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ABSTRACT

Despite stipulations in local government legislation that Municipalities should build the capacity of the local communities to enable effective public participation and to foster community participation in local government, little is known on how municipalities capacitate their people staying in the rural areas to participate effectively in the IDP process. This research study investigated, explored and analyzed capacity building programmes used by Lepelle-Nkumpi Local Municipality to capacitate its people staying in the rural areas to participate effectively in the IDP process. The study was conducted through qualitative interviews with officials working and people living in two rural wards.

An analysis of the interviews yields that Lepelle-Nkumpi municipality does not have a capacity building policy or strategy for promoting effective participation of people in the IDP process. The capacity building programmes used by the municipality are more focused on ward committees, ward councilors and project steering committee members than on traditional leaders, small businesses and other people staying in the rural areas. The municipality has planned training programmes for ward committees, ward councilors and project steering committee members and none for other people. Information sharing is done through ward committees, municipality and council meetings for all categories of citizens. People who practise subsistence farming are capacitated through agricultural research based interventions. Skills development programmes are used to enhance participation of project steering committee members in monitoring the implementation of IDP projects. The capacity building programmes are effective in making people aware of structures they can use to participate in the IDP process and to participate during IDP project implementation and to a minimal extent enhances people’s participation in monitoring the implementation of IDP projects. The Municipality’s capacity building programmes enhances people’s skills to participate effectively during implementation of IDP projects and not in the decision making during analysis, strategies and approval phases of the IDP process.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

This chapter gives the background to the study, the significance of the study, the research problem, the purpose of the study, and the structure of the rest of the research report. The main research question and supplementary questions as well as the scope and focus of the research are also discussed in this chapter.

The 1994 democratic elections in South Africa led to a new form of governance that emphasizes public participation in public policy making in all spheres of government. According to the Department of Provincial and Local Government (DPLG) (2002) this new form of governance is also stipulated in the South African Constitution (1996) that mandates that all public policy processes should encompass democratic participation of the people. For local government, this implied new approaches to development planning that led to the introduction of the Integrated Development Plans in 1996. Through the Integrated Development Planning process, the people are given an opportunity to identify and prioritize their needs, identify available resources from their communities, and to participate during the development, implementation and review of the Integrated Development Plans.

According to the Municipal Systems Act (2000) and the Municipal Structures Act (1998) all the municipalities should develop an Integrated Development Plan in consultation with local people, that is, there should be full and active participation of the people in each ward in integrated development planning process. Integrated development planning is aimed at addressing poor planning of the past and to ensure sustainable rural development. It is therefore a requirement for and the responsibility of each municipality to ensure that there is adequate and effective participation of the local residents in each ward. The two pieces of legislation stipulate that people participation forums and community based planning should form an integral part of the Integrated Development Planning process.
According to legislation, municipalities in South Africa should have Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) and they are mandated to ensure that the Integrated Development Planning (IDP) process includes high levels and quality of citizen participation in their respective localities. Despite this legislative requirement, most rural communities “do not have the knowledge and information of the options and the implications of the options they can use to participate meaningfully in local government affairs” (Brynard, 1996: 42) because they were left underdeveloped and under-serviced by the apartheid regime.

Resources to empower rural communities are in most cases inadequate. It is therefore a challenge for local government to capacitate the people in rural communities to participate effectively in the IDP process in their own localities. DPLG (2002) recognizes and emphasizes the importance of empowering the people to participate meaningfully in the IDP process. The researcher therefore sees it useful to consider and investigate capacity-building programmes employed by local authorities to strengthen the quality and level of participation of rural communities in the IDP process.

1.1 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Rural development is currently a key issue in South Africa in addressing past injustices. Rural development is not sustainable without active and meaningful participation of the people staying in the rural areas in development programmes initiated by government in those areas. Effective capacity building programmes play a crucial role in strengthening the participation of these communities in the IDP process and for sustainable rural development.

Participation of rural communities in the IDP process in their own localities is highly critical. Effective and meaningful participation by people staying in the rural areas will add more value to the process; however this will only happen if they have all the necessary knowledge and skills. It is therefore important to investigate and explore
capacity building programmes used by Lepelle-Nkumpi Local Municipality to capacitate the people staying in the rural areas to participate effectively in the IDP process. The study assumes that capacity building programmes that educate, develop skills of the people, change attitudes towards participation, train and provide appropriate information in an appropriate manner improve the quality and effectiveness of people’s participation in the IDP process.

1.2 STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Lack of public participation by rural communities in local government affairs and in the IDP process is a common challenge in many municipalities. The problem is that rural communities often have low literacy levels and lack the knowledge and understanding of local government issues, and understanding of benefits of their participation to their lives. They often do not know their rights, roles and responsibilities in the IDP process, and do not know structures they can use for participation and how they can participate effectively in the process.

These communities often lack the necessary knowledge, information, expertise and capacity to participate meaningfully in the IDP process, particularly in decision-making. Rural communities cannot access IDP related information and there is often lack of resources to capacitate them. Lack of people’s involvement and provision of information by the municipality sometimes results in protests by the people. Capacity building programmes for improving participation of rural communities in the IDP process are often lacking and not effective to create an environment where the people and their municipalities have meaningful engagements on issues that affect them. They are powerless and do not know how they can empower themselves to influence decisions in the IDP process. These factors coupled with poor access to information about the IDP process cause people staying in the rural areas not to participate effectively in the process.
Although research has been done on public participation in Local government affairs in the most affluent areas of South Africa as well as the townships which are semi-urban, little has been done on capacitating rural communities. Little or no training, skills development and provision of appropriate information have been done to enable them to participate effectively and to engage in meaningful discussions on IDP related issues in their own local authorities.

1.3 STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The purpose of this research is to investigate, explore and analyse capacity building programmes used by Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality to capacitate the people staying in the rural areas to participate effectively in the IDP process, in order to recommend effective interventions so that the people in the areas are participating.

The purpose of this study is therefore to:

1.3.1. Establish whether Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality has a capacity building policy aimed at enhancing effective participation of rural communities in the IDP process.

1.3.2. Investigate and explore the types of programmes and resources used by Lepelle-Nkumpi municipality to capacitate rural communities to participate effectively in the IDP process.

1.3.3. Establish the effectiveness of the programmes in promoting the people’s knowledge and understanding of the IDP and the IDP process, structures they can use for participation in the IDP process, benefits and importance of their participation in the IDP process, their rights and responsibilities in the IDP process.

1.3.4 Investigate the factors considered and challenges in capacitating the people in the two rural wards to participate meaningfully in the IDP process.
The study did not only explore how the municipality capacitates its people staying in the rural areas to participate effectively in the IDP process, but also explored national and international best practices with regard to the research topic.

The knowledge gained from the study was used to recommend capacity building programmes for improving participation of rural communities in the IDP process to municipalities in South Africa. Through the analysis of the findings, the researcher hopes to provide valuable input and lessons on effective capacity building programmes aimed at improving participation of rural communities in the IDP process.

The primary research question for this study is “what types of capacity building programmes are used by Lepelle-Nkumpi Local Municipality to capacitate the people in two identified rural wards to enhance the effectiveness of their participation in the IDP process and how effective are the programmes?” Supplementary research questions used to assist in answering the primary research question are:

i. What type of programmes, strategies and resources are used by Lepelle-Nkumpi District Municipality to capacitate various categories of the people in rural wards to participate effectively in the IDP process?

ii. Do the various categories of the people know and understand what the IDP is and its processes, their rights and responsibilities in the IDP process, structures they can use for participation and how they can participate in the process as well as the benefits and importance of their participation to the process and how effective are the programmes in this regard?

iii. What are the factors considered and the challenges in capacitating people staying in the two rural wards in the study?

1.4 UNIT OF ANALYSIS AND DELIMITATIONS

This study focused on capacity building strategies, information dissemination programmes, as well as programmes and policies used by Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality
to enhance meaningful participation of the people staying in the rural wards in the IDP process. The study is limited to the people staying in two rural wards in Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality of Limpopo Province, namely ward 16 and ward 19. The people interviewed for the study include, ward councillors, ward committee members, traditional leaders, small business owners as well as other people staying in the two wards not falling within the mentioned categories. Primary data collection was limited to the above-mentioned categories of the people as well as Community Development Workers working in the two wards, IDP officials from Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality and South African Local Government Association (SALGA) officials whose duties are relevant to the research topic.

1.5 STRUCTURE OF THE REST OF THE RESEARCH REPORT

The rest of the research report is organised as follows. In Chapter 2, local government policies, legislation and strategies as well as existing literature that relates to the study are reviewed. This chapter also reviews literature on public participation in local governance including the rationale for public participation, legislative framework, as well as strategies used internationally to enhance the levels and quality of rural communities’ participation in local governance and development planning. In essence, the chapter explores literature on various factors considered and challenges in capacitating rural communities to participate effectively in local government development planning.

Chapter 3 presents the detailed research design, methodology and techniques employed in the research. The chapter also explains the data analysis process. Limitations of the study are also provided in the chapter. Chapter 4 presents research findings from the various categories of the people in the two rural wards and the officials who participated in the study. Chapter 5 analyses and interprets the findings generated from the semi-structured and focus group interviews with the various participants in relation to the literature reviewed in Chapter two. The chapter describes how the information generated was categorised in accordance with the research questions presented in chapter one. This chapter also presents an analysis of the information gathered from other government
documents, like records of meetings with the community, reports, and so on. Chapter 6 concludes the study. It is in this chapter where some key recommendations with regard to capacity building programmes for improving the quality and level of the people’s participation in the IDP process are made and suggestions for future research offered.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews literature on capacity building programmes used nationally and internationally to enhance the participation of various categories of the people in development planning at local government level. The purpose of this literature review is to explore capacity-building programmes, policies, strategies, and resources used internationally and nationally to empower the people to participate meaningfully in development planning at local government level, during the formulation, implementation and monitoring of local development plans.

It was of great significance and beneficial to the researcher to review existing literature on the research topic because the knowledge gained from the literature review was used to analyse the research findings and to recommend effective capacity building programmes, strategies and resources for improving participation of rural communities in the integrated development planning process in the two rural wards under investigation in the research. Lessons learnt from the literature review can also be applicable to other rural wards in South Africa.

2.1 DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS

The section presents definition of concepts used in the study as well as legislative framework governing capacity building for public participation. It further presents the rationale for public participation, factors affecting rural communities’ participation in local development planning processes, capacity building programmes, strategies and policies used to improve public participation during formulation, implementation and monitoring of local government development plans, as well as the factors considered in designing capacity building programmes for improving participation of people staying in rural areas in local development planning.
2.1.1 Public Participation and Community Participation

Public participation is a two-way communication process between the public and the government through their elected local authorities (Brynard, 1996: 40). Public participation is not synonymous with citizen participation because public participation is a wider concept that may include citizen participation (Brynard, 1996:40). Participation is a process of consientisation (Burkey, 1993:57; Coetzee & Graaf, 1996: 23; Crook & Jerve, 1991:34), awareness raising (MacKay, 2004:30) and it is an essential part of human growth (Meyer & Theron, 2000). According to Sachs (in MacKay, 2004:30), public participation is perceived as an instrument for greater effectiveness as well as a “new source of investment in democratic states”.

In this study, community participation implies the involvement of ward councillors, ward committee members, business people, traditional leaders and other people in the two rural wards in the integrated development planning during analysis, strategies, approval phases of the IDP as well as during IDP projects implementation and monitoring. It refers to participation of the above categories of the people in identifying their own developmental needs and prioritization of these needs, finding solutions together with the municipality.

2.1.2 Capacity-Building

Capacity building is defined as being much more than training (Wakely, 1998; Davidson & Peltenburg, 1996; Mpango, 1998; Sessions, 1993). These authors define capacity building as including human resource development, organisational development and institutional and legal framework development. Human resource development involves the process of equipping people with the understanding, skills and access to information, knowledge and training that enables them to function and perform what is expected of them effectively (Department of Education, 2006). Organisational development includes the elaboration of management structures, processes and procedures, within not only organisations but also the management of relationships between the public, private and community organisations and sectors (Wakely, 1998). Institutional and legal framework
development involves “making legal and regulatory changes to enable organisations, institutions and agencies at all levels and in all sectors to enhance their capacities” (Urban Management Center, 1999:1)

Sessions (1993:1) defines capacity building as “helping governments, communities and individuals to develop the skills and expertise needed to achieve their goals”. Capacity building for participation includes confidence building, leadership development, management and organisation (Vernooy, Sun & Jiancu, 2003: 146). According to Wing (2004: 154) capacity building “takes in a large area including purchase of equipment, consulting assistance in everything from fund raising to strategic planning, coaching, mentoring, training, providing resources and financial support and more”. Capacity building is also defined as an ability of individuals, organisations or systems to perform appropriate functions effectively, efficiently and in a sustainable way (Hemmati & Whitfield, 2004). Strategies for implementing capacity-building programmes therefore need to focus on capacity for what, who, and how? It is about empowering communities to fulfil their role in sustainable development, policy making and implementation as well as promoting exchange of information and knowledge among the people (Hemmati & Whitfield, 2004).

Mannion (in Motlhake, 2006) refers to capacity building as the process of strengthening the knowledge, skills and attitudes of people so that they can establish and sustain their own development. The term applies to the capacity of an entire local population, rather than just individuals to contribute. According to Frank and Smith in Motlhake (2006:12), capacity building for rural communities is a “planned effort to improve the economic, social, environmental and cultural aspects of community well being”. It involves community members coming together to take collective action and generate solutions to common problems.

From the above definitions of capacity-building it is clear that capacity building initiatives need to be holistic to achieve sustainable development. As Berg (in Motlhake, 2006: 14) argues, for capacity building initiatives to achieve sustainable development
they should be “ongoing processes, and should take place over time.” In this study, capacity-building means skills development, educating, training and providing information and resources to various categories of the people including building their knowledge and understanding of the IDP processes and policies as well as their rights, roles and responsibilities. It further refers to building people’s knowledge and understanding of local government policies informing IDPs, knowledge of structures they can use to channel their views about the IDP process.

2.1.3 Community Development

Community development denotes:

[T]he processes by which the efforts of the people themselves are united with those of Governmental Authorities to improve economic, social and cultural conditions of communities, to integrate these communities into the life of the nation, and to enable them to contribute fully to national progress (DPLG, 2005: 5).

It includes participation of the people themselves in efforts to improve their levels of living with reliance on their own initiatives, and a provision of technical and other services in ways which encourage initiative, self help and mutual help, and make these more effective. It is expressed in programmes designed specifically to achieve a wide variety of specific improvements (DPLG, 2005:6). DPLG (2005) further defines community development as a process of social action in which the people of the community organise themselves.

Frank and Smith, as cited by Motlhake (2006:13) recommend that Community development should be “a long-term endeavour, well planned, inclusive and equitable, holistic and integrated into the bigger picture”, initiated and supported by the community member, of benefit to the community and grounded in experience that leads to best practice.
According to Frank and Smith in Motlhake (2006: 14), common causes of problems in community development include not understanding your own community, “getting from planning to action, failing to evaluate results, lack of financial resources, role confusion and power struggles, unresolved conflict, and not applying tools and techniques effectively”.

The United States Department of Agriculture (2005) defines Community Development as a process of developing a broad network of interaction in order to increase community capacity, support sustainable development and improve the rural quality of life. The Department identifies two essential elements of community development, namely, the people’s participation in efforts to improve their quality of living and secondly, the provision of technical and other services in ways which encourage initiatives, self help and mutual help and make these more effective.

To achieve community development it is necessary for local government to create an environment that offers opportunities for effective engagement of people in local government development planning. One way of creating a favourable environment for the people’s participation, according to Reddy (1999) is to build social capital by providing community leadership and vision and to empower the disadvantaged and excluded groups, including women and youth.

According to the Department of Provincial and Local Government (2004), Community development is about putting the people at the centre of the development process and assisting them to realize their potential. It furthermore argues that community development emphasises people’s participation, fosters self-reliance and bottom-up problem solving. This argument is based upon the principle that through raising awareness, individuals within the community become motivated to participate in development planning and take control in solving their own problems.
2.1.4 The process of Integrated Development Planning (IDP)

Integrated Development Planning is a process through which municipalities prepare a strategic development plan for a five-year period (DPLG, 2005). It involves the whole municipality and its people in finding the best solution to achieve effective sustainable development (DPLG, 2005). The result of the integrated development planning process is an Integrated Development Plan. The IDP is the principal strategic planning instrument that guides and informs planning, budgeting, management and decision making in a municipality (DPLG, 2005:75). The IDP process consists of five phases, namely, analysis, strategies, projects, integration and approval (SALGA, n.d.: 24).

*Phase 1: Analysis Phase*

The purpose of the analysis phase is to ensure that development decisions target real needs and problems of the people. The analysis phase focuses on identifying the needs and problems as diagnosed by local communities, finding out available resources and those that can be accessed for intervention purposes and studying dynamics that may impact on development activities in a municipality (SALGA, n.d.: 24).

*Phase 2: Strategies*

This is a phase of making choices. With the comprehensive information gathered in the analysis phase, possible solutions are explored and debated with a view to deciding on the most impact on the problems gathered. This happens via an intensively participatory exercise (SALGA, n.d.: 24).

*Phase 3: Projects*

Professionals in various relevant fields play a leading role in this phase because specialized planning has to take place. Beneficiaries are not left out though. Projects are planned based on the inputs of the beneficiaries. A long-term developmental vision is formulated during this phase of the IDP (SALGA, n.d.).
Phases 4 and 5
This phase involves the realignment of the proposed projects, and checking them against the development vision. Interrelationships are pinpointed and harmonizing done for maximising usage of resources for greater impact. Consolidation, financial planning and institutional positioning occur at this stage so that implementation could be possible (SALGA, n.d.). Phase 5 is approval phase and it involves to official adoption of the plan as a decision making tool (SALGA, n.d.: 25).

In this study, integrated development planning means the approach to planning of local government as stipulated in the Municipal Structures Act (1998) and the Municipal Systems Act (2000) of which all the Municipalities in South Africa should have. The focus of this study is on the participation of rural communities in phase one (the analysis phase), phase two (strategies) and phase five (approval) as well as project implementation and monitoring. Therefore IDP process in this study refers only to analysis, strategies, approval, project implementation and monitoring phases of integrated development planning.

2.1.5 Ward
A ward in this study refers to “a small unit of a local authority, like a neighbourhood, or suburb that can elect a ward councillor to represent residents of the respective community on the local authority/ municipal council” (DPLG, 2005: 75).

2.1.6 Rural Community
Existing literature indicates that “rural” is a complex concept to define. There is no agreed definition of rural world wide. There is also no agreed upon official definition of rural in South Africa, however, South Africa used the categorisation of municipalities to define the term “rural” and a rural area is defined as a small locality where less than 50% of people live more than 5 km from a tarred road, less than 25% of people use water from
streams, rivers, dams or rainwater tanks and people have very limited choice of services within the municipality (Department of Health, 2006, 6). In this study, a rural community is a community where the majority of the people are living below the poverty line, have low literacy levels, do not have access to electricity, clean and safe water and sanitation. This study has adopted the South African definition of rural and a rural community in the study refer to people staying in the same ward where the majority of the people are living below the poverty line, have low literacy levels, do not have access to electricity, clean and safe water and sanitation.

2.1.7 Ward Committee

The Municipal Structures Act (Act 117 of 1998) makes it compulsory for each ward to have a committee. The ward councillor leads the process of establishing a ward committee. The councillor in consultation with the people nominates members of the committee. Two models can be applied to establish a ward committee. A ward committee can either be a fully-representative ward body enjoying full legitimacy but lack basic capacity to lead community participation in development and democracy, or be less representative in terms of members being members of sector structures, but possess reliable capacity to lead development and effect participatory democracy (DPLG, 2005).

The former model involves a process where all sectors in the community are identified, for example, youth, women, businesspersons, the unemployed etc (SALGA, 2006). Each sector nominates a person who will represent them in the ward committee and it results into a ward committee that is representative of all interest groups in the community (SALGA, 2006). The council will then put resources aside for orientation training of all ward committee members (Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality, 2006). Some of the disadvantages of this model are that some sectors may not be organised. When a sector is not organised it will result in a situation where there is no legitimate representation. A sector representative may fail to perform up to the expectations of the sector and as a result there will be a problem of sectors changing representatives too often such that
group cohesion at ward committee level is never achieved (Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality, 2006).

The second model of establishing a ward committee involves nominating people with proven interest and potential in a particular sector and allocated a responsibility of representing a sector in the ward committee (SALGA, 2006). A sector development strategy is then developed which will put pressure on the representatives to do sector organising work while operating as a ward committee (SALGA, 2006).

2.2 THE LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK


Section 16(1) of the Municipal Systems Act (Act no. 32 of 2000), Section 152 of the South African Constitution (Act no of 108 of 1996) and Chapter 4, Section 152 (1)(e) of the Municipal Systems Act (Act no 32 of 2000) require municipalities to develop a culture of municipal governance that complements formal representative government with participatory governance. The Act stipulates that the municipality, ward councillors and ward committees should encourage and create conditions for the local community to participate in the affairs of the municipality. Through the Act all municipalities should foster community participation in local government through building the capacity of the local community to enable it to participate effectively. The Act further mandates municipalities to use its resources, and annually allocate funds in its budget for the purpose of achieving effective participation of local communities on the affairs of the council, and creating an environment for this culture to thrive.
2.2.1 Constitution of the Republic Of South Africa

Chapter 7 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act 108 of 1996) requires that local government should encourage the involvement of communities and community organisations in local government matters. According to the White paper on Local Government (Local Government, 1998), like the Constitution, the role of local sphere of government is to build local democracy. It therefore requires that municipalities should continuously involve the people, business and community groups in a participative manner.

2.2.2 Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP)

The RDP as defined by the ANC (1994) and the White Paper on Reconstruction and Development is “an integrated, coherent socio-economic policy framework that seeks to mobilise all people and resources of the country towards the building of a democratic, non-racial and non-sexist future”. RDP is a framework to address transformation issues, imbalances and inequalities of the past and it is most critical at local government level as a delivery system through community participation. According to the ANC (1994:15) one of the core objectives in meeting basic needs and improving the people’ socio-economic situation is “a commitment to grassroots, bottom-up development which is owned and driven by communities and their representative organisations”. Community participation is therefore an important part of development at local government level. Bond and Khosa in MacKay (2004) are of the opinion that if government can facilitate effective participation, it must introduce capacity-building programmes to enhance the capacity of community organisations. They further recommend that in order for the RDP to achieve the widest possible consultation and full participation of civil society, government should remove obstacles to the public participation process.
2.2.3 Municipal Structures Act (Act 117 of 1998)

According to Section 19 of the Municipal Structures Act (Act 117 of 1998), all Municipalities are required to develop systems that enhance effective community participation in local government. Section 72 (3) of the Municipal Structures Act stipulates that ward committees should be established to strengthen public participation at local government level. Representation of ward committees should be inclusive of civic, business, women and youth, religious, cultural and other interest groups (MacKay, 2004).

The ward councillor is the head of the ward committee and is the chair of the committee. The membership of a ward committee is limited to ten members elected from community members of the ward (SALGA, 2004), that is, the ward councillor and nine other ward committee members. The ward councillor in consultation and together with the community elects the ward committee members and each ward committee member heads the respective portfolio within the ward (Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality, 2006).

This system of allocating ward committee members portfolios ensures that each ward committee member has a particular role to play within the ward (DPLG, 2005). According to DPLG (2005), this system also allows them to develop experience and understand issues related to their portfolios. The portfolio arrangement allows members to engage with both the municipal line departments and the sub-committees of council that are relevant to their portfolios (DPLG, 2005: 34). According to the DPLG (2004), the purpose of a ward committee is to promote participatory democracy by assisting communities and community organisations in the municipal processes such as municipal budget, integrated development planning and review process, municipal performance management system, by-laws and provision of municipal services.

2.2.4 Municipal Systems Act (Act 32 of 2000)

Municipal Systems Act (Act 32 of 2000) makes provision for core mechanisms and processes, which are necessary to enable municipalities to socially and economically
uplift local communities (MacKay, 2004: 51). The preamble of the Act states, “The fundamental aspect of the Act is the active engagement of communities in the affairs of municipal planning, service delivery and performance management” (MacKay, 2004:51). According to the Act, participatory measures should include notifying members of local communities in good time about meetings, through appropriate communication measures. According to the Act, provision must be made for comments, consultation sessions and report back sessions and public hearings must be held to enhance participation processes. In terms of Section 17 (2) of the Municipal Systems Act (Act 32 of 2000) community members with special needs such as the illiterate, the disabled, women and the youth, must be taken into account to allow them to participate meaningfully in the IDP process.

2.2.5 Promotion of Access to Information Act (Act 2 of 2000)

The Promotion of Access to Information Act (Act 2 of 2000) fosters and promotes a culture of transparency, accountability, freedom of information to the people and propriety (MacKay, 2004). The Act recognizes the right of all people to have access to information and requires that if government institutions want to withhold the information it should be justified (MacKay, 2004). Through the Act the people will be involved in public debate on issues that affect them. These issues will be tabled on the agenda for IDP related discussions. Planning and resources must be channelled increasingly towards dialogue with affected communities. Supporting MacKay’s (2004) argument and based on this legislation, it is evident that the new system of local government offers opportunities for all the people to become actively involved in local government issues and makes it compulsory for each municipality to create an environment and to set up systems that makes people participation in local governance possible and effective.
2.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN LOCAL GOVERNANCE

The integrated development plan underpins the foundation and effective planning at local government level. For municipalities to achieve sustainable development in rural areas and to address the challenges of the second economy, the IDP should be developed with the people. It is therefore a very integrated and holistic plan, enabling local governments to take broad, strategic views of development requirements (MacKay, 2004).

The IDP is a result of the integration of sector plans of all government departments to achieve broader government vision creating a better life for all (SALGA, 2006). Prior to the implementation of IDPs by municipalities, national and provincial departments used to make development decisions and municipalities were not included in those decisions (SALGA, 2006). According to MacKay (2004) these decisions were done through representative democracy and the decisions were mostly inappropriate and too expensive. MacKay (2004) emphasises the importance of shifting from representative democracy to participatory democracy through using a sub-council and a ward system of governance.

IDPs offer opportunities for communities to be involved in determining the priorities of the IDP (MacKay, 2004). An IDP promotes participatory decision-making at local government level and promotes sustainable development. According to Planact and Caesar as cited by MacKay (2004: 53), IDP promotes developmental local government “by enabling municipalities to align and direct their financial and institutional resources towards agreed policy objectives and programmes”. These objectives are based on broader government priorities and goals.

Through the provision of tools, an Integrated Development Plan ensures the development and integration of local government activities in a co-operative manner (DPLG, 2004). It serves as a basis for local government and the people to engage at local level, and to engage with various stakeholders and interest groups. It enables local authorities to re-engineer or streamline resources to meet basic needs through the prioritisation of programmes while at the same time maintaining the existing economic and social
infrastructure (DPLG, 2004). According to Mac Kay (2004) if used effectively, the IDP could contribute to the organisational development and administrative re-organisation of municipalities and it can assist local authorities to sustainable delivery of basic social and economic services.

2.3.1 Theoretical Concepts on Public Participation

While the importance of community participation is widely recognized among development practitioners, when the different methods of public participation are analysed they vary considerably in meaning, degree and intent (Narayan, 1996). There are several definitions of public participation. For MacKay (2004) there is little agreement about the concept of public participation in public policy making and in development planning. There is no single universally accepted definition of public participation (Arnstein, 1969, Meyer and Theron, 2000). This argument is based on the “elusiveness of the concepts, public, citizen, people or community which have become umbrella terms for the idea of development intercession” (MacKay, 2004:13).

Many types of participation are not necessarily suited to sustainable development (Owens, 1990) but all types of participation share some common principles that should include the respect and attention given to the opinions, ideas and perspectives of locals (Pretty, in Owens 1990). There is the degree of control locals have in setting goals, making decisions; planning, implementing, evaluating and reviewing programmes and policies (Abaza and Baranzini, in Owens 1990); and the extension to the community not only of information, but also the capacity to solve problems on their own through appropriate means of assessment, analysis, and experimentation (Owens, 1990).

Local government is a sphere of government that interacts most closely with the people and it is a sphere of government where service delivery takes place (Cameron and Stone, 1995) and the municipal council is accountable to communities in their localities. It is a sphere of government which if well capacitated can speed up socio-economic
development and respond effectively to local problems (Cameron and Stone, 1995). In support of this view, local government is a sphere that can drive the process of addressing socio-economic development issues of the 2nd economy in South Africa since it is closer to the people.

Planact in MacKay (2004: 43) argues that “the people’s participation must not be a once off activity to fulfil legislative requirements in order to produce an IDP, but should rather be seen as a continuum”. It should be a continuous capacity building exercise to ensure that the people are more knowledgeable on local government issues and that they have in-depth understanding of the IDP process and what is required of them for sustainable development of their communities.

### 2.3.2 Rationale for public participation

Public participation in rural development is assumed a good if not a vital thing. International experience has shown that people participation is an essential part of effective and accountable governance at local government level. International experience has shown that one way of achieving successful and lasting models to ensure citizen participation takes place is through establishing structured and institutionalised frameworks for participatory local governance (DPLG: 2005).

The “voice of the people” has always been seen as important in the political decision-making process in democratic states. Freedom of speech is one of the basic elements of democracy. Public participation is not specifically bound by laws, regulations, or forms of expression, and the possibilities of voicing out one’s opinion is unlimited, provided that the opinion of others is respected.¹

Structured and institutionalised models for citizen participation generally work when the people see them as legitimate and credible, where there is political commitment to their

¹ See [www.rec.org/REC/Publications/PPManual/FeeBased/ch12html](http://www.rec.org/REC/Publications/PPManual/FeeBased/ch12html). Retrieved 2007/07/27
implementation and they have legal status (DPLG, 2005). These conditions for successful community participation in local governance require that there are adequate and necessary resources to inform and capacitate the people about local government issues and policies as well as to empower them to participate meaningfully, otherwise the system will only exist in principle.

According to Brynard (1996: 41), public participation is a way of democratizing the planning process to the extent that public participation in public policy making and implementation is considered a democratic right. Sharma in Brynard (1996) argues that grass-root participation in rural development and planning is important as a means of obtaining information about local conditions, needs and attitudes, and people are more likely to support projects in which they were involved in their planning and implementation. Buy in from the communities during planning stages and implementation of development programmes ensures that people identify with the projects and see them as their own rather than as government’s projects (Sharma in Brynard, 1996).

It is a constitutional requirement in all democratic countries that the people should participate in development initiatives that affect their lives. Democracy requires that all the people should have access to the resources, which could empower them as well as the right to exercise their power in such a way, that they are able to participate in public affairs (African National Congress, 1994: 120). Participation of the communities builds trust between the local authorities and the people. If the communities are involved, they will have a very strong sense of ownership and accountability. They will feel that they participated in the plan “for themselves, and not for others”. Furthermore, through collective action people become more united and more confident about solving their problems. (ANC, 1994: 147).

Citizen participation in local government planning has benefits for government, the people and communities because the people contribute knowledge. According to Baum (2002) citizen participation is like a therapy for the marginalized and powerless because
involvement in political activity enhances their self esteem, promotes a sense of potency and growth, and inherently participation in public life makes someone a citizen. Furthermore Baum (2002) points out that collaboration helps the people to become part of networks that provide social support it can bring power, knowledge, the ability to solve problems, and improvements in living conditions, including services. When the people participate in planning programmes they are more likely to develop relationships with local government, consider programmes legitimate, and use or accept them (Baum, 2002).

Baum (2002) argues that citizen participation can enable the people and others who participate with them to learn and can empower them to act together in ways that would have been impossible otherwise. The purposes of citizen participation include communicating information, developing relationships, developing the capacity to act and change conditions.

It is widely held view that broad based community participation is a fundamental element of most effective sustainable development programmes (Mog, 2004). “The central tenet of sustainable development is that poor people should be given the opportunity to create their own solutions to the problems they face” (Mog, 2004:3). The poor must therefore be seen as lead actors in all the formulation, implementation and review of development plans for their own communities. They should participate in research, trials and experimentation that can assist in orienting them towards identifying and solving the problems, they face (Mog, 2004). Community participation of the poor in their own development planning helps to empower and educate poor people to sustain the programmes long after the end of the programmes.

2.3.3 Forms of Public Participation

The recommended models of public participation are the ones that focus on territory, diversity and the optimization of local resources and those “that seek to enhance the particular strengths of a rural locality by developing the potential of local actors –
individuals, businesses, communities and voluntary organisation, as well as its cultural and natural assets” (Lowe et al, 1998: 18).

Lowe et al (1998) further argue that public participation is about power and how it is redistributed. They further argue that local groups cannot gain control without others losing some and that in principle, the pursuit of participation, as a development objective should involve a greater transfer of power than when it is used as a means of development planning or implementation. To transfer power from the officials to the people staying in the rural areas in the study there is a need for educating, informing and developing skills of the rural communities.

Governance plays a major role in ensuring sustainable development through public participation in the decision making of local development planning. The so-called “consultation” of stakeholders is no longer adequate; stakeholders often demand genuinely cooperative decision-making, if not outright control over policy decision-making (Arnstein, 1969).

Arnstein (1969) formulated an eight-step ladder of participation model, from lower levels of citizen control to full citizen control. The lower steps are essentially non-participative and are characterized as manipulation and therapy; and are more of public relations exercises (Arnstein, 1971). The second step is informing and it represents the most important step to legitimate participation, and usually the flow of information is one way without opportunity for feedback (Arnstein, 1971). Following informing is consultation, which involves attitude surveys, neighbourhood meetings and public enquiries (Arnstein, 1971). Arnstein was sceptical about the practical merits of this level of participation and “saw it as a merely a window dressing ritual “(Lowe et al, 1998: 22). Roseland (2000) supporting Arnstein (1971) argues that consultation and a fair hearing is no longer sufficient to achieve sustainable development. Rather, direct participation in the decision making process is necessary.
Placation comes next. It involves the co-option of handpicked local “worthies” onto committees to advise on plans and projects, but the power holders or officials retain the right to judge the legitimacy or feasibility of the advice (Arnstein, 1971). The next step is partnership, which is characterised by the redistribution of power through negotiations between local people and the municipality, and planning and decision-making responsibilities are shared through (Arnstein, 1971), for example, joint committees. The seventh step is delegated power whereby the people hold a clear majority of seats on committees with delegated powers to make decisions (Arnstein, 1971). The highest level of community participation is citizen control and it is characterised by the people exercising full control over the planning, policy making and management of a programme, with no intermediaries operating between the people and the source of funds (Arnstein, 1971).

For rural communities to reach the last three levels of Arnstein ladder of participation, that is, partnership, delegated power and citizen control, they must be very knowledgeable and constantly informed about local government issues. This means that there should be capacity at the municipality level to ensure that the people are capacitated to participate at these three levels. It also indicates the significance of focusing capacity-building programmes for enhancing the peoples’ participation not only at skills development, education and training but also at changing people’s attitudes. Moseley and Cherret (n.d.) identified public meetings, adult education and training centres, village appraisals, exhibitions and fairs, media and telecommunications. These and other tools of public participation are explained below:

**Public meetings:**

Public meetings are useful in publicising projects and providing open debates. They could be optimal platform for municipalities to share information about the needs of their communities and to give clarity on issues related to integrated development planning. Community members and leaders, political structures, local council members could use
these meetings to promote public participation on developmental issues (Sewell and Coppock, 1997, MacKay, 2004).

**Adult Education and Training:**

Adult education and training play a determined role in the active involvement of local people, most particularly in the implementation of development projects (Moseley & Cherret, n.d.). In all the two wards in the study there are adult basic education and training centres operating in each of the primary and high schools of each ward in the study and therefore it provides a bigger opportunity for effective community participation in local government.

**Village appraisals:**

They are self-administered community surveys for local people to formally identify their common problems and opportunities and the action required to tackle them (Moseley and Cherret, n.d.).

**Exhibitions and fairs:**

They can be used for bringing projects to public attention and eliciting popular responses (Moseley and Cherret, n.d.).

**Media and telecommunication:**

They provide for widespread and regular dissemination of information and debate about development projects and programmes (Moseley and Cherret, n.d.).
**Public Hearings:**

According to Sewell and Coppock (1997), public hearings may be held in strategic areas closer to the communities. Moseley and Cherret (n.d.) and Sewell and Coppock (1997) argue that these forms and tools of participation are appropriate at different stages of the development process and with different groups. It therefore means that applying these forms of participation will depend on the phase of the IDP process as well as the category of the people and their role in the process.

Other forms of participation include demonstrations, protest meetings, lobbying, public hearings and public meetings, letters to the editors of newspapers and magazines, letters to politicians, establishment of organisations and circulating newsletters, pamphlets, brochures, etc.² Individuals can participate in local government and influence decision-making through direct advice or support. The people can also request the councillor to set up a regular clinic on specific days at a certain place in the community (DPLG, 2006). This means that the ward councillor must be available to see anyone from the community at these agreed times and the councillor should then advertise these dates around the community. Other forms of public participation include animators, community networks/Forums, cooperatives or community enterprises and rural development partnerships.³

---

making, where decision-making power is shared in reality if not in name, has been effective in some contexts and some regions, for instance, Community land trusts in the United States, Mondragon system of industrial cooperatives in the Basque region of Spain are all examples of the potential of democratic decision making (Roseland, 2000).

Curtin (1996) distinguished two dominant models of community participation in community development. The first one is the consensus model. The consensus model puts emphasis on all people within a particular area working together and taking actions to improve the whole community. Although disparities of income and access to other resources may be recognized, the underlying assumption is that the similarity of interest is powerful enough to form the basis for building consensus (p. 257). This model cannot be applied to areas with high social inequalities among the people. The second model is the conflict model, which sees local inequalities as an expression of the structural causes of poverty and marginalisation. While the model equally emphasises bringing people together to discuss their problems and organise collectively in search of solutions, its focus is more directly on the “poor and disadvantaged and empowering those who are outside the power structure” (p. 259). This model is more relevant to the two wards in the study based on the socio-economic status of the majority of the people in the two wards, that is, high illiteracy, poverty and unemployment levels.

According to Bryden et al (1995), it is not practically possible to involve the whole community in the planning and execution of local development projects. As pointed out by Moseley and Cherret (n.d.: 8) “the scale of such involvement is too massive and the public in any case is made up of many different interests, priorities and resources”. Based on this view the tendency is often to operate through the community’s social and political leadership (Lowe et al, 1998), this means applying the consensus model, for instance through ward committees and other already existing structures.

However, Syrett (1995) and other critics of the consensus model point out that the model reinforces existing power structures that oppress the marginalised poor and disadvantaged groups of society, like those in rural areas of South Africa. Irish experience is instructive
of this and it proved that this model when used “it tended to be dominated by a small
group of enthusiasts, adept at assembling the illusion of consensus that allows the
interests of some to masquerade as the interest of all” (Varley in Lowe et al, 1998: 25).

However, it can be argued that using the conflict model requires municipalities to put
strategies that put more emphasis on assisting and capacitating the poor and most
disadvantaged, like the people in the two wards in the study. Furthermore, the strategies
should guard against unintended consequences whereby the strategies work largely for
the rich and not for the poor. The Irish experience is indicative of these unintended
consequences during the first European Anti-Poverty Programme in 1970 – 1980 (Irish
National Committee to Combat Poverty, in Lowe et al, 2004).

2.4 RESOURCES FOR EFFECTIVE PARTICIPATION

Resources required for capacitating communities for effective participation in local
government affairs include community development workers, Municipality officials.
Rural development centres, resource centres, adult education and training centres,
financial institutions.

2.4.1 Community Development Workers and Other Officials

Provision of human resources to the communities by local authorities is vital to build
capacity for participation at community level. For instance, Sewell and Coppock (1997)
argue that although public meetings and the media are appropriate for dispersing
information to the communities, employment of adequate and well-trained community
workers and local government officials attached to a particular community is equally vital
to facilitate and increase interaction between local planning authorities and people
staying in the rural areas.
In all examples of good practice, public participation needs resources to support the process and it is therefore funded. In some cases public participation is the object of a special programme, such as the renowned participatory budgeting process in Porto Alegre, Brazil, which involves thousands of community members each year supported by a team of municipal employees dedicated to facilitating the participation process (DPLG, 2004). The process also included dissemination of information relevant to the participative process in a manner that is relevant and understandable to the communities involved, which requires the use of local languages (DPLG, 2005).

A community development worker is a community resource person who collaborates with other community activists to help community members to obtain information and resources from the municipality and service providers (DPLG, 2004). The aim is to learn how to meet their needs progressively, achieve goals, identify their community development needs, realize aspirations and maintain their well-being. According to the Department of Provincial and Local Government (2004: 17) a community development worker is expected to be living in the communities in which he/she works. Community development workers should among other things deepen insight into people’s needs and resources through exchanging information, guiding, educating, providing expertise, enabling, advocating and catalyzing action (DPLG, 2004). They are expected to promote the notion of partnership between themselves and local structures such as ward committees.

The role of community development workers as indicated above indicate the crucial role that community development workers can play in capacitating communities about the IDP and its activities and on educating the rural wards on the IDP processes and as such improving their active participation in the IDP. Since a community development worker according to DPLG should be a member of the community, he/she will understand the community and how they can be capacitated to participate effectively in the IDP since he/she can identify well with the economic, social and cultural conditions of the rural community.
Community Development workers are regarded as conduits of information and empowering facilitators, working within a supportive framework, having adequate management support and access to resources so that they can effectively support or supervise community members working in community projects to develop local assets and resources (DPLG, 2004). The fact that Community Development Workers are continuously involved in community research like community needs assessment, community profiles etc., they are the relevant resources to educate the community on the IDP and therefore contribute to effective participation of the community in the IDP.

One of the duties of community development workers is to compile community profiles of their wards and monitor the extent to which integrated development plans are being implemented within their own wards and municipality (Motlhake, 2006). In order to do these duties, community development workers need to give accurate information because the information helps with regard to developing municipal plans that will eventually help with the allocation of resources according to the needs of a particular ward based on accurate information (Motlhake, 2006). This type of information can be shared with the rural wards in a simplified form and in the language they understand in order to understand their wards better and to be able to identify needs in their own wards and to identify resources in their own communities for implementation of the integrated development plan projects. Community development workers are also expected to improve people’s access, particularly the rural poor, to government information, knowledge and services.

Lessons learnt from the Irish experience to broaden participation of the poor and the disadvantaged in the Second Anti-Poverty Programme (1985 – 1989), has been the establishment of resource centres and allocating adequate and competent officials specifically to build confidence in the people and changing people’s attitudes towards community participation in local development planning (Cullen, 1989). This indicates that capacity-building programmes aimed at promoting effective citizen participation in local government planning should be holistic and inclusive of skills development, information dissemination, education and attitude related aspects.
The system may meet all the conditions said above with regard to funding the system and providing resources, have all the human resources required. However, as noted by Brynard (1996), what is more important is the extent to which these conditions are met, that is, the need for meaningful participation, the extent to which people in the community participate in processes of relevance to them so they can also make a valuable and meaningful input to the IDP process.

2.4.2 Other Resources

According to Fudge (1983) other resources that can be utilized for capacitating rural communities to participate effectively in the IDP process include training providers for newly elected local representatives, mentors, colleagues, political parties, non governmental organisations, provincial and national government departments, universities and colleges. Capacity building programmes include provision of financial and physical resources to people staying in the rural areas. Adult education centres, rural development centres, and resource centres have also played a significant role in capacitating rural communities on local development planning (Sewell & Coppock, 1997).

Training institutions and some non-governmental organisations with the help of international organisations and government played a major role in capacitating elected representatives through various institutional and field programmes in India (Narwani, 2002). The non-governmental organisations have also succeeded in creating awareness among Panchayati Raj communities regarding participation in planning at local level (Narwani, 2002). NGOs and Community Based Organisations are very appropriate and relevant to play a crucial role in educating the people about IDP related issues in the rural wards in the study, but they will need to be strengthened by the municipality in order to play this role effectively.
2.4.3 Factors Affecting Participation

According to Jerkins (2000) and Stoker et al. (1994), the high social inequalities cause non-participation among the poorer marginalised communities because they have a feeling of powerlessness and they do not believe that their inputs can have any impact on final plans. Stoker et al. (1994) argues that this feeling of powerlessness increases non-participation of the people in development planning and it is therefore crucial that they are empowered for meaningful inputs. This view supports the Freirian paradigm that maintains that for people to participate in their own development they should be empowered to change from being “passive objects to active subjects”. They should be educated to think in a creative way to change their situation, and this includes educating them because effective citizen participation is reflected when people are involved in the decision-making about their own development (Coetzee & Graaf, 1996: 315).

Hughes (2005) argues that rural communities are often the politically, economically, socially and linguistically marginalized and they lack access to education facilities, information, networks, alliances and capacity building opportunities. It is known that rural communities in most cases cannot access information and lack the knowledge about government policies partly due to illiteracy, language problems and because they cannot access most facilities like the media, internet, etc. due to poverty.

In support of the above argument, Brynard in Masango (2002) asserts that disadvantaged people often cannot participate effectively in local government affairs because they cannot understand the “professional jargon and find it difficult to conceptualise” (p. 48). The saying “knowledge is power” applies and without knowledge, people participation is limited, uninformed and therefore not meaningful and effective to influence final policy decisions. It is common knowledge that generally the educated and wealthy communities have meaningful participation than illiterate rural communities, because the former have broader knowledge and skills to participate in local government affairs and have access to information than the latter. All these factors compromise the right of rural communities to
participate during the design, implementation and review of policies and programmes (Hughes, 2005).

According to Sewell and Coppock (1997), representative governance is dependent on elected representatives and it includes a two-way communication between the public and the government through their elected local authorities who provide a channel of communication between government and the people. They argue that this system works well when the elected representatives, the local authorities and the communities affected can articulate their views and when channels of communication are well known to the people. However, in most cases there are no channels of communication for the transmission of information or the expression of views, and even when they exist, the people, particularly people staying in the rural areas do not know about them or they are ineffectual (Brynard, 1996). This argument indicates that it is critical for ward councillors and ward committees to be well capacitated to perform their duties effectively.

According to the World Bank Report (1995:135), “there are many cultural, economic and political barriers that prevent poor communities to having real stake in development activities”. The report emphasises that without appropriate policies to address and overcome barriers to community participation, “the voices of the poor groups will not be heard and their participation will, at best be a token one” (World Bank, 1995:135). It is therefore important that among the policies to enhance poor people’s participation in their own development, there should be a capacity building policy which assist the poor communities to understand how development decisions are made (World Bank, 1995), how to identify development needs in their own wards and educating them on the institutions and mechanisms they can use to participate effectively in their own development and those which can afford them opportunities and resources.

### 2.5 CAPACITY BUILDING FOR ENHANCED PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The advantage of capacitating communities is that the quality of public participation and public policy making will be improved. This is supported by the view that an “educated
citizen is enabled to exercise his or her judgment, contribute to the debate about planning, and is aware of societal problems and the difficulties of finding solutions to them.” (Boaden et al., 1987:167).

Masango (2002:62) advocates for “public education, capacity building for participation, reforming attitudes towards participation, and publicizing local government affairs” as some of the important factors to be considered in any capacity building programme aimed at improving and sustaining public participation. Masango (2002) recommends a training programme that includes workshops for rural communities, and advocates for an education programme for the people on the nature and functions of their local authority, their rights, as well as introducing civics as a compulsory school subject at the General Education and Further Education and Training levels as a long-term strategy to enhance citizen participation.

Concern (2001) argues that to improve the participation of people staying in the rural areas in their own development, capacity building strategies should include aspects of broadening their awareness of the factors that have impact on their situation, so that they become more aware of their own abilities and have more self-confidence in their abilities, knowledge and experience. This will increase their interest in local government affairs and make these communities to have confidence and knowledge required to participate actively and meaningfully in development planning of their own communities and in improving their own life situations.

The people’s participation requires that the people have a broader understanding of the issues and policies of their local authorities. However, most rural communities have little knowledge about the affairs and policies of their local authorities and the implications of these policies to their lives, and some have little knowledge about local structures where they can actively participate in local government affairs (Brynard, 1996; Coetzee & Graaf, 1996; Cloete, 1996; Masango, 2002). Therefore, a skills development strategy combined with a strategy to ensure provision of easy access to information and resources is crucial to improve the quality of participation of people staying in the rural areas in
development planning (Concern, 2001). These strategies can assist rural communities “to overcome the feeling of powerlessness and develop a strong sense of community since community bonds develop by way of interaction” (Masango, 2002: 29).

According to SALGA (2006), one way of capacitating communities to participate effectively in local government is to put the people into social action groups that continuously liaise with their constituencies to take mandate on issues impeding social progress, and take action to challenge injustices, and propose changes. It can be argued that this will only happen if people know their rights and understand that they have the right to exercise these rights, without knowledge and understanding of their rights they will not challenge injustices of the Local Municipality. As noted by SALGA (2004), it is therefore crucial that people should be conscientised about possible change they can achieve through active participation in democratic processes around their lives. It can also be added that people should be conscientised about their roles, rights and responsibilities in the whole development process. These are an important part of the content of a capacity building strategy. They enhance people staying in the rural areas’ participation in the local government affairs.

Communities elect people who represent them in various structures at local government level, IDP forums in particular, and it is therefore crucial that these elected representatives are capacitated and understand local government and development issues since they are mouthpiece of the community. According to Hughes (2005) an effective capacity building strategy for elected representatives should include strengthening their skills in advocacy, fundraising, legal action, negotiation, networking, participatory research and analysis as well as rights awareness. Other elements of an effective capacity building strategy to ensure that the people participate in a meaningful manner in local and national decision-making are “raising awareness of power relations and mobilizing the poor to work on issues of common interest” (Concern, 2001: 1).

Sewell and Coppock (1997) argue that strategies for public participation may be related to information dispersal, information gathering and promotion of interaction between the
planning authority and the public. They assert that naturally, some strategies can achieve more than one objective, and some strategies might be inappropriate in the context of specific models of public participation. They suggest employing community workers and using existing political structures and political parties as some of the strategies to be used to empower rural communities.

Target groups for capacity building for effective participation in local government planning include community leaders, elected representatives, councillors, block committee members, Community Forum members and representatives of the marginalised groups like women and the disabled (Midgley et al., 2005). The representatives can then empower their own constituencies. Lombard (1991) argues that identifying leaders of groups and role models within the community whose involvement in local government activities will encourage the involvement and participation of other members should be considered. Development of Community leadership and “human potential” is also another strategy for empowering other members of the community (Lombard, 1991: 75).

In India, since 1994 after the Constitutional Amendment, more than 90% of the representatives of the Panchayati Raj institutions were elected for the first time, and they were mostly the previously marginalised, for instance, women (Kumar, 2001). The newly elected representatives therefore needed knowledge of the laws, policies, rules and procedures of local government as well as understanding their duties and responsibilities, and skills on how to do their work (Narwani, 2002). It was crucial that interpersonal, communication and leadership skills had to be developed among the newly elected representatives (Narwani, 2002).

Cook in Midgley et al. (2005) argues that capacity building should be holistic and it is about developing people’s skills, knowledge and attitudes to perform their tasks with

---

4 Panchayati Raj institutions are grass-root units of self-government in India operating at village level established in 1993 and have been proclaimed as the vehicles of socio-economic transformation and rural development in rural India. Effective and meaningful functioning of these bodies depends on active involvement, contribution and participation of the people (http://en.wikipedia.org/wik/panchayat, retrieved on 15 August 2007).
competence. This model of capacity building was utilised by the Indian government with regard to empowering the elected representatives of the Panchayati Raj institutions in 1993, through the promulgation of the Constitution (73rd Amendment) Act of 1992 that provided constitutional rights to these institutions. The strategy adopted by the Indian government to develop the skills of the newly-elected representatives in the Panchayati Raj institutions was to train Master Trainers. Narwani (2002) indicates that the Master Trainers trained five resource persons per panchayati with the assistance of local government authorities, the training covered developing knowledge, skills, and attitude related issues on development planning and other areas relevant to the communities like agricultural related programmes.

Although there were some successes to these strategies, there were some challenges. The challenges included among others “non-availability of competent and sufficient staff at local government level to discharge the duties, lack of detailed knowledge with both elected representatives and government support system regarding exact procedures, rights, obligations and duties and dominance of infrastructural development and building construction rather than human development (Narwani, 2002). The other challenges cited were lack of skills, experience and exposure of elected representatives that resulted in dominance of bureaucracy in project selection and execution as well as low levels of the people’ participation at ward level.

Buckley and Caple (1991) argue that training is not a once off and for all activity but a continuous process throughout working life. They further argue that a great deal of learning takes place through on-the-job experience. Therefore, it can be argued that mentors and coaches for ward councillors and ward committee members can be major contributors to the process of capacitating ward councillors and ward committee members, particularly those that are newly elected and are doing these roles for the first time.

The Department of Provincial and Local Government commissioned a study to investigate the sustainability of Local Governance through integrated development
planning in Ugu, Buffalo City and Kgalagadi District Municipalities in 2002. It found that Ugu District Municipality in Kwazulu Natal has included a Training and Capacity Building Strategy for small and micro businesses in the economic projects (Department of Provincial and Local Government, 2002). The findings also indicate that the municipality has education and skills development programmes that include several skills development projects. The findings further indicate that workshops are conducted with local businesses and the Services Sector Education and Training Authority develops training programmes for the businesses, which links up with the integrated development plan. The Municipality also has several popular education programmes for elected councillors, wards committee members as well as the people on resource use and the environmental aspects of the integrated development plan (Department of Provincial and Local Government, 2002).

The study indicates that the commitment to training and capacity building of the local community is strong in the Kgalagadi Municipality’s integrated development planning process. The Municipality identified human resource development as one of its priorities (Department of Provincial and Local Government, 2002). To address the issue of developing communities, the Municipality established Human Resource Foundation for human resource development (Department of Provincial and Local Government, 2002). All the projects were designed to foster capacity building. Certain projects were identified and initiated specifically to cater for community development and to enhance effective community participation in the integrated development planning, for instance, educating communities about legislation through adult basic education and training projects, which were included in the integrated development plan (Department of Provincial and Local Government, 2002).

Lessons learnt from the Buffalo City Municipality during the study was that the absence of a capacity building strategy for the community to enhance their participation in the integrated development planning, resulted in most elected ward councillors and ward committee members not being able to participate effectively in the integrated development planning process (DPLG, 2002). The study recommended that an inclusive
capacity building strategy and training programmes at various levels should be developed and implemented amongst all stakeholders. According to the study, the programme should target officials in charge of integrated development plans in local municipalities, ward councillors, ward committee members, local businesses, traditional and community leaders and leaders of different organised groups in the community, nongovernmental and community-Based organisations working at community level. The study emphasises the importance of this kind of programme to ensure that these groups function and participate meaningfully at formulation, implementation and review stages as of the integrated development plan as well as monitoring of the process.

According to Bartle (2005) the training programme adopted by the Ugandan Government to develop communities to participate in rural development was focused more on skill transfer, awareness raising, information dispersal and reorganization. The training was non-formal, demand driven, on-the-job, context oriented, non classroom, non lecture, facilitative and participatory and there was no overall plan of action for training, however, it was not effective to raise the quality of community participation in rural development and the impact could not be measured (Bartle, 2005). The shortcoming of the training was that it should have been more planned to include monitoring and evaluation elements and that the content of the training programmes should have included more specific outputs on gender awareness and gender balance (Bartle 2005). This argument is based on the view that the Ugandan government favours gender balance, while on the other hand the attitudes of local government authorities and rural communities do not share the same view (Bartle, 2005).

Bartle (2005) indicates that lessons to be learnt from the implementation of Uganda Community Management Strategy developed between 1992 and 1998 indicate the importance of considerable awareness raising initiatives through information dissemination, skills transfer, training of Non Governmental Organisations and district officials. Training materials and awareness training programmes should explicitly focus on the necessity of monitoring and evaluation by the community and all stakeholders, especially during implementation of the plans (Bartle, 2005).
In Scotland, the need for capacity building for community participation was not only seen as an integral part of rural development, but also as an instrument of rural development policy (Midgley et al., 2005). Capacity building programmes for elected councillors and the people’s representatives in Scotland was based on the belief that “the more thorough the knowledge the elected representatives have, the more democratic the decision making is” (Martlew, 1988: 131). In the 1980s the Scottish government developed a rural development policy that incorporated training strategy on functional, intentional, ideological, organisational, specialist and personal training for elected councillors and representatives (Martlew, 1988: 131).

Functional training included skills development in relation to the day-to-day activities of the councillor and the intentional training represented a conscious extra activity aimed at the development of skills and expertise (Midgley et al., 2005). Ideological training incorporates issues related to party policies and their relationship to local issues and development, and it can be done by political parties or through organisations (Midgley et al., 2005). Organisational training provides insight into the functioning of local authorities, their structures, policies, powers and procedures and it covers the development of general management issues and techniques (Midgley et al., 2005). Specialist training provides in depth knowledge and expertise in particular development issues and services, and personal skills training programmes include chairmanship, negotiating skills, media presentation, learning how to express oneself clearly verbally and in writing (Midgley et al., 2005).

The elected representatives are trained using various techniques, for example, attendance of formal programmes at university or college that are organised by local authorities, attending formal and informal meetings with Council officials where local government issues were discussed at length (Martlew, 1988). Newly elected councillors in Scotland are also taken through a mentorship programme where the experienced and outgoing councilors mentored the new inexperienced Councillors during their early days in office Martlew (1988). Discussion and group meetings among councillors and other community
leaders in similar positions also reinforced information sharing among peers (Martlew, 1988).

As part of a capacity building strategy for all newly elected Councillors in Scotland, an induction and introductory seminar is conducted for new and returning councillors immediately after elections (Midgley et al., 2005). The Capacity Building and Training Strategy also includes education programmes around local government legislation and rights of the people in the development planning process (Midgley et al., 2005). The lessons learnt by the Municipality in this regard were that the training provided to the community was not enough. Instead of a once off training during project implementation, there was a need for a long-term training and capacity building programme and monitoring, and that it was important to consider which forms of training are effective for particular purposes and target groups (Midgley et al., 2005).

The core focus of the training of elected representatives in Scotland involves clarifying their roles, rights and powers, and skills development in their day-to-day duties as councillors (Midgley et al., 2005). The findings of a study conducted by Martlew (1988) on the best mode of learning by newly elected councillors in Scotland said that a number of councillors interviewed cited learning by experience as the best way to learn even if they favoured some form of formal training. In the same study, what came out very strongly from the newly-elected councillors was the councillors’ awareness of a need to serve a form of apprenticeship or mentorship and informal discussions with officers and other councillors. The design of training and development programme for elected representatives in Scotland examines both its content and are adapted to meet training needs of individual elected representatives because training depends on social, educational, political, career and personal backgrounds of individuals (Martlew, 1988).

In a study conducted by Fudge (1983) on the training and development needs of newly elected representatives in Scotland to enhance their participation in local government, the majority of the elected representatives cited local government finance, planning principles and local government policies as subjects they would like to be trained on. In
the same study, the findings indicate that the Councillors said that they want to be developed in leadership skills and committee procedures. These findings informed the Scottish government to develop a training programme directed towards explaining the system of local government finance and keeping them updated on the changes that might occur (Fudge, 1983).

Various information sharing sources used for the Scottish elected representatives included committee discussions, committee reports, informal discussions with officers and other councillors, press cuttings, research notes, local party meetings, conferences, seminars, newspapers, media, journal publications (Midgley et al., 2005). Most of these sources of information might not be suitable for elected representatives in a rural context in South Africa because of high illiteracy levels among people staying in the rural areas, and will only be effective if they are coupled with an effective adult basic education programme aimed at functional literacy and numerical skills for illiterate elected representatives. The use of these forms of communication and information sharing in the South African context requires that language issues should be taken into consideration.

According to Stoker et al, (2004:10) local authorities are the main actors in capacitating rural communities. Stoker et al (2004:10) argue that local authorities should embrace the responsibility of developing the capacity to provide appropriate leadership at village level, “including the ability for leadership to identify community needs in order to exercise collective choice”. Fudge (1983) suggested self, mentors, colleagues, political parties, local authorities, trade unions, professional associations, non-governmental organisations, provincial government, universities and colleges of higher education, adult education centres, press, television and radio, non-profit educational and research organisations as training providers for newly elected local representatives.

According to Phillips and Africa (1996) if rural communities are not involved in selecting, prioritizing and management of IDP projects, there is likelihood that the projects will not be sustainable. In training and preparing development facilitators to assist rural communities to realize their own development agenda, rural communities
themselves need to be assisted with some form of a monitoring system to ascertain whether they are doing, what was intended (Philips & Africa, 1996).

In the case of the CBPWP, project committees were formed per project and people within the project committee and the labour force for the project were targeted for training (Ntsime, 1999). In the CBPWP, skills required to work on individual projects were assessed and a training provider and schedule would be decided upon based on the skills levels of the target group (Ntsime, 1999). Different types of training were provided to different community members depending on their involvement in certain projects and the skills required by the projects (Ntsime, 1999).

Ntsime (1999) indicates that the fact that rural communities have very low literacy levels presented challenges to those who were tasked to train them. Findings of the research report indicate that most of these people require certain skills to participate effectively and to work efficiently and effectively in the projects. The report further points out that while lack of skills and the types of skills needed were easy to identify, what remained a challenge was how best to train such individuals. The communities within which the CBPWP were implemented were poor, and the majority was illiterate and 87% were unemployed (Ntsime, 1999).

Most of the training for the CBPWP was done on-site rather than classroom training (Ntsime, 1999). In addition, because some of the people working in these projects were unskilled, suitable training was provided, for example, brick making and brick laying (Ntsime, 1999). The study showed that on-site training works better in training illiterate community members because even an illiterate person can be endowed with practical skills without even having to learn how to read, write or do mathematical calculations”. At the project level, some workers already had basic skills such as bricklaying, plumbing, carpentry, etc. but many others needed training (Ntsime, 1999). As said in the study, most illiterate people can be involved during IDP projects implementation, since most of the skills to be learnt on-site for some projects do not require someone to be necessarily literate, for example, building a toilet. This scenario applies to the two wards in the study.
Therefore on-site training will be the most applicable during implementation of IDP projects in the two rural wards in the study.

People staying in the rural areas have skills and they teach each other on the job. For instance, if someone needed to be trained, for example in carpentry, there would usually be one or more members of the work force who had some skills and experience which they could transfer to others on-site while working on the job (Ntsime, 1999). Such people would also monitor the progress of those being trained.

Other lesson learnt from the CBPWP is the importance of training project steering committee members on facilitation skills, running a meeting, conflict resolution, project management because of the vital role of the committee on the projects, and where possible financial management (Ntsime, 1999). According to Ntsime (1999) training of committee members, in facilitation skills could have longer-term benefits in alleviating unnecessary conflicts during project implementation.

### 2.6 RESEARCH BASED INTERVENTION PROGRAMMES

Research programmes can bolster the capacity of local people if research results are shared with the community, e.g. a land-care and development programmes in the Philippines that are aimed at capacititating farmers, the people and local institutions to manage their own natural resources effectively (Mog, 2004). The programmes involve transmitting the findings of their research to the local people. The Land-care research projects engage in many forms of capacity building for farmers including managerial and leadership training programmes, seminars and workshops, formal and informal on-the-farm experimentation, field trials and field demonstration; field trips and experimental research plots; facilitated group meetings and discussions; farmers’ field schools; individual extension; and popular radio shows (Mercado et al., 2000).

Another capacity building strategy included institution building and the formation of local communities organisations through which residents share ideas, information and
inspiration while networking with external resources. Facilitators of the programmes helped people to understand how to learn about sustainability, adapt and innovate. Garrity et al (2003) indicates that in numerous occasions local people were inspired by the programme to debate issues of natural resource management and sustainability within the community, experiment with new ideas on their farms, and exchange information with other community members. He points out that this process resulted in widespread institutionalization of an ongoing process of learning and innovation within the community” (Garrity et al., 2003).

2.7 CONCLUSION

From the literature reviewed, it is apparent that in designing capacity-building programmes for enhancing rural communities’ participation in local development planning, there are challenges to be considered. The challenges include among others the community’s limitation of lack of understanding of the process of development. A community on its own, particularly a rural community seldom has the necessary skills to initiate a structured long-range development process. The variables that generate this limitation are community politics, e.g. leadership challenges within the initiative, and power dynamics within community based organisations. Leading a development process requires energy that can only be sustained when a person or group is sufficiently resourced.

In terms of Section 17(2) of the Municipal System Act (Act 32 of 2000), community members with special needs such as the illiterate, the disabled, women and the youth should be taken into account by the municipality in promoting the people’s participation in the IDP process. The meetings, workshops, hearings and other tools used by the municipality for participation and for information sharing should ensure that it is easily accessible by the people and is inclusive.

Capacitating rural communities for effective participation in their own development should consider encouraging organised social action. Communities should organise
themselves so that they can participate in own development in a structured way. It becomes difficult to capacitate unorganized communities with development issues. It is a widely held adage that those who struggle to gain control over their lives need to generate as much power as possible. Their strength lies in their number and courage to challenge social injustice with collective action.

According to section 16 of the Municipal Systems Act (Act 32 of 2000), the municipality must develop a culture of municipal government with a system of participatory measures that people in the ward including ward committee members and councillors where appropriate must be notified in good time about meetings, through appropriate communication measures. According to the Municipal Systems Act, Provision should be made for comments, consultation sessions and report back sessions and public hearings must be held to enhance participation processes. In support of the Act, meetings, workshops and public hearings should be held at strategic points closer to the communities as they usually are unemployed and do not have transport fares.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research methodology of the study. It also explains the rationale for utilizing the selected methodology, tools and designs. Furthermore, it discusses the participants in the study and why they were chosen for the study. Finally, the chapter presents the data analysis technique of the study.

The study used qualitative approach. According to Leedy and Ormrod (1985), a qualitative research methodology is focused on developing social phenomena. The qualitative approach methodology offers certain advantages to the researcher because it requires one-on-one interaction with the participants or in a focus group setting that allows one to understand the research topic at length and in terms of the kind and richness of information one can collect from the participants (Leedy and Ormrod, 1985). The qualitative approach helps in getting the inside picture of how others see the world and is concerned with achieving a holistic understanding of feelings and a world-view (Neuman, 1997:73). This study includes among other things obtaining the people’s views about the capacity building programmes used to promote people’s participation in the IDP process, hence the selection of the qualitative approach. Furthermore, the researcher selected the qualitative approach because it provides rich, deep data from each interviewee, and this allows the researcher to acquire deeper and clearer understanding of the topic under study.

Qualitative data was collected through semi-structured interviews that were later categorised into different themes guided by the research questions to allow easier interpretation as recommended by Leedy and Ormond (1985). The interviews were used in order to obtain in-depth understanding of the contribution of the capacity building programmes in promoting rural people’s understanding and knowledge of the IDP process, their rights, roles and responsibilities in the process, structures they can use to participate and how they can participate in the IDP process. Most importantly the
interviews were aimed at obtaining data on how the capacity building programmes have assisted the people staying in the rural areas to participate effectively in the IDP process, as well as the challenges and factors considered in capacitating rural people to participate meaningfully in the process.

3.1 RESEARCH SITE

The research was done on the two rural wards, wards 19 and 16, located under Lepelle-Nkumpi Local Municipality in Limpopo Province. The two wards were chosen because they were rural and were accessible by the researcher. A list of all the wards in Lepelle-Nkumpi was collected from the municipality and two rural wards were selected based on accessibility of the wards by the researcher.

A database of all the wards in the Lepelle-Nkumpi District Council was collected from Lepelle-Nkumpi Local municipality. The database was examined to check similarities and differences in the wards in terms of their socio-economic situation to check for rural wards with poor socio-economic status and with many people who are illiterate. Information on the wards with high levels of poverty and low literacy levels were selected from the database. From this information and the database, two rural wards with similar socio-economic characteristics accessible to the researcher were selected for the study.

3.2 DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES

One-on-one and focus group semi-structured interviews were used to collect primary data, while a literature survey was used to obtain secondary data. One-on-one semi-structured interviews were held with officials, community development workers, ward councillors and traditional leaders, while focus group interviews were held with ward committee members, small business owners and other people in the two wards.
3.2.1 Primary Data Collection

Primary data was obtained from the above-mentioned target group using one-on-one and focus group semi-structured interviews. Focus group interviews using a semi-structured interview guide were held with ordinary people, ward committee members and small business owners. These categories of the people were divided into groups of five for the focus groups as recommended by Krueger (2002). One-on-one semi structured interviews using interview guide were conducted with Community Development Workers, IDP officials in Lepelle-Nkumpi local municipality, SALGA officials and traditional leaders.

The purpose of the interviews was to obtain qualitative data from the above-mentioned categories of the people on the effectiveness of capacity building programmes in enhancing the people’s knowledge and understanding of the IDP and its processes, their rights, obligations and responsibilities in the IDP process, benefits of their participation in the IDP process and their knowledge of the structures they can use for participation and how they can participate effectively in the IDP process. Interviews were also crucial in finding out information dissemination programmes and resources available to capacitate people staying in the rural areas about the IDP and the type of information given to the community to enhance their quality of participation in the IDP process. Furthermore, the interviews were used to obtain in-depth knowledge about the factors considered and challenges in capacitating people staying in the rural areas to participate effectively in the IDP process.

The interviews were structured into topic areas in accordance with research questions covering the availability of a capacity building policy aimed at enhancing effective and meaningful participation of rural communities in the IDP process, the types of programmes and resources used by Lepelle-Nkumpi district municipality to capacitate rural communities to participate effectively in the IDP process, people staying in the rural areas’ knowledge and understanding of the IDP and its processes, structures they can use for participation in the IDP process, benefits and importance of their participation in the IDP process, their rights, obligations and responsibilities as the people in the IDP process,
and finally factors considered and challenges in capacitating the people in the two rural wards to participate meaningfully in the IDP process.

The research topic required the researcher and the interviewees to discuss some topics in a detailed way. To check the effectiveness of the capacity building programmes and to source views of different categories of the people required probing and that was only possible with focus group semi-structured interviews. Furthermore, the researcher felt that one-on-one semi-structured interviews with individual officials, ward councillors and community development workers would be appropriate to capture their views on the capacity building programmes to promote participation of the people in the IDP process within limited timeframe.

3.2.2 Secondary Data

Literature was surveyed on the types of capacity building programmes used internationally and nationally to capacitate the people and the people’s representatives to participate effectively in local governance. Furthermore, literature was surveyed on the factors considered and challenges in capacitating people staying in the rural areas for effective participation in the IDP process. Since the focus of this research is on capacity building programmes for improving the people’s participation in the IDP, the literature also surveyed literature on public participation and what improves community participation.

Secondary data was sourced from existing literature on the research topic, IDP documents of the two wards, minutes of IDP meetings, training manuals, workshop reports as well as IDP reports and other documents from the Municipality. The purpose of the literature review was to explore, investigate and analyse capacity building policies, strategies and programmes used internationally and nationally to capacitate the people to participate effectively in development planning processes at local government level. The knowledge gained from the literature review was used to analyse the research findings and to recommend effective capacity building programmes and strategies for improving
participation of rural communities in the integrated development planning process in South Africa. The minutes of the ward committee meetings and stakeholder meetings were used to explore the type of information sharing activities on the IDP during meetings that can empower the people about IDP processes and other IDP related issues. The literature survey was aimed at removing biases, which might emanate from interviews and questionnaires and to explore international and national best practices, which are relevant to the study. Furthermore, According to Mgwira (2006) secondary data offers the following advantages to the researcher. It is readily available. It is inexpensive to conduct. It alerts the researcher to potential problem areas. It helps to clarify research problems and it can cover greater periods of time than other approaches. These advantages led the researcher to survey existing literature that was relevant to the research topic.

3.3 RESEARCH POPULATION AND SAMPLING

Data collection for this study varies according to the sources of data and it focused on both primary and secondary data sources. The sections below indicate the research population, sampling methodology for the people including type of sampling technique used, primary and secondary sources, and the kind of information collected from various data sources and how the data was collected from various sources and how it was analysed.

There was a need in this study for the researcher to select people who could provide information on their knowledge and experiences related to the topic under study in order to have in depth understanding and knowledge of capacity building initiatives that can help to promote the people’s participation in the IDP process.

A sampling method was used to select the target population for this study. A sample is a group, which is selected from the population and it is thus less than a population (Mulder, 1992: 55). Of the various sampling techniques used in research, this study used stratified random sampling as well as judgemental sampling.
According to Cohen and Manlon (1994) stratified random sampling entails dividing the population into homogenous groups and it is relevant in the case where the population from which the sample is taken is heterogeneous in order to obtain a sample that is representative of the population. Each group in a stratified random sample will contain subjects with similar characteristics (Cohen & Manlon, 1994: 87).

The two rural wards involved in this study constitute people with dissimilar backgrounds. For instance, there are people who cannot read and write who are in the majority. There are literate people like teachers, nurses, and police, who are in the minority. There are traditional leaders, ward councillors in the two wards, ward committee members and people who run small businesses. Thus, stratified random sampling was considered the most ideal for selecting the people who participated in the study to ensure that all these sub-groups within the community are represented.

Although ward councillors and ward committee members are representatives of the people in the IDP process, they might not give information reflecting the views of the ordinary people. This is based on the view that councillors and ward committee members are on many occasions not necessarily representative of the people’s socio-economic status and are usually those who are better off as compared to the ordinary people. The researcher saw this technique as relevant to avoid falling into the trap of assuming that a community is homogeneous and of ensuring that the information gathered for the study reflects the views of all the people and to ensure that each of the groups is represented fairly.

The people in the two wards were categorised into a number of strata according to the above-mentioned characteristics. Thereafter simple random samples were then selected from each stratum in order to make the sample a proportionate random sample that is representative of all the different sub-groups within the communities in the two wards.
The stratified random sample group was used to select ward committee members, ordinary people and small business owners only. All the ward councillors, Community Development workers and traditional leaders were selected for the study. Five ward committee members from each ward participated in the study. The ten ward committee members were selected at random from a list of ward committee members in the two wards that was supplied by the officials of Lepelle-Nkumpi Local Municipality.

The researcher deliberately or purposefully selected judgemental samples because she believes that the “selected people would provide valuable insight to the research topic and to answering research questions” as noted by Werbeloff (1996:7). Generally, in relation to the research topic under study, there was a need to select a target sample that would be in a position to provide insight on policy issues. Apart from selecting ward councillors, ward committee members, community development workers, businesses and traditional leaders, there was a need to select officials from Lepelle-Nkumpi Local Municipality responsible for integrated development planning and those from SALGA responsible for training of ward committees and ward councillors. Officials were selected based on the relevance of their official duties to the research. A judgemental sampling was used for this reason. Table 1 at the next page presents the target population selected for the research.

3.3.1 Officials from Lepelle-Nkumpi Local Municipality

The research looks at the capacity building policies, strategies and programmes used by Lepelle-Nkumpi Local Municipality to empower rural wards to participate effectively in IDP processes. The IDP officials are the ones responsible for ensuring that the IDP process is a success and the process will not be a success without the people’s participation. It is therefore their duty to initiate, facilitate, coordinate and manage capacity building policies, strategies and programmes to achieve meaningful participation of all the people in the IDP process. Therefore, to obtain information on capacity building policies, strategies and programmes officials in the Public Participation Office,
Community Development Office and IDP office of the Municipality were very significant for the study. Hence, they were selected for interviews in the study.

**Table 1: Target Population for the study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward Councillors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Committee members</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Owners</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people in the two rural wards</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Steering Committee members</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Workers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepelle-Nkumpi Local Municipality Officials</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALGA Officials</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Leaders</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3.2 South African Local Government Association (SALGA) Officials

SALGA has been mandated to train ward councillors and ward committees. The study among other things investigates training of ward committees and ward councillors. Since SALGA trains and develops training manuals for these two categories of the people it was important for the researcher to understand what informs the training programme, how the training is done and other aspects of the training programmes. It was also important to source information on the content of the training programmes for ward councillors and ward committees to check relevance and their effectiveness in enhancing the participation of ward councillors and committees in the IDP process. Hence, SALGA officials were selected for the study.
3.3.3 Community Development Workers

Community Development Workers are appointed officials of the municipality and their core function is to develop communities on development-related issues, including IDP-related issues. Community Development Workers facilitate community engagement and participation in local government issues and they are deployed at community level as community based resource persons for government. They also provide information, training and empower communities. Since the aim was to investigate how rural wards are capacitated to participate in the IDP processes the CDW are the most appropriate target group to source data on the research topic.

3.3.4 Ward Councillors

Ward councillor is a person elected by residents within the ward during local elections to represent them in the local authority or municipal council and is the chairperson of the ward committee. Ward Councillors’ role is to encourage and channel community and neighbourhood engagement, local voice and local choice. Ward councillors are elected as the people’s representatives. As democratically-elected representatives of the people in the wards, capacitating them for meaningful participation in the IDP as well as capacitating them to capacitate other people in their wards is critical, hence they form part of the target group for the study.

3.3.5 Ward Committee\(^5\) members

Ward committee members are representatives of the community elected by the community together with the ward councillor and they represent the interests of the people in their wards. Ward committee members are allocated responsibilities in accordance with their portfolios that are in line with the portfolios of the nine portfolio heads of the Local municipality Executive Committee, namely, Community Services, Community Services, Community Services, Community Services, Community Services, Community Services, Community Services, Community Services, Community Services.

\(^5\) Ward committee is a voluntary apolitical and representative committee established in each ward to enhance participatory democracy (SALGA, 2006: 4).
Water and sanitation, Land and Planning (LED), Health, Sports, Arts and Culture, Finance, Housing and Electricity, Road and Transport, and Corporate Services.

They are representatives of the people in the wards and they require to be capacitated on how to empower other community members and in order for them to perform their duties as representatives of the community effectively. As nominated community representatives in their wards capacitating them for meaningful participation in the IDP as well as capacitating them to capacitate other people in their wards is critical, hence they form part of the target group for the study.

### 3.3.6 Traditional Leaders

One traditional leader in each ward participated in the study. These are indunas⁶ in the community. They have inherited their positions of community leadership from their fathers as per cultural customs. Participation of traditional leadership in the IDP processes is very vital to ensure sustainability of the IDP projects and buy in from the community since traditional leaders are very influential in rural areas. Capacitating them to understand the IDP process, their rights, roles and responsibilities in the process as well as that of the other community members will play a crucial role in the success of local government initiatives, the IDP in particular. They are centres of authority in rural areas and are highly respected by the community. Ninety five (95%) of the land in the rural wards of Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality belongs to traditional leadership (Lepelle-Nkumpi IDP, 2005 – 2006) and land is an important resource for socio-economic development in rural areas. Meaningful participation of traditional leadership and their buy-in of the IDP process is therefore critical for socio-economic development in the two wards in the study. It is because of these reasons that they have been selected for the study.

---

⁶ Indunas are representatives of chiefs in rural areas.
3.3.7 Small Business Owners

This category includes builders (2), electricians (2), plumbers (1) and small-scale farmers (5) without formal qualifications in these trades and the businesses are unregistered. The electricians, plumbers and builders who participated in this study learnt these skills from working for big businesses. Small-scale farmers are those people with livestock and piece of land that they use for crop production.

Sustainable community development is realized when community members play an active role in their own development. Small Businesses can play this active role during the implementation phase of the IDP by tendering for some of the IDP projects like building RDP houses, toilets, installing electricity, etc. They therefore want to be capacitated on how to participate effectively during certain phases of the IDP process. This kind of participation by Small Businesses will also result in job creation and economic development in their own communities that is the core of the IDP. Hence they have been selected as one of the target groups for the study.

3.3.8 Project Steering Committee members

These are people selected by residents in a ward to monitor projects emanating from the IDP. They are selected per project and should report to the ward councillor, ward committee and ward people on the projects. They are responsible for signing off projects and authorizing that service providers can are paid after project completion.

These are the people selected by residents in a ward to monitor projects emanating from the IDP. They are selected per project. It is important that these people understand how to do the monitoring of the projects they are mandated to monitor and therefore capacitating them to play this role is crucial for the success and sustainability of the projects, hence they form part of this study.
3.3.9 The people in the two rural wards

This category of the people is made of community members who do not fall under any of the above-mentioned categories of the people. The people in this study include the educated (5), semi-literate (5) and illiterate people (5) residing within the two rural wards in the study.

People, particularly in rural areas usually do not participate in the development process for their own areas because of lack of knowledge on how to participate effectively and to organise themselves into groups that will have a powerful voice to influence decisions in the IDP and lack of information. Ordinary people are the major stakeholders in development decisions that will affect their communities, and therefore they should be a way of making them participate effectively in the IDP, either through organised groups or as individuals in ward committee meetings. Capacitating ordinary people to participate effectively in the IDP process will contribute to sustainable development. Hence they were selected for this study.

3.4 DATA ANALYSIS

A tape recorder was used during the interviews with the people. The individual interviews and focus group interviews were then transcribed after each interview. The researcher transcribed the entire interview and the analysis was done in a narrative way. An analysis of the content of the discussions was done to look for trends and patterns that reappear within one category of the people and one focus group and among various categories and focus groups as well as within one ward and between the two wards in the study. A report of interview of one category and one focus group was developed in a question-by-question format with amplifying quotes and in the original language of the research participants. The researcher compared and contrasted results by category and focus group. The factors that made the capacity building efforts to be effective for one or other categories and not for some were picked up and documented in the research report. Interviews with various categories of the people helped to triangulate the data obtained through interviews on the same aspect from the various sub groups.
The researcher analysed the responses of individual respondents from each category and noted the percentage of people within a category and a ward responding the same way to a particular item. This was compared across categories and focus groups to see similarities and differences within people’s categories and focus groups. The researcher also checked patterns and trends within and across the wards, within and across the categories and the focus groups.

3.5 CONCLUSION

This research is limited to two rural wards in Lepelle-Nkumpi District Municipality. Outcomes and conclusion of the research should be viewed within the framework of a relatively limited scope of enquiry, which might be difficult to generalize. However, it can present some lessons for other capacity building initiatives for enhancing the people’s participation in local governance in rural settings.

One of the limitations of this study is the issue of reliability. It is difficult to obtain reliability when using qualitative research methodology. Reliability criterion is necessary to ensure that the research results obtained on certain occasion, under certain conditions can be reproducible (Werbeloff, 1996). Although it is difficult to obtain reliability in a qualitative study, the researcher used the same set of questions for all participants in accordance with the research questions. As recommended by Mgwira (2004: 61) the researcher attempted “to find wording for questions that had consistent meaning across the entire target group and probing for more detailed information was done where respondents seemed not to understand the questions”.

To ensure reliability of the data the researcher after collating all the responses according to themes validated the data with the respondents for them to confirm that what was captured represent their views.
It is very difficult to conduct a qualitative research with a very large sample. This might compromise representivity as pointed out by Mgwira (2004). To ensure that the study is representative of the people in the two rural wards a stratified random sampling as said above was used by the researcher to ensure that the various categories of the people are represented in the focus group discussions. Although the stratified sampling ensures that different sub-groups in the community are represented in the sample, it does not mean that the people within the same sub-group are homogeneous, and this maybe one of the limitations. The researcher checked literacy levels, poverty levels of participants from within one category to check for differences in order to avoid generalizing within the one citizen category.

One of the limitations of interviews is that the interviews in a qualitative study are more likely to give the information that the researcher did not plan for and the researcher obtains information from different people and may not be able to compare information (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). To minimize this, the researcher asked same questions guided by the research questions and categorised the data into themes in relation to the research questions to get a pattern or trends in the data as recommended by Leedy and Ormrod (2001). The researcher developed some questions for each theme using research questions and used probing to get more information out of each question.

The researcher triangulated the data by interviewing different people within the community, to obtain multiple perspectives on capacity building programmes from various sources. For objectivity, the researcher looked for more evidence and multiple perspectives and sources from various categories of the people on the topic under study as recommended by Leedy and Ormrod (2001).

The research was conducted within a short period. The time the researcher spent in Lepelle-Nkumpi Local Municipality and with various people was limited to few visits, and that means that the opportunity to observe and participate in broad discussions was constraint. Because of this, the research was affected adversely by the ability to generalize the findings to all the rural wards in Lepelle-Nkumpi Local Municipality since
only two wards participated in the study. The research was also constrained by financial constraints with respect to transport, funding etc. However, regardless of these limitations the research has offered valuable information on how to capacitate rural communities to participate effectively in local government issues.
CHAPTER FOUR
PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

This chapter reports on the findings of the study conducted on capacitating rural communities for participation in the integrated development planning in two rural wards in Lepelle-Nkumpi District municipality. The chapter first presents the background of Lepelle-Nkumpi Local Municipality. The second section presents a brief profile of the people in the study in terms of literacy levels and gender. The third section presents the findings from the interviews with each category of the people on capacitating rural communities for effective participation in the IDP process in accordance with the research questions. The chapter is concluded with a summary of the general impression given by all categories of the people and other participants in the study with regard to the capacity building programmes.

Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality is one of the local municipalities within Capricorn District Municipality in Limpopo Province and is located in the Southern area of Polokwane city. The Municipality was established in 2000 and its economic centre is Lebowakgomo. The Municipality is pre-dominantly rural with a population of about 227 965 and covers 3 454 78 sq. km (Capricorn District Municipality Spatial Development Framework, 2004). The municipality is divided into 25 wards, 22 of them are rural villages (88 villages), while three of the wards fall within a township, called Lebowakgomo that can be classified as semi-urban (Lepelle-Nkumpi IDP, 2005-2006). About 95% of the land belongs to traditional leadership (Capricorn Municipality Spatial Development Framework, 2004). The municipality has a proportionately high number of functionally illiterate people and unemployable as their education levels are below the minimum requirements for most skills development programmes offered by Sectoral Education and Training Authorities (Lepelle-Nkumpi IDP, 2005 – 2006).

The high number of illiteracy in the municipality results in a significant number of households in the municipality living below the poverty line. According to the 2001
Census (Statistics South Africa), 31% of the households in Lepelle-Nkumpi have no source of income, 10.9% of households earn less than R400.00 per month, 25% of households earn less than R800.00 (Lepelle-Nkumpi IDP, 2005 - 2006).

4.1 PROFILE OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY

Forty-five people participated in the interviews of which 20 (44%) were from ward 16, 19 (42%) were from ward 19. Other people who participated in the study are 2 SALGA officials, 2 Lepelle-Nkumpi IDP officials and 2 Community Development Workers working in the two wards. The following tables present the profile of the participants in the study in terms of gender and literacy levels.

4.1.1 Breakdown by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Participants</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Councillors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Committee members</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business People</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people in the two wards</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Steering Committee members</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALGA officials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepelle-Nkumpi local Municipality officials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.2 Breakdown by literacy levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The people’s categories</th>
<th>Illiterate</th>
<th>Semi-literate</th>
<th>Highly literate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward Councillors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Committee members</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business owners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary people</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Steering Committee members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illiterate people are those who cannot read or write, Semi-literate are those that can read and write in their mother tongue but cannot read, write and communicate in English. The highly literate refers to those who can read, write, understand and communicate in both their mother tongue and English. The latter group is the group that the researcher conducted the interviews in both English and a bit of Sepedi, while in the case of the former two categories only Sepedi was used.

4.2 CAPACITY BUILDING POLICY AND STRATEGY

All the officials who participated in the study said that there is no capacity-building policy and or strategy aimed at capacitating people staying in the rural areas and all the other people to participate effectively in the IDP process.\(^7\) The municipality should capacitate the local communities to participate effectively in the IDP process. This was also confirmed by desktop search of Lepelle-Nkumpi District Municipality website. From the website, although all the other documents of the municipality like the IDP and other

---

policies are available, a capacity building policy for enhancing participation of people staying in the rural areas in the IDP process is not available.

### 4.2.1 Types of Programmes and Strategies

There are programmes ranging from research-based capacity building interventions, information dissemination and training programmes. The research-based interventions are only those from agricultural research output, for example, in ward 16 the Agricultural Research Council in collaboration with the Provincial Department of Agriculture and ward committees train subsistence farmers into farming with medicinal plants and assists them to work as cooperatives. The project also involves organising the people into cooperatives and teaching them about soil erosion, how to prevent it as well as land care techniques. It also includes aspects of project management, Agri-business management; writing business plans to source funding and teamwork. It furthermore educates them about the services offered by The Provincial Department of Agriculture that will assist them in their project.

According to the people participating in the project, the project has improved their economic status largely. This is one of the projects in Lepelle-Nkumpi IDP. The ARC official said that because most of the people participating in the project cannot read or write, they teach them through contact and the methodology is practical and on-site. She said,

> [W]e sometimes give them written materials that are translated in their mother tongue. We make the research output reader friendly for those who can at least read in mother tongue. Those who cannot read are encouraged to attend ABET classes in ABET centres to learn reading and writing skills.

With regard to information-sharing programmes, various departments and other organisations like SALGA provides information on various aspects of the IDP. However, this happens more during implementation stage and not during the planning stage where decision-making about which projects will be included in the IDP is done. Information sharing is limited to ward committee meetings, project steering committee meetings, IDP
forum meetings and Council meetings. The latter two are for ward councillors only and not other categories of the people. It was said that rarely is radio used to share information on IDP related issues, for instance, inviting the people to meetings but not on educating the people about IDP issues and legislation.

Training programmes are limited to training of ward councillors and ward committee members as well as project steering committee members. Other categories of the people are only given information on IDP related issues and are not trained, unless if they are Project Steering Committee members. It emerged that all of these programmes with the exception of induction programmes for ward councillors and ward committees, only happen during implementation and not during planning and needs assessment. Most of the decision-making on the needs of the communities is done during the planning phase because needs assessment and prioritization of needs for the Ward IDP is done during this phase. Therefore, there are limited capacity building programmes during the planning phase.

It also emerged from the interviews that different categories of the people are capacitated differently based on their role in the process, for instance ward committees are capacitated differently from the ordinary people, traditional leaders etc. The section below indicates how different categories of the people are capacitated to participate in the IDP process.

### 4.2.2 Capacitating Ward Councillors

From the findings Ward Councillors are the most capacitated category of the people than all the other categories of the people who participated in the study. This is because the two ward councillors, SALGA officials, Public participation Office and IDP officials who participated in the study all strongly agreed that there are structured programmes and meetings, workshops, conferences and seminars for ward councillors.
According to the SALGA official ward councillors and ward committees are trained using formal lectures and by attending formal and informal meetings with municipality officials. The IDP officials agreed that there is induction training for new and returning ward councillors at the beginning of their term of office to orientate them about their roles and functions as ward councillors. Sometimes training programmes are organised for ward councillors throughout their term of office as needs for training arise. South African Local Government Association (SALGA) provides the orientation and training programmes for Ward Councillors. The content of the training programme for Ward Councillors as noted by the ward councillors, IDP officials and SALGA official are:

**Table 2: Training Content for Ward Councillors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Related</th>
<th>Skills Related</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- What is the IDP?</td>
<td>- Developing a ward profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local government legislation</td>
<td>- Doing Community needs assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Why the IDP?</td>
<td>- Public Speaking skills / public communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Legal/legislative framework around IDPs</td>
<td>- Basic organisation skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Key elements of the IDP</td>
<td>- Facilitating and conducting productive meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental local government</td>
<td>- Running campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Phases of the IDP process</td>
<td>- Report writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Agenda of transformation</td>
<td>- Lobbying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How council work and how it is structured</td>
<td>- Budgeting process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Performance management System</td>
<td>- Leadership skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Role and functions of ward committees and ward councillor</td>
<td>- Networking and consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reporting requirements for ward committees</td>
<td>- Developing an annual action plan for ward committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Role of proportional representative (PR) councillor</td>
<td>- Conflict management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the SALGA training manuals (n.d) for ward councillors the training is divided into five modules. Module 1 covers Local Government legislation (the South African Local Government legislation, the Context of Developmental Local Government and the demands thereof on Ward Councillor, how council is structured, meeting procedures and standing orders, decision-making cycle in council, legislative powers of local council). Module 2 trains them about leadership skills (leadership qualities, types and styles of leadership, transactional and transformational leadership, visionary and political leadership, working in wards, conflict management in a municipal environment, managing disaster and crises in the community, understanding group dynamics, leading and creating cohesive teams, characteristics of effective teams). Module 3 is about Integrated Development Plans (Strategic Planning, Basic Project Management, Community Participation, and Community needs analysis, linking financial processes to other processes, MTEF, Budget Cycles, and Drafting Budget from proposal to finish). Module 4 focuses on community development (Understanding Community development, community organising, a change programme, cooperative governance, community participation). Module 5 focuses on roles and responsibilities of ward councillors.

In addition to these courses, there are meetings for ward councillors organised by Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality. All the two ward councillors said that they are more capacitated to understand local government affairs through attending these meetings. However, one ward councillor said that they are trained to understand how to monitor projects in their wards. She said, “we know how to identify ward needs and projects that will develop the community but we do not have information on where to go after identifying these projects”. The same ward councillor does not understand the IDP process clearly but knows that the ward will start by identifying their needs and those needs and needs of other wards form Lepelle-Nkumpi IDP. It emerged that the community are informed as a token and do not really participate in needs identification and prioritization. This is because all the two ward councillors said that the ward IDP is presented to the people in the ward. One ward councillor said, “the people participate in needs identification and the municipality will decide which ones will be included in the IDP and implemented first due to limited resources and I will then tell them that these
projects will be implemented this year and these ones will not be implemented because of the budget.” This implies that the people do not participate in the strategies and approval phases of the IDP and it is therefore unlikely that the municipality will empower them to participate effectively in these phases. However, from the other people, it emerged that they do not participate in the process of needs identification; they are only told about the projects in the IDP that will be implemented in the financial year.

4.2.3 Capacitating Ward Committee members

Of the ten ward committee members who participated in the study, five were from ward 16 and the other 5 from ward 19. They have all attended the ward committee induction workshop, seven attended training courses related to their responsibilities and three never attended courses related to their portfolios. They attend workshops and meetings to discuss IDP issues that relate to their portfolios.8

Like in the case of ward councillors, the municipality organises induction programme for all the ward committee members to orientate them about their role and responsibilities as ward committee members within the ward committee and the community. Training programmes and information sharing sessions are organised with the ward committee members. The municipality and the different government departments are involved in the training of ward committee members and participate in the ward cluster workshops. For example, the ward committee member responsible for community services attended a workshop on community services, water and sanitation as well as cooperatives that was organised by the Department of Local Government. According to him, “the workshop was beneficial for him and made him to understand community services issues.”

---

8 The content of the induction programme according to the ward committee member include what the IDP entails, policies and by-laws related to the IDP, building a relationship between the community and the municipality, roles and responsibilities related to their portfolios, community leadership, how to communicate and consult effectively with the community, and how not to politicize community issues and how to collate a portfolio report within their wards.
However, the concern of the entire ward committees was that the workshops and most of the meetings are conducted in English and only few workshops were conducted in both English and Sepedi, except the workshop on monitoring of the RDP housing project and building of toilets that were conducted in Sepedi that were done on site. They said that although some of the workshops were conducted in both languages, English was dominating. They said that they are not happy about the workshops conducted in English because they could not follow the discussions. One ward committee member remarked “all the training materials are written in English, so even when I want to refer or read at my own time at home I cannot since I do not understand English.”

They all agreed that the most effective workshops are those that train them to monitor projects emanating from the IDP. For example, two ward committee members holding the “Electricity and Housing” and the “Water and Sanitation” portfolios said that the workshop on monitoring the RDP housing project assisted her to perform her monitoring role effectively as a ward committee member. She said that the workshop provided her with adequate information and skills on what and how to monitor the project. They both concurred that since they were going to monitor the housing and toilet projects and report to their Portfolio committees the workshops gave them hands on training on what to look for when monitoring the projects. They said that the NHBRC in collaboration with the Municipality conducted the training. They said that the programme helped them to know the required number of bricks, bags of cement, wheelbarrows of sand and the depth of the foundation when building an RDP house or a toilet.

All the ward committee members understand the role of a ward committee as well as their individual role and functions as ward committee members. They clearly understand what their portfolios are and what the community expects of them. All ward committee members said that their responsibilities are to educate the people in the ward about the IDP and portfolio related information. For example, the ward committee member holding the water and sanitation portfolio said that her role is to educate the community on water conservation and management and encouraging the people to contribute towards water services in the ward, to work with the Department of Water Affairs through the ward
councillor to ensure that all the households in the wards have water and that she is responsible for monitoring the installation of water metres in all households in the ward and report to the ward councillor.

They all agreed that their other roles include obtaining inputs from the people in the ward on priority projects on planning for the ward IDP and report to the head of the portfolio, ensure that the projects listed in the IDP for the ward are achieved through monitoring and reporting to the ward councillor and the head of the portfolio. They further said that they also have to contribute to poverty alleviation and job creation through identification of projects with the people within the ward that will improve the socio economic situation of the community. They also said that their other functions include ensuring that communities are developed in skills programmes that will uplift their socio-economic status.

Seven (70%) of the ward committee members who participated in the study said that the workshops and meetings have improved their understanding of the IDP and they are very beneficial in assisting them to do their job better. The ward committee member responsible for community services said that she represents the community on community service issues like “ensuring that the community is safe, alleviate poverty, to work with the police to fight crime in the ward.” She said, “I ensure that the IDP includes projects like community policing. The one responsible for the health and social development portfolio said that her main responsibility is

[T]o carry the mandate of the community on health related issues and to ensure that the IDP includes projects to enhance the health of the community in her ward as well as to ensure that the people in the ward receive health care. , For example, I ensure that there is a mobile clinic in the ward.

However from the findings it emerged that there is no mobile clinic in the ward and she said that it is because prioritization of the IDP projects is done without their involvement and it is not done for their own ward only but for Lepelle-Nkumpi municipality.
The ward committee member holding the health portfolio said that her responsibilities are assessing health related issues within the community. She ensures that the ward has access to health facilities, ensuring that the aged are taken care of and to do HIV/AIDS awareness campaigns within the community, assist the poor people and the aged who cannot access health care facilities by referring them to social workers. She was very confident that she is able to do these duties well because of the meetings organised by the Department of Health and the Portfolio meetings she attends.

Although all the ward committee members know their roles and functions, six of them still are less confident that the induction programme was effective in improving their participation in the IDP process. One of the ward committee members said, “I still cannot write the portfolio report for my ward, I am not confident also in making community members to participate in the IDP process, hence we have low participation rates of the people in ward committee meetings.”

She said that the programmes should make them able to attract the youth and the majority of the people to ward committee meetings because the youth do not participate in the IDP process, and they do not come to the meetings.” This was also supported by another ward committee member who asserted,

[W]e know our roles and what is expected of us, but what is crucial is can we do it. I am not convinced that we have appropriate skills to perform our duties perfectly, we know but doing is a problem, even convincing the municipality to keep the identified projects for our ward and implement them is difficult.

It emerged during the interviews that all ward committee members do not know how their responsibilities as ward committee members differ from that of the ward councillor and that of the officials, except that they said that they are not paid while the ward councillor and the officials are paid. Role clarification of ward councillors, municipality officials and ward committees should be strongly emphasised during the induction programme.

According to the ward committee member responsible for local and economic development (LED), the municipality is not doing enough to empower people about how
they can use the land that they have to improve their lives. He said, “The municipality should teach us what is it we can do about the land we have to solve our poverty problems?” He strongly feels that the municipality should assist them to make good use of the land they have and the river in the village and that this should be a priority project in the IDP. He said that the local authorities should come to their ward, see what they have so that their IDP can be practical, and relate to the resources in the community. According to the ward committee member priority projects for the 2005-2006 IDP, particularly for his ward are Poultry project, building a dam from the river in the village and educating people on how to use their land to make a living and a Vegetable scheme. He observed that “although we have water from the river and land we live in poverty, because we do not know how we can use these natural resources to improve the quality of our lives and the municipality does not take these factors into consideration when formulating the IDP.” This statement indicates that municipality does not involve the ward committees in the decision-making during the planning phase of the IDP and there is no ownership of the IDP by ward committees.

It emerged from the ten ward-committee members that none of them knows and understands their rights in the IDP process. One of the ward committee members when asked about their rights in the IDP process said, “Maybe it is to help the community”, while others confused rights with their duties. It was very clear that all of them do not know their rights in the IDP, even those ward committee member who are semi and highly literate were not sure about their rights and powers as ward committee members in the IDP process. Some ward committee members are not well conversant with the right to public participation of the people in local governance matters and that the IDP becomes legitimate if the people have participated fully in the process according to legislation.

They said that they get IDP-related information from the ward councillor, and booklets from the municipality. They feel that there is not enough information to make them well informed about the IDP processes and legislation and they recommended that there should be many workshops focusing on different aspects of the IDP. They all mentioned that they are notified of the workshops on short notice and sometimes they already have
other commitments and are not able to attend the workshops. All the ward committee members said that they get most of the information on IDP related matters from the ward councillor and other ward committee members, workshops and meetings organised by the Municipality and the Premier’s office.

There are also ward committee cluster workshops organised by the municipality where they discuss service delivery issues and other local governance issues. These are workshops where all ward committee members from Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality holding a similar portfolio, for example, ward committee members holding the Health portfolio, come together to discuss and share information on health issues. The municipality, relevant government departments and other organisations that are relevant to services within the portfolio participate in these workshops. According to one ward committee member, these workshops assist us to learn from each other.

4.2.4 Capacitating Traditional Leaders

All the two traditional leaders who participated in the study said that they are capacitated through being provided with information when attending Council meetings called by the Local municipality and ward committee meetings. They attend bi-monthly meetings of the local municipality. The two traditional leaders said that they are informed about projects and they participate mainly during the implementation of the IDP projects and they form part of the monitoring of the IDP projects. One of the traditional leaders said that they participate in the identification of indigents within their wards.

From the findings, it appears that there is no training of traditional leaders on the IDP except that they are given information on the IDP when attending meetings. From the interviews with the traditional leaders, it emanated that they are clear about their roles and responsibilities as traditional leaders in the IDP process, however they do not understand their rights in the process. They said that they were given the Constitution of the ward committee by the ward councillors during ward committee meetings. Hence, they know their role and responsibilities in the process.
All traditional leaders who participated in the study know the structures they can use to participate in the IDP process. Both of them know that they can use ward committees or meetings called by the local municipality to participate, or they can write to the Local municipality or to the ward councillor to point out their views related to IDP processes. For instance, both agreed that their role during planning is to identify developmental needs of the ward and should support and work together with the ward councillor and ward committees to develop their wards and that they are ex-officio members of the ward committee. Both two traditional leaders know and understand the IDP, what it is but do not know and understand the IDP process. This is evident because they pointed out that the IDP is about ensuring that their wards develops but could not explain the process involved and also did not know the importance of all the people’s participation in the IDP process, particularly in the decision making process during the various IDP processes.

From the interview, they were not aware that there were Community Development Workers in their wards, what the roles of the community development workers were. This might be because according to the ward councillors and community development workers, the CDWs were only appointed in April 2007 and the interview took place in May 2007.

4.2.5 Capacitating Small Businesses

All the five small business owners who participated in the study agreed that they do not know anything about the IDP. One said that she heard the word “IDP” but do not know what it is. They do not know the IDP process, their rights, roles and responsibilities in the process. However, they said that they know that there are ward committees but they did not participate in the process of electing ward committee members. When asked if they attend ward committee meetings, they all said that they do not because things discussed in these meetings are never achieved. One said, “what is the use of attending these meetings, we just talk and talk but nothing happens after that. And you do not even know what they are going to talk about, the agenda is never attached to the invitation” However
they all agreed that they are always invited to these meetings but never attend. The other two business owners never attended a ward committee meeting but one attended only once. When asked if they understand and know the benefits of attending these meetings and their participation in the IDP process, they were all not aware of the importance of their participation in the IDP. They also do not know about how they can participate during the process,, that is, what they can do to contribute during the different stages of the IDP process

Ward committees and the ward councillors also said that there is poor attendance of small business owners in ward committee meetings. However, both ward councillors agreed that they never called a stakeholders meeting in their wards that includes small businesses and other interest groups. It was said by the ward councillors that there would be a stakeholders meeting in June where small businesses will be consulted, educated on the IDP and its processes. According to the two ward councillors, this will be the first stakeholder meeting and will serve as an information sharing session on IDP processes, achievements and future plans. The municipality initiated the stakeholder meeting.

Small businesses and the people are not capacitated at all by the municipality except in the case where they form part of the project steering committee or if they are in an agricultural project. For instance, the findings depict that ward councillors are the most capacitated category, followed by ward councillors and traditional leaders. Training programmes include and are limited to training of ward councillors, ward committee members as well as project steering committee members. Other people and small business owners who participated in the study are not trained. According to ward councillors and the officials, there are organisations\(^9\) that are mandated to train SMMEs and those people who aspire to open small businesses, the people do not know about them and about the services, they provide and as a result never attended any training from these organisations.

\(^9\)Such as the Limpopo Business Support Agency (LIBSA) and Limpopo Development Organisation (LIMDEV).
From the findings there are no specific programmes aimed at capacitating small businesses to participate effectively in all the stages of the IDP process, except for meetings called by ward councillors for all ward the people. However, there are programmes to capacitate them for effective participation during implementation of the IDP that are done by other organisations. From the officials of Lepelle-Nkumpi Local municipality and ward councillors, organisations like Limpopo Business Support Agency (LIBSA), LONMIN and LIMDEV provide training for small businesses on Business management, Developing business proposals/ plans, Planning skills, Budgeting, and Pricing.

LIBSA provides free training on how to develop business plans and how to run and manage a business. It was said by the ward councillors that people do not use these opportunities and do not know about these organisations because they do not attend ward committee meetings where all these opportunities are discussed. When small business owners were asked if they know of these organisations and how they can benefit from the organisations, they answered in the negative to both.

4.2.6 Capacitating the local people

Of the 20 people interviewed, only two said that they know what the IDP is all about, and the rest did not know. Even some of the semi-literate and the highly literate said that they do not know but have heard about the IDP from other sources and not from their municipality. However, the highly literate people know their rights in local governance issues, but indicated that they do not exercise those rights. All the people with the exception of the highly literate ones do not know the benefits of their participation in the process.

According to all the people involved in this study, the people are capacitated through information from the ward committee meetings. Like in the case of small businesses, the people only get information on IDP if they attend ward committee meetings. They all said that they know that they can use the ward committees for their views on the needs of
the community, but they do not attend the meetings. IDP officials confirmed this and said that there are no specific programmes to empower the people in their wards to participate effectively in the IDP process. This excludes members of the Project Steering committee.

It emerged from the findings that some people in ward 16, those who are in subsistence farming, have been grouped into cooperatives, are given land and some financial support, and are trained on Medicinal Plants, Land Care Projects and how to build earth-dams to prevent soil erosion. The other project for in subsistence farming is “Dipudi” Project. These two projects are driven by Limpopo Provincial Department of Agriculture collaboration with the Municipality and the people receive training on farm. The people involved in the project said that the projects are very effective. One person said that the project is helping them to understand how to run an Agri-business and how to use farming to better their lives and that they have been encouraged by officials facilitating the programmes to attend ABET classes in the ABET centres so that they can be more knowledgeable about agriculture.

According to the ward committee member holding the LED portfolio some community members who were identified by ward committees and traditional leaders have attended training programmes to provide skills on beadwork, dress making, shoe making and tourist attraction projects. This was done in line with Limpopo Growth and Development Strategy goals on encouraging entrepreneurship.

Ward 16 councillor said that instead of relying only on the ward committee meetings, he uses community forums, social clubs and stokvels\textsuperscript{10}; soccer club, meetings, clan meetings to communicate IDP related information and to educate people about how they can participate in the IDP. He said that he also uses the Community meetings that are called by the chief every quarter to communicate IDP issues. He said that he uses community meeting called by the chief during December when all the migrant workers are at home to source participation. He said this system of using already existing structures like traditional meetings; stokvels, clan meetings and social clubs work well. He said that it is

\textsuperscript{10} South African township language for Social Club.
compulsory in the ward that every household belonging to the same clan have monthly clan meetings that were introduced by the chief to avoid a situation where people do not have funds to bury their loved ones with dignity because they do not have money. The clans meet monthly and pay R10 per month, and these are the meetings used to discuss IDP related information.

There are no specific programmes for capacitating other people in the ward except if they are members of the project steering committee. Three people who were part of the project steering committees were interviewed. The Project steering committee is established per project, that is, each project will have its project steering committee, and the community chooses project steering committee members for each project. The members of the steering committee are members of the community who will be tasked to monitor the project.

According to one ward councillor, Lepelle-Nkumpi Officials and one member of the steering committee, steering committee members are well capacitated to monitor and oversee implementation of a particular project. All project steering committee members who were interviewed are those who were involved in the building of the RDP houses and toilets. One member who felt that they are well capacitated to monitor said, “I now know how many cements, how much sand, how much concrete should be used and the depth of the foundation for RDP houses and toilets. However, some steering committee members and one ward councillor felt that steering committee members are not well capacitated. For instance, the ward councillor said that

[L]ack of technical knowledge on what to look for when monitoring a project poses a problem because the contractor knows specifications for building toilets but steering committee does not know, and because of that toilets are falling after they are built even when we had steering committee members doing the monitoring. Training for project steering committee members is not adequate and effective.
The steering committee members said:

[W]e are expected to ensure that the project is done according to specifications and to check the scope of work by the contractor and at the end of the project they should sign the payment certificate, and therefore we should know what to look for before signing for payment.

Institutions specializing in skills development in relation to the skills required by the specific project that the steering committee would be monitoring train the steering committee members. The training programme for project steering committee includes project management, The IDP officials are the ones responsible for ensuring that the IDP process is a success and the process will not be a success without the people’s participation. It is therefore their duty to initiate, facilitate, coordinate and manage capacity building policies, strategies and programmes to achieve meaningful participation of all the people in the IDP process. The training includes business management, basic understanding of labour law and to check if labourers are paid the minimum wage, check if they are insured and registered as well as ensuring that there is no misuse or stealing of materials.

4.2.7 Resources for capacitating rural communities

From the data collected each ward has a Community Development Worker (CDW). The community development workers are “multi-skilled public servants who are deployed at community level to bridge the gap between the provision of services by government and access to those services” (DPLG, 2005, p 42).

According to DPLG (2005), Community Development Workers are deployed in the wards where they live. Some of the duties of Community Development Workers that relates to the study, according to DPLG (2005, p 42) are to: address the lack of information, knowledge and poor communication experienced by communities on local government issues; develop communities to articulate their developmental needs; facilitating the development of community structures; facilitate community participation
in government development projects, for example, IDP, local economic development, infrastructure and service delivery projects, and so on. However, it emerged during the interviews that the community development workers in the two wards have just been appointed in January 2007. They were also not experienced. They were still going to attend a training programme that will capacitate them to perform their duties effectively.

Other government departments and organisations also contribute by providing information in relation to IDP projects that is related to their mandate as Departments. For example, the Department of Agriculture provides information from agricultural research outputs to subsistence farmers and encourage them to move into commercial farming. However, these institutions only provide information that capacitates the people during implementation not during planning stages of the IDP.

4.3 CONCLUSION

The two ward councillors felt that the municipality is making efforts to capacitate them to participate effectively in the two wards. The language used for training and in some of the meetings by Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality can be an obstacle to their effective participation in the IDP. This was particularly evident from the ward councillor who is semi-literate and it is her first term as a ward councillor. She is not that much knowledgeable about local government policies and from the interviews it was also not convincing that she knew her rights and that of the people in the whole process. The SALGA official also said that the use of the English language in meetings, workshops and training of ward committees is a challenge that affects their effective participation.

The concern of the semi-literate ward councillor was that all the training is conducted in English, she is not conversant in English and most of the meetings are in English. She said:

I cannot go back to the training manuals at my spare time and refer or remind myself of certain legislation because all the manuals are in English.” She said that she would rather ask another knowledgeable and experienced ward councillor than to read the manuals. Even if I do not understand during the training or meeting I ask other ward councillors
who understand rather than the facilitator, because I cannot communicate confidently in English, people will laugh at me; I would also not even know what I am saying myself, it is a difficult language to speak, although I can hear there and there.

These sentiments are also shared by most of the ward committee members. The fully literate councillor did not have a problem with usage of English in meetings and for training, but said that for those ward councillors who do not understand the language it may affect their participation in the process.

From most of the ward committee members the invitations to the meetings and training workshops reach them late. Their main concern was that the Municipality knows that they are not paid to do the job, most of them are unemployed, and therefore if they receive the invitations late they sometimes do not have the money for transport to the venue and as a result do not attend. Furthermore, the municipality does not reimburse them the transport costs immediately after the workshop. According to most of the ward committee members, timing for meetings as well as short notice should be considered because sometimes they have other commitments. According to them, these factors affect their participation and morale in the IDP process. They also said that they are concerned because their role is to attend these workshops and meetings and to be empowered so that they can also empower the people in their wards. They said that their non-attendance of meetings and workshops organised by the municipality affects the people as well in terms of giving them the information to enhance their participation in the IDP.

The other challenge highlighted by the IDP officials regarding capacitating rural communities was buy in from traditional leadership. This is due to the fact that if traditional leadership have authority and are highly respected by their communities. One of the IDP officials said,

[I]f there is buy in from traditional leadership they are able to influence the people to attend ward committee meetings and thus make it easier to share information and educate communities about IDP related issues.
From the SALGA officials responsible for training ward committees and councillors, the other challenge is that the training programme for ward committees and ward councillors is not aligned to the National Qualifications Framework and the participants only receive certificates of attendance and not competence certificates. Other factors considered in designing the training programmes for ward councillors and ward committee members according to the SALGA officials are the location, traditional leadership in the area, gender mainstreaming, level of education and knowledge of local government issues of the participants and youth participation.

There are high illiteracy rates in rural wards. Capacity building includes information sharing through not only meetings and workshops but also using print media or written materials. This poses a challenge to the municipality and other organisations involved in capacitating rural communities on various aspects of the IDP.

According to the IDP official in Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality, there are various ethnic groups in Limpopo with different languages, for example, Shangaan, Venda, Sepedi, English, Afrikaans, and it becomes “difficult to train people in their mother tongue, there must be common language we use for training.” He also said that he will not be able to communicate in all these languages and this is a challenge on capacitating people with different languages and academic backgrounds. A mixture of different ethnic groups -- with different languages in one session -- calls for interpreters for various groups and that needs extra resources and budgets. The language issue goes beyond the meetings and workshops because the training manuals and all written documents are in English. This poses a challenge of translating the documents and manuals in the languages the people can understand.

There is poor service delivery in rural areas and according to some of the people interviewed hence there are no visible results of local government efforts in their socio-economic development. According to the IDP officials, Community Development Workers and ward committee members, poor service delivery causes non-attendance of ward meetings by the people in rural wards. These are the meetings where IDP issues are
discussed, particularly because most people staying in the rural areas cannot read or write and ward committee meetings are aimed at empowering this category of people with the required information for their effective participation in the IDP process. The other challenge is lack of adequate resources for capacitating rural communities.
CHAPTER FIVE
ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter analyses and interprets the research findings presented in the previous chapter by reflecting on them drawing on the literature and theory in Chapter 2. Specifically, the chapter analyses the findings using noticeable differences and similarities, and trends picked up by the researcher within the same ward and across the wards. The analysis focuses on the purpose of the research, namely, to analyse how Lepelle-Nkumpi Local Municipality capacitate people staying in the rural areas to participate effectively in the IDP process and the research questions.

The absence of a capacity-building policy or strategy undermines effective participation of the people in the IDP process. There are no objectives by the Municipality for improving the people’s participation in the IDP process. There is no monitoring and evaluation framework for participation of the people since there are no objectives set on improving the people’s participation in the IDP process. According to the World Bank Report (1995), without appropriate policy to address capacity issues to overcome barriers to community participation, the voices of the poor groups will not be heard and their participation will be limited to being informed and not participate in the decision-making processes and their participation in the IDP will, at best be token one, and this is likely what is happening in the two wards in the study.

Drawing from the lessons learnt from the study commissioned by DPLG (2002) in Kgalagadi and Buffalo City municipalities to investigate the sustainability of local governance through IDPs, a capacity-building policy of the municipality contributes much to effective participation in the IDP process. From Kgalagadi Municipality the availability and effective implementation of a human resource development strategy, structured skills development policies for various categories of people in the municipality, for example, for businesses, farmers etc., and accompanying monitoring
and evaluation frameworks resulted into high and effective people’s participation in the IDP (DPLG, 2002). In comparison, the absence of a capacity building strategy in Buffalo City municipality resulted in most ward committee members not being able to participate effectively in the IDP process. It can therefore be argued that the absence of such a policy in Lepelle-Nkumpi District Municipality might lead to a situation where capacity-building initiatives for rural wards are not well planned and structured and where other categories of people are not capacitated at all.

Due to the absence of a capacity building policy or strategy for enhancing rural people participation in the IDP process one cannot say whether the Municipality is achieving the objectives or not and therefore the Municipality itself will not be able to improve on its capacity building interventions because they are not guided by any objectives or goals. This also shows that the municipality will never evaluate and review its capacity building interventions since they are unguided and ad-hoc and do not have objectives to reach and therefore no direction for capacity building efforts. As advocated by the World Bank (1995) without a capacity building policy encompassing a monitoring and evaluation framework for the policy/strategy objectives, community participation in local government will at best be a token one, which is the case in the two wards in the study. The monitoring and evaluation element in a capacity building policy is core to monitoring implementation and evaluating achievement of objectives (Bartle, 2005; Narwani, 2002) as learnt from the Indian and Ugandan systems of capacity building for enhancing people’s participation in local government.

The significance of a capacity-building programme that encompasses a monitoring and evaluation framework is also evident from the lessons learnt from the Buffalo City and Kgalagadi Municipalities (DPLG, 2002). The absence of a capacity building policy to enhance people’s participation in the IDP process in the Buffalo City Municipality resulted in the people including traditional leaders, ward councillors and ward committees not being able to participate effectively in the process. The availability of the policy in the Kgalagadi Municipality backed up by a monitoring and evaluation frameworks improved the efficacy of people’s participation largely. The findings of this
study proved this right since although all the people in the study know structures for participation it was evident that they cannot have meaningful participation in the IDP process. A capacity building strategy and policy is therefore a success factor in capacitating people staying in the rural areas to participate effectively in the IDP related issues.

From the findings, it is apparent that Lepelle-Nkumpi municipality has programmes for capacitating ward councillors, ward committees and project steering committee members, but not for other people in the two wards unless they are project committee members. It is also clear from the findings that traditional leaders are ex-officio members of ward committees according to ward committees Constitution and therefore should attend all ward committee meetings. The analysis of the findings below will focus on the types of capacity building programmes and the effectiveness of the programmes in educating various categories of the people and in making their participation in the IDP meaningful.

5.1 TYPES OF CAPACITY BUILDING PROGRAMMES

One of the causes of non-participation, particularly by people staying in the rural areas is lack of confidence in them and in the local authority. Therefore confidence building as advocated by Vernooy, Sun and Jianca (2003) should form an integral part of the capacity building programmes for enhancing people’s participation in the IDP process. The element of confidence building seems neglected by Lepelle-Nkumpi municipality in their capacity building programmes for rural communities. Adequate information on IDP issues disseminated in a way that is understandable and appropriate will also build confidence in the people to participate meaningfully in the process. Confidence building will include building trust among the Municipality, ward councillors, ward committees and the people.

Capacity building, particularly for elected people’s representatives, is more than a once-off training; it is holistic including mentoring, coaching and training, providing resources,
financial support and more (Wing, 2004; Buckley and Caple, 1991). In comparison to the findings in the study, the focus of capacity building is more on training and information sharing through meetings, workshops and by Community Development Workers. The other elements of capacity building like mentoring and coaching, particularly for ward committees are not explored fully by the Municipality and these elements are equally important as training, meetings and workshops. It was evident from the findings that the Ward councillor who was new and not experienced expressed her need for a mentor and that she uses the other experienced ward councillor as her mentor, coach, and it works very well for her. This practice also yielded fruitful results for new councillors in Scotland with regard to improving the efficacy of their participation in the decision making process in local governance, where it was a normal practice that newly elected inexperienced ward councillors are taken through an effective six months mentorship programme by the experienced and outgoing councillors (Martlew, 1988).

From the SALGA manuals used for training new ward councillors in 2005, the content is very comprehensive and covers a range of topics including skills and competency issues, attitude, interpersonal issues, and local government legislation. However, some of the training content is not of immediate use to the officials and the other participants.

One of the major shortcomings of the training programmes for ward councillors in Lepelle-Nkumpi District Municipality is that the content of the training does not include attitude related issues and the technical aspects of an IDP. Although attitude related issues and technical matters are contained in the manuals, neither the ward councillors nor SALGA officials mentioned them during the interviews. Ward councillors were also asked about the type of attitude related issues covered by the training and they all agreed that the training does not cover them. According to Narwani (2002) attitude, related issues like teamwork, assertiveness, initiative taking, and interpersonal relations form an important part of the training content for ward councillors and they are of equal importance to skills and knowledge acquisition. It can be argued that attitude related content for community leaders like ward councillors will assist them to perform their IDP related work effectively because they need to build effective teams, deal with gender
issues, which will require them to be assertive, and to take initiative as leaders. Without these skills, their participation in the IDP process will be negatively affected.

It is also noticeable from the content that the training programme does not cover the rights and obligations of the ward councillors, ward committees and other people in the wards. According to Cook’s argument as cited by Midgely et al (2005) educating community leaders about their constitutional rights is a critical part of the training programme for community leaders in enhancing their effective participation in local governance. Therefore, the omission of rights and obligations in the content of a training programme for ward committees will affect the effective participation of the ward committees in the IDP process. It will be important for ward committees to know their powers and rights in the IDP process for effective participation. They must know that they can challenge the Municipality if their views and that of the people are not taken into consideration and they should know the procedures they can follow in doing that.

Although the content of the training programme for ward committees does not include rights, and intensive training on technical aspects of the IDP it is noticeable that most of the aspects of the content match international good practices. The content covers a range of topics that if combined with technical aspects and attitude related aspects can enhance the effectiveness of ward councillors’ and ward committees’ participation in the IDP process. This argument is based on the literature reviewed on capacitating local community representatives in India, Scotland, Uganda and Kenya. However, despite the best training content, some of the ward committees do not have thorough knowledge and understanding of some issues. For instance, about 70% of the ward committee members including one ward councillor who participated in the study were not well conversant with the powers of the ward committee, their rights as well as local government legislation relating to IDPs. Therefore the methodology used for conveying this information poses a challenge to the municipality to ensure that the information disseminated through workshops and training translate into knowledge and wisdom beneficial to both the people staying in the rural areas and the municipality.
It is evident from the findings that ward councillors are informed of the IDP issues during meetings and workshops. The two ward councillors involved in the study supported this view. The question is can they participate effectively in these meetings and how do these meetings and workshops capacitate them to give meaningful input to IDP discussions during meetings if they do not understand their rights and powers in the process?

According to Hemmati and Whitfield (2004) capacity building includes promoting exchange of information and knowledge among the people. The municipality is doing this in the case of ward committee members through portfolio committees and therefore to a minimal extent this is done. Extending this to the various categories of people in the study, like youth, women groups, subsistence farmers, SMMEs, can assist the people to have a broader and in-depth view of IDP related issues and how they can participate effectively in the process as a collective. It can be acknowledged that it will not be easy for the municipality to reach all the people, but through using already existing structures, like soccer clubs, school parents meetings within the ward, as done in the one ward in the study it can reach many people in the ward. This again calls for provision of adequate resources by the municipality for formation of such structures. Through the Portfolio Committee, meetings of ward committees it emerged that these structures assist ward committee members not only to understand their roles but also to share common frustrations and problems and together formulate solutions. The municipality can be commended on the establishment of Portfolio Committees for ward committees. Hence, such forum should be expanded to other categories of people in the study.

According to Martlew (1988), the above method of information sharing that includes peer groups being organised to share matters of same concern can also be extended to ward councillors. Although the findings indicate that they meet in the Council meetings of the municipality they also need to meet as peers without local authorities involved where they will share common problems and how to best perform their duties by learning from others and together resolve the issues. This might also assist in terms of service delivery problems, which are forever a big challenge for ward councillors.
It emerged from the findings that the majority of people in ward 16 although to a minimal extend at least have the knowledge of IDP related issues and why they should participate in the IDP process although not to satisfactory levels as compared to those in ward 19 who at all do not have the knowledge. Even from the attendance registers it emerged that ward 16 has higher participation levels compared to ward 19. This can be attributed to the strategies used by the ward councillor to reach as many people within the ward as possible through using clans meetings in the ward. This finding indicates the role which social capital can play in capacitating the people for effective participation in IDP processes and how to use already existing social structures to achieve meaningful people’s participation in the IDP process.

Like in the case of the other model of establishing ward committees (SALGA, 2006) which Lepelle-Nkumpi did not adopt, the people can be organised using the model of ward committees but use different interest groups within the ward like Women, Youth, Businesses, sports and aspirant businesses, subsistence farmers etc. Representatives of these groups should then be capacitated fully and should then capacitate their own constituencies. It should not only be through ward committee meetings that people are given information. Each interest group can have its own contributions and be capacitated through its own constituency meetings, like soccer club meetings. Sustainable capacity building for rural communities requires the Municipality to invest significant resources in developing social capital necessary to maintain community participation in the IDP in the long run (Pretty, 2002). The implication of this is that the municipality should embrace the responsibility of developing capacity to identify and build appropriate leadership at village level (Fudge, 1983).

Critical to the process of capacity building is the dissemination of information relevant and appropriate to the participative process in a manner that is appropriate and understandable to the communities involved (DPLG, 2006). According to the Municipal Systems Act (Act 32 of 2000), special needs of community members such as illiteracy should be considered in enhancing people’s participation in the IDP process. In contrast, the issue of language in training and information sharing emerged as a major factor
resulting in the capacity building programmes being ineffective in improving the people’s participation in the IDP. According to Brynard (1996), the language issue makes it difficult for local communities to conceptualise local government issues. The use of the local language becomes important in information sharing. Information dissemination can be done through pamphlets written in the local language to realize effective citizen participation. As it emerged from the findings, all categories of the people agreed that English is the dominant language used in meetings, workshops and training programmes, and this stifles the people’s participation in the IDP process.

The other factor that was evident from the findings is that there are no strategies to empower the people to organise themselves into interest groups or to identify and develop leaders within the community. A number of observers (see, for instance, Lombard (1991); Midgley et al (2005); Fudge (1983); Martlew (1988)), argue for capacity-building initiatives for rural communities to consider identifying and building leaders of groups and role models within the community. The involvement of rural communities in municipalities will encourage the involvement and participation of people and help them to develop other people and encourage more people to participate in local government activities. They argue that developing community leadership and human potential, as well as investing resources to assisting communities to organise themselves into civil organisations is an effective strategy for empowering other members of the community. Since rural communities feel powerless by organising themselves and being capacitated as groups will give them more power to influence IDP decisions and this will also build their confidence to want to participate in decisions that affect their lives. From the findings, the Municipality does not explore this aspect fully.

The above argument is in line with the Freirian paradigm (as supported by the ANC (1994); Stoker et al (1994); Coetzee and Graaf (1996)) that through collective action the people become more united and more confident about solving their problems. Concern (2001) asserts that one way of doing this is to raise awareness of power relations and mobilise the poor to work on issues of common interest. This is one aspect that Lepelle-Nkumpi municipality is lacking in capacitating people staying in the rural areas to
participate effectively in the IDP. This view has also been proven to be effective from the findings because it emerged that ward 19 where people are organised into clans and there is a stronger social capital had better levels of people’s participation in the IDP than ward 16.

It is evident from the findings that the concept of “train the trainer” in the training of ward councillors and ward committees is not included. Although ward committees members said that one of their functions is to educate communities about IDP related issues, and this is also confirmed by the Municipal Systems Act (Act No. 32 of 2000). Using the Indian capacity building model for Panchayati Raj institutions, where the training programme for elected representatives and identified community leaders and train Master trainers who then train five resource persons per Panchayati was effective in improving the people’s participation within the Panchayati Raj institutions (Narwani, 2002). The municipality can also use this model of training Master Trainers on IDP related issues and who can be identified leaders or representatives of interest groups who will then train other people.

Training strategies for rural development should incorporate training on functional, intentional, ideological, organisational, specialist and personal training for elected representatives and councillors and newly elected and returning councillors should go through an induction and introductory seminar (Midgley et al, 2005). From the findings in the study, there is comprehensive induction training for all ward committees and ward councillors. It also emerged from the findings that the training of ward councillors and ward committee members incorporate training on functional, organisational, intentional, personal and ideological issues. Ideological training, which incorporates issues related to party policies and their relationship to local issues and development, should be provided by political parties or through specific organisations organised by the Municipality (Midgley, 2005). The training programme provided by SALGA for ward committees and ward councillors do not incorporate the ideological and specialist aspects. The specialist aspects, which according to Midgley (2005) provides in depth knowledge and expertise in development issues and services are very crucial to build the confidence in the ward.
committees and councillors and for meaningful participation in the IDP. The IDP is about development and its main purpose is to fast-track development of communities, therefore without in-depth knowledge of development issues, the people, particularly ward committees and ward councillors, as representatives of the people can never make meaningful input in the IDP process or participate effectively in the decision-making regarding IDP related issues. The specialist aspects combined with ideological aspects, in addition to other aspects covered by SALGA in the training of ward committees and ward councillors can make a major contribution to effective participation of all the people in the IDP process.

Ward councillors and ward committees should be able to mobilise resources for development in their wards, particularly because the budget from the municipality cannot always be adequate to meet some of the developmental needs of the wards. According to Stoker et al (1994) resource mobilisation, which entails mobilizing support networks and other resources is very critical as part of the training programme for ward councillors and ward committees. The training programme for ward councillors and ward committees does not include this critical component. This will result in the ward committees depending on the municipality alone for resources and not being creative to mobilise their own resources for development.

From the literature, research based interventions have shown to make a major contribution to capacity building of rural areas, particularly if the research outputs are shared with the people and communicated to them in appropriate ways. Almost all the people in the two wards in the study practice subsistence farming and have a piece of land for farming and some have livestock. Making this information available to them as it was done in the Phillipines (Mog, 2004) can capacitate the people to participate effectively during IDP implementation. For instance, transmitting research outputs on Land care, medicinal plants and veterinary aspects can assist them to play a major role in their own development. To a certain extent, it emerged from the findings that the Limpopo Department of Agriculture is capacitating the communities on these aspects
during IDP implementation, for example, through the “Dipudi\textsuperscript{11} project”, Land-Care project where the people are taught how to protect the soil from soil erosion and Marula projects. Such programmes emanating from research outputs can be extended to other sectors and the Municipality can be commended on such efforts since they enhance effective participation of the people during IDP implementation.

In general Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality does not have specific capacity building programmes for small businesses and other people in the two wards in the study, the focus of capacity building is on ward committees, ward councillors, project steering committee members and to a minimal extent traditional leaders. The findings show that capacity-building programmes for small businesses are not effective and not all the small business owners who participated in the study knew of the availability of the programmes and organisations providing services for small businesses. It can be argued that capacitating local SMMEs that are not registered can contribute more to sustainable development in rural wards. The findings depict that SMMEs in the two wards in the study did not have knowledge of IDP issues, their rights and responsibilities in the IDP process. Thring (2000) emphasizes the benefit and importance of harnessing local capacity and resources for sustainable local development SMMEs in rural areas have a greater potential to lift socio economic conditions in rural areas. If Lepelle-Nkumpi District municipality does not effectively capacitate them to participate effectively in the IDP process, it will fail to harness this important local capacity and resource for sustainable local development.

According to Sewell and Coppock (1997), there are appropriate capacity building programmes for different categories of people and some strategies can achieve more than one objective and some strategies can be inappropriate for some of the people in the context of specific models of public participation. The municipality should consider creative ways of capacititating other people, which can be done through developing community leadership of different interest groups within the wards as mentioned earlier.

\textsuperscript{11} Dipudi is a Sepedi name for goats.
and through distribution of pamphlets to households and using community radios and resource centres to reach all categories of the people.

5.2 POPULAR UNDERSTANDING OF PARTICIPATION

There is general agreement among all categories of the people who participated in the study that they fully understand and know structures they can use to participate effectively in the IDP process. In line with this view, the municipality has clear channels of communication with the people guided by the Municipal Systems Act (Act 32 of 2000). The large majority of the people involved in the study confirmed the efficacy of the programmes in making them know structures they can use to participate in the IDP process. This is in line with the views of Sewell and Coppock (1997) that the efficacy of a capacity building programme for enhancing the people’s participation is measured by among other things the people’s knowledge of the structures they can use to participate and when the channels of communication are well known to the people.

Therefore, to a greater extent capacity building strategies by Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality are effective in making the people across all categories to have in depth knowledge of the structures they can use to participate effectively in the IDP process. However, what remains the challenge for Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality is how to build on this knowledge of structures for participation as stipulated by the Municipal Systems Act and provide the people with appropriate and adequate technical information, and empower them fully for their meaningful participation as noted by Brynard (1996) otherwise the system and structures would only exist in principle.

It is also evident from the knowledge of the ward councillors that they will not confidently answer some of the questions raised by the people on service delivery, due to lack of expertise and knowledge. This is the general problem of ward councillors across the country; hence, there are protests by many communities like the case of Merafong, Khutsong etc. This is also exacerbated by lack of awareness of obligations by the people.
since the people do not know that they can raise concerns with the Mayor or even the Minister if they feel their ward councillors are not doing what they are supposed to do.

The municipality can be commended on the establishment of cluster portfolio committees. This kind of a forum is an effective capacity building initiative for information sharing, to assist ward committee members to understand their roles and to share good practices with their fellow colleagues sharing the same portfolio. It is also evident that it is effective since all the ward committee members were very clear about their roles and responsibilities in the IDP process.

The Municipality can also be commended on the effectiveness of the programmes in making ward councillors and ward committees to clearly know their roles and responsibilities in the various stages of the IDP process. All the ward councillors and the ward committee members could clearly articulate their roles and responsibilities in the IDP process. The capacity building programmes have therefore played a key role in helping these categories of people in the two wards to understand their role and responsibilities. It can however be argued that knowledge only without effective application to solve one’s problems is useless knowledge. Since it emerged that, the majority (92%) of the ward councillors and ward committee members in the study were not confident that they could give meaningful input to the IDP process; the knowledge of the structures for participation is not useful to the people. The Municipality should ensure that the people utilize this knowledge to input meaningfully to the IDP process.

The shortcoming of the programmes is that other categories of people in the two wards are not capacitated fully to understand their role in the IDP process. Equally important the other categories of people should know their role, how they can participate meaningfully in the process. For instance; traditional leaders as influential people in the rural communities, assisting ward committees and ward councillors, can contribute immensely to the IDP process and if effectively capacitated they can capacitate other people on IDP related issues and influence others to participate. As advocated by Hemmati and Whitfield (2004) interventions aimed at enhancing the people’s
participation in local governance should empower all categories of the people to know and fulfil their role in their own development. This is a matter of consideration by Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality in their capacity building interventions.

It is crucial that the people know the benefits they will get out of participating in the IDP process and why it is important that they participate. This can be achieved through broadening their awareness of factors that have impact in their situation (Concern, 2001). The people need to know that through participation in local government they will influence local authorities to address their needs and not what the local authorities assume are their needs and that their participation will lead to sustainable societal development (Baum, 2002). For Baum (2002), if the people are made aware that through participation in local development planning they are more likely to develop relationships with local government authorities and that local government authorities are more likely to design and deliver services that meet their needs. This requires that local government authorities be also capacitated to deliver on the services required by communities and to build trusting relationships with the communities. Without capacitating the authorities on these aspects, it may be difficult for communities to see benefits of their participation, particularly if the local authorities do not take into consideration communities’ views and just consult with communities for the sake of consultation or as a token. Service delivery in itself builds trust between the municipality and the people and service delivery requires that the officials have skills and can deliver on their mandate; hence capacity within local authorities can make a major contribution to effective the people’s participation in the IDP process.

It emerged from ward councillors that although the people participate and indicate their needs at ward level, the municipality prioritises for the ward but does not involve the people during this prioritization process because of limited budget. This indicates they do not come back to the wards to indicate that some of the things that the community identified in the ward IDP through ward committee meetings cannot be delivered in a particular financial year, indicate reasons, and give the wards an opportunity to re-prioritise their needs. This in itself kills the trust the people have in the local authorities
and results into them not participating in the IDP process, which dis-empowers them as a community. Capacitating people staying in the rural areas on the benefits of their participation in the IDP process should therefore be visible from the municipal officials’ way of conducting their business. Through effective implementation of “Batho Pele” principles, trust can be built among the various stakeholders of the Municipality and the people can see the benefits of their participation in the IDP process.

The capacity building programmes are ineffective in terms of educating people staying in the rural areas about their rights in the IDP process. According to Martlew (1988, 131) “the more thorough the knowledge the elected representatives have, the more democratic the decision making is.” From the findings, it is not convincing that the ward committee members and the ward councillors are more knowledgeable about legislation and their powers and rights in the IDP process, and this may compromise democratic principles in the decision-making during the IDP processes. The fact that all the people involved in the study, including ward councillors and ward committees, could not articulate what their rights in the IDP process are indicates that they cannot exercise these rights which might also affect their effective and meaningful participation in the process:

[T]he people should know that they have the right to participate in decisions that affect their lives, to access the resources and information that could empower them as well as the right to exercise their power in such a way that they are able to exercise these rights if they are violated (ANC, 1994).

In support of these sentiments, it can be argued that equally important as educating the people about their responsibilities in the IDP process, capacity building programmes for enhancing rural communities’ participation in the IDP must also put emphasis on educating various categories of people in the study about their rights and powers in the IDP process.

Information dissemination forms an integral part of capacity building initiatives for people staying in the rural areas. Various information sharing sources like committee

---

12 Batho Pele is a government programme to improve delivery in the public service and requires that eight service delivery principles be implemented by all public servants, namely, courtesy, access, service standards, consultation, value for money, redress, openness and transparency, information (DPSA, 1997).
discussions, committee reports, informal discussions with officials, press cuttings, research notes and sharing research outputs with the people, local party meetings, conferences, seminars, newspapers, pamphlets, media and journal publications can be powerful sources of information for the people to know and understand issues on IDPs, their rights and powers, roles and responsibilities in the process (Midgley et al, 2005). From this list of information dissemination sources, Lepelle-Nkumpi municipality uses ward committee meetings, conferences and seminars for ward councillors and ward committees, and the media (radio and newspapers). This is understandable because of high illiteracy levels in the two wards and it might be that the people cannot be able to read research notes, journal publications and pamphlets. However, there are certain categories of the people who will be able to read in their mother tongue and in English. For these two categories of the people, user-friendly pamphlets and research notes in Sepedi and English are critical and can be placed in schools, clinics and public places to make information accessible to the people who will then share the information by word of mouth with other people who cannot read.

According to the Municipal Systems Act (Act 32 of 2000), the people should be notified timeously of the meetings and workshops. However from the findings, the majority of the ward committee members in the study said that they do not attend meetings because they are notified late about the meetings and workshops. This issue should be considered because ward committee members are not paid for their work, and in rural areas, most of them are unemployed.

5.3 RESOURCE LIMITATIONS

According to Sewell and Coppock (1997), provision of human resources by local authorities is vital to build capacity for participation at community level, and they suggest employing CDWs and using existing political structures and political parties. The allocation of Community Development Workers per ward by the municipality is therefore a step in the right direction towards capacitating people staying in the rural areas to participate effectively in the IDP process. According to DPLG (2004), CDWs are
conduits of information and empowering facilitators for communities. For CDWs to perform their role effectively they will need appropriate skills development programmes aimed specifically at ensuring that the CDWs can capacitate rural communities to participate meaningfully in the IDP process. Although ward committee meetings and the media are appropriate for dispersing information to rural wards the appointment of competent CDWs attached to the wards will effectively educate communities about IDP related issues and facilitate interaction between the people and local authorities.

According to Concern (2001) provision of resources, for example, provision of technical and human resources by local government plays a crucial role in capacity building initiatives. The effectiveness of the capacity building initiatives in Lepelle-Nkumpi municipality is among other things negatively affected by lack of human and financial resources. It emerged from the findings that financial resources allocated by the Municipality to capacitating the people are limited to training, workshops and meetings of ward committees and ward councillors only and not to other categories of the people. Although there is one community development worker for each ward, they are not adequate to educate the communities and empower them about IDP related issues.

From the findings lack of competent and sufficient staff to develop capacity within the wards, lack of in depth knowledge and understanding by ward committees, and ward councillors regarding their rights, procedures as well as technical expertise from the Community Development Workers negatively affect the success of capacity building programmes in the two wards. All of these, as shown by literature reviewed for this study results in the people, including ward councillors and ward committee members in rural wards, not effectively participating in the decision making of the IDP processes and just endorsing what the municipality has decided.

In addition to CDWs it emerged from the findings that there are various role players in capacitating the people on IDP related issues. Some government departments and organisations are involved in capacitating the people on various issues related to the IDP. However, most of these organisations and departments only capacitate the people during
IDP implementation and not during the planning, analysis, and strategies phases of the IDP. The real decision-making process that will have an impact on the lives of the people takes place during planning, analysis and strategies. It will therefore be important that these organisations and departments have a way of participating in educating the people to participate effectively during all the phases of the IDP and not only during implementation of the IDP projects.

As recommended by Midgley et al (2005) Community leaders, Community Forum members, ward committee members, traditional leaders, representatives of the marginalized groups and ward councillors can also provide an important resource for informing, training, and educating their communities about IDP related issues, how they can participate effectively in the process. From the study, it emerged that one of the roles of ward councillors and ward committees is to educate and share information on IDP issues with the community. This role can be extended to traditional leaders and representatives of different interest groups within the wards so that the information can reach the majority of the people in the wards.

Organisations like LIBSA are doing a good job in training small businesses to participate effectively during project implementation of the IDP. However, a point for consideration by Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality is to ensure that small businesses in rural areas know about these organisations and the kind of services they can get from these organisations and be provided with resources to access these organisations, which is currently lacking. These organisations should also market their services not only to township people but also to people staying in the rural areas. Like in the case of Cameroon, in addition to local authorities, financial institutions and big businesses can play a major role in training small businesses on how they can participate effectively in the entire IDP process (Living Land, SABC Programme, 2007) and not only during project implementation. Non-Governmental organisations and community development organisations can also be mobilised and supported by the municipality to empower the people and small businesses with information on how they can influence policy decisions that will affect their lives in local government.
In line with the recommendation of Living Land, SABC (2007) during project implementation phase, among other role players implementing agencies also play a greater role in training the people in the two rural wards in the study to participate in project implementation. This was quite evident from project steering committee members, ward councillors, ward committee members and officials as they all agreed that the service providers train them to monitor the projects, for instance in the building of RDP houses and toilets.

Lack of resource centres and rural development centres in the two wards contributes to the people not being knowledgeable about IDP issues. Resource centres and rural development centres as used in India and which serve as information centres in each block (Narwani, 2002) are also relevant in the case of the two wards in the study, and will add value to the people’s knowledge of local government issues because the information will be easily accessible through these centres in their own localities. This calls for provision of financial resources to set up these centres and to provide the necessary human resources to run the centres.

In the two wards, there are Adult Basic Education and Training (ABET) Centres, primary and high schools. These centres can be utilized fully by the Municipality to share information with the people attending these programmes. The educators in these centres can provide valuable resources. The ABET centres can provide a good platform to educating the people about development issues, their rights and powers in the IDP process, their role and responsibilities in the process, local government legislation, structures for participation and how they can participate effectively in the IDP process and other issues of IDP. The fact that the curriculum in South Africa is Outcomes-Based allows the ABET educators to use issues like IDP that confronts the people in lesson design for some learning areas. This can be done by working closely with the Municipality and inviting municipality officials to the centres to talk about these issues. Since it is a legislative requirements for the Municipality to capacitate the people for
effective participation in the IDP process the municipality should initiate this process with ABET centres. In the same breadth, the municipality can do the same in schools.

5.4 CONCLUSION

The municipality is faced with many challenges regarding capacitating and empowering people socially and economically. High illiteracy can make it difficult for the municipality to inform those using print media or in written form. The high unemployment rates also poses a challenge for the municipality because training programmes for ward committee members, who are not paid for their work, should either be conducted in the wards because they do not have money for transport. As said by some of the ward committee members, they missed some training programmes because they do not have money for transport. Although the municipality repays them for transport costs, they only get refunds after and it does not help if they cannot have the transport fares prior to the workshop.

Greater consideration should be given to the language used in print materials and in meetings with all the categories of the people given the high illiteracy rates in rural wards of Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality. From the findings in all the wards and in all categories of the people the issue of language was a major challenge. English appeared to be the dominant language in meetings and training programmes and workshops organised by the municipality. The explanation given by the Municipality for this state of affairs is that meetings are held with various ethnic groups who speak different languages. It is of no use holding discussions with ward councillors and ward committees, traditional leaders and other the people if the majority of them do not follow the discussions because of the language used.

It is also fruitless to train ward councillors and ward committees using a foreign language they do not understand and to give them all the training materials written in a foreign language. The municipality should consider dividing ward councillors, ward committee members and other categories of the people according to ethnic groups and train them separately and meetings can be held separately by categorising the people according to
language groups. Materials should also be translated into the languages the people will understand so that they can keep on referring to the materials even after the training. In this way it will not be training for the sake of training and meetings will not be conducted as a token but will capacitate the people fully to participate effectively in the IDP process and will also motivate people to participate.

The training approach for most of the various people in the study, like Ward councillors, ward committees, traditional leaders and project steering committees is formal training. This is also evident from a study conducted by DPLG (2004) on the training of ward committees. This study observed that little capacitating happens through informal means like briefings and in service training. “Training strategies have been conventional and the main strategy has been event-centred initiatives with little recognition of the unique nature of ward committees as fragile voluntary bodies who are still in the process of exploring and building upon this new and uniquely structured model of participatory democracy” (DPLG, 2004: 68).

According to DPLG (2005) training of rural communities on IDP-related issues should be very interactive and participatory. This will only be realized if the participants understand the language used for facilitation and for materials, and can use the language they are competent in during the training programme.

It emerged from the findings that even ward councillors, ward committee members lack skills, and do not have adequate exposure and knowledge of development issues. This poses a challenge resulting in the dominance of public bureaucracy in project selection and execution as well as low levels of the people’s participation at ward level since the elected representative cannot influence the decision making nor empower their own wards to participate effectively in the IDP process (Narwani, 2002).

Peer-to-peer mentoring for ward councillors and ward committee members can play a major role in orientating new ward councillors and ward committee members to their new functions. Since from the findings it was clear that the ward councillor who has been a
councillor for two terms is more knowledgeable and empowered with regard to performing his functions and making people in his ward to participate better as compared to the new ward councillor, such a mentoring model can be very beneficial.

It is crucial that the experience of longer serving ward committee members is carried over into capacity building strategy for new ward committees. This was also evident from the semi-illiterate ward councillor who said that if it was not for the other ward councillor who is serving the second term as a ward councillor and who is always willing to assist and mentor her, she would not have coped in doing her duties.

It should be considered that because most people staying in the rural areas do not have knowledge of development issues a once off training and ward committee meetings alone are not going to capacitate them fully to participate effectively in the IDP process. Training should be continuous and should be focused on making them participate effectively in decision-making not only during implementation. Awareness campaigns should be organised by the Municipality to make people aware of the IDP and related activities and to encourage them to participate by giving them information.

A major concern from different categories of the people within the two wards was that youth do not attend ward committee meetings and do not participate in the IDP process. Specially designed programmes for improving youth participation in the IDP are crucial. Youth clubs, sports clubs can be used for sharing information with the youth and it should be interesting for the youth and should indicate the benefit for youth if they participate in the IDP process. Youth in schools can be educated about IDP related issues through the curriculum.

The capacity building programmes by Lepelle-Nkumpi municipality should therefore consider these challenges when designing capacity building programmes and address them so that the people are well capacitated to influence decision making processes of the IDP as required by legislation on local governance. Without adequate knowledge of local governance, the IDP and development issues the people’s participation will never be
meaningful and will not influence policy decisions and municipality officials will continue making decisions for the people.
CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter concludes the study by looking at the purpose and objectives of the study in relation to the research findings. It makes recommendations for improving the effectiveness of the capacity building programmes. Finally, the chapter makes suggestions for future research.

6.1 CONCLUSION

The study investigated capacity-building programmes used by Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality to enhance effective participation of the people in the two rural wards in the IDP process. It also investigated the availability of resources to capacitate people to participate meaningfully in the IDP process. Through interviews with various participants, it was able to establish if there is a capacity building policy and or strategy for enhancing rural the people’s participation in the IDP. The study was able to establish the people’s knowledge and understanding of the IDP, their rights and responsibilities in the IDP process and the structures they can use for participation; and how they can participate meaningfully in the IDP process. It further established people’s knowledge and understanding of the benefits of their participation in the process. Finally, the study investigated the factors considered and challenges in capacitating people staying in the rural areas in the two wards.

The Municipality neither has a capacity building strategy nor policy aimed at enhancing rural people’s participation in the IDP process other than the existing legislative framework on public participation, for example, Municipal Systems Act, Municipal Structures Act etc. Therefore capacity building efforts for enhancing rural the people’s participation in the IDP process are not guided by policy objectives. It also shows that
there are no mechanisms in place to monitor and evaluate citizen’s participation in the IDP process.

Although the legislative framework provides a broader policy framework for all the municipalities to capacitate their local communities to enable them to participate effectively in the IDP process, the municipality should still have its own policy on capacitating the people for effective participation. The municipality should develop a capacity building policy, which combines a skills development strategy, a strategy to ensure provision of easy access to information and resources, and monitoring and evaluation framework of the capacity building interventions (Concern, 2001). The focus of the policy should be on capacitating the people and should have a chapter on capacitating people staying in the rural areas to participate effectively in the IDP process. The policy should be adapted to suit capacity building needs of the people in Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality, for instance, high illiteracy, unemployment and other challenges of the people staying in the rural areas. The policy should include a monitoring and evaluation framework for improving the people’s participation in the IDP process. Since there are different categories of people in the two rural wards in the study the policy should recognize that and indicate how the different categories of the people in the study will be capacitated.

There are different capacity building programmes for different categories of the people in the study. The research results indicate that programmes used by Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality to capacitate people staying in the rural areas in the two wards in the study to participate effectively in the IDP process are workshops, training programmes, and council and ward committee meetings, as well as agricultural research based interventions. Ward councillors and ward committee members are capacitated through training, workshops, and meetings. There is a compulsory comprehensive induction-training programme for all new and returning ward councillors at the beginning of their term of office. Most of the information for ward councillors is received through council meetings.
Ward committee members are not capacitated as much as ward councillors are. Information sharing activities for ward committee members are ward committee meetings and portfolio meetings. Induction training workshop for ward committee members is not compulsory like the one for ward councillors and as a result, some of the ward committee members in the study never attended any induction training. Some of the ward committee members who are selected to monitor some projects as members of the project steering committee also receive training related to the specific project they are monitoring.

Training content for both ward committee members and ward councillors, covers a wide range of issues such as their roles, responsibilities, structures for participation, legislation governing IDPs. It does not cover attitude related issues, their rights in the IDP process, capacitating other people in their wards (train the trainer) and technical aspects of the IDP. Traditional leaders are only capacitated through information sharing activities, which are limited to attending ward committee meetings as ex-officio members as well as attending council meetings. There are no training programmes for traditional leaders. They therefore receive IDP related information from ward committee and council meetings.

Small businesses and other people in the two wards are only capacitated through information dissemination through their attendance of ward committee meetings. They only receive training if they are members of the project steering committee to enable them to monitor the projects. Other capacity building programmes for people and small businesses in the two rural wards are agricultural research-based interventions for those who practice subsistence farming, namely; Medicinal Plants, Dipudi, Building earth-dams (How to prevent soil erosion) and Land Care Projects.

It was evident that not all these categories of the people are capacitated for decision-making in the IDP process (analysis, strategies and approval phases) but rather for their involvement during implementation of IDP projects. The people in the two wards are not involved during analysis, strategies and approval phases but are only involved through
monitoring implementation of IDP project and as labourers during projects implementation.

Thus, only ward councillors and ward committee members in the two rural wards in the study are the most capacitated categories on IDP related issues as compared to other categories of people in the two rural wards. However they are also still lacking in terms of critical issues in the IDP that will assist them as representatives of the people in the two wards to participate effectively at the highest levels of decision-making in the IDP and are not confident enough to participate effectively in the IDP.

The programmes are ineffective in educating the people in the study about the IDP, its processes and legislation informing integrated development planning. For instance, while ward councillors, ward committee members and traditional leaders clearly understand what the IDP is, only ward councillors know what the IDP process entails. It was evident from research results that traditional leaders and ward committee members do not have in-depth understanding and knowledge of the IDP process except that they should be involved in monitoring IDP projects. It was also evident that very few people and small businesses know and understand what an IDP is and what its processes entail. Those who know are mostly the highly literate who have read about it in the newspapers.

The people in the study, including ward committee members and ward councillors, are not knowledgeable about IDP related legislation like the Municipal Structures Act, Municipal Systems Act and other local government legislation informing the IDP process. This is true in relation to the rights of the people to participate effectively in the process and that the Municipality should empower the people to enable them to exercise this right.

Although to a minimum extent, the programmes enhance ward councillors knowledge of the IDP process they are also like other categories of people not fully capacitated to participate effectively during analysis, strategies and approval phases because it emerged that they are controlled by what the municipality decides on during these phases. They
are capacitated adequately to participate effectively during implementation of IDP projects through monitoring. This situation is also the same with other categories of the people. It emerged from the findings that the people are well capacitated to monitor IDP projects implementation and as labourers during implementation.

The municipality can be commended on the effectiveness of the programmes in improving the people’s knowledge of structures they can use for participation in the IDP process. All the people in the two rural wards who participated in the study were very clear and aware about the structures they can use to participate in the IDP process. It can therefore be concluded that the Municipality’s capacity building programmes for the two rural wards in the study are effectively in communicating with and sensitizing the people in the two wards on the issue.

What the programmes are not able to achieve is educating people in the two rural wards in the study on how they can participate effectively in the IDP process and how they can empower themselves as the people and organize themselves to be powerful and influence the decision making that affect their lives. This was evident from all the categories of people in the study.

The capacity building programmes used by the municipality are effective in educating ward councillors, ward committee members about their roles in the community and in the IDP process. However, they do not know their rights in the IDP process. The other categories of people in the two wards in the study do not know their role, rights and obligations as the people in the IDP process. The programmes are not effective on sensitizing the people about rights of different role players in the IDP process and indicating that they are an important role player in the process, and the role they can play in the process and how to play their role effectively.

Capacitating rural communities to participate effectively during implementation stage of the IDP in their own wards should not be ignored in order to attain sustainable rural development. Implementing agencies can play a greater role in capacitating communities
to participate effectively during the implementation phase through skills transfer. The communities can also be empowered on how to manage, implement and monitor the projects. The notion of capacitating and involving people staying in the rural areas and working in partnership with them in the IDP process has implications on how the IDP in South Africa will be implemented and its effectiveness in addressing socio-economic problems in the country.

The Findings depict that the capacity building programmes used by Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality in the two rural wards in the study do not enable the people to understand the benefits and importance of their participation in the IDP process and do not change the people’s attitude towards participation in the IDP process. The people are of the view that participating in the IDP processes benefits the municipality and are not aware that it contributes towards their own development; what they can get out of their participation.

In capacitating rural the people to participate effectively in the integrated development planning in the two wards, the municipality involves various role players. The role players in capacitating people staying in the rural areas are provincial departments, the municipality, community development workers, Limpopo Development Cooperation (LIMDEV) and LIBSA for small businesses, SALGA. However, these role players only capacitate the people to participate effectively during the IDP implementation phase and not on the other phases of the IDP.

There is a lack of competent officials to share adequate and appropriate information with the people in the two wards. The only officials appointed by the municipality for capacitating people staying in the rural areas on the IDP and its related activities are community development workers who at the time of the research were new and not yet trained to perform their mandate with excellence.

Apart from the fact that ward councillors are remunerated and there is a budget for induction training of ward councillors and ward committees as well as council meetings
there are no other financial resources specifically for capacitating people staying in the rural areas on IDP related issues.

6.2. RECOMMENDATIONS

The main challenge in capacitating ward committee members and ward councillors is the language used in meetings and for training. Analysis of the findings yields that the use of English language during meetings poses a problem for the people. It emerged that ward committee members struggle with English as a language during meetings. The municipality has different ethnic groups; there is no common language for all of them, except for English. This issue among other things contribute to the ineffectiveness of the capacity programmes in reaching most of the people because many people cannot communicate in English because of high illiteracy rates in the two wards in the study.

In accordance with the Municipal Systems Act (Act 32 of 2000) information on IDP and IDP related issues should be conveyed to the people in the language they understand to allow them to participate effectively in the IDP process. It is therefore recommended that meetings should be conducted in the language they can communicate. In Lepelle-Nkumpi municipality these events should be held closer to the communities, that is, in the wards because it appeared that all the people in the two wards are Sepedi speakers. This will solve the language problem if the municipality will go to the people and not the people going to the municipality.

The legislation, for example, Municipal Structures Act (Act No. 117 of 1998), Constitution and Constitutional rights and other legislation pertaining to public participation and IDP issues should be simplified to ward committee members and ward councillors during the training. Pamphlets should be written in mother tongue and should be distributed in simplified form to all the people. These pamphlets should be in a simplified form summarising the people’s powers, rights, obligations, benefits of the people’s participation, how they can participate, structures for participation and other
methods they can use to participate in the IDP processes other than ward committees or council meetings.

Training should be conducted in the language of the people. Community development workers should play a major role during training of ward committees since they know the language of the people in the wards and they can be used as interpreters during training and meetings. Training materials, the IDP document and pamphlets should be written in all the official languages to be accessible to all the people and so that the ward committees and community leaders can constantly refer and read at their own time. This will also assist them to educate and train their constituencies easily about local government issues. Since some of the ordinary people cannot read or write even in their mother tongue, verbal discussions in meetings will assist them to understand issues while their family members can read the written material to them after meetings.

This requires that funds should be made available for translating materials into all the official languages spoken in Limpopo and to employ trainers and officials who can speak the languages of the wards or have interpreters. For training, community-development-workers can be utilized since they know and speak the languages of the people in the wards. During council meetings, there will be a need for interpreters, which also requires funds.

Analysis of the findings indicated that invitations to meetings and workshops reach ward committee members late, which is an administrative problem. To capacitate ward committees effectively the municipality should address this issue and ensure that the people are notified of meetings and workshops on time. It is also crucial that the municipality ensure that venues for meetings and workshops are easily accessible by ward committees, and it should provide transport.

It emerged from the findings that traditional leaders are not well capacitated to participate effectively in the IDP process and as a result there is little buy-in from traditional leadership. Since traditional leaders are well respected in rural areas, it is crucial that they
are well informed and more involved in the process. Effective capacity building for traditional leadership in rural areas can have far reaching benefits for people participation in the IDP process since they are well respected and regarded as centres of authority in rural areas. It is therefore recommended that the municipality should strengthen the relationship between traditional leaders and ward committees through effective information sharing initiatives in order to achieve required participation of people in rural areas.

The findings indicate that there is poor training for ward committees and councillors. Analysis of the research findings yields that the training processes of ward councillors and ward committees members are misaligned with the National Qualifications Framework and they get mere certificates of attendance and not competency based certificates. It is recommended that the training should be NQF aligned and should include theory and a practical component on the field. The practical part can also be assessed using portfolio of evidence on the job. Based on the lessons learnt from this study it is also recommended that in addition to the training programmes and workshops, mentoring and coaching programmes should form part of capacity building programmes for newly appointed ward councillors, ward committees and community leaders and leaders of different groups within the two wards.

It emerged from the findings that one of the shortcomings of the capacity building programmes for the two wards in the study is that the municipality does not have a strategy to assist communities to organize themselves into civil organizations to make it easier for them to reach out on many people. Although there is a ward committee organized according to the different portfolios in the Municipality, establishing community leadership is crucial for capacitating the wards to participate effectively in the IDP process. To build community leadership the municipality should put people in the two rural wards into social action groups that continuously liaise with their constituencies to take mandate on IDP related issues (SALGA, 2006). It is therefore recommended that ward committees and the municipality should among other things assist and encourage the people to organize themselves into interest groups, for example, youth, subsistence
farmers, women, small businesses, unemployed etc. In the same way as ward committees are capacitated through training and information sharing on IDP related issues appropriate training should be done for interest group leaders and use the leaders as resource people, but of great importance is to educate the people how they can participate effectively in decision making of all the IDP phases.

Already existing structures like the clans in ward 16, soccer clubs, stokvels and social clubs and leaders of these structures within the two wards should be strengthened. These structures should be used for information sharing on IDP related issues, educating the people about their role, obligations and rights in the IDP process and changing their attitudes towards participation in the process.

Since in all the two wards in the study there are no resource centres, it is recommended that there should be a resource centre and rural development centre in each ward where the people can easily access information on IDP related issues. The municipality should work closely with the ABET centres and the schools in the community to market the municipality, the IDP and its processes to the people in the two wards. The municipality should make arrangements with ABET centres and schools in the wards, where officials from the municipality visit these institutions to educate adults and youth in the wards about the local government, development issues, IDP and its processes, their rights, roles and obligations in the process and how they can participate in the process.

As recommended by Masango (2002) school curriculum should include public education, reforming attitudes towards public participation in policy making and publicizing local government affairs as a long-term strategy for enhancing the people’s participation in the IDP process. Furthermore schools and ABET centres should have a training programme for people staying in the rural areas, which includes workshops on the nature and functions of their local municipality, their rights and obligations in the IDP process.

Community development workers in the two wards if well trained can make a positive impact on capacitating the people in the two wards to participate effectively in the IDP.
Community development workers should work closely with the ward committees and should continuously provide the people in the two wards with information on IDP verbally through block meetings. They can also be used through the train-the-trainer methods to train ward committees since they are well known to the community, they know the language of the people and people in rural wards can associate better with them.

Since it emerged from the findings that the people are not well capacitated to participate during analysis, strategies and approval phases of the IDP, it is recommended that the Municipality should involve them fully during these phases. By involving the people during these phases on continuous basis will in itself empower them in the long run. Community development workers should have workshops with the people on the ward profile reports outlining the situation in their wards, problems in their wards and opportunities so that they can participate knowing what impacts on their lives during the analysis phase. This information will assist the people to analyse their situation and identify the real needs in their wards during the analysis phase. Without this information, it will not be possible for all the categories of the people in the two rural wards to participate during the analysis phase of the IDP.

Since the strategies phase is the phase of making choices and prioritizing based on the available resources and budget, it requires information gathered during the analysis phase. Instead of depending only on ward committee meetings to involve the people, block meetings should be used to workshop the reports emanating from the analysis phase and provide the people with adequate information on available resources, needs, and identified projects so that the people can decide on the projects they see will have the most positive impact on their lives. To make choices one needs all the information to make informed and evidence based choices.

The approval phase also needs the municipality to involve the people not just to inform them about the projects that will be included in the IDP, but also to engage them in the approval process. By involving the people, it will be empowering them, building confidence in the community, and making the communities to have confidence in the
municipality. During this phase, the draft IDP should be put in simple language and it should be given to the people to offer them an opportunity to approve the contents of the IDP and to debate its contents to enhance buy-in. Knowing the projects and the resources, they can contribute and what their role and that of the municipality will be as well as timeframes for delivery of certain services or projects, empowers the people to monitor implementation and to assess performance of their municipality. If the people can be capacitated during these phases and not only during IDP implementation, they will be confident to participate in the IDP process.

6.3 SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The research provided some insight into the effectiveness of the capacity building programmes used by Lepelle-Nkumpi Municipality to enhance participation of people staying in the rural areas in the IDP process. Future research could conduct an in depth study on the role of research-based interventions in capacitating subsistence farmers in rural areas for effective participation in the integrated development planning process.
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ANNEXURES

ANNEXURE A

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR IDP OFFICIALS OF LEPELLE-NKUMPI MUNICIPALITY
1. Does the municipality have a capacity building policy for enhancing participation of rural citizens in the IDP processes and activities? 

If yes is the policy effectively implemented and does it achieve what it intends to achieve? Kindly elaborate on how the policy is implemented.

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

2. What programmes does the Municipality have to empower the following categories of citizens to participate effectively in the IDP process (analysis, strategies, approval, IDP project implementation and monitoring phases) and activities? Elaborate on the content of the programmes for the following categories of citizens.

2.1. Ordinary Citizens

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

2.2. Traditional leaders

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

2.3. Small Business Owners

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

2.4. Ward Committee members

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

2.5. Ward Councilors

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

3. In your view are the programmes effective in enhancing the meaningfulness and effectiveness of citizens’ participation in the IDP Process? Why do you think so? How did the participation of different categories of rural citizens in the IDP process change?

4. Which information sharing activities are there to ensure that all categories of rural citizens are knowledgeable about the IDP and its processes and activities, structures they can use to participate in the IDP process and how they can participate effectively, and citizens’ roles, rights, responsibilities and obligations in the IDP process?

5. In your view do you think these activities adequately inform all rural citizens to be able to participate effectively in the IDP process? Why do you think so?

6. Which resources are there for capacitating rural citizens to participate effectively in the IDP process and how effective are these resources? Why do you think they are effective or they are not effective?
7. Which factors do you consider in designing capacity building programmes, strategies and policies for rural citizens to participate effectively in the IDP process? Why these factors

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

8. What are the challenges in capacitating rural citizens to participate effectively in the IDP processes and activities and what is the municipality doing to address these challenges?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

9. What do you suggest can be done to address these challenges?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

10. What other comments do you have on any other aspect related to capacitating all categories of rural citizens to participate effectively in the IDP process?
ANNEXURE B

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR PEOPLE IN THE TWO RURAL WARDS
1. What are the programmes/things that your Municipality is doing to empower and inform you about the IDP and its processes and activities?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

2. Are you well informed to participate effectively in the IDP process? Why do you think so?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

3. Which information do you receive from your Municipality, ward committees and ward councilor?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

4. What is an IDP and how did you get to know about it?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

5. What does the IDP process entail?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

6. Do you know how to participate in the IDP and the structures for participation?
If yes what are the structures you can use to participate in the IDP process and how can you participate?
7. What are your rights in the IDP process?

How did you get to know your rights in the IDP process?

8. What are your roles, responsibilities and obligations in the IDP process?

9. How did you get to know your roles, responsibilities and obligations in the IDP process?

How do you play your role in the IDP process?
10. Do you think you have adequate information about the IDP and its processes? Why do you think so?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

11. Where and from whom do you get the information about the IDP and its activities?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

12. Can you say your participation in the IDP process has improved because of the capacity building programmes?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

How has your participation in the IDP process improved?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

13. In your view, did the programmes change your attitude towards participation in the IDP process?
In what way did the programmes change your attitude?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

14. In your view do you think the municipality is capacitating you adequately to participate effectively in the IDP process? Why do you think so and in what way does the municipality capacitate you?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

15. What other comments do you have on any other aspect related to capacitating rural citizens to participate effectively in the IDP process?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
ANNEXURE C

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR TRADITIONAL LEADERS
1. What are the programmes/things that your Municipality is doing to empower and inform you about the IDP and its processes and activities?

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

2. Are you well informed to participate effectively as an Induna in the IDP process? Why do you think so?

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

3. Which information do you receive from your Municipality, ward committees and ward councillor to enhance your participation in the IDP processes?

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

4. What is an IDP and how did you get to know about it?

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

5. What does the IDP process entail?

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

6. Do you know how to participate in the IDP and the structures for participation? If yes what are the structures you can use to participate in the IDP process and how can you participate?
7. What are your rights in the IDP process?

How did you get to know your rights in the IDP process?

8. What are your roles, responsibilities and obligations as an Induna in the IDP process?

How did you get to know your roles, responsibilities and obligations in the IDP process?

9. How do you play your role in the IDP process?
10. Do you think you have adequate information about the IDP and its processes to participate effectively in the IDP processes? Why do you think so?

11. Where and from whom do you get the information about the IDP and its activities?

12. Can you say your participation in the IDP process has improved because of the capacity building programmes?

How has your participation in the IDP process improved?

13. In your view, did the programmes change your attitude towards participation in the IDP process?
In what way did the programmes change your attitude?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

14. In your view do you think the municipality is capacitating you adequately to participate effectively in the IDP process? Why do you think so and in what way does the municipality capacitate you?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

15. What do you think the municipality, ward councillors and ward committees should do to enhance the quality and effectiveness of your participation in the IDP activities?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

16. What other comments do you have on any other aspect related to capacitating rural citizens to participate effectively in the IDP process?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
ANNEXURE D

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR WARD COUNCILLORS
1. What are the programmes/things that your Municipality is doing to empower and inform you as a ward councillor about the IDP and its processes and activities?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

2. Do you think you are well informed to participate effectively as a ward councillor in the IDP process? Why do you think so?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

3. Which information do you receive from your Municipality to enhance your participation in the IDP processes?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

4. What is an IDP and how did you get to know about it?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

5. What does the IDP process entail?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

6. Do you know how to participate in the IDP and the structures for participation?
If yes what are the structures you can use to participate in the IDP process and how can you participate?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

7. What are your rights in the IDP process?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

How did you get to know your rights in the IDP process?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

8. What are your roles, responsibilities and obligations as a ward councillor in the IDP process?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

9. How did you get to know your roles, responsibilities and obligations in the IDP process?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
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How do you play your role in the IDP process?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

10. Do you think you have adequate information about the IDP and its processes to participate effectively in the IDP processes? Why do you think so?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

11. Where and from whom do you get the information about the IDP and its activities?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

12. Can you say your participation in the IDP process has improved because of the capacity building programmes by your municipality?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

How has your participation in the IDP process improved?
13. In your view, did the programmes change your attitude towards participation in the IDP process? 
   In what way did the programmes change your attitude?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

14. In your view do you think the municipality is capacitating you adequately to participate effectively in the IDP process? 
   Why do you think so and in what way does the municipality capacitate you?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

15. Which things do you as a ward councillor do to empower/capacitate ordinary citizens, small business owners and traditional leaders/indunas in your ward to participate effectively in the IDP processes and activities? 

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Are they effective in enhancing their participation in the IDP process? Why do you think so?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

16. What programmes does the Municipality have to empower ordinary citizens, small businesses and Traditional leaders to participate effectively in the IDP Process?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Are they effective in enhancing their participation in the IDP process? Why do you think so?
17. What do you think the municipality, ward councillors and ward committees should do to enhance the quality and effectiveness of your participation in the IDP activities?

18. What other comments do you have on any other aspect related to capacitating all categories of citizens including ward councillors and ward committees to participate effectively in the IDP process?
ANNEXURE E

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR SALGA OFFICIALS
1. What role does SALGA play in capacitating rural ward councillors and other rural ward committee members to participate effectively in the IDP process and activities?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

2. Which programmes do you use to capacitate rural ward councillors and other rural ward committee members to participate effectively during the following IDP phases? Also elaborate on the content of the training programme for rural ward councillors and ward committees.

2.1. Analysis Phase
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

2.2. Strategies Phase
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

2.3. Approval phase
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

2.4. IDP project implementation and monitoring Phase
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

3. In your view are the programmes effective in enhancing the meaningfulness and effectiveness of rural ward councillors’ and ward committees’ participation in the IDP Process? Why do you think so? How did the participation of rural ward councillors in the IDP process change?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
4. Do you think the training programmes, workshops and information sharing activities you offer for rural ward councillors and ward committees are effective to enable them to have meaningful and effective participation in the decision making processes of the IDP process? Why do you think so?

5. In your view do you think there are adequate resources to capacitate rural ward councillors and ward committees to participate effectively in the decision making processes of the IDP process? Why do you think so?

6. Which factors do you consider in designing capacity building programmes, strategies and policies for rural ward councillors and ward committees to participate effectively in the IDP process? Why these factors?

7. Do you get feedback on the effectiveness of the programmes in enhancing rural ward councillors and ward committees’ participation in the IDP process? If yes from whom and how is the feedback?
8. What kind of feedback do you receive from ward committees and ward councillors regarding the effectiveness of the programmes in enhancing their effective participation in the IDP process?

9. What are the challenges in capacitating rural ward councillors and ward committees to participate effectively in the IDP processes and activities and what is do you do to address these challenges?

10. What do you suggest can be done to address these challenges?

11. What other comments do you have on any other aspect related to capacitating rural ward committees and ward councillors to participate effectively in the IDP process?
ANNEXURE F

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS
1. What are the programmes/things that your Municipality is doing to empower and inform you about the IDP and its processes and activities?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________  

2. Are you well informed to participate effectively as a business person in the IDP process? Why do you think so?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________  

3. Which information do you receive from your Municipality, ward committees and ward councillor to enhance your participation in the IDP processes?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________  

4. What is an IDP and how did you get to know about it?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________  

5. What does the IDP process entail?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________  

6. Do you know how to participate in the IDP and the structures for participation?

If yes what are the structures you can use to participate in the IDP process and how can you participate?
7. What are your rights in the IDP process?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

How did you get to know your rights in the IDP process?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

8. What are your roles, responsibilities and obligations as a business person in the IDP process?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

9. How did you get to know your roles, responsibilities and obligations in the IDP process?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

How do you play your role in the IDP process?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
10. Do you think you have adequate information about the IDP and its processes to participate effectively in the IDP processes? Why do you think so?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

11. Where and from whom do you get the information about the IDP and its activities?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

12. Can you say your participation in the IDP process has improved because of the capacity building programmes?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

How has your participation in the IDP process improved?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

13. In your view, did the programmes change your attitude towards participation in the IDP process?
In what way did the programmes change your attitude?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

14. In your view do you think the municipality is capacitating you adequately to participate effectively in the IDP process? Why do you think so and in what way does the municipality capacitate you?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

15. What do you think the municipality, ward councillors and ward committees should do to enhance the quality and effectiveness of your participation in the IDP activities?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

16. What other comments do you have on any other aspect related to capacitating rural citizens to participate effectively in the IDP process?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
ANNEXURE G

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR WARD COMMITTEES
1. What are the programmes/things that your Municipality is doing to empower and inform you about the IDP and its processes and activities?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

2. Are you well informed to participate effectively as a ward committee member in the IDP process? Why do you think so?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

3. Which information do you receive from your Municipality, ward committees and ward councillor to enhance your participation in the IDP processes?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

4. What is an IDP and how did you get to know about it?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

5. What does the IDP process entail?
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

6. Do you know how to participate in the IDP and the structures for participation?
If yes what are the structures you can use to participate in the IDP process and how can you participate?
7. What are your rights in the IDP process?

How did you get to know your rights in the IDP process?

8. What are your roles, responsibilities and obligations as a ward committee member in the IDP process?

How did you get to know your roles, responsibilities and obligations in the IDP process?

How do you play your role in the IDP process?
10. Do you think you have adequate information about the IDP and its processes to participate effectively in the IDP processes? Why do you think so?

11. Where and from whom do you get the information about the IDP and its activities?

12. Can you say your participation in the IDP process has improved because of the capacity building programmes?

How has your participation in the IDP process improved?
13. In your view, did the programmes change your attitude towards participation in the IDP process?
   In what way did the programmes change your attitude?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

14. In your view do you think the municipality is capacitating you adequately to participate effectively in the IDP process?
   Why do you think so and in what way does the municipality capacitate you?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

15. Which things do you as a ward committee member do to empower/capacitate ordinary citizens, small business owners and traditional leaders/indunas in your ward to participate effectively in the IDP processes and activities?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Are they effective in enhancing their participation in the IDP process? Why do you think they so?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

16. What programmes does the Municipality have to empower ordinary citizens, small businesses and Traditional leaders to participate effectively in the IDP Process?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Are they effective in enhancing their participation in the IDP process? Why do you think so?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
17. What do you think the municipality, ward councillors and ward committees should do to enhance the quality and effectiveness of your participation in the IDP activities?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

18. What other comments do you have on any other aspect related to capacitating all categories of rural citizens including ward committees and ward councillors to participate effectively in the IDP process?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________