DSPACE

https://dspace.org/

Perceptions about the effectiveness of programme monitoring and evaluation rendered to Development Centres by the Department of Social Development in the Gauteng North Region.

Henna, Thembinkosi Elliot

2014-07-21
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/14937

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

Acknowledgements

There are several individuals and institutions to which I owe a debt of gratitude.

I am most grateful and especially indebted to Dr Edmarié Pretorius, my research supervisor, for being an ever present help and support from the beginning until completion of this study. It was always a joy to work with you, your continued support and constructive feedback made this study possible.

I also convey my heartfelt gratitude to the Gauteng Provincial Department of Social Development, the North Gauteng Development Centres and all the participants interviewed in this study.

Thanks also to my family for the support, my wife Philiswa, children, Bukiwe, Kamva, Kuhle and Hlali and to my friend Carol for translating the beneficiaries ‘questions into Tswana.

Last and most importantly, I would like to give glory to God the Almighty, because without His blessings and those of my Ancestors this study would never have been possible.

Declaration

I hereby declare that this research report is my own unaided work, and that I have given full acknowledgement to all the sources that I have used.

....

Thembinkosi Elliot Henna Date

Abstract

Eradicating poverty is one of the biggest challenges in South Africa. A Development Centre Model was developed by the Department of Social Development as a strategy to empower citizens of South Africa to become independent and self-reliant in an attempt to alleviate poverty. The Department fulfils the role of programme monitoring and evaluation of different programmes offered by the Development Centres. A Social Development Approach was used as a guide to the theoretical framework of the study. The primary aim of the study was to explore the perceptions about the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation of income-generating projects rendered to the development centres by the Department of Social Development in the Gauteng North Region. A qualitative research strategy was followed and a multiple case study design was applied. Purposive sampling was used to initially select six beneficiaries, six centre managers, two service providers and two departmental officials involved in the development centres that are government-funded. However, the total number of the participants in the end came to thirteen; five beneficiaries; five centre managers; two evaluators and one departmental official. Data was collected via face-to-face interviews with participants and the interviews were tape recorded. To analyse data, thematic content analysis was applied. Some of the findings and the recommendations are, firstly, that the study contributes to the understanding of the effectiveness of programme monitoring and evaluation; secondly, that programme monitoring and evaluation is in fact effective; and thirdly, that beneficiaries should participate in monitoring and evaluation of their projects. Fourthly, the majority of the beneficiaries and the centre managers felt that the process has no impact on the actual programme or projects. These participants felt that there is no follow-up to solve problems that have been identified during this process of monitoring and evaluation. The participants recommended that the department do more visits thereby making sure that problems identified during monitoring and evaluation are immediately resolved through constant visits to the development centres.

Key words: Income-generating projects, Development Centres, Social Development,

Developmental Social Welfare, Sustainable Development.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement.....i

Declaration..... ii

Abstract.....iii

Table of contents..... iv

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Brief overview of the study.....1
1.2 Statement of the problem and rationale for the study.....1
1.3 Research methodology.....3
1.4 Significance of the study.....3
1.5 Definition of terms.....3
1.6 Organisation of the report.....6

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction.....7

2.2 Poverty in Africa.....7

2.3 Poverty in the South African context.....8

2.4 A Developmental approach.....8

2.5 Poverty Alleviation Strategies implemented by the Department of Social Development in Gauteng.....9

2.6 Poverty Alleviation Programmes.....10

2.7 Challenges facing the Gauteng Department of Social Development.....11

2.8 Income-Generating Projects as an Enterprise Strategy to Social Development.....12

2.9 Programme Monitoring and Evaluation.....15

2.10. Different Approaches to Programme Monitoring and Evaluation.....16

2.10.1 The Logic Model.....16

2.10.2 Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Systems.....17

a. Differences for PME and Distinction from Conventional Approach.....18

b. Designing PME System.....19

c. Conducting Participatory Evaluation and Project Review.....21

2.11 Purpose of Evaluation.....23

2.12 Summary.....23

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction.....25

3.2 The research question.....25

3.3 Purpose of the study..... 25

3.4 Primary aim and objectives of the study.....25

3.5 Research strategy and design.....26

3.6 Sampling procedure.....26

3.7 Research tool.....27

3.8 Pre-testing the research tool..... 27

3.9 Data collection.....27

3.10. Data analysis.....29

3.11 Data verification.....30

3.12 Limitations and Delimitations.....31

3.13 Ethical consideration.....32

3.14 Summary.....32

CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction..... 33

4.2 Section A. Reflection on the data collected from the participants in the four different categories during study..... 33

4.2.1 General observations.....33

4.2.2 Catering project.....34

4.2.3 Toilet project.....36

4.2.4 Cane project.....37

4.2.5 Health project.....38

4.2.6 Sewing project.....40

4.2.7 Gauteng North Development Centre Managers.....41

4.2.8 The Evaluators.....42

4.2.9 Departmental Official.....42

4.3 Section B: Discussions of findings in relation to the primary aim of the study.....43

4.3.1 The views of the Development Centre managers on monitoring and evaluation of income-generating projects.....44

4.3.2 The opinion of evaluators as role players in monitoring and evaluation in income-generating projects.....44

4.3.3 The views of the Departmental officials as role players in monitoring and evaluation of income-generating projects.....45

4.4 Summary.....46

CHAPTER FIVE: MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction.....47

5.2 Summary of the main findings.....47

5.3 Recommendations for the Development Centres.....48

5.4 Recommendations for future research.....49

5.5 Conclusion.....49

REFERENCES.....50

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Participant information sheet..... 53

Appendix B: Consent form for participation in the study.....54

Appendix C: Consent form for tape recording the interview.....55

Appendix D: Semi- structured interview schedule beneficiaries.....56

Appendix E: Semi-structured interview schedule for mangers.....58

Appendix F: Semi-structured interview schedule evaluators..... 59

Appendix G: Semi-structured interview schedule for Departmental officials.....60

Appendix H: Ethics Clearance Certificate..... 61

Appendix I: Letter of permission from the Department of Social Development….....62

LIST OF ACRONYMS

DFID --Department for International Development

GPG --Good Practise Guide

HQ --High Quality

HIV/AIDS --Human Immune Deficiency Syndrome/Aquired immune deficiency syndrome

IMPE --Integrated Model Programme Evaluation

MDGs --Millennium Development Goals

PME --Programme Monitoring and Evaluation

PMES --Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

PLA --Participation Learning Approach

PRA --Principle Research Areas

PEP --Project Execution Plan

PP --Project Planning

M&E --Monitoring and Evaluation

WWF --World Water Fund

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Role of Development Centres…….14

Table 2: Differences between Conventional and Participatory Evaluation……18