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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

This research focuses on the gendering of spaces within the inner city of Johannesburg using Usindiso Ministries Women’s Shelter as a case study. This case study was chosen due to the shelter’s location in a building which used to be the old Albert Street Pass Office. The juxtaposition of the past and present realities of the space is an interesting issue to explore especially with regards to women’s experiences of gendered spaces. The primary aim of this study is to describe the complexities of the process of gendering of spaces and how it occurs as well as the shelter staff members’ perceptions of women’s experiences of safety (read inclusion and belonging) within those spaces.

This research draws on qualitative research with diverse individuals who are associated with issues of space and gender in the inner city of Johannesburg. It explores how the space (perceived, conceived and lived space as defined in (chapter Two) influence or affect gendered realities. The researcher considers the shelter (Usindiso Ministries Women’s Shelter) as a map of and metaphor for restoration and rehabilitation; and makes a hypothesis that Usindiso Ministries Women’s Shelter is created as an imagined space, a refuge from all sorts of threats. Just like a map is not the territory but a representation of a particular area that is abstract, soUMWS is also an abstract description of transformation from a system of oppression to rehabilitation and restoration. Hence, it is useful to also focus on women’s experiences and perceptions of safety. However, the shelter is a refuge that is temporary rather than liberation that is permanent. Drawing on in-depth research (by architects, geographers, anthropologists, urban planners) based on space and gender (gendered spaces), the shelter is explored as a safe haven, a healing space and at the same time a heterotopic space (Space of otherness).

Methodologically, there is a combination of observations, interviews, photographs and archives relating to the case study. The combination of these strategies is used in an attempt to provide empirical evidence to describe the way in which the spatiality of shelters impact on women’s experiences of safety and security. This research explores gender and space through the lens of intersectional analysis, particularly as it has developed in feminist studies. Women in this research are considered as a non-homogenous group, their different intersecting realities affect how they experience and perceive the space. That is the research will explore how women of different backgrounds (displaced or abused), races and religions
experience the space because of these intersections (multiple oppressions). The focus will also be on how homelessness intersects with abuse, this is to mean whether being displaced and living on the streets might perhaps increase the chances of being abused or whether being abused might lead to the chances of being displaced. “Within particular spaces there are dominant spatial orderings that produce moments of exclusion for particular groups” (Valentine, 2007: 19), thus the need for this research to explore intersectionality as well. Burgess (2008: 112) notes “that there are many gendered patterns in the use of space, but planning policy tends to ignore the fact that men and women use space differently”.

McDowell (1983) states that planners and practitioners especially those involved in spatial planning and urban regeneration need a holistic consideration of gender in their projects. For some time the urban has been identified as a fundamental spatial scale of cities through which gender is comprised and experienced (McDowell, 1983). According to Bondi and Rose (2003) the urban as a conceptual framework indicates how space and place, as social constructions that are materially grounded, shape the ways in which gender relations and identities are played out, modified or reinforced. Furthermore, gender and other social relations are thus actively constructed by urban form, processes and differences in location within cities.

**Background**

“The city is not about danger and fear (woman as the perpetual victim) or boredom and limitation (woman as housewife); it is also a site of possibility, pleasure and excitement” (Ainley, 1998: xiv).

Women in Johannesburg have varying access to shelters. Shelters that are reserved for women have been reported to be on the decline, this also includes women-only spaces designated within co-ed shelters (Bayes and Brewin, 2012). It is likely that women might be faced with safety issues within co-ed shelters.

Throughout history and globally, efforts for provision of safety to women and children at risk of harm have been supported by women, whether through institutions that are faith-based, non-governmental organisations or community support (Gierman et al., 2013). The social recognition of the problem of domestic violence prior to the 1870s was little or non-existent: the problem was a private problem. Thus, there were many closed doors to this issue. Later on, women began to open up and speak out about violence happening in their lives; as a result
the battered women’s movement began (Murray, 1988). The movement gained popularity through the women’s liberation movement, civil rights movement and the anti-rape movement, all of which built the foundation for the analysis of violence against women analysis in political and social causes. The feminist analyses have informed and inspired the battered women’s movement; and maintain that violence against women by males has throughout history been overlooked (Murray, 1988).

Mhlanga (2011) also notes that the historical use of shelters as places of safety in the United States dates back to 1875 when a refuge in Belton, United States was opened by Martha McWhirter for battered women which flourished well into the 1890s. The first well documented women’s shelter in the United States opened in 1973, Minneapolis. Close to five hundred shelters were in operation by 1982 within the whole country. A number of these shelters initially started as grass-roots feminist collectives, in which they promoted a philosophy which was in rejection of bureaucratic forms of dealing with problems (Murray, 1988). Furthermore, in Great Britain the first women’s shelter that was well documented established in Hounslow, 1971 and provided domestic violence survivors with an unofficial refuge.

Park et al. (2000) note that the phenomenon of shelters for abused women in South Africa is relatively new. In 1984 the organisation called People Opposing Women Abuse (POWA) was the first to open a shelter for abused women. In South Africa the need to establish shelters for abused women and their children was addressed in 2003 in the strategy for shelters which was developed by the Department of Social Development, as the principal department for the Victim Empowerment Programme. Battered women’s shelters are used to make available immediate and safer shelter for women who experience violence in their lives and who became homeless due to their circumstances1. However, shelters are only the response to the problem of violence against women within the society, not the solution (Gierman et al., 2013).

Prior to 1999 shelters in South Africa were operated by non-governmental organisations only and the focus was to provide women and children with safe shelters (Groenewald, 2006). The national Department of Social Department conducted the Rapid Appraisal of Shelters for Abused Women and their Children (2000). The purpose of this process in 2002 was to

---

1 For this research the term displaced or displaced persons is considered an appropriate term therefore it will be used in place of homelessness
establish a baseline of the South African shelters in existence. Currently, shelter services fall under the broader sphere of the national government’s Victim Empowerment Programme (VEP) which is a significant feature of the crime prevention strategy. The members of the South African Police Service are obliged by the Domestic Violence Act (DVA) (116 of 1998) to provide specified services to victims of domestic violence and these include referring and transferring women to shelters (Lopes, 2013). Shelters serve as a safe haven for women and children especially those that are extremely vulnerable, although they provide a lot more than just a safe place to stay. Therefore, shelters signify a crucial part of crisis intervention (Groenewald, 2006).

Shelters provide vital aspects of protection, resources and services which make it possible for the victims of domestic violence to recuperate, restore their self-esteem and become independent. There are various categories of shelter accommodations across regions and communities and they are heavily influenced by the funding they receive (Gierman et al., 2013). These comprise emergency shelters, transitional housing, women-only shelters, but this research will only focus on the women-only (and their children) shelter for a more in-depth analysis of the spatial relationship between gender and space (in this case the spaces surrounding the shelter). In many cases, considerations for women tend to be reduced to physical safety and security although there is more than that, the need for safety extends to psychological and cultural safety as well (Bayes and Brewin, 2012). This research explores gender and space through the lens of intersectional analysis, particularly as it has developed in feminist studies. The feminist scholars recognised that there were significant variances among women and men rather than simply between them. Furthermore, they made an argument that class, gender and race are interconnected as “Intersecting oppressions” (Jones et al. 2013). Therefore, women’s different cultures, races and backgrounds (displaced or abused) will be considered.

Most shelter operators find themselves faced with the dilemma of Not-In-My-Backyard attitudes (from local residents, merchants and property owners) whereby people with the strongest voices such as the private owners contend that these buildings are undesirable and would reduce their property values; and as a result shelters are then placed in industrial areas or neighbourhoods that are located in the downtown parts of the city in order to reduce community opposition (Bayes and Brewin, 2012 and Hurtubise et al., 2009). This strategy or response does not deal adequately with the issue of homelessness and domestic violence because it raises concerns of safety and security and isolates shelter users from communities.
This goes against community integration efforts which are part of the core purposes of shelters. Consequently, in considering shelters; ‘space’ (urban fabric) then becomes an integral point.

“Space is at once both real and metaphoric: space exists as a material entity, a form of representation and a conceptual and political construct” (Rendell et al., 2002). Taylor (1998: 130) notes that securing space, in any way is an act that is political: whether it is through dispossession, purchasing real-estate or invasion of territories. Moreover, occupying space is an assertion of power, and the continual displacement is the spatial effect of power. Here the focus is on the function of a shelter in relation to its locality, particularly in a consideration of a gendered use of space.

The spatial situation of a shelter refers to the locality of the building structure in relation to neighbourhoods and city zoning (Graham et al., 2008). In this research attention will also be paid to the design and spatial aspects of the immediate urban fabric² and the elements of gender roles that they tend to reinforce. “A major issue to emerge in terms of the gendered use of space, both at a macro- and a micro-level, is that of physical control and personal safety” (Little, 1994). A consideration of space should look beyond bricks and mortar whilst acknowledging the shifting certainties of gendered realities (Grant, 1998).

**Rationale**

The research on gender and space is extensive on a global scale; however in South Africa gender research is limited. Therefore, it is imperative for the researcher to try to avoid the dangers of adopting western (Occidocentric³) views when dealing with a local context such as South Africa because their contexts are different; and instead focus on context specific views and solutions. Professor Deirdre Byrne (2015) argued that gender is an academic discipline which is an intellectual quest just as history and sociology in which the object of study is gender. “Overall, women’s and gender studies units in South African universities

---

²Urban fabric refers to the physical form of towns and cities. These are the aspects urbanism, highlighting the types of buildings, open spaces, thoroughfares, streetscapes and frontages (Artibise, 2010).

³This term is used synonymously with Eurocentrism, it refers to projection of values that are predominantly Western (Occident means ‘the west’ America, Europe or both, as dissimilar from the Orient) and notions of colonialism in relation to non-Western cultural contexts that are pervasive and under-examined (Jarvis et al, 2009).
tend to be small and under-resourced” (Byrne, 2015). In South Africa the dualistic approach of researching the intersection of space and gender has been explored to a certain extent; the focus has been gender and violence and spaces that are dangerous or not inviting for women. Additionally, the spaces that many South African gender scholars tend to extensively focus on are: bodily, cyberspace, cultural, community, and imagined and the built environments (which is primarily on the feminine vs masculine dualistic approach).

When it comes to research on women in shelters and their safety perceptions and experiences, research seems to be limited especially from a spatial point of view. ‘Space’ in this context refers to the urban fabric within the shelter’s immediate surrounds. This is, space as it is used, found, occupied and transformed through ordinary activities. Space is studied with both its dimensions of social and physical aspects. Thus, using the urban fabric as the canvas for this research, the intersectionality of gender and space is explored. Therefore, the motive of this study is influenced by the lack of research focus on the role that spaces (within the localities of shelters) play in women’s experiences of safety.

The challenge as with gender mainstreaming in general, is to avoid gender being defined as ‘women’ (Jarvis et al., 2009). However, it is important in this research to focus only on women because of the researcher’s interest in the women-only shelter in Albert Street. This shelter is an intriguing site to focus on due to its history (it used to be an old pass office). Thus, this shift from a pass office to women’s shelter gives clues about the complexities of gendering of spaces within cities. UMWS is located in the part of Marshalltown which is predominantly zoned for industrial use and the conditions as well as the current activities in the area (such as squatter settlements and chop shops⁴) raise safety issues for the researcher and seem contradictory to the shelter as a “healing space” or a “safe haven”. This is especially for women who are considered vulnerable due to their different life experiences with displacement and gender-based violence. The initial view and experience of the locality within which the shelter is located gave me an impression that the space is an abrasive surrounding for the shelter, and this prompted a desire to want to understand better how the surroundings are experienced and impact on what I understand to be a particularly vulnerable set of people.

---

⁴A place where vehicles that are stolen are disassembled so that the parts can be sold or used to repair other stolen vehicles (Stevenson, 2010: 308).
Therefore, it is important for the researcher to investigate the safety dynamics of women-only shelters in relation to their localities, with the aim of proposing a gender lense regarding shelters in the city. Furthermore, this study deals with the question of women’s safety, in its entirety. The study aims to bring to light multiple factors of safety which relate to aspects of shelter operation, locality, accessibility and visibility which can influence how the users perceive the space. The aim of the study is not necessarily to plug the gaps within shelter and gender research in South Africa rather to flag them, thus the use of a single case study.

**Problem statement**

Most women fear for their safety as they are more vulnerable than men on the streets. Other women who seek shelter do so because they are fleeing from domestic violence. But Bayes and Brewin (2012) reported that most women who find shelter in co-ed shelters feel intimidated by their male counterparts and as a result do not feel safe in co-ed shelters. Consequently, displaced women (this includes battered women) have been reported to choose to stay in abusive relationships, remain in the streets where they have their own secluded spaces, trade sex or personal services for a place to stay instead of entering a shelter where they often fear for their safety and their few possessions (Bayes and Brewin, 2012). In the context of this research there is difficulty in finding gendered data, that is data which indicates the statistics of displaced and battered women in Johannesburg. The shelters that are available and still operating lack funding from both the state and the donors which influences the types of shelters and services that can be provided (Gierman et al., 2013). Therefore, spaces and buildings that are allocated to shelters are sometimes not favourable especially when it comes to their localities. In 2007 the shelter was experiencing burglaries and in response to these burglaries the shelter has been fenced with an electrical fencing along the side of the wall where the chop shops are (City of Johannesburg, 2007). For many women the shelter location is linked directly to personal safety (Graham et al., 2008). This also includes a sense of belonging and inclusion. Burgess (1998) states that “what is perceived to be real is real in its consequences”. The location of the shelter can affect the psychological and emotional well-being of the shelter users, and it can also have a direct impact on whether they seek or are able to access the services they need (Graham et al., 2008).

“This segregation–the warehousing of society’s most destitute–isolates the homeless population; it also helps conceal the structural nature of homelessness in a market economy where those who are homeless represent the periphery of surplus labour” (Hartnett and
Harding, 2005: 27). However, women are not a homogeneous group, thus it makes it difficult for the shelter alone to provide for each and every woman’s individual needs. Without thoroughly understanding the intersection of space and gender in shelters, the opportunity to create “safe spaces” and eliminate problems faced by shelter users is missed. Therefore, it is important to design or create spaces that are conducive to those in need of safe havens.

**Research Question**

How is the current spatial context of UMWS understood and experienced by those associated with the shelter, and what are the shortcomings with regards to women’s safety perspectives?

**Sub-questions**

1. How are issues of safety and security understood and conceptualised by the shelter operators and experts?
2. How do the shelter staff members understand the place of the shelter?
3. How does the physical context of the space affect or encourage women’s activities?

**Structure of the report**

With this as an introduction to the research, I turn to Chapter Two to discuss specific key themes that contain sub-themes namely: shelters; gender and space; safety and security; and intersectionality. Chapter Two draws on a specific body of literature in order to fully understand the themes that are related to the research topic. Then Chapter Three focuses on methodologies and highlights different techniques used to understand the process of gendering of spaces. These methods include interviews, observations and case study strategy. Then in Chapter Four the case study is described in more detail. This chapter is a descriptive chapter and presents the findings and data gathering involved interviews, observations and photographs. Chapter Five concludes the research and draws on the findings as well as explaining the relevance of the research on urban planning. This chapter concludes that gendered spaces are complex spaces and there is no universal way of providing shelters for women but it is important to make available women-only shelters in order to help speed up the healing process.
CHAPTER TWO

Literature review

For this research topic it is important to explain concepts of space and gender, intersectionality, shelters, safety and security as they are imbedded within the issues of safe shelters for women. There is a broad spectrum of causal factors that lead women to seek places of safety and many of these women find themselves in shelters.

Shelters as healing spaces and heterotopic spaces

Definitions of a shelter are numerous and subject to different interpretations. To begin with, a shelter can be considered as place that people go to when they have nowhere else to go or when they are in danger (Hurtubise et al., 2009). Dobash and Dobash (1992) have used the definition of shelters as places of safety, which is usually an apartment or a house. On the other hand Mhlanga (2011: 13) defines a shelter as a place of healing, recovery and political change for women who encounter abuse in their homes. Furthermore, the use of shelters could be understood as a strategy for women empowerment.

For many researchers the definition of shelters is directly dependent on the purposes it serves and its functions. For Hurtubise et al. (2009) a shelter can be defined by the type of services offered or the number of beds. However, most of them attach the aspect of safety in their definitions of a ‘shelter’. According to Cook (2001) shelters for women were historically initiated as feminist-oriented grassroots organisations which aimed to raise awareness about violence against women, and also to issue tangible material assistance to battered women. Towards the end of the 1980s, many shelters began facing problems with the location of shelters. This was due to the new developments within cities where property values began to rise and shelters’ funding was very insufficient for shelters to keep up with the rising costs.

Even today, when new shelters are constructed or when old ones relocate, in most instances they are faced with opposition from merchants, local residents, NIMBYists (Not In My Backyard) and property owners (Hurtubise et al. 2009). Johnsen et al. (2005) noted that the critics accused shelters of hiding the homeless populations from the general public instead of simply providing them with assistance. This was due to the fact that most people were annoyed by the presence of homeless people in plain sight. Therefore, the efforts that emerged such as designing public spaces that are not desirable to homeless people
encouraged shelters to be developed as a way of shielding the population from homeless people.

THE HOUSING LADDER

Figure 5: The housing ladder is a diagram which shows a continuum of housing options that people are intended to move through, created by Operation Job Creation (Emdon, 2007).

The clientele of shelters varies greatly and over time their needs change; thus the conceptualisation of the housing ladder to address these issues. Currently in South Africa there is no clear policy on women’s shelter, the National Department of Housing does not have a policy that is explicit and specific to fund the building capital costs, purchasing or remodelling properties for women’s shelters. Some shelters allocated to battered women have been funded by means of the transitional and institutional housing subsidy within the national housing policy (Emdon, 2007). Operation Job Creation is a non-profit organization situated in Roodepoort and the organisation devised a useful categorisation known as the Housing Ladder and sometimes is referred to as the Housing Continuum. This refers to the continuum of housing options that people move along. There is an assumption there is change in people’s needs and that people can progress over time to a more sustainable and independent position concerning their housing, if the facility offers support.
The researcher’s initial thought of UMWS as a healing space involved looking at the space as well as looking at the building type due to a belief that one cannot exist without the other. This is to mean that a building cannot entirely be a healing space when its space does the opposite. Literature is vital for this section in order to better understand the what has been said about ‘healing spaces’ as well reasons why certain spaces would fulfil the building’s purpose and why some would not. However, there is limited research on healing spaces in architecture and urban design. Schweitzer et al. (2004: 71) noted that “Most relevant research has been concentrated on a limited number of settings and is inadequate to inform the creation of design guidelines for the physical elements of an optimal healing environment”. Thus, it has been difficult to find similar research which focuses on shelters as ‘healing spaces’. According to Schweitzer et al. (2004) the space’s “ambiance” has an effect on people that utilise the space.

Places that are intended for healing need to be spaces in which individuals feel the urge to go because they know they will get healing there. Fundamentally, a healing space is a space whereby each and every person, whether aware or unaware with the technicalities of architecture and urban design, can feel content, safe and secure (Veliotes, 2006). Furthermore, it is a space that has an appeal to all the senses thus resulting in a conscious or subconscious effect on its inhabitants.

There are many different levels in which healing takes place therefore the creation of space that is psychologically invigorating combined with a space that is restorative functionally, the outcome may be a space that is considered to be a very efficient healing space (Veliotes, 2006: 11). “To be healing, a place must be harmonious, bringing change as an organic development so that new buildings seem not to be imposed aliens but inevitably belong where they are” (Day, 1990: 19). These places and buildings need to respond to the surroundings and also be responsible, in a quest to reduce pollution that might be caused by their materials. “But places-and buildings- must be more than that: they must be nourishing to the human being” (Day, 1990: 19). Healing spaces can be considered to be spaces that either heal or spaces whereby there is provision of cure and ideally if it is a building it needs to be located within a space that have need of healing, this allows the building to provide restoration of the environment.

There are various forms that healing spaces can take. Generally, healing spaces are either spaces that permit spiritual healing or medical healing. Places that can be regarded as healing
spaces encompass spiritual healing spaces like spas, churches, parks and temples, while on the other hand medical healing spaces are hospitals, wards and clinics. These diverse settings have capabilities for healing but their users and occupants perceive them in ways that are completely different (Veliotes, 2006: 10). Thus, some see spaces such as these and shelters as heterotopic spaces.

The researcher proposes that Foucault’s (1986) heterotopia concept conveniently captures the complexities of connections between stability and instability, order and disorder that define shelters as organisations of authority, knowledge, restoration, institutionalisation and assimilation. Hetherington (1997) also noted that heterotopias are spaces of multiple orderings. In this research the attention is also on how the shelters as spaces of healing, restoration and safety are configured by orderings that are contested and manifold. Heterotopias are sites that are unique and they are both related to and defined in opposition to all other sites. They indicate an alternate social order which disturbs or reverses the social relations that symbolise those other social spaces (Street and Coleman, 2012).

According to Wright (1997: 51) people who are displaced find themselves more often floating between spaces within the city that are defined as heterotopias of deviation and a set of crisis heterotopic sites (that are in decline) which unlike heterotopias of deviation, are spaces that are reserved for people who are in a crisis state such as sacred, forbidden or privileged places. Heterotopias of deviation is a concept devised by Foucault (1986) to describe the world of prisons, rest homes, and psychiatric hospitals which are seen as spaces where deviation from structured norms is anticipated. Therefore, the displaced persons would then be part of a heterotopic space that is somewhere between these two forms of social spaces.

**Gender and space**

The concepts of space and gender are also important to define as the research is also interested in how they interrelate. How space influences women’s experiences of safety and also how gender influences the way in which spaces are shaped. Anthropology (mostly through feminist anthropologists) was one of the fields which began proposing that there was a relationship between space and gender, and it was defined through relations of power (Rendell, 2002). Rosing (2003) argues that there are four types of approaches that can be distinguished when making a systematic review of studies on gender and space in general sociology, anthropology, architecture and other associated fields of social science. These are
studies on space, gender, on the gender of space and on gender and space this includes
gendered space. This research only focuses on gender and space with the aim of exploring the
complexity of sites that are invested with gendered meanings based on the social production
of space. Gendered spaces may be described as spaces which are used preferably by one or
the other gender.

Gender includes, however it does not mean women, and so seems to lead to no critical threat
of gender being defined as ‘women’. Furthermore, Brandes et al. (2012: 5) also notes that
“Gender is not a polarised sphere of two antagonistic extremes: the male and female, like the
opposite halves looking for each other in order to be complete, like Plato’s tale describes”.
However, it is noted that gender refers to those cultural, psychological and social
characteristics that are linked to females and males through specific social contexts. For
example “Sex makes us male or female; gender makes us masculine or feminine” (Lindsey,
2005: 4). However, gender can be regarded on a continuum of traits demonstrated by an
individual irrespective of their biological sex.

According to the American Psychological Association (2011) gender refers to the feelings,
attitudes and behaviours that a given culture tends to associate with an individual’s biological
sex. Furthermore, “Behaviour that is compatible with cultural expectations is referred to as
gender-normative; behaviours that are viewed as incompatible with these expectations
constitute gender non-conformity” (American Psychological Association, 2011: 1). This
definition is often used in the field of sociology.

Gender can also be defined as a social category which is imposed on a sexed body (Rendell et
al., 2002). Because gender is a social construct then gendered spaces become socially
constructed spaces. Grob and Gryl (2015) also argue that socialisation is the most important
factor of gender differences in abilities that are spatially related. From a very young age
gender roles are already present, and gender differences in the appropriation of space may
also lead to uneven chances of social participation. Gender is subject to variation and change
because it is a social construct. Butler (1999, xxiii) also notes that "What we take to be real,
what we invoke as the naturalized knowledge of gender is, in fact a changeable and revisable
reality." Therefore, gender is not fixed. This can be seen in modern societies whereby the
roles as well as identities of women and men have changed significantly as compared to
medieval times.
The fact that cultures considerably differ from each other in their expectations and rules for both masculinity and femininity is evident that gender is a social construct (Sadoughianzadeh, 2008). In other words, to some extent, each society has its own made up set of rules to define what being a woman or man means, moreover people establish gender through their interactions by behaving in ways that are deemed appropriate. Lips (2003: 6) also notes that the way in which rules tend to change arbitrary over time even within a specific culture is an indication that gender is socially constructed.

Gender identity is a social construct that for many centuries in many societies has been strongly associated with the organisation of space: “In fact this social construct, like any other social construction is interconnected with the "space", because as it was said “gender” itself is a constitute part of social system and social system is an important dimension of “space” (Sadoughianzadeh, 2008: 27). Space is to some extent produced by social powers, then that social system (gender too) is in turn influenced by space. Consequently, gender is produced by space and produces it.

Durning and Wrigley (2000: 1) argue that “architectural space is not the container of identities, but a constitutive element in them." This is to say that there is a mutual relationship between gender (identity) and space. According to Lico (2001) space is an instrument of action and thought, which plays out the struggle over power between genders. Nevertheless, there should be acknowledgement that space in itself is not innately powerful. The politics of spatial usage determine its (space) power. Moreover, Bryant and Livholts (2007) comprehend spaces as meeting places which are formed by embodied social relations mediated by power. They also understand it as being open to negotiation, contestation, resistance, and restriction. Moreover, the past, present and future form spaces.

The definition of space has been challenged within various disciplines. Quinn (2010: 449) argues that “space is not …some static absolute, devoid of effects or implications. It is constructed out of social relations which themselves are saturated with an integral dynamism”. When studying the everyday life, it becomes apparent that “space is not only a production of material components, but also a production of space which is affected by numerous factors such as place, material, culture, space and so forth (Bilgic, 2013). Anthropologists have argued that space is culturally and materially produced, and here architecture is viewed as one of the many artefacts produced culturally (Rendell, 2002).
The concept of space is fundamentally about the significance of location and spatial distribution, and the ways in which people organise and manage the spaces that we live in. Moreover, according to Maude (2013) spaces are structured perceived, managed and organised by people, and can therefore be designed and redesigned to achieve specific outcomes. According to Street and Coleman (2012: 8) in 1967 Foucault also made an argument that he argued that “space is not an empty void in which individuals and things are located but rather consists of multiple heterogeneous sites that are defined by their relationship to one another”.

**Gendered spaces**

Thus far the term ‘gendered spaces’ has been used without any definition, therefore what follows is a focus on what gendered spaces are and how different authors have conceptualised the term. The extensive work of feminist geographers on space and gender has enabled my engagement with the notions of how space turns out to be gendered across political and historical periods (Ardener, 1993; Bondi, 1993; Domosh and Seager, 2001; Grosz, 1995; Massey, 1994, 1999; McDowell, 1980, 1999; Valentine 1989, 1996). Gendered spaces should be understood less as geographically imposed by patriarchal structure but more as social processes of symbolic encoding and decoding (Blunt and Rose, 1994: 3).

A space that has been seen conventionally as male can consequently be re-configured as female (Quinn, 2010). Rendell (2002) notes that the issue of whether space is gendered and if it is, then how it is gendered, is a challenging one. “Specific places may be ‘sexed’ according to the biological sex of the people who occupy them, or gendered according to the ‘gender’ associated with the different kinds of activities which occur in them” (Rendell, 2002: 101). For instance, toilets can be ‘sexed’ male or female reason being they are utilised by men and women, although the kitchen in the domestic realm can be gendered feminine reason being cooking is socially associated with women.

Ardener (2002) argues that different spaces that are culturally allocated to men and women play a particular role in reinforcing, symbolising and maintaining gender relations. The gendering of spaces is dependent on continual transformation in conjunction with changes in social conventions and legislation. This is to say that the gendering of spaces happens over time. It is a gradual process because conventions and social attitudes do not change instantly and also it takes money and time to modify buildings in response to rising needs (Jarvis et al., 2009).
**Lefebvre’s spatial triad**

In *The production of space*, Lefebvre (1991: 11) noted that space can be categorised into three factors which are social, physical and mental. He made this classification due to his view of space as a living organism and analysed space production with those concepts (physical space, social space and mental space) that he created (van der Klashorst, 2013). In this research Lefebvre’s spatial triad has been adopted as a framework for understanding the urban fabric in Marshalltown from a more holistic perspective. This was especially helpful in observations. A three dimensional dialectic (termed trialectic) was established by Lefebvre. It is a concept in which three factors are interconnected dialectically. These factors are: material, social practice or spatial practice (derived from Marx); language, knowledge and thought or representations of space (derived from Hegel); and the creative, poetic act or spaces of representation (derived from Nietzsche) (van der Klashorst, 2013).

Schmid (2008: 29) noted that the three factors are in existent parallel to additional series of three concepts, and they are then doubly designated: *spatial practice, representations of space* and *representational space* on the one hand, and *perceived, conceived and lived space* on the other. The diagram below shows the relationship of the three factors. However, Lefebvre’s production of space as mentioned by van der Klashorst (2013) “has to be understood, not as a simple diagram, but rather as a contradictory, three-dimensional interaction through which social space is produced as a product as well as a medium”.

![Diagram of the produced social space triangle by Henri Lefebvre](image)

*Figure 6: The produced social space triangle by Henri Lefebvre. (Bilgic, 2013)*
Spatial practice/perceived space

This dimension includes mainly the spatial aspects that can be grasped by the senses such as tasting, hearing, seeing, touching and smelling (Bilgic, 2013). Lefebvre (1991: 38) notes that the spatial practice of society is "an interaction between daily reality and urban reality". However it is a paradoxical or dialectical connection, for the reason that there is inclusion of separation between the places it binds together. Spatial practice is also characterised as a perceived space which contains the interaction between daily routines and institutional environment. Furthermore, this space can be analysed, perceived and interpreted to unfold the spatial practice and competence of the society, however it can only be empirically evaluated (Lefebvre, 1991: 38).

Representations of space/conceived space

Representation of space can be defined as the space that is developed by cognition. This dimension is conceived as the space that is planned and organised, which refers to the space that is utilised by planners, urban designers, engineers and scientists to structure and conceptualise the city (van der Klashorst, 2013). According to Lefebvre (1991: 39) “space cannot be perceived without first being conceived”. Moreover, conceived space is a mode of production that is dominant in a society. This space is first planned and then produced by competent authorities in the form of discourse, signs, discourse, images, speech such as maps and plans and are part of social science (Heintzelman, 2009).

Representational space/Lived space

Carp (2008: 135) notes “the processes by which conceived space becomes built (or destroyed) and used (or avoided) are saturated within a third aspect of the conceptual triad” which is conceptualised as representational space. According to Heintzelman (2009) discerning representational space is difficult because it involves both mental and physical space. Lived space overlay physical space making use of its objects in a symbolic manner. Carp (2008: 135) notes that “rather than being identified primarily by physical features, representational space is recognized as a matter of lived experience where it is infused with meaning that cannot be adequately expressed without verbal, visual…symbolism”.

Furthermore, this kind of space may be described as the world as it is experienced by individuals in their everyday lives (Goonewardena et al, 2008: 40). Carp (2008) devised a
chart to understand in-depth space as conceptualised by Lefebvre, the chart is presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Aspects of triad (Physical Space/ Experience)</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Human being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Spatial Practice</td>
<td>Routes, destinations, wayfinding, modes of transport</td>
<td>My body/ Your body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived space</td>
<td>Smelling, seeing, hearing, tasting, touching, moving, attending, dissociating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>Representations of Space</td>
<td>Plans, discourses, concepts, methods, models, theories, academic disciplines</td>
<td>My mind/ Your mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceived space</td>
<td>Thinking, reflecting, systematizing, ideating, imagining, interpreting, measuring, categorizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Representational space</td>
<td>Home, graveyard, festival, family farm, office, public movement, nature, bed</td>
<td>My direct experience/ Your direct experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lived space</td>
<td>Living “in the moment” loving, feeling, creating, witnessing, finding intersubjectivity, joining in, recognizing limits, remembering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Breakdown of the Conceived, Perceived, and Lived Layers of Space. Source: Carp (2008)

**Safety and security**

From early childhood, both boys and girls are socialised by society to conform to the different expectations placed on their spatial use. “Girl children are socialised off the street through an implanted fear of men, by restrictions on street games and activities and by an emphasis on activities that concern grace rather than speed”. Soon these girls learn to take up space that is as little as possible, while boys on the other hand learn that they can prove their ‘boyness’ by taking up as much space as possible, mainly outside on the street (Boys, 1984: 41, cited in Little, 1994: 62).
The importance of women’s safety and security in cities across the globe is now recognised widely. For many years the words safety and security have been used interchangeably. However, other authors such as Brady et al. (1990) began debating that these words are independent and have different meanings. However, in many languages there is only one word for safety and security. Some of the examples include French where the word is 'sécurité', in German it is 'Sicherheit' and in Italian it is 'sicurezza' (Byres and Cusimano, 2010). The Latin root of safety ‘saluses’ literally means uninjured and security originates from the Latin word ‘securus’; ‘se’-without, ‘cara’ – care, - ‘securus’ which means free from care. According to Albrechtsen (2003) safety and security are both conditions where an individual is well protected and without risks.

Albrechtsen (2003: 1) defines safety as protection against incidents that are random. These random incidents are unwanted incidents that occur on account of one or more coincidences. On the other hand security is defined as protection against incidents that are intended. These intended incidents are wanted incidents that take place due to deliberate and planned acts.

UN-Habitat (2008) conducted a global assessment of women’s safety and this was done because safety has different meanings in different areas and contexts. The results of this assessment revealed that women’s safety involves safe spaces, self-worth, financial security and autonomy, freedom from poverty. Furthermore, women’s safety is concerned with practices, strategies and policies that aim to decrease gender-based violence, as well as fear of crime by women.

Security as a concept is both challenging and complex. The use of security only makes sense when it is attached to a specific discipline, a group or context. For Ceccato (2012: 3) “security is a social construct which is produced and reproduced by individuals, their actions and interventions in everyday life”. Furthermore, a definition of safety can be expanded to mean a state of being protected against “planned, malicious and criminal incidents from a wide range of threats, where what is protected is all kinds of values to an organisation/individual and incidents happen due to the wish for a wanted output/consequence for the attacker.” (Albrechtsen, 2003: 7). The table summarises the differences between security and safety and it demonstrates the dynamics that make the two concepts differ. This distinction is important for this research because it is essential to have an in-depth understanding of the degrees of safety and security that the shelter can provide women with, within their scope/mandate of shelter and services provision. The table below outlines some of the elements that differentiate security and safety.
Intersectionality

Intersectionality is a concept devised by American critical legal race scholar Kimberle Crenshaw which underscores the multifaceted nature of marginalised subjects’ lived experiences. Intersectionality emerged in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Nash, 2008). However, intersectionality has been interpreted in various ways, some discussed it as a theory, paradigm, methodology or framework. Scholars across different fields, which include anthropology, feminist studies, political sciences and sociology have drawn on intersectionality in order to challenge injustices and advance social justice. Furthermore, intersectionality is a crucial theme that emerged in recent feminist theorising which is highlighted by post-structural emphasis on fluid and multiple identities and identifications (Jarvis et al., 2009).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causes</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An incident is most often a result of one person or a group’s will</td>
<td>An incident is most often a result of human behaviour in combination with the environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes</td>
<td>Often planned actions</td>
<td>Often unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes</td>
<td>Criminal acts</td>
<td>Criminal acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes</td>
<td>Mainly malicious acts</td>
<td>Seldom, if ever, malicious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes</td>
<td>Mainly deliberate acts with a wish of a wanted output/consequence of the act.</td>
<td>Mainly deliberate acts without a wish of a wanted output and accidental incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats/hazards</td>
<td>External and internal human threats</td>
<td>Internal human threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats/hazards</td>
<td>Threats are not always observable, tangible and proximate</td>
<td>Hazards are observable, tangible and proximate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss</td>
<td>Loss is mainly related to physical assets and information</td>
<td>Loss is related to human injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surroundings</td>
<td>Reflects the state of society through its structures, economical situation, law-abidingness and moral</td>
<td>Includes physical and environmental conditions – not only humans and society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>High degree of uncertainty and low degree of knowledge about threats within</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This practice has also been adopted by policymakers, community organizers and human rights activists in search of better approaches in confronting intricate social issues (Hankivsky, 2014). Intersectionality aims to advance an understanding of human beings as shaped by the interplay of various social locations such as ethnicity, gender, class, sexuality, geography, age, race and religion. These interactions happen within a context of connected systems and structures of power such as laws, policies, states, government, religious institutions and media.

Through processes such as these, interdependent forms of oppression and privilege are produced (Hankivsky, 2014). Within the term itself, notions of difference and diversity are suggested, not least in terms of a culturally diverse understanding of what equality means (Jarvis et al., 2009). The difference that is crucial between this approach and previous approaches to identify interconnectedness and contextualisation is a conscious effort to map multiple geometries and discriminations of oppression (Valentine, 2007 in Jarvis et al., 2009). “From this perspective, axes of difference are construed as ways of ‘doing’ contingent and discontinuous identities through ‘clash, conflict, disagreement…and dispute’” (Jarvis et al., 2009: 92).

**Androcentrism**

Modern cities and urban lived experiences to a large extent are man-made, shaped by design and planning cultures that are androcentric and by centuries of division of gender and conflict (Jarvis et al., 2009). Early city planning especially in the industrial European and North American cities focused on spatially separating residential areas from sites of industry, commerce and government. These residential areas were mostly designed for women (not by women) to display their feminine skills of home making (Jarvis et al., 2009). Androcentrism refers to the way in which individuals and cultures are evaluated based on male standards, values and perspectives (Hibbs, 2014). Jarvis et al., (2009) also defines androcentrism (male centred world view) is defined as being focused or centred on men, often neglecting their female counterparts.

**Ethnocentrism**

William Graham Sumner first coined the term ethnocentrism in 1906. He discussed the concept of between group fighting in this writing. His belief was that warfare evolution was due to ethnocentrism and xenophobia. Furthermore, every person that is born into a certain
culture is taught the ways of living which include customs, values, language, and beliefs. In many instances it is inevitable that attitudes such as these be adopted as normal.

Ethnocentrism is defined as the act of judging a different culture from one’s own perspective (Bizumic, 2014). Consequently, another culture is regarded as inferior when compared to one’s own (Atingdui, 2011). Jarvis et al, (2009) defines ethnocentrism as the observer/author’s tendency to view the world from a cultural standpoint that is their own and then to have a belief that their own culture is superior to that of other groups.

From an ethnocentrism point of view there is a tendency to use one’s culture as the standard by which other cultures are judge and evaluated. This can lead to biases in research processes, therefore certain studies can be criticised as for having ethnocentric bias (Cherry, 2015). Being a black, Sotho female who is also Christian the challenge arose in terms of being neutral and avoiding cultural bias. Growing up the struggle has always been choosing which cultural practices were appropriate to take part in as a Christian, however being from a traditional family that is also Christian the view has always been that no side (religion or tradition) is better than the other thus no reason to choose between the two. This has been helpful in focusing on the faith-based shelter organisation (UMWS) because there is no danger of looking at the shelter from a faith-based point of view and disregarding other views on shelters.

**Theoretical and analytical approaches**

Jansen (2005) argues that theories that are generalised will always be reductionist in form; nonetheless they are valuable tools that can be used to comprehend complex ‘realities’. The current issues related to shelters focus on a wide variety of issues; these include shelter operation, design, funding, policy and rising need for shelters. This research aims to add a spatial dynamic to the existing body of work on shelters. This will also be done by employing a lens of intersectionality. Intersectionality aims to advance an understanding of human beings as shaped by the interplay of various social locations such as ethnicity, gender, class, sexuality, geography, age, race and religion. This will help understand the shelter users’ perception of safety from their individual experiences as a non-homogenous group. The theoretical perspective of feminism provide broader perspective in understanding gendered spaces. “While feminist analysis recognises both that representations may be gendered and that gender is itself a form of representation, the emphasis accorded to representations of
gender and space is a matter of feminist debate” (Rendell, 2002: 104). Feminist researchers have throughout time concerned themselves with these representations.

The other theoretical perspective which also relates to the reasons why women need shelters and their safety thereof is based on the theory of structuration by Anthony Giddens. In “The Constitution of Society” (1984), Giddens argues that structure is both the medium and outcome of action. Theoretically, the focus for Giddens is on understanding the human agency and social institutions (Burnett, 2012). Additionally, the theory of structuration is useful in providing a more specific way of understanding the impact of social structure on women’s experiences of safety in shelters. Both theoretical perspectives give emphasis to the link between structure and agency. For example the issue of safety may be seen as an individual state and the relation to the psychological needs in order for one to feel safe but on the other hand safety might be seen by others as relating to the social constructions that make the individual feel safe or not safe (Burnett, 2012).

As mentioned above there is a broad spectrum of debates on shelters including shelters for women. Therefore, different authors have focused on different issues that relate to women-only shelters and some of these include research on: Sheltering women in crisis (Bridgman, 2002), models of shelters (Dobash and Dobash, 1992), gender-sensitive urban planning (UN-Habitat, 2008) and Gender-responsive shelters (Bayes and Brewin, 2012). Bayes and Brewin (2012) explain how experiences that different women have had influenced them and continue doing so in their perception of privacy and protection.

Some women who have been in close contact with the social services or the criminal justice system have had experiences whereby the authority invades their privacy as a form of protection. However, some women have become acclimatized to being protected by external intervention and thus feel safe when there is close scrutiny. Contradictory to this other women have been stalked and their privacy was violated therefore being scrutinized by the authorities might be problematic for them (Bayes and Brewin, 2012). Thus, in light of all this Bayes and Brewin (2012) use the term “institutionalisation” to describe the phenomenon in which women become habituated to surveillance and end up not feeling safe without it.

There is limited research in South Africa on the safety of shelters for women from a spatial point of view. This research aims to contribute to the existing body of work by focusing on the spatial perspective of shelters and the impact thereof on safety and security. However authors such as Park et al. (2000), Wright (2005), Bhana et al. (2012) and Mhlanga (2011)
draw attention to the subject of shelters in South Africa by focusing on their history, purposes and policies developed by the state but do not deal much with spatial aspects. This research is guided by the feminist theoretical perspective. Thus, it is acknowledged that women are not a homogeneous group and therefore their safety and security needs will differ significantly.

This research is structured around the unique experiences of South Africa based on gender, power relations, religion, tradition and race. These factors affect how women choose shelters and how they feel about these shelters. Furthermore, safety and security too often influence the women’s decision in choosing their desired shelters. Bayes and Brewin (2012) note that in considerations of women more often considerations are reduced to safety, security and safe places. But according to them there is more than that. For instance, ensuring cultural and emotional safety is one of the significant aspects of safety. This is what I also argue in the research report, based on the South African experience one of the most important aspects of safety extend to the issue of culture and tradition. The table below demonstrates the relationship between the above mentioned themes.

**Summary of the themes, (2015)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelter</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>space</th>
<th>Safety and security</th>
<th>intersectionality</th>
<th>Androcentrism</th>
<th>Ethnocentrism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women-only shelter</td>
<td>Shelter cannot exist without its space</td>
<td>Women’s experiences of safety within the shelter space</td>
<td>Women of various background have differing experiences of the shelter</td>
<td>UMWS was designed by men even though the space is now for women</td>
<td>Shelters were mainly started in the Western countries and many are not context specific in non-Western countries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| gender | The aim of this research is to find out how one | Women might have different experiences of safety around the urban fabric just outside the confines of the | Different women are defined by different identities such as culture, race and background | Different cultures have different understanding of gender and the researcher should not |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>concept shapes the other</th>
<th>shelter</th>
<th>only pose his/hers as accurate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>space</td>
<td>Similar to 'gender'</td>
<td>The different dynamics of spaces such as design, uses, and maintenance can determine whether or not a space is safe for its users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Similar to 'shelter'</td>
<td>Cities were historically designed by men, even spaces for women. For instance the Old Pass Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER THREE

Introduction

This research only uses the qualitative research method and is explorative in nature. The focus of this chapter mainly outlines the approach, research design and process, as well as data collection strategies based on the research theoretical and conceptual framework. Furthermore, the rationale for choosing the case study will be discussed.

Research design in this context refers to the procedures and plans that lead to the achievement of the study’s aims. Qualitative research has an in-depth encounter with the participants, with the use of a small number of cases and it is also flexible thus allowing the researcher to make changes if required. Qualitative research approach is often a non-numerical way of investigating the underlying meaning of various phenomena (Mohamed, 2011). The aim of qualitative research is to comprehend a given research topic or problem from the involved local population’s perspectives. Moreover, qualitative research is particularly effective in attaining culturally specific information about the opinions, values, social contexts and behaviours of specific populations (Mack et al., 2011).

In this research there is a combination of observations, interviews, photographs and archives relating to the case study, as well as Welmar Thulile Mhlanga’s research report for her Social Work degree titled “Shelter as a place of safety for women who suffer abuse at home: The case of Usindiso Shelter for abused women and their children” whereby interviews found in the report were also adopted by the researcher. The combination of these strategies is used in an attempt to provide empirical evidence to describe the way in which the spatiality of shelters impact on women’s experiences of safety and security. The case study which is used to answer the research question is Usindiso Ministries, which provides an opportunity to understand the relationship between space and gender and how one might affect the other.

Different analytical methods can be used in different ways to inform effective design, development and management processes. There has been difficulty in finding similar empirical research done by scholars on shelters to find how the shelters’ spatial dynamics might have an impact on the use of the shelter and women’s experiences of safety or even place meaning (the individual’s unique feelings and experiences of space (Genereux et al., 1983)). However, many studies are based on environmental psychology which attempts to describe how the built form influences behaviour, such scholars include Dovey’s “Framing
Places: Mediating Power in Built Form” (2008). The methods employed in such studies mostly employ direct observations and space syntax analysis. Boys’ (2009) paper titled “Playing with (in) difference? 30 years of gender and space” explores how feminist conceptualisations of space and gender have been articulated and re-articulated over the period of thirty years.

The research is carried out through the use of the case study strategy which explores women’s experiences of safety within the spaces in which the shelter is located. This was mostly achieved by conducting interviews, but also through observation strategy. Time was taken to observe the use of spaces within the urban fabric in order to better understand the gendering of spaces process through personal experience. The primary aim of this study is to describe the gendering of spaces and women’s experiences of safety within those spaces.

The process of understanding the case study.

![Diagram of the case study process](image)

Figure 9: The process taken to discern the best possible outcomes for the research project. (Adapted from Khoza, 2014)

Case study

Case studies are utilised when doing holistic and in-depth investigations. The reason behind using a case study is to have understanding of an individual, a group of people or a system in great depth (Skivington, 2012). Schell (1992) notes that the case study is the most flexible research design strategy, because it enables the researcher to preserve the holistic traits of the real events and settings, while investigating empirical events. Consequently, the case study is described as an empirical study that is aimed at the investigation of a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context (Schell, 1992: 2). Furthermore, the need for the use of
case studies emerges out of the desire to comprehend social phenomena that are complex. Briefly, the case study as a research method permits investigators to maintain the holistic and significant characteristics of real life events such as neighbourhood change, small group behaviour and individual life cycles (Yin, 2009). The questions starting with “how”, “who” and “why” are more exploratory and likely to lead to the usage of case study as an ideal research method strategy. Moreover, the case study research is suitable for the investigation of events that occur in a contemporary context (Yin, 2009). Case study research is an empirical investigation, in a sense that it is based on experience and knowledge, or more practically the analysis and collection of data.

Case studies are selective and focus on a single issue or problem. The researcher gathers wide-ranging data on an individual, programme or company of study (Feagin, et al., 1991; Leedy and Ormrod, 2005). There is an aim to provide an analysis that is smaller based on the number of cases, in this research only one case will be employed. There are six sources where evidence for the case study may come from, these include: interviews, observations (participant and non-participant), archival records, physical artefacts and documents. The benefits of using case studies are that they provide high contrast validity, in-depth insights and establish a connection with research subjects (Todes, 2015). The limitation of the study area to a small number of units allows the researcher to look in depth at a topic of interest or phenomenon (Farquhar, 2012). Noor (2008) notes that flexibility in application is offered by the case study which is more sensitive to the complexities of the social phenomena.

Eysenck (2004) noted that the results of a case study tend to be unreliable or limited due to the smaller sample size. Furthermore, there are difficulties with regards to generalising from one case study to another. Neale et al. (2006) also argue that case studies are prone to overgeneralisation which is linked to selecting a few samples and assuming without proof that they represent the entire population. The researcher thus needs to take care in drawing appropriate conclusions from a case study. The researcher can experience stress during the research due to the labour intensive nature of case studies. Furthermore, Schell (1992) argues that case studies tend to be biased compared to other research. Darke et al. (1998) note that the rigorousness of the process used to attain the required results and the validity of the findings is time consuming which may affect the research time frame at hand. This might result in difficulties with obtaining the correct information and therefore affect the case findings.
Rationale for the chosen case study

The Usindiso Ministries is a shelter in 80 Albert Street, Marshalltown, Johannesburg and it was chosen as a case study due to its location and historical background. The shelter occupies a four storey red-brick building that was once known as Albert Street Pass Office. It was dominated by males but today it is occupied by women and their children. This is an example of the gendering of space from masculine to feminine through changed usage. In this research Lefebvre’s (1991: 11) notion of space is adopted; He conceptualises space as an entity that is inherently political which is firmly interconnected to power and hegemony. For Lefebvre space is a notion that is both mental and physical, nonetheless it is deeply entrenched in the existing mode of production. Therefore, gendered spaces are spaces which are deemed male or female either by division of space, cultural norms or socialisation of space within each society. Moreover, Bazylevych (2010: 3) notes that “gendered space is the culturally and materially embedded repertoire of the appropriate gender roles that create frames (porous, not rigid) within which women construct and negotiate their identities”.

The Central Pass Office was opened in 1954 as the Non-European Affairs Department to enforce the apartheid control measures such as the Pass Laws of 1952. Under apartheid the Central Pass Office situated at 80 Albert Street was a key checkpoint of the influx control system. In the 1960s the building was enlarged extensively in order to further accommodate the scaling-up and intensification of influx control (Usindiso Ministries, 2015). The building stood empty for some time as a result of the collapse of the pass system in the mid-1980s. During the early 1990s the building was occupied by the Transvaal Provincial Administration (Usindiso Ministries, 2015). However, in 1994 the building was reopened and converted into a shelter. The listing of the building on the Johannesburg Heritage List represents its historical importance. In July 2007 the City of Johannesburg Department of Arts, Culture and Heritage declared the building at 80 Albert Street a Heritage Site (City of Johannesburg, 2007).

The building is one of the historical buildings that epitomize the way in which everyday forms have shifted, reoriented and endured post-apartheid (Heritage Portal, 2013). In 2003 Usindiso Ministries took over the running of the shelter and Chief Executive Jay Bradley runs the shelter. She has been involved in the shelter since 2001. The building was extended to include both the first and second floors, the shelter’s use of the building was extended into additional existing parts of the building. The first floor is allocated to abused women and
their children and the second floor is allocated to displaced women and their children respectfully. Each floor with the building is registered to accommodate sixty women and their children. This separation is necessary because the two groups of women are affected different needs and their therapy needs differ (Usindiso Ministries, 2006). Women and their children are provided with basic requirements which include accommodation, toiletries, clothing and nappies. Furthermore, the services rendered by the shelter range from skills training, individual and group counselling, daily devotion, to assist the women in securing grant applications, applying for identity documents and finding work (Mhlanga, 2011). The women are referred to the shelter by nearby hospitals, the police and other institutions.

**Observations**

Observations are essential in that they provide the researcher with direct experience and comprehension of a space (Canter, 1977). Rasouli (2013) notes that observation of a space results in in discovering how it is utilised, rather than how a designer predicts and thinks how it ought to be used. According to Gillespie Michelson (2011) there are two types of observation and these are participant and non-participant. In terms of Participation observation the researcher acts as a participant and puts himself/herself in the participant’s shoes to experience more or less the same phenomena as the subjects. On the other hand non-participant observation encompasses visual concentration on the contact between individual activities and their physical traces without the observer being an insider. “These observations could be organized by recording types of activities through notes, photographing, mapping, or a combination of these techniques” (Rasouli, 2013).

According to Jacobs (1985: 7) as a primary enquiry and analysis method, observation lost favour among researchers reason being that it is thought “to be too subjective as a basis for serious action compared to more quantifiable, statistically oriented data ….professionals and academics are often uncomfortable with findings based on observation rather on “hard data” and yet so much of what they speak of concerns what they have seen”. However, observation method is essential in research and could be utilised as a starting point because it “helps recall other places, thus triggering ideas about possible ways to bring about desirable change” (Jacobs 1985, 8).

The aim of using this method is to gain better knowledge of the relationship between space and gender pertaining to Usindiso Ministries shelter. The focus will be mainly on perceived and lived spaces as described by Lefebvre. The researcher observed the activities around and
within the shelter while volunteering on a daily basis to gain a better understanding of the space. The researcher volunteered at the shelter for a month as a form of personal experience and feeling the space. Limitations of this method include the fact that data collection can be time consuming (Todes, 2015).

**Observing the perceived space**

Every neighbourhood has its own character or identity and this can contribute to the user feeling safe or unsafe in that space. Buildings also play an important role by giving the user a functional service as well as aiding in the creation of the neighbourhood’s character and identity through the aesthetics and the way in which they are maintained (Heintzelman, 2009). It was within the scope of this research to describe the spatial aspects of UMWS that can be seen or discerned through the senses. This included observations around the space in order to describe the neighbourhood’s physical aspects and in particular the aesthetic layout and quality of the built environment. Analysis of the built form in much of the literature focused on making commentaries that are personal on the attributes of the environment as well as how people conceptualise, visualise and ultimately comprehend the city (Moudon, 1992: 339).

The observation of the built form was based on the observer’s orientation within the space; that is the technique used to locate where the researcher was at all times. Orientation was described by Kevin Lynch as “the sense of clear relation of the observer with the city and its parts, and with the larger world around it. In the simplest sense it may be taken as knowing where one is at any time, and how to reach any other part,” (Banerjee et al, 1990, 135).

Overall, observing the physical identity of the space helped the researcher gain better understanding. Feeling safe in a space is part of having a sense of belonging, inclusion, and ease which in some part stems instinctively from familiarity and history, on the other hand reinforced by physical aspects (Banerjee et al, 1990, 138).

**Observing the lived space**

Observing the lived space is important in this research as it gives clues of the way in which the space is gendered and appropriated. The community interactions within the neighbourhood gave insights regarding how the space is used (everyday life). The clues that were found within the space were analysed using a structured method of observation. The use of a structured method of observation was important because it provided distinctive and
clearly outlined clues to focus on within the neighbourhood. This method of study was also adopted by Allen Jacobs to observe the neighbourhood. His strategy included identifying particular aspects of the built environment and explaining the meaning with relation to the community (Heintzelman, 2009). Certain clues such as street, commercial areas and buildings were classified and categorised by Jacobs and then ordered according to frequency and visibility. Photograph documentation has been utilised in the findings section because as Lefebvre (1999: 35) noted “man does not live by words alone”. Thus, images are important in order to help the reader gain an insight and better understanding of the space that is being investigated. There are limitations in language and it can restrain and limit the researcher’s explanations of what is being observed within the space. This means that, the researcher will employ sketches and graphic presentation of the observed spaces to enhance the explanation of what was observed in and around the space.

**Interviews**

Interviews were used to explore the views and experiences unique to the individuals. The interviews are aimed at shelter staff members, Lisa Vetten (gender and violence against women expert) and Hilton Judin (architect and involved in studying the building) to better understand how they conceptualise or understand the link between space and gender. Issues the researcher wanted to explore included: what design principles are applied to ensure that the women and children who use the shelter feel safe? Are there other methods such as Crime prevention through environmental design principles that can be used to effectively make women feel safe or is safety a subjective notion which will only depend on the woman and her previous experiences in life. The interviews were mainly semi-structured. This method was chosen because there is room for the interviewer and interviewee to diverge in order to pursue an issue or responses in more detail (Britten, 2007). The flexibility of this method allows for the researcher to discover issues that might be of particular importance to the interviewees in relation to the research topic.

**Population**

Population refers to all the elements that meet certain criteria which are included in a study (Burns and Grove, 2003:43). Furthermore, for Best and Kahn (2003: 12) and Mouton (2002: 134) population is a group or collection of individuals that have some characteristics that are of the researcher’s interest. The population of this study consists of three shelter operators who were chosen due to availability and most of all their knowledge of the shelter.
and the surroundings or the neighbourhood. They also work closely with the women and might know what their perceptions of safety are within the neighbourhood. Lisa Vetten (WiSER) was chosen because her knowledge in gender through her works as a gender activist. She is also a Senior Researcher and Political analyst for the Tshwaranang Legal Advocacy Centre to end violence against women. She has also worked as Manager of the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation's gender programme; as well as being the member of the Shukumisa Campaign. Hilton Judin is an architect and a curator; who is also involved in the project called Ordinary Apartheid: Exploring 80 Albert Street which researches the history and the current use of the building (Heritage Portal, 2013). Throughout the selection process it was important for the researcher to select the key informants that would be able the shed optimum light on the issue being investigated.

A sample is a subset of population which is carefully selected to take part in a research study (Mbokane, 2009). This research is based on the purposive sampling technique. According to Hashim et al. (2015) “purposive sampling is virtually synonymous with qualitative research.” Purposive sampling characterizes a collection of diverse non-probability sampling techniques. Purposive sampling technique also tends to rely on the researcher’s judgement when it comes to the selection of units such as cases, people, events or organisations that are to be studied.

The first step identified in purposive sampling is to determine the selection criteria used for case selection (Brandt, 2011). The specifications for this case study included the type of shelter; it had to serve women only or with their children. The location had to be an example of a gendered space. Finally it had to be in a location that is easily accessible for the purpose of interviewing and observation.

The second step in the technique of purposive sampling is determining the type of sampling method to be employed. The sampling types that are common in purposive sampling technique include: unique, typical, convenience, maximum variation and snowball or chain sampling (Brandt, 2011). The sampling used in this research is the snowball or chain technique because it involves the location of relevant experts or organisations that have knowledge about the research topic at hand. Given this research project’s goal to understand the gendering of spaces in Johannesburg and women’s perceptions of safety and security, the following criteria were identified as being important for selecting participants for the case study. First, the participants had to have knowledge about the relationship between space and
gender (this is through their research and field of work). Second, the participants need to be within an easy reach for interview purposes.

**Data collection**

Observation method was utilised in this research. The researcher volunteered at the shelter before commencing with data collection. The aim of volunteering at the shelter was to gain more knowledge and experience the space personally on a daily basis for a month. Moreover, the intention of this strategy was to be familiar with the space and form relationships with the staff members. The development of a trusting rapport with the key informants was a fundamental basis for the interview process but one that required time. However, the request to volunteer and do the research at the shelter was sent via email to the shelter management explaining also the underlying research project. Therefore, the research was conducted with permission.

Interviews were conducted at times suitable to the respondents. They were face to face interactions. This allowed the researcher to have close interaction with the respondent and assist in building a trusting environment. The information shared by the key informants has been recorded by means of transcribing verbatim. However, this was laborious as the researcher was compelled to listen to the interview over and over again in order to record the exact words of the respondents. During the earlier stages of research the data from the interviews was analysed and enabled the researcher to refine the interview questions. The later stages involved exploring key themes that resonated from the responses given by the key informants. Then, data from the interviews was decoded and compared to the literature so that key themes and concepts from the literature could assist in interpreting the data. This enabled the researcher to understand better the role that different ‘contexts’ play when it comes to the same concepts or issues.

As part of her Social Work degree, Welmar Thulile Mhlanga carried out a research study with UMWS as a case study in 2011. The research title was “Shelter as a place of safety for women who suffer abuse at home: The case of Usindiso Shelter for abused women and their children”. This study was useful for this research because it reflected the women’s experiences that the researcher could not personally investigate because of the ethical constraints in interviewing the women. As a result, the research findings of Mhlanga’s study are adopted and are taken to be representative of current issues and conditions.
**Ethical considerations**

The researcher acknowledges that the case at hand is of a sensitive nature, therefore all ethical considerations are taken into account. Ethical consideration include the way in which the researcher relates to the informants, the issues regarding methodologies and the way in information gathered is used (Mohamed, 2011).

For this research formal letters was sent to the key informants to request permission to interview them. This included the relevant information regarding the research purpose. All participants were also given the option to withdraw from the interview if they wished to do so. This is particularly important when dealing with a sensitive matter such as sheltering women. The researcher also notified the interviewees that participation is voluntary, and they have the rights to opt for anonymity. A consent form was given to the participants to sign in order to have evidence of their informed consent to participate in the study. The researcher will not be talking to the residents themselves because most of them are going through processes of healing and therapy and the questions asked might trigger negative emotions and thus affect their healing process. This is also due to the resources limited to the researcher. The researcher had no contacts of the experts necessary to contact should women being interviewed need them.

**Limitations**

The case study method was chosen due to the opportunities it presented to understand the space from a spatial point of view as is necessary in urban planning. It is an appropriate method for certain situations, as long as it is done carefully and its results used appropriately. Moreover, this method is criticised for containing biased views as it is fairly easy for the researcher to influence the findings in the way that suits their personal biases and beliefs (Yin, 1994). It would have been desirable to interview shelter residents, but this posed ethical complexities due to the women’s backgrounds and situations the very reason they were in the shelter suggested some emotional trauma and psychological distress. As an Honours level researcher with a short timeframe for the study the requirements for getting ethical clearance, appropriate preparation for sensitive discussions etc. the only option was to talk to those around and involved in the shelter, hence selection of interviewees. But unbeknownst to the researcher some of the staff members initially got involved with the shelter as residents and later became staff members even though they still reside in the shelter, so they also spoke about their experiences as women staying in the shelter.
As a young, black female the research had its own advantages and disadvantages. The first few visits to the shelter were uncomfortable because the researcher was made to feel as an outsider. The assumption is that there are issues with safety because it is a women’s shelter, therefore safety has to be their first priority. The researcher walked every day to the site and most women experience cat calling by males in the city and sometimes it gets extreme to a point where they start touching the female in question. Thus, the researcher’s dress code had to be of a certain standard (not too tight or revealing) and time spent at the site was limited due to safety hazards of walking in the evening alone as a female. In order to gain the shelter’s trust the researcher worked at the crèche every day until late in the afternoon, the children were fed and dishes were washed immediately after and when the lady who runs the crèche had to be somewhere else the children were taken care of by the researcher because she usually works alone and cannot leave the children by themselves.

The more time was spent at the shelter the easier it was for the shelter staff to open up and trust me. Sharing information about the researcher also helped especially in casual conversations during the day. Nevertheless, it was more difficult for almost all the key informants to trust the researcher with information regarding the shelter and women’s issues, this is because the issue of shelters is very sensitive and complex. However, there were no language barriers and the respondents asked questions for clarification whenever the question was unclear to them or the choice of words used in the question. It was difficult getting information from the other staff members who reside at the shelter because of their fear of jeopardising their accommodation.

The task of walking alone in the space that has multiple orderings can be difficult and dangerous. During observations, the researcher started to notice the tensions within the neighbourhood. This is a neighbourhood where there is a clear juxtaposition of order and disorder. That is, the clear spatial and social distinctions between the spaces that fall within the Main Marshall City Improvement District where street are clean and well-kept and the people that socialise and interact within the space are of upper and middle class. On the other hand the rest of the spaces are not well kept, have noise pollution and illegal activities take place on a daily basis and people that socialise in the space are considered to be of lower class (it should be noted that these observation are within the site boundary where observations took place).
On the last day of observations the researcher went with one of the male staff members to take photographs around the site and the focus was on the streets and buildings. However, the researcher was not informed about the building near the shelter so there was commotion when a picture of the building was taken. The men who were sitting outside the building started swearing at and approaching the researcher with stones in a violent manner and the situation was dissolved by the staff member who talked to the men. It was later found that the building is a high-jacked building and over the past year attempts have been made to evict the residents because of the living conditions and the drugs being sold.

The researcher continued to walk around and take pictures even after this incident but encountered the security guards who requested that pictures should not be taken around the area and this was the whole site for this research. When asked why that is, the security guard said that the researcher had to speak to management but he was not sure where one had to go to get access of the people in management, thus he wanted to call his supervisor. Even though photographs were not taken after that the ones that were taken before were kept and not deleted. It was difficult as well to secure interviews with experts and this slowed down the progression of the research project.
CHAPTER FOUR

Findings and analysis

The key informants associated with the shelter provided the researcher with insightful information on how the spatial aspects of shelters have a direct impact on their experiences of using the shelter services as well as their perceptions of women’s experiences of safety within the space where the shelter is located. The other informants in different professional fields provided direct insights into how the shelter’s spatial aspects and gender relate to each other including other issues such as safety that have an impact on the shelter.

The researcher also employed the observation method to observe the use of spaces within the urban fabric in order to better understand the process of gendering of spaces through personal experience and trace the socialisation of space (if it does exist at all) whereby some spaces are deemed appropriate for women, that is spaces which are appropriate for women to go to. Spaces studied here included the semi-private spaces of the neighbourhood and public spaces. Formal and informal findings will be presented as well.

Data organisation

There were two sets of data for this research, therefore data was organised into two sections (representational space/lived space and representations of space/conceived space) and then subdivided into themes:

- Shelter staff’s perceptions under representational space/lived space section
- Experts’ views under representations of space/conceived section

Dividing the findings from the interviews into two sections was necessary because the key informants had different experiences of UMWS precinct and their insights had to be relevant to their experiences. The reason for classifying the shelter staff members under the section of representational space/lived space is due to the fact that they have a lived experience of the space. Therefore the questions were mainly focused on their everyday lives and their perceptions of women’s experiences of this everyday life in terms of safety. According to van der Klashorst (2013: 69) in relation to the lived space “the resulting material reality has the ability to convey meaning, therefore it is a symbolic dimension of space, or a process of signification, rather than physical space itself”. Lefebvre (1991: 33) describes the lived space as complex, for example through history churches were built and conceived as
representational spaces of power and religious gathering, as such UMWS is conceived as a representational space of restoration, healing and safety (as stipulated by the key informants). Thus, the shelter staff member are in a better position to give their insights regarding this section and their experiences of the space might give an in-depth understanding of gendered spaces in Marshalltown. The researcher also included the study by Mhlanga (2011) to record the female residents’ experiences of safety within the space.

On the other hand the experts were more suitable to be classified under the conceived space because they did not have much lived experience with the shelter. Representations of space is thought of as the space that is planned and organised, which refers to the space that is utilised by planners, urban designers, engineers and scientists to structure and conceptualise the city (van der Klashorst, 2013). Lisa Vetten and Hilton Judin were in a better position to give insights on how they understand the space from their respective fields. The experts had stated that they have only been at the shelter several times and had no in-depth lived experience of the site and its everyday life. The insights from the interviews with the experts mainly focussed on their professional knowledge in relation to their respective fields, as well as how they deciphered, understood and analysed the space.

The shelter manager Pastor Bradley was interviewed as well because it became apparent that the other staff members did not have sufficient information about the shelter and some were a bit sceptical about providing information because of fear of compromising their accommodation. The concerns of theirs raised questions about the women’s perceptions of the stability of their accommodation. The experts (Hilton Judin, and Lisa Vetten) interviewed using the same set of questions with additional questions relating to their field of interest.

**The site (how the current spatial context of UMWS is understood and experienced)**

The study area is located in Marshalltown; focusing will be on the Usindiso Ministries Women’s Shelter and its surrounds. The shelter occupies a four storey; red-brick building that was once Albert Street Pass Office situated in 80 Albert Street. By way of background to the area, Henry Brown Marshall requested a town planner named Kidger Tucker on the 27th of September 1886 to draw up a plan for a new residential area in Johannesburg. In October 1886 the plan was then laid out and Troye, Commissioner, Ferreira, Cornelius and Albert Street were among the street names on the plan; all these streets are still in existence today (Main Marshall, 2015).
Pastor Bradley noted that she has been running the shelter for thirteen years and she was there two years before that under the previous shelter operators (Bradley, 04 September 2015).

This map illustrates the location of the shelter in relation to the greater context of Johannesburg.
This map locates the shelter (Green outline) in relation to the Main Marshall Improvement District (Main Marshall, 2015).

EVERYDAY LIFE AS A MODE OF PRODUCING A GENDERED SPACE

Representational space/lived space (shelter staff member’s perceptions)

The interviews carried out at UMWS focused on three staff members working at the shelter who were: Pastor Jay Bradley who runs the shelter and was helped by Shann (surname not
given) who was not officially part of the interview; Charmaine Coetzee (a shelter resident as well) who takes care of the crèche and looks after the children; and the lady who opted to be Anonymous and volunteers as well at the shelter (she is also a resident). The interviews intended to gather information on their lived experiences as well as the staff members’ perceptions of women’s experiences of safety. The two staff members who are residents at the shelter and also started off as displaced women who needed shelter gave insights on preventing displacement and how to best shelter abused women based on their experiences.

The staff members participated in semi-structured interviews which were approximately thirty minutes to one hour in length and the interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. This section presents the analysis of the interviews and is divided into themes which are: conceptualising the shelter; attitudes about gender and space; relationships within the neighbourhood; Safe haven: Women’s safety and responsibility (including safety measures and design specifications); rescue mission and intersectionality. Conceptualising the shelter

“The women here used to say ‘this is the wilderness and God will take them to their promised land’ and I also look at it like that but my promised land from here is not another shelter, or another centre - from here I believe that God is going take me to my house” (Coetzee, 08 October 2015).

The researcher did not start by asking whether “shelters are safe spaces” but by asking “how shelter spaces are conceptualised”. The questions from the interviews explored the informants’ understanding of shelters. Initially the researcher needed to understand how the respondents defined the term ‘shelter’, and it became apparent that each response was based on personal experience and what shelters mean to them personally. Furthermore, their responses to that question ended up being about UMWS and what it aims to do, even when the researcher tried to probe their understanding of shelters in general. This is to say that the first batch of questions from the interviews was specifically generic but the respondents gave context specific answers about UMWS. The intersecting identities (race, gender, background) of the key informants were not taken into account; they were only interviewed on their availability.
The responses from the interviews are presented in their exact words as much as possible. The excerpts from the interview transcripts are indicated with the use of italics. The questions focused on shelters, what their aims and roles were as well as why some shelters only focused on sheltering women only rather than men as well. Pastor Bradley reported that she had a good understanding of the shelters and said “I’ve run one for thirteen years now. I understand very well about shelters. Usindiso started on the first of July 2003, so we are like twelve years and I was here two years before that under the previous people. So I do have a good understanding.” (Bradley, 04 September 2015). In responses to the broad question about the roles and aims of the shelter she gave information about Usindiso Ministries. The other two staff members had personal responses about shelters as they themselves have been shelter users before and were even now as staff members.

One member who wanted to remain Anonymous said that “shelter is for women who are abused and where you go to be safe. She went on to express her view that there is an element of individual responsibility or contribution from the shelter user that has to be in place, also emphasising ‘personal choice’ - “they help people to help themselves and they won’t force anything on you if you don’t want to be told to do that and they give you choices. And at the end of the day it’s up to you which one are you going to choose” (Anonymous, 08 October 2015). This answer comes from personal experience and what she has learned over the past years as a shelter resident. Furthermore, it was interesting to find out that she understood the role of shelter as helping people to go back into society so as not to live long term in an institution. Through volunteering the researcher had an opportunity to talk to Coetzee one of the staff members working at the crèche and had the opportunity to hear her story. She saw a shelter as a safe place, a refuge and when asked what safe housing looked like for her she said that “It protects you from people that hurt you and you are safe there. Nobody can touch you” (Coetzee, 08 October 2015).

The responses from key informants regarding the question about ‘their understanding of shelter’ related more to their personal experiences with the shelter. For instance, Pastor Bradley’s understanding of shelters was from a more expert point of view and her response related to her experience of running the shelter. The other two staff members – Charmaine Coetzee and Anonymous – understood the shelter as a place of refuge and they both viewed a shelter as a place that people could go to in order to be ‘safe’ from harm. As stated previously in the literature chapter, for many researchers the definition of shelters is directly dependent
on the purposes it serves and its functions. Thus, the definition of shelters is complex due to its fluidity.

The shelter staff members are all women and this presumably helps them understand the women’s experience better. They also reported that shelters which housed women-only were needed because of the women’s past experiences with men. Anonymous went on to say that “there would be a lot of rape and unwanted children – I want a husband I don’t want to live in a shelter with another man sleeping next to me” (Anonymous, 08 October 2015). Anonymous reported that she was sheltering from abuse. Her response about women-only shelters might have been due to her past experiences. It is very revealing that she assumes merely living in the same building as men will result in rape – that is not everyone’s assumption but it is hers, possibly resulting from her experience. Bayes and Brewin (2012) argue that some women do not feel safe in co-ed shelters, hence the need for women-only shelters, the response given by Anonymous about the possibility of rape and unwanted children in mixed shelters indicates that indeed some women do not feel safe in these types of spaces. Anonymous also said that she would not suggest sheltering both men and women in the same shelter even if they were separated by occupying different floors.

The respondents were all of the same view that UMWS was in a perfect location in contrast to the researcher’s initial view of the shelter which was that it is in an undesirable location for a shelter. Literature also suggests that shelters are only located in these spaces such as industrial areas because of NYMBYist attitudes. However the respondents saw this location to be the best location. Pastor Bradley said that “Well I would say the best place would be where most people can access it. If it’s too difficult to get to it’s not going to serve the purpose really. Because us being here, we work with the police, the hospitals, clinics. Everybody, they refer people here and many ladies just come also on their own because we’re quite well known on the ground and that’s us. For a place to be stuck where it’s far would be difficult for people to get to especially because they are people in need and won’t have the money to get there” (Bradley, 04 September 2015). On the other hand, Anonymous said that she does not know what a preferable location for a women’s shelter would be. When asked what she would change to make UMWS safer she said “No I wouldn’t want it to change, I like it the way it is”. Perhaps this demonstrates that there is not one universal location for shelters. However the researcher maintains that safety should be the key priority in order to speed up the healing process. Furthermore, it was surprising to have the researcher’s initial assumptions that the shelter is not in a desirable location for a healing space contradicted. The
initial concerns related to safety and security, and it seems as though Pastor Bradley’s view of a preferable location for a women’s shelter has to do more with accessibility and not so much about the positive aspects for daily functioning, but just about initially locating the place.

**Attitudes about gender and space**

The questions about space and gender were problematic for the respondents to understand. As noted from the literature these two concepts are slippery and it is difficult to point out what they are exactly (Rendell, 2002 and Rosing, 2003). Therefore, the respondents found it difficult to understand and pin down what each concept meant. When the researcher tried to ask them “if someone talks about space or gender what comes to mind?” they almost immediately assumed that gender meant women perhaps because the previous questions mostly focused on women and their sheltering. Anonymous did not understand the question at all, even the explanation I provided. These are some of the responses from the informants:

“Say that again…oh you mean why is there just women here? I think there are shelters in the suburbs and there are also in different areas and then what I think happens is the ladies that are more comfortable in the suburbs will go to the shelters that are in the suburbs but for us we’re in downtown, we’re in the city so people who... It’s kind of central for people when the ladies get jobs and all that it’s easy for them to get transport and go and all that kind of thing. So it’s central. It’s easy access to everything here. But people would go to where they’re most comfortable ‘cause there are shelters around as well” (Bradley, 04 September 2015).

This question proved to be difficult and even when talking about space the respondents answered in relation to the shelter. They gave answers based on the shelter and the activities that take place there rather than what the researcher was intending which was the relationship between the two concepts and how one might have an effect on the other. For example, commercial spaces such as the mall or shopping centres traditionally created or introduced changing rooms for women with infants. This is an example of a space being altered to cater for the needs of one gender or to assist in that gender’s adaption in space.

**Relationships within the neighbourhood**

This theme focuses on the character of the neighbourhood and the relationship it has with the shelter. The everyday life within the neighbourhood plays a pivotal role as well on the functioning and use of the shelter. The researcher had a perception that the shelter was
located in an area that is not safe for women and children because of the character of the urban fabric. That is, the taverns, the buildings that are occupied illegally, chop shops and the squatter settlement just behind the shelter where people live in precarious conditions. These conditions are suggested in the literature to be the kinds of conditions that would slow down the women’s healing process (Bayes and Brewin, 2012). Because women are vulnerable and still timid when they come to shelters and such spaces would add to their feelings of not being safe. They would make women more fearful and would require them to feel the need to defend themselves against tormenting. However, the respondents had a different view and saw this location as a perfect location for women who are in need of a shelter. When conducting interviews under this theme, three issues surfaced: security of the shelter, vs roughness in the neighbourhood, vs interaction with neighbours and sense of community.

When asked to describe the location within which the shelter was located, Anonymous (08 October 2015) stated that it is “very nice we’re protected with security guards all around the place. The response given by the shelter manager was very contradictory to the statement given by Anonymous, Pastor Bradley described the location in the following way “we’re in Marshalltown; it can be like gangland here sometimes. Other times it’s fine, it used to be much better until they had the cameras installed but the cameras stopped, I think in Anderson Street and they came one street down. So then all the ‘tsotsi’ people moved down to be out of range of the cameras but we know all our neighbours around especially Shann she knows everybody. And they all run to Usindiso, whether they’re gangsters or whatever or need help they come here” (Bradley, 04 September 2015). For the researcher, this raises issues of what safety means for each individuals and what measures have to be in place for one to feel safe. For Anonymous having security guards all around the place means being protected, while on the other hand Pastor Bradley suggests that the security measure to install cameras resulted in ‘criminals’ conglomerating in areas where they are out of range of the cameras. Moreover, when asked what were the disadvantages of the neighbourhood and locality of the shelter Pastor Bradley said “How long is your list? [Then laughs briefly] but actually for what we’re doing not really It’s the perfect place for it, but it’s also not safe, so one has to be wise”. She stated that what they are doing as a Christian ministry is trying to help the people in need, therefore in that regard there are not many disadvantages. As stated previously, the researcher got the impression that the informants did not view safety as the main priority for the preferable shelter’s location because they kept on stating that it is a perfect location for the
shelter but then make statements such as “it can be like gangland here sometimes” (Bradley, 04 September 2015).

They also stated that despite the criminal activities and attempts to break into the shelter, they have somewhat good relationship with the community. Pastor Bradley stated that the relationship with the community has changed from what it used to be and they work with them now. They (some community members) do not try to break into the shelter anymore and they actually show the shelter operators the culprits who try to break the law. The researcher got a sense that some community members stopped trying to break into the building as the result of the relationship that was built between the shelter and community members. Anonymous stated that “we also cater for the shacks here at the back, vegetables, rolls, bread we give them food stuff that is too much here in the shelter so it can’t go rotten. And clothing” (08 October 2015). Furthermore, with regards to advantages of the neighbourhood, Pastor Bradley stated that “the advantages would be for the neighbours I should think because the community all come around here and we help them. There’s a squatter camp just at the back here, an informal settlement and another big one for the town. They all come for help. The guys, even though we don’t accommodate them, we give them a meal when they ask. We help some of the children get in school. So we’re active within the community. And they all run to Usindiso, whether they’re gangsters or whatever or need help they come here” (Bradley, 04 September 2015). This gives the researcher the sense that some of the neighbours do not want repay the shelter’s kindness or generosity with ungratefulness (bite the hand that feeds them), that is why they do not try to break into the shelter anymore and show the authority the culprits that try to break the law.

Safe haven: Women’s safety and responsibility (including safety measures and design specifications)

This theme began to focus more on the respondents’ perceptions of resident women’s experiences of safety. It is acknowledged that the staff members would not know everything about the women and their individual experiences, thus the findings will not be in-depth. This was a challenge because the researcher could not talk to the resident women themselves but tried by all means to get information from the staff members about the issues they face on a daily basis.

Initially the respondents argued that the neighbourhood and location of the shelter was safe for women and their children but as the interviews went on they started to open up more
about their safety concerns. The other two staff members also reported that the location was
good for the shelter and posed no threats for women and children. However, as the interview
went on contradictions to the previous statements began to surface such as the response from
the shelter manager “You can’t just walk around outside especially when it’s dark and all that
kind of stuff, but some of our ladies do. They think they know everything. But it’s actually the
perfect place here” (Bradley, 04 September 2015). Anonymous pointed out that the bar was a
danger spot and for Pastor Bradley these danger spots were all around the neighbourhood and
people had to “open their eyes” when walking around. Women were seen to be irresponsible
and at times blamed for endangering their own safety through their lack of judgement.

The shelter manager said that women “sometimes do some stupid things” when it comes to
their safety. Shann also said that “but in terms of security our ladies are not wise or they just
don’t want to see the danger especially over weekends. I mean they’ve been here for a while
so they see the environment. I promise you sometimes a taxi driver will come and knock there
and say ‘there’s one of your ladies. Can we bring her?’… half past two in the morning and
she can barely walk” (Shann, 04 September 2015). There’s only so much the shelter can do
when it comes to the residents’ safety and they cannot force their security measures onto the
women or make them feel like the shelter is an imprisonment of some sort. The researcher
got the impression from Shann’s statement above that the women are still allowed to exercise
their own agency. Furthermore, Pastor Bradley stated that they have security and the doors
close at seven at night. she also said that “being a shelter we’re not a prison we can’t lock the
people inside. And being hurt people, abused people they kind of like to push the rules as far
as they can to see what they can get away with. So we always have problems, but we do our
best. We can’t lock the people inside. They have to look out for themselves as well, and the
kids - as well be responsible for their own children which many women don’t want to be, but
they’re mothers so they have to” (Bradley, 04 September 2015).

As much as the shelter provides protection for the women they are also expected to look after
themselves and be responsible for their safety as well as their children. However, women are
seen to impact negatively on their own safety. Pastor Bradley said that “some of our ladies
are here for a safe place because they’ve been really badly abused by a husband or boyfriend
or whatever. And also if there’s court cases and stuff sometimes they place the lady here, also

Harrel et al. (2000) “self-determination, volition, or free will; it is the power of individuals to act
independently of the determining constraints of social structure”
a safe place for the court case. Those are secret obviously but then the one that lets the guy know is that woman herself” (Bradley, 04 September, 2015). This suggests that women are also blamed for compromising their own safety. Binney et al. (1988) noted that keeping the women’s location unknown to their families and friends is vital to ensure their own safety. One woman from Mhlanga’s (2011) study also noted that she kept her location secret from the people close to her because she was afraid her abusive husband would find her. The only thing she wanted was a divorce because she was tired of living in fear.

Sometimes the shelter takes extreme measures when it comes to the responses that they adopt when women break their rules such as stay out past their seven o’clock curfew. One woman from Mhlanga’s study stated that “here at Usindiso everybody is supposed to be in the shelter by 19h00, failing which you are not welcome back into the shelter. Permission to pass out is only granted by the social worker and is monitored. Should you have more than five pass out you are then asked to leave because it showed that you have a place where you can actually stay. Residents as Usindiso are discouraged from giving information about other residents to strangers to ensure safety of everyone” (Mhlanga, 2011: 35).

The researcher is of the view that women are supposed to be educated about safety and security including what not to do to compromise that. As much as these women are adults they also need to be informed about such issues of safety because some might be fragile and naïve due to their experiences of abuse. When asked who was responsible for ensuring that women were safe, Pastor Bradley said “Well me ultimately, I suppose, but us as a team and security obviously. Security patrols and all that just to make sure” (Bradley, 04 September, 2015). Women were not explicitly mentioned in this statement and this could suggest that the shelter residents’ safety and security is the responsibility of the authority (shelter manager and security patrols).

Shelters are considered by most people including the key informants as refuges and safe havens. Park et al. (2000) stated that shelters are spaces of recovery, safety, political change and healing. However, shelters have a certain length of stay for women to be at the shelter until they can be independent again and find their own place to stay. When asked about the official length of stay and how long the women end up staying at the shelter, Pastor Bradley (04 September, 2015) said that “officially it’s about six months... but then is really gauged by each person, what they’re doing if they’re staying, if they on a course, what they are doing and how far are they in their lives, in their healing and all that”. Coetzee (08 October 2015)
also stated that if women cannot find shelter after the stipulated official length of stay “they (she possibly means the shelter manager and social workers) recommend, they phone around. They won’t put you on the street. They’ll make sure that from here if you can’t afford...Okay like when the women come here they give them counselling or they send them for counselling whichever way. But then after they’ve been counselled they get healed, then they find a job, then they start saving money. I’ve seen miracles happening here. They move out into their own places. They get to be independent again because when they come here that is truly taken away from them, their independence”.

Mhlanga’s study comprised eight women between the ages of twenty to thirty-five and one woman was between thirty-six and forty-five. Mhlanga (2011: 29) stated that almost all of the participants were of the view that a shelter is a place of safety. One of the women in her study stated that “being in the shelter has helped me to become self-reliant”. This statement indicates that shelters are also beneficial as they offer support, healing and protection among others. “Basically a shelter becomes an alternative to a home based on the many circumstances that result in women seeking refuge in a shelter” (Mhlanga, 2011: 30). Most women are abused by their partners and in some instances their families and friends cannot help them, thus they seek shelter. One woman said that “the next time he beat me I ran away, I phoned the People Opposing Women Abuse (POWA). They gave me Usindiso’s number and I’m feeling safe and secure here. While at my mother’s house there was nothing and nobody to protect me from my husband” (Mhlanga, 2011: 30). Kraus and Lissette (2000) noted that in most instances women who are married are expected to stay married no matter what happens.

The collaboration of UMWS with organisations such as Tshwaranang Legal Advocacy Centre, Ikhaya le Themba, and POWA as well as in conjunction with the South African Police Service (SAPS) helps the shelter to be better equipped to help the women in need of the shelter services. References of women to the shelter made by these organisations including social workers ensure that women who seek shelter find it conveniently without any struggles or having their safety jeopardised. Coetzee (08 October 2015) also said that if the shelter is full or unable to offer the woman accommodation they will be referred to other shelters (see table 1 in the appendix). Women who have children can also bring their children to the shelter if they wish to do so.

However, as much as women appreciated being at the shelter they also had complaints. For example Mhlanga (2011) noted that some women complained about being provided with the
same food every day and they did not believe that the shelter did not have enough money to change meals at least once a day. The researcher also observed this while volunteering at the shelter, there were days when the food was not enough to feed to children at the shelter and some days they ran out of food and so Coetzee (who runs the crèche) had to make ends meet by getting food from her apartment to give to the children who did not receive anything to eat.

**Rescue mission**

This theme discusses the views of the shelter in terms of religion and the faith-based manner of saving people from abuse and homelessness as well as helping them. There are mixed emotions amongst different people including the researcher regarding the manner in which faith-based shelters operate or seek to ‘rescue’ people in religious terms, because some of them have intentions to convert the women into their respective covenants ultimately. Pastor Bradley (Bradley, 04 September 2015) saw the location as a good place, even the fact that it is an old pass office made it a preferable location because as a Christian ministry it was important to turn around the situation from oppression to uplifting people. In addition, she said that “the advantages would be for the neighbours I should think because the community all come around here and we help them. There’s a squatter camp just at the back here, an informal settlement and another big one for the town. They all come for help. The guys even though we don’t accommodate them, we give them a meal when they ask. We help some of the children get in school. So we’re active within the community” when she was asked about the advantages of the shelter being located where it is located.

Park et al. (2000) noted that women who were accommodated at faith-based shelters were often forced to abide by the strict religious and disciplinary regimes of the covenant that offered them with accommodation. Mhlanga (2011) also noted that women did not like being controlled and they viewed being forced to go to church because it was a form of control. Abusers have control over women’s activities and they also insist on making decisions for them. Thus, some abused women resented being forced by the faith-based shelters to attend the church services every Sunday and everyday church devotion. One woman from Mhlanga’s (2011: 33) study stated that “I truly appreciate the help the shelter offers me and my children away from the bastard, but I do not like it when they force me to go to their church. Every Sunday basically I feel like I am back to his control, where I am deprived the freedom to be me. At least during the week I do not have to go for midday devotion because
at that time I’m at skills training”. But not all women resented going to church. Coetzee is one of the women who enjoyed going to church and believed in the spiritual benefits of being a church member. When asked about the spiritual services offered to women, she stated that “on a Sunday, there is one thing, you have to attend your church. No matter where your church is you got to go attend. But they’re going to open up a church any time soon”.

According to Shann the church at Usindiso had been closed for some time now but from Coetzee’s statement it is clear that women are encouraged to attend different churches around the neighbourhood.

**Intersectionality**

According to Groenewald (2006) countries around the world dedicated themselves to address the constraints faced by women; this was as a result of the Beijing Conference (1995) that dealt with violence against women. These governments (including South Africa) signed the Dedication at the Beijing Conference (1995) and they committed themselves to protect women from violence. The governments dedicated themselves “to promote, protect … women and girls who face multiple barriers to their empowerment and advancement, because of such factors as their race, age, languages, ethnicity, culture, religion, or disability, or because they are indigenous people” (Groenewald, 2006: 35). The researcher is also of the opinion that women’s intersecting identities contribute to their experiences of spaces within the city, even in different cultures such as the Basotho where different spaces within the home are divided according to the gender roles. These divisions and allocations of spaces can contribute to women’s oppression and exclusion in decision making. When it comes to experiencing the space such as the immediate surroundings of UMWS in Marshalltown, women might have different experiences due to their intersecting identities (multiple barriers). Mhlanga (2011: 33) noted that one of the women said “we come from different cultural backgrounds therefore it is very difficult to tolerate each other’s ways of doing things”.

The staff members at the shelter were of the opinion that women’s multiple intersections did not affect their use of the space. They contended that the shelter did not define women by these identities and to them, the multiple barriers merely existed. Pastor Bradley was asked if women’s different intersecting identities affected the way in which they experienced the space and she said “I don’t think we really have an issue with that ‘cause we do accommodate everybody but the majority are black ladies. It’s more having a shelter full of
ladies which can be a problem more than anything else. I mean women in a big group together can just be a problem sometimes” (Bradley, 04 September 2015). Furthermore, Coetzee said that the neighbourhood was good for everyone. However, like many other parts of the city in Johannesburg; there are spaces where a large number of certain groups of people can be found in their majorities and others are either the minority if not found there. Thus, the researcher finds that the responses given by the key informants that women of intersecting groups experience the space in the same way might be influenced by the fact that they do not usually see other women in the space and perhaps it might be a personal view of such issues. The researcher asked Charmain if she thought that race or background made the experiences of homelessness different and she said “No, I was never a coloured by heart I was a black person by heart because my mom abused me verbally by saying I’m a k****, and a k**** to me is a nicest person I’ve ever met and they used to treat me with respect other than my culture. So in my heart I became black, my name is Nosipho Dibala”.

When the researcher went to the shelter, there were hardly ever other women of different races other than the dominant black and a few coloured women. Moreover, women of other classes (middle and upper) were mostly present a few blocks away from the shelter (ABSA bank precinct). These enclaves of different groups of people made it hard for the researcher to determine whether women experience the space in the same way or not because they hardly ever move beyond their imagined spaces. This is to mean that middle class or working women occupying the imagined working enclaves such as ABSA bank precinct and the eateries hardly ever traverse beyond these spaces in their daily activities into the shelter precinct (spaces) where the physical conditions are deteriorating and security guards are hardly present. Even within these distinctive domains, a person can encounter widely differing spatial modulations. For example, Lefebvre argued that space is not heterogeneous thus a person within a specific space might not experience it in the same way, that person’s spatial encounters will be different from one point to the next. Even though the shelter staff members did not explicitly state it, they do not feel entirely safe within the urban fabric and therefore limits their experience of the lived space. Anonymous and Coetzee never went out much and they had specific routes that they take when they go wherever they need to go such as shopping and church. However, some women residents were reported by Shann (04 September 2015) to be used to the space that they even go out till late at night. During a conversation with Coetzee while volunteering at the crèche, she noted that some women went out at night and they spent time around the bars in the area.
The themes in this section are part of a discussion relating to the gendered space of UMWS and the shelter staff members’ perceptions of women’s experiences of safety within the urban fabric. The process of gendering of spaces is a complex phenomenon to unpack in this type of research report but the researcher made an effort to discuss the themes deemed as important in beginning to decipher what a gendered space looks like and what makes a space gendered. This discussion is only the tip of the iceberg and the researcher acknowledged that deeper issues and concepts could be discussed and introduced to the study but due to time constraints and limited resources, the report only focused on the themes and issues presented. The aim of the representational space/lived space section was to conceptualise how a gendered space might be experienced by different women. The shelter staff members were the ones viewed by the researcher as better equipped to give insights about the experiences of their everyday lives including their perceptions of the resident women’s experiences. “Rather than being identified primarily by physical features, representational space is recognized as a matter of lived experience where it is infused with meaning that cannot be adequately expressed without verbal, visual…symbolism” (Carp 2008: 135). Therefore, the researcher noted that the shelter staff members had knowledge of the more intricate insights on the imagined spaces of their everyday lives.

The researcher noted that when a space becomes gendered or in this case when the Old Pass Office changed to be used as a shelter for women, the transformation could then be translated as gendering of space. However, certain changes had to be made in order to facilitate this shift, for instance the layout of the original built form had to be altered. That is, land uses that would accommodate the new users (women) had to be incorporated in the space which used to be predominantly office and semi industrial. The altered uses that were introduced to make the space liveable included converting some of the warehouses into churches or supermarkets, reinforcing security in the area, introducing the clinic, crèche (day care centre) and transport to travel to different places such as work and school.

**Representations of space/conceived space (experts’ views)**

According to van der Klashorst (2013: 68) the representations of conceived space exist “as discourse, speech, signs, and images, such as maps and plans, and are part of social science”. Representations of space are about the history of ideologies (Lefebvre, 1991:116). These histories of ideologies can be studied by examining how plans of a space change over time. This space provides a concrete guideline for how ‘thought’ can become ‘action’ (Lefebvre,
The architect Judin had an involvement with the Usindiso building in the 1990s just after it had been closed. This was in relation to his Masters research. He has an understanding of how the building has changed over time and this is valuable for this report. Vetten spent a number of years working in women’s organisations and this makes her eligible to provide information about shelters and women’s experiences of safety.

**Conceptualising the shelter**

In many cases shelters are defined by the functions and purposes they serve and some authors attach an element of safety to the definition (Hurtubise et al., 2009). The responses from the key informants suggest that their understanding of shelters was more from their personal experiences within their fields. Vetten (23 October 2015) said “I mean I have a broad understanding of what we take shelter to be. What the word suggest shelter’s some kind of protection from the elements - somewhere a safe space for you to stay. So you know shelter can be - your home can be a shelter too, to places or spaces that are specifically designated as institutions for people who are homeless or usually who don’t have relation to people for whatever reason have no home of their own.” Vetten’s statement also relates to the definition whereby shelter is associated with safety. However it was interesting that she states that a person’s home can also be a shelter. This is in contradiction with the views of the shelter staff members and the residents women about their understanding of shelters; who only associated shelters with protection, healing and safety. Coetzee (08 October 2015) also stated that a shelter is not a home; it was a place to stay when a person needed a place to stay, a refuge. Olufemi (2002), and Tipple and Speak (2009) argued that a home is an environment linked with social ties, a home has infrastructure, electricity, water, toilet and emotional connection; a structure which is able to provide protection from eviction, and provides safety and security. The researcher is of the view that the reason why some staff members and women residents who considered a shelter as being different from a home is due to their lack of emotional attachment to the shelter as well as the issue of the shelter not being a permanent place for them to stay. Vetten also noted that the shelter is only temporary, and this increases the threats of eviction. Moreover, the threat of being evicted contributed to these feelings of the shelter not being a home. Judin (05 November 2015) was also asked about the understanding that he has of shelters and his response was “so the little I understand was in fact related to the project where Rebecca Walker who was doing research on Usindiso had at that time some relationship with different women shelters in the city. She had discussed with
us on a number of occasions the difficulties she was having with Usindiso in relation and how untraditional it was from many of the...I’m not sure if they’re connected to the city but at least official shelters that exist. My understanding is of what is a traditional shelter or a care space versus Usindiso which is more specifically religious”.

All the key informants (staff members and the experts) had the same views that it was necessary to shelter women separately from men. They supported these views by noting that most women found themselves in shelters as a result of abuse from their male partners. Thus, sheltering women with other men would do more harm than good because it might slow down their healing process and other might start relationships prematurely with those men due to their vulnerable states. “Someone needs time away to think about their next step, what they’re going to do with their lives. So from a safety point of view including emotional, from a therapeutic point of view it’s not a good idea” (Vetten, 23 October 2015). Furthermore, Vetten gave an example of one Salvation Army Shelter which mixed men and women and she noted that it was a very bad idea especially when dealing with domestic violence because some men in the shelter tend to become actively abusive towards the women. On the other hand Judin noted that women-only shelters are needed, however there was a strong equal need for family shelters where older boys would not be separated from their mothers as in women-only shelters. He said that “it seems like both options need to be explored by the city and by these so called religious shelters” (Judin, 05 November 2015). The views from both these experts were made as a result of having been involved in the analysis of shelters at some point in their fields. Conceived space is that space that is deciphered, analysed and conceptualised by different experts, therefore both the key informants made contributions about putting thought into action which is a concrete guideline for conceived spaces.

**No universal space for a shelter**

The researcher argued that the location of UMWS was not safe space as a healing space and a space gendered female. However, the key informants had contradicting views of shelters and their location. Vetten (23 October 2015) said that “It really depends on where you put them. I don’t think that anyone has figured out...Shelters I don’t think really work in rural areas they do work better in urban areas, I mean, I think what’s important is...it depends on whether you want to take the decision around whether or not your shelter should be at a hidden location, whether you want to make it public”. But she was also of the view that the shelter’s safety has to be optimised as well as being the priority. “I think what’s also quite important is
that it also needs to give women a sense of safety so I think located in areas which have a reputation for being dangerous and high risk is not a good idea either. You need to try and find an environment that’s in and of itself does enhance and encourage safety” (Vetten, 23 October 2015). There have been several criminal activities that have in most instances compromised the women’s safety such as criminals trying to break into the shelter. However, as noted previously in the interviews with the staff members, a sense of community also seems to play a major role in ensuring that the shelter is safe. Pastor Bradley and Shann (04 September 2015) stated that the people that used to try to break into the shelter stopped doing that and they even help them find the culprits that do try.

Other informants are of the view that shelters should be provided wherever there is a need for them in order to reduce people’s journeys to find the shelters, thus where there is a need there should be an equal supply for it. Judin (05 November 2015) said “I don’t think there is one preferable; I think probably they need to be in different areas where the need arises. So as far as I understand the need arises there, it relates to people living in the area and people with access to particular parts of the area and maybe with working and familiar relationships in those areas”. When urban planners create spaces, they have to do feasibility studies of the potential areas for the land use to be created, including locating the facility around a space which is located closer to the facilities. The experts also noted that facilities had to be kept in mind as well as being located in proximity to the police station and hospitals. “I think placing them centrally and imagining women can sort of congregate there, I think would be a mistake. So the best for me would be having shelters sort of in relation to living neighbourhoods where the need is there as well as the life conditions so that they can continue to work, children could go to school, there’d be social facilities in that area that could meet the needs of the very localised population” (Judin, 05 November 2015).

**Shelters as healing spaces and heterotopic spaces**

A healing space is a space that has an appeal to all the senses thus resulting in a conscious or subconscious effect on its inhabitants even if they do not have and awareness of the architectural and urban design effects on a person. These are spaces where people are willing to goand feel content, safe and secure within the space. The researcher asked how would a person begin to design a space such as a healing space without disturbing the current flow or setting of the space. Judin (05 November 2015) said that “The process of healing would need to be understood better. It’s got to be probably a combination of social work, therapy. In
some cases it will involve a clinic...In addition it’s probably by having social relationships encouraged, not isolation, so shared living units of a particular scale, so not too large and not overly institutionalised seem optimal”. Vetten (23 October 2015) also said “I think if you put people on top of each other it causes stress, so you got to look at the space in and out; I remember the Department of Social Development for example had sorts of specifications on how many beds per square metre of space which are a little bit... I think encourage people further being on top of each other. The informants understood healing spaces from the physical and social point of view. They also mentioned the design specifications that are ideal for shelters which not only include the urban fabric but the internal spaces of the building as well.

Heterotopias are site that are unique and they are both related to and defined in opposition to all other sites, they indicate an alternate social order which disturbs or reverses the social relations that symbolise those other social spaces (Street and Coleman, 2012). UMWS is a shelter or space which is intended to provide help and healing to women and their children. However, the researcher was fascinated by the juxtaposition of the spaces whereby a space for healing was put side by side with a space that is overridden by crime and other negative aspects such as land and noise pollution which counteract the intentions of the shelter. Displaced people often find themselves somewhere between the two forms of social spaces which are heterotopias of deviation (prisons, rest homes and psychiatric hospitals) and heterotopias of crisis (sacred, forbidden or privileged places).

The researcher interpreted UMWS as a heterotopic space due to its different functions such as being a refuge, a healing space (counselling and therapy) as well as a space that provides facilities and encourages devotion. These functions are aimed at people who are both in crisis (escaping abuse) and deviating from society (being homeless). “Shelters would need to control access I think it’s really important because often, as you know, the women coming there are coming from either abusive or difficult relationships and so they need to be protected in many cases from outsiders. However the degree of control of security seems to be the issue, and completely impinging their movement is a slippery slope because the next thing there’s kind of partial imprisonment or onerous conditions placed on the woman in order to find security in that shelter” (Judin, 05 November 2015). The former statement brings to light the multiple orderings of shelters and how it is somewhat inevitable that they might take the form of heterotopias of deviation and heterotopias of crisis all at the same time.
The shelter as a safe space

In many shelters women are not allowed to sign in their partners or their boyfriends for safety reasons. Some of these shelters also go to an extent of keeping the shelter secret thus requesting women not to inform their families and friends about their whereabouts. During observations the researcher had a casual conversation with Coetzee and she said that she wanted her baby’s father who was in Cape Town to come to visit but the problem was that he would not be able to stay over at her apartment. For the shelter manager Pastor Bradley, this measure was important to ensure everyone’s safety. However, the experts had views that were slightly different from those of the shelter staff members. When asked what the women’s responsibilities were when it comes to ensuring their safety, Vetten said that “sometimes it happens that women miss their partners, or their children want to speak to their father and that’s why they get in touch with their partners again. And in that way safety can sometimes be breached but I think not all shelters are run by people with a good solid ground in domestic violence. And I think some shelters as said can be very punitive they treat women like little children, they want to tell them what to do, they don’t want them to have visitors, they want to tell them when to pray, when to eat etc. I mean you’re dealing with somebody who is an adult, even if they are in distress”. The researcher noted that this statement suggests that some women cannot tolerate living in isolation from their loved ones and trying to be in contact with them might pose a security threat for the shelters. However the way in which women are treated in unacceptable because they are their own persons with the abilities to make their own judgements. Furthermore, some of the people who are involved in dealing with the women might not have enough experience to deal with a battered woman and help her in her journey of healing and self-discovery. She further stated that in some shelters if a woman has left the shelter she would not be allowed back again into the shelter and this does not show great understanding of the dynamics of abuse. Some women need to leave a few times to go back to their partners before they finally take the decision to leave for good, and for those who are single parents or unemployed making the decision to leave can be very daunting.

Both the experts stated in order for shelters to maximise the safety of their clients, they needed a strict controlled access into the shelter but they pointed out that there is a thin line between maximum security to keep the women safe and imprisonment. Judin (05 November 2015) said that in order for a shelter to be safe for women “it would probably have to take institutional forms in other words controlling access but I think this has to be done in
relationship to the individual woman or in relationship to some kind of structure that’s set up independently by the women; I think that would make the most sense where you have the institutional structure on the one hand and a kind of collective arrangement with the women themselves so that they could bargain with the shelter in a more fair and equitable manner”.

Vetten also stated that the design obviously constituted a safe shelter, things like walls; at least a security gate; some control over access—who comes in and out. She said that the Department of Social Development had “awful ideas” about the interior design of shelters in ensuring women’s safety. “I think there is a fine line between a shelter and an institution because sometimes some shelters become institutional, so situations where it’s communal living, dormitory living which is not great” (Vetten, 23 October 2015).

**Rescue Mission**

“If someone is religious then they might want to be in a faith-based shelter. I have found some, certainly not all, faith-based shelters to be quite punitive. They impose their particular religious beliefs on you and if you don’t want to comply with their particular version of the Bible then they won’t take you in. They’ll move you, but that of course is not every shelter. I think there are those who understand that their beliefs are not beliefs they should impose on other people” (Vetten, 23 October 2015). Although some but not all faith-based shelters do not make it explicit, they tend to impose their religious views on their clients. Thus, the researcher interprets this as the rescue mission adopted by the shelters where there is some sort of intended conversion of their clients. Judin stated that the advantages of faith-based shelters are the ones that keep being told to people by city administrators if not for Usindiso Ministries using and managing the building it would probably be abandoned or at least only parts of it used such as the clinic, the fear was that without that ministry shelter in the building that it would probably go to ruin. Furthermore, he said that “that’s in the one side in relation to the building. In relation to the so called rescuing of abandoned women, they’re definitely are filling a gap or need in the area and with a particular group of women that isn’t being met by any other agency. And so with all the difficulties of it, it does seem to be serving some purpose”. However, the disadvantages of faith-based shelters, in this case Usindiso Ministries included mistreatment of the women and women not being taken in as Vetten stated previously due to their noncompliance with the shelter beliefs. “On the other hand, we heard of so many incidents of abuse, I would say not physical abuse so much as emotional abuse. The women that were going in there were given shelter based on very specific conditions some of which could be met by the women, others couldn’t. So for the
women that couldn’t meet those conditions, they were I think placed in a very difficult position and often were abandoned once again- told to leave if they couldn’t meet the conditions of the shelter. So it’s a very difficult one and that difficulty I could see in that we might have not wanted to work with the shelter, it often was necessary for us in terms of the project” (Judin, 05 November 2015).

A personal analysis

This section focuses on the researcher’s observation findings around the space. These findings take a descriptive format because the observations were personal, thus the researcher used her own discretions to decipher the space. Spatial practice is characterised by Lefebvre as a perceived space which contains the interaction between institutional environment and daily routines (van der Klashorst, 2013). The perceived space represents 'the practical basis of the perception of the outside world' (Lefebvre, 1991). Space, according Lefebvre may not change, but “our perceptions of (it) does – they become more fine, more subtle, more profound, more differentiated” (Lefebvre, 1991: 182). Perceived space is also space that is perceived by the senses, so being at the shelter for the first time might be experienced through the senses and as such have an effect on the use and feelings towards the space as well as the individuals’ patterns of movement. Therefore, the main focus was on the perceived space. Heintzelman (2009: 16) states that “this dimension mainly constitutes aspects of a space that can be grasped by the senses, which include: seeing, hearing, touching, tasting, and smelling”. The perceived space within the community can relate to the built environment including how and why people move about in the built form.

Heintzelman (2009) noted that in many cases the information gathered during observations of the city is be descriptive, meaning the “why” and “what is” is stressed. The researcher utilised walking and photography as experience and tool to reveal the hidden identities within the space. Van der Klashorst (2013: 67) notes that “this space can be perceived, analysed or deciphered to reveal the society's spatial practice and spatial competence, but can only be evaluated empirically”.

The researcher’s first visit to the site involved walking from Braamfontein to Marshalltown in order to better decipher the space through the senses. This exercise required the researcher to be aware of the space so as much as sensing the space was vital, the main activity was being aware of the surrounding spaces as well as being self-aware within the space. This
means that, during observations the researcher had to be aware of her feelings and responses to the spaces being traversed through. Furthermore, the researcher had to have “the sense of clear relation of the observer with the city and its parts, and with the larger world around it. In the simplest sense it may be taken as knowing where one is at any time, and how to reach any other part” (Banerjee et al., 1990, 135). Due to limited resources and time constraints the research report only focuses on the physical space for observation. The observations focused on the landmarks, buildings, modes of transport, facilities, maintenance of the built form and land uses. Different routes were taken on a daily basis to get to the shelter, some spaces were more overcrowded than the others while others were too quiet but the researcher felt unsafe in both types of spaces. The only comfort that was felt was along spaces that were moderately occupied such as the spaces around the Main Marshall City Improvement District as well as Main Street.

The researcher stated that gendered spaces are complex because they are more symbolic than physical as such the people who experience the lived space in their everyday lives had better knowledge of this. However, the researcher attempted to study and analyse this gendered space (UMWS precinct) by identifying the alterations that were made within the space when the building turned into the women’s shelter. Merely changing the gender that uses the space does not mean that the space is gendered, however if the space functions to serve the purposes mainly of that gender and if the other people within the same space recognise and acknowledge this shift as well as normalise this gendering process; it is when a space can begin to see the space as undergoing the genderisation process. The pictures below outline some of the observations that the researcher made of the physical space. It was hard to take pictures because the residents had formed different enclaves or spaces of otherness where only a few people were allowed in and out. These different spaces occurred within the broader space of Marshalltown which had multiple orderings. Thus, people who occupied these many spaces felt the need to be protective and were excessively suspicious of anyone that seemed to pose a threat. The images below where taken by the researcher during the site visit in the afternoon, one of the security guards was present during this activity as it was not very safe to take pictures around the area. The images illustrate the path taken by the researcher during the observation; the juxtaposition of the spaces within the site is shown.

**The images on the following page represent the space as experienced by the researcher, the juxtaposition of order and disorder was also captured.**
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Refurbished building in Main Marshall CID

The Creche at UMWS

Hard edges along the street

The building used for funeral services business

Main Marshall regeneration

The Ikhaya le-Themba social housing
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Findings Summary

The overall study aimed to respond to the question: How is the current spatial context of UMWS understood and experienced by those associated with the shelter, and what are the shortcomings with regards to women’s safety perspective? The current context in this regard refers to the shifting realities of the shelter; before (during apartheid) the spatial context was an office and semi-industrial but currently the building is used as a shelter for women within the space that is constantly being altered. Judin (05 November 2015) was asked by the researcher if the current use of the building gave it a new meaning and he said “I think for different people it does. A lot of people either using the building, walking past or using it as the clinic have very little knowledge, certainly no memory of its past history. Older people, that means sixty or seventy years old that have experience with the building of course can relate it to its history but I think given its current condition which is partly damaged, partly reused it’s very difficult for people without specific knowledge to understand the history of the building. There is a small blue plaque, I’m sure very few people understand what it means even though it’s written there that it was former pass office. So I think the memory of the building is limited and resides probably in the recollections of anyone who might have experienced it back in 1950-1960”. This statement by Judin highlights the end of history theory which was devised by Hegel. Van der Klashorst (2013: 64) states that this theory “means that history as a concept disappears by being transformed from action to memory”. For the older generation the memory of the building might be fading (even though it is anchored in the building) as new memories and experiences which do not relate to the previous intentions are produced. Thus, researcher is of the view that battered women might have not experienced the space the same way during apartheid when the building was functional as they do currently.

Most of them do not have memory of what the previous function of the building and some that do have memories such as Pastor Bradley believes that the space changed for the better. Different measures such had been incorporated within the space to help the women feel safe and adapt it for the use of women and children rather than the male dominated use of the space. The management of Elangeni Gardens had cameras put up along Albert Street in Marshalltown, ABSA security patrols as well as the security at Elangeni Gardens also patrolled the area; these are some of the measure taken to mitigate threat from any criminal activities.
CHAPTER FIVE

Introduction

This section of the research report aims to trace the procedures followed in understanding the complexities of the process of gendering of spaces and how it occurs as well as the shelter staff members’ perceptions of women’s experiences of safety (read inclusion and belonging) within those spaces. The research focused on Usindiso Ministries Women’s Shelter as a case study. The section then reflects on the theoretical foundations and the research methods used in the report and then ultimately understanding the findings in relation to the research question and the primary aim.

Theory

The different studies on gendered spaces and shelters made it clear that these concepts were complex to define due to their fluidity, which means multiple meaning within different contexts and academic fields. Intersectionality on the other hand could be conceptualised because its theoretical foundations could be traced back to feminist studies. Then it was not that hard to understand what is meant by the concept. Other concepts such as gender, space (including Lefebvre’s notions of space), safety and security were also somewhat challenging for the researcher to grasp because of the contradictions by different authors trying to define them. However, all these notions were seen by the researcher as being important with regards to gendered spaces and they all had impacts on the process of gendering of spaces. Gendered spaces should be understood less as geographically imposed by patriarchal structure but more as social processes of symbolic encoding and decoding (Blunt and Rose, 1994: 3). Gendered spaces take many forms, but the process is not just the transparent appropriation of space by the other gender.
Conclusion and recommendations

The key respondents had different views of what shelters are and what their function should be. But all of them were of the consensus that shelters were safe haven, spaces where people could go for protection and safety. The key informants had contradicting views on who was responsible for making sure that the shelter clients were safe. Making sure that people are safe can be a struggle and cooperation is needed from both parties; the one providing safety and the one being kept safe. Judin (05 November) noted that instead of maximising security that might end up being like some sort of imprisonment, women had to be incorporated in the safety measures that are taken to keep them safe as well as their children. Women who come to the shelter were either abused or went through some other difficulties in their live, thus it is not recommended for shelters to control and impose their beliefs on the women. The researcher discovered that conceptualisation of the relationship between gender and space was tricky for the key informants, whom assumed almost immediately that gender meant women. The focus of the report on women might have been a contributing factor in their answers because most of them concluded that space meant UMWS and gender meant women. The changes that the Old Pass Office went through are an indication that functions of buildings change over time and memories of their meaning and uses fade as well. The building has a blue plaque which reminds the user of the building what the space used to be about but if people had not experienced the space before, their experiences of the space might not be affected by this history. Thus, genderisation of space also depends on this gradual change and change in legislation. For example, younger or new people who do not know the shelter might think of the space as being normal due to the older generation’s normalisation of space. Gendered spaces need to be understood by urban planners in order to provide solutions that are viable and practical, which also function conveniently for the users. Urban planners and policy makers should also focus on gender at the core of their safer cities agenda. Shelters should be a priority as well because they provide healing for the society’s most vulnerable and destitute; this provision of shelters has the potential to curb negative economic and social externalities such as petty crimes and drug abuse.
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### Table 1: Literature review concepts, authors and methods. This table was useful in discussing the terms within the literature. Kgosiemang (2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Sub-concepts</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>(Rendell, 2002); (American Psychological Association, 2011)</td>
<td>Gender identity; Gender expression</td>
<td>1. How does the physical context of the space affect or encourage women’s activities? 2. What is the ideal location for a women’s shelter?</td>
<td>Interviews, case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>(Quinn, 2010); (Bilgic, 2013); (Maude, 2013); (Ardener, 2002); (Rendell, 2002)</td>
<td>Imagined spaces; Gendered spaces; Spatiality; spatial situation</td>
<td>1. How does the shelter understand its place physically in space? 2. What is the significance of women-only shelters in Johannesburg?</td>
<td>Interviews and observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>(Hurtubise et al., 2009); (Dobash and Dobash, 1992); (Mhlanga, 2011); (Cook, 2001); (Johnsen et al., 2005); (Emdon, 2007)</td>
<td>Safe haven</td>
<td>1. How does the shelter understand its place physically in space? 2. What is the significance of women-only shelters in Johannesburg?</td>
<td>Case Study, interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersectionality</td>
<td>(Nash, 2008); (Jarvis et al., 2009); (Hankivsky, 2014); (Valentine, 2007 in Jarvis et al, 2009)</td>
<td>Fluid and multiple identities</td>
<td>1. How does the intersection of gender, race, ethnicity, class, sexuality and religion reinforce the gendering of space?</td>
<td>interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>(Brady et al., 1990); (Byres and Cusimano, 2010); (Albrechtsen, 2003); (UN-Habitat, 2008); (Ceccato, 2012)</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>1. How are issues of safety and security understood and conceptualised by the shelter operators?</td>
<td>Interviews, observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban fabric</td>
<td>(Artibise, 2010); (Ceccato, 2012)</td>
<td>Urban tissue</td>
<td>1. What role do the surrounding areas play in the women’s feelings of safety? (place attachment and belonging)</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Known Existing shelters in Gauteng that women can be referred to. Source (Groenewald, 2006). The physical address of the shelters cannot be provided due to issues of confidentiality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name of shelter</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name of shelter</th>
<th>Town</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Amcare</td>
<td>Heidelberg</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>NISAA Institute for Women’s Development</td>
<td>Lenasia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bella Maria</td>
<td>Vanderbijlpark</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>PAHA</td>
<td>Sunnyside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>Bertrams</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Polokego West Rand</td>
<td>Krugersdorp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Beth Shan</td>
<td>Pretoria West</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Polokegong MaliMartin</td>
<td>Bronkhorstspuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bombani</td>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Potters House</td>
<td>Pretoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Eldorado Park</td>
<td>Lenasia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>POWA West Rand</td>
<td>Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Faith and Perseverance Community Centre</td>
<td>Eikenhof</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>POWA East Rand</td>
<td>Vosloorus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Frida Hartley</td>
<td>Yeoville</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Thusong WAWA Shelter</td>
<td>Bekkersdal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Leamogetswe</td>
<td>Saulsville</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Toekomsrus WAWA</td>
<td>Johannesburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Leratong</td>
<td>Springs</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Usindiso</td>
<td>Johannesburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mercy House</td>
<td>Capital Park</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>House of Mercy</td>
<td>Alberton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mother’s Nest</td>
<td>Brakpan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consent Form

Good Day

I am Mmathapelo Kgosiemang, a student registered for honours in Urban and Regional Planning at the University of the Witwatersrand. I am conducting research into the intersectionality of space and gender, using Usindiso Ministries Shelter as a case study. The primary aim of this study is to describe the complexities of gendering of spaces and how these occur as well as women’s experiences of safety (read inclusion and belonging) within those spaces.

I would like to invite you to participate in my research. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you can withdraw from the interview whenever you want to. Should you agree to participate I will organise an interview with you at a time and place suitable to you. The subject at hand will not include sensitive information however, should you feel overwhelmed during the interview you are permitted to stop at any time. Furthermore, you are allowed to refrain from answering any questions that make you feel uncomfortable. Should you wish to be Anonymous, I will not use your information in the study.

I would like your permission to take photographs and record the interview. The recordings and personal information will be available to my supervisor only and your personal information will not be released to anyone else. If you have any questions regarding this research please feel free to ask me any questions, I will answer the questions to the best of my ability. On completion of the study the summary will be sent to you. The full report will be sent to you should you request it.

Thank you for taking the time to consider participating in my research.

Yours truthfully

____________________
Interview Questions

The set of Questions for Pastor Bradley

1. What understanding do you have of shelters?
   - What is their role, what do they aim to do?

2. Why are some shelters only for women residents? What is the significance of sheltering women only instead of mixing them with men?

3. What is the preferable location for a women’s shelter? In which part of the city, in what sort of neighbourhood and surrounds? Why do you say this?

4. Can you describe the UMWS?
   - Who does it target? Who uses it?
   - What are the specific roles and objectives of the UMWS?
   - How do women seeking shelter find it, how do they gain access to it?
   - How long can people stay there? How long do they stay?
   - What does the shelter offer its residents? What are they sheltering from?

5. How would you describe the location and surrounds of the UMWS?
   - Why is the shelter located here?

6. What advantages of this neighbourhood and locality for the shelter? And disadvantages?

7. What are the safety challenges have you identified since your involvement with the shelter identified?
   - What is the response to these?

8. How can shelters ensure or maximise the safety of their clients?

9. What issues in the surrounding neighbourhood affect how a shelter operates, from a safety and security perspective?
• Who is responsible for making sure that the shelter is safe for all its users?

• How involved is the community in ensuring the women’s safety?

10. In your view what is the relationship between space and gender?

11. How do women of different identities (intersections) experience the shelter and its surroundings? By identities I mean culture, ethnicity, class, race and religion.

• What issues or experiences, in your view, affect their experience, their use of the shelter, its neighbourhood, and the city?

• How do people overcome, manage or respond to these issues?

12. How does funding affect the overall function of shelters especially with regards to safety and spatial aspects?

• What are the shortfalls in funding (if any) and - what are the consequences/impacts of this shortfall?

The following questions are intended to understand the spaces and user activities.

1. What are the women’s top five destinations? Why these?

• When do women go to these? How frequently?

• BY what routes, and modes (walking/ taxi etc.)

• And what about their children?

2. Are there differences amongst women regarding how they interact with the surrounding areas/ neighbourhood? And what do you think influences or shapes these differences

3. What are the facilities that they mostly require?

   a. How accessible are they to women? By this I want to understand whether or not they are within an easy reach or if there are any other constraints that might deter women from using the facilities.
4. Since the shelter operation started, have there been any facilities introduced to meet the women’s demands?
   
a. If so who introduced these and has the response by women been positive?

5. Does the shelter encourage community integration and if so how is it ensured or made possible?

6. Are there any danger spots (crime spots) that women need to be aware of?
   
a. What is done to overcome/ mitigate the threat from these areas
   
b. What do the residents themselves do?

7. Are there any activities or any features within the neighbourhood you would prefer to be changed?
   
a. Why do you say that?
   
b. What would be the alternative?

8. What physical measures would be suitable to ensure women and children’s safety within the neighbourhood? (design interventions)
   
a. And what about other interventions that might not be necessarily physical?

The set of Questions for Charmaine Coetzee

1. How old are you?
2. What’s your current marital status?
3. What is your ethnic background? White? Coloured? Black?
4. Do you have any children? Are they living with you?
5. Do you presently have a place to live? (If yes, how long have you been there?)
6. How stable is it? If no, where are you staying?)
7. So if someone says define homeless now how would you put it in words?
8. What has worked best for you in overcoming homelessness?
9. What does — safe housing look like for you?
10. Have you ever been with an abusive partner?
11. What types of abuse did you experience?
12. What about emotional, physical, sexual, financial, spiritual abuse?
13. How have you dealt with the abuse? Did you turn to anyone for help? (i.e. friends, family?)
14. Did this help? If yes, in what way?
15. How did this help, what changed?
16. Did you contact any agency or service to help you deal with the abuse?
17. What was the procedure when you first came to UMWS?
18. In your view have other women, possibly your friends experienced the neighbourhood differently?
19. What happens to a person who does not have a place to stay after three months?
20. Have women of other spiritual beliefs resided here?
21. Does the shelter provide women with other spiritual centres to go to?
22. Were you ever turned away from a VAW shelter? If yes, for what reason? What did you do?
23. What happened the first day you became homeless?
24. How old were you?
25. Did ever have any contact with Child Protection services?
26. Where did your son stay when you became homeless?
27. Did you turn to anyone for help with housing?
28. What impact did this have?
29. Did any of the VAW services that you contacted (such as shelters) assist you to find housing?
30. Did you contact any agency or service to help you find housing?
31. When you were homeless, were you at risk for/or experienced being a victim of violence from others? If yes, who was violent towards you?
32. So what about passers-by and other people?
33. Where do you plan on going next from Usindiso?
34. Do you know of other services or programs in your area that help women and children affected by domestic violence to find safe, adequate and affordable housing?
35. If a friend told you about being abused, what advice would you give her about finding housing in your area?
36. Beside counselling what other forms of help did you get?
37. Is there anything else you’d like to add about housing and homelessness for women abused by their intimate partners?
38. What type of housing did you get when you first arrived here?
• Which floor was your room?
• Did you get along with your roommates?
• Which race were they?

39. Have there been any incidences where women had conflict among each other?
40. If you had never found Usindiso, would you have gone to a mixed shelter or a women-only shelter?
• Why is that?

41. What about shelters that are divided into two floors for men only and women only?
42. How do other women feel about shelters?
43. What are the shortfalls in funding (if any) and what are the consequences/impacts of this shortfall?
44. Do you think that race or background makes the experiences of homelessness different between women?
45. Were you ever discriminated against when you were homeless because of your skin colour?
46. Would you say that your experience would have been different if you were only homeless and not raped?

The set of Questions for Lisa Vetten

1. What understanding do you have of shelters?
2. What is their role, what do they aim to do?
3. Why are some shelters for women residents only
4. What are the advantages or disadvantages of faith-based shelters?
5. What is the preferable location for a women’s shelter?
6. So what for you constitutes a safe shelter?
7. How can shelters maximise safety for the use of their clients?
8. Who should be responsible for ensuring that women are safe?
9. What about women themselves?
10. What policies are there for the provision of safe shelters?

The set of Questions for Hilton Judin

1. What understanding do you have of Albert Street pass office precinct?
2. Can you describe the UMWS?
3. How would you describe the location and surrounds of the UMWS?
4. Does the current use of the building give it a new meaning?
5. What understanding do you have of shelters?
6. In your view what are the advantages and disadvantages of faith-based shelters?
7. Why are some shelters only for women residents? What is the significance of sheltering women only instead of mixing them with men?
8. What is the preferable location for a women’s shelter? In which part of the city, in what sort of neighbourhood and surrounds? Why do you say this?
9. How can shelters ensure or maximise the safety of their clients?
10. What issues in the surrounding neighbourhood affect how a shelter operates?
11. Shelters are considered healing spaces, then how does one begin to design a space such as that one without disturbing the current flow or setting of the space?
12. How easy is it for one to find their way around the precinct from a design point of view?
13. Do people of different intersections (race, gender, culture) experience the space such as Usindiso Ministries precinct different?
14. In your view what is the relationship between space and gender?

The set of Questions for Anonymous

1. What understanding do you have of shelters?
2. What is their role, what do they aim to do?
3. Why are some shelters only for women residents?
4. What is the significance of sheltering women instead of mixing them with men?
5. What is the preferable location for women’s shelter?
6. If you were to start a women’s shelter now, where would it be?
7. Can you describe the UMWS?
8. How do women seeking shelter find it, how do they gain access to it?
9. How long can people stay there? How long do they stay?
10. What does the shelter offer its residents?
11. What are they sheltering from?
12. How would you describe the location and surrounds of the UMWS?

13. Generally is this place safe for residents?

14. How safe is it for children outside the shelter?

15. How do the women who were abused experience the space?

16. Why is the shelter located here?

17. What are the advantages of this neighbourhood and locality for the shelter?

18. What are the safety challenges have you identified since your involvement with the shelter identified?

19. How does the shelter ensure the safety of women and their children?

20. What issues in the surrounding neighbourhood affect how a shelter operates, from a safety and security perspective?

21. Who is responsible for making sure that the shelter is safe for all its users?

22. How involved is the community in ensuring the women’s safety?

23. In your view what is the relationship between space and gender?

24. How does funding affect the overall function of shelters especially with regards to safety and spatial aspects?

25. What are the top five destinations?

26. How frequently do you go to these places?

27. By what routes, and modes (walking/ taxi etc)

28. And what about their children?

29. What are the facilities that women mostly require outside the shelter?

30. Are there any danger spots (crime spots) that women need to be aware of?

31. What do the residents do about such spaces?
32. Are there any activities or any features within the neighbourhood would you prefer to be changed?

33. If the municipality asked what you would like them to change what would you say?

34. Do you refer them to other shelters?

35. What would you change to make Usindiso safer?