A multi-stakeholder dialogue model for building trust at the local level

This section explores the role of dialogue in trust-building and enhancing partnerships between local government and communities in order to address service delivery issues. It features public opinion data from the Reconciliation Barometer to examine trends on trust in South African society.

Introduction

This section considers the breakdown of trust between ordinary South Africans and the governance structures that serve them, particularly local government. Firstly, it explores how this lack of trust plays itself out at the grassroots level. Here, we look at examples of how people express their unhappiness. Then, we consider whether there are different ways of building trust. To this end, the value of dialogue and the viability of the multi-stakeholder dialogue (MSD) approach are explored as a potential vehicle to involve local communities in issues affecting their lives. Next, the Western Cape town of Doringbaai is considered as a case study. Thereafter, we explore how local MSD might be represented at sub-council level, with possible further escalation to council, municipal and, ultimately, national level. Municipality-level MSD could be accommodated in an existing facilitative structure, such as the South African Local Government Association (SALGA), which has a provincial and national competency and footprint. Finally, we consider the potential impact of institutionalised dialogue as a trust-building mechanism that is not a social pact, but rather is an organic, accountable and effective means by which the government and the people would have the opportunity to engage with each other in constructive and productive ways.

The status quo

One day everything will be well, that is our hope. Everything is fine today, that is our illusion – Voltaire

Project 'New South Africa' turned twenty-one in 2015. It was built on the promise of a better life for all embodied in the interim constitution and later entrenched in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa. South Africans were promised a more equal and humane future in which all forms of exclusion would be challenged. There have been glimpses of togetherness over the last twenty-one years. We had moments of national euphoria when South Africa won the Rugby World Cup in 1995 and hosted the 2010 Soccer World Cup. Who can forget the outpouring of sorrow when we mourned the passing of Nelson Mandela? Sadly, such moments are overshadowed by the stark reality of a deeply wounded society. The cause of this 'woundedness' is an extremely troubled past, the ghosts of which have not yet been laid to rest.

South Africans who believe that their concerns are not being taken seriously have used strikes and direct protest action to vent their anger. Protests by local communities against their municipalities, which are typically related to service delivery, have become commonplace in the last decade. According to research undertaken by Dr Sethulego Matabesi of the University of the Free State, there has been a substantial increase in such protests, from 10 in 2004 to 111 in 2010 and peaking at 176 during 2014 (UFS 2015). The protests often are characterised by violent confrontations with the police, extensive damage to property and the looting of formal and informal businesses, and sometimes result in injury and death.

Ann Bernstein and Sandy Johnston (2007) used high-profile protests in Phumelela in the Free State and Khutsong near Carltonville as case studies. In Phumelela, the protest was about an inadequate and unhygienic water supply, poor management of the bucket sewage system, sewage spills, irregular electricity supply and the poor condition of roads. In addition, the municipality was accused of nepotism, corrupt practices, arrogance and indifference. In Khutsong, people were unhappy with the proposed incorporation of the Merefong Local Municipality into the North West Province. The Khutsong unrest, which generated in excess of 80 news reports, caused damage to the value of more than R70 million. Members of the Khutsong community further boycotted the 2006 municipal elections – a mere 232 out of 29 540 registered voters cast their ballots. While the reasons for the protests were very different in the two communities, they do speak to the stresses on local communities and small towns, the fragility of institutions, bad appointments, lack of accountability and poor responsiveness. They also show how communities are prepared to use their collective power as a last resort to make their voices heard.

Local political institutions: a breakdown of trust

Institutional trust

The South African Reconciliation Barometer (SARB) measures confidence in a range of political and social institutions by asking respondents to indicate their levels of confidence in them on a four-point scale.[1] Table 3.2.1 shows the means of popular trust or confidence in each of the institutions between 2006 and 2013, as well as percentage scores over the period.

The merged mean scores for all years show that South

Africans had greater confidence in their national political institutions than in their provincial or local political institutions. Civil society institutions, including religious institutions and the media (radio, television and newspapers), attracted the greatest levels of trust. Political parties were the least trusted bodies, eclipsing even the police, widely regarded by South Africans as corrupt, inefficient and ineffective. Trends between 2006 and 2013 reveal a pattern of decline in confidence levels in almost all of these institutions. Fluctuations are most noticeable around the 2010 period, when South Africa successfully hosted the 2010 Soccer World Cup. In that year, confidence levels improved for almost all institu-

tions (but not large companies, several of which in the construction sector were embroiled in a price-fixing scandal that may have affected attitudes towards the private sector). However, trust declined after the 2010 event, before rising again in 2012. It may be the case that the local government elections of 2011 and political infighting during this time contributed to the temporary decline in confidence. Civic institutions were less affected by a decline in confidence over time, with some, such as the legal system, Constitutional Court and the South African Human Rights Commission, displaying trendless fluctuations over time. Thus, it appears that political institutions, particularly in the local government sphere,

Table 3.2.1: Confidence or trust in civic and political institutions, percentages and average mean (a great deal or quite a lot), 2006–2013										
Confidence in		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Merged
Presidency	%	78	69	59	56	68	67	66	57	65
	Mean	1.86	2.10	2.36	2.40	2.15	2.18	2.16	2.35	2.20
National government	%	74	64	59	58	67	67	67	56	64
	Mean	1.97	2.23	2.36	2.38	2.16	2.18	2.15	2.38	2.23
Provincial government	%	67	58	51	50	59	58	63	53	57
	Mean	2.14	2.38	2.51	2.55	2.32	2.38	2.22	2.44	2.37
Local government	%	51	44	41	39	44	44	51	50	46
	Mean	2.45	2.66	2.71	2.77	2.64	2.65	2.46	2.53	2.61
Parliament	%	71	64	58	57	68	64	66	57	63
	Mean	2.05	2.25	2.38	2.41	2.17	2.24	2.18	2.37	2.26
Political parties	%	50	39	37	35	46	42	48	48	43
	Mean	2.49	2.71	2.76	2.82	2.58	2.67	2.52	2.55	2.63
Newspapers	%	69	63	66	66	72	66	70	67	68
	Mean	2.15	2.30	2.25	2.24	2.15	2.22	2.14	2.20	2.21
TV & radio	%	78	72	74	75	77	75	76	69	75
	Mean	1.97	2.13	2.09	2.05	2.05	2.07	2.00	2.15	2.06
Religious institutions	%	73	73	71	75	77	76	77	70	74
	Mean	2.04	2.05	2.14	2.03	2.02	2.02	1.96	2.09	2.04
Constitutional Court	%	71	66	60	63	69	71	73	62	67
	Mean	2.10	2.24	2.36	2.32	2.16	2.12	2.06	2.26	2.20
Legal system	%	66	60	54	55	65	67	71	60	62
	Mean	2.21	2.38	2.48	2.45	2.26	2.22	2.12	2.32	2.30
Police	%	–	–	–	52	60	64	62	49	58
	Mean	–	–	–	2.49	2.34	2.23	2.26	2.54	2.37
Human Rights Commission	%	74	69	65	68	73	71	–	–	70
	Mean	2.03	2.19	2.26	2.22	2.09	2.11	–	–	2.15

have experienced the greatest loss in public confidence.

With regard to low levels of public confidence in local government, the National Development Plan notes that:

> municipalities have often found that expectations exceed their administrative and financial ability. This has led to a loss of confidence. To overcome these issues, a clear, long-term and consistent approach is required. This can be achieved through a shift in four critical areas:
> - An enabling framework for local government
> - A proactive approach to improving intergovernmental relations
> - A long-term approach to building capacity
> - Mainstreaming citizen participation. (NPC: 436)

The last point is the one that, over time, can change the confidence levels of the public in local government. The extent to which ordinary citizens feel that their voices are heard is an important indicator of the quality of democracy in any country. The increase in service delivery protests suggests that for the vast majority of citizens the vote alone is not enough, particularly if elected politicians are deemed to be unresponsive to their needs and aspirations. The result has been a breakdown of trust and a sense of betrayal, which undermines prospects for building developmental pacts at the local level.

Trust in national leaders

Levels of trust in national leaders are measured in the SARB by asking respondents to rank on a five-point scale their agreement or otherwise with the statement that most of the time they can trust the country's national leaders to do what is right.[2] It is clear that scepticism towards political actors has increased, with trust declining by 16 percentage points between 2006 and 2013. By 2013, more than half of the respondents (51 per cent) were either sceptical of or simply did not trust political actors

(see Table 3.2.2). The merged mean scores for all years (2.52) show that roughly half of the respondents trusted national leaders to do what is right. However, since 2006 the mean score has generally increased, indicating that trust is in decline.

Interracial distrust

Turning to trust among individuals and groups, the SARB has no specific questions addressing interpersonal trust between individuals, but the survey does repeatedly ask about trust towards 'other' racial groups. Given that race is a primary social division in South Africa, it is pertinent to establish the implications of interracial trust for social capital more generally. When asked whether people of races different to their own are untrustworthy, 39 per cent of all respondents agreed, while 31 per cent were uncertain and 30 per cent disagreed (see Table 3.2.3).[3] Over a third of South Africans perceive that people of other racial groups are untrustworthy. However, the trends over time suggest that interracial distrust is decreasing. Between 2004 and 2013, the proportion who agreed dropped from 44 per cent to 31 per cent. Those who strongly disagreed increased over the same period.

In search of alternatives

Building trust

Trust may be defined as a belief in the reliability, goodness, honesty and effectiveness of someone or something. Lack of trust creates cynicism, doubt and anxiety. A key requirement of a good democracy is that its citizens trust one another, as well as the institutions and leaders that govern them. This should not be a blind trust, which would allow leaders to get away with undemocratic behaviour. In an interview with the *Daily Maverick* (7 June 2015), David Makhura, the premier of Gauteng, outlined his understanding of what is required of government:

Table 3.2.2: Trust in national leaders, percentages and means, 2006–2013									
	2006	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**Merged**
Strongly agree/agree (%)	65	58	50	50	59	53	51	49	57
Uncertain (%)	18	21	22	18	20	27	26	29	22
Disagree/strongly disagree (%)	17	21	28	32	21	20	23	22	21
Average mean	2.33	2.55	2.75	2.77	2.50	2.57	2.64	2.64	2.52

Table 3.2.3: Interracial group trust, percentages, 2004–2013											
	2004	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**Merged**
Strongly agree (%)	16	18	16	15	13	11	12	11	10	9	13
Agree (%)	28	26	28	32	25	26	26	28	23	22	26
Uncertain (%)	29	26	27	27	34	31	32	33	31	33	31
Disagree (%)	22	22	22	19	20	24	24	22	24	22	22
Strongly disagree (%)	5	8	7	7	8	8	6	6	13	14	8

It is about getting the basics right. It is about politicians doing what they are supposed to do – identifying the problems, finding the solutions, getting public servants in the right frame of mind to implement them and setting deadlines for results.

Makhura instituted a service delivery 'war room' to deal with lethargic government responses to problems, the intention being that no issue should be in the public domain for more than 24 hours without a response from the government. He stressed that:

we need to change the pace of dealing with issues and bring in urgency. Communities are edgy. We can't respond like there's no hurry.

He believes that the government needs to work hard and deliver in order to close the trust deficit between itself and the citizens.

Ken Blanchard (2010) refers to trust as a common language, and argues that the high cost of low trust creates an untenable situation for any organisation. He goes on to list eight things that can be done to build trust:

- demonstrate trust;
- share information;
- tell it straight;
- provide opportunities for everyone to win;
- provide feedback;
- resolve concerns head-on;
- admit mistakes; and
- walk the talk.

Makhura's intentions would score high on Blanchard's trust-building list, but it is important for intention to be translated into tangible action, not just in Gauteng but throughout South Africa. While his strong emphasis on systemic intervention is to be applauded, there is a dialogical gap in his approach. Ideally, the systemic and dialogical (where people are not just reported to be, but feel that they are, partners with the government) should both feature in the type of effective and efficient government Makhura is trying to build. This would increase the likelihood of achieving the trust that is so elusive.

Dialogue

For trust to develop, effective communication is vital. This is best done through dialogue that has mutual understanding as its outcome, which is different from negotiation or debate. Negotiation takes place when there is a specific problem that has to be resolved, and aims to arrive at a decision that all parties accept. The aim of debate is to challenge the validity of arguments. Debate is very important because it is in the context of debate that the weaknesses of specific arguments can be uncovered – to the benefit of all concerned. The central purpose of dialogue is to improve mutual understanding. Dialogue seeks to answer the questions: Why are other people thinking and behaving as they do? What is it that we must understand about them that will help us to improve our relationship?

Multi-stakeholder dialogue

MSD is a methodology for designing and implementing consultation and cooperation in complex change processes that require the inclusion and integration of different interest groups. The intention is to get people from different walks of life and with different perspectives and needs into a conversation that results in a practical outcome. High-quality MSD has the potential to produce innovative outcomes that benefit all stakeholders. It can enhance trust-building, cooperation,

acceptance of decisions, ownership and collective responsibility. MSD can also bring about a qualitative improvement in how different stakeholders communicate with one another. MSD can be particularly effective if there is a longer-term orientation rather than a once-off engagement to deal with a difficult situation. MSD should have sustainability rather than crisis management as the objective.

The negotiated agreement that ushered in South Africa's democratic dispensation of 1994 was the result of MSD. The process, with all of its imperfections, engendered enough trust for the seemingly unthinkable outcome of universal franchise to be realised. A peaceful election was secured through the institution of the National Peace Accord, which saw potential conflict being resolved through stakeholder dialogue.

The 'dialogic model' has the potential to result in the following beneficial outcomes:

- improved quality of decision-making;
- enhanced creativity and innovation;
- decisions that enjoy greater credibility;
- increased likelihood of implementation;
- collaborative cross-section relationships;
- increased problem-solving capacity; and
- robust and sustainable results.

While there are different forms of MSD, all of them foster consultation, collaboration and implementation. It is an ideal platform to bring together the public sector, civil society and the private sector to explore common interests. The dialogic change model is a results-orientated approach that promotes the implementation of dialogue in four phases:

1. *Phase one*: exploring and engaging. In this phase, the focus is on understanding the context and the views of stakeholders, with a view to preparing them for the possibility of dialogue with people from a different perspective. This is also the stage where excitement is built, energy generated and the case for change is made.
2. *Phase two*: building and formalising. In this phase, commitment and buy-in from stakeholders is secured, formal agreements are created and the process is jointly planned.
3. *Phase three*: implementation and evaluation. Recommendations and activities that have been agreed upon

are implemented. Progress is constantly evaluated.
4. *Phase four*: developing further, replicating or institutionalising. During this phase, the dialogue is taken to the next level, with the focus on creating lasting structures for change. (Keunkel, Gerlach & Frieg 2011)

Each phase has the potential to yield both positive results and common difficulties, as is illustrated in Table 3.2.4.

MSD requires an approach to facilitation and leadership that is different from the traditional means. MSD facilitators are non-hierarchical; rather, they have the ability to work with others to convene, initiate, coordinate, facilitate and implement. They have the ability to work with difficult people in a constructive way to achieve a common goal. There is an understanding that the key to success lies in the collective intelligence of all the stakeholders and that any change in action is preceded by a change in thinking. They do not behave in a way that stifles the emergence of different points of view and they are not afraid of the truth, even if it is awkward. What is needed is to develop these competencies as part of deliberate capacity-building processes at local government level, with the inclusion of members of civil society.

If taken seriously, MSD has the potential to shift the way people communicate from uncontested statements to generative dialogue. One of the reasons for the breakdown in relations between many local government institutions and their constituents is a lack of meaningful communication. There is the unfortunate practice of engaging in serial monologues, often manifested in uncontested statements that leave no room for questions. When local government and the people do get together, communication is characterised by debate and verbal brawling based on the winner/loser paradigm. Here, the focus is on convincing others of the rightness of one's argument, in an attempt to control outcomes. Such interactions usually leave people frustrated and unhappy.

The next step should be to institute facilitated discussions that ensure more equal participation. This will open the door for reflective dialogue whereby different views and approaches are integrated, assumptions are clarified and deeper concerns are acknowledged. If this trajectory continues it should lead to generative dialogue, in which the focus is on fostering collective intelligence, insight and respect for differences and innovation. The more the members of a stakeholder system grow

Table 3.2.4: Phases of the dialogic change model

Phase	Potential results	Potential difficulties
1. Exploring and engaging	Trust among stakeholders Resonance for the dialogic process Credibility for implementation Participating stakeholders identified Context explored and understood	Lack of ownership Insufficient context analysis Excluding important stakeholders Hurrying into agreements Lack of understanding Absence of committed core group
2. Building and formalising	Clarity on use of stakeholder dialogue Agreements to collaborate Project/activity plans Agreements on implementation Formal structures	Rushing into signed agreements Absence of joint problem-solving Insufficient buy-in Too little focus on trust-building Not taking procedures, rules and regulations seriously
3. Implementing and evaluating	Showcase of success Achieved milestones Implementation reports Public communication Monitoring systems established	Uncoordinated implementation Insufficient communication Overambitious implementation plans Lack of transparency Loss of motivation
4. Developing further, replicating or institutionalising	Extending participation Institutionalising dialogue Replicating success	Insufficient institutionalisation Insufficient engagement Fragmented success stories Insufficient adjustments

together, the more likely the possibility of reaching the stages of reflective and generative dialogue.

Doringbaai: an MSD case study

An example of a successful MSD at local government level is to be found in the small fishing town of Doring-baai. With a population of less than 1 300 people, Doring-baai is typical of towns on the west coast of the Western Cape that once had vibrant local economies. It is part of the Matsikama Municipality, which, in turn, falls within the West Coast District Municipality. Historically, Doringbaai's main economic activities were fishing (done by local men), and the packaging and export of crayfish (which employed many women). Its harbour also once served as an anchorage for boats unloading provisions for onward transport inland. With the intro-duction of fishing quotas, as a result of declining fish and crayfish stocks, the local factory, which provided many jobs, fell silent and the infrastructure deteriorated. The prospect of employment opportunities looked (and remains) bleak, and a sense of hopelessness fuelled social ills. The community needed to rally together to do something about their situation. It is in this context that the MSD is discussed below.

An MSD platform can be an existing structure, rather than a new entity. In Doringbaai, the Community Policing Forum (CPF) is the platform. One advantage to using an existing platform is that a structure is already in place. The CPF in Doringbaai had been extended to include stakeholders such as the police, religious bodies, civic movements, NGOs and government departments. The Institute for Justice and Reconciliation's Community Healing Project had been working with some of the community leaders in Doringbaai who saw an ideal opportunity to use the CPF for MSD.

The following observations are based on attendance at a CPF meeting as invited guests. One of the first items on the agenda was a report by the police. After a compre-hensive breakdown of the crime statistics, followed by a discussion on what could be done to improve the situation, other issues that affect the community were raised. What emerged was an encouraging insight into how effective a good MSD platform can be. The discus-sions were both respectful and robust, and it was clear that the participants had been able to build a rapport with one another over time. Issues under discussion included: an improved community response to fires, given that the fire station they depend on is in the nearest large town; what measures to put in place for

two offenders who were going to be released back into the community; how to lobby the Department of Social Development to secure a stronger presence in the town; how to engage the municipality with regard to housing challenges (which included a discussion about the absence of the local councillor); economic opportunities created by local farmers at the defunct fish factory; what to do with a mentally challenged young woman who the local clinic is unable to assist; the concern that so many fishermen are unable to swim; and the programme of action of the 'fatherhood group'.

What became evident is that the MSD platform created opportunities for the discussion of hard and soft issues, and we left the meeting with a sense of hope and a vision of what is possible if sufficient will and goodwill, coupled with an effective process, are present. The Doringbaai experience highlights the following insights:

- MSD can be built on existing platforms, which can be made more inclusive of broader community issues;
- the potential for members from different sectors of the same community, with different perspectives and different interests, to come together on one platform is enhanced through MSD;
- as more issues that affect the livelihood and welfare of locals are recognised and dealt with, the potential for increased agency is promoted;
- as processes become more transparent, trust is enhanced;
- with increased positive outcomes, higher degrees of ownership are experienced;
- high-quality MSD can improve the way people engage with each other and with authorities;
- increased levels of confidence in stakeholder processes are accompanied by commitment to deal with pressing social and economic challenges at the local level; and
- increased trust holds the potential for improved service delivery, as a result of stronger partnerships between the government, civil society and the private sector.

It is important to note that various dynamics play themselves out during MSD. Over time, as stakeholders become more comfortable with each other, there is greater appreciation of the different roles people play. In every process, there are people who are consistently present and who show a high degree of interest, while others are less consistent but bring high levels of

influence to bear on the process. Judging from the discussion regarding the absence of the local councillor at the CPF meeting, it was evident that the stakeholders recognised that they needed to respond in a way that would not alienate the councillor, and discussed rather how to keep him informed. There was a strong sense, too, that members of the community needed to be informed at all times, and stakeholders were urged to ensure that decisions made at the meeting were clearly communicated to all constituents.

Another dynamic that emerged was how different people played different roles and how all stakeholders had found ways to make sense of this. Higher levels of inclusiveness, ownership, credibility and cohesion increase the likelihood of acceptance of different styles of engagement. It is in the combination of the different roles that MSD finds direction, correction, perspective and completion.

The example of Doringbaai illustrates that it is possible to put in place MSD platforms that qualitatively can improve the way local government, other government departments, civil society and the private sector engage with one another in the areas of sponsorship or leadership, relationship management, goals and process clarity, credibility, inclusivity, ownership and delivering outcomes. In most communities, such quality of engagement is absent. However, if MSD were explored more widely, it could fundamentally change the landscape of local government as we know it. This is not a call for processes that compete with local government, but it is a call for an improvement in the way local government engages with people. It should also not be seen as a soft and unrealistic proposal; it is, rather, a viable, implementable contribution. Local government has been struggling with capacity, low trust and poor service delivery for far too long. Something needs to be done to prevent a total implosion and complete breakdown of confidence.

Potential for implementation

While the Doringbaai example present us with interesting insights, it is not enough to have isolated examples championed by a few civil society actors. What Doringbaai illustrates is that there are effective ways in which communities can participate in the social welfare of their areas. Opportunities to address political and economic challenges are enhanced when dialogue is mainstreamed

OPPORTUNITIES TO ADDRESS POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC CHALLENGES ARE ENHANCED WHEN DIALOGUE IS MAINSTREAMED AND INCLUSIVELY IMPLEMENTED.

and inclusively implemented. What is needed is an integrated and widespread implementation strategy that can deliver sufficient positive outcomes nationally to enhance the state of local government.

Many communities across the country have vibrant structures that are driven by a combination of actors from the public and private sectors and civil society. Community policing forums enjoy variable success but are potential arenas for sustainable MSD processes. There might be many other structures with the potential to bring people together, and this level of MSD could create opportunities for local confidence-building engagements. However, it might be advisable to limit this level of MSD activity at municipal ward level.

Potentially, each ward could have an elected representative, other than the councillor, on an MSD platform at sub-council level in smaller towns. It is at this level where local concerns can be escalated. Officials from the municipality responsible for delivery of services, as well as representatives of local clinics, police stations, social service and other relevant government departments could interface with representatives from ward MSD initiatives. Not only would citizens be party to important strategic discussions, but they would also be able to go back to their wards armed with first-hand information.

MSD could be scaled up further to metro level in big cities, and regional council level in rural areas. If the principle of representation is followed, then each sub-council or small municipality would elect representatives, other than councillors, for the metro MSD. This could be similar to the service delivery 'war room' that exists in Gauteng. It is here that the systemic and the dialogic approaches can come together.

At the national level, an organisation like the South African Local Government Association (SALGA) has both the mandate and the ability to act as convenor or secretariat for a national MSD platform. At least two of SALGA's existing directorates – Community Development and Municipal Institutional Development – could take on such a function. SALGA, further, hosts other important events and entities, including:

- the National Municipal Managers Forum;
- the SALGA National Conference;
- Local Government Week; and
- workshops and training.

A national MSD would require a fundamental shift in the way different entities see each other. The only way the existing lack of trust can be dealt with is through active engagement, not on a once-off basis, but as a long-term investment in the future of South Africa.

This conceptualisation of a national MSD is far from the finished article, but it does have the potential to contribute towards the building of a better society. It would increase trust, transparency and service delivery, and significantly reduce the number of violent service delivery strikes. Admittedly, such a process might be vulnerable to political capture, gate-keeping, bureaucracy and the like; nevertheless, it remains a viable alternative to the status quo.

Conclusion

It is argued above that South Africa has stumbled through the last 21 years in its attempts to create a better life for all. Well-run MSD would increase the trust relations between the government and citizens, promote and increase accountability and stem toxic practices. It has the potential to create a vibrant state, in which the notion of social compacts is given a fresh interpretation. It can unblock some of the paralysis that besets municipalities and other spheres of government, as well as civil society, making the relationships between them collaborative rather than competitive.

ENDNOTES

1   The question is phrased as follows: Please indicate how much confidence you have in each of the following institutions. Would you say: a great deal (1); quite a lot (2); not very much (3); none at all (4)?
2   The question is phrased as follows: Most of the time I can trust the country's national leaders to do what is right. Would you say you strongly agree (1); agree (2); uncertain (3); disagree (4); strongly disagree (5)?
3   The question is phrased as follows: Please say whether you strongly agree, agree, are uncertain, disagree or strongly disagree that…[list of race groups other than the one the respondent belongs to] people are untrustworthy.

REFERENCES

Bernstein A & Johnston S (2007) *Voices of anger.* Johannesburg: The Conflict and Governance Facility.

Blanchard K (2010) *Building trust.* Available at: http://www.kenblanchard.com/img/pub/blanchard-building-trust.pdf [accessed 26 November 2015].

Keunkel P, Gerlach S & Frieg V (2011) *Working with stakeholder dialogues: Key concepts and competencies for achieving common goals. A practical guide for change agents from public sector, private sector and civil society.* Cape Town: Collective Leadership Institute.

NPC (National Planning Commission) (2012) *National Development Plan 2030: Our future – make it work.* Pretoria: NPC.

UFS (University of the Free State) (2015) *UFS research sheds light on service delivery protests in South Africa.* Press release, 3 February. Available at: http://pressoffice.mg.co.za/universityofthefreestate/PressRelease.php?StoryID=255849 [accessed 25 November 2015].