

1 RESEARCH ARTICLE

2

3 TITLE: 'Voice needs teeth to have bite!' Expanding community-led multisectoral action-learning to address  
4 alcohol and drug abuse in rural South Africa

5

6 SHORT TITLE: Community-led action-learning on alcohol and drug abuse in rural South Africa

7

8 Dr. Lucia D'Ambruoso\* <sup>a, b, c, d</sup>

9 Ms. Denny Mabetha <sup>b, a</sup>

10 Dr. Rhian Twine <sup>b</sup>

11 Ms. Maria van der Merwe <sup>e, a, b</sup>

12 Ms Jennifer Hove <sup>b, a</sup>

13 Dr. Gerhard Goosen <sup>f</sup>

14 Mr Jerry Sigudla <sup>f</sup>

15 Prof. Sophie Witter <sup>g</sup>

16 On behalf of the Verbal Autopsy with Participatory Action Research (VAPAR)/Wits/Mpumalanga Department of  
17 Health Learning Platform<sup>1</sup>

18

19 a. Aberdeen Centre for Health Data Science, Institute of Applied Health Sciences, School of Medicine, Medical  
20 Sciences and Nutrition, University of Aberdeen, SCOTLAND, UK

21 b. MRC/Wits Rural Public Health and Health Transitions Research Unit (Agincourt), School of Public Health,  
22 University of the Witwatersrand Johannesburg, SOUTH AFRICA

23 c. Department of Epidemiology and Global Health, Umeå University, SWEDEN

24 d. Public Health, National Health Service (NHS) Grampian, SCOTLAND, UK

25 e. Maria van der Merwe Consulting, White River, SOUTH AFRICA

26 f. Mpumalanga Department of Health, Mbombela, SOUTH AFRICA

27 g. Institute for Global Health and Development, Queen Margaret University, SCOTLAND, UK

28 \*Corresponding author Tel +441224437127 Email: [lucia.dambruoso@abdn.ac.uk](mailto:lucia.dambruoso@abdn.ac.uk)

---

<sup>1</sup> Author addresses - LD: Aberdeen Centre for Health Data Science, Institute of Applied Health Sciences, School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition, University of Aberdeen, Foresterhill Health Campus, Aberdeen AB25 2ZD, SCOTLAND, UK; RT, DM, JH: MRC/Wits Rural Public Health and Health Transitions Research Unit (Agincourt), New School Of Public Health Building, Education Campus, University of the Witwatersrand, 27 St. Andrews Road, Parktown, 2193 SOUTH AFRICA; MV: Maria van der Merwe Consulting PO Box 1882 White River Mpumalanga 1240 SOUTH AFRICA; GG, JS: Mpumalanga Department of Health, 3 Riverside Government Complex, Cnr Nelspruit & Rivier Road, Nelspruit 1201, SOUTH AFRICA; SW: Institute for Global Health and Development, Queen Margaret University, Musselburgh Edinburgh EH21 6UU, SCOTLAND, UK.

29 ABSTRACT

30

31 There is limited operational understanding of multisectoral action in health inclusive of communities as active  
32 change agents. The objectives were to: (a) develop community-led action-learning, advancing multisectoral  
33 responses for local public health problems; and (b) derive transferrable learning. Participants representing  
34 communities, government departments and non-governmental organisations in a rural district in South Africa co-  
35 designed the process. Participants identified and problematised local health concerns, coproduced and  
36 collectively analysed data, developed and implemented local action, and reflected on and refined the process.  
37 Project data were analysed to understand how to expand community-led action across sectors. Community  
38 actors identified alcohol and other drug (AOD) abuse as a major problem locally, and generated evidence  
39 depicting a self-sustaining problem, destructive of communities and disproportionately affecting children and  
40 young people. Community and government actors then developed action plans to rebuild community control  
41 over AOD harms. Implementation underscored community commitment, but also revealed organisational  
42 challenges and highlighted the importance of coordination with government reforms. While the action plan was  
43 only partially achieved, new relationships and collective capabilities were built, and the process was  
44 recommended for integration into district health planning and review. We created spaces engaging otherwise  
45 disconnected stakeholders to build dialogue, evidence, and action. Engagement needed time, space, and a  
46 sensitive, inclusive approach. Regular engagement helped develop collaborative mindsets. Credible, actionable  
47 information supported engagement. Collectively reflecting on and adapting the process supported aligning to  
48 local systems priorities and enabled uptake. The process made gains raising community 'voice' and initiating  
49 dialogue with the authorities, giving the voice 'teeth'. Achieving 'bite', however, requires longer-term  
50 engagement, formal and sustained connections to the system. Sustaining in highly fluid contexts and connecting  
51 to higher levels are likely to be challenging. Regular learning spaces can support development of collaborative  
52 mindsets in organisational contexts aligning community voice with state capacity to respond.

53

54 **KEYWORDS:** alcohol and other drug abuse; South Africa; health policy and systems research; participatory  
55 action research; verbal autopsy; multisectoral action; social accountability; structuration.

56

## 57 INTRODUCTION

58

59 The social determinants of health paradigm cemented appreciation of fundamental causes of health inequalities  
60 <sup>1</sup>. While recognition of the need for integrated action on health within and beyond the health sector followed,  
61 working in silos and multi-sectoral *inaction* (inertia) remain the norm <sup>2 3</sup>. Similarly, despite acceptance of the  
62 social causes of health inequalities, marginalised community voices are seldom considered in practice settings <sup>4</sup>  
63 <sup>5</sup>. The latter is despite long-recognition of community participation as integral to equitable health systems as part  
64 of a social justice approach <sup>6 7</sup>. Pervasive policy-implementation gaps reflect limited practical understandings of  
65 how to operationalise these important public health ideas.

66

67 In this paper, we report on a community-led, multisectoral, action-learning process in rural South Africa and  
68 make practical suggestions for integrating in practice settings as part of routine functions. The process focussed  
69 on alcohol and other drug (AOD) abuse, as a critical issue affecting rural communities experiencing serious and  
70 multidimensional hardship in the rural sub-district. Below, we provide an overview of health and health systems  
71 in South Africa in which we locate the research questions and objectives.

72

73 South Africa is an upper-middle income country with a population of 60 million, a third of which is rural. Life  
74 expectancy was 62 years in 2021 <sup>8</sup>. Since the end of the apartheid regime, a new political order set out to  
75 transform the health sector to one based on community-based primary health care (PHC), equitable provision,  
76 prevention and health promotion through radical nation-building reforms <sup>9</sup>. Health policy and strategy are  
77 described as ‘near-ideal’: progressive, inclusive, and pro-poor. In 2022, however, South Africa remains one of  
78 the most unequal countries in the world. Historical structural and racial injustices combine and converge with  
79 more current economic inequalities <sup>10 11</sup>. A generation after its emergence, HIV prevalence in black populations  
80 is 40–50 times that of white and HIV risks are eight times higher in adolescent females than males <sup>12</sup>.

81

82 Entrenched health inequalities reflect and exacerbate wider social problems. The synergistic nature of HIV and  
83 substance abuse is well-documented <sup>13 14 15</sup> and alcohol and substance abuse is recognised as a serious,  
84 growing problem in the country <sup>16</sup>. Treatment demand for heroin-related problems is high in Mpumalanga, the  
85 rural province where the research was based <sup>17</sup>. Nationally, up to 15% of South Africans use drugs and a third of  
86 adults who consume alcohol report harmful use <sup>18 19</sup>, with binge-drinking increasingly reported <sup>20</sup>. A significant  
87 increase in substance misuse among women has also been observed, although it is poorly understood <sup>21</sup>.

38

39 There has been increased drug use among youth and adolescents, with severe increases in opioid-related  
40 disorders <sup>22 23</sup>. Over the past decade, *Nyaope* has emerged as a low-grade heroin smoked with marijuana,  
41 benzene, glue, and antiretrovirals (ARVs), used widely in rural areas. *Whoonga* is a distinct heroin-based street  
42 drug, made with household cleaning products, rat poison, and ARVs to which youth are seen as especially  
43 vulnerable <sup>16</sup>. There are limited resources allocated to the issue: low capacity, poor infrastructure, lack of  
44 information and poor intersectoral collaboration <sup>24</sup>. Targeted prevention and treatment is nevertheless seen as a  
45 priority and public health harm reduction approaches are urgently required <sup>25</sup>.

36

37 The burden of AOD abuse exists in a public health system simultaneously dealing with the deeply unequal  
38 burdens of chronic comorbidities: 8.2 million known HIV positive in 2017, 2 million not on treatment (many with  
39 TB); declining treatment adherence; inadequate basic immunization; skyrocketing obesity; and mortality owing to  
40 injury and violence double the global average <sup>8 26-28</sup>. Serving the vast majority of the population, the public  
41 health system deals with this complex burden in the face of systemic underinvestment, human resource crises,  
42 corruption and deteriorating infrastructure <sup>29</sup>.

33

34 Recognising deep-rooted social pathologies and a distinctly two-tier health system, a major district health  
35 systems revival is underway. Through Ministerial support for Universal Health Coverage (UHC), National Health  
36 Insurance (NHI) was introduced in 2012 with provincial guidelines for PHC Re-engineering <sup>30</sup>. In 2017, a policy  
37 framework and strategy for Ward-based Primary Healthcare Outreach Teams (WBPHCOTs) underscored  
38 commitments to *bringing services to people*: connecting vulnerable communities with health systems and  
39 devolving power to communities to create a more patient-focused and community-oriented system <sup>31 32</sup>.

L0

L1 Within PHC Re-engineering, however, there is a familiar contradiction. Despite policy and strategy commitments  
L2 to connect people and services, there are restricted operational spaces inclusive of marginalised community  
L3 voices to understand and respond to local health priorities. In practice, frontline managers and providers are  
L4 unable to engage with and respond to community priorities and local health planning seldom provides learning  
L5 spaces. Participatory governance processes, such as clinic and health committees, do not function effectively  
L6 and organisational 'compliance cultures' are seen as the norm, characterised by centrally-defined targets and  
L7 outputs, with limited authority for local planning and management <sup>4 5 33 34 35</sup>.

L8

19 This paper is concerned with multisectoral action on the community-nominated local public health priority of AOD  
20 abuse. Despite progress in multisectoral working in COVID-19 responses, maternal, newborn and child health <sup>3</sup>,  
21 non-communicable diseases (NCDs) <sup>36</sup>, and HIV/AIDS <sup>2</sup>, there remains limited understanding around *how* to  
22 achieve integrated, community-engaged action in practice: in relation to time, resources and power relations for  
23 system change inclusive of vulnerable communities, and in terms of contexts that constrain or enable impact <sup>3</sup>.

24

25 In response, we sought to address the research questions: how can multisectoral action with communities be  
26 achieved and advanced?; what factors enable or disable it?; what institutional factors shape it?; and how can  
27 approaches be refined and expanded? The objectives were to: (a) support and enable multisectoral  
28 accountability for local public health problems through community-led action-learning; and (b) derive  
29 transferrable learning.

30

31

## 32 MATERIALS AND METHODS

33

### 34 *Study setting*

35

36 The study was progressed within the VAPAR (Verbal Autopsy with Participatory Action Research) programme  
37 ([www.vapar.org](http://www.vapar.org)). VAPAR combines verbal autopsy (VA), an established health surveillance tool to measure  
38 levels and causes of death where deaths are often uncertified <sup>37</sup>, with participatory action research (PAR). PAR  
39 is a distinct methodology, which disrupts conventional subject-object distinctions in the health and social  
40 sciences, and whereby those most directly affected by problems adopt active roles as co-researchers and  
41 change agents, organising evidence for action and learning from action <sup>38</sup>.

42

43 Combining these methods in an adaptive action-learning process, the programme addresses to two inter-  
44 connected problems: the lack of research evidence on the health needs of those socially excluded from access  
45 to health and information systems; and the lack of uptake of evidence in the system by health service planners,  
46 managers, policy makers and providers at different levels.

47

48 VAPAR is based at the Agincourt Health and Socio-Demographic Surveillance System (HDSS) in Mpumalanga,  
49 a rural province of 4.7 million. Established in 1992, the HDSS covers 450 km<sup>2</sup> with a population of 120,000

60 encompassing settlements in former apartheid homelands typified by poverty and underdevelopment. The  
61 Agincourt HDSS is among Southern Africa's oldest and largest prospective population-based cohorts, and has  
62 supported the district health system over decades<sup>39</sup>. We worked in formal research partnership with planners,  
63 managers, and practitioners in the provincial Directorate for Maternal, Child, Women and Youth Health and  
64 Nutrition (MCWYH&N).

65  
66 In the study area, there is a large population of orphaned youth experiencing severe impacts on wellbeing,  
67 familial support and school drop-out<sup>40</sup>. 16% of the population in the province is illiterate<sup>41</sup> and in 2019,  
68 unemployment in the district was 37%<sup>42</sup>. In the study area, villages vary in size from less than 5,000 to over  
69 10,000. According to the policy prescript, wards are determined by village size, with WBPHCOTs catering for  
70 populations of approximately 7,600 people<sup>30</sup>. Depending on the ward, outreach teams consist of 6-10  
71 community health workers (CHWs) and each CHW supports approximately 150-250 households. In practice,  
72 however, coverage is lower and uneven<sup>43</sup>.

73  
74 As described above, in post-apartheid South Africa, entrenched structural and systems challenges limit the  
75 potential of progressive health policy. This is seen across sectors, where the realisation of policy goals is  
76 undermined through uneven implementation<sup>44</sup>. Understanding and strengthening implementation is therefore  
77 urgently required. Moreover, in line with PHC re-engineering, community health brings attention to operational  
78 levels, local realities and needs, and feasible, local action; building inclusive, socially-accountable and resilient  
79 health systems<sup>45 46</sup>. While implementation can be improved through strengthening accountability, however,  
80 state-citizen relationships are not well understood<sup>47-51</sup>.

81  
82 In pilot work, we established that: (a) engaging community and health systems stakeholders in deliberative  
83 participatory processes promoted new forms of dialogue; and (b) including stakeholders beyond the health  
84 sector was necessary to address the social determinants of avoidable mortality<sup>52</sup>. On this basis, we set out to  
85 re-engage stakeholders representing communities and in the authorities in different levels and sections to  
86 expand the pilot process. The process sought to support and enable mutual accountability as a means to  
87 address, and ultimately close, policy-implementation gaps.

88  
89 We designed an adaptive action-learning process as follows: *Step 1* - engage community stakeholders to  
90 identify and generate evidence on local health priorities; *Step 2* - initiate dialogue between communities and the

31 authorities to build mutual understanding, analyse data and plan remedial action; and *Step 3* - collectively act on  
32 data generated, and collectively reflect on and refine the process. The cycles were designed to be iterative and  
33 adaptive to the local context. Our theory of change was that repeated cycles of action and reflection would  
34 enable relationships and collective capacities, supporting improvements in service delivery and health outcomes  
35 and with potential for sustainability and wider uptake (Fig. 1a)<sup>53</sup>. In this paper, we report on the first cycle.

36

### 37 *Data collection*

38

#### 39 *Step 1: 'Engage/observe'*

30

31 To maintain prior relationships, we engaged community stakeholders involved in the pilot in villages across the  
32 three clinical catchment areas in the Agincourt HDSS. Three villages were selected based on demographic  
33 variation, socioeconomic status, and accessibility to health services. Within each village, participants were  
34 selected to represent a cross-section of the community including traditional healers, community and religious  
35 leaders, family members and community health workers (CHWs) (n=24) (reported elsewhere<sup>54</sup>). Of the 24  
36 former participants approached, 13 agreed to be involved and 11 additional individuals were recruited (see  
37 *Ethical considerations*, below).

38

39 We held an introductory workshop in which participants were invited to co-design key aspects of the process:  
40 nominating priority health concerns and directing expansion of the participant base to include otherwise  
41 excluded perspectives. Alcohol and other drug abuse (AOD) was nominated as a priority health concern locally,  
42 and youth and adolescents were identified as a specific group directly affected by, and whose voices were  
43 excluded from attention to, the problem. Community stakeholders then connected the researchers to 24  
44 additional participants, known in the community to represent youth and adolescent perspectives. These  
45 individuals were approached and recruited by researchers (see *Ethical considerations*, below).

46

47 A series of three workshops was then held in each village, with a further four bringing participants from all  
48 villages together (August-September 2017). PAR methods were employed to: (a) systematise subjective  
49 experiences into shared accounts of the problem; (b) build shared accounts reflecting consensus on cause-and-  
L0 effect relationships; (c) explore locally-acceptable actions to address the issues identified; and (d) articulate  
L1 'action agendas', i.e. overall goal(s) and stepwise actions and actors to achieve these<sup>38</sup>. Visual evidence was

L2 also collected and appraised <sup>55</sup>. Photographs collected by participants to convey lived experience were  
L3 presented and discussed in the workshops.

L4  
L5 The workshops were also designed to support participants to assume ownership and control over the process.  
L6 Participants directed practical aspects such as times and venues for workshops, shared the facilitation and  
L7 recording of proceedings, and we regularly discussed broader participatory principles of representation, voice,  
L8 collective action, power-sharing. Participants cross-verified analyses and reflected on the process and its further  
L9 development throughout, and in a dedicated session at the end of the sequence.

L10  
L11 Statistics on mortality attributable to AOD abuse were also compiled by the research team using VA data from  
L12 the Agincourt HDSS to provide additional evidence on the scale of the burden of mortality owing to community-  
L13 nominated priorities. Data were acquired on all deaths 2014-15 and processed using InterVA-4 <sup>56</sup>. The VA and  
L14 PAR data were compiled into a 'DoH Research Brief' for the next step (Supporting Information 1).

L15  
L16 *Step 2: 'Analyse/plan'*

L17  
L18 To initiate dialogue between communities and the authorities, a series of 'analysis' workshops was then held  
L19 (January-April 2018), to present and appraise the VA and PAR data generated in the prior step. The first  
L20 workshop was held in DoH offices in the City of Mbombela with 13 officials from provincial and district  
L21 programmes. We reviewed data from Step 1 and codesigned the remainder of the process, agreeing on multi-  
L22 sectoral representation. Two further analysis workshops convened 12 and 15 participants respectively:  
L23 community stakeholders, representatives from provincial and district DoH and from departments such as  
L24 education, social development, and culture, sports, and recreation. Following presentation of the VA and PAR  
L25 data via the research brief and by research and community partners, we used group model building to develop a  
L26 collective definition of the focus and boundaries of the problem, formulate problem statements, consider  
L27 potential strategies to address the issues, and appraised policy contexts <sup>57,58</sup>.

L28  
L29 Thereafter, two 'planning' workshops were held with representatives from communities and authorities to  
L30 appraise and organise collective action addressing the issues identified. These workshops were located in the  
L31 Agincourt HDSS field offices to bring the focus to implementation and the rural sub-district (September-  
L32 December 2018). Fifteen (15) participants were engaged, a combination of those already involved and local



13 implementing partners: sub-district DoH, local municipality and local non-governmental organisations (NGOs).  
14 In the 'planning' workshops, we developed the prior 'analysis': to understand and operationalise multisectoral  
15 responses. Through facilitated group work, we mapped the micro-systems in which interventions could be  
16 introduced and identified potential entry and leverage points through strategic and operational analyses. We  
17 then developed and appraised action in terms of affordability, acceptability, regulatory impact, fit with other  
18 policies, implement-ability, timescales, and health and social impacts. This culminated in the development of a  
19 joint Local Action Plan that all participants had active roles in and made formal commitments to, and that was  
20 circulated in a written report.

21

### 22 *Step 3: 'Act/reflect'*

23

24 Participants who committed to specific action-items in the Local Action Plan were followed up over a subsequent  
25 4-month implementation period (January-April 2019). Participants were visited by researchers at venues of their  
26 choice. Visits were responsive to participant feedback and progressed at different intensities. A structured tool  
27 was used to capture mechanisms through which change did or did not occur (Supporting Information 2). The  
28 research team collated data on implementation and reflected weekly on the extents, benefits, and risks of action,  
29 and on the process and its acceptability. A total of 16 follow-up visits with participants from rural communities,  
30 government departments at district, sub-district and community levels and NGOs were completed with an  
31 additional five telephonically. At the end of the monitoring period, the researchers assigned categories of  
32 achievement for each action item, supplemented with detailed narratives.

33

34 The cycle culminated in a group reflection. In April-May 2019, we interviewed 10 participants from communities,  
35 government departments and NGOs, and held two workshops with health systems stakeholders (n=8 and 4  
36 participants, respectively). We sought perspectives on whether and how impacts had been achieved;  
37 acceptability and utility of the process; levels and mechanisms for integration into the health system; and future  
38 linkages. The researchers developed a revised theory of change in a report shared with participants (Fig. 1b).

39

### 40 *Analysis*

41

42 This paper presents an analysis of whether and how the process enabled and supported mutual accountability  
43 for local health concerns among community and health systems stakeholders. The main focus was the idea

74 that health inequalities are fundamentally driven by structural factors over which individuals have little or no  
75 control. From this perspective, health inequalities are social issues with social, as opposed to individual,  
76 causes and can only be solved with collective action<sup>59,60</sup>. The research was therefore located within  
77 structure/agency theoretical debates and the reframing of wholly individualistic explanations.

78

79 We used *strategic social accountability* developed by Fox focussed on strengthening citizen voice *in parallel* with  
30 supporting state capacity to respond<sup>48</sup>. To deepen the focus on processes and interfaces between actors and  
31 institutions, we also used structuration theory<sup>61</sup>. Structuration resolves the fundamental structure-agency conflict  
32 in the social sciences by recursively linking them through social processes. Structuration thus attends to *how*  
33 individual agents are influenced by social structures and, how similarly and simultaneously, social structures are  
34 shaped by the actions of individual agents. Structuration theory has been used extensively in organisational and  
35 management studies and its relevance in public health is recognised<sup>62 63 64 65</sup>.

36

37 The main data sources were narrative and visual data, workshop reports, reflective journals, and formal and  
38 informal participant feedback supplemented with presentations, registers, study protocols and individual and  
39 team reflections. Researchers familiarised with the data, immersed in data sources, performed an initial  
40 organisation according to analytical (deductive) categories: forms and dynamics of the process, actor  
41 interactions and interfaces, impacts and degrees of impacts, enabling and constraining contextual factors, as  
42 well as to emergent (inductive) themes. We reviewed the analysis regularly, creating and assigning themes, and  
43 considering relationships within and between them to build a reflexive account related to the theory of change.  
44 The analysis was partly progressed through group reflections and analysis, and partly by organising and  
45 analysing material using the data management package NVIVO.

36

### 37 *Ethical considerations*

38

39 Rooted in participatory theory and method, ethical considerations related to sharing of power during the process,  
40 and the continual reflection on and development of principles of representation, social justice, lived experience  
41 and collective action. These were embedded into the overall design, which explicitly sought to shift power  
42 towards those with little or none regarding the priority issue identified. Similarly, every workshop and  
43 engagement re-visited principles of power, control, action, and representation. Otherwise, all participants were  
44 provided with written information on the research with contact details for the research team and given minimum

72 hours to consider and ask questions. Written consent was sought from all participants in which we assured anonymity and that participants were free to leave the process at any time and for any reason. Participants were provided with refreshments, transport costs and were reimbursed for time spent participating in workshops: 300ZAR per participant (Step 1), 250ZAR and 200ZAR per workshop (Steps 2 and 3 respectively). All workshops were held in agreed locations, at convenient dates and times and in local languages where appropriate and as directed by participants. For the visual PAR component, participants received basic training in photography, and on how to obtain permissions from subjects of photographs. Finally, institutional boards at the University of [anonymous] (M1704155; M171050) and University of [anonymous] (CERB/2017/4/1457; CERB/2017/9/1518) reviewed and approved study protocols and the provincial health authority gave permission for the research (MP\_201712\_003). Data were stored on secure servers at the Universities of the [anonymous] and [anonymous].

L6

L7

## L8 RESULTS

L9

The results are presented by emergent themes and, within this, by analytical constructs drawn from the frameworks and theories adopted. These were: process forms and dynamics; actor interactions and interfaces; impacts and degrees of impacts; and enabling and constraining contextual factors. Where possible, the analysis is illustrated with verbatim quotes from participants. This is followed by an account of transferrable learning.

24

*Regular community engagement in rural villages built rich and vivid community intelligence*

26

In Step 1, community stakeholders developed sophisticated, multi-level accounts of AOD abuse as an entrenched social problem. Distinct dynamics were observed and expressed in rich and vivid discussions and accounts of AOD abuse, depicting a reciprocal, self-sustaining issue with destructive effects on families and communities, and with children and adolescents placed at the centre of exposure to risk and lifelong consequences (Step 1 on AOD abuse is reported in detail elsewhere<sup>66</sup>). Researchers supplemented this with VA data, in which approximately 30% of all deaths were attributed, at least in part, to AOD abuse.

33

*...alcohol is destroying our communities and families...if we continue like this our children will not have a better future; our level of education will remain poor forever [Community stakeholder, Step 1]*

35

36

37 *It makes me happy to see that two villages have chosen to talk about drugs and alcohol which shows*  
38 *us that it doesn't affect certain people only but all villages. All we want is to see our children recovering,*  
39 *we want to see our children living a normal life because if they continue using drugs and alcohol their*  
40 *future is destroyed, which also destroys the future of the whole community [Community stakeholder,*  
41 *Step 1]*

42

43 Interactions changed markedly over the course of the village-based workshops in Step 1. Initially, significant  
44 dissatisfaction and mistrust were expressed by community stakeholders towards the authorities. Willingness to  
45 collectively advance solutions emerged, however, through repeated interactions that were action-oriented and  
46 focussed on ideas of mutual accountability and collective action. The PAR tools and principles provided a  
47 framework for this: moving from identifying and problematising the issue in terms of subjective perspectives,  
48 through to building collective accounts, mindsets, and shared agendas to address the issues identified.

49

50 Impacts in Step 1 were observed in terms of familiarity, ownership, and control, which built over the course of the  
51 workshops. This was supported and enabled by prioritising prior relationships, co-designing the process, regular  
52 dialogue, and engagement, and locating workshops in accessible areas and at reasonable times. New  
53 participants brought a needed perspective, but also challenges, reflecting aspects of wider social contexts.  
54 Some youth participants were initially sceptical about the potential for change and often disruptive during the  
55 workshops.

56

57 *We have learned some of the things, but let's face the main issue - this process won't change anything,*  
58 *there's a lot of things that won't change [Community stakeholder, Step 1]*

59

60 In response, we reinforced principles of respectful engagement and took time to manage expectations. We  
61 discussed and agreed that, while the process sought to build appreciative understandings of what works or does  
62 not and why within a mutually supportive 'learning platform', change could not be guaranteed. With sensitive  
63 facilitation that was responsive, compassionate, and consistent more constructive and collective attitudes  
64 emerged. The resulting VA and PAR data and evidence were clear, actionable, and seen as legitimate sources  
65 of evidence by participants. A research brief containing VA and PAR data was produced for the subsequent  
66 workshops with the authorities (Supporting Information 1).

57

58 *...this research will improve our community and we gain knowledge, we learned about caring for*  
59 *ourselves and to work together with other people [Community stakeholder, Step 1]*

60

61 *...we know the statistics of people using drugs and alcohol it is easier to work with something that you*  
62 *are sure of [Community stakeholder, Step 1]*

63

64 *Time, space, and a sensitive, inclusive approach supported multisectoral dialogue*

65

66 The VA and PAR data and evidence were then used as the basis of dialogue between rural communities and the  
67 authorities. Here, contextual, and organisational influences were again evident in the interactions and interfaces.

68 The 'analysis' workshops were initially located in provincial DoH offices, which we quickly realised may have  
69 restricted participation, especially among community representatives, owing to these being far away, highly  
70 professional spaces. Nevertheless, key dynamics were observed. Government participants were responsive to  
71 the process, verifying and remarking upon the consistency of their analysis with that of the communities'.

72 Government stakeholders were also enthusiastic about communities reporting on their situations and taking  
73 active roles in health action.

74

75 *I have benefitted a lot from the approach of this project. The workshops displayed the importance of*  
76 *real participatory approach in research not just the theoretical approach [DoH stakeholder, Step 2]*

77

78 Reflections of mutuality deepened when operational contexts in which interventions could be introduced were  
79 examined. DoH stakeholders highlighted the need for multisectoral approaches to tackle AOD abuse and an  
80 urgent need to regulate taverns. CHWs were identified as vital support for rural communities grappling with AOD  
81 abuse. In open and frank discussions, multiple obstacles to cross-sectoral integration were described with  
82 candid accounts provided in the mapping sessions. Participants found that departments shared policies  
83 addressing similar problems with similar objectives and aims. However, the impracticality of some policies,  
84 resource shortages, donor-driven priorities 'crowding out' local needs and priorities, and frequent policy revisions  
85 were identified as obstacles to implementation. In response, participants indicated that multisectoral  
86 collaboration among various government departments, communities and researchers is needed to improve  
87 health through development of relevant programs and interventions that are tailored to the needs of

18 communities. Participants also raised concerns over lack of attention to how organisational cultures impact  
19 implementation, and outcomes (Supporting Information 3-4).

20  
21 Addressing potential constraints on engagement and dialogue in overly 'professional' spaces, the location of the  
22 subsequent 'planning' workshops in the Agincourt HDSS field offices helped shift the focus to rural  
23 implementation contexts. In these workshops, we jointly developed a time-bound, monitorable Local Action Plan  
24 that was owned by and shared among participants. Community stakeholders committed to mapping AOD abuse  
25 hotspots and strengthening collaboration between traditional leaders and police to regulate taverns. District-level  
26 DoH stakeholders committed to encouraging professional nurses to provide information and support in schools.  
27 Other governmental representatives at operational levels committed to improving application of substance abuse  
28 legislation in alcohol outlets, disseminating information on social support and mobilising resources for a  
29 community-based rehabilitation facility (Supporting Information 5).

30  
31 In terms of impacts, community and government stakeholders reported appreciation of neutral 'safe spaces'  
32 outside institutional environments to connect with and understand other stakeholders and remarked on how this  
33 supported 'new ways of thinking'. Multisectoral engagement inclusive of communities was challenging, however,  
34 both logistically and in the discussions and reflected contextual constraints. Creating spaces outside institutional  
35 environments was well-received but required time to build and maintain relationships and sensitive facilitation to  
36 support inclusive dialogue. This posed challenges for already over-burdened practitioners and service planners.  
37 Again, sensitive, and respectful engagement supported repeated engagements, which in turn provided the time  
38 and space to reinforce principles of cooperative learning, normalised dialogue, and established confidence with  
39 the process among diverse participants.

40  
41 *... [the workshops] created an awareness and gave more insight on the gaps the Departments may be*  
42 *faced with when delivering their mandate in the respective disadvantaged communities. More still*  
43 *needs to be done and Departments should play a major role in implementing activities that can benefit*  
44 *these communities [Government stakeholder, Step 2]*

45  
46 *...the workshops were all effective considering that they brought in stakeholders from various*  
47 *departments and organizations [Government stakeholder, Step 2]*

48

19            *The greatest gain was insight into the functioning of other sectors and Departments [DoH stakeholder,*  
20            *Step 2]*

21  
22    *Appreciative monitoring supported collective action*

23  
24    Over the implementation period, there was mixed progress with the action plan. Of the six action items, one was  
25    achieved, four were partially achieved and one was not progressed (Table 1). The action-item that was achieved  
26    was the mapping of substance abuse hotspots. This was led by the youth representative of the community  
27    actors supported by the researchers, among whom there was an arguably higher ‘stake’ in the process, coupled  
28    with a short-term, relatively achievable outcome.

29  
30    Of the four partially completed action items, two involved actors at national level (drug laws and compliance in  
31    taverns), one depended on departmental funding (social support services dissemination), and one was longer-  
32    term in nature, and subject to shifting priorities and spending (community rehabilitation centre). Collective  
33    reflection on these helped achieve deeper, shared understandings of how, where, with whom and to what extent  
34    action was feasible. Elsewhere, some activities were to an extent already planned or in progress. While there  
35    may have been merit in bringing them together in a multisectoral plan, progress could not be solely attributed to  
36    the process and was often outside the control of those who had committed to the action.

37  
38    Reflecting constraining contextual factors, one action-item was not achieved: health sector support for schools.  
39    This activity had been displaced owing to multiple, competing priorities among nurses at PHC level. Despite  
40    policy support for integrated school health services, overall budget restrictions have led to limited staff.  
41    Combined with the commitment not being assigned as a key performance area, it amounted to encouraging  
42    nurses to adopt schools as part of their social responsibility, which was not feasible in practice. Coordinating with  
43    governmental priorities was identified in response, as critical to support action and impact, which helped to build  
44    a more strategic view which ultimately supported a deeper degree of impact (see below).

45  
46    In terms of actor interactions and interfaces, during implementation of the Local Action Plan, researchers quickly  
47    became aware of punitive implications of ‘follow-up’ monitoring particularly among DoH stakeholders. This was  
48    especially the case where action was challenging and did not progress as planned. In response, we reinforced

39 that the process was appreciative: it was not about fault-finding but focussed on building relationships and  
30 shared understandings about needs, priorities and what supports or constrains action.

31

32 Process forms and dynamics expanded during implementation, as participants connected researchers to  
33 additional actors. Researchers developed new connections with the Department for Basic Education, who  
34 confirmed gaps between mandated and delivered services and provided insights into where NGOs were working  
35 with the authorities to deliver health promotion in schools. We also connected with the Mpumalanga Economic  
36 Regulator (MER), sub-regional managers of the local municipality, and the community policing forum (CPF): a  
37 platform where community organisations, provincial government, local government, traditional authority and  
38 parastatals and the police meet to discuss local crime prevention initiatives.

39

70 *Collective reflection, adaption and coordination with government enabled uptake*

71

72 In the final, reflective element, the importance of aligning to government priorities was highlighted. DoH actors  
73 affirmed finding the process appropriate and relevant to promoting community participation in the health system.  
74 Reflecting on limited and variable functionality in formal community engagement processes, the process was  
75 seen as a complementary model for community participation in PHC. In terms of impacts, these discussions and  
76 reflections concluded in support of integrating the process into routine PHC planning and review and adapting it  
77 to support CHWs to develop skills in participatory methods (Table 2).

78

79 Otherwise in term of impacts, community stakeholders expressed more constructive attitudes about the  
30 authorities, together with beliefs about self-efficacy, and reported building strategic, analytical, and public-  
31 speaking skills and confidence as a result of the process (Figs. 2-3). Government stakeholders gave positive  
32 feedback reporting their enthusiasm about opportunities to meet, learn about and engage with other  
33 departments, which was reported to enable linkage and collaboration. They responded positively to the methods  
34 employed during the workshops. Government stakeholders found it encouraging and intriguing to hear  
35 community voices directly, enjoyed engaging with the community and seeing communities adopt roles as active  
36 change agents. Government stakeholders also appreciated the combination of statistical and qualitative  
37 (including visual) data combining 'hard' data on burden of disease, with evidence on lived experience (Fig. 4).

38



39 In terms of dynamics and interfaces, and while the action plan was only partially achieved, the process overall  
40 was seen as valuable: engaging a diverse and otherwise disconnected set of stakeholders in 'safe spaces'  
41 where difficult conversations could occur, and where shared awareness of local priorities could be built. Overall,  
42 there was good participation, high levels of workshop attendance and engagement in follow-up discussions.  
43 Participants reported seeing the platform as able to foster learning opportunities and new ways of thinking:

44  
45 *The workshops reconfirmed that community participation is key to planning and improving service delivery*  
46 *[Government stakeholder, reflective workshop]*

47  
48 *There have been a lot of service delivery protests in communities, but they did not accomplish much;*  
49 *everyone realized that it is time to shift our ways of thinking and initiate dialogue, unite and collaborate and*  
50 *create sustainable partnerships to solve community problems [Community stakeholder, reflective*  
51 *workshop]*

52  
53 Revisiting assumptions about how, where, for whom and to what extent change occurs, we revised the theory of  
54 change with explicit attention to integrating with routine systems, acting on data and evidence as an input to  
55 services, learning, skills exchange, shared priorities, improved awareness of local health priorities, sustaining  
56 action, and roles, and on how rural PHC and research contexts present challenges and opportunities (presented  
57 elsewhere<sup>67</sup>). The collective reflection was reported acknowledging all participants in a written report.

58

59

## L0 DISCUSSION

L1

### L2 *Transferrable learning*

L3

L4 Our initial theory of change was that a series of adaptive action-learning cycles could support development of  
L5 capacities and relationships to enable recognition and uptake in the health system<sup>53</sup>. Inclusivity was a key *input*.  
L6 With a focus on marginalised voices, we initially worked with community stakeholders developing collective  
L7 capabilities to raise and frame local health concerns. Stakeholders from the authorities were then engaged to  
L8 build mutual understandings of the issues, appraise policy and systems responses, and identify how, where and  
L9 with whom collective local action could address the issues identified.

20

21 Throughout, inclusive representation and the criteria through which representatives were appointed were defined  
22 and negotiated. Continuous efforts were made to nurture 'voice', power, and agency among those with little or  
23 none. Initially, males and females representing rural communities had generally similar ethnicities, racial and  
24 social status. Representation was further expanded by participants themselves to draw in excluded  
25 perspectives. This supported development of collective capabilities and voice, which provided a necessary  
26 foundation for engaging with the authorities. Subsequent engagement with service providers at strategic and  
27 operational levels (province, district, sub-district and local) introduced a range of power asymmetries related to  
28 various forms of formal and informal status and privilege. We reconfigured and adapted processes and tools to  
29 accommodate everyone regardless of status, embracing diversity and enabling mutuality.

30

31 The Agincourt HDSS also brought additional 'hard' data to bear on the mortality burden related to community-  
32 nominated priorities. Such data are essential for public health planning, but their availability and quality are often  
33 lacking, especially on community deaths. Credible, actionable information was a further input that supported  
34 multisectoral engagement with the authorities. As stable public health observatories, HDSSs occupy strategically  
35 important positions to broker data-driven decision-making between communities and authorities.

36

37 Regular engagement was a critical *mechanism* that helped develop collaborative mindsets. Repeated 'safe  
38 space' engagements first with community representatives, then with the authorities, helped build dialogue,  
39 relationships, and shared understandings. The Agincourt HDSS was seen as a neutral space to bring together  
40 service users and providers, between whom there were clear divisions and tensions. With consistent and  
41 sensitive facilitation, it was possible to develop mutual accountability and reflect on the fit and functionality of the  
42 process, adapting and reconfiguring as necessary. Recognition of and space for shared facilitation was  
43 important to bridge cultural and power differences. While the researchers developed enabling environments and  
44 brokered interfaces, these practices can and should be diffused through distributed, dynamic processes  
45 responsive to local contexts.

46

47 The Local Action Plan was a crucial *output* that ratified shared understandings and commitments to work  
48 together on common problems. While progress was mixed, and monitoring was identified as potentially punitive  
49 among some participants, regular time and space for shared reflection supported principles of mutual  
50 accountability and action. Collectively reflecting on and adapting the process was pivotal in supporting shared

ownership and control, and enabled uptake into formal service planning and management. The codesigned adaptations will structure future cycles, further testing these inputs, mechanisms, and outputs, with deeper reflection on contextual conditions and whether and how change can be achieved and sustained (Table 3).

While suggestive of impact, the results should be interpreted with caution in terms of the relative strengths and limitations of the process. Firstly, while designed to be jointly owned, researchers controlled several aspects: overall design, resources, monitoring implementation of the action plan, and preparing outputs such as manuscripts and other briefing materials. Nevertheless, and while the action plan was only partly achieved, the process was clearly acceptable, and of practical value and benefit to participants. Reflecting on *instrumental and intrinsic* value in accountability processes, Joshi highlights the importance of how, and by whom, success is defined in social accountability processes <sup>49</sup>：“... if a social accountability intervention fails in improving services but scores highly on empowerment of citizens, do we consider it a failure or a success, given that the intervention has changed the long-term prospects for accountability by changing the starting point for the next intervention? Whose definition of outcomes count?”

In terms of the researchers' positionality, the team was primarily South African, based at Agincourt HDSS or Mpumalanga Department of Health and in the UK affiliated to Agincourt. We are a long-standing collaboration with a shared commitment to distributed and evidence-informed decision-making in rural PHC. Within the team, we considered practices, such as who controls funding, collects and analyses data, who publishes, and whose perspectives are prioritised <sup>68</sup>. This was informed and supported by the Agincourt HDSS, a centre grounded in commitments to rural communities over decades <sup>69 70</sup>. As noted above, HDSSs occupy strategically important positions and can play important roles connecting service users and providers and providing robust data. Further embedding in the HDSS will support development of transferrable processes to align research to national and sub-national priorities, and support accountability of researchers to local contexts.

In future iterations, more explicit recognition that design choices overall are underpinned by ideological and epistemological positions is needed, as is attention to categories of power and politics in evidence and action on health inequalities <sup>50 51 71 72 73</sup>. Specifically, testing and revising assumptions about how, where, for whom and to what extent change occurs should be driven in future cycles *by the collective*. As described above, limitations of social accountability relate to sustaining collective action among multiple stakeholders to achieve and understand change in long-term processes <sup>74</sup>. A learning approach that is emergent, built in and for local

32 contexts, inclusive of collective articulation of theories of change, attention to power and sustained action will  
33 support relevant and sustainable processes enabling mutual accountability.

34

35 Framed in terms of social accountability, the process thus made gains raising community *voice* and initiating  
36 multisectoral dialogue with the authorities, giving the voice *teeth*. Achieving *bite*, however, requires longer-term  
37 engagement and more formal connections to the system<sup>74</sup>. Ultimately, institutionalising within sectoral  
38 processes supports sustainability. Avoiding additional administrative burdens in already constrained  
39 environments is highly important. While creating spaces outside institutional environments was well-received,  
40 significant time and energy were required to maintain relationships, and multiple, competing priorities ultimately  
41 undermined DoH stakeholders' ability to progress action. In addition, financial compensation for participants may  
42 not be sustainable and consideration of incentives for long-term engagement and to engage higher-level  
43 leadership is key. While a relatively short-term research project is not likely to be commensurate with the long-  
44 term processes and partnerships required, the intention is that, through continued cycles, small-scale work can  
45 support longer-term engagement.

46

#### 47 *Relevance and practical utility*

48

49 Taking control of the agenda, community stakeholders identified an entrenched social problem conferring  
50 significant burdens on rural communities and the health system. This finding has wider relevance. While  
51 HIV/AIDS is declining in South Africa, drug and alcohol abuse is *increasing* among youth and adolescents linked  
52 to intergenerational trauma, high levels of violence and accidents, and emergency medical services of low  
53 quality<sup>75 76 77 78</sup>. Globally, alcohol-related diseases and injuries take approximately 3.3 million lives every year,  
54 with over 190,000 drug-related deaths recorded in 2015<sup>79</sup>. Despite this, substance abuse is a low priority in low-  
55 and middle-income countries (LMICs) and evidence-based policy is lacking<sup>80 81</sup>. In South Africa, alcohol industry  
56 influence on regulatory reforms over sale and advertising is strong<sup>82</sup>. Despite this, however, sales were  
57 repeatedly banned during COVID-19 lockdowns and alcohol-related harms reduced significantly: by up to 65% in  
58 trauma cases during this time<sup>83,84</sup> supporting renewed calls for regulatory reform<sup>85</sup>.

59

L0 In the neutral learning spaces, policy and systems responses to AOD abuse were examined candidly and in  
L1 detail; with policy-implementation gaps affirmed as a critical issue. This finding also has wider relevance. While  
L2 the 2013-17 National Drug Master Plan adopted a joined-up harm reduction approach<sup>86</sup>, no reduction in AOD

L3 abuse was observed by 2016 and the absence of an implementation strategy was acknowledged in the  
L4 subsequent 2019-24 plan <sup>87,88</sup>. There is broad recognition of the lack of attention to effective policy  
L5 implementation in South Africa and across many LMICs, in public health systems characterised by  
L6 underinvestment, limited links with communities, corruption, deep-rooted inequalities and political instabilities <sup>29</sup>  
L7 <sup>89</sup>. Regular dialogue and exchange supported attention to deeply constrained operational contexts and how  
L8 these limit progress. In doing so, conducive relationships were developed between communities and the  
L9 authorities, resulting in shifts towards collaborative mindsets, and recommendations to embed the process into  
L0 formal PHC planning and review <sup>67</sup>.

L1  
L2 The process surfaced a clear operational need: to support CHWs to connect with communities and rapidly  
L3 generate evidence on local needs and situations <sup>90</sup>. There are many obstacles to integrating CHWs into the  
L4 public system, however. Implementation of WBPHCOTs has been slow and uneven and there is low coverage  
L5 <sup>43</sup>. There is also low awareness of expanded CHW roles and functions in communities, resulting in roles that are  
L6 not well-defined, valued or supported <sup>91 92</sup>. Nevertheless, within and beyond South Africa, CHWs have made  
L7 critical contributions in local surveillance and response efforts for more informed responses, supporting calls for  
L8 recognition of, and support for, this critical cadre <sup>93 94 95 96 97 98 99</sup>.

L9  
L0 In terms of practical utility, institutionalising within sectoral processes and maintaining linkages in highly fluid  
L1 contexts will undoubtedly present challenges. As described above, despite broad PHC revival, operational  
L2 accountability spaces are restricted in South Africa <sup>34</sup>. Top-down governance persists, overlooking significant  
L3 ingenuity, innovation and resilience at lower levels <sup>33 89 100</sup>. International evidence indicates entry and leverage  
L4 points, however. In the Philippines, connecting communities to PHC was supported through careful examination  
L5 of roles and motivations <sup>101</sup>. And, in Nepal, recognition of local value and relevance of participatory action  
L6 learning has supported sustained action over time <sup>102</sup>.

L7  
L8 Sustainability is also considered relative to challenges and opportunities related to COVID-19. South Africa had  
L9 timely and decisive action in response to COVID-19 with strict lockdowns, integrated support and nationwide  
L0 community-based screening and testing <sup>103 103</sup>. While a highly centralised strategy initially slowed the rise in  
L1 cases, the phased lifting of lockdown has been accompanied by further waves, driven by new, more  
L2 transmissible variants. There have also been severe impacts on incomes and food security, particularly in  
L3 informal settlements, and there are serious concerns over diagnosis and treatment of other conditions,

14 particularly HIV/AIDS and TB <sup>45 104 105</sup>. The pandemic brings new demands to already-challenged systems,  
15 nevertheless, it also underscores the necessity of real-time local data and action, community involvement, and  
16 multisectoral approaches.

17

18 Finally, exclusively 'local' accountability processes may be limited, based on assumptions that problems are only  
19 local <sup>48 49</sup>. Longer-term processes connecting to higher levels with power to act, and 'sandwich strategies'  
20 building citizen voice *and* supporting state responsiveness can help navigate hierarchical organisational  
21 contexts. In Thailand, for example, the National Health Assembly supports coalitions of civil society, government  
22 and academics in participatory health systems governance and is a prominent example of virtuous cycles of  
23 voice and response <sup>106</sup>. Social and political contexts exert considerable influence on whether and how  
24 accountability process exist and are effective. Our analysis reflects that, a deeply hierarchical system  
25 notwithstanding, nurturing and democratising the *social processes* through which agents and structures interact  
26 and influence one another can support shifts towards cooperative mindsets, alliances, and new ways of thinking.  
27 Future analyses should focus on understanding the ways that 'voice' and 'teeth' combine, interact and situate in  
28 contexts that institutionalise participation as a rights-based approach to health <sup>7 107 108</sup>.

29

30

## 31 CONCLUSION

32

33 Despite normative support, there is limited operational understanding of *how* to progress multisectoral action on  
34 health inequalities with meaningful inclusion of underserved communities. Tensions exist between policy  
35 commitments to bring services closer to people and restricted operational spaces inclusive of community voices  
36 to understand and respond to local health priorities. Through an action-learning process to support and enable  
37 mutual accountability among communities and health systems actors, we elicited community intelligence on local  
38 health concerns, quantified associated burdens of disease, and supported stakeholders from rural communities  
39 and the authorities to build dialogue, partnerships, and to develop, implement and evaluate local action. The  
40 process supported otherwise disconnected actors to build collaborative mindsets and collectively progress and  
41 learn about action. The potential for impact was identified, with acceptability and practical utility affirmed in  
42 recommendations to embed into routine PHC planning and review. In contexts of deeply embedded social and  
43 health inequalities, nurturing meaningful citizen-state interfaces, such as those reported here via cooperative  
44 learning platforms, can support the realisation of meaningful community participation and multisectoral action.

75

76

77 REFERENCES

- 78 1. WHO. *Closing the Gap in a Generation Health Equity through Action on the Social Determinants of Health*.  
79 Geneva; 2008.
- 30 2. Mahlangu P, Vearey J, Goudge J. Multisectoral (in)action: towards effective mainstreaming of HIV in public  
31 sector departments in South Africa. *African J AIDS Res*. 2018;17(4):301-312.
- 32 3. Kuruvilla S, Hinton R, Boerma T, et al. Business not as usual: How multisectoral collaboration can promote  
33 transformative change for health and sustainable development. *BMJ*. 2018;363.
- 34 4. Hove J, D'Ambruso L, Kahn K, et al. Lessons from community participation in primary health care and water  
35 resource governance in South Africa: a narrative review. *Glob Health Action*. 2022;15(1).  
36 doi:10.1080/16549716.2021.2004730/SUPPL\_FILE/ZGHA\_A\_2004730\_SM1697.DOCX
- 37 5. Mulumba M, London L, Nantaba J, Ngwenya C. Using Health Committees to Promote Community Participation  
38 as a Social Determinant of the Right to Health: Lessons from Uganda and South Africa. *Health Hum Rights*.  
39 2018;20(2):11-17. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30568398>. Accessed October 2, 2019.
- 30 6. WHO. *Declaration of Alma-Ata. International Conference on Primary Health Care*. Kazakhstan; 1978.
- 31 7. World Health Organization. *Voice, Agency, Empowerment. Handbook on Social Participation for Universal  
32 Health Coverage*.; 2021.
- 33 8. Statistics South Africa. *Mid-Year Population Estimates 2020. Statistical Release P0302*. Pretoria: Statistics  
34 South Africa; 2021. <http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P0302/P03022020.pdf>. Accessed May 10, 2021.
- 35 9. Government of the Republic of South Africa. *National Health Act*. Pretoria: Government of the Republic of  
36 South Africa; 2003. <https://www.gov.za/documents/national-health-act>. Accessed September 29, 2018.
- 37 10. The Lancet. South Africa sliding backwards. *Lancet (London, England)*. 2018;391(10129):1456.  
38 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30839-0
- 39 11. World Bank. *Overcoming Poverty and Inequality in South Africa: An Assessment of Drivers, Constraints and  
40 Opportunities*. Washington DC: World Bank; 2018. <https://tinyurl.com/y6u599bt> [Accessed 30 Jan 2020].
- 41 12. Shisana O, Rehle T, Simbayi L, et al. *South African National HIV Prevalence, Incidence and Behaviour Survey,  
42 2012*. Cape Town: HSRC; 2014.
- 43 13. Gilbert L, Raj A, Hien D, Stockman J, Terlikbayeva A, Wyatt G. Targeting the SAVA (Substance Abuse,  
44 Violence, and AIDS) Syndemic Among Women and Girls. *JAIDS J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2015;69:S118-  
45 S127. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000000626
- 46 14. Russell BS, Eaton LA, Petersen-Williams P. Intersecting Epidemics Among Pregnant Women: Alcohol Use,  
47 Interpersonal Violence, and HIV Infection in South Africa. *Curr HIV/AIDS Reports 2012 101*. 2012;10(1):103-

110. doi:10.1007/S11904-012-0145-5
15. Hatcher AM, Gibbs A, McBride RS, Rebombo D, Khumalo M, Christofides NJ. Gendered syndemic of intimate partner violence, alcohol misuse, and HIV risk among peri-urban, heterosexual men in South Africa. *Soc Sci Med*. 2019. doi:10.1016/J.SOCSCIMED.2019.112637
16. Tyree GA, Mosery N, Closson EF, et al. Trajectories of initiation for the heroin-based drug whoonga – qualitative evidence from South Africa. *Int J Drug Policy*. 2020;82:102799. doi:10.1016/J.DRUGPO.2020.102799
17. Parry C (@propparry). At 3rd SA Substance Abuse Conference ...my presentation indicating increasing treatment demand for heroin-related problems over 10 years, especially in the north of country @SACENDU @MRCza Tweet.2019.
18. Pasche, Sonja; Myers B. Substance misuse trends in South Africa. *Hum Psychopharmacol Clin Exp*. 2012;27(3):338-341.
19. Morojele NK, Ramsomar L. Addressing adolescent alcohol use in South Africa. *South African Med J*. 2016;106(6):551.
20. Vellios NG, Van Walbeek CP. Self-reported alcohol use and binge drinking in South Africa: Evidence from the National Income Dynamics Study, 2014 - 2015. *S Afr Med J*. 2017;108(1):33-39. doi:10.7196/SAMJ.2017.V108I1.12615
21. Dada S, Harker Burnhams N, Laubscher R, Parry C, Myers B. Alcohol and other drug use among women seeking substance abuse treatment in the Western Cape, South Africa. *S Afr J Sci*. 2018;114(9/10). doi:10.17159/sajs.2018/4451
22. Harker N, Lucas WC, Laubscher R, Dada S, Myers B, Parry CD. Is South Africa being spared the global opioid crisis? A review of trends in drug treatment demand for heroin, nyaope and codeine-related medicines in South Africa (2012–2017). *Int J Drug Policy*. 2020;83:102839.
23. Parry C, Plüddemann A, Bhana A. Monitoring Alcohol and Drug Abuse Trends in South Africa (1996–2006): Reflections on Treatment Demand Trends. *Contemp Drug Probl*. 2009;36(3-4):685-703. doi:10.1177/009145090903600319
24. Myers B, Louw J, Fakier N. Alcohol and drug abuse: removing structural barriers to treatment for historically disadvantaged communities in Cape Town. *Int J Soc Welf*. 2008;17(2):156-165. doi:10.1111/J.1468-2397.2007.00546.X
25. Peltzer K, Phaswana-Mafuya N. Drug use among youth and adults in a population-based survey in South Africa. *South African J Psychiatry*. 2018;24(1). doi:10.4102/SAJPSYCHIATRY.V24I0.1139
26. Marinda E, Simbayi L, Zuma K, et al. Towards achieving the 90–90–90 HIV targets: Results from the south African 2017 national HIV survey. *BMC Public Health*. 2020;20(1):1375.



- 11 27. Neethling I, Groenewald P, Schneider H, Bradshaw D. Trends and inequities in amenable mortality between  
12 1997 and 2012 in South Africa. *South African Med J.* 2019;109(8):597-604.
- 13 28. Bhalla K, Harrison J, Shahraz S, et al. *Burden of Road Injuries in Sub-Saharan Africa.* Baltimore: Johns  
14 Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health; 2014.
- 15 29. Coovadia H, Jewkes R, Barron P, Sanders D, McIntyre D. The health and health system of South Africa:  
16 historical roots of current public health challenges. *Lancet.* 2009;374(9692):817-834.
- 17 30. DOH. *Provincial Guidelines for the Implementation of the Three Streams of PHC Re-Engineering.*; 2011.  
18 <https://tinyurl.com/sruskxh>.
- 19 31. Setswe G, Witthuhn J. Community engagement in the introduction and implementation of the National Health  
20 Insurance in South Africa. *J Public Health Africa.* 2013;4(1):6. doi:10.4081/jphia.2013.e6
- 21 32. DOH. *Policy Framework and Strategy for Ward Based Primary Healthcare Outreach Teams 2018/19-2023/24.*  
22 Pretoria: Department of Health; 2017.
- 23 33. Moosa S, Derese A, Peersman W. Insights of health district managers on the implementation of primary health  
24 care outreach teams in Johannesburg, South Africa: a descriptive study with focus group discussions. *Hum*  
25 *Resour Health.* 2017;15(1):7.
- 26 34. Cleary SM, Molyneux S, Gilson L. Resources, attitudes and culture: an understanding of the factors that  
27 influence the functioning of accountability mechanisms in primary health care settings. *BMC Health Serv Res.*  
28 2013;13(1):320.
- 29 35. Haricharan HJ, Stuttaford M, London L. Effective and meaningful participation or limited participation? A study  
30 of South African health committee legislation. *Prim Health Care Res Dev.* 2021;22.  
31 doi:10.1017/S1463423621000323
- 32 36. Arora M, Chauhan K, John S, Mukhopadhyay A. Multi-sectoral action for addressing social determinants of  
33 noncommunicable diseases and mainstreaming health promotion in national health programmes in India.  
34 *Indian J Community Med.* 2011;36(SUPPL.). doi:10.4103/0970-0218.94708
- 35 37. Byass P, Hussain-Alkhateeb L, D'Ambruoso L, et al. An integrated approach to processing WHO-2016 verbal  
36 autopsy data: The InterVA-5 model. *BMC Med.* 2019;17(1). doi:10.1186/s12916-019-1333-6
- 37 38. Loewenson R, Laurell AC, Hogstedt C, D'Ambruoso L, Shroff Z. *Participatory Action Research in Health*  
38 *Systems: A Methods Reader.*; 2014.
- 39 39. Kahn K, Collinson MA, Gomez-Olive FX, et al. Profile: Agincourt Health and Socio-demographic Surveillance  
40 System. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2012;41(4):988-1001.
- 41 40. Ntuli B, Mokgatle M, Madiba S. The psychosocial wellbeing of orphans: The case of early school leavers in  
42 socially depressed environment in Mpumalanga Province, South Africa. *PLoS One.* 2020;15(2):e0229487.  
43 doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0229487

- 74 41. Statistics South Africa. General Household Survey:2019. 2019;21(4):482.  
75 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11469378>.
- 76 42. Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA). *Ehlanzeni District: MP Profile and*  
77 *Analayis*. Mobombela: Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA); 2019.  
78 [https://www.google.com/search?q=ehlanzeni+COGTA&rlz=1C5CHFA\\_enGB841GB841&oq=ehlanzeni+COGT](https://www.google.com/search?q=ehlanzeni+COGTA&rlz=1C5CHFA_enGB841GB841&oq=ehlanzeni+COGT)  
79 [A&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i60.3082j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8#:~:text=PROFILE%3A EHLANZENI](https://www.google.com/search?q=ehlanzeni+COGTA&rlz=1C5CHFA_enGB841GB841&oq=ehlanzeni+COGT)  
80 [DISTRICT,uploads](https://www.google.com/search?q=ehlanzeni+COGTA&rlz=1C5CHFA_enGB841GB841&oq=ehlanzeni+COGT) › 2020/07.
- 81 43. Schneider H, Besada D, Sanders D, Daviaud E, Rohde S. Ward-based primary health care outreach teams in  
82 South Africa: developments, challenges and future directions. *South African Heal Rev*. 2018;Chapter 7:59-65.
- 83 44. Sutherns T, Olivier JI. Mapping the Multiple Health System Responsiveness Mechanisms in One Local Health  
84 System: A Scoping Review of the Western Cape Provincial Health System of South Africa. *Int J Heal Policy*  
85 *Manag*. 2022;11(Special Issue on CHS-Connect):67-79. doi:10.34172/IJHPM.2021.85
- 86 45. van Ryneveld M, Whyte E, Brady L. What Is COVID-19 Teaching Us About Community Health Systems? A  
87 Reflection From a Rapid Community-Led Mutual Aid Response in Cape Town, South Africa. *Int J Heal Policy*  
88 *Manag*. 2020;2020:1-4. doi:10.34172/ijhpm.2020.167
- 89 46. Tetui M, Hurtig A-K, Jonsson F, et al. Strengthening Research and Practice in Community Health Systems: A  
90 Research Agenda and Manifesto. *Int J Heal Policy Manag*. 2022;11(Special Issue on CHS-Connect):17-23.  
91 doi:10.34172/IJHPM.2021.71
- 92 47. Malena C, Forster R, Singh J. *Social Accountability: An Introduction to the Concept and Emerging Practice*.  
93 Washington DC: World Bank; 2004.
- 94 48. Fox JA. Social accountability: what does the evidence really say? *World Dev*. 2015;72:346-361.
- 95 49. Joshi A. Reading the local context: A causal chain approach to social accountability. *IDS Bull*. 2014;45(5):23-  
96 35.
- 97 50. Devarajan S, Khemani S, Walton M. Civil Society, Public Action and Accountability in Africa. *World Bank Policy*  
98 *Res Work Pap*. 2011;(5733):68.
- 99 51. McGee R, Gaventa J. *Shifting Power? Assessing the Impact of Transparency and Accountability Initiatives*.  
10 Brighton: IDS; 2011.
- 11 52. D'Ambruoso L, van der Merwe M, Wariri O, et al. Rethinking collaboration: developing a learning platform to  
12 address under-five mortality in Mpumalanga province, South Africa. *Health Policy Plan*. 2019;34(6):418-429.
- 13 53. Witter S, Van Der Merwe M, Twine R, et al. Verbal Autopsy with Participatory Action Research (VAPAR)  
14 programme in Mpumalanga, South Africa: Protocol for evaluation. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(2):36597.
- 15 54. Wariri O, D'Ambruoso L, Twine R, et al. Initiating a participatory action research process in the Agincourt  
16 health and socio- demographic surveillance site. *J Glob Health*. 2017;7(1).

55. Blackman A. The PhotoVoice manual: a guide to designing and running participatory photography projects. In: London: Photovoice; 2015. <https://tinyurl.com/tgwulqk> [Accessed 30 Jan 2020].
56. Byass P, Chandramohan D, Clark SJ, et al. Strengthening standardised interpretation of verbal autopsy data: the new InterVA-4 tool. *Glob Health Action*. 2012;5(1):19281.
57. Lembani M, de Pinho H, Delobelle P, Zarowsky C, Mathole T, Ager A. Health systems resilience: a systems analysis. A case study of maternal health service provision in OR Tambo district, Eastern Cape, in the context of chronic poor health performance. In: ReBUILD Consortium; Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health, SOPH; 2015. [https://rebuildconsortium.com/media/1216/health-systems-resilience\\_eastern-cape-case-study\\_final-report.pdf](https://rebuildconsortium.com/media/1216/health-systems-resilience_eastern-cape-case-study_final-report.pdf).
58. Carey G, Landvogt K, Barraket J. *Creating and Implementing Public Policy*: Cross-Sectoral Debates. London: Routledge; 2016.
59. Marx K. *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*.; 1852.
60. Wright-Mills C. *The Sociological Imagination*. 40th ed. New York: Oxford University Press; 2000.
61. Giddens A. *New Rules of Sociological Method: Second Edition*. Redwood City: Stanford University Press; 1993.
62. Jones M, Karsten H. *Review: Structuration Theory and Information Systems Research*. Vol 32. Cambridge: University of Cambridge; 2003. [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=424062](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=424062).
63. Rütten A, Gelius P. The interplay of structure and agency in health promotion: Integrating a concept of structural change and the policy dimension into a multi-level model and applying it to health promotion principles and practice. *Soc Sci Med*. 2011;73(7):953-959. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.07.010
64. Zanin AC, Piercy CW. The Structuration of Community-Based Mental Health Care: A Duality Analysis of a Volunteer Group's Local Agency. *Qual Health Res*. 2019;29(2):184-197. doi:10.1177/1049732318786945
65. Maller CJ. Understanding health through social practices: performance and materiality in everyday life. *Sociol Health Illn*. 2015;37(1):52-66. doi:10.1111/1467-9566.12178
66. Oladeinde O, Mabetha D, Twine R, et al. Building cooperative learning to address alcohol and other drug abuse in Mpumalanga, South Africa: a participatory action research process. *Glob Health Action*. 2020;13(1):1726722.
67. Merwe MS Van Der, D'Ambruoso L, Witter S, et al. Collective reflections on the first cycle of a collaborative learning platform to strengthen rural primary health care in Mpumalanga, South Africa. *Heal Res Policy Syst*. 2021;19(66).
68. Abimbola S. The foreign gaze: authorship in academic global health. *BMJ Glob Heal*. 2019;4(5):1-5.
69. Tollman S. The Pholela Health Centre--the origins of community-oriented primary health care (COPC). An appreciation of the work of Sidney and Emily Kark - PubMed. *South African Med J*. 1994;84(10):653-658.

- 10 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/7839251/>. Accessed March 9, 2021.
- 11 70. Madhavan S, Collinson M, Townsend NW, Kahn K, Tollman SM. The implications of long term community  
12 involvement for the production and circulation of population knowledge. *Demogr Res.* 2007;17(13).
- 13 71. Flores W, Hernández A. Health accountability for indigenous populations: Confronting power through adaptive  
14 action cycles. *IDS Bull.* 2018;49(2):19-34.
- 15 72. Topp SM, Schaaf M, Sriram V, et al. Power analysis in health policy and systems research: a guide to research  
16 conceptualisation. *BMJ Glob Heal.* 2021;6(11):e007268. doi:10.1136/BMJGH-2021-007268
- 17 73. Bhakuni H, Abimbola S. Epistemic injustice in academic global health. *Lancet Glob Heal.* 2021;9(10):e1465-  
18 e1470. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(21)00301-6
- 19 74. Wheeler-Brooks J. Structuration theory and critical consciousness: Potential applications for social work  
20 practice. *J Sociol Soc Welf.* 2009;36(1):123-140.
- 21 75. Department of Health. *National Adolescent and Youth Health Policy 2017*. Pretoria: Department of Health;  
22 2017. <https://tinyurl.com/y5wbkpw8> [Accessed 30 Jan 2020].
- 23 76. Hogarth L, Martin L, Seedat S. Relationship between childhood abuse and substance misuse problems is  
24 mediated by substance use coping motives, in school attending South African adolescents. *Drug Alcohol*  
25 *Depend.* 2019;194:69-74. doi:10.1016/J.DRUGALCDEP.2018.10.009
- 26 77. Probst C, Parry CDH, Wittchen HU, Rehm J. The socioeconomic profile of alcohol-attributable mortality in  
27 South Africa: A modelling study. *BMC Med.* 2018;16(1):1-11. doi:10.1186/S12916-018-1080-0/FIGURES/4
- 28 78. Sommer J, Hinsberger M, Elbert T, et al. The interplay between trauma, substance abuse and appetitive  
29 aggression and its relation to criminal activity among high-risk males in South Africa. *Addict Behav.*  
30 2017;64:29-34. doi:10.1016/J.ADDBEH.2016.08.008
- 31 79. UNODC. *World Drug Report 2016*. Vienna; 2016. <https://tinyurl.com/kneeqmo> [Accessed 30 Jan 2020].
- 32 80. Sankoh O. Why population-based data are crucial to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals on behalf  
33 of the INDEPTH Network and partners. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2017;4-7. doi:10.1093/ije/dyx010
- 34 81. Benegal V, Chand PK, Obot IS. Packages of care for alcohol use disorders in low- and middle-income  
35 countries. *PLoS Med.* 2009;6(10):e1000170.
- 36 82. Bertscher A, London L, Orgill M. Unpacking policy formulation and industry influence: the case of the draft  
37 control of marketing of alcoholic beverages bill in South Africa. *Health Policy Plan.* June 2018.  
38 doi:10.1093/heapol/czy049
- 39 83. Maliba A. Covid-19: Ban on alcohol sees trauma unit numbers significantly lowered, say healthworkers. *IOL.*  
40 [https://www.iol.co.za/sundayindependent/news/covid-19-ban-on-alcohol-sees-trauma-unit-numbers-](https://www.iol.co.za/sundayindependent/news/covid-19-ban-on-alcohol-sees-trauma-unit-numbers-significantly-lowered-say-healthworkers-46980267)  
41 [significantly-lowered-say-healthworkers-46980267](https://www.iol.co.za/sundayindependent/news/covid-19-ban-on-alcohol-sees-trauma-unit-numbers-significantly-lowered-say-healthworkers-46980267). Published 2020. Accessed September 24, 2020.
- 42 84. Parry C. The temporary ban on alcohol sales during levels 4 & 5 of Covid-19 lockdown in South Africa:

- 73 Lessons learnt. In: *Usher Institute COVID-19 Webinar Series*. Edinburgh: Usher Institute, University of  
74 Edinburgh; 2020. [https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/usher\\_institute\\_covid19\\_webinar\\_-\\_south\\_africa\\_-  
75 \\_charles\\_parry\\_03\\_july\\_2020.pdf](https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/usher_institute_covid19_webinar_-_south_africa_-_charles_parry_03_july_2020.pdf). Accessed October 30, 2020.
- 76 85. Rehm J, Kilian C, Ferreira-Borges C, et al. Alcohol use in times of the COVID 19: Implications for monitoring  
77 and policy. *Drug Alcohol Rev.* 2020;39(4):301-304.
- 78 86. DSD, CDA. *National Drug Master Plan 2013-2017*. Pretoria: Department for Social Development (DSD);  
79 Central Drugs Authority (CDA); 2013.
- 80 87. DPME. *Implementation Evaluation of the National Drug Master Plan*. Pretoria: Department of Planning,  
81 Monitoring and Evaluation; 2016.
- 82 88. DSD. *National Drug Master Plan 2019-2024*. Pretoria: Department for Social Development (DSD); Central  
83 Drugs Authority (CDA); 2019.
- 84 89. Gilson L, Barasa E, Nxumalo N, et al. Everyday resilience in district health systems: Emerging insights from  
85 the front lines in Kenya and South Africa. *BMJ Glob Heal.* 2017;2(2).
- 86 90. D'Ambruso L, Twine R, Mabetha D, et al. Supporting CHWs to connect with communities in rural South Africa  
87 during COVID-19. *CHW Cent.* 2021. [https://chwcentral.org/twg\\_article/supporting-chws-to-connect-with-  
88 communities-in-rural-south-africa-during-covid-19/](https://chwcentral.org/twg_article/supporting-chws-to-connect-with-communities-in-rural-south-africa-during-covid-19/). Accessed November 10, 2021.
- 89 91. Ameh S, D'Ambruso L, Gómez-Olivé FX, Kahn K, Tollman SM, Klipstein-Grobusch K. Paradox of HIV stigma  
90 in an integrated chronic disease care in rural South Africa: Viewpoints of service users and providers. *PLoS  
91 One.* 2020;15(7):e0236270.
- 92 92. Murphy JP, Moolla A, Kgowedi S, et al. Community health worker models in South Africa: a qualitative study  
93 on policy implementation of the 2018/19 revised framework. *Health Policy Plan.* 2020.  
94 doi:10.1093/heapol/czaa172
- 95 93. Igumbor J, Adetokunboh O, Muller J, et al. Engaging community health workers in maternal and infant death  
96 identification in Khayelitsha, South Africa: a pilot study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* 2020;20(1):1-12.  
97 doi:10.1186/s12884-020-03419-4
- 98 94. Basera TJ, Schmitz K, Price J, et al. Community surveillance and response to maternal and child deaths in  
99 low- And middleincome countries: A scoping review. *PLoS One.* 2021;16(3 March):1-21.  
100 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0248143
- 101 95. Nichols EK, Ragunathan NW, Ragunathan B, Gebrehiwet H, Kamara K. A systematic review of vital events  
102 tracking by community health agents. *Glob Health Action.* 2019;12(1). doi:10.1080/16549716.2019.1597452
- 103 96. O'Connor EC, Hutain J, Christensen M, et al. Piloting a participatory, community-based health information  
104 system for strengthening communitybased health services: Findings of a cluster-randomized controlled trial in  
105 the slums of Freetown, Sierra Leone. *J Glob Health.* 2019;9(1):1-15. doi:10.7189/jogh.09.010418

- 96 97. Hutain J, Perry HB, Koffi AK, et al. Engaging communities in collecting and using results from verbal autopsies  
97 for child deaths: An example from urban slums in Freetown, Sierra Leone. *J Glob Health*. 2019;9(1):1-11.  
98 doi:10.7189/jogh.09.010419
- 99 98. Nabukalu D, Ntaro M, Seviiri M, et al. Community health workers trained to conduct verbal autopsies provide  
L0 better mortality measures than existing surveillance: Results from a cross-sectional study in rural western  
L1 Uganda. *PLoS One*. 2019;14(2). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0211482
- L2 99. De Savigny D, Renggli S, Cobos D, Collinson M, Sankoh O. *Maximizing Synergies between Health  
L3 Observatories and CRVS: Guidance for INDEPTH HDSS Sites and CRVS Stakeholders*. INDEPTH Network  
L4 and the Bloomberg Data for Health Initiative; 2018.  
L5 [https://getinthepicture.org/sites/default/files/resources/Maximizing Synergies between Health Observatories  
L6 and CRVS v2.5.pdf](https://getinthepicture.org/sites/default/files/resources/Maximizing%20Synergies%20between%20Health%20Observatories%20and%20CRVS%20v2.5.pdf). Accessed March 20, 2021.
- L7 100. Gilson L, Goudge J, Lehmann U, Schneider H. Dear Mr President, we need to talk about our health system.  
L8 *Spotlight*. 2018. <https://www.spotlightnsp.co.za/2018/09/18/dear-mr-president-re-our-health-system/>. Accessed  
L9 January 9, 2019.
- 10 101. Mallari E, Lasco G, Sayman DJ, et al. Connecting communities to primary care: A qualitative study on the  
11 roles, motivations and lived experiences of community health workers in the Philippines. *BMC Health Serv  
12 Res*. 2020;20(1):860. doi:10.1186/s12913-020-05699-0
- 13 102. Sondaal AEC, Tumbahangphe KM, Neupane R, Manandhar DS, Costello A, Morrison J. Sustainability of  
14 community-based women's groups: reflections from a participatory intervention for newborn and maternal  
15 health in Nepal. *Community Dev J*. 2019;54(4):731-749. doi:10.1093/cdj/bsy017
- 16 103. DOH. *COVID-19 – Community Screening and Testing Programme*. Pretoria: Department of Health; 2020.
- 17 104. Odendaal N. Recombining Place: COVID-19 and Community Action Networks in South Africa. *Int J E-Planning  
18 Res*. 2021;10(2). doi:10.4018/IJEPR.20210401.0a11
- 19 105. Kirby T. Global tuberculosis progress reversed by COVID-19 pandemic. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2021;0(0).  
20 doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(21)00496-3
- 21 106. Thamarangsi T. The “triangle that moves the mountain” and Thai alcohol policy development: four case  
22 studies. *Contemp Drug Probl*. 2009;36(1-2):245-281.
- 23 107. Mulumba M, London L, Nantaba J, Ngwena C. Using health committees to promote community participation as  
24 a social determinant of the right to health: Lessons from Uganda and South Africa. *Health Hum Rights*.  
25 2018;20(2):11-17.
- 26 108. Meier BM, Pardue C, London L. Implementing community participation through legislative reform: A study of  
27 the policy framework for community participation in the Western Cape province of South Africa. *BMC Int Health  
28 Hum Rights*. 2012;12(1). doi:10.1186/1472-698X-12-15

39

## 40 FIGURE LEGENDS

41 Figure 1: (a) VAPAR schema: adaptive action-learning cycles to coproduce and embed evidence in practice to  
42 improve care and outcomes; (b) Action-learning cycle detailing each stage of the process

43 Figure 2: Community stakeholder presenting and appraising visual evidence (image reproduced with permission)

44 Figure 3: Community stakeholder facilitating a group discussion on AOD abuse as a priority local health concern  
45 (image reproduced with permission)

46 Figure 4: Government, non-government and community stakeholders map key actors and institutional contexts  
47 to address issues identified (image reproduced with permission)

48 Readers may contact the corresponding author to request access to Figures 2-4.

49

## 50 SUPPORTING INFORMATION

51 Supporting Information 1: Department of Health Research Brief

52 Supporting Information 2: Local Action Plan Monitoring Proforma

53 Supporting Information 3: Government and community stakeholder analysis of AOD abuse in rural communities

54 Supporting Information 4: Governmental and community stakeholder analysis of existing policies, implementing  
55 partners and recommendations to address AOD abuse

56 Supporting Information 5: Local Action Plan to address AOD abuse among youth and adolescents

57 Readers may contact the corresponding author to request access to Supporting Information 1.

58

## 59 ABBREVIATIONS

60 AOD Alcohol and other drug abuse

61 CHW Community health workers

62 COGTA Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs

63 CPF Community police forum

64 DBE Department of Basic Education

65 DCSR Department of Culture, Sport and Recreation

66 DoH Department of Health

67 DSD Department for Social Development

68 HBC Home Based Care

69 HDSS Health and Socio-Demographic Surveillance System

70	HPSR	health policy and systems research
71	LDAC	Local Drugs Action Committee
72	LMIC	Low- and middle-income countries
73	MCWYH&N	Maternal, Child, Women and Youth Health and Nutrition
74	MER	Mpumalanga Economic Regulators
75	MRC	Medical Research Council
76	NCD	Non-communicable diseases
77	NDMP	National Drug Master Plan
78	NGO	non-governmental organisations
79	PAR	Participatory action research
80	PHC	Primary health care
81	SANCA	South African National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence
82	SAPRIN	South African Population Research Infrastructure Network
83	SAPS	South African Police Service
84	VA	Verbal autopsy
85	VAPAR	Verbal Autopsy with Participatory Action Research
86	WBPHCOTs	Ward-based Primary Healthcare Outreach Teams

87

88 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:** The authors would like to thank community, government, and non-governmental  
89 stakeholder participants for agreeing to be part of the process, and for sharing their time, knowledge, and  
90 perspectives. Thanks also to the Verbal Autopsy with Participatory Action Research (VAPAR) team and staff of  
91 the Medical Research Council (MRC)/Wits Rural Public Health and Health Transitions Research Unit  
92 (Agincourt), especially Simon Khoza, Sizzy Ngobeni and Ella Sihlangu. Thanks to Roosamaria Savela for help  
93 with literature searches. Finally, thanks to Rene Loewenson for comments on an earlier draft.

94

95 **IMAGES:** The schematic diagram in Fig. 1 was produced by the research team. Permissions have been secured  
96 from participants for the reproduction of all images taken during the course of the research. All images are  
97 owned by the VAPAR programme and reproduced in this paper under a creative commons license. (Figs. 2-4).

98

99 **COMPETING INTERESTS:** The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

100



11 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS: LD conceived of the study, prepared study protocols, coordinated submission to  
12 funding agencies and ethical review boards in collaboration with MV and SW. LD, RT, DM, MV, JH, GG, JS, and  
13 SW developed the methodology, supported and/or conducted data collection and developed the analysis plan.  
14 DM led the fieldwork, management and coordination for the research activity planning and execution. LD led the  
15 analysis and planned and wrote the first draft of the paper. All authors reviewed and contributed significantly to  
16 the analysis and manuscript, and all authors read and approved the final version.

17

18 DATA AVAILABILITY: Data are available from the research team upon reasonable request. A non-author point  
19 of contact to field future requests (where authors are not available) is [achds@abdn.ac.uk](mailto:achds@abdn.ac.uk) . Public deposition of  
20 the dataset would be in breach of the data management plan (DMP) within the study protocol approved by the  
21 research ethics boards in South Africa, the UK, and the permission for the study granted by the provincial health  
22 research committee, as well as the DMP within the funding proposal and the conditions upon which the research  
23 funding was granted.

24

25 FUNDING INFORMATION: The study is funded by the Joint Health Systems Research Initiative from the  
26 Department for International Development/MRC/Welcome Trust/Economic and Social Research Council  
27 (MR/P014844/1). The work is nested within the MRC/Wits Rural Public Health and Health Transitions Research  
28 Unit (Agincourt), supported by the University of the Witwatersrand and Medical Research Council, South Africa.  
29 The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the  
30 manuscript.

31

32 WORD COUNT: 7355, ABSTRACT WORD COUNT: 299

33

25 Table 1: Progress towards the Local Action Plan

Action item	Outcome	Implementation mechanisms
<b>Community stakeholders (leads)</b>		
1. Identify AOD abuse hotspots to focus action and aid departments planning interventions	Achieved	A home-based carer (CHW category) working outside the study area was nominated to lead this action as a community stakeholder representative. The researchers found it hard to engage with her during the monitoring period, however, and through the home-based care organisation connected with a home-based carer working within the study area who was a community stakeholder. Together with other community stakeholder representatives, they validated a list of AOD abuse hot spots (shebeens, taverns) obtained from a study in the Agincourt HDSS, and added hotspots that were not on the list. While community leaders were not convened due to lack of resources and other commitments, the action was completed by other means, with verification of the hotspots by community stakeholders.
2. Strengthen collaboration between traditional leaders and police service to regulate taverns	Some progress	Follow-up visits highlighted various and variable connections between traditional leaders and law enforcement. The action is happening in the sub-district in which the Agincourt HDSS is based, but not in the study area. The Local Drugs Action Committee (LDAC) (a body consisting of government, SAPS, and NGO partners) works with traditional leaders encouraging community members (especially men) to attend LDAC information sessions. To further understand the connection between traditional leaders and law enforcement, we linked to Community Policing Forums (CPFs) in the study area to find out how they work with police and report cases of AOD abuse. Through this, we established that CPFs in the study area do not know about LDAC. We also engaged with MER (Mpumalanga Economic Regulator previously liquor board) that works with traditional healers, SAPS and municipalities when issuing licences. Traditional leaders endorse the application while SAPS checks for criminal records on all applicants.
<b>Department of Health (leads): district, sub-district and community levels</b>		
3. Encourage nurses to adopt schools (primary and secondary)	No progress	Stakeholders leading the process reported multiple and competing priorities during implementation follow up, which precluded action. In response, the researchers met with DBE in March 2018 to find out more about school health services, which revealed a gap between services mandated and delivered, as well as providing insights into where NGOs such as SANCA are working with the authorities to deliver health promotion in schools. DBE advised that while DoH policy supports nurses in schools, in practice, nurses only provide services when required. Otherwise, SANCA provides health promotion in schools, albeit variously, and in partnership with DoH, SAPS and DSD.
<b>Other departments and agencies (leads): district, sub-district and community levels and NGOs</b>		
4. Align Department of Justice (DoJ) and SAPS on application of substance abuse legislation in liquor outlets	Some progress	This is a long-term outcome. The policy is under review at national level. However, we engaged with MER, whose main duties are compliance and licensing, to understand the process of licensing and issues of compliance. MER runs programmes with SAPS, DBE, HSRC (Human Science Research Council), municipality and traditional leaders. MER also work with SANCA and other organisations on public awareness in schools and communities. MER have inspectors in the sub-district on compliance and responsible trading. The researchers established a relationship with MER and they are willing to attend our workshops when invited in the next action-learning cycle.
5. Disseminate information on AOD abuse activities	Some progress	DSD had in their annual plan to host the 'Blitz' event however it was not done due to lack of funds. At the time of reporting, the DSD are awaiting the subsequent annual budget and seek to highlight the need for role clarification and dissemination of information on provisions for social support identified through the process in department planning in the subsequent period.
6. Mobilise resources for community-based rehabilitation	Some progress	There were no applications for treatment centres received by DSD at province level by the time of reporting. However, the district level is assisting and supporting willing organisations to apply, none of whom are in the study area. A potential role for the researchers was discussed during implementation follow up to mediate and support the applicants to keep pace/motivation through a mid-term process.

centre

26 CPF: Community Police Forums; DBE: Department of Basic Education; DoJ: Department of Justice; DSD:  
 27 Department for Social Development; HSRC: Human Science Research Council; LDAC: Local Drugs Action  
 28 Committee; MER: Mpumalanga Economic Regulator; SANCA: South African National Council on Alcoholism  
 29 and Drug Dependence; SAPS: South African Police Service  
 30

31 Table 2: Collective recommendations on integration into routine health systems processes

Stakeholders	Recommendation
Government, NGO and community stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Include local municipal managers during all stages of prospective action-learning cycles</li> <li>- Convene stakeholders at the end of each VAPAR cycle for collective reflection and learning</li> </ul>
Provincial DoH stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PHC clinic operational managers and CHWs to be included at all stages of the next action-learning cycle, with a focus on skills exchange</li> <li>- VAPAR representatives to participate in routine district and sub-district planning and reporting processes, including development of the district health plan and quarterly performance review</li> <li>- Alignment/integration of VAPAR programme into existing health structures at critical levels of engagement; primarily at household/community (CHW/WBPHCOT) and sub-district (clinic operational managers, PHC supervisors) level</li> <li>- Focus on community participation and contemporary priorities - support strengthening the management model of PHC facility manager, and consider other programmatic priorities such as adolescent and mental health</li> </ul>
National DoH stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Refinement of VA with regards to place of death/circumstances of mortality</li> <li>- Continued engagement at national level to report on progress and inform future development/application and feeding up into national learning</li> </ul>

32 Source: <sup>67</sup>

33 Table 3: Transferable learning on community-led multisectoral action learning

Theory of Change	Analytical domain	Transferable learning
Inputs	Actors (agents)  Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusivity is fundamental, representation should be continually negotiated, focussed on those most marginalised, excluded and hard to reach;</li> <li>• Communities generating information on their own situations confers collective efficacy, action and generates credible, actionable information;</li> <li>• Initiating new linkages with and insights into the functioning of other sectors and departments for improved understanding of public services as well as of the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders;</li> <li>• Community knowledge is a rich and vivid source of sophisticated information;</li> <li>• Information that is coproduced with citizens and service providers confers legitimacy;</li> <li>• Clear, accessible information that is useful and actionable by stakeholders is more easily integrated into routines;</li> <li>• Connecting to the health observatories brings additional data to bear on community-nominated priorities;</li> </ul>
Mechanisms	Processes, dynamics and interfaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regular community engagement builds strategic, analytical and public-speaking skills and confidence;</li> <li>• Regular engagement between communities and authorities, fosters awareness, mutual understanding and trust;</li> <li>• 'Safe spaces' outside institutional processes to connect with and understand other agencies and communities are valuable;</li> <li>• Spaces close to implementation contexts support inclusivity, managed expectations, reinforced principles, and a process owned and controlled by those involved;</li> <li>• Processes framed as shared endeavours can deepen engagement, ownership and understanding;</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processes need time to build and maintain constructive, cooperative relationships and trust between sectors;</li> <li>Monitoring is effectively done by those closest to the issue;</li> <li>Recognition of roles of mediators is important – facilitators between communities and authorities with two-way communication “bridging cultural and power gaps”;</li> <li>Incentives and remuneration require careful consideration as positive reinforcement to sustain the practice;</li> </ul>
Outputs/ outcomes	Legitimate process, ownership, uptake and collective action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify range of intermediate and ultimate outcomes and timeframes with sensitivity to challenges in operational levels;</li> <li>Continually and collectively test and revise assumptions about theories of change to build relationships and trust;</li> <li>Document and emphasise improved engagement and mutual understanding, capacity in deliberative processes;</li> <li>Develop collective action towards shared priorities, joint reflection and adaption of process;</li> <li>Coordinate with government reforms, processes and priorities. Uptake of process into routine planning and management processes important to support state response;</li> <li>Sandwich strategies' building citizen voice and support state responsiveness can help build mutual respect, understanding, and ultimately mutual empowerment. Analysis should focus on different ways that 'voice' and 'teeth' combine, interact and situate in particular contexts;</li> </ul>
Contexts	Meso/micro context (structure)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify capacity built on local relationships for innovation, efficiency and responsiveness to improve the quality of service delivery;</li> <li>Build on existing processes to avoid imposing administrative burdens in already constrained operational environments;</li> <li>Sustainability key consideration: iterative, dynamic and responsive/sensitive to realities on the ground to support strategic, empowerment-focussed approaches to emerge and have legitimacy;</li> <li>Past experience of interaction with the state, trust, cultures of expectations from the state need to be recognised;</li> </ul>
	Macro context (structure)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focussing only on local, front-line service providers, should be supplemented with attention to higher levels;</li> <li>Attention to macro-level social and political contexts can help to identify how impacts are both supported and undermined;</li> <li>Forward-looking, preventative approaches may be challenging to advance in contexts of limited accountability;</li> <li>Universal Health Coverage and Primary Health Care are important supporting reforms; however realities of implementation reflect deep tensions that require dedicated analysis;</li> <li>Design as longer political process of citizen engagement with the state;</li> <li>Consider how to improve incentives to sustainably engage higher-level leadership for policy design and implementation.</li> </ul>


}4

}5

}6

}7

(a)



(b)

Step 1 Engage/observe

Step 2 Analyse/Plan

Step 3 Act/Reflect

<b>Participants</b>	Community stakeholders in 3 rural villages selected to vary by key demographic characteristics. Participants represented cross-section of community: traditional healers, community and religious leaders, community health workers, and family members (n=24 participants). Participants co-designed key aspects, including expansion of participant base: youth and adolescents also recruited as perspectives normally excluded (n=24 participants).	Community, government and NGO representatives from Department of Health (PHC, MCHWYN, and NCD programmes), Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA), Department of Home Affairs (DHA), Department for Social Development (DSD), Department of Basic Education (DBE) and Department of Culture, Sport and Recreation (DCSR), local municipality, Local Drugs Action Committee (LDAC), South African Police Service (SAPS), and NGOs Home Based Care (HBC) and South African National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence (SANCA) (n=12-15 participants).	Participants committing to actions in Step 2 followed-up regularly during implementation. Participants from rural communities, government departments (at district, sub-district and community levels) and NGOs who had committed to progressing specific action items in the Local Action Plan engaged regularly during the Local Action plan implementation period. Participants visited by researchers at venues of their choice to reflect on progress. Visits responsive to participant feedback, and progressed at different intensities.
<b>Mechanisms</b>	8 weekly, village-based workshops progressing through a sequence to: co-design process; identify priority health issue(s) and direct expansion of participant base; PAR tools (problem trees, Venn diagram, action pathways, Photovoice) used to develop evidence on the problem and action to address it. VA to quantify burden of attributable mortality.	5 workshops progressed through a sequence to: analyse data from Step 1, develop shared understandings of problem, analysis of implementation contexts in which interventions/actions could be introduced and appraisal of policy/implementation contexts. Co-design remainder of process; planning of collective action, mapping micro-level systems, identification of actions, timescales and implementing partners.	16 follow-up visits plus 5 telephonically. Researchers assigned categories of achievement for each action item, supplemented with detailed narratives. Followed by collective reflection with stakeholders from communities, government departments and NGOs (n=10); and 2 workshops, at provincial level with programme and directorate managers and at national level with health programme and policy specialists (n=8 and 4, respectively).
<b>Outputs</b>	Data presented in Research Brief for DoH in Step 2: contained evidence on lived experience of AOD harms as wholly destructive of communities, with children and adolescents at the centre of harms. VA data on levels and causes of mortality indicated high levels of attributable mortality. Collective capabilities developed among community stakeholders.	Joint Local Action Plan rebuilding sense of community control over AOD harms with monitorable action-items for Step 3. Development of collective mindsets and shared understandings of the problem between service users and service providers. Collective capabilities extended to communities and authorities: normalized dialogue outside institutional settings, supported mutuality and 'new ways of thinking' among diverse stakeholders.	DoH actors affirmed the process appropriate and relevant to promoting community participation in the health system. The process was seen as a complementary model for community participation in PHC. Reflections concluded in support of integrating the process into routine PHC planning and review, and adapting it to support CHWs to develop skills in participatory methods. Reflective findings collated into a revised theory of change and report shared with participants.