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Resilience studies typically privilege the views and assumptions of minority-world research. One way to circumvent this is through methodologies that give voice to the experiences of majority-world youth. Our aim in this article is to reflect critically on the use of community-based participatory video (CBPV) to understand and promote resilience processes in 28 black South African adolescent girls. The girls, aged from 13 to 19 years, were recruited by social workers and teachers collaborating with the South African Pathways to Resilience Project. The findings suggest that CBPV does champion participant-directed understandings of resilience. However, the findings also draw attention to the difficulties of realising the potential of the social change inherent in CBPV, and the complexity of stimulating deep reflection in the girl participants.
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Introduction

The successful completion of high school by many South African young people is under threat because they are made vulnerable by various adversities including economic disadvantage; underperforming schools; high HIV prevalence; poor service delivery; and lived experiences of trauma and abuse (Du Preez, 2011; Ramphele, 2012). Although boys and girls in South Africa are both vulnerable, girls in particular are considered to be at risk of negative developmental and educational outcomes (Bottrell, 2009) because of sex- and gender-based violence; unsafe school environments; higher risks of contracting HIV; and teenage pregnancy (Mitchell, 2006; Moletsane, 2007; Phasha, 2010). But sometimes these girls do better than expected. Instead of responding in ways ranging from developing mental illness
to failing at school or becoming teenage mothers, these girls cope well with risk-filled lives (Jordan, 2013); they are resilient, a measure of which is regular school attendance and making progress at school (Phasha, 2010).

Resilience is the capacity to do well in life, despite significant adversity (Masten, 2011). According to Ungar’s (2011) Social Ecology of Resilience Theory (SERT—the theoretical framework of the study informing this article—doing well despite adversity is a process during which individuals steer themselves towards resources that will support their doing well. Simultaneously, the individual’s social ecology (SE) reciprocates and provides support in culturally and contextually relevant ways. The SE consists of social structures that have an impact on human development such as immediate family, school, peers, community organisations, culture, and the broader political and educational systems, among others (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). Ungar (2013) suggests that SEs have greater responsibility than individuals to promote resilience in at-risk youth. Unhelpful explanations of resilience have focused on individual capacities (Masten, 2014), or generalised Western minority-world explanations of resilience about majority-world youth, i.e. those from non-Western cultures (Ungar, 2013). Such studies either blame individuals for not being resilient, while overlooking how SEs obstruct resilience, or they constrain majority-world communities’ support of their youth by privileging the explanations of minority-world youth, and allied interventions (Ungar, 2013).

Community facilitation of resilience requires a contextually-sensitive understanding of resilience, and how processes of resilience manifest in specific youth, such as, for example, black girls. The insights of young people into what supports their resilience and what puts them at risk need to be respected. Unless their insights are “substantially voiced” (Mitchell, Milne & De Lange, 2012: 1128), advocated for, and respected in subsequent programmes and interventions, youth vulnerability is likely to prevail. Black girls in rural areas, particularly, need to be given such substantial voice so that their SEs will understand how to support their resilience meaningfully (Mitchell, Milne & De Lange, 2012; Moletsane, 2007).

One methodological tool that offers to provide girl-centred accounts, by black girls, of their resilience is CBPV, an interactive research process in which participants construct visual narratives, using storyboards and a video documentary, of their insights into a given research phenomenon (De Lange, Olivier & Wood, 2008). The principles of CBPV include respect for participants as expert informants; participant control of filming and editing; and researcher and participant use of the video products to advocate for social change (Corneil, 2011). These principles are attractive when we are working with black adolescent girls because they potentiate the respectful foregrounding of black girls’ voices that have often been left out of traditional social research (Waite & Conn, 2011), and research on resilience in particular (Liebenberg & Ungar, 2009).
To generate more meaningful accounts of resilience, researchers have included participatory visual methods, such as photo elicitation (Liebenberg, Didkowsky & Ungar, 2012), a Day-in-the-Life video method (Cameron, Pinto & Tapanaya, 2014), the Mmogo method (a visual projection technique) (Roos, 2013), and draw-and-talk as well as draw-and-write (Guillemin, 2004). Notwithstanding the popularity of participatory visual approaches in research on resilience, there are no published accounts of the usefulness of CBPV to explain and promote resilience, particularly resilience in black adolescent girls. The only CBPV study we could locate was by Haw (2010) but this study focused on UK youths’ experiences of risk with little attention paid to their positive adjustment.

Thus, given the potential of the method, and because, following Schratz & Walker (1995), we subscribe to research that prompts meaningful social change, we initiated a CBPV-facilitated study of black girls’ resilience. As already noted, the purpose of this article is to reflect critically on the value of using CBPV to explore, and advocate for, processes of resilience in school-going black South African girls faced with significant adversity.

**Methodology**

Critical psychology informed our choice of a visual participatory methodology. Critical psychology interrogates stereotypical explanations of human behaviour because, historically, psychological knowledge (including theories of resilience) has been produced in Western contexts and generalised universally (Hook, 2004; Mkhize, 2004). Critical psychology challenges such so-called expert theories by questioning who is producing this knowledge and for whom it is being produced (Hook, 2004: 16). Accordingly, critical psychology interrogates methods of knowledge production and promotes the inclusion of non-Western voices in research (Mkhize, 2004). This aligns with SERT’s critical response to the stereotypical understandings of resilience produced in minority-world contexts. SERT questions explanations of majority-world youths’ resilience processes that are not produced by these youths (Ungar, 2013), and urges using creative, participatory research methods to do so (Liebenberg & Ungar, 2009).

As white women researchers and outsiders to the community to which we introduced CBPV, we needed to choose a method that would downplay our voices. Using CBPV offered us the opportunity to amplify the voices of black South African girls in explanations of their own resilience.
Background to the CBPV-facilitated study of black girls’ resilience

Our CBPV study forms part of the Pathways to Resilience Project (P2RP). P2RP (see www.resilience-research.org) aims to explore formal services and informal pathways that support resilience among at-risk youth. The South African P2RP research site is in the Thabo Mofutsanyana District, Free State Province (see Theron, Liebenberg & Malindi, 2014).

Recruitment of participants for the CBPV-facilitated study

Social workers and teachers who collaborated with the P2RP team recruited girls with whom they worked closely, and whom they believed were doing well in life, despite adversity. In keeping with Dass-Brailsford (2005) and Phasha (2010), doing well, for us, primarily meant progressing at school and not presenting with symptoms of psychological problems. Adversity included lived experiences of emotional, physical, and/or sexual abuse; being HIV positive and/or living in AIDS-affected communities; being exposed to harmful peers; and having suffered the death of loved ones as well as living with the prevalence of community-based violence and substance abuse.

Research process and data collection of the CBPV-facilitated study

The CBPV method requires a group format as a tool for social change within communities (High, Singh, Petheram & Nemes, 2011). We worked with four groups of girls on separate occasions. Group 1 was comprised of six girls living in a children’s home. We met with them there on three occasions on Saturdays for six hours at a time. The second group consisted of 18 girls living in an informal settlement. We split them into Group 2 and Group 3. We met with them twice on Saturdays at the local child and family welfare offices for seven hours each time. Group 4 was comprised of five girls from a township school. We engaged with them twice for five hours at a time after school hours, at their school. In total, the girls made nine participatory videos (see Table 1).
Table 1: Videos created during the CBPV-facilitated study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Most threatening risk</th>
<th>Video Title</th>
<th>Gist of resilience process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Death/loss</td>
<td>Video 1: The bright side</td>
<td>Girls navigate towards supportive co-habiting friends and God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Video 2: Jesus is my hero</td>
<td>Girls emphasise God as their most reliable resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Video 3: 5 steps to feeling better</td>
<td>Girls repeat reference to co-habiting friends and God as resilience-promoting, and add supportive social workers and music/writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>Video 1: A depressed girl</td>
<td>Female family members (mother, sister) facilitate support from a social worker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Video 2: A depressed girl 2</td>
<td>The girls’ application of the social workers advice, amidst supportive friends and family, encourages resilience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Peer pressure</td>
<td>Video 1: The girl next door</td>
<td>A supportive friend encourages resistance to peer pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Video 2: The good advice</td>
<td>Supportive SE (friends, mother, teacher, pastor) promotes resilience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Abuse (emotional/physical/sexual)</td>
<td>Video 1: Child-headed household</td>
<td>Girls identify potential resources (supportive sister and social worker).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Video 2: Reality of life</td>
<td>Prayers for protection against an abusive mother animate improved maternal behaviour. This and supplementary meaning-making (facilitated by sister and social worker) support resilience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each first session, Guillemin’s (2004) draw-and-talk method was used to explore risks experienced by the girls. The girls depicted, in drawings, their lived experiences
of risk, and then explained their drawings to the group. The girls listed the collectively reported risks and each girl then voted for the risk she perceived to be most threatening. Once the girls reached consensus regarding one overarching risk, they were again engaged in Guillemin’s (2004) draw-and-talk method; each girl drew a picture showing why she was strong despite this risk. After the girls explained these drawings, they collaboratively drew storyboards to plan a video showing how the strengths and protective processes identified in their pictures supported them and enabled their strength despite adversity. The girls then acted out and filmed their stories of resilience as planned in their storyboards. The videos varied in length from 5 to 10 minutes.

One month later, a second CBPV session was held in order to better understand the girls’ resilience. The girls were specifically asked to reflect on their resilience between CBPV sessions to stimulate deeper awareness of their processes of resilience in the hope that such awareness would deepen subsequent explanations of their resilience. During the second CBPV sessions the girls again drew pictures depicting why they were strong in life, explained their drawings, and created a storyboard showing how these strengths and protective processes facilitate their resilience. This was then acted out and video-recorded by the girls.

All CBPV sessions included having the girls, and the teachers and/or social workers who recruited them and who were available watch the videos. We screened the videos immediately since we had followed the no-editing-required (NER) approach that results in videos being shot and completed in the same process (Mitchell & De Lange, 2011). Following Yang, (2011), reflective discussions about the meaning of the videos from the girls’ perspectives followed each screening. The teachers and social workers, out of respect for the girls’ authorship of the stories, did not contribute to these reflective discussions.

The P2RP team later engaged social workers, teachers, and community stakeholders (including the P2RP advisory panel) in awareness-raising dissemination activities during which the girls’ videos were screened and the girls’ explanations of their resilience processes made public. The first dissemination was to social workers and caregivers at the children’s home where the Group 1 girls lived. The second was to community stakeholders and teachers at a dinner hosted by the P2RP team. The remaining two disseminations occurred concurrently with the CBPV sessions when teachers and social workers were present.

Analysis

Informed by SERT, we reflected on how CBPV facilitated the understanding and advocacy of resilience for this specific group of girls in their specific context. These reflections are based on qualitative data generated during the research process of the CBPV and P2RP project, comprised of the first author’s research journal; field notes of CBPV sessions; photographic records of CBPV sessions; telephonic follow-up
interviews with recruiting teachers and social workers; interviews with advisory panel members (APMs); minutes of P2RP team discussions; and transcribed participants’ reflections.

The first author immersed herself in the data by reading and re-reading all journal entries, notes, and transcripts to reflect on clues related to the possible benefits and limitations of using CBPV to understand and advocate for black girls’ resilience. She grouped segments of data that addressed benefits and limitations. Following Creswell (2009) she then used inductive, thematic content analysis to identify themes explaining the value and limitations of using CBPV to explain and promote resilience in black adolescent girls. In this process, she was mindful of SERT and therefore paid attention to how SEs enabled or constrained resilience. In this sense, as Creswell (2009) observed elsewhere, there were deductive elements in the analysis. Both authors had lengthy discussions about the emerging themes, and revised initial themes, as Saldana (2009) advises, before reaching consensus. Members of the P2RP team scrutinised these tentative conclusions. They mostly concurred, thus substantiating the trustworthiness of the findings.

**Ethical considerations**

The institution to which the authors are affiliated provided ethical approval. The P2RP advisory panel (see Theron, 2013) sanctioned the CBPV method as appropriate for local youth. The girls and their parents/caregivers signed detailed consent letters that included details about risks to confidentiality and anonymity entailed in using CPBV. Critical psychology and SERT urge the generation of contextually and culturally-relevant knowledge that foregrounds youth participant insights (Ungar, 2013). However, using CBPV to meet this expectation created ethical tensions because dissemination of the videos could expose the girls’ identities and this could possibly prompt their victimisation. This risk was emphasised to the girls prior to the start of the research project, but they were proud to make their knowledge known and gave permission for their videos/video-stills to be made public.

**Findings**

The findings suggest that CBPV champions participant-directed understandings of resilience, but that the method is not without challenges. The first section reports CBPV’s usefulness in this regard using three themes: CBPV (i) facilitates understandings of resilience as a context-specific, co-constructed process; (ii) it heightens participant awareness of potential resilience-supporting processes; and (iii) it offers a fun-filled way to engage girls in a research process. The second section acknowledges that there are limitations in using CBPV to explain and promote black girls’ resilience, using two themes: (i) the difficulty in realising the social change potential of CBPV; and (ii) the complexity of stimulating deep reflection in the girl participants.
The value of using CBPV to explain and promote black girls’ resilience

**CBPV facilitates understandings of resilience as a context-specific, co-constructed process**

As already discussed, SERT calls for resilience research using non-traditional methods to uncover non-Western understandings of how the socio-cultural context shapes resilience processes (Masten, 2014). Along with critical psychologists, leading resilience researchers, therefore, urge theorising that explains resilience as a contextually-specific, collaborative, youth-society process (Masten, 2014; Panter-Brick, 2015; Ungar, 2013). This is precisely what the CBPV-facilitated study of resilience foregrounded.

The CBPV-facilitated study flagged co-constructed processes of resilience. All nine videos showed how others (e.g. female peers/social workers/teachers, sisters, mothers, male clergy, and God—see Table 1) support girls’ resilience. Not one video depicted a girl beating the odds by relying predominantly on her own strength, even though there was reference to girls’ personal strengths (e.g. diligence and determination). The girls in every group show that connections to supportive others are what help them to be strong in life. Likewise, practitioners who attended the dissemination event commented on how the videos drew attention to the need for adults to collaborate with youth to promote resilience.

Comments from psychologists who attended a presentation of the CBPV-facilitated study at the 2013 Psychological Society of South Africa Conference drew similar conclusions. For example, the second author reported that a UWC-based psychologist commented: “The power lies in how the CBPV method allowed these girls to portray that resilience is in community”. Thus, the CBPV method illustrates SERT through its provision of visual evidence that positive adjustment is facilitated by partnered processes (i.e. girls are not resilient on their own).

Drawing attention to the co-constructed nature of resilience potentiates SE awareness of the duty of the SE to partner in girls’ processes of positive adjustment. Dissemination activities revealed that CBPV made the importance of this partnership clear. The teacher who recruited Group 4 stated that watching the videos inspired her to begin a girl-child life-skills programme at her school. The teachers at this same school also said that they became more aware of the girls’ struggles, felt more empathy towards the girls, and noted that they needed to support the girls more actively.

In addition to CBPV’s usefulness in accentuating the co-constructed nature of resilience and in sensitising SEs to their responsibility to facilitate resilience, CBPV provides a medium that illustrates how such co-facilitated processes manifest in specific ways for black girls in a specific socio-cultural context. In their videos, the girls portrayed a relationship with God as helpful to coping well with loss, or with
having been removed from their family homes. Social workers were portrayed as accessible sources of human comfort when loss overwhelms them. The social workers who watched Group 1’s videos said they felt encouraged because the videos show their interactions with the girls as constructive, and demonstrate that the girls had internalised their teachings. The manager of the children’s home remarked: “It is exciting for us to hear their faith is important ... it’s actually the bottom line of what we try to teach them”.

Group 2 participants, who were not in care, did not include spiritual resources in their depictions of resilience. Likewise, Group 3 included reference to support from only a pastor. However, in the video called “The reality of life”, girls prioritised God as a source of help. The strong Christian ethos of the children’s home might explain Group 1’s emphasis on faith, but we cannot assume this Christian orientation to be true of the homes of the Group 4 participants, even though the APMs advised us that the local community prioritised faith as an enabling resource.

This raises questions about whether resilience processes are simply informed by context-specific resources and/or community norms about which resources are valuable, as previously suggested (Ungar, 2013). Might the resources that inform resilience processes be animated, rather, by which resources are missing, or by life-experience of resources seen to be more reliable? For example, adults were reported to have let Group 1 and 4 participants down (i.e., they died or were abusive). This left these girls with limited immediate tangible support and this might then explain their emphasis on faith in a god who could or would not die or abuse them. Similarly, Groups 2 and 3 experienced negative peer influences, resulting in their turning towards adults and family members who were immediately available and reliable.

Our use of CBPV facilitated the generation of persuasive visual evidence of how life-experience and/or resource constraints, along with the socio-cultural context, has an impact on supportive others who are available to collaborate in processes of resilience. This raises interesting questions about teachers.

Teachers were part of the daily context of all four groups. However, only two groups portrayed teachers as supportive, and they did so only briefly. In the video called “The good advice”, Group 3 included a single instance of a teacher enquiring about a girl’s wellbeing but taking no action to nurture her. In “A depressed girl” Group 2 fleetingly portrayed a teacher suggesting protective resources—a mother, a sister—towards whom the girl might consider navigating. In Group 2’s follow-up video “A depressed girl 2”, the same teacher was included once: in the video she briefly encourages the girl’s sense of self-efficacy. Despite these passing references to teacher support, the impression given by the collective videos is that teachers do not actively co-facilitate girls’ resilience processes. This is at odds with earlier studies of black South African youth that portray teachers as champions of youth resilience (Dass-Brailsford, 2005; Ebersöhn, 2007; Phasha, 2010). Using CBPV, therefore, offers sensitive insight into who co-facilitates girls’ resilience in a specific context at a specific point in time.
Girl-generated videos can be used as advocacy tools: screening the videos to teachers in this specific context should raise awareness of their absence in the girls’ accounts of their resilience. Likewise, the videos could galvanise teacher and teacher-educator explorations of teacher actions that would facilitate their being key partners in girls’ resilience processes.

**CBPV heightens participant awareness of potential resilience-supporting resources**

Critical psychology, in interrogating who benefits from knowledge production (Hook, 2004), implies that research should hold direct benefits for research participants. One such benefit could be that participants themselves are enabled by the knowledge they produce. Producing and watching their videos, and those of others, heightened the girls’ awareness of existing and potential protective resources. For example, after watching Group 3’s video “The good advice”, a Group 2 participant commented, “I like the church thing ... I like when you mentioned that it’s good to involve God in your decisions”. Group 2 reflected that, given an opportunity to re-story their video, they would have added faith-based resources, thus indicating their awareness of an additional source of support. Similarly, in “The girl next door”, Group 3 portrayed how pro-social school friends can support girls to do well in life and at school, whereas Group 2’s “A depressed girl” portrayed difficulty with abusive school friends. Group 3’s explanation emphasised how pro-social school friends support constructive ways of coping with negative peer influences. In their second video “A depressed girl 2”, Group 2 continued their initial story, but progressed to portraying some school friends as being supportive and generously sharing knowledge to overcome emotional abuse.

Cross-learning also occurred within groups as girls swapped experiences and knowledge about resources while planning their videos. This, and watching and reflecting on their videos, heightened their awareness of potential support. In Group 4’s second CBPV session, for example, they could better articulate how resources included in the first session (e.g. sister, counsellor) supported them.

**CBPV offers a fun-filled way to engage girls in a research process**

Research into resilience must foreground youth experiences, but too often traditional methods fail to do so; these methods bore young people (Liebenberg & Ungar, 2009). Moreover, vulnerable youth have little opportunity for fun because of the multiple demands and responsibilities that challenge them (Chuong & Operario, 2012). The CBPV process is an enjoyable method; it stimulates reflection on hidden experiences through play (Bloustien, 2011; Mitchell, Milne & De Lange, 2012). Engaging the girls in CBPV, therefore, offered some respite from their demanding lives. When asked how they experienced the CBPV process, the girls remarked that “it was very fun” (Participant 2 from Group 1), they felt “excited” (Participant 1, Group 1), and they
“enjoyed it a lot” (Participant 1, Group 4). The girls’ enjoyment of the CBPV process was also visually evident (see Photographs 1 and 2 below, taken by the P2RP team).

Photograph 1: Group 1 laughing while watching their first video

Photograph 2: Group 2 members smiling while preparing for their second video

The atmosphere was uncomfortable and tense during the exploration of the risks the girls faced. This was evident in the girls’ serious facial expressions and the sense of a shared sadness as each girl explained her drawing. When the focus shifted to their resilience, their mood lightened. The CBPV process facilitated this shift, particularly because the girls enjoyed creating storyboards and filming their videos. As the girls watched their videos they laughed at themselves and each other, patting one another
on the shoulders, and expressing pride in their videos. Thus, rather than traditional positivist research methods, the CBPV process offered a fun-filled, encouraging way for the girls to discuss the adversities they face and to articulate why they are strong despite them.

**Limitations of using CBPV to explain and promote the processes of black girls’ resilience**

*Difficulty in realising the social change potential of CBPV*

A P2RP team discussion highlighted the difficulty in realising social change that would support resilience processes, despite the potential of the CBPV method to do so. During this discussion, the P2RP team questioned whether there was any actual change in the lives of the girls after CBPV-related dissemination activities. After such activities social workers and teachers were excited about their role in promoting girls’ resilience, but there was limited tangible action in this regard. For example, the teachers who recruited Group 4’s girls were excited about starting girl-child life skills programmes at school, but follow-up telephone interviews one year later revealed that no programmes had been instituted. Preliminary findings from Group 1’s videos were presented to social workers and caregivers working and residing in the children’s home where Group 1 lived. Although the social workers and caregivers seemed excited and proud of the girls’ videos, there was limited response when they were asked to comment on how they might support the girls. Despite repeated attempts to prompt reflection in, and action from them, they offered no concrete ideas to further support the girls’ resilience. One month after the dissemination, the girls in Group 1 said many of their caregivers were unsupportive despite having seen the videos.

This inactivity suggests that galvanising, realising, and sustaining resilience-supporting social change probably requires long-term research projects, or purposeful interventions that include assisting communities to facilitate girls’ resilience (High et al., 2011). It requires more than girl-community dialogue, or information-focused disseminations, even though it is important for communities to hear how girls need their support, and to become aware of their responsibility to promote girls’ resilience. Once communities are aware, action is essential: the social ecology is expected to support youth (Ungar, 2013). However, attention to SE capacity to offer meaningful support is neglected. For example, burnout in teachers, social workers, and other helping professionals is a serious problem in South Africa (Newsome, Waldo & Gruszka, 2012), and this calls their capacity to actively and consistently support girls’ resilience into question.

Thus, although the CBPV method sensitises communities to their co-responsibility for girls’ resilience, realising this responsibility is more complicated. For supportive action to follow community awareness of their responsibility to girls’ resilience, communities probably need to be supported to facilitate girls’ resilience processes.
meaningfully, and to sustain such facilitation. In the context of this CBPV study, this requires that education departments, community members, professionals (social workers, counsellors), and researchers capacitate the SE to partner with girls.

The complexity of stimulating deep reflection in the girl participants

In this study, reflections included girls’ thoughts on the protective processes included in their videos, and how these supported their doing well in life. Such reflections are crucial to the dissemination of accurate understandings of these girls’ resilience, which, in turn, is pivotal to trustworthy knowledge production that privileges majority world insights. In our experience, it was challenging for the girls to explain the resilience-supporting mechanisms underpinning the concrete events portrayed in their videos. For example in “The good advice”, Group 3 portrayed a priest who, while praying for the girls, violently shakes their heads. After the videos were screened, the girls struggled to explain how the priest supported their resilience. The P2RP team hypothesised that a schooling system that does not encourage critical and independent thinking and/or the developmental stage of the girls may have affected their ability to reflect on and explain their resilience processes.

In adolescence, formal operational thinking that, as we know, involves the ability to think and reason abstractly is generally reached between the ages of 12 to 15 years. However, many adolescents are able to reason abstractly only in late adolescence or young adulthood (Louw & Louw, 2009). This may be the reason why the girls struggled to reflect on and explain abstract phenomena. Skilful, patient questioning by the research team assisted the girls to explain the underlying processes of their resilience, but this became tiring for the girls. This protracted process led the P2RP team to wonder if older girls at university level, who are more sophisticated in their cognitive development, might have reflected deeply with more ease.

Another barrier to reflecting deeply could be the South African schooling system, which does not facilitate critical thinking and active learning sufficiently (Adams, 2011). Traditional teaching approaches characterise teachers as transmitters of knowledge and learners as passive recipients (Botha & Du Preez, 2014). Despite recent implementation of learner-centred curricula in schools, many learners still have difficulty thinking critically (Lombard & Grosser, 2008). The need to shift from being a passive learner to being creators of knowledge in the CBPV process was probably alien—something not understood and therefore unavailable to the girls.

In summary, the potential of CBPV to investigate resilience was challenged by the girls’ difficulty in reflecting deeply, despite researcher support of such reflection. In future CBPV-facilitated explorations of resilience, researchers must consider youths’ developmental stage carefully and recognise how the schooling system to which they are exposed may limit their ability to reflect deeply on abstract phenomena.
Concluding discussion

The aim of this article was to consider critically the value of using CBPV to explain and promote resilience in school-going black South African girls’ faced with significant adversity in ways that privilege their insights and life-experiences, rather than hegemonic Western theories of resilience (Hook, 2004; Ungar, 2013). The videos offered robust visual evidence that the resilience processes of these girls were co-constructed by their SE in ways that reflect the risks and sociocultural realities of these SEs. In doing so, they drew attention to the importance of explaining and promoting resilience in ways that are contextually sensitive rather than Eurocentric, and confirmed the importance of what Hook (2014) and Ungar (2013) see to be a critical approach to knowledge production. However, there were definite challenges to our using CBPV to explore the abstract phenomenon of resilience and to realise resilience-supporting social change. These challenges were addressed partly by conducting follow-up CBPV sessions focused only on processes of resilience. Between the two sessions, the girls were asked to reflect in diaries provided by the researchers on their resilience and what they had learnt about this process. In our experience, using CBPV to explore resilience in school-going youth is more useful when it incorporates many CBPV sessions and structured reflection activities between these sessions.

The challenge of slow social change necessitates continued research and intervention-oriented dissemination activities. School communities, in particular, need to be engaged in these continued activities. The school environment is a crucial facet of girls’ SEs, partly because it forms part of their daily context, and because schools have the potential to facilitate resilience (Phasha, 2010). To advocate for the responsibility and potential of schools to facilitate resilience, girl-generated videos could be used in awareness-raising activities with teachers, principals, school-based support teams, school governing bodies, and the Department of Education. Sensitising the school ecology to its co-responsibility for facilitating girls’ resilience is not enough in and of itself since this assumes that school ecologies are capable of responding in resilience-supporting ways without assistance. Future research and dissemination, therefore, must focus on what teacher-education initiatives are needed for school ecologies, along with the necessary support, to better support girls in adjusting well to hardship.
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