

# Navigating fieldwork challenges in rural South Africa: a reflexive study in the Umvoti local municipality

<sup>1</sup>Blessing George Akpan and <sup>2</sup>Raveen Rathilall

<sup>1</sup>Department of Operations and Quality Management, Durban University of Technology.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Operations and Quality Management, Durban University of Technology.

<sup>1</sup>[22063681@dut4life.ac.za](mailto:22063681@dut4life.ac.za) [blesyn84@gmail.com](mailto:blesyn84@gmail.com), <sup>2</sup>[raveenr@dut.ac.za](mailto:raveenr@dut.ac.za)

**ABSTRACT** - In rural area research, fieldwork is important for the collection of data in several disciplines. This study reflects on the challenges encountered during a failed field research project in the Umvoti Local Municipality, South Africa, aimed at exploring rainwater harvesting practices. Despite initial planning, the project was disrupted by community resistance, logistical hurdles, and cultural barriers. Through a reflexive analysis, the study highlights the need for early community engagement, security preparedness, cultural sensitivity, and researcher well-being. It emphasises that rural fieldwork is inherently unpredictable and requires adaptability. Key lessons inform recommendations for future research in similar contexts, stressing the importance of aligning research design with local realities to ensure both scientific relevance and community acceptance.

*Index Terms*—Community resistance, culture, fieldwork, rural research

## I. INTRODUCTION

Fieldwork offers a unique means of obtaining firsthand ideas, gathering data, and examining intricate phenomena within their natural settings or real-world environments [1]. It is often the first significant test of research design robustness and ethical conduct for undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral students [2]. Unlike laboratory research, field-based studies, particularly within qualitative paradigms, require direct engagement with individuals and communities whose cultural norms, values, and views may differ significantly from those of the researcher [3] [4].

Fieldwork embodies a practical application of interdisciplinary knowledge, values, and principles to support sustainable development objectives [5]. In this context, emphasis is that field-based research is central to efforts aimed at uplifting rural communities [6]. However, several factors such as social dynamics, local customs and traditions, infrastructural deficiencies, and geographical distance, as well as limited communication channels, population density, and vulnerability issues contribute to the complexity when conducting ethically sound and methodologically rigorous research in such environments [2] [4] [7]. Additional challenges such as illiteracy, language barriers, bureaucracy, and inflexible cultural beliefs, as well as apathy and a lack of self-sufficiency further complicate community engagement and research processes [8] [9].

Notwithstanding these challenges, fieldwork remains a vital approach for identifying community needs and co-developing solutions that advance local development and sustainability [10]. Recognizing the complexities involved, a “people-centered” approach is advocated that promotes conscientization and community empowerment in field research [11]. This approach acknowledges the unpredictability of human behavior, socio-cultural dynamics, and environmental conditions that often demand flexibility, adaptability, and a readiness to revise initial assumptions during this research process [2] [3].

The aim of the paper is to provide a reflexive account of a research team's fieldwork experience, particularly the challenges encountered during the research project implementation. The original study focus was nanotechnology application to improve harvested rainwater quality in the Umvoti Municipality. Since this rural community relies primarily on harvested rainwater, it encouraged the researcher to embark on this study to explore how nanotechnology could possibly be applied to improve harvested rainwater quality [12]. Correspondence between the research team and local authorities was delayed by bureaucratic processes for approximately eight months. However, after obtaining full ethical clearance, the fieldwork stage of the study ended abruptly, following physical assaults on the research assistants by community members.

The objectives of this reflexive study are to:

- Critically reflect on the fieldwork process and the challenges encountered during this community-based research project.
- Examine the theory behind the social, cultural, and institutional barriers that impeded the successful execution of the original research project.
- Highlight ethical, safety, and communication considerations when conducting fieldwork in rural settings.

## II. CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

Rural communities in many developing nations, including those in Asia and Africa, often share common characteristics such as high poverty levels, underdeveloped infrastructure, and limited access to essential services [13] [14]. In South Africa (SA), approximately 19.4 million of the 60 million population reside in rural areas, representing a substantial portion [15]. Regardless of targeted policies, rural development has stagnated or regressed in some regions, exacerbating inequalities and reducing access to clean water, healthcare, and education [14].

Umvoti Local Municipality, situated within the uMzinyathi District Municipality of the KwaZulu-Natal province, exemplifies many challenges associated with rural living in SA. The population is predominantly Zulu-speaking and dependent on local agricultural subsistence and social aid. Economic activity in this community is minimal, and infrastructure remains underdeveloped, with inadequate access to electricity, healthcare, and educational facilities [16]. In addition, water insecurity is an alarming concern as the community depends on diverse and often unreliable water sources, including rainwater, rivers, boreholes, and springs, along with municipal water tankers [17]. Droughts, insufficient water treatment infrastructure, and inconsistent water quality further exacerbate the situation [18]. While rainwater harvesting (RWH) presents a viable alternative, the harvested rainwater quality is frequently compromised by airborne pollutants and inadequate storage practices [19].

These challenges prompted a research study to investigate the application of nanotechnology to improve harvested rainwater quality in the Umvoti community. The original study employed a mixed-methods approach by integrating quantitative surveys with qualitative community member interviews. The intention with the quantitative surveys was to examine existing RWH processes, while the qualitative interviews were crafted to explore how the RWH practices identified in the survey affected the daily living conditions and health perceptions among residents in the Umvoti community. All ethical protocols were followed, including informed consent and confidentiality assurances. However, despite these preparations, data collection was severely hampered by a lack of community cooperation and two incidents of violence directed at the research team.

It is observed that fieldwork can be unpredictable and chaotic, even under optimal conditions. Therefore, reflecting on this failed fieldwork effort in the Umvoti community offers a valuable learning opportunity of the need for flexible, context-sensitive strategies and contingency planning when undertaking fieldwork in rural settings [20]. Sharing detailed accounts of fieldwork experiences, particularly those involving failure, can inform and improve future research efforts in similar contexts [21]. Lessons learned from the Umvoti case can guide future researchers in anticipating logistical, cultural, and ethical challenges, thus fostering more effective engagement and robust research outcomes in rural environments.

### III. LITERATURE REVIEW

#### *Theoretical Framework*

The theoretical underpinnings of fieldwork are rooted in interpretivist and constructivist perspectives, which prioritize comprehending the social environment from the viewpoint of its inhabitants [22] [23]. Fieldwork speculates that knowledge is socially created and context-dependent, therefore, making immersive techniques such as participant observation, interviews, and participatory tools fundamental to this activity [24]. The research process is also influenced by reflexivity, when the researcher critically examines how their background, preconceptions, and interactions affect the study [25]. In rural areas, where communities are frequently underrepresented in official statistics or misrepresented in policy discussions, fieldwork enables researchers to reveal local knowledge systems, power dynamics, and culturally specific livelihood, resilience, and wellbeing interpretations [26] [27] [28].

The Sustainable Livelihood Framework (SLF), established by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) in 1999, is one of the most prevalent strategies for organizing rural fieldwork. Although not a fieldwork method itself, the SLF provides a conceptual framework that directs design, data collecting, and analysis of fieldwork in rural development [29]. SLF assists researchers in determining the types and from which appropriate sources to gather information. Interviews may be structured to, for example, ascertain the impact of local institutions on credit accessibility or to evaluate how social networks affect employment prospects. Instruments including asset mapping, seasonal calendars, and focus group discussions can be integrated with SLF components [30].

Research has effectively employed the SLF alongside Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) to investigate the methods rural farmers use to develop and maintain their livelihoods [31]). This integration renders the SLF as both an analytical framework and a model for fieldwork, facilitating theory-driven investigation as well as participatory involvement [32]. Similarly, in SA's Vhembe District in the Limpopo province, rural communities have adopted sustainable livelihood practices such as agroforestry and RWH to cope with climate change impacts, demonstrating the relevance of SLF in resilience building [33]. The original study adopted the SLF framework to guide data collection and analysis, considering its suitability for examining rural livelihood systems such as those in Umvoti.

### IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION OF THE FIELDWORK CHALLENGES IN UMVOTI

During the field research, the researcher identified several challenges encountered during the data collection process. While the researcher deployed mixed methods as part of the research process, the challenges reflect what is applicable to qualitative research/studies. In noting data collection challenges in developing (rural) communities, poor acknowledgement of the significance data collection holds as an important research activity, is deemed a major challenge faced by researchers. In addition, participant refusal to share personal information with researchers, a sparsely populated area and problems relating to logistics and technical expertise are found to be salient issues affecting fieldwork and data collection [34]. The challenges experienced in the fieldwork reported on in this paper included logistics, municipal bureaucracy, insecurity and disruptions, financial constraints, language barriers, and psychological stress.

#### *Logistics*

A major concern facing graduate students engaged in fieldwork, particularly those whose budgets and time are limited, is optimizing time in the field and merging remote work [35]. However, logistics was a major challenge faced by the research team in the research. Certain logistical factors were considered by the researcher such as communication, mobility and safety in the course of fieldwork planning. For instance, due to the researcher's unfamiliarity with the environment and lack of language fluency as a graduate student, research assistants were employed [36]. Nonetheless, their presence hardly mitigated the turbulence associated with carrying out research in the Umvoti Local Municipality, due to other factors.

Certain factors such as the readiness of community elders and leaders to support the research, local transportation and travel plans, reachability of the research area, and the researcher's living conditions, as well as the safety and security situation in the proposed research location, and health aspects are logistics factors to be considered. For the researcher, distance was a significant difficulty in

the fieldwork process [37]. The distance from Durban, where the researcher resided, to the Umvoti Local Municipality, is 155.4 kilometers [38], which is quite some distance, particularly when covering the transportation cost for research assistants.

### ***Municipal Bureaucracy***

Municipalities in SA were created to provide local communities with, among other aspects, representative and reliable governance, as well as ensuring the provision and delivery of services in a sustainable way. However, recent studies show SA municipalities are failing in these respects [39]. Emphasis, in this paper, is on the service provision and delivery aspects. Municipal bureaucracy was a major challenge faced by the researcher and her research assistants during the fieldwork. Obtaining approval from the Umvoti Local Municipal office was problematic irrespective of the proactive communication and correspondence via e-mails and phone calls. Despite this, there was no positive feedback from the Umvoti Local Municipal office. Research assistants visited the office with the requisite information and tools such as the request letter and research instruments needed for physical proof. The goal was to obtain approval to conduct the study in the municipality. Nevertheless, all proactive efforts were stalled, and approval was only provided after eight months and two appointments at the office.

Bureaucratic impediments are often common in fieldwork/research and are encountered by several field researchers. One recounts his experience, as a German anthropologist embarking on fieldwork in the Andaman Islands, faced with the problem of reapplying for a Restricted Area Permit (RAP) every few weeks, despite having been cleared by immigration [40]. Similarly, in a study in rural Himalayas, it was noted the researchers faced challenges from the 'culture of bureaucracy', when unable to access an education official of key importance to their research [2]. These reported incidents demonstrate that bureaucratic challenges take different forms but have the same negative impact in hampering a research process.

### ***Finance***

Rural community field/research work can be financially exhausting due to varying factors, including accessing the research location. Obtaining the funds to propel movement, acquire the needed research materials and facilitate logistics can be daunting for the field researcher [41]. This issue has, furthermore, been found to hinder archaeological research, making it slow and many times, rendering it incomplete. Moreover, for swift execution of plans, which include logistics, acquisition of equipment for the fieldwork, payment of assistants and workers, as well as publication and everything in-between, sufficient funds are required [42].

Oftentimes, these essential costs are covered by grants for some individuals. Nevertheless, expenses not included in available grants can be burdensome to researchers, specifically undergraduate and graduate students at the start of their academic journeys [43]. This was the case of the researcher during fieldwork in the Umvoti Local Municipality; taxed with the burden of footing the research cost alone, without the help of grants. The logistics required to access the rural community multiple times, printing and transportation of research materials and the remuneration and welfare of the research assistants made the fieldwork financially taxing.

Financial limitations are an obstacle facing research in rural areas. Rural community field/research work can be financially exhausting due to varying factors including accessing the research location. Obtaining the funds to propel movement, acquire the needed research materials and facilitate logistics can be daunting for the field researcher [41]. It is asserted that this issue has hindered archaeological research, making it slow and many times, rendering it incomplete. She further opines that for the swift execution of plans which include logistics, acquisition of equipment for the fieldwork, payment of assistants and workers, publication and everything in between, sufficient funds are required [42].

Oftentimes, these essential costs are covered by grants for lucky individuals. Nevertheless, expenses not included in available grants can be burdensome to researchers, especially undergraduate and graduate students who are at the start of their academic journeys [43]. This was the case of the researcher during the fieldwork in the Umvoti Local Municipality. The researcher was taxed with the burden of footing the cost of the research alone without the help of grants. The logistics required to access the rural community multiple times, the printing and transportation of research materials and the remuneration and welfare of the research assistants made the fieldwork financially taxing.

### ***Insecurity and Disruption of Fieldwork***

After obtaining municipal approval to carry out fieldwork in the Umvoti Local Municipality, the research team proceeded to conduct a pilot study and while busy, were interrupted by some individuals from the community. This was a major hindrance to the study, because these individuals confiscated and destroyed research materials, including the approval for the study obtained from the Umvoti Local Municipal office. The miscreants also assaulted the research assistants and confiscated their personal belongings.

Another set of research assistants was, subsequently, trained by the researcher and sent to the Umvoti Local Municipality, provided with a new set of research materials. Again, they faced similar harassment and were locked up for hours. In addition, the assistants' personal belongings and money were stolen by miscreants in the Umvoti Local Municipality, which meant they were, consequently, unable to perform any research activity in the community. The two sets of research assistants sent to the Umvoti Local Municipality were assaulted, notwithstanding correspondence via email and phone calls between the researcher and the Umvoti Local Municipal office. The people of this community did not want to be researched and saw research activities as though they were being spied on.

The researcher's experience has bearing on the security challenges facing fieldwork in rural communities. This is echoed in findings that feelings of insecurity can be increased by language barriers, cultural specificities and in general, by being away from family and friends [35]. Similar experiences in field research carried out in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria, note the volatile community environment and attack on the research team stunted the field research progression. Furthermore, despite the consultations and awareness within the community prior to fieldwork commencement, the research team was mobbed and held hostage, because they were thought to be spies sent to the community by feuding neighbors. Some effects of the community attack on the fieldwork included loss of important data, an incomplete research report and fieldwork, vandalism of life and property and the abandonment of that study, with eventual commencement of new research, among others [42]. These experiences are indicative of and reflect some of the researcher's experiences, as the research on how to use nanotechnology to improve the quality of harvested rainwater in Umvoti Local Municipality had to be terminated, due to threats to life and property.



### Language Barrier

The language and cultural milieu of a community are crucial points of consideration for any researcher when conducting field research [44], because a minor inconsistency or barrier in communication between the researcher and the participants could impede the progression of any fieldwork/research project. The researcher encountered a communication gap in the SA community, being a graduate student of Nigerian origins. Additionally, the language predominantly spoken by the Umvoti Local Municipality is Zulu, which the researcher could not understand. Despite having research assistants, the language barrier remained between the researcher and the participants at the early research stages, with some research assistants unable to clearly convey information. Communication gaps often lead to misinterpretations and potential inaccuracies in the data collection process, thereby threatening the field research impact and success [45].

### Mental Stress

Mental stress and trauma are significant challenges faced by researchers in rural area studies. Having to deal with these different stress levels during fieldwork can induce mental stress and fatigue in the process. Psychological trauma is further found to be a major challenge specific to researchers, specifically those who experience physical threats and attacks. In addition, financial and mental assets invested in the research over time, as well as the discomfort suffered, culminate in intense mental stress [42]. This is an experience similar to the researcher's during fieldwork; undoubtedly, the failed fieldwork and having to find a new research location within a short time frame were added stressors for the researcher. According to previous research, it is often natural for fieldwork on sensitive issues to impact the researcher's mental wellbeing [36][46][47][48][49][50]. While research on how nanotechnology can be used to improve the quality of harvested rainwater in a rural community such as Umvoti Local Municipality might not seem a sensitive issue, the reactions it sparked from the rural dwellers indicate differently and this affected the researcher, particularly in the absence of her usual support system [36][46].

## V. REFLECTION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Sensitization and Community Engagement:** For rural field researchers, building rapport and earning research participant and community stakeholder trust can be taxing and oftentimes, time-consuming, particularly in culturally diverse contexts. However, paying attention to this would make the difference for a seamless research experience. Carrying out research sensitization in the field prior to fieldwork commencement, taking the time to understand local customs, actively engaging with the community and building a mutually beneficial relationship are recommended practices that would aid research success and limit fieldwork disruption by rural natives [51]. It is expedient that rural community dwellers should be sensitized regarding research work and activities preceding commencement.
- **Meticulous Logistical Planning:** To mitigate logistical issues, proper logistics planning needs to be performed by field researchers before undertaking research in any rural area. Aspects such as creating a comprehensive logistics plan, securing relevant permits and having alternative plans in the face of unplanned circumstances [52]. Furthermore, ensuring plans incorporating transportation, sustenance and security are put in place can help field researchers easily navigate the research process.
- **Security Consciousness:** Field researchers are to prioritize safety by being security conscious during rural research. Good security during fieldwork is part of the preparation prior to going into the field and planning the exit, even before encountering dangerous situations. In the case of a potentially dangerous situation, possible ways of escape for the field researcher should thus be identified, such as a native interlocutor, who could help the researcher/ research team escape life-threatening situations, the presence of easily accessible military or security personnel and a detailed map that could lead researchers to safety. Furthermore, it is opined that for researchers, managing difficult situations requires imagination and flexibility that may involve movement in unconventional ways, for example, sneaking through fields at night [53].
- **Grant Application for Financial Support:** In the course of fieldwork, researchers, particularly graduate students, can apply for grants to mitigate financial expenses that might pertain to security, logistics and the procurement of research materials, which are persistent problems facing researchers. Seeking grants from academic institutions or non-governmental organizations can provide the research team with the leverage needed to carry out fieldwork. In this field research, the researcher was unable to obtain sufficient funding for the very demanding fieldwork in Umvoti Local Municipality. Nevertheless, the grant funding impact on fieldwork and research of any kind, specifically in rural areas, is far-reaching and could lead to innovations that propel economic development and generate job opportunities [54].
- **Bridging Language and Cultural Barriers:** Since language barriers can significantly affect fieldwork research and participation in rural areas, it is recommended that researchers who are non-native speakers of the predominant languages in the rural community engage a multilingual team of research assistants early in the research planning stage. Engaging research assistants who speak the target languages can encourage a rapport with participants and community leaders and build trust between both parties, as assistants can take on the tasks of translation and interpretation of cultural phenomena, which would ensure accurate and seamless communication. It is additionally asserted that researchers need to develop competency in the culture and traditions of their target rural community, by understanding values and communication styles to ensure meaningful and proper interactions [55].
- **Building Interpersonal Relationships:** The mental stress researchers experience during the fieldwork process can be reduced by investing in interpersonal relations before, during and after fieldwork. It is suggested the researcher seeks the company of the community inhabitants, or that of other field researchers, as that could help make fieldwork more satisfying and relieve anxiety. Furthermore, in coping with mental stress, the researcher must first accept the validity of their emotions and then embrace taking breaks and rest through the research processes [36].

## VI. CONCLUSION

This paper has documented the experiences and challenges faced by a researcher in a failed research project in Umvoti Local Municipality. While the social, cultural, and institutional challenges encountered may be anticipated by field researchers, the idea of being fully prepared for every aspect of fieldwork is often unrealistic. Unforeseen circumstances beyond the researcher's control can arise, potentially stumbling the research efforts [36]. Researchers must thus remain flexible and willing to adapt their data collection plans, research questions, interview guides, and other methodology aspects in response to evolving field conditions.

Fieldwork in rural areas should be regarded as an ongoing learning process rather than a once-off event [35]. This perspective is supported by the researcher, who initiated new research, following the failed fieldwork, with the failure highlighting the importance of contextualizing technological interventions within the social, cultural, and infrastructural realities of rural communities. The study also emphasized key ethical, safety, and communication considerations when conducting fieldwork in rural settings. While the recommended solutions for overcoming these challenges, such as enhanced preparation and community engagement are important, they are not exhaustive. Further research should expand on these considerations, taking the broader range of factors influencing fieldwork success in rural communities into account. Future research should explore technological solutions and also account for the unique characteristics and needs of rural communities, ensuring interventions are both scientifically viable and socially acceptable.

## REFERENCES

- [1.] Preissle, J., & Grant, L. Fieldwork traditions: Ethnography and participant observation. In J. Preissle & L. Grant (Eds.), *Foundations for research: Methods of inquiry in education and the social sciences*, pp. 161–178. Routledge., 2003.
- [2.] Rana, K., Greenwood, J., Fox-Turnbull, W., & Wise, S. Challenges in accessing fieldwork in rural Himalayas: An emerging researcher's experiences. *Waikato Journal of Education*, vol. 24(1), pp. 67–77, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.15663/wje.v24i1.605>
- [3.] Darling, J. Emotions, encounters and expectations: The uncertain ethics of 'the field'. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, vol. 6(2), pp. 201–212, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jhuman/huu011>
- [4.] Morales, E. J., & Elsa, A. Challenges in doing research in a rural area: Experiences in Cambodia. *Aquaculture News*, 2002. [https://mrag.co.uk/sites/default/files/fmspdocs/R7917\\_pap1.pdf](https://mrag.co.uk/sites/default/files/fmspdocs/R7917_pap1.pdf)
- [5.] Woli, L. Issues and challenges in fieldwork practice of social workers in the context of Nepal. *International Journal of Education, Culture and Society*, vol. 8(4), pp. 170–177, 2023.
- [6.] Horiuchi, S. Fieldwork studies in rural areas: Growth of students in an urban university in Japan. *Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences*, vol. 18(4), pp. 117–128, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.9734/arjass/2022/v18i4409>
- [7.] Pierce, C., & Scherra, E. The challenges of data collection in rural dwelling samples. *Online Journal of Rural Nursing and Health Care*, vol. 4(2), pp. 25–30, 2004. <https://doi.org/10.14574/ojrnhc.v4i2.197>
- [8.] Kumar, H. Rural fieldwork: A mosaic of learning and experiences. *Village Square*. 2024. <https://www.villagesquare.in/rural-fieldwork-a-mosaic-of-learning-and-experiences>
- [9.] Cheema, A. R., Mehmood, A., & Khan, F. A. Challenges of research in rural poverty: Lessons from large field surveys. *Development in Practice*, vol. 28(5), pp. 714–719, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2018.1467881>
- [10.] Duran, S., Hrenyk, J., & Sahinyazan, F. G. Re-righting renewable energy research with Indigenous communities in Canada. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 432, p. 139875, 2024.
- [11.] Sousa, W. Community members as facilitators: Reclaiming community-based research as inherently of the people. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, vol. 14(2), pp. 1–15, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.5130/ijcre.v14i2.7767>
- [12.] Bhati, M., & Rai, R. Nanotechnology and water purification: Indian know-how and challenges. *Environmental science and pollution research*, vol. 24, pp. 23423–23435, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-017-0066-3>
- [13.] Allieu, A. M. Implementing nationally appropriate social protection systems and measures for all: Gaps and challenges facing rural area. *ILO Regional Office for Africa*. 2019. [https://www.un.org/development/desa/dspd/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2019/03/Andrew-Allieu\\_SP-for-rural-areas\\_22-Feb-18.pdf](https://www.un.org/development/desa/dspd/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2019/03/Andrew-Allieu_SP-for-rural-areas_22-Feb-18.pdf)
- [14.] Kativhu, S., & Netshandama, V. Tracking rural development progress in South Africa: Towards an alternative approach. *African Journal of Development Studies*, vol. 14(1), pp. 183–203, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.31920/2634-3649/2024/v14n1a9>
- [15.] Statistics South Africa (Stats SA). Mid-year population estimates. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa, 2020.
- [16.] Umzinyathi District Municipality. District growth and development plan: Final draft report, 2015.
- [17.] Viljoen, G., & Van Der Walt, K. Suid-Afrika se waterkrisis - 'n Interdisiplinêre benadering. (South Africa's water crisis – an inter disciplinary approach). *Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe*, vol. 58(3), pp. 483–500, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.17159/2224-7912/2018/v58n3a3>

- [18.] Lebek, K., Twomey, M., & Krueger, T. Municipal failure, unequal access and conflicts over water: A hydrosocial perspective on water insecurity of rural households in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *Water Alternatives*, vol. 14(1), pp. 271–292, 2021. <https://www.water-alternatives.org/index.php/alldoc/articles/vol14/v14issue1/613-a14-1-8/file>
- [19.] Celik, I., Tamimi, L. M. A., Al-Khatib, I. A., & Apul, D. S. Management of rainwater harvesting and its impact on the health of people in the Middle East: Case study from Yatta town, Palestine. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, vol. 189(6), 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-017-5970-y>
- [20.] Reichenborn, M. M., Rottler, C., Aragón, L., Bishop, T. B. B., Hayes, K., Kottler, E., Talal, M. L., & Sommers, P. Advice from the field: Practical skills, challenges, and how to support early career ecologists. *Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America*, vol. 105(2), 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bes2.2127>
- [21.] Casale, M., Lane, T., Sello, L., Kuo, C., & Cluver, L. Conducting health survey research in a deep rural South African community: Challenges and adaptive strategies. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, vol. 1(1), 2013. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1478-4505-11-14>
- [22.] Bryman, A. *Social research methods*, 5th ed. Oxford University Press. 2016.
- [23.] Creswell, J. W. *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* 3rd ed. SAGE Publications, 2013.
- [24.] Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*, 5th ed. SAGE Publications, 2018.
- [25.] Rose, G. Situating knowledges: Positionality, reflexivities and other tactics. *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 21(3), pp. 305–320, 1997.
- [26.] Yanuartati, E. Y. Understanding the framework of sustainable rural livelihoods in the implementation of market-led rural development. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan IPA*, vol. 9(5), pp. 3800–3807, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.29303/jppipa.v9i5.3572>
- [27.] Chambers, R. Participatory rural appraisal (PRA): Challenges, potentials and paradigms. *World Development*, vol. 22(10), pp. 1437–1454, 1994.
- [28.] Scoones, I. Livelihoods perspectives and rural development. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, vol. 36(1), pp. 171–196, 2009.
- [29.] Department for International Development (DFID). *Sustainable livelihoods guidance sheets*. 1999. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/sustainable-livelihoods-guidance-sheets>
- [30.] Banerjee, R., Sheoran, S., Kumar, S., Sanodiya, R., Dhanya, V. G., & Samota, M. K. Participatory rural appraisal techniques for problem identification and formulation of village agricultural development plan of Chosla Village. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology*, vol. 38, iss.9, pp. 80–99, 2020. <https://journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/article/view/964>
- [31.] Sikwebu, N., Zwane, E. M., & Ramashala, M. A. An investigation on the application of the participatory rural appraisal approach in determining farmers' needs of Winterveldt Community, Tshwane Municipality, South Africa. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, vol. 10(12), pp. 33–45, 2021. <https://kwpublications.com/papers/detail/IJARBSS/15950/>
- [32.] Kiconco, M., Alinda, K., Mwebaza, S., & Ssemata, R. Livelihood strategies for achieving sustainable livelihood outcomes among communities near national parks in Uganda: A study of tourism-related and non-tourism-related approaches. *Tourism Critiques*, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TRC-09-2024-0052>
- [33.] Netshisaulu, K. H., Chikoore, H., Chakwizira, J., and Kom, Z. Sustainable livelihood options adopted by rural communities in response to climate change dynamics: A case study approach in Vhembe District, South Africa. *Sustainability*, vol. 17(3), p. 1284, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17031284>
- [34.] Munyoro, I. Research data collection in challenging environments: Barriers to studying the performance of Zimbabwe's parliamentary constituency information centres (PCICs). *African Journal of Information and Communication*, vol. 21, pp. 81–95, 2018.
- [35.] Irgil, E., Kreft, A.-K., Lee, M., Willis, C. N., & Zvobgo, K. Field research: A graduate student's guide. *International Studies Review*, vol. 23(4), pp. 1495–1517, 2021.
- [36.] Zvobgo, K., Willis, C. N., Lee, M., Kreft, A., & Irgil, E. *Fieldwork*. ResearchGate, 2022. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/363818089>
- [37.] Desai, V., & Potter, R. (Eds.). *Doing development research*. Sage Publications, 2006.
- [38.] Google Map Data, 2025
- [39.] Bureau for Economic Research. SA's municipal challenges and their impact on local economic development: Research note. Bureau for economic research, vol. 6(1), 2021.
- [40.] Zehmisch, P. J. Navigating bureaucracy during fieldwork. ResearchGate. 2015. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/371576889>



- [41.] Gwadabe, N. M., & Balogun, A. D. The challenges and strategies of accessing hard to reach locations during fieldwork data collection: The case of northeast Nigeria. ResearchGate. 2021. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/351912592>
- [42.] Akpan, E. The challenges of archaeological fieldwork in Nigeria: The case of Oku Iboku Community, Akwa Ibom State. 2020. ResearchGate. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373898374>
- [43.] Freund, C. The hidden costs of fieldwork are making science less diverse. Massive Science, 2017. <https://massivesci.com/articles/science-fieldwork-funding-system-reform>
- [44.] Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. Ethnography: Principles in practice, 4th ed. Routledge, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315146027>
- [45.] Tanu, D., & Dales, L. Language in fieldwork: Making visible the ethnographic impact of the researcher's linguistic fluency. The Australian Journal of Anthropology, vol. 27(3), pp. 353–369, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1111/taja.12150>
- [46.] Wood, E. J. The ethical challenges of field research in conflict zones. Qualitative Sociology, vol. 29(3), pp. 373–386, 2006.
- [47.] Hummel, C., & El Kurd, D. Mental health and fieldwork. PS: Political Science & Politics, vol. 54(1), pp. 121–125, 2020.
- [48.] Loyle, C. E., & Simoni, A. Researching under fire: Political science and researcher trauma. PS: Political Science & Politics, vol. 50(1), pp. 141–145, 2017.
- [49.] Skjelsbæk, I. Silence breakers in war and peace: Research on gender and violence with an ethics of engagement. Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society, vol. 25(4), pp. 496–520, 2018.
- [50.] Schulz, P., & Kreft, A.-K. Researching conflict-related sexual violence: A conversation between early career researchers. International Feminist Journal of Politics. Advance online publication, 2021.
- [51.] Tindana, P., Singh, J. A., Tracy, C. S., Upshur, R. E., Daar, A. S., Singer, P. A., Frohlich, J., & Lavery, J. V. Grand challenges in global health: Community engagement in research in developing countries. PLoS Medicine, vol. 4(9), pp. e273, 2007. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0040273>
- [52.] Erinjogunola, F. L., Ajirotutu, R. O., Sikhakhane-Nwokediegwu, Z., & Olayiwola, R. K. Navigating multi-national construction projects: Overcoming challenges. Research and Development Journal, 2025. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/389508255>
- [53.] Felbab-Brown, V. Security considerations for conducting fieldwork in highly dangerous places or on dangerous subjects. Social Science Research Council: Drugs, Security and Democracy Program, vol. 3, pp. 2–4, 2024.
- [54.] Flanagan, W. What is research funding? 2024 expert guide for beginners. Infonetica, 2025. <https://www.infonetica.net/articles/what-is-research-funding>
- [55.] Bajaj, S. Addressing language barriers in research participation. Editage, 2023. <https://www.editage.com/insights/addressing-language-barriers-in-research-participation>