scope of this paper but it can be noted that OLPC has been critiqued by others involved in development for its technical limitations and assumptions about adoption of ICTs in developing countries (Kraemer, Dedrick et al. 2009). We also suggest that a multi-modal approach to addressing digital divide issues is needed in which the DD can also complement various other ICTs in the same community, such as providing Bluetooth access for mobile devices for young people to upload and download local information, learning materials, and music and videos that they may make, as part of their learning in the community.

The evidence from the Hole in the Wall project is that children quickly learn basic computer skills through unsupervised experimentation and exploration (Gush 2004; Mitra, Dangwal et al. 2005). Thus, informal education for school-age children outside of the classroom setting has been the first target of the DD project, with the consequent desire to develop an Africanized technology using Open Source products. While the focus has been upon the production of interfaces in English, materials in South Africa's other official languages can be installed. The standard Open Office suite, cached Wikipedia, and multimedia tools are installed for children to explore and create content.

The core Digital Doorway terminal is a robust digital kiosk with up to four screens, and keyboards with touchpads, built to withstand the rigors of the African climate, enthusiastic use, as well as physical vandalism. It can be securely bolted to the ground or floor. Kiosk terminals are connected to a server running Xubuntu, have connected video cameras, concealed speakers and can be configured for uninterruptible power supplies or solar power. Units can be configured for offline cached accesses or direct internet access via broadband (wireless, cable) or satellite, and remotely administered. A key role in adoption of the terminals has been a

local champion who can demonstrate the relevance of the device to children's education. DDs are technically reliable and can be remotely supported with little need for local support other than a reboot or cleaning.

Additional versions of the DD are being developed, including the lighter and portable 'BEE' in conjunction with UNICEF, targeted at emergency environments (The Communication Initiative Network 2008). A visually-appealing and ventilated portable classroom or public space version called the Container DD has also been developed. It can be transported by truck and easily erected.

However, bridging the divide is not just an issue of hardware and software, or even content. As is known from the widely acclaimed work of Rogers, technology will only be adopted if it is perceived as relevant and beneficial and having value in such a way that it is adopted, despite any inconvenience it may cause (Rogers 2003). This experience is known from encounters with ICTs in developing countries (Heeks 2002) and other studies which speak of the need for 'soft technology' and 'soft infrastructure' to support people's interactions with ICTs (Simpson 2004). The environmental factors which support or inhibit use and adoption or adaptation are therefore of particular interest to future stages of the project.

Because of the apparent success of the DD in engaging children, after eight years in operation, the government is now interested in the DD being modified for a wider agenda for social and community developmental or economic impact, and potentially, for commercialization. The integration of the Living Lab philosophy with the DDI is seen to provide a platform for the development of commercial applications, services, and processes in townships or other environments where individual computing may not be a cost effective option or mobile devices may not be adequate for conducting all forms of business online.

There is a consequent need to understand how the DDI as a social-technical system can be repurposed to meet these demands from government and other stakeholders. Meraka has also realized that there is a need to better understand the dynamics between system designers and those engaged in social research and development within Meraka. The cultures of technical designers and socially-oriented researchers are somewhat different and do not always overlap well. More effective exchange between different orientations involved in a social-technical initiative can also be used to design for and discover what is often elusive through traditional laboratory-based or quantitative research means: social impact and particularly community impact. Combine this with the mutual desire to engage users on the ground as community collaborators, and the research-design-implement-evaluate equation becomes culturally and practically quite complex.

THE ZANDSPRUIT COMMUNITY AND ITS NEEDS

Zandspruit has a population of approximately 17,000 families / 50-60,000 people in an area of about 3 square km, on the north-western edge of the metropolis of Johannesburg. It is bordered on all sides by a number of affluent communities which includes the Monash University South Africa campus. In addition, the mixed ethnic nature of the township with its different languages and cultures as well as the disembedding of family relationships because of forced or voluntary migration, and the pervasive effects of the AIDS pandemic mean

that community social networks are multifaceted and social needs are very diverse. Such factors cannot be ignored in social or technical research or intervention.

Similar to other townships, basic infrastructure is lacking. Those townships, situated close to major communication routes, grow so rapidly that they often have poor or no electricity supply, sewerage, water, roads and other urban services, including schools, health facilities and so on. The digital divide is also starkly highlighted with poor communities that live in close proximity to wealth and technological opportunities in modern South Africa.

However, despite the lack of amenities, townships are vibrant living communities and not just stigmatized 'slums' that lack social, cultural or economic capital with positive attributes that can be built upon rather than being bulldozed². For example, the Alexandra township situated across the road from the affluent suburb of Sandton in Johannesburg is now 104 years old, and is a thriving multi-generational family settlement. Zandspruit is only about 12 years old, but is showing signs of becoming a permanent township.

Monash University South Africa has a program of social engagement with NGOs, including student and staff support of the community in a Saturday School and other activities in partnership with NGOs based at the Emthonjeni Community Centre at Zandspruit. The installation of a DD kiosk in early 2010 is viewed as an important step in developing infrastructural support at Zandspruit and providing opportunities for all the community to have a computer experience beyond formal lessons or technological access in a laboratory environment. Monash has been careful and respectful in the development of its relationship with Zandspruit, given that it is a prosperous foreign institution in the eyes of most South Africans³.

Why is the DD relevant to such communities when other priorities such as water, sewerage, electricity or basic housing are needed? A key reason is that English is the major language of the formal economy in South Africa. English and computers provide life opportunities, whether for the local settlement's economy or in the life of the bigger city. Many of those living in settlements who are employed now use some form of technology that requires an understanding or use of English, whether it is an electronic order PDA or cash register as a waiter, or using software and emails in a clerical position. We additionally suggest, based on anecdotal evidence, that there is a strong aspiration amongst parents and carers in townships for their children to have ICT skills. Thus, schools need robust ICTs to educate children to the same level as other more fortunate South African youth so that they too have equivalent employment opportunities in the future. Furthermore, mother language tuition in the primary schools is also under pressure. The learners and teachers consequently need exposure and access to educational resources in languages other than English.

For the large unemployed population technological proficiency is therefore a prerequisite for skilled employment. There is a pervasive use of mobile phones in many poor communities (United Nations Development Program 2008), but access to mobile phones is only part of the answer for effective integration into the world of ICT interaction.

A LIVING LAB APPROACH TO COMMUNITY-FOCUSSED ICT DEVELOPMENT

As already suggested, the Living Lab refers to a research and development methodology where innovations are created and verified in collaborative, multi-contextual real-world settings (Eriksson, Niitamo et al. 2005). However, the past thrust of ICT-focused Living Labs has been mainly upon technology-driven product development (for example, cell phones), rather than tools that are part of a broader social development or social change agenda. Thus, a more conventional definition of the Living Lab has been to support:

'Functional regions' where stakeholders have formed a Public Private Partnership (PPP) of firms, public agencies, universities, institutes and people, all collaborating for creation, prototyping, validating and testing of new services, products and systems in real life contexts (Wills, Parker et al. 2009).

The Living Labs approach to the DDI has adopted a broader social-political viewpoint where the LL takes a role influencing and assisting collaboration between different community-oriented stakeholders using technology for community building and community problem-solving (Pitse-Boshomane, Marais et al. 2008). The methodology equally draws upon, and aims to harmonize the diversity of social and technical knowledge, whether tacit or practical, that contributes to people's agency in society (a sociological point emphasized by Giddens, (1984)). A particular concern is to engage users and stakeholders from deprived communities, working with the complexity of grass-roots community dynamics, politics, and power structures in the community engagement and development process, a factor long-recognized in community development literature and practice, but only recently acknowledged in Information Systems thinking (Byrne and Sundeeep 2006) which is more attuned to the theory and practice of management (Rothman 1972).

When considering the issue of social change, Suchman's insight about the 'situatedness' of technology is critical to effective design and use in a variety of social settings (Suchman 1997; Suchman 1999). However, this principle has not been well-articulated, if at all, with respect to disadvantaged situations such as those found in townships. A most difficult challenge in all of this is to work with communities to find socio-technical solutions to the proposition that people are not merely stakeholders in their heritage or particular communal identity, but that they 'own that heritage and the right to fully control if and how research is undertaken on that heritage'(Niven and Russell 2005: 236). In particular, the issue of intellectual property rights regarding co-creation of innovations within communities should be addressed in any project.

This interpretation of the Living Labs approach can be associated with insights in Community Informatics and Development Informatics with which it has considerable conceptual overlap (Heeks 2006). Gurstein, who is widely cited in Community Informatics, recently suggested that Community Informatics involves:

... a commitment to universality of technology-enabled opportunity including to the disadvantaged; a recognition that the "lived physical community" is at the very center of individual and family well-being - economic, political, and cultural; a belief that this can be enhanced through the judicious use of ICT; a sophisticated user-focused understanding of Information Technology; and applied social leadership, entrepreneurship and creativity (Gurstein 2007).

That is, Community Informatics is a type of social-technology theorization and practice that promotes social change and human development in conjunction with technology. Community Informatics is thus a specific form of research and implementation at a micro-level of society, directed at local communities and even smaller collectivities in them (community organisations, families, informal groups, village micro-enterprises. Its theories and practice are based on fields as diverse as information systems, management systems, library sciences, program evaluation, and community development, and these bring a particular nuance to working with communities on the ground whether in Western or developing countries.

Furthermore, without effective consultation and community acceptance, all sorts of projects and interventions flounder, and ICT projects are no exception to this experience (Stoecker 2005a). The diversity and social circumstances of communities present a great challenge to assumptions about linear project implementation or simplistic forms of evaluation, because working with on-the-ground issues in collaboration with communities takes forbearance, patience, flexibility, time, and especially humility. However, because ICT policy and practice for needy communities is often driven by political imperatives that can be risk averse and time-driven, finding a solution that bridges community, and other funding and political interests, is an enormous challenge.

Another point that is strongly held in Community Informatics is that the overall history of action and research (even of the most well-intentioned sort) with disempowered, marginalized and other communities has all too frequently been bound up with the effects of colonization, unequal benefits of research, and deterministic cultural, political, and economic agendas in favour of the researcher, rather than the 'researched' (Bishop 2005). The same comment is relevant to socio-technical research, however well-intentioned, where the concept of the 'individual' and 'community' has lacked multi-disciplinary depth and nuance (Stillman and Linger 2009). We therefore aim to explore ways of solving the problem of working across the ontological and epistemological boundaries that exist between IS designers and those focused on broader social processes in which technology plays a significant part, because it influences the innovation process, whether in the social or technological domains that can be outlined for different IS processes (Hirschheim, Klein et al. 1996).

Additionally, within the field of Development Informatics, there is an approach that is critical of the appropriate use of Western ICTs and systems which benefit no-one but elites and in fact, only serve to highlight the potential for well-intentioned projects to serve to disempower local interests (Avgerou and Walsham 2000; Zheng and Heeks 2008) and reinforce relations of dependence on external players. This is a viewpoint that has emerged from dependency theory which has developed in a variety of different (and debated theoretical forms) as described by Sonntag (Sonntag 2001). Consequently, socio-technology interventions should empower and provide dignity to those in need. At their worst, interventions psychologically alienate and disempower, a point well known from the writings of Franz Fanon on colonization in Africa (Fanon 1967; Gibson 1987). Equally, the question of empowerment was the major theme of the November 2009 Prato Community Informatics Conference.

However, in the desire to compensate for this inequity, it is naïve to assume that it is always possible to work 'from the bottom up', and that 'participation' means everyone needs to take part. An important insight from community based research methodologies concerns the technique of 'working from the middle' (Stoecker 2005b: 47ff). Instead, more often than not, a project works with key stakeholders or intermediaries (Madon and Sahay 2002), such as community workers, who act as middle-of-the way brokers between researchers and research participants. Having a trusted relationship with such stakeholders is important, because their leadership-both within a community, and in many ways, leading the researchers, is critical to developing more authentic and confident community participation in contexts such as that found in Development Informatics projects (Bailur 2008a; Bailur 2008b). Therefore, being familiar with community based research techniques such as working from the middle is important for effective LL practice.

Ultimately, to adapt what has been suggested by the Aspen Institute in its overview of the necessity of open and multi-disciplinary comprehensive studies of community change (Kubisch 1997), the 'recipes, ideas and techniques' discussed here can create a culture of 'systemic connection'. Understandings between developers, researchers and community stakeholders can be deepened and strengthened through a better understanding of the different rationales for the development and implementation of such an initiative. This is also supported by the LL methodology.

However, such new connections and recipes are not intuitive or easy to acquire, but need to be consciously 'worked at' as 'systems of accumulated expertise' because of their differences with more conventional socio-technical activity (Giddens 1992). New, community-oriented skills need to be acquired. This remains the ongoing challenge to working with communities such as those found in Zandspruit and of course, the communities themselves should be both encouraged and supported to develop their own ability to work with professionals in organizations like Meraka and Monash.

PRIOR, CURRENT AND PLANNED ACTIVITY

1. PRIOR ACTIVITY, 2008-2009

A review of the principles of Community Informatics and program evaluation techniques was conducted by the first author in conjunction with Meraka and Monash South Africa (MSA) staff on two occasions in 2008 (Stillman 2008). Principles behind community-based research (including different forms of evaluation) and community development were also discussed as a way of providing concepts and a vocabulary to describe and outline different community and stakeholder interests.

Through this intensive process Meraka and a few MSA academic staff were able to acquaint themselves with each other's interests and develop a common framework about working with communities. Additionally, new and significant ideas were generated. For example, in the first workshop series, the metaphor of an 'ideal type' was introduced, drawing upon Max Weber's foundational work in sociology (Weber, Gerth et al. 1977:90). The principle of the ideal type was used to develop a representation of the DD ideal for modelling and discussion. This struck a strong chord with people, and one of the participants came up with a statement which still carries

some weight because it encapsulates much of what is intended about the DD: 'Digital Doorways being built by each community and maintained by the community, that are sustainable and contributing to the development of that community'. This statement brought to the fore the insight that the Digital Doorway device was something more than a device, but a social-technical change agent and that it was positioned within a process—the Digital Divide Initiative (DDI).

APRIL 2009

An additional set of workshops held in April 2009 reflected upon the DDI as a group or social (rather than individual) socio-technology that could serve different purposes. An Australian indigenous elder paid MSA a visit as part of Monash's interest to develop the DDI for Australia. Some of the key factors that were articulated included:

- an emphasis on group rather than individual use (as opposed to commercial devices which focus on the individual user). Group social interaction by a group is critical for informal learning as distinct from the more individualized approach that underlies the One Laptop per Child, for example.
- a goal of support infrastructure being aimed at bottom-up adoption and innovation rather than off the shelf commercial technology which stops at the consumer, or depends on a further commercial relationship. Thus, the DD is a 'sponsored' social computer for multiple users, rather than a self-funded or corporate personal computer.
- the fact that the DD is an 'embedded social technology' in deliberately designed or intended circumstances concerning social, economic, educational, and community development.
- the fact that the DD may be a first stepping stone for many people into more portable and personalized/configurable technologies and that it is a place and platform for peer-assisted learning/informal learning.
- the idea that the DD is a communication hub for uploading and downloading information.
- the idea that the DD as a social hub and focal point for the community.
- the issue that the DD is designed for circumstances where technical support is limited and a strong, robust device is needed that can be easily supported locally or remotely.
- the fact that the DD is meant to be a technical platform and environment for social-technical research.

OCTOBER 2009

In October 2009 a workshop between Zandspruit stakeholders, Monash and Meraka resulted in a values and mission statement being developed. A number of community project ideas were outlined. A second Australian indigenous elder paid MSA a visit as part of the discussions around an Australian DDI.

During the workshop a number of scenarios were developed on which to base possible future collaboration within Zandspruit around the DDI. The group was mindful of the need to carefully balance academic expectations of a community as a 'research subject' and the desire of students for social engagement and academic publications, with the stronger ethical concern about the rights of a poor community to protect itself from colonization by a prosperous international institution.

The mission and values statements were as follows:

- Community-based Research (CBR) for Zandspruit is a collaborative co-creative journey between scholars (researchers, technologists, community members) and the people they serve.
- CBR for Zandspruit validates multiple sources of knowledge and promotes the use of multiple methods of discovery and implementation and of dissemination of the knowledge produced.
- CBR for Zandspruit has as its goal social action and social change for the purpose of achieving social justice and improving the human condition.

It was strongly felt that the process of community engagement, and not just research was a 'collaborative co-creative journey' in which there was a lot to be learned, whether on the part of high level academics and administrators or members from the community. The third statement is also significant because it offers an overarching vision in which to place social-technical change activity.

An even higher ranking mission statement was also developed between Meraka and Monash, which in the opinion of one participant, could become a statement in which to frame many other projects undertaken by Monash in the social justice area. If such a statement is adopted, it would be a significant achievement for Monash. The statement outlined the following principles:

- Monash and Meraka wish to work towards a joint impact for transformation in a partnership with the Zandspruit community.
- For Monash and Meraka the challenge is empowerment of the Zandspruit community in the context of a long-term trusting sustainable relationship.
- Monash and Meraka wish to establish a framework which can be adopted elsewhere to inform other community processes.

One participant strongly suggested that a way of ensuring community support would be for it to be endorsed by the local African National Congress councilor, a strong advocate for the community. A meeting was held with the councilor after the workshop and she expressed her support for the proposed partnership on the DDI. While this may seem a limited step, at something removed from a 'community vote', this is a significant step forward in South African political terms,

Four scenarios for potential projects were also outlined. These can be summarized as follows:

- 1 PhD research by Sheelagh Walton: does the DD enhance informal learning as compared to tutor-based computer literacy knowledge.
- 2 Kids as Designers: kids could implement and investigate a bottom-up design approach to any project they need information on, such as designing their own games for maths or typing skills.
- 3 Skills development in entrepreneurship with ICTs tools for small or micro-businesses in partnership with the Monash students' organization SIFE.
- 4 An NGO capacity building project: to develop ICT innovation with NGOs based in Zandspruit around social media for the community.

FEBRUARY 2010

In February 2010 the DD was installed and launched at Zandspruit. It is available for everyone in the community to openly use and experiment on.

MAY 2010

In May 2010, a joint Meraka-Monash workshop focused upon the connection between the Living Lab approach and Community Informatics and the DD technical development trajectory.

A research agenda is now proposed around the main research question:

What is an effective LL innovation method through which the DD can evolve as a social-technical intervention?

The associated questions are:

- What guides the innovation process of the DD?
- What is the response of the different players in the communities to the DD as a social-technical intervention?
- How can LL methodology be applied to facilitate different user driven innovations?
- How does socio-technical design influence the usefulness of the DD?
- How can customization of the DD add value to the stakeholders in different communities?
- How to effectively engage LL techniques as a research tool to address the questions?
- How can community members most effectively inform other stakeholders?
- What is an effective self-reflection process for the LL stakeholders?

- What are effective community-based impact evaluation means and measures for social-technical systems?

The transition from technical design with its inbuilt specifications based upon traditional user-requirements analysis, to a richer form of interactive social design by non-typical users with researchers and designers is a major transition point for Meraka. Meraka's desire to change reflects a move away from the underdevelopment of 'social factors' within Information Systems and Soft Systems (Walsham 1995; Lamb and Kling 2003) from a systems approach, and a desire for positive experiences in meeting complex social reality for designers from the perspective of ethnographers or those with other social insight (Salvador and Sherry 2004).

Social use in complex settings cannot be predicted in the laboratory. There must be effective social embedding for full social-technical interaction and the observation and feedback of effects, experimentation, and recording of unanticipated. Understanding and incorporating the socially unexpected is a long-standing problem in social theory (Merton 1936), but is necessary task for effective social technical design.

Related to this desire was a discussion during the workshop concerning the need for a cross-paradigmatic language between the technical and social researchers to deal with issues such as technical product development needs, the different natures of technical and social feedback, and as a means for jointly articulating the social impact of technology across technical and social domains of expertise. From the examination of different perspectives and techniques and real, symbolic or perceived boundaries (Lamont and Molnar 2002) that exist or can occur between technical, social and community interests better design, implementation, and evaluative actions can be undertaken.

The table below, based upon earlier work in comparing the dimensions of Information Systems, Social Informatics and Community Informatics, has an added column outlining the perspective of the Living Labs approach and this will be developed in future research.

Table: ICT perspectives compared

Standard (Tool) perspectives for IS	Social Informatics perspectives	Community Informatics perspectives	Living Lab Community innovation perspective applied to townships
IT is primarily an individual tool	IT is a socio-technical network	Community networks are social technical relationships and structures for local communities; both people ICTs have degrees of agency.	Observing and assisting with the innovative use of the ICT artefact in a real life community
Traditional business model is sufficient	Ecological view is needed	A community model is needed that incorporates depth understanding of community and community organisations as supporting group social solidarity and human agency	Facilitating negotiation between business and community over ownership of IP created. Living Lab acts as an incubator for community innovation.
One shot implementation	Implementation is an ongoing social process	Ibid., and is ideally a community-oriented participatory process	Co-creation of innovation by all stakeholders (community, social & technical specialists, entrepreneurs)
Technological effects are direct and immediate	Technological effects are indirect and involve different time scales	Ibid.	Ibid, but research is directed towards finding means to demonstrating economic and social impacts and outcomes.
Politics are bad or irrelevant	Politics are central and even enabling	Community politics are as complex as any other politics. Social justice is critical.	In order to achieve institutional collaboration, institutional politics need to be managed (community, business, academic, funders)
Incentives to change are unproblematic	Incentives may require restructuring (and may be in conflict with other organizational actions)	Incentives are in the social domain: 'what's in it for us'.	A complex mix of stakeholder incentives. Striving for alliances and alignment between stakeholders.
Relationships are easily	Relationships	Power, language, power,	Also complex and dynamic where

reformed	are complex, negotiated & multivalent	gender, class, disability, ethnicity need to be accounted for	culture, social structure, and technology concepts play a role. There are different power relationships.
Social impacts of ICT are large but isolated and benign.	Potentially enormous social impacts of ICT	Ibid, and potentially enormous social and community repercussions of ICT	The same, but one of LL's aims to demonstrate impacts and usage for different stakeholders
Contexts are simple (a few key terms or demographics)	Contexts are complex	The vocabulary and agency of community and community organisations need to be well understood. Gender, class, disability, ethnicity need to be accounted for	Contexts are complex and different based on specific community requirements and needs. The composition of key stakeholders differs in each context.
Knowledge and Expertise are easily made explicit	Knowledge and Expertise are inherently tacit/implicit	Ibid. ICTs are not at the core of many community/community agencies actions. Social/people technology is just as important.	There is a complex relationship between IS or artefact designers, and social researchers, and communities in explicating knowledge and expertise; developing a shared language is difficult
ICT infrastructures are fully supportive.	Additional skill and work are needed to make ICT work	ICTs are an additional layer to human-technology networks and may encounter resistances	Test and evolve ICT infrastructures 'the jury is out'. Does this work for the community?

TABLE 1: ADAPTED FROM (STILLMAN AND LINGER 2009)

This work will be used to align ongoing work by Stillman, Linger, and others at Monash to unpack the conundrum of Information Systems and Community Informatics; that the 'social' and 'technical' are so difficult to integrate in design, use, and evaluative methodologies (Stillman and Linger 2009). A comparison of different approaches to the social and technical, incorporating the Living Labs perspective was also briefly outlined for future exploration. From the examination of different perspectives and techniques, real, symbolic or perceived boundaries for conceptual or practical demarcation (Lamont and Molnar 2002) that exist or can occur between technical, social and community interests-are highlighted as issues for careful reflection and research during the next project stage at Zandspruit.

CURRENT RESEARCH

First, it is anticipated that baseline research will be conducted in June (and will be reported on at the IDIA conference in November 2010) as an initial study of reactions to the DD in Zandspruit by key community stakeholders since its installation in February. Findings will also be integrated into a second paper by the project team

Second, a PhD study undertaken by Sheelagh Walton is assessing the impact that an ICT training program, held on the Monash University South Africa campus, undertaken by the severely impoverished Zandspruit learners, might have on the engagement of the learners with the DD. The exploratory study is testing the hypothesis that a community will be more technologically empowered, when the small group of learners, acting as change-agents within their own community, informally share their ICT knowledge with members in the community. Walton's study intends to describe the extent to which this unique combined set of circumstances has far-reaching effects in a community, generating a technologically-rich 'ripple effect' through the community.

The research will show the extent to which a minimally-invasive learning environment, that which is being supplied by the DD, can be nurtured, promoting self-exploration and encouraging technological-usage, understanding and enjoyment. Educational enhancement, increased technological understanding and enjoyment, the scope for community empowerment and social engagement will be addressed in the study. Preliminary findings from questionnaires, focus groups and individual interviews have already been collected, yielding some interesting results. These will be shared in an additional IDIA 2010 conference paper by Walton.

FUTURE ACTIVITY

It is also anticipated that a number of research applications for field research on the social and educational effects of the DD will be made on the basis of this partnership with Monash and to external funders. Funding has been approved for continuing small-scale research in the coming year.

The results of such research could also be applied in the development of DD projects in partnership with indigenous communities in Australia and/or the Pacific in conjunction with Monash and UNICEF, and preliminary discussions have been held in Australia about funding opportunities in the future.

CONCLUSIONS

Research on the evolution of the DDI in the Zandspruit community allows for the interaction between different role players and stakeholders which include academics, social and technical researchers, NGOs, Monash University, Meraka Institute and most importantly, the Zandspruit community. The application of the LL methodology is seen as a vehicle to support the development and empowerment of all the role players

involved, enhanced by a better understanding of the social-political context of research and action. Community-based needs and input is highly recognized and encouraged. The potential of future papers and idea generation is indicated and research perspectives outlined and this allows for a fertile ground for action and research where the DDI is a social-technical change agent set in action through human agency.

REFERENCES

- Avgerou, C. and G. Walsham (2000). Information technology in context : studies from the perspective of developing countries. Aldershot, Ashgate.
- Bailur, S. (2008a). Analyzing telecentres using post-colonial theory. Manchester, Development Informatics Group, Institute for Development Policy and Mangement.
- Bailur, S. (2008b). Deconstructing Community Participation in Telecentre Projects. Manchester, Development Informatics Group, Institute for Development Policy and Mangement.
- Bishop, R. (2005). Freeing Ourselves from Neo-colonial Domination in Research: A Kaupapa Māori Approach to Creating Knowledge. The SAGE handbook of qualitative research. N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.
- Byrne, E. and S. Sundeeep (2006). "Participatory design for social development: A South African case study on community-based health information systems." Information Technology for Development **13**(1): 71 - 94.
- Callon, M. (1991). Techno-Economic Networks and Irreversibility. Sociology of Monsters: Essays on Power, Technology and Domination. London: J. Law. London, Routledge. **32-61**.
- Eriksson, M., V.-P. Niitamo and K. S. (2005). State of the art in utilising Living Labs approach to user-centric ICT innovation - a European approach. Unpublished Working Paper.
- Fanon, F. (1967). The wretched of the earth. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Gibson, M. (1987). Anthropology and tradition: a contemporary aboriginal viewpoint (paper written by Noel Pearson). ANZAAS. Townsville, 1987
- Giddens, A. (1976). New rules of sociological method : a positive critique of interpretative sociologies. London, Hutchinson.
- Giddens, A. (1984). The constitution of society : outline of the theory of structuration. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Giddens, A. (1992). The transformation of intimacy : sexuality, love, and eroticism in modern societies. Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press.
- Gurstein, M. (2007). What is community informatics (and why does it matter)? Milan, Italy Polimetrica.
- Gush, K. (2004). Open Source and the Digital Doorway. Paper presented at the Idlelo Conference, Cape Town. Cape Town, CSIR.
- Gush, K. (2008). Towards a more personalised user experience and better demographic data on the Digital Doorway public computer terminals. 5th Prato Community Informatics & Development Informatics Conference 2008: ICTs for Social Inclusion: What is the Reality? Conference CD, Prato, Italy, Centre for Community Networking Research, Monash University.
- Gush, K., G. Cambridge and R. Smith (2004). The Digital Doorway - minimally invasive education in Africa. ICT in education conference Cape Town.
- Heeks, R. (2006). "Theorizing ICT4D Research." Information Technologies and International Development **3**(3): 1-4.
- Hirschheim, R., H. K. Klein and K. Lyytinen (1996). "Exploring the intellectual structures of information systems development: A social action theoretic analysis." Accounting, Management and Information Technologies **6**(1-2): 1-64.
- Kraemer, K. L., J. Dedrick and S. Prakul (2009). "One laptop per child: vision vs. reality." Communications of the ACM **52**(6): 66-73.
- Kubisch, A. C. (1997). Voices from the Field: Learning from the Early Work of Comprehensive Community Initiatives. Washington, DC, Aspen Institute.
- Lamb, R. and R. Kling (2003). "Reconceptualising users as social actors in information systems research." MIS Quarterly **27**(2): 197-235.
- Lamont, M. and V. Molnar (2002). "The study of boundaries in the social sciences." Annual Review of Sociology **28**: 167-95.

- Law, J. (1992). "Notes on the Theory of the Actor Network: Ordering, Strategy and Heterogeneity." Systems Practice 5: 375-393.
- Law, J. (2001). "Networks, Relations, Cyborgs: on the Social Study of Technology (draft)." Retrieved 6 June, 2003, from <http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/soc042jl.html>.
- Loader, B., L. Keeble and Joseph Rowntree Foundation. (2004). Challenging the digital divide? : a literature review of community informatics initiatives. York, Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Madon, S. and S. Sahay (2002). "An Information-Based Model of NGO Mediation for the Empowerment of Slum Dwellers in Bangalore " 18(1): 13-`9.
- Merton, R. K. (1936). "The Unanticipated Consequences of Purposive Social Action " American Sociological Review 1(6): 894-904.
- Mitra, S., R. Dangwal, S. Chatterjee, S. Jha, B. R. S and K. P (2005). "Acquisition of computing literacy on shared public computers: Children and the 'Hole in the Wall'." Australasian Journal of Educational Technology 21(3): 407-426.
- Niven, I. J. and L. Russell (2005). Appropriated pasts: indigenous peoples and the colonial culture of archaeology. Lanham, Altamira.
- Orlikowski, W. J. (1999). Technologies-in-practice : an enacted lens for studying technology in organizations. Cambridge, MA, Sloan School of Management Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Orlikowski, W. J. (2000). "Using technology and constituting structures: A practice lens for studying technology in organizations." Organization Science 11(Jul/Aug): 404-428.
- Pitse-Boshomane, M. M., M. Marais, C. Morris, K. Roux, R. van Rensburg, M. Herselman, M. Ajay and I. Mulder (2008). Catalysing innovation: the promise of the Living Lab Approach in South Africa. Prato CIRN 2008 Community Informatics Conference: ICTs for Social Inclusion: What is the Reality?. Prato, Italy, CCNR, Monash University.
- Rogers, E. (2003). Diffusion of Innovations New York, Free Press.
- Rothman, J. (1972). Three Models of Community Organization Practice. Strategies of Community Organization. F. M. Cox. Itasca, Ill, FE Peacock: 20-36.
- Salvador, T. and J. Sherry (2004). "Local learnings: an essay on designing to facilitate effective use of ICTs " Journal of Community Informatics 1(1): 76-83.
- Sen, A. K. (2001). Development as freedom. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Sen, A. K. (2009). The idea of justice. London, Allen Lane.
- Simpson, L. (2004). Big questions for community informatics initiatives: a social capital perspective. Community and Information Technology: The Big Questions. A Search Conference Report 19 October 2002. L. Stillman. Melbourne, Australian Scholarly Publishing.
- Sonntag, H. R. (2001). Dependency Theory. International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences. N. J. Smelser and P. B. Baltes. Oxford, Elsevier Science Ltd: 3501-3505.
- Steyn, J. (2007). Community memory and ICT in a developing economy. Constructing and Sharing Memory: Community Informatics, Identity and Empowerment. L. Stillman and G. Johanson. Newcastle, UK, Cambridge Scholars Publishing: 247-261.
- Stillman, L. (2008). Is there an ideal type? Developing planning and evaluation models for a digital social inclusion project: Digital Doorways, South Africa 5th Prato Community Informatics & Development Informatics Conference 2008: ICTs for Social Inclusion: What is the Reality? Conference CD, Prato, Italy, Centre for Community Networking Research, Monash University.
- Stillman, L. and H. Linger (2009). "Community Informatics and Information Systems: how can they be better connected?" The Information Society 25(4): 1-10.
- Stillman, L. and R. Stoecker (2008). Community Informatics. Handbook of Research on Public Information Technology. G. D. Garson and M. Khosrow-Pour. Hershey, PA, Idea Group: 50-60.
- Stoecker, R. (2005a). "Is Community Informatics good for communities? Questions confronting an emerging field." The Journal of Community Informatics 1(3): 13-26.
- Stoecker, R. (2005b). Research methods for community change : a project-based approach. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.
- Stoecker, R. and E. A. Tryon (2009). The unheard voices : community organizations and service learning. Philadelphia, Pa., Temple University Press.
- Suchman, L. (1997). "The Social and Interactional Dimensions of Human-Computer Interfaces." American Anthropologist 99(Sep): 660-661.
- Suchman, L. (1999). Working Relations of Technology and Use. The social shaping of technology. J. Wajcman and D. A. MacKenzie. Milton Keynes, [Eng.] ; Philadelphia, Pa., Open University Press: 258-265.

- Terreblanche, S. (2009). The Developmental State In South Africa: The Difficult Road Ahead. State of the Nation: South Africa 2008. P. Kagwanja and K. Kondlo. Cape Town, HSRC Press: 107-130.
- The Communication Initiative Network. (2008, September 8, 2008). "The Drum Beat 459 - Solar-Powered Communication Hub: The BEE." Retrieved 13 June, 2009, from <http://www.comminit.com/en/node/276119/307>.
- United Nations Development Program (2008). UNDP Annual Report 2008. NY, NY, UNDP.
- Walsham, G. (1995). "Interpretive case studies in IS research: Nature and method." European Journal of Information Systems 4(2): 74.
- Weber, M., H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills (1977). From Max Weber: essays in sociology. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Wills, J., M. Parker and G. Wills (2009). Social and Community Informatics and Social Theories of Networks, University of Southampton.
- Winner, L. (1980). "Do Artifacts Have Politics?" Daedalus 109(1): 121-136.
- Zheng, Y. and R. Heeks (2008). Conceptualizing information culture in developing countries. Manchester, Development Informatics Group, Institute for Development Policy and Mangement.

¹ <http://www.statssa.gov.za/PublicationsHTML/P03022009/html/P03022009.html> (Accessed 31 May 2010).

² <http://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/2010/01/how-slums-can-save-the-planet/> (Accessed 24 May 2010)

³ <http://www.theage.com.au/national/education/an-african-venture-20091113-ie67.html> (Accessed May 19, 2010).
<http://emthonjeni.com> (Accessed May 10, 2010)