

https://dspace.org/

An analysis of community participation, in income generating projects at the Tembisa/Kempton Park Development Center.

Chikadzi, Victor

2009-09-10T09:17:23Z
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/7229

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

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Brief overview of the study

This study focuses on the analysis of community participation in income generating projects at the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center. Community/citizen participation has long been regarded as the hallmark of a democratic society and community development practitioners are among the strongest proponents of community participation as an integral component of economic advancement and social progress. (Bowen, 2007). Community participation has become one of the fashionable concepts within the development discourse of the 21st century. Community participation has also largely become a requirement and pre-requisite for funding of development initiatives by many donors as it is regarded as an indispensable part of sustainable socio-economic and political development. The participation praxis has come to be embodied in what is now widely known as people- centered development. In 2004 the Gauteng Provincial Department of Social Development introduced the Development Center model for community development which largely encouraged the practice of participatory methods of community development. Ever since then, hardly any research has been done that focused on community participation, looking at the Development Centers that emerged as a result of the initiative, hence the study. This chapter will give background to the rationale of the study, a brief purpose of the research and an overview of the research design and methodology.

1.2 Statement of the problem and rationale for the study

In South Africa community participation is regarded as an integral part of all social, economic and political activity. There is always an attempt to either involve the community in different programmes or at least to pretend to have involved people as community participation is a constitutional prerogative that the broader masses should meaningfully participate in issues affecting their lives.

Participation is interpreted differently by different people and many people have abused it to serve their own interest since participation can take the form of mere tokenism or co-option of

the people in projects that they were not initially involved in. In an attempt to alleviate poverty in Gauteng, the Gauteng Provincial Department of Social Development introduced the Development Center concept which is a model of development that seeks to empower citizens with life skills and capacity building through initiation of income generating projects with the community and for the community. The Development Center concept is a model of development which emphasises the need for participatory engagement with the community in the implementation of development initiatives.

The research undertaking was prompted by the growing realization that in spite of highly structured administrative procedures, policies and strategies for social development in South Africa, there are remaining gaps between the activities undertaken in community development initiatives and the intended beneficiaries. Kotze and Swanepoel (1983, p. 2) confirm that, "it is by participating in community development activities that people can reap the fruits of development". According to de Beer and Swanepoel (2000) community development is mainly project-based and residents should voice their own needs and have the opportunity to participate in defining the contents of developmental projects. It is in this light that the researcher decided to make an in-depth social and scientific inquiry into the phenomenon of community participation in income generating projects run by the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center, which is a Non- Governmental Organization (NGO).The problem investigated in this study was to determine the extent to which beneficiaries in the Tembisa and Kempton Park area are involved as one of the major role players in the development process of income generating projects managed by the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center. The researcher felt that the study was very relevant in that ever since the time when the Development Center concept was pioneered no research has been done that focused on community participation.

1.3 Research design and methodology

In order to investigate the aims and objectives of the study a qualitative research design and a case study research strategy was used. According to Babbie and Mouton (2001) qualitative research has always been interested in describing the actions of participants in great detail and it enables the phenomena under study to be explored in great detail. Creswell (1998, p. 61) states that, "a case study is an exploration or in-depth analysis of a "bounded system" (bounded by

place and time) or a single or multiple cases over a period of time". Thus the use of a case study involved exploration and description of the phenomenon under study and it enabled the researcher to provide both descriptive data as well as an in-depth exploration of the phenomena under study.

A semi-structured interview schedule as displayed in appendix C, D and E was used to conduct the research. It enabled the researcher to explore issues in depth because semi-structured interviews allowed the researcher to follow up and probe relevant issues pertaining to the research. The schedule also guided the researcher and participants and focused on aspects that were more linked to the research questions, aim and objectives of the study.

The unit of analysis consisted of all beneficiaries of income generating projects at the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center, the staff who were directly responsible for managing the Development Center and the main funders of the organisation.

Purposive sampling which is a type of non- probability sampling was used to select participants. The sample consisted of ten beneficiaries of income generating projects, three staff members and the two main funders of the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center. The strategy was to select participants based on the judgment of the researcher regarding the characteristics of a representative sample.

Face to face interviews of approximately one hour in duration were conducted with participants during data collection. The researcher did not use tape-recording during the interviews seeing that this could have disrupted the flow of the interview and also caused participants to withhold sensitive information due to the uncertainty with whom the information may be shared. Babbie and Mouton (2001) argue that where tape recording is not used detailed process notes of the interviews must be taken shortly after the each interview. The researcher therefore made field notes during and also shortly after each interview. The researcher also observed the sites where the income generating projects are located and had access to information from documents that participants voluntarily availed to the researcher was also used. Therefore information gathered from interviews, observations and documentation were used in the data analysis, discussions and findings of the research report.

Thematic content analysis was used to analyse the collected data. Once the data had been collected the researcher familiarized himself with the obtained data by reading and rereading the data thoroughly. The data was then summarized and categorized into emerging themes which the researcher interpreted and integrated with related literature on the study and linked the discussion of findings to the research questions, aims and objectives of the study.

1.4 Significance of the study

This research significantly contributes to the theoretical knowledge base of a people- centered development approach in South Africa. The research findings generated have the potential to steer more progressive and beneficial debate about the extent to which development initiatives need to be decentralized to enhance people-centered development. Based on the nature of findings the researcher made recommendations on how the development approach at Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center could be enhanced in order to maximize the effectiveness of intervention methods. The findings may be of use to the other development centers and multiple other organizations in Gauteng and countrywide which are involved in similar income generating projects. The research findings might also help to transform current approaches to development in order to maximize development benefits for the people. Moreover, the research might have laid the ground work for potential further research on issues of community participation in social development projects in South Africa.

1.5 Limitations and delimitations of the study

The following were the anticipated limitations and delimitations of the study:

- Credibility or trustworthiness of research findings has always been a problematic issue in qualitative research where there is bound to be researcher bias. Credibility as noted by De Vos, Strydom, Fouche, Delport, (2002) is an alternative to internal validity in which the goal is to demonstrate that the inquiry was conducted in such a manner as to ensure that the subject was accurately identified and described. To counter this problem the researcher cross checked comments with participants in all three categories (beneficiaries, managing staff members and funders). Where there were contradictions,

an in-depth verification process was done to gather as accurate information as possible, which ensured credibility of research findings.

- The transferability of the qualitative research findings to other settings might also be problematic. Although there are other Development Centers in Gauteng running similar projects, their development models or approaches might be slightly different from the one used at the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center which will make it impossible to generalize the research findings. It should however be noted that the results might still be useful to other settings as the research offers valuable insights that may be used a guiding tool for designing a policy framework on people centered development.

- The method of thematic content analysis has limitations. The researcher's own subjective pre-occupations could have influenced the way in which data was interpreted. The researcher however made considerable attempt to be as objective as possible by eliminating all pre-occupations and approached data interpretation with an open-minded inquiry attitude.

- The participants may have given socially desirable answers or withheld important information from the researcher which they could have regarded as sensitive. Although the researcher assured confidentiality of information shared by participants and this helped to develop mutual trust between the researcher and participants, the researcher cannot guarantee that participants provided all important information.

- Participants may also have hurried answers so as to get done with the interview, as a result important information may not have been provided.

- There is also a possibility that the research instrument used may not have been effective and exhaustive of all aspects important to the research questions. However the researcher

gained an insight on the research instrument during the pre-testing and made the necessary adjustments, but the researcher cannot guarantee that the research instrument was effective and exhaustive.

- Dependability is also one of the major concerns in qualitative research. This refers to the degree to which the reader can be convinced that the findings did occur as the researcher says they did. The researcher will attempt to enhance dependability through providing rich and detailed descriptions of the data collected and also by providing a frank statement of the methods used to collect data (Terre Blanche, 2006).

1.6 Organisation of the report

This chapter provided the background and contextualized the area of study. Chapter Two that follows will focus on the review of related literature on the participation praxis or people-centered development. Chapter Three describes the research design and methodology in detail and Chapter Four provides an in-depth discussion and presentation of the findings that emerged from the study. The Final Chapter of the report summarizes the major findings and the proposed recommendations emanating from the study.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

This chapter mainly focuses on the review of relevant literature that is allied to the field of study. The researcher is going to highlight, compare, and integrate views on participatory development by different scholars. Within this offering, the broader picture or panoramic view of social development in South Africa within which the practice of community participation is mainly centered will be addressed. The chapter also traces the genesis of participatory development, what it entails, and the different ways of participation and how the participatory development praxis has evolved over the years within the global and local context in South Africa.

2.2 Social development

Colonialism and apartheid in South Africa left behind a legacy of appalling levels of inequality, deprivation, neglect and immense disparities of wealth, health and opportunities that condemn millions to lives of despair today. With the attainment of independence and the establishment of democracy in South Africa in 1994, the African National Congress (ANC) led government has found itself confronted with the enormous task of redressing imbalances and exclusions of the past.

As part of the rebuilding process soon after the formation of national government, the (ANC) published its Reconstruction and Developmental Programme (RDP), (African National Congress 1994). The RDP as a policy framework advocated for a developmental approach to welfare and as Midgley (1997) points out, in keeping with the spirit of the RDP the department of welfare published its draft White Paper for Social Welfare in 1996 which detailed government's intention to introduce a developmental welfare system which would be integrated, comprehensive, egalitarian, progressive and **participatory**. The White Paper was subsequently adopted as official government policy, this lead to the renaming of the Welfare Department to the Department of Social Development. As part of the redress process the **social development** initiative has been touted as an alternative view of social policy that will be instrumental in the

nation's quest to narrow the inequality gap and achieve equity amongst citizens. Social development offers a unique intervention method due to its broad macro-outlook and focus. It is intimately linked to economic development and its methods ensure that the wider population benefits from the productive economy. The White Paper (1997) states that, South Africans are called upon to **participate** in the development of an equitable, people-centered, democratic and appropriate social welfare system. The prime goal of social development is to promote self-reliance, through enabling people to **participate** fully in all spheres of social, economic and political life.

It is strongly upheld within the White Paper for Social Welfare that full participation of all beneficiaries in development initiatives should be the aim and end to which development must serve. While the policy framework looks promising on paper it is widely held that achieving meaningful **participation** of citizens in development initiatives remains nothing much more than a fantasy due to the bureaucratic and top-down nature of most organizations.

It is however widely recognized that social development must always seek to maximize the participation of recipients of development initiatives. The aim should be to actively involve community members in the social development process and activities. In essence this means that recipients of development initiatives should be one of the main role players when decisions are made about issues affecting their lives. This implies that the success of development projects and initiatives depend on whether a people centered process to development was followed which allows empowered participation of the people in the development process. It is against this backdrop that the researcher conducted the issue of community participation in income generating projects at the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center.

2.3 Defining participation

The practice of participation is always connected to the active involvement of communities, groups or individuals, in activities related to the development, improvement or change of an existing situation, to something better. Moser (as cited in de Beer & Swanepoel, 2000).

The participation approach emphasizes having power to access and control resources required for livelihood. As noted in the *Manilla Declaration on People's Participation and Sustainable*

Development, to achieve participation means that people should be able to exercise their sovereignty and assume responsibility for the development of themselves and their communities, the people must control their own resources; have the means to hold officials of government accountable to them rather than the people accounting to officials (Korten, 1990).

According to Korten and Carner (1984, p. 201) empowerment and people centered development rest on the simple assumption that "it is an approach to development that looks at the creative initiative of people as the primary development resource and to their material and spiritual well-being as the end that the development process serves". People need to participate and be involved and Racelis (1986, p. 179) states that: "By releasing the energy and abilities of millions, they will create a society in which the once poor majority will emerge out of their poverty and transform themselves into citizens with rights and responsibilities – like everyone".

According to Midgley, Hall, Hardian, & Narine (1986) community participation serves immediate helpful goals such as the identification of felt needs as well as the enlistment of local resources when undertaking social development projects. It also promotes broader social development ideals, by participating fully in decision making for social development, ordinary people experience fulfillment which contributes to a heightened sense of community and a spiraling of community bonds.

Midgley et. al., (1986) further argues that participation is not only one of the goals of social development but an integral part of the social development process. It is argued that, social development is facilitated if people participate fully in decision making that affects their welfare and in implementing these decisions. He further states that the mobilization of people in this way not only fosters improvement in social circumstances but strengthens human and community bonds. Participation creates a sense of community which gives meaning to human existence and foster social assimilation.

While participation has become a topical word, the greatest hazard with participation is the continued use of the word although in reality there is no evidence of changed conduct, methods and approaches. Thus, unless the behaviour of outsiders in social development changes participation will remain no more than a romanticized catchword. According to Midgley et. al.,

(1986) participation, in the full empowering sense is in itself a paradigm – a pattern of ideas, values, methods and behavior- which can apply to almost all social activity and spread in all directions.

Midgley et. al., (1986) further point out that, conventional opportunities for participation in social development present a restricted scope for involvement. In moderate democracies, electors may exert some influence over the political process but this is minimal. In autocratic systems, opportunities for participation are even more truncated. It is argued that the increasing centralization of the state in all societies has diminished the capacity of ordinary people to influence decisions and to contribute meaningfully to social development. People become not only passive but increasingly dependent on state welfare. Often participation in social development results in little more than the utilization of local labour in the construction of projects – however to be effective participation must be direct and give ultimate power to local communities so that they themselves can decide about their own affairs.

2.4 The origins of participatory development

Chambers (as cited in Nelson and Wright, 1995, p. 42) says that: "The new popularity of participation has several origins, recognizing that many development failures originate in attempts to impose standard top- down programmes and projects on diverse local realities where they do not fit or meet needs; concern for cost-effectiveness, recognizing that the more local people do the less capital costs are likely to be; preoccupation with sustainability, and the insight that if local people themselves design and construct they are more likely to meet running costs and undertake maintenance; and ideologically for some development professionals, the belief that it is right that poor people should be empowered and should have more command over their lives".

According to Theron (2005, p. 111), "participation got its popularity from a growing recognition of the need to involve stakeholders in development interventions. Through participation, the public are enabled to determine and control the allocation of development resources, and not merely influence its direction". In other words participation enables ordinary citizens who are the beneficiaries of social development to become active participants in key decision making on

issues affecting their own lives. This leads citizens to start taking ownership and responsibility over their own lives.

According to Korten (1990) the contemporary status of participatory development is reflected in what has in recent times become branded as "people centered development" (PCD). The manifesto of this approach is the *Manilla Declaration on People's Participation and Sustainable Development,* drawn up by 31 NGO leaders in June 1989. People centered development stresses the involvement of the majority of the population in development activities particularly the once marginalized such as women, youth and the illiterate. This involvement is considered bottom-line for the thriving execution of any development project. Furthermore the Manilla Declaration of 1989 as quoted in Theron, (2005, p. 112) formulates the following four basic public participation principles for people centered development which read as follows:

"

1. Sovereignty resides with the people, the real actors of positive change.
2. The legitimate role of government is to enable the people to set and pursue their own agenda.
3. To exercise their sovereignty and assume responsibility for the development of themselves and their communities, the people must control their own resources, have access to relevant information and have means to hold officials of government accountable.
4. Those who would assist the people with their development must recognize that it is they who are participating in support of the people's agenda, not the reverse. The value of the outsider contribution will be measured in terms of the enhanced capacity of the people to determine their own future".

It should however be noted that the principles outlined in the *Manilla Declaration of 1989* are far fetched from the current reality on the state of social development particularly in third world developing countries. Development initiatives are largely bureaucratically administered and people are co-opted into predetermined initiatives rather than coming up with their own

initiatives. Centralized and bureaucratized planning and government funding of social development projects remain a threat to the achievement of real and genuine participation.

Apart from the *Manilla Declaration on People's Participation and Sustainable Development 1989,* some of the core values for the practice of public participation at the international level are formulated by the International Association for Public Participation (IAPZ). These values act as guidelines on how the participatory process should unfold if it is to be seen as genuine and not just window dressing. The core values of the (IAPZ) as quoted by Davids et al., (2005, p. 112) reads as follows:

"

1. The public should have a say in decisions about actions that affect their lives;
2. Public participation includes the promise that the public's contribution will influence the decision;
3. Public participation process communicates the interests and meets the process needs of all participants;
4. The public participation process seeks out to facilitate the involvement of those potentially affected;
5. The public participation process involves participants in defining how they participate;
6. Public participation process communicates to participants how their input affected the decision and,
7. The public participation process provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way".

2.5 Participation and Social Development in South Africa

Participation in social and economic development by ordinary citizens is a key premise for most development initiatives in South Africa. According to Patel (2005) the idea of participation in social development is embodied in the demand that the "People Shall Govern" which is contained in the freedom charter adopted at the congress of the people in 1955. The sentiment is also echoed in the preamble of the South African constitution (as cited in the White Paper for Social Welfare, 1997) which states that the people of South Africa must obligate themselves to

laying the foundations for a democratic and open society in which Government will be based on the will of the people. In other words, participation by the people is one the central characteristics of social development. This comes from the realization that it is the people who should be the main role-players in decision making on issues that affect them. Thus, social development in South Africa should be people-centered in nature and look at the active participation of beneficiaries in development initiatives.

As advocated for in South Africa's White Paper for Social Welfare (1997) ordinary citizens will be afforded the opportunity to play an active role in promoting their well-being and in contributing to the growth and development of the nation. Patel (2005) argues that the point of departure of the social developmental approach is that social welfare users of services and those who seek help are not passive recipients of services but are active allies in solving social and economic conditions which impede people's functioning. It is therefore agreed in principle that the full participation of beneficiaries should always be sought in any social development initiative within South Africa.

According to Sinclair (1990), community development in South Africa should not be aimed only at providing black South Africans to resist repression and build institutions that are expected to form the foundation of a new- socio-political order. Fundamentally, community development is a process of organizing to enable all communities and community members to participate fully in, and manage development programmes to leverage resources for community services and to assert their democratic rights.

As noted by Craig and Mayo (1995) participation is a critical ingredient of social development and there is need for conscientization to raise the self-reflected awareness of the people rather than educating or indoctrinating the people. The people should be empowered to assert their "voice", to stimulate their self driven collective action and to take responsibility to transform their reality. To feel genuine belongingness one must participate in the affairs that matter to one's life. At all levels of society human beings want to fit in through participation. This is true of social, political as well as economic realms. People in South Africa are the greatest possession of the nation and people centered development can assist to redress past apartheid imbalances that where based on race, gender, class and ethnicity.

In South Africa, micro - level participatory processes basically represents the initiative of people seeking life improvement through a process of awareness build up and organized group action aimed at self dependence. Such a process of change is initiated by organized self-conscious people who are conscious of the need for change; use whatever spaces are available within the existing political- economic – social structures while also seeking to expand the space of their actions through careful strategic means. According to Wagnaraja, Hussain, and Wagnaraja (1991) these micro-initiatives tend to have the potential to sow seeds of social change.

The central actors in a participatory process are, the destitute, the deprived and the underprivileged, who have habitually lacked opportunities to participate in social processes benefiting them were hitherto excluded. Availability of opportunities for people to build up their capacities to move from the status of objects (manipulated by external forces), and passive victims of social processes, to the status of subjects (guided by self consciousness) and active agents of change, is fundamental to the generation of people a centered development process. (Wagnaraja, et al., 1991).

As argued by de Beer and Swanepoel (2000), people affected by development projects are to be the main role- players and decision makers. They ought not to be "a passive citizenry". This poses serious questions on the encouragement for "a people centered process" especially in the South African context where government plays a central role in giving out materials, support and funding for social development purposes. Funding often implies more involvement on the part of government, other aid agencies and private sector responsible for bankrolling social development initiatives. This may become a threat to people participation as most aid, comes with strings and conditions attached. As propounded by Ife (1995, p. 111), "reliance on external resources comes at a price; namely the price of loss of autonomy and independency, genuine autonomous communities can only flourish in the absence of such external dependency". The question becomes, whose agenda should followed, that of the people or the "savior"?

2.6 The enterprise strategy as a way of promoting Social development

As noted by Midgley (1997), enterprise strategies are often touted as the best method of fostering rapid economic growth. Proponents of this strategy believe in the importance of individual effort,

the market and entrepreneurship in promoting people's welfare. It is important to note that the proponents of this approach do not advocate an extreme laissez faire position that rejects any form of government intervention. Instead they advocate for policies that strengthen individual capabilities to function in a competitive market situation. In South Africa such initiatives are resembled by the Development Centre Model initiative where people are being equipped with entrepreneurship skills and also participate in income generating projects.

Government has adopted preferential procurement strategy to allow these projects to take–off until they can be competitive. Such State intervention according to the enterprise strategy is necessary to help small business that might if left alone be suffocated by stiff competition from large established businesses. The proponents of the enterprise approach in 3rd world countries place greater emphasis on the informal sector activities which they believe offer the best hope for people to generate income needed to improve their standard of living. In South Africa initial enterprise initiatives have shown to be promising, with more governmental and business sector support more success will be realized.

2.7 Income generating projects as an enterprise strategy to Social development

According to the Development Center Operations Manual (2004) income generating projects are envisioned and one of the major strategies being used by the Gauteng Department of Social Development as a poverty reduction initiative. The document offers guidelines on how the concept of Development Centers should be operated in the province. The term income generating projects is used to denote initiatives that lead to the accumulation of monetary gains by those involved in the projects in form of profit. According to the Development Center Operations Manual (2004, p. 27), "income generation will always remain the most crucial need in all human beings. Without a sustainable income in a household survival is impossible". The income generating projects objectives are set as follows:

> *"Alleviating poverty, by making it possible for poor people to generate income to meet basic needs; reducing poverty through employment creation; redistribution of wealth, income and opportunities; and contributing to economic growth, by improving innovation and thus competitiveness".*

The Gauteng Department of Social Development explains the role of Development Centers with regard to income generating projects as follows:

Service	Required response	Key performance indicators
Market research	The Development Centre to undertake basic research in area to assess the viability of an entrepreneurial activity.	Report on research undertaken.
Capacity building	Business management training and technical training needed.	Training completed. Register of trainees.
Secure start-up capital	Purchasing of equipment and material necessary to start project.	Equipment and material procured.
Development of key developments	Development of a project plan. Financial management system.	Project plan in place. Financial system in place.
Quality control	Procurement of quality control/ assurance services.	Quality products.
Support	Regular meetings to discuss progress and provide advice. Daily meals for project members for three months.	Minutes of meetings. Register of daily meals.
Assist with registration	Assistance with registration as business entity / co-operative.	Application and registration forms.
Marketing	Assistance with linkages with markets. Applications for tenders. Assistance with development of pamphlets that could be distributed on products. Adverts in community newspapers/ radio.	Copies of procurement agreements. Copies of tender applications. Pamphlets.
Monitor	Monitor compliance with regard to: financial management; reporting; production and sales.	Reports.

Source: Adapted from the Development Center Operations Manual of July (2004)

2.8 Ways of achieving participation

Although genuine participation is difficult to achieve, Ife (1995) argues that there are a number of ways in which participation can be encouraged. He states that non- participation is not natural, nor is it necessarily inevitable. People will participate in community structures, under the right conditions. He highlights five conditions for effective community participation which are as follows:

- People will participate if they consider the issue or activity to be important
- The people need to feel that their action will make a difference
- Different ways of participation must be acknowledged an valued
- People must be enabled to participate and be supported in their participation
- Structure and process of development must not be segregating

There are various ways in which participation can be achieved and enhanced. Midgley et al., (1986) points out that, if participation is to be achieved effectively, it needs the direct face to face involvement of citizens in social development and ultimate control over decisions that affect their own welfare. Participation must involve the whole community and the disadvantaged must be empowered to take a lively part in the political process. Participation must take place on a direct interpersonal basis, the unity for participation and the primary forum for the expression of views, must be the small local community.

As argued by Theron (2008, p. 9), "no society exists that has not been influenced by some type of development intervention at some stage. In just about all cases, this is a process induced from outside in a top-down manner…, the nature of this uneven relationship outside/ developers vs. insiders/ developees is complex. Part of this approach – one that persists among some agents and their institutions is the arrogant; they have the problem we have the solution point of departure". This approach tends to overlook home-grown knowledge systems and the social capital of beneficiaries are ignored or treated as obstacles to development. In this approach change agents are concerned about how they are going to get the beneficiary community to do what they want them to do, based on prescriptive mechanistic planning models; however change agents should rather focus on how they can manage a development process that will lead to minimum disruption in the local beneficiary community, (Theron, 2008).

2.9 Democracy as a way of achieving participation

Democracy is one of the critical components that ensures participation and involvement of all community members in any development initiative. Democracy has many different meanings, and can be applied to so many different situations. Ife (1995) argues that, it is tempting to conclude that democracy has lost all substantive meaning. It however remains a powerful ideal and represents a crucial element in any attempt to derive a vision of a future society, particularly a society in which all can participate meaningfully over issues that affect daily human existence.

As noted by Ife (1995) democracy means rule of the people, but such a definition implores many questions. The conceptions who are "the people" has differed and seldom meant all people. Another issue is the question of what decisions will be taken by the people, and what will be left to the individual, family or informal group. The rules of "the people" can easily become the dictatorship of the people and the denial of fundamental freedoms. How then can the rule of the people be exercised? In participatory democracy, "the people" participate directly in decision making.

2.10 Components or characteristics of participatory democracy

As noted earlier democracy is one of the ways in which participation by the majority of the people can be enhanced. However there are various kinds of democracy and not all types of democracy encourage participation. The ideal model that would enable full participation would be participatory democracy or direct democracy. Direct democracy is any system of democracy based on civics theory in which all people can directly participate in the decision making process. Ife (1995) argues that participatory or direct democracy requires there to be workable structures at a level which relates to people's day to day experiences, where people will be able to participate effectively in decisions affecting their lives. For this to happen, the structures need to be meaningful for the people concerned, who need to experience belonging and acceptance, otherwise genuine and effective participation will not eventuate. The four characteristics of a participatory democracy namely; decentralization, accountability, education, and obligation as described by Ife (1995) are important to social development, and contribute to the understanding of participation in the context of this research study.

2.10.1 Decentralization

Participatory democracy requires decentralized decision making structure, and decentralization is a major component of an alternative vision based on ecological and social justice principles. For some reasons more centralized decision making or at least coordination is required and the principle involved is that no decision or function should occur at a more centralized level than is necessary. Where centralized functions exist, it should preferably focus on coordinating information and activities and structures. Mechanisms need to be developed to ensure that the perspective of the periphery, rather than the centre, is given priority when disputes arise. This contradicts the conventional view which sees the perspective of the centre as the more valid because it is able to make an overview. This notion is also supported by Pearson and Stiefel (1979, cited in Burkey, 1993) who noted that, participation should involve organized efforts to have decentralized control of resources and regulatory institutions in a given social context in favor of the hitherto excluded. Although decentralization is not without its own problems, it can be dealt with by more effective networking, communication and coordination rather than necessarily central control. From the perspective of participatory democracy, challenges of decentralization are outweighed by its advantages. While for momentous citizen participation to crop up there is a need for a decentralized system that enables people to be involved in a range of activities. Increased decentralization does not robotically mean that people will participate as it is probable to have decentralized bodies which nevertheless limit the opportunity of most people to participate successfully.

2.10.2 Accountability

The conventional view of accountability has been that of accountability upward to the centre, within a traditional bureaucratic structure. However, from a participatory democracy perspective, accountability downward or outward to the people directly concerned is much more important. Indeed, such accountability is central to the idea of participatory democracy because participatory democracy does not only involve “the people” in making decisions but also requires that they should take responsibility and ensure that decisions are carried out (Ife, 2002).

2.10.3 Education

As noted by Burkey (1993) education is one of the prior requirements for genuine participation. This education is a process of awakening, raising levels of consciousness; a process of transformation through which people grow and mature. According to Ife (2002) if people are to participate in decision-making they can only be expected to do so successfully if they are well informed about the issues at stake and the likely consequences of particular decisions. To ensure that people are equipped to make informed decisions requires a level of awareness and education higher than is generally understood as being necessary for participation. To embark on a programme of participatory democracy without such an education programme is a recipe for failure and would serve to support the views of those who see participatory democracy as unworkable.

2.10.4 Obligation

Rights and obligations are linked, and participatory democracy can be regarded as one instance of rights, namely people's right to self determination. With the exercise of rights goes a corresponding obligation to participate and to be well informed about the relevant issues. One cannot force people to participate – but a climate can be created in which people feel a strong moral obligation or duty to participate. One way of achieving this is by ensuring that people's participation is genuine rather than token. The tokenistic nature of many participation programmes of government readily alienates community members (Ife, 2002). In order to ensure that people are obliged to participate, Freire (1970) stresses the notion of dialogue arguing that if dialogue is founded upon love, humility and faith it becomes a horizontal relationship in which mutual trust between those in dialogue becomes the logical consequence and people can therefore feel obligated to participate.

2.11 Change from below as way of achieving participation

Instead of using bureaucratic top-down structures in social development, there is need for a bottom up approach in which the needs as defined by the people take precedence. Ife (2002) introduces an interesting notion about the idea of change from below. He argues that change from below can only be completely realized through meaningful community participation whereby the community should be able to determine its own needs, be self directing and self-

reliant. This is however easier said than done. The application of such an initiative is extremely radical, and requires major changes in the behavior of 'change agents' as it goes against many of the dominant and prevailing views inherent in policy making and programme management. According to Ife (2002) change from below should be undertaken around ideas of local knowledge, local culture, local resources, local skills and valuing local processes. These aspects will be discussed in detail below.

2.11.1 Valuing local knowledge and skills

The valuing of local knowledge is an indispensable element of social development. There is no doubt that community workers do often have specialist knowledge, but to privilege this knowledge, whilst devaluing the local knowledge of the community itself, is the antithesis of social development. The members of the community who have the experience of that community, of its needs and problems, its strengths and positives and its unique characteristics always know best. Except if a community worker has been a longtime dweller in the community, he/she cannot claim to be an expert and the role becomes that of a listener and learner from the community (Ife, 2002).

One way of valuing local knowledge is by recognizing local skills. Often outside expertise is sought after through consultations, when there are local people with such knowledge. Local skills are more appropriate in that they are grounded in local experience. Ife (2002) is of the opinion that one of the most important points about valuing local skills is that it empowers rather than disempowers the local people. Using local skills provides people with prospects to make meaningful contributions and strengthens self reliance and social capital within the community itself.

Ife (1995, p. 96) further argues that, "structures of domination and oppression have resulted in the legitimating of the wisdom of the dominant groups, while alternative wisdom of the oppressed groups is unrecognized". Although the wisdom of senior managers, policy makers, academics, church leaders and authors of books is important it should not overpower the wisdom of the oppressed. This should not only allow acknowledgement of their right to define their own needs and aspirations in their own way, but this wisdom should be shared within a wider society

as an essential component of the social development approach. Strategies of consciousness raising and of ensuring that the voices of the oppressed are heard, recognized and appreciated should be incorporated in the process of social development. According to Ife (1995, p. 96), "a fundamental principle of community development is that, "wisdom comes from *below* rather than from *above*. People need to be assisted to articulate their own needs and develop their own strategies of action in order to have those needs met".

The role of the community development worker is not to be a source of wisdom, but simply a resource that may be used by the people to help them articulate and meet their own perceived needs. A community development worker can assume the role of an enabler and one who enables empowerment in which he provides opportunity and making it possible for the community to become more articulate (Patel, 2005). This attitude indicates real empowerment rather than disempowerment of the consumers of human services.

2.11.2 Valuing local culture and processes

A community culture can be eroded by the imposition of outside values and practices. This leads to the undermining and devaluing of local community experience. Often community development workers are part of this cultural erosion through influencing and telling the community what is important, about the best way to do things, and about protocols in interpersonal communication. Therefore it is important for community development workers to be careful not to assume the superiority of their own cultural traditions. Community workers need to remove 'cultural blinkers', this does not necessarily mean to agree with local culture but to value and accept it, and where possible to validate it and to work with it. If a community development worker is new in a community there is need to engage more in the networking role (Patel, 2005). It is through networking that he will become more knowledgeable about the community and better understand local processes. To seek to impose a different set of values simply because the worker is more familiar and comfortable with them is to engage in a form of cultural imperialism. Thus, a community development worker needs to respect and accept the importance of the local culture to the people of the community, and use that as a starting point for working towards change (Ife, 2002).

It is also important for a community worker to seek to understand local community processes about the way in which things are usually done and work within this tradition. There may be local community processes that work well, and are understood and utilized by the local community and processes should not necessarily be imported from outside.

2.11.3 Valuing local resources

Self-reliance is one of the chief principles of community development. Communities need to be able to survive and sustain themselves without much reliance on outside sources. Without considerable self-reliance, community-based structures will not be feasible in the long-term. While external funding is indispensable it should be in the short term with the ultimate aim of minimizing or eliminating it altogether. According to Ife (2002) community development workers need to value local resources and find ways in which local resources can be harnessed for the future sustainability of a community. The notion of valuing local resources is complementary to the strengths perspective whereby community development workers focus more on capabilities and opportunities in people rather than concentrating on weak points of people or the community Saleeby (1997, cited in Whitley, White, Kelley and Yorke, 1999).

2.12 Different kinds of power needed for community based alternatives that encourage participation

According to Ife (2002) there are different kinds of power that play an important role in encouraging participation in communities which will be addressed in more detail.

2.12.1 Power over the definition of need

One of the characteristics of modern society is the "dictatorship over needs" in that needs are often determined and defined not by the person who has the need but by external parties. For instance, in some cases the state has taken the responsibility of defining people's needs, social workers, doctors, teachers, psychologists and managers also have become experts in the definition of people's needs. Often their views correspond with their own world (expects) but not to that of the people. This is disempowering and an empowerment perspective would require that people be given power to define their own needs. (Ife, 2002 & Freire, 1970).

The definition of need is of critical importance to community development. Ife (1995) mentions two critical community work principles relating to the establishment of needs. The first is that community development should seek to bring about agreement between the different need definers, namely the population as a whole, consumers, service providers, and researchers. Therefore there is a need for dialogues among all the stakeholders to ensure consensus about the community's needs. Where there are different perceptions between the needs definers, there is a reduced amount of likelihood that people's needs will be met efficiently, and the various actors will be working at divergent purposes.

The second principle refers to the need definition of the people themselves that ought to take precedence despite the views of other need definers. Community development as defined by Ife (1995, p. 199) is, "a process of helping communities to articulate their own needs and then to act so they can be met". In order for this to be realized people must themselves own and control the process of need appraisal and classification. It is therefore imperative to put in place ways that promote equal participation otherwise community based organizations are likely to be characterized by uneven levels of participation and domination of many by few. Need definition is also stressed by Freire (1970, p. 83) who noted that, " many political and educational plans have failed because their authors designed them according to their own views of reality, never once taking into account (except as mere objects of their action) the men- in–a- situation to whom the program was ostensibly directed".

2.12.2 Power over ideas

Ife (2002) noted that ideas are undoubtedly powerful and of critical importance in either maintaining or challenging the dominant order. An empowerment process should incorporate the power to think autonomously and not have one's world view dictated either by force or by being denied access to alternative frames of reference. The expression of these ideas in public forums, the capacity of people to enter into dialogue with each other, and the ability of people's ideas to contribute to the public culture should be encouraged and there is need to emphasize the educational aspect of empowerment.

The above postulation is also supported by Freire (1970) who argued that, one of the basic elements of the relationship between the oppressor and the oppressed is prescription which represents the imposition of one man's ideas upon another. He goes on to emphasize the need for dialogue in which the critical consciousness of the oppressed is developed leading to their autonomy and responsibility. The importance of dialogue as an educational tool is further reinforced by Burkey (1993) who stressed the need for people to become conscious of their own situation if genuine participation is to be realized. He further noted that, people must become aware of their socio-economic reality around them, of their real problems, the causes of their problems and what they need to do to change the status quo. During dialogue with the community the development worker assumes the role of educator (Patel, 2005). The role of educator should involve reciprocal information sharing with the community rather merely instructing the community without their reflective thinking.

2.12.3 Power over institutions

A good deal of disempowerment is maintained due to the fact that social institutions, such as the education system, the health system, the family, the church, the social welfare system, government structure and the media keep disempowerment intact. To counteract this, an empowerment strategy would aim to increase people's power by means of participation over these institutions by equipping people to influence and impact these institutions, but more fundamentally, to change these institutions to make them more accessible, responsive and accountable to all people, and not just the forces in power. A community based strategy would be particularly significant in this regard which implies community involvement in decision making about the way in which institutions in their locality are managed (Ife, 2002). In this case a community development worker can play the role of a mobiliser in order to influence collective action by the community to sway key decisions made by institutions in their favour (Patel, 2005).

2.12.4 Power over access to resources

According to Ife (2002), many people don't have access to resources, and have relatively little knowledge and discretion as to how these resources would be utilized. This refers to financial resources and non- material resources such as education, opportunities for personal growth,

recreation, and cultural experience. A community development worker can in this instance play the brokering role and facilitate clients' access to resources and information (Patel, 2005). An empowerment strategy would seek to maximize the effective power of all people over the distribution and use of resources, and to redress the evident inequality of access to resources which characterize modern society. This notion is also supported by Burkey (1993, p. 58-59) who noted that, "we cannot conceal the fact that empowerment challenges established interests of the existing order. It seeks to confront those forces which oppose the poor's access to the means of production and development".

2.12.5 Power over economic activity

The basic mechanisms of production, distribution and exchange are vital in any society, and to have power in a society one must be able to have some control over and access to the mechanisms. As noted by Burkey (1993), participation by the people in institutions and systems which affect their lives need to be regarded not as a privilege but a basic human right. It is also essential for realignment of political power in favour of disadvantaged groups and for social and economic development. According to Ife (1995) this power is unequally distributed in modern capitalist society, and this is a cause of significant disempowerment. This is confirmed in South Africa where most economically enriching initiatives by the poor have been rather unsuccessful due to the monopolistic nature of large business co- operations that fix prices which affects the cost. Therefore it is rather difficult for community based small to medium scale enterprises to do business. More so, in this era of rapid globalization most small business cannot survive due to strong competition from superior or cheaper priced imports. Therefore the economic terrain is uneven and an empowerment strategy should seek to regulate economic activity in order to protect the poor and promote social development. This view is supported by Yunus (1997) who argues that there is great capacity and enormous potential in every human being. However many people never get to discover the capacity they posses and never realize how far they can go. The societal arrangements and institutional designs of our times create barriers that render people inarticulate and incapable to overcome the poverty trap which they do not necessarily have control over.

2.13 Typology of participation

As has been noted earlier the real meaning of participation and how it should be practiced remains elusive. Kumar (2002, p 24-25 cited in Masanyiwa and Kinyashi, 2008) and Arnstein (1969, p. 217 cited in Bowen, 2007) have attempted to identify the different types of participation or levels at which people are said to participate.


Kumar'**s** *typology of participation*

Level	Characteristics of each type
1. Passive participation	People participate by being told what is going to happen or has already happened. It is a unilateral announcement by leaders or project management without listening to people's responses or even asking their opinion.
2. Participation in information giving	People participate by answering questions posed by extractive researchers using questionnaire survey or similar approaches. People do not have opportunity to influence proceedings, as the findings of the research are neither shared nor checked for accuracy.
3. Participation by consultation	People participate by being consulted, and external people listen to views. These external professionals define both problems and solutions, and may modify these in light of people's responses. Such a consultative process does not concede any share in decision making, and professionals are under no obligation to take on board people's views.
4. Participation for material incentives	People participate by providing resources, for example labour, in return for food, cash or other materials incentives. It is very common to see this called participation, yet people have no stake in prolonging activities when incentives end.

5. Functional participation	People participate by forming groups to meet predetermined objectives related to the project, which can involve the development or promotion of externally initiated social organization. Such involvement does not tend to occur at the early stages of project cycles or planning, but rather after major decisions have been made. These institutions tend to be dependant on external initiators and facilitators, but may become self-dependent.
6. Interactive participation	People participate in joint analysis, which leads to action plans and the formation of new local institutions or the strengthening of existing ones. It tends to have interdisciplinary methodologies that seek multiple perspectives and make use of systematic and structured learning processes these groups take control over local decisions, and so people have a stake in maintaining structures or practices.
7. Self- mobilization	People participate by taking initiatives independent of external institutions to change systems. They develop contacts with external institutions for resources and technical advice they need, but retain control over how resources are used. Such self-initiated mobilization and collective action may challenge existing inequitable distributions of wealth and power.

Source: Adapted from Kumar (2002, p. 24- 25 cited in Masanyiwa and Kinyashi, 2008)

Arnstein's *typology of participation*



Ladder of Participation. Modified illustration of Arnstein's (1969, p. 217) "eight rungs" cited in Bowen 2007, p. 66).

The types of participation described in the typologies are complementary. However Arnstein (1969, cited in Bowen 2007, p. 66) groups the types into three different categories identified as follows:

(a) Non-participation

The first category is that of non-participation. The category of non-participation denotes instances whereby people do not have a say in programme content or participate in the design thereof and they are manipulated as objects of action in programmes. This also largely resembles the top down and bureaucratic nature of many government programmes.

(b) Degrees of tokenism

This category denotes situations where by organizations pretend to be involving people by consulting them. The people's views are however not taken into account when the actual programme content is designed and in most cases consultation of the people is done after the

programme has already been designed. The views of the people in this instance do not in any meaningful way alter the predetermined programme content.

(c) Degrees of citizen power

This category denotes much more conscious efforts by organizations to authentically involve the people in designing programme content, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the programme. A platform for genuine dialogue is created in which the community is able to define and determine their own needs.

The category that denotes degrees of citizen power shows more meaningful participation by the community. It is in the researcher's view difficult to attain this type of participation in many large organizations given their bureaucratic and top down nature. The role of experts will also have to radically shift from provision of expert knowledge to that of partnering and learning with the community if this type of participation is to be enhanced in development projects.

2. 14 Asset-based Community- driven Development (ABCD) as a Development model that promotes full community participation.

It should however be noted that in all the above mentioned categories of participation, the community is in a way viewed as a client or beneficiary and it may not be possible to have total autonomy given the vested interest of other stakeholders in the development process. This necessitates the need for communities to initiate their own self –driven initiatives that are totally independent of outside help if total autonomy is to be achieved. One such initiative is reflected in the work of Alison and Cunningham (2003) on asset-based community driven development.

Asset–based community driven development as an alternative approach ensures that the community has total ownership of the development process. The Asset–based community driven development is an alternative model for community development premised on the idea that, people within communities are capable of organizing themselves to drive the development process independent of outside influences. This according to Mathie and Cunningham (2003, p. 2-3), is done, "by identifying and mobilizing existing (but often unrecognized) assets, thereby responding to and creating local economic opportunity. In particular, the model of Asset–based community driven development draws attention to social assets: the particular talents of individuals, as well as the social capital inherent in the relationships that fuel local associations

and informal networks. Communities are helped to build an inventory of their assets and are encouraged to see value in resources that would otherwise have been ignored, unrealized or dismissed". Such forms of capital involve:

Natural capital – this refers to natural resources which are beneficial to improving livelihoods for the community like, land, water, mineral resources, wildlife and forests.

Social capital – according to Coleman (1990, p. 302 cited Nieman, 2006) social capital is described as "the glue that develops between people in groups and societies by sharing experiences, ideas, ideals, beliefs and practices…., social capital is dependant on the social structures that exist between people, which make it possible for those involved to take certain actions and to be able to get things done that they would not have been able to do on their own."

Human capital - this is used to refer to the technical skills, knowledge and expertise or abilities that are possessed by individuals within a community that can be used to promote community driven development.

Physical capital - this refers to infrastructure like roads, hospitals, libraries, buildings and other means that enable people to pursue livelihoods.

Financial capital- this refers to monetary resources available to a community. Such capital can be accessed through informal or formal borrowing and lending channels.

The Asset–based community driven development is therefore one of the community development models in which full participation by the community can be realized. Instead of community members viewing themselves as clients, they begin to assume total ownership and initiative in a fully community driven development initiative.

The Asset–based community driven development is a model that is in a way synonymous with the strengths perspective principle. This principle is premised on the idea that instead of development practitioners looking at the weakness or needs of clients, they should rather focus on what the communities possess, its strengths and how those strengths can be used to further enhance and extend the people's livelihoods. It is argued that focusing on weakness leads to the community or client to feel more vulnerable and less capable. There are strengths that the

community posses and these are found in people and their environment Saleeby (1997, cited in Whitley, White, Kelley and Yorke, 1999). In much the same as Asset–based community driven development can foster total control of the development process by the community, the strengths perspective if followed leads to the community being the main actors within the development process and the more involved the community is the less likelihood of manipulation by outsiders.

2.15 Summary

This chapter has provided a detailed discussion on the practice of participation or people-centered development. It is clear that if development is to have meaningful change in people's lives there is need for ordinary citizens to take charge of the development process in making crucial decisions about their own welfare. Therefore the people for whom development initiatives are intended need to be the main role players in deciding on the nature of development projects and how they should be implemented. In this chapter, the origins of participatory development and the various typologies and controversies emanating from the participation praxis where outlined. Given this particular context the researcher attempted in the research study on income generating projects run by the Tembisa / Kempton Park development Center to ascertain whether or not there is full participation by the beneficiaries of the projects; what could be hampering full participation and what are the implications of the Center's particular development approach in relation to participatory development. Chapter Three will describe the research design and methodology applied during the research study.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the research design and methodology that was utilized during the research process. Particular reference will be made to the sampling procedures, methods of data collection, and how the data was analyzed as well as the limitations and delimitations of the research.

3.2 Purpose of the study

The purpose was to determine the extent to which beneficiaries in the Tembisa and Kempton Park areas were participating and involved in the development and implementation process of income generating projects being managed at Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center.

3.3 Objectives of the study

The Objectives of the study were to:

- Identify gaps between the needs of the beneficiaries and the nature of the income generating projects offered by the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center.
- Establish the extent to which beneficiaries participate and contribute to the needs analysis when income generating projects at the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center were planned and implemented.
- Determine if beneficiaries were empowered to manage the development process of income generating projects at Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center independently.
- To establish the influence of funder expectations on the development and implementation process of income generating projects at Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center.
- Identify potential obstacles with the implementation of community participation in projects at Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center.
- Provide recommendations regarding possible future implementation models for income generating projects at Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center.

3.4 Research questions

The research questions in the study were as follows:

- To what extent were beneficiaries participating in and contributing to the planning and implementation of income generating projects at Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center?
- Were beneficiaries empowered to participate and manage the development process independently?
- How did funder expectations influence the development process in income generating projects implemented by the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center?
- What were obstacles hindering beneficiaries' participation in income generating projects at Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center?

3.5 Research design and strategy

Fouche & Delport (2002, p. 79) define a qualitative research design as "a research paradigm that seeks to elicit participants accounts of meaning, experiences or perceptions….. Qualitative research generates descriptive data drawn from participants' spoken or written words". A qualitative approach is one in which the researcher often makes claims based primarily on constructionist perspectives which entail the multiple meanings of individual experiences, views that were socially and historically constituted, with an intent to formulate a theory or identify a pattern. Different strategies of inquiry are applicable to the qualitative approach which includes phenomenologies, ethnographies, grounded theory studies, or case studies. In the qualitative approach the researcher collects open-ended data after which emergent themes will be drawn from the data in order to make meaning of it (Creswell, 2003).

Qualitative research is also concerned with understanding a particular phenomenon in detail as it takes as its point of departure the insider perspective as opposed to the outsider perspective in the quantitative research. In qualitative research detailed thick descriptions are constructed using inductive logic and it is suited for studying phenomena that the researcher knows little about.

Given that the researcher wanted to explore and understand the phenomenon understudy in great depth and detail the qualitative research approach was the most suitable and applicable method by which the aims and objectives of the study could be attained and the research questions explored.

In this study the researcher utilized the case study research strategy. Creswell (1998, p. 61 cited in de Vos et al., 2002) states that, "a case study is an exploration or in-depth analysis of a "bounded system" (bounded by place and time) or a single or multiple cases over a period of time". Thus the use of a case study enabled the researcher to provide both descriptive data as well as an in-depth exploration of the phenomena under study. The case under study may refer to an individual, group of people, an organization or event. Various in-depth data collection methods are utilized in the case study research strategy and multiple sources of data are considered that relate to context of the research. The methods include interviews, documents, observations or archival records. The end result of this process is an in-depth description of the case/ cases under study (Stake 1995, as cited in Creswell 2003, and in Fouche, 2002).

In this research the income generating projects at the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center were the case under study with particular focus on analyzing community participation in the development and implementation process of income generating projects. The various data collection methods applicable in this strategy enabled the researcher to explore, describe and understand the phenomenon under study in depth.

According to Black (1976) the advantages of using a case study are as follows:

- A variety of data collection methods can be utilized in a case study research design and these multiple methods enrich the data that is gathered.
- Case studies can also be conducted in any social setting.
- Case studies also enable the testing of theory.
- Lastly the flexibility of a case study extends to virtually any dimension of the phenomena under study and the researcher can focus only on aspects of the phenomenon that are important to the theoretical framework and objectives of the study.

The disadvantages of using a case study are the following:

- While thick in-depth descriptions are generated to describe and understand a social phenomenon, the information gathered cannot be generalized to other settings in a meaningful way because the representation of the sample is a challenge due to the fact that a non-probability sampling method was utilized.

- The case study research strategy is very time consuming because it requires the direct involvement of the researcher in collecting relevant information (Black, 1976).

3.6 Sampling procedures

According to Seaberg (1998, cited in Strydom & Venter, 2002) a population is the total set from which the individual or units of the study are chosen. A sample is a small proportion of the total set of objects, events or persons that together constitute the subjects of the actual study. The population of this study comprised of three categories of participants namely, one for beneficiaries of income generating projects; one for funders and the other for staff members working at the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center. Authorisation from relevant authorities had been obtained and these letters can be found in appendix F, G, and H. Purposive sampling, a type of non- probability sampling was used in this research. The strategy was to select participants based on the judgment of the researcher regarding the characteristics of a representative sample capable of generating the data that was needed. The population did not have an equal chance of being included in the study and the problem with this type of sampling is the inability to generalize the findings. It should however be noted that, the researcher's primary objective in qualitative research is not to generalize findings but rather to describe and understand the phenomenon under study. The criterion for selection in each category of research participants was based on the researcher's own judgment. Out of the total population of the beneficiaries, ten participants were chosen to participate in the study. Two participants were chosen from the population of funders and three staff members of the Development Centre were selected to participate in the study.

3.7 Research tools

A semi-structured interview schedule was used as the research tool. It was a set of questions designed to guide the researcher and the participant's narrative. In the process of constructing the schedule the researcher had to think critically about all issues to ensure that the information gathered would be in line with the objectives and research questions of the study. It also helped to fine tune the wording of questions to be asked beforehand. Open ended questions were used in the interview schedule. During the research study, three different semi-structured interview schedules, one for beneficiaries of income generating projects, one for funders and the other for staff members working at the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center were used by the researcher to elicit the required information. These are set out in Appendices C, D and E.

3.8 Pretesting the research tool

The three semi-structured interview schedules were pre-tested prior to the beginning of the research study. The pre-test was done to determine potential areas that might have been overlooked and to establish whether the interview schedule would elicit the relevant responses that would enable the researcher to meaningfully explore, describe and understand the phenomenon under study. Pre-testing an interview schedule also improves the dependability, credibility and trustworthiness of the qualitative research tool. Three separate interviews were done with a representative from each of the three categories of the sample in the research, who did not participate in the study. The questions were generating the necessary responses. One question was added to the schedule of the beneficiaries which sought to determine the level of education of each beneficiary. The researcher realized that the question was very important given the strong correlation between a person's level of education and level of participation. No other amendments were made to the interview schedule.

3.9 Data collection

Data was collected through face to face semi-structured interviews with participants, the researcher's own observations at the sites where income generating projects were located and the studying of documentation that participants voluntarily availed to the researcher. These will be discussed separately in more detail.

3.9.1 Interviews

"Interviewing is one of the predominant methods of data collection in qualitative research" (Greeff, 2002, p. 292). During data collection semi-structured one-to-one interviews were utilized as the major mode of gathering information. The duration of every interview was approximately one hour. The set of pre-determined open ended questions guided but did not control the flow of the interview. This allowed the researcher much flexibility to follow up on interesting leads and participants managed to give a richer and more complete version of issues being discussed. According to Greeff (2002) semi-structured interviews are more suitable when the researcher is particularly interested in the complexity or process or where an issue is controversial or personal. Therefore given the contentious nature of the topic understudy and the complexities involved, the researcher anticipated that the utilization of a semi-structured interview schedule would probably facilitate the best outcomes.

Due to the dislike and discomfort of many people regarding tape recording the researcher decided not to make use of it but rather made use of field notes. Holstein & Gubrium (1995, cited in Greeff, 2002) noted that where tape recording is not used detailed process notes should be taken immediately after completion of the interview. This helped the researcher to remember and also explore the process of the interview and adequate time needed to be set aside to complete the notes. During the interviews, important information was taken down as the interview progressed and the participants knew about this because it was addressed in the participant information sheet. The field notes where expanded and completed after the interviews based on the important points noted during the interviews. This enabled the researcher to avoid a lot of data degradation that results from memory lapses should important points not been jotted down during the interview.

3.9.2 Observations

Observations were also used during the data collection process. According to Creswell (2003) the researcher can take field notes on the data observed from the research site and different roles can be assumed by the researcher either that of participant or non-participant observer. The researcher's role was that of a non-participant observer during onsite visitations to some of the

projects. Observations were a very important source of information that added to the richness of the data collected during the interviews because the researcher could probe and elicit more information from the interviewees as a result of the observations.

3.9.3 Documents

The researcher can also gather documents like newspapers, letters, office reports or any other forms of documentation that could be useful to the research (Creswell, 2003). During the study the researcher gathered a variety of documents that provided vital information and contributed to the findings generated in the study. These documents included policy documents of the Development Center; fundraising proposals, information brochures, as well as the Development Center manual which is a document that guides the operation of Development Centers in the Gauteng province published by the Gauteng Provincial Department of Social Development.

3.10 Data analysis

Thematic content analysis was used in the analysis of collected data. Once the data had been collected, the researcher familiarized himself with the obtained data by reading and rereading the data thoroughly. The data was then summarized and categorized into recurring subject matters or emerging themes, this was interpreted by integrating with relevant literature on the study and linked to the discussion of the findings in relation to the research questions, aims and objectives of the study.

During the analysis of data the following steps were followed:

Data collection and preliminary analysis-During this stage the actual data collection was done. As noted by de Vos (2002, p. 335) "data analysis in a qualitative inquiry necessitates a twofold approach. The first aspect involves data analysis at the research site during collection and the second aspect involves away from the site following the period of data collection". The first phase of data analysis by the researcher unfolded at the research site during the data collection as the researcher began to make sense of the responses that where given by participants and linked it to the research aims and objectives. As the researcher discovered, this is not an intentional process but it is natural, one cannot help it; it simply happens.

Organizing the data- this stage was basically a data management process that involved completing the field notes and organizing the data in the three categories of participants to make sure that the data was complete. This process also helped the researcher to get the fuller version of the collected data which is a very relevant step in the data analysis process. As noted by de Vos (2002), the organization of data or handwritten field notes offers an opportunity to the researcher to get immersed into the data in the transition between field work and full analysis and helps to get a feel of the cumulative data as a whole.

Familiarization and preliminary writing- during this phase of the data analysis the researcher read through all the data several times and began writing down the themes and categories that were emerging in a summarized format. This would later be expanded in the final analysis and writing up of the research report. This process is supported by de Vos (2002) who argues that the researcher must read the data transcripts in their intensity several times and get immersed in the data by breaking it into parts. This process was also very closely guided by the attempt to answer the research questions in order to achieve the aims and objectives of the research study.

Coding the data-the coding process was used to generate a description of the setting and people as well as a decision on the major categories and themes of the research. This process is supported by Creswell (2003) who noted that this kind of analysis is useful in designing detailed descriptions for case studies.

Writing up the research report- according to Marshall and Rosman (1999, cited in de Vos, 2002) writing up the research report signifies the choice of words to summaries and reflects the complexity of the data. The researcher engaged in the interpretive act, lending shape, and giving meaning to a massive amount of raw data. During this final stage of the data analysis process, the researcher attempted to support findings by integrating relevant literature, answered the research questions and related the findings to the aims and objectives of the research study.

3.11 Limitations and delimitations of the study

Credibility or trustworthiness of research findings has always been a problematic issue in qualitative research where there is bound to be researcher bias. To counter this problem the researcher cross checked comments with participants in all three categories (beneficiaries, managing staff members and funders). Where there were contradictions, an in-depth verification process was done to gather as accurate information as possible, which ensured credibility of research findings. The transferability of the qualitative research findings to other settings might also be problematic. It should however be noted that the results might still be useful to other settings as the research offers valuable insights that may be used as a guiding tool for designing a policy framework on people centered development. Also the participants could have given socially desirable answers or withheld important information from the researcher which they may have regarded as sensitive even though the researcher assured confidentiality of information shared by participants.

3.12 Ethical considerations

The researcher attempted to abide by ethical standards. Firstly permission to conduct the study was obtained from the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center and from the Department of Social Development in Gauteng. Only participants above the age of twenty were drawn into the sample. Participation in the study was voluntary and based on informed consent. Participants were informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any stage, without incurring any negative consequences. Confidentiality was discussed with participants prior to the participation in the research study. The researcher discussed the taking of process notes during interviews with the participants and obtained their permission. In cases where participants travelled for an interview the researcher reimbursed participants with an equivalent sum of money for traveling expenses and also provided them with a meal. Assurance was also given to participants that they will get feedback on the research findings once the study was completed. Lastly, permission to conduct the study was sought from the University's Research Ethics Committee (non- medical). Ethics clearance certificate No H080609 was issued by this committee. (See Appendix H).

3.13 Summary

This chapter provided an in-depth outline of how the research was undertaken. All the probable strengths and shortcomings of the research methodology and design have been clearly delineated. The ethical considerations were described in detail. Chapter Four will focus on presenting and discussing the actual findings of the research study.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter mainly focuses on the presentation and discussion of the research findings in relation to literature on participatory development and in accordance with the research questions and objectives of the study. The findings will be presented and discussed in two sections. Section A is composed of and reflects the summarized data as given by participants representing the three different categories of the research participants that is, beneficiaries of income generating projects, staff at the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center and the funders of the projects. Reflection on the summarised data will be presented per project and the commonalities will be addressed under general observations. Section B is composed of and describes the findings in the research study in relation to the research questions. Various themes emerged during the analysis of the data and these themes will be presented under the applicable research questions.

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

4.2.1 General observations

The researcher noted that there were some common characteristics in all the different projects from which participants where drawn. Membership in all the projects was not limited to the founding members alone. The membership remained open to any community member living in the Tembisa or Kempton Park vicinity, who may wish to join, subject to having followed the procedures. If a community member wanted to join any of the projects he/she had to approach the Development Center staff who would in turn link the person to the other project members who would have to enroll the person subject to their rules and regulations regarding new membership. In all the projects there were management structures which are mandated to oversee the day to day coordination of activities in the projects. The management structure comprised of a chairperson, a vice chairperson, a secretary and the vice secretary, the treasurer and the vice

treasurer. The structure differed slightly in some of the projects beneficiaries opted to have fewer people in their management structures. The tenure in office for the position was said to lapse after a year. New office bearers would then be democratically elected into office by all the members participating in the project. There was also a selected panel of members who were tasked to look into disciplinary issues or conflict among members as it may arise. The panel was only selected to hear a particular matter thereafter it was dissolved. As a last resort members in all of the projects would approach the staff from Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center when they failed to resolve their disputes internally.

4.2.2 The Sewing project

Two participants where interviewed on this particular project. The sewing project was not initiated by the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center. The project started in 1999 before the Development Center was founded in 2002. The initiative was community driven and the project came about as a result of community members who organized themselves and formed community co-operatives. Initially, three co-operatives where formed composed of 25 members in each that all got involved in sewing. Each member within the co-operative had to contribute a sewing machine and R50 to the project as startup capital. The money was used to purchase other accessories and materials needed in the sewing trade. Regardless of all the community efforts that went into starting these initiatives, little progress was made in terms of profitably running these small business enterprises. This was largely due to insufficient startup capital, lack of business skills, technical skills and the difficulty to compete in the main stream market. This necessitated the community members to approach the Gauteng Provincial Department Welfare to fund their initiatives.

Due to the complexities surrounding government bureaucracy in service delivery, money could not be channeled directly to the accounts of individual community members and this necessitated the need for a formalized structure. The Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center then became the patron through which government was going to fund community development initiatives in the Tembisa and Kempton Park area. As a precondition for funding, the three co-operatives had to merge into becoming one entity which then comprised of all 75 members.

With the help of the Development Center the community members came up with a business proposal which they submitted to the Development Center. The Development Center had to support the community members through the process of writing up a business plan largely due to the very low level of formal education of the majority of the people participating in the project. It took three months before the Development Center informed them that their proposal had been accepted for funding.

Before they received funding, the Development Center organized a six week training programme to upgrade the skills level of all the community members who were beneficiaries of this initiative. Immediately after the completion of the training programme the beneficiaries were given a starter pack which included industrial sewing machines of different types and other accessories needed in the sewing trade.

To lend support, the government contracted the beneficiaries of the sewing project to do various business tasks for them. These contracts given particularly involved sewing school uniforms for children who where enrolled in the local surrounding schools whose uniforms where being sponsored by the Provincial Department of Social Development. Ever since then the project has primary relied on government contracts as their major money generating source. The community however does not solely rely on government contracts as they sometimes get business from individual people and other organizations surrounding Tembisa. As noted by Participant **A,**

"*We are struggling to get customers for our micro- enterprise and we largely rely on the Development Center to look for customers on our behalf. This owes largely to our lack of business skills; all of us have very low education levels*".

Out of the 75 people that formed the sewing project in the aftermath of the merger of the three co-operatives, only 11 members remained part of the project. When asked about the reason of the mass exodus of members, participant **B** comments that,

"Many of the members became tired along the way. The money that the project was generating was so little that it was not sufficient for the basic needs of members and many people left as a result".

Participant **A** replied that,

"*Most of the people who left managed to go and start their own small business enterprises given the skills they have amassed during their period of enrolment in the project".*

Both participants, **A** and **B** who were interviewed in the sewing project noted that,

"*The project has changed their lives for the better*".

They felt that they were empowered and capacitated to work for their own survival rather than being dependant. Participant **A** said that,

"*Because of this project I can buy my own food, pay my own rent and fees for my children with the money that I generate, I have even started my own small business at home to expand my income base".*

On her involvement in the project participant **B** noted that,

"*Members of the project have become like a family as they managed to build strong bonds".*

During crisis times like bereavement, the members provide financial, physical and moral support to the affected member or members. Thus for them the project has created a platform for social interactions and relationship building that enables members to extent their circle of friends and also provides a sense of belonging.

Participants in the sewing project have also managed to initiate another new business venture that is now enabling them to increase their income generating potential as they diversify their business activities. In the process they have also managed to create employment for other people within the Tembisa community. The current new business venture is a food outlet that mainly provides lunch to community members and other people working near the location of the food outlet.

The researcher also gathered that the project had been helped a lot by the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center. The Center provided them with information on many economic opportunities and through the provision of capacity building programmes which mainly included training on basic business management skills, report writing, financial management, and the

beneficiaries' capacities developed. The Center also provided support when consulted on various matters.

Asked about whether they would want to start business venture of their own participants in the project noted that, they would want to start other profitable projects on their own but capital remained a huge impediment to their aspirations. Participant **A** said that,

"I would want to start a recreational facility for children I think it is a very lucrative venture given that there is a gap in the market for such services".

Thus given that she could have her own way regarding sourcing of capital and premises for her business venture she would not want in any way to be involved in the sewing project.

The participants also noted that a lot still needed to change if their project was to become successful. They noted that the project had the capacity and potential to grow into a big firm but they don't have capital to diversify their services. One of the huge impediments to the success of the project was the location from which they operate. This is obscured from the eyes of many potential customers and given their lack of professional marketing skills their business relies only on few customers which in turn mean that limited money is generated.

4.2.3 Cleaning and Garden project

One participant was interviewed about the cleaning and gardening project. The cleaning and gardening project was started as a voluntary initiative by unemployed members of the Tembisa community. When the project started they mainly used to do cleaning in schools around their communities and other public places on a voluntary basis. Later on when the Tembisa Kempton Park Development Center was initiated in 2002, the members of the cleaning project submitted a business proposal to the organization. After acceptance their project was given a capital injection in the form of machines for cleaning and grass cutting. Among some of the activities they do is cutting grass at schools, churches, houses and planting of flowers when required by their customers.

While the motive of the project has been to alleviate poverty, meaningful progress has thus far not been forthcoming. Participant **C** noted that,

"*My continual involvement in the project is only because I do not have any other alternative…"*

She argued that very little progress had been made in the growth of the project and it is very difficult to operate the project due to a variety of factors. Among some of the challenges the participant alluded to were a convenient place from which to operate, transport to go to distant customers and lack of customers for the business due to their inability to market the business properly. She also lamented the fact that the project had received very little support from the Tembisa Kempton Park Development Center ever since its establishment but acknowledged the fact that the new manager who had just joined the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center was actively engaging them and she hoped things would change.

Asked about whether she would want to start up any other project apart from the cleaning and gardening project, participant **C** noted that,

"I would want to start up a laundry business which I think would be more viable than the project I am currently involved in but capital remains the only obstacle in my way".

The project has a management structure that compromises of two directors, whom the participant argued were more active than all the other members. Participant **C** said that,

"*Other members are illiterate and they usually sit back and only take instructions from the directors".*

The participant felt that the project had done very little to meaningfully change her life, she argues that she is just hanging in there and hope keeps her going as there is little success in the project. She bewailed the lack capital for them to properly structure their business as the main reason why the project is still struggling. It was also said that all the people involved in the project are old and she argued that most youth lack patience and cannot cope with having to get very little or no finances at all over a long period of time.

4.2.4 The welding project

Three participants were interviewed about the welding project. The roots of the beginning of the welding project can be traced back to one individual who was self taught in the trade and he decided to start his own small business venture. As a prerequisite for funding in 2002 he formed a group with other community members who were interested in the trade and then approached the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center with their business proposal which was accepted for funding.

The welding project usually has new members coming to join but they do not last for long, once they acquire the skills most members go and seek employment in big companies where it is financially more rewarding than staying in the project itself. Participant **E** lamented this, arguing that,

"It is very unfair to us given that we spent a lot of the time and effort training community members who join the project only for them to leave after they have acquired the skills".

Participant **D** argued that,

"The government needs to pay us for all the people whom we trained to compensate us for our time and effort; we are capacitating people while we get nothing for it".

Asked about whether there were any projects that they would prefer to be involved in other than the welding project, participants felt that the welding project is the priority for them as they voluntary chose to be involved in it from the beginning when it was founded. They however, lamented the fact they have insufficient operating capital which will enable them to upgrade their machinery in order for them to diversify their range of services. Participants pointed out that currently the equipment they have, can only perform a limited range of tasks and they lose out on lucrative business because of that. There was also a general agreement by participants of the welding project who where interviewed that, the project is struggling to get customers and they do not have marketing skills needed for them to broaden their customer base.

Participants also highlighted the fact that their project was failing to attract educated people with business knowledge and skills who would add value and growth to the project. As noted by participants **E** and **F**,

"*we preferred the welding project because we never went to school, welding is easy to do when one is taught, but it is very difficult to know how to market and grow the project especially given our lack of education".*

The Development Centre is however involving beneficiaries in educational programmes that will empower them. Participant **D** said that,

"*The Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center occasionally invites us to participate in capacity building and training workshops that help to enhance our business management skills".*

However, only one member of the project regularly attends workshops arranged for them by the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center. Participant **D** said that,

"Other participants are not confident and are very uncomfortable to participate in the workshops largely due to illiteracy".

4.2.5 Bakery project

Three participants involved in the bakery project were interviewed by the researcher. The baking project was started in 2001 before the establishment of the development which was an initiative of the then Gauteng Ministry of Health and Social Welfare. Community members were encouraged to mobilize themselves into groups and come up with viable business plans which would then be government funded. It was also a requirement then, that the community members needed to demonstrate or poses some skills within the area of business focus they chose. Participant **G** became involved in the baking project primarily because he had previous experience in baking.

When asked about what could be done differently to improve the performance of the project, participant **G** argued that,

"On our own we are incapable of raising financial capital that is needed to buy modern equipment that will enable us to increase production and also become more competitive in the mainstream business sector".

Participant **I** said that,

"The project is currently struggling to expand on its market share owing to their inability to aggressively market their products given the high levels of competition in the sector".

Participant **H** highlighted the fact that,

"*We have just lost out on a government contract to supply bread to some of the local schools in Tembisa. We were competing with well established big supplying companies, who use modern equipment, and can afford to buy their flour more cheaply direct from producers and have got good transportation systems while our bakery does not even have any means of transport. Currently the bakery project relies on two major buyers which aren't enough to bring significant progress in the project".*

Participants also highlighted that they wanted to diversify their products which included among other things producing ice-creams and yogurts but capital remains the only impediment in the way. When the bakery project was started they where only given a startup package of equipment without any working capital that would cover payment of rentals, telephone bills, ingredients like flour, sugar and other products that where needed. Thus members had to contribute money from their own personal savings, which was very minimal, towards the working capital of the project to enable the venture to flourish. As a remedy to this participants argued that there is a need to improve the financial package given to projects as start up capital. All the participants stressed that they needed more finances to reinvent the project's image. The money, if availed, would secure them a better place of operation, new equipment, product diversification and buying a delivery truck. On their own they cannot raise such a large amount of capital, yet without it their project will continue to struggle.

The participants felt that the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center failed to help them in meaningful ways. The participants noted that the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center do not have the capacity within their staff members to transfer the much needed business skills to the beneficiaries. To remedy this shortcoming it was suggested that by participant **G** that,

"There is need for the government to recruit qualified graduates who come to support the projects for a period of time until the community has benefited from getting exposure in business development and the much needed marketing skills to enable the projects to improve on their market share".

Asked about the positive experiences that the project has promoted, participants noted that, they had managed to extend their circle of friends beyond the confines of their own families. They also noted that they felt empowered through their involvement in the project; they all get a monthly salary which enables them to provide for their basic necessities. Participant **H** noted that,

"My involvement in the project has managed to make me independent and claim my self worth as I can work for myself".

She however noted that her involvement in the project was merely because she did not have any other better option and she still hopes that something better will come along the way and then she will immediately leave the project.

In the bakery project the money generated is shared among members on a monthly basis. The salary level of each member is determined by the period of the member's involvement within the project. The longer the period of involvement the better the salary the member will get. New members are given a period of probation during which their earnings are rather low and the salary level is only raised at the end of the probation period.

4.2.6 The Hope poultry co-operative

One participant was interviewed by the researcher about the poultry project. Like all the other projects, the hope poultry co-operative was also started before the establishment of the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center. The project was started in 1998. At the time of data

collection in July 2007, it was approximately a year after the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center had intervened to partner with the Hope poultry project. The members are also bound by the service level agreement between them and the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center which was signed prior to receiving funding.

The members are the workers and owners of the business as with the other projects and management of the project is a community driven process. On a daily basis members give each other duties to carry out and members take turns to feed the chickens following their agreed upon time table. The project is highly successful but its growth is constrained by a variety of factors. Currently the project gets more demand for their chickens than the supply they are capable of handling. Thus most of the time customers come and return empty handed given the very high demand for their chickens. The participant noted that, they do not have a convenient place from which to operate the project where there is enough space to enlarge their brood of chickens. Although the project is currently very successful the community members cannot build and expand on this success without having enough land. The input prices are also continuously increasing and they do not have enough capital to buy in bulk and stock inputs.

As a result of her involvement in the project, the participant said that,

"The opportunity enabled me to realize my business acumen and I now have confidence in myself to do much more challenging and rewarding business ventures. Capital however remains the main impediment in my way".

The participant noted that she would want to start vegetable farming and a bakery of her own. However the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center cannot fund her as an individual and more so, they cannot fund a similar project to the one that already exists in the area. As for vegetable farming she argued that the inputs needed are not very expensive but it is nearly impossible to access land on which one can farm.

The participant also noted that, she had managed to meet a lot of people who have contributed a lot to her life as a result of her involvement in the Hope poultry project. She had also set for herself a three year target after which she hopes to become financially independent so that she can take on a new business initiative.

4.2.7 Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center staff

Three staff members were interviewed by the researcher. The Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center is a Non Governmental Organisation (NGO) that is mainly responsible for partnering community members in the Tembisa and Kempton Park area in their community development initiatives. Participant **K** is largely involved in the management of the Development Center. Chief among his duties is to ensure that community projects run smoothly, efficiently and productively. The role of the Development Center in the projects involves policy formulation on the criteria that is used to fund income generating projects and guidelines on how project beneficiaries should conduct their business. This is not a control mechanism but rather general guidelines that are meant to support the successful development of the projects.

It is also the duty of the Development Center staff to ensure accountability on the part of project member beneficiaries when they are given funding for particular initiatives. The Development Center also receives funding from government and it is the channel through which the funds will be disbursed to start new projects or strengthen existing ones. It is also one of the core duties of the development centre staff to fundraise and harness financial and material resources apart from government funding which is often not sufficient to meet the start up needs for community projects. At the time of data collection for the purpose of this research little efforts had thus far been done by the staff at the Development Center to make substantial inroads as regards to fundraising. As such there is too much reliance on government as the sole funder of the projects. Participants did however indicate that plans were underway to step up their fundraising efforts so as to broaden their financial base.

The staff members at the Development Center have ongoing contact either on a weekly or monthly basis with the beneficiaries from different projects in which they discuss the overall progress and performance of the different projects. It is also at such meetings where they discuss any concerns that the beneficiaries of income generating projects might have. There is basically a mutual working relationship between the Development Center staff and project beneficiaries. Much of the development process is however community driven and the Development Center is only there to guide and support the beneficiaries on an ongoing basis and when needs arise.

It is also the role of the Development Center to facilitate and provide training to the beneficiaries of income generating projects. This involves organizing training programmes that will capacitate and empower beneficiaries with knowledge and skills that will be beneficial and useful for the projects that they are or will be involved in. Some of the training programmes organized include; computer training, tender process training, basic business management and report writing.

The Development Center also ensures that the project beneficiaries comply with the minimum standards required in terms of, registration of business entities paying up of annual fees and tax registration. It is also the duty of the Development Center to ensure that the quality of goods and services provided by the project beneficiaries complies with minimum product quality standards and to ensure that the goods and services produced are competitive on the market.

The Development Center is also responsible for the selection of new projects for funding. Within this process, community members organize themselves into groups of not less than ten people and they submit a business plan to the Development Center. Based on the viability of the business plan and availability of the funds the Development Center selects the project that they will fund. Participants noted that it is unusual for the Development Center to contribute the full amount requested by the beneficiaries in the business plan due to insufficient funds and they end up spreading resources thinly over a number of projects.

If a project is chosen for funding by the Development Center, the project is formally registered as a cooperative or private cooperation. The community usually does not have knowledge on how to go about registering a company or cooperative thus, it is the responsibility of the Development Center staff to link and provide them with information on how to go about registering their projects.

The projects are located within the various locations of the Tembisa community and the Development Center is the central place for coordinating all activities. A project officer is directly responsible for ongoing contacts with the management teams of each project. Participants also noted that the greatest challenge facing the Development Center is to ensure

that projects get a sizeable market niche for their products, which will ensure that the projects are sustainable and independent.

The success of income generating projects is also reliant upon linkages with various stakeholders. Hence, the Development Center as the patron for all the income generating projects interacts with various stakeholders for the benefit of the beneficiaries. Some of the stakeholders include; government departments, local community leadership, private sector businesses and other stakeholders depending and determined by the specific need of a particular situation.

It was noted by the participants that most of the beneficiaries have never been involved in running their own businesses and they do not have experience within the cooperate sector. As such they need a lot of support if they are to become successful in running their projects. This necessitates the need for mentoring of beneficiaries of income generating projects by the Development Center staff. The mentoring is done in such a way that it builds the confidence of the beneficiaries to enable them to manage the projects on their own.

The Development Center also does not allow replication of projects. Thus if other members in the community want to submit a business plan/proposal for funding it needs to be a project that is different from those already existing. Different channels are used to spread information to the community on the services offered at the Development Center these entail; the local newspaper, local radio station, information brochures, and by word of mouth spread by community members who are benefiting or may have benefited from the services.

The staff from the Development Center also outsource some of the functions to external people to do consultancy work on areas that the staff are not capable of doing on their own. The participants indicated that this is very costly and they often do not have the means to afford consultants.

4.2.8 The Funders

Two participants from the funder category were interviewed. The researcher gathered that the Development Center relied on the Gauteng Provincial Department of Social Development as the sole funder. Not much information was obtained from the funders since they had a very minimal

role to play in the running of the projects. They however do have certain expectations that are in a way mandatory for the Development Center to adhere to in order to continue receiving funding. The expectations of the funder to the Development Center entail that the Development Center should employ people to fill the positions of Development Center Manager, Project officer, Administrator, and the Advice Center officer. The organisation also needs to have a Board of Directors who posses financial, project management and fundraising skills. Apart from these expectations, the Development Center staff is also expected to, keep all financial records and audit statements, ensure transparent tender awarding process and attempt to secure other sources of funding apart from Gauteng Provincial Department of Social Development.

4.3 Summary

Section A provided summarised data based on information drawn from interviews by the participants in the three categories of the research sample. Based on this data a discussion of findings of the study will be outlined in section B which follows.

4.4 Section B: Discussion of findings in relation to the research questions.

4.4.1 Research question one: To what extent are beneficiaries participating in and contributing to the planning and implementation of income generating projects at Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center?

Participation in the criteria for involvement- The point of departure in the initial stage of the development process at the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center is that members of the community have to group themselves into a group of more than 10 members who can then approach the Development Center staff for support with start up capital for their project. The selection criteria for involvement is not imposed upon the beneficiaries by the Development Center staff and there is a high level of autonomy within this process as it is largely decided upon by the community members themselves. This is the beginning of evidence towards active community participation in the development process as this process is community driven.

Participation in project identification- The beneficiaries at the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center have the autonomy to choose a business idea or project of their choice that they want to be involved in. It is not the duty of the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center to impose or choose particular projects of their choice and impose it on the community members. This also points to evidence towards greater involvement of beneficiaries as active participants as the development process unfolds. This is in line with the Social Development principles as outlined in the White Paper for Social Welfare (1997) that ordinary citizens will be afforded the opportunity to play an active role in promoting their well-being and in contributing to the growth and development of the nation. As argued by Patel (2005), the point of departure of the social developmental approach is that social welfare users of services and those who seek help are not passive recipients of services but are active allies in solving social and economic conditions which impede people's functioning. It is therefore highly encouraging to see that the beneficiaries of income generating projects at the Development Center are not just mere subjects, but rather active stakeholders who have leverage as regards to the way or direction that the development process should unfold. This also points towards occurrence of meaningful participation. Power in decision making as evidence for participation is also supported by de Beer and Swanepoel (2000), who argue that people affected by development projects are to be the main role- players and decision makers and they ought not to be "a passive citizenry".

Also the fact that beneficiaries are given the power to decide on a project of their own choice points to the fact that they have power over the definition of need. This is also a strong indication of meaningful participation as the community needs take precedence over that of the Development Center. The Development Center will only guide this process to ensure that the community chooses an idea that will be viable or profitable as a business. The community's power over definition of need is supported by Ife (2002) who argues that, one of the characteristics of modern society is the "dictatorship over needs" in that needs are often determined and defined not by the person who has the need but by external parties. This according to Ife (2002) is disempowering and an empowerment perspective would require that people be given power to define their own needs.

Ife (2002) goes on to mention two critical community work principles relating to the establishment of needs. The first is that community development should seek to bring about agreement between the different need definers. Therefore there is a need for dialogues among all the stakeholders to ensure consensus about the community's needs and the need definition of the people themselves ought to take precedence despite the views of other need definers. Community development as defined by Ife (1995, p. 199) is, "a process of helping communities to articulate their own needs and then to act so they can be met". In order for this to be realized people must themselves own and control the process of need appraisal and classification. It is therefore positive to note that the development process at the Development Center is handled in such a way that, the beneficiaries have power and control over the process of need identification and definition. This also points towards strong evidence of active and meaningful community participation.

Also the fact that the beneficiaries are given power over definition of needs points to change from below rather than change as imposed from above by "experts". In apartheid times as is also now most development organizations and government departments used top down management styles in delivering welfare services and this means that the community was co-opted as passive recipients of services and they had no choice. Promoting change from below is therefore a strong indicator of active community involvement in the development process. Using change from below as a way of promoting meaningful community participation is supported by Ife (2002) who noted that instead of using bureaucratic top-down structures in social development, there is need for a bottom -up approach in which the needs as defined by the people take precedence. Thus, there is greater evidence towards people centered development by the Development Center as their initiatives are being responsive to the needs of the beneficiaries as defined by them. The Development Center's role becomes that of an assisting agency in a largely community driven process.

Participation through consultation in project design- When the community has identified a project they have to go to the Development Center staff to discuss more on the business idea to determine whether or not the project will be viable. The assessment of viability is a process in which beneficiaries and the staff of the Development Center engaged as equal partners. When

the community submits a business plan, the Development Center sets up an appointment with all members in which beneficiaries will be interviewed to gather information on their readiness to undertake the venture and also to brainstorm on the potential impediments or opportunities that the project might have. The community's active participation in this consultative process points to evidence towards genuine and ongoing active community engagement within the development process. This form of participation is different to that of tokenism identified by Arnstein (1969, cited in Bowen, 2007) whereby community consultation is done to merely ratify decisions of "experts". At the Development Center, the consultation process fosters genuine participation in that the beneficiaries are not being co-opted in what the Development Center staff planned but, it is rather the Development Center staff who are co-opted in what the community members have planned as a way to strengthen and improve their project design. The practice of consultation is common in all business activity whereby people seek the advice of peers or private consultants to improve the prospects for success. Such form of active participatory consultation in which the community is not a junior partner, but an equal stakeholder is advocated for by Freire (1970) who argued that, we cannot simply go to people in "banking style" to give them knowledge or impose upon them what we think is good contained in programmes whose content the people themselves never organized. Also the consultation process is very important in that, the development Center cannot just blindly give money or resources to the community to initiate a project before a careful analysis of the prospects for success has been done, given that most of the beneficiaries do not possess any business skills.

The consultation process also helps beneficiaries to be alert and become more aware and more critical of their own business plan as they get questioned on how they seek to undertake the execution of the business plan. This open forum discussion and consultation is also an important educative tool for both the beneficiaries and the staff members. Dialogue as an educative tool for participation is supported by Freire (1970) who argues that dialogue that requires critical thinking generates and helps to mould people to become critical. Without such dialogue communication is absent and the absence of communication in turn means there is no learning that takes place. It is therefore evident that the consultation process between beneficiaries and Development Center staff during the development process is not only educative but also participative in nature. This open dialogue in a way affirms the belief in the beneficiaries'

capabilities by the Development Center staff and it also affirms their worth and dignity by being listened to and being engaged with. Freire (1969 as cited in Burkey 1993, p.57) further postulates that, "attempting to liberate the oppressed without their reflective participation in the act of liberation is to treat them as objects which must be saved from a burning building; it is to lead them into the populist pitfall and transform them into masses which can be manipulated". Thus, the active engagement of the beneficiaries during the consultation process points towards a participatory development process at the Development Center. According to Burkey (1993), such a participatory process is an essential part of human growth that leads to the development of self confidence, initiative, creativity, responsibility and cooperation, without which all efforts to alleviate poverty will be immensely more difficult.

Participation through resource contribution- Bowen (2007) identifies resource contribution as one of the indicators that point to strong evidence towards community participation in anti-poverty programmes. Resource contribution takes place in different forms; it can be financial, material, knowledge or any other form of help that an individual can bring to a project. At the Development Center, community members participate in various ways as a way of resource contribution.

Material resource contribution- Beneficiaries at the Development Center actively participate in the development process through material contributions. Looking at the sewing project as an example each individual had to bring a sewing machine from their homes as a contribution to the start up package to the project before the Development Center was established. This points towards active participation by community members; they are not just passive recipients of welfare provisions but rather active participants who proactively take responsibility to improve their own well-being. Material resources contribution as participation is also supported by Chambers (1993, as cited in Nelson and Wright, 1995) who noted that if local people fully participate in the designing of development projects, there is a likelihood that capital costs would be largely reduced as beneficiaries are likely to meet some of the running costs of the project and also take ownership and undertake maintenance of the project.

At the Development Center resource contribution does not only happen in the sewing project but in all the other projects. Given the insufficient funds at the disposal of the Development Center

contrasted to the high level capital costs needed to start-up or upgrade the projects, it has always been the case that beneficiaries do not receive the full amount of capital needed. This then forces beneficiaries to seek alternative ways of raising additional capital and by so doing they become more involved and take responsibility and ownership of the project due to their personal investments into the project. Material contributions also enable beneficiaries to mentally and emotionally invest their energies into the project to ensure that it becomes a success as they would want to recoup their initial investments into the project through profits. In so doing it increases their commitment to the project more than if they had not contributed anything at all.

Resource contribution also increases a high sense of ownership of the project. Participant C argued that,

"I can not quit the project when I have invested so much in the project, though others may quit at some point, quitting for me is never an option and I am determined to see the project succeeding".

It is also interesting to note that most of the members who pioneered projects that are struggling have not quitted even though new members who joined at a later stage have already left. This points to a very strong correlation between material, emotional and mental investment into a project and the amount of commitment and determination that one will be willing to put into the project to make it a success.

Material contributions as a form of participation helps to eliminate dependence syndrome, which is often fostered by welfare programmes in which communities are made passive recipients of welfare provisions like grants. Participant **A** and **B** indicated that their involvement in the sewing project meant that they won't have to passively wait for the government or their husbands to provide money for them as they are now empowered and capacitated to generate money for themselves. Thus, instead of people looking at themselves as helpless victims they see themselves as people with potential to bring change to their unfavorable circumstances. This also asserts their value, dignity and confidence. Burkey (1993, p. 56) also supports material contribution by the community in development projects, arguing that, "this process whereby

people learn to take charge of their own lives and solve their own problems, is the essence of development".

Financial resources contribution as participation- Also beneficiaries participate in resource contributions through provision of money by each member. Looking at the poultry project as a case example, the project was initiated before the Development Center was established and the finances that were used as startup capital came from the savings of individuals who had to each contribute a particular amount. In the sewing project members had to each contribute R50 to enable them to buy materials and other accessories needed for sewing. While the community may not be able to become self-reliant in the short-term; these seemingly small and insignificant contributions mark the steps towards self reliance of the community which should become the ultimate aim of all community development initiatives. Ife (2002) supports the notion of community self-reliance and argues that, self-reliance is one of the chief principles of community development and communities need to be able to survive and sustain themselves without much reliance on outside sources. Without considerable self-reliance, community-based structures will not be feasible in the long-term. While external funding is indispensable Ife (2002) noted that, it should be in the short term with the ultimate aim of minimizing or eliminating it altogether.

Labour as participation through resource contribution- Labour is also one of the ways in which active and meaningful community participation is being realized in income generating projects managed by the Development Center. While it is often common to find communities being merely co-opted into providing labour in most development projects, the difference at the Development Center is that it is the people who initiated these projects and they are actively providing labour for projects that they initiated. Thus, beneficiaries are self employed workers in their own projects. Also the labor done in the projects is not imposed upon by the Development Center staff but it is the beneficiaries who decide on their own how they want to run their projects and the role that each member will play in the project. Hence, there is a great degree of autonomy and self-determination for the community in the manner in which projects are managed. This is also the hall-mark of genuine participation. Ife (2002) argues that people will participate if they feel that their actions are valued and will make a difference, given that beneficiaries work on what they, themselves decided upon, it means that they consider the work

important and they also firmly believe that their actions will indeed make a difference. This also points to genuine participation of beneficiaries in income generating projects at the Development Center.

Also, labour as a way of promoting participation is empowering to the community. In projects such as the bakery, sewing, and welding there is need for beneficiaries to first gain the skills before they can provide their labour in the projects. Thus, there has been a lot of capacity building for community members who joined these projects as they are taught by their experienced counterparts. The skilling becomes and important indicator of capacitating and empowerment of the people, which in turn means beneficiaries are genuinely enabled to participate in the projects. Most beneficiaries have exited the sewing and welding projects once they possessed the skills. Participant **A** and **D** pointed out that, most of the people get employed in industries once they get experience from participating in the projects and some have initiated their own small business ventures. This points to evidence of genuine community participation. Empowerment and participation go hand in hand and the reason why people exit these projects is because they have not only been skilled but they would also have accumulated experience and wisdom that they in turn can use to better their lives. Imparting community people with skills is supported by Ife (2002) as an important empowerment initiative and he noted that, one of the most important points about promoting and valuing local skills is that it empowers rather than disempowers the local people. Using local skills provides people with prospects to make meaningful contributions and strengthens self reliance and social capital within the community itself.

Participation during implementation of the project- Some of the most active forms of participation namely that of labour, material and financial contributions by beneficiaries in the development process during project implementation have already been discussed. However during implementation, participation goes beyond mere labour, material and financial contributions to include the strategic planning and operational planning of the project deliverables. During this process the community takes ownership and responsibility to determine the direction that the project will take. The income generated by beneficiaries is also controlled by them and they share or use it at their own discretion. One example to illustrate this is when

the beneficiaries in the sewing project decided to start a food outlet in order for them to broaden their income base. While this was a diversion from their core project, they did not need to ask for any permission from the Development Center staff though they do report on their activities to them. This points to strong community ownership and control of the development process and it confirms genuine and active community participation by the community in income generating projects.

On the other hand community participation during project implementation can also be witnessed during conflict resolution. It is common that whenever there are different people working together, conflict is inevitable. What is important is how conflict will be handled. If conflict is well managed it can in many instances be good for the development of both the beneficiaries and the growth of the projects. All participants reiterated that they resort to roundtable discussions as a way of managing conflict and charting the way forward for the project. Within the sewing project there is a special committee that is elected to deal with conflict or misconduct of a member/s. It is only in cases where beneficiaries on their own have failed to manage a problematic situation that the intervention of the Development Center will be sought. The fact that the beneficiaries can solve their problems is also evidence towards empowerment and community participation.

Participation during monitoring and evaluation- Beneficiaries also actively participate in the development process when monitoring and evaluating the activities that take place within each of the projects. Monitoring and evaluation is done on an ongoing basis and currently the time limit at which the Development Center will no longer be involved in supporting the projects has not yet been decided upon. It is the researcher's view that this situation might be very problematic given that in participatory development projects, organizations need to preferably have a time limit after which they will permanently hand over the project to the community. It is important that the project belongs to the community and therefore full ownership needs to be transferred to the community. The situation currently is that the Development Center staff monitors and evaluates on an ongoing basis the progress in each project. The beneficiaries are not passive in this process; rather they assume a more active role through monthly report writing detailing their successes, challenges, financial status and any other things happening within the project. Should

there be any challenges the development Center can quickly intervene to help the project. It should also be noted that the intervention of the Development Center staff is not imposed on the beneficiaries but it is by mutual consent and for the benefit of the beneficiaries themselves.

Women's involvement as evidence of participation- One of the hallmarks pointing to participation is that of involvement of previously marginalized groups especially women, who in times past where allocated peripheral roles in society and largely sidelined in all important matters. The deprived status of women has been one of the central issues in development today and many institutions require or impose quotas of their composition which prescribe a mandatory number of women to be included. The Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center is no exception as they require that women need to be strongly represented in all projects. Rahman (1990, cited in Shepherd, 1998) supports the inclusion of women as a hallmark of participation arguing that one of the indicators by which participation can be measured is the progress made for women to articulate their points of view, and the evolution of gender relations towards equality, as assessed by women themselves.

According a research done by the World Bank cited in Kinyashi and Masanyiwa (2008, p. 11) it was discovered that "gender biases in participatory development projects may exist in the form of customs, beliefs, and attitudes that confine women mostly to the domestic sphere; women's economic and domestic workloads that impose severe time burdens on them." It is however very encouraging to note that about 80% of the beneficiaries involved in the income generating projects of the Development Center are women. This is a strong indicator and pointer to community participation in projects at the Development Center.

4.4.2 Research question two: Are beneficiaries empowered to participate and manage the Development process independently?

It is the view of the researcher that participation, it should be noted, is not an event but a process. Any meaningful participatory development process should have as its ultimate aim the empowerment of the community to enable them to manage the development process independently. Participation as a process should therefore always culminate in the complete handover of the project to the community. The time for the withdrawal of an organization from a community project may not be fixed because communities are different and the right time is

when the community indicates that it is ready to function independently, the organization must then withdraw. In the researcher's view it is desirable that the shorter the time the organisations intervenes before termination the better. At the Development Center the main concern is whether the community can manage the projects on their own without their help. This view is supported by Lovell (1992) who stressed the need for the communities to quickly become self- reliant in all aspects, when engaged in poverty alleviation development projects.

Thus, if it is possible that the community can cope without the Development Center it means that they would have been really empowered to participate and manage the development process independently. Looking closely at the projects being managed by the Development Center it was clear during the data collection that some projects are already being managed more independently with very minimal support from the Development Center while in other projects participants indicated that it will be very difficult for them to manage without the help of the Development Center and they may ultimately crumble. One such example is the sewing project where beneficiaries largely rely on the Development Center for them to secure business tenders. Participant **A** noted that on their own, beneficiaries of the sewing project were failing to get any customers due to increased competition and their inability to aggressively market their services. This is in contrast to the beneficiaries in the poultry project who are failing to meet customer demand for their products. Their project is doing very well with little help from the Development Center; their only limitation has been their inability to secure a bigger space of land to allow them to expand their project.

In both the above cases beneficiaries still need help from the Development Center. In the case of the sewing project there is need to equip beneficiaries with marketing skills to enable them to secure customers or tenders on their own. In the poultry project there is need help beneficiaries to secure a bigger space to operate from. It is such pertinent issues that the Development Center staff need to focus on before beneficiaries are able to manage the development process independently. This however seems very unlikely given the serious lack of administrative capacity on the part of the Development Center staff to handle some of these challenges facing income generating projects. Therefore the empowerment of beneficiaries to manage the

development process independently still needs attention and guidance. The lack of empowerment explains why most the projects have only managed very modest success.

4.4.3 Research question three- How do funder expectations influence the development process in income generating projects implemented by the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center?

One of the research questions was to look at how funder expectations influence the development process of income generating projects at the Development Center. It was established that the Gauteng Provincial Department of Social Development is currently the sole funder of all the operations at the Development Center. As a pre-condition to the funding there are some expectations that need to be fulfilled by the Development Center staff. The question of funder expectations has always raised strong debate in the participatory development praxis as many people believe that it is an impediment to genuine participation due to funder prescriptions or dictatorship. Funding often implies more involvement on the part of government, other aid agencies and private sector responsible for bankrolling social development initiatives. This may become a threat to people participation as most aid comes with strings and conditions attached. As propounded by Ife (1995, p. 111), "reliance on external resources comes at a price; namely the price of loss of autonomy and independency, genuine autonomous communities can only flourish in the absence of such external dependency".

It was however very interesting to note in this research that, contrary to the widely held notion of negative funder prescriptions, funder expectations can sometimes ensure that receiving organizations become more accountable and better equipped to deliver on their services. The expectations of the Gauteng Provincial Department of Social Development do not in any way affect the autonomy of beneficiaries of income generating projects. The expectations of the funder to the Development Center entail that the Development Center should have staff members to occupy the positions of, Development Center Manager, Project officer, Administrator, and the Advice Center officer. The organisation also needs to have a Board of Directors who possess financial, project management and fundraising skills. Apart from these expectations, the

Development Center staff is also expected to keep all financial records and audit statements, ensure transparent tender awarding process and to have alternative sources funding apart from Gauteng Provincial Department of Social Development.

These funder expectations are positive in that it ensures that there are good business practices and strict accountability on the part of the Development Center. Without such expectations or demands from the funder the Development Center may as is the case with many other organizations end up abusing funds that are intended to benefit the community. Thus in this case funder expectations ensure that the community is protected against potential abuse as the funders will monitor but not dictate how funds will be used. Also funder expectations work to ensure that minimum standards for organizational operation are adhered to, like having enough staff to deliver services and a management board to help manage the Development Center. Thus the monitoring by Gauteng Provincial Department of Social Development of the organization's activities benefits rather than prejudices the community.

4.4.4 Research questions four: What are the obstacles hindering beneficiaries' participation in income generating projects at Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center?

The last research question the researcher sought to explore was in connection with the obstacles impeding the genuine and meaningful participation of beneficiaries in income generating projects at the Development Center. The researcher established that while the model being used to manage projects is largely participatory and community driven, it is not without its own challenges. The main hindrances identified were institutional, structural and social in nature. These main hindrances will be discussed briefly.

(a) Institutional barriers to community participation

The first institutional barrier identified was that of ***administrative capacity***. Administrative capacity of organizations that support the community in a participatory development process is of utmost importance. It is therefore imperative that organizations have to be adequately staffed with the right people who possess the right skills needed to adequately support the participatory

development process. At the Development Center the lack of administrative capacity may be one of the reasons that account for the modest performance of all projects.

The researcher identified that most of the income generating projects are largely dependant on marketing for their success. Thus marketing becomes one of the "must have" skills by staff at the Development Center if they are to meaningfully support the beneficiaries. It would also be expected that this all important skill should be imparted to the beneficiaries so that they may independently on their own be able to market their products without having to dependent on the Development Center. However given the very limited budget at the disposal of the Development Center, they cannot in any way succeed in attracting people with the needed skills to effectively deliver on their mandate and in the end it is the community that is prejudiced. Chambers (1997, p. 33) argues that, "again and again administrative capacity- the ability to get things done emerges as a pre-occupation. It is, indeed, often the most critically scarce resource".

All of the interviewed participants lamented the fact that their inability to market their products has been the major challenge in impeding the success of the projects. Without proper marketing strategies it is almost certain that these projects will continue to struggle and modest gains will only be attained without any prospect of significant growth being realized. Participant **G** noted that the Development Center staff has been unable to help them with marketing as they are also unskilled to do it. This may also explain the reason why there has been a mass exodus of beneficiaries in most projects, which owes to the fact that the income generated is not sufficient to provide a meaningful source of living. Of all the participants interviewed the highest educational qualification of beneficiaries was Grade 12, this means that the beneficiaries need to be taught marketing skills; but who then will impart those skills if the staff at the Development Center are also unskilled.

It is therefore apparent that in all income generating projects the community is paying the price for lack of business skills. It should however in essence be the duty of the Development Center staff to equip the community with these skills. Thus if these administrative deficiencies are not addressed real progress in most of the projects will remain elusive. Lele (1995, cited in Chambers, 1997) concluded in her study that most projects in Africa often have limited effectiveness due to extreme scarcity of trained manpower. This is also the case at the

Development Center, there a serious deficiency of skilled manpower with the ability to get the job done meaningfully.

Lack of administrative capacity at the Development Center may also account for the reason why they rely on only one funder. It is apparent that they do not have the capacity or ability to fundraise. During interviewing, the researcher also inquired on the tools they utilize for fundraising and all they had was a two paged letter which they use for fundraising. Given that fundraising has become increasingly difficult due to increasing competition for scarce resources, one would have expected to see a detailed and structured proposal that would grasp the attention of funders. However due to the lack of a skilled staff complement at the Development Center, there remains lack of administrative capacity.

Another factor identified in the lack of administrative capacity is the inability by the Development Center staff to link and network with other mainstream organizations that are in a similar line of work or organizations that can positively support the Development Center initiatives. A link with such organizations can lead to good practices sharing and widening exposure for the Development Center staff to be linked with information that will benefit not only the Development Center but also the beneficiaries of income generating projects.

Another limitation to community participation that was identified had to do with ***organizational policy***. Some policies result in restrictive mechanisms that limit the aspirations of community members. One such example is the fact that the Development Center cannot fund community members who may want to start a project that is similar to the already existing ones. The community members will therefore either have to join the already existing project or think of a new project idea altogether. This policy which prohibits replication of projects is not only denying community members their right to self determination but it is also an anti-competitive business practice. Participant **J** argued that it is unfair for the Development Center to refuse them funding to initiate similar projects. She pointed out the fact that if she could start another bakery in the area it would be more successful than the currently existing bakery project because of her business acumen. Thus while the policy prohibiting project replication is intended to restrict competition between similar projects, it restricts and prejudices other community members who may want to initiate a similar project and having better ideas on how to manage the project

differently and more successfully. The free market principle in this case has to be encouraged given that the playing field for all beneficiaries is leveled.

Also one of the policy deficiencies limiting full community participation is the inability by the Development Center to fund individual people. It is required that for community members to access funding they need to be in a group of more than 10 members. Two problems crop up as a result of this policy position. The first is that many group members who are recruited by other members may merely be co-opted to reach the needed number while they may not in any way be interested in the particular project and they may end up exiting the project immediately after the group received funding. Hence the system may be open to abuse. The second problem with this policy position is that, some people can operate more efficiently and smoothly as individuals than when in a group. Thus the policy limits individual aspirations and potential of many community members who may end up not seeking financial support from the Development Center due to their dislike of operating in groups.

Another policy related barrier to community participation is that of targeting. Targeting is whereby the Development Center deliberately focuses on the poorest people in the community and they would be given preference for funding. While this policy outwardly seems to be well intentioned and positive, it has its own limitations. Firstly, the targeting policy excludes some community members who may also want to benefit from the process. Given that social development is all inclusive and non-discriminatory it becomes very problematic when other people who may want to participate are excluded. Secondly the targeting policy is problematic in that when you group the poorer people together there is a high likelihood that they will all be less educated and it also in turn means that, they will struggle to run the project. If the targeting policy is abolished it may give opportunity for more affluent people in the community to also join these development initiatives and this will largely benefit the less educated and poorer people because they can learn from their more educated counterparts if they are partnered together. The chances for growth and success of the projects will also be likely to increase.

A ***sound financial*** base is of paramount importance for participatory development. As is the norm in most business, success is highly dependant on the provision of enough capital injection into the business. At the Development Center the lack of sufficient capital remains one of the

huge impediments to the success of income generation projects. In all projects the Development Center has been unable to fund the full amount of start up capital required by the beneficiaries. Most of the start up capital is in the form of equipment without any additional capital to finance the running costs of the projects. This often means that the beneficiaries themselves will have to raise the operational capital on their own. Given that the beneficiaries are coming from poverty stricken backgrounds it is often difficult for beneficiaries to raise large amounts of capital needed to give the projects a competitive edge. It also becomes difficult for beneficiaries to diversify or enlarge their business operations.

Projects hardly recover from the bad start they had due to lack of sufficient capital and without meaningful capital injections the project may forever struggle not because the people cannot manage the project properly, but because resources are the major limitation. The shortage of resources at the Development Center often means that capital will have to be thinly spread across all the projects which in turn severely compromise the quality of these projects. It is therefore better to fund two projects in a year that will become very successful than to fund five projects that will forever struggle.

Lastly the researcher noted during the study that the community ***does not have the power to influence how resources are allocated***. As noted by Pearson and Stiefel (1979, cited in Burkey, 1993, p. 59), "participation involves organized efforts to increase control over resources and regulative institutions in given social situation on the part of groups and movement of those hitherto excluded from such control". This implies that there is a need to also involve the community when making decisions on how resources are to be allocated. The inclusion of the community in this process also helps to minimize abuse of resources by organizations. The failure to include the community in this process not only prejudices the community, but the Development Center also misses an opportunity to create a platform of dialogue in which the community can make valuable inputs on how to deal with the shortage of resources. It is often these community inputs which are the springboard for collective action in which solutions can be sought to resolve the issues of resource constrains.

(b)Social barriers to community participation

Under social barriers to genuine and meaningful participation, the researcher noted that while there is active community participation in the development process, not every one of the beneficiaries participate in the same way. Some actively participate and dominate while others passively follow. Some beneficiaries are rendered inarticulate by their more powerful counterparts. As noted by participant **C**, only two of them- beneficiaries are active in making decisions and others are just followers who do what they are told to do because they are not educated. Thus, ***status seems to be a barrier in community participation***. This raises a situation whereby the relatively affluent become more articulate and dominant over others in the projects. In such cases the Development Center can play an active role in creating a space in which all beneficiaries are able to articulate their points of view and participate equally.

In the participatory development praxis, education is one of the determinants of the degree or extent to which one will genuinely participate in the development process. An educated mind is usually an empowered mind and ***lack of education becomes a social barrier to community participation*.** Of all the participants interviewed among the beneficiaries only one had passed matric which on its own may not be sufficient to capacitate a person with business skills needed to run income generating projects profitably within a fast paced business environment like that of South Africa. It is therefore difficult for the community to participate fully and meaningfully without a heightened level of awareness. Ife (2002) supports the need for education for participation by arguing that, if people are to participate they can only do so successfully if they are well informed and to make sure that people are well equipped to make informed decisions requires a level of awareness and higher education than is generally understood to be necessary for participation. Thus while most beneficiaries are trained and equipped with particular skills in line with the project they are involved with, this skilling and education is not enough in that there is a need to further equip them with sound business skills on marketing and management of the business in a more professional manner. In support of this view participant **H** when asked on what can be done differently to enhance the success of the projects, argued for the Development Center and government to provide them with graduate students who majored in business studies who can join the projects for a short period of time in which they will impart business skills to

the beneficiaries. This points the serious absence of business knowledge both in the beneficiaries and the Development Centre staff.

(c) Structural barriers to community participation

One of the greatest challenges to meaningful community participation in income generating projects at the development Center is as a result of macro factors over which neither the Development Center staff nor the beneficiaries have control over. This relates to ***structural barriers to community participation***. South Africa adopted a macro economic strategy that favours free market capitalism in which the State plays a very minimal role such that legislation that protects small business enterprises like that of income generating projects at the Development Center, has not been forth coming. Thus most of these small business are faced with the harsh reality of having to compete with well established national companies that can easily manipulate the distribution channels of products in such a way that it will be difficult for small business to survive. Burkey (1993) in support of the aforementioned observation noted that, capitalism in the form of all-powerful transnational corporations have monopolized the production and extraction of raw materials, the production of manufactured goods, commerce, banking, marketing and information. Not only do these organizations use their huge economic muscle, but also corruption, unfair and immoral practices to eliminate competition and preserve dominance.

Thus, the macro economic prescriptions adopted in South Africa while being good for big business to flourish; have created a local environment that is not very conducive for most small scale enterprises to survive. As an example in support of this postulation, participant **G** in the bakery project spoke of how they lost out on a lucrative government tender to supply bread in local schools since they where competing with a well established national company. These tenders had the potential to transform the project and bring the much needed growth but this was not to be, owing to the dominant economic muscle of big companies. Without a conscious effort on the part of government to try and factor in ways in which these small enterprises can also benefit from lucrative business tenders, small business will continue to miss out and ultimately close down operations due to a lack of profitability. The basic mechanisms of production, distribution and exchange are vital in any society, and to have power in a society one must be

able to have some control over and access to these mechanisms. According to Ife (1995) this power is unequally distributed in modern capitalist society, and this is a cause of significant disempowerment. More so, in this era of rapid globalization most small business cannot survive due to strong competition from superior or cheaper priced imports. Therefore the economic terrain is uneven and an empowerment strategy should seek to regulate economic activity in order to protect the poor and promote meaningful and participatory social development.

While competition is to be encouraged, such competition if unregulated is neither free nor fair since these small enterprises are not on an equal footing with big companies given their unlimited access to capital. The unleveled playing ground within the economic structure to a greater extent prejudices the full participation of beneficiaries to be integrated and also benefit from the productive economy. Chambers (1997) also supports this notion arguing that uncontrolled globalization and unfettered market forces lead to uncertain and often negative outcomes for the poor. Given such an economic environment it becomes very difficult for communities participating in small business ventures to be fully integrated and empowered to also participate and benefit from the growing economy.

Ife (2002) is also of the view that if communities are to participate meaningfully, the people's power over institutions like education, welfare sector, health, media and other dominant institutions need to be increased. These institutions need to be more accountable, accessible and responsive to community needs. Such an example would be that of shortage of start-up capital for income generating projects at the Development Center. If the community had power or influence over the welfare sector they could have been in a better position to lobby for improved capital to fully fund their business operations. It is such lack of influence and control over institutions by communities that render meaningful community participation unattainable. The idea might seem radical but that is in essence the gist of the participatory development praxis.

In support of the above notion, Burkey (1993, p. 58) noted that, "we cannot conceal the fact that the practice of participation and empowerment challenges established interests of the existing order. It seeks to confront those forces which oppose the poor's access to the means of production and development". Oakley and Marsden (1984, cited in Burkey, 1993) also support the above thinking, noting that meaningful participation of the people in development should

enable direct access to resources necessary for development and some active involvement and influences in the decisions affecting those resources. To participate meaningfully in this instance implies the ability to positively influence the course of those events.

It can therefore be noted that the lack of full access to the means of production remains one of the structural impediments that limit or impede community participation. These structural forces affect not only beneficiaries of income generating project at the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center. It is rather a microcosm of macrocosm- of the challenges faced by small scale business enterprises in the rest of the country.

Given that the Development Center's development model is the brain child of the Gauteng Department of Social Development, there is need for them to rethink their development strategy and focus not only on sectoral issues within their mandate but to also work inter- sectorally and partner with other sectors like Land affairs, Housing, Health and others. This will enable a broad, multi-faceted, holistic and macro approach to social development and through integrated service delivery the poor will benefit more.

One of the evident impacts of structural barriers to community participation is the manifest situation which the researcher termed the ***broad way and the narrow way to development***. The narrow road to development is composed of the majority of the people who receive welfare provision like the beneficiaries of projects at the Development Center. Within the narrow road there is a very limited resource base that has to be shared among millions of people within the population who are welfare recipients. Also the people in the narrow road are less educated and poor. On the other hand there is the broad road in which the resource base is unlimited and people who benefit from the broad road to development are usually the already rich and often highly educated people. In South Africa a few thousand people fit into this category. Most of these people benefit from Black Economic Empowerment and they can also easily access huge sums of capital from organizations that promote industrial development.

The business ventures of people who belong to the broad road usually become very successful, not because these people are better than those in the narrow road; but because they are well resourced and supported by business mentors who are highly experienced. The question becomes

why aren't the people in the narrow road also accessing enough capital, education and support that is needed for their enterprises to flourish. This anomalous situation has characterized development since time immemorial; Schon (1987, cited in Chambers, 1997) noted this unfavorable trend that capitalist development often leads to. He argued that in the varied topography of professional practice, there is a high, hard ground overlooking a swamp. On the higher ground, manageable problems lead themselves to solution through the application of research- based theory and technique. In the swampy lowland, messy, confusing problems defy technical solution. The irony of the situation is that the little problems of the higher ground tend receive all the attention while little or no effort at all is made to better the situation of the swamp lowland wherein resides the majority of the population. Thus the balance sheet of development is highly skewed in favour of the broad road to development that benefits the selected few while deprivation and underdevelopment continues to hound the people in the crowded narrow road. It is such structural imbalances within the macro- socio-economic and political environment that deprive meaningful participation by the ordinary citizens like the beneficiaries of income generating projects at the Development Center.

4.4.5 Conclusion

In this chapter summarized data given by participants has been presented in Section A and a detailed discussion of the presented findings was made in Section B in relation to pertinent literature on participation. The discussion of findings was mainly been guided by an attempt to answer each of the four research questions and various themes emerged out of the content analysis. The Final Chapter will now provide a summary of the major conclusions drawn from the discussion of findings.

CHAPTER FIVE

MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter the presentation and analysis of obtained data was given. In this final chapter, major findings and conclusions of the research are documented as drawn from the presentation and analysis of data in chapter Four. Recommendations and areas for further research are also suggested. The recommendations in this chapter are based on an attempt to provide possible remedies to some of the major hindrances to community participation in income generating projects at the Tembisa/ Kempton Park Development Center that were identified in the study.

5.2 Major findings

The complex processes involved in community participation were clearly articulated in this study. It was established that the community development model used by the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center is largely participatory even though there are challenges that were identified. Different phases of the development process in which the community participated were identified as follows:

Participation in project identification- It was established that the community takes ownership of the process of project identification. This process is the equivalent of need identification which is one of the most important determinants of community participation. Thus the beneficiaries are not merely being co-opted into the development agenda of the host organization rather the beneficiaries are active determinants of their own needs. From a social work perspective one can argue that the clients' right to self-determination is being preserved. In this process the Development Center's role is that of providing guidance rather than that of determining how the process unfolds.

Participation through consultation in project design- It was also clear this study that beneficiaries participate through consultation during the project design phase of the development process. This consultation unfolds in a two way dialogue between beneficiaries and staff at the

Development Center. It was also gathered that beneficiaries are engaged within this dialogue as equal stakeholders rather than junior partners. This active engagement and dialogue largely reflects the participatory nature of the development model used at the Development Center. This form of participation is genuine and meaningful and authentic in that the community consults or is consulted on an idea that they created.

Participation during implementation of the project- It was also realised in this study that the community actively and meaningfully participates within the development process during the implementation phase of the project. The bulk of the activities undertaken during this phase of the development process are largely community driven with the Development Center taking on a more peripheral and supportive role. The fact that the community members are the main actors in this phase also reflects the participatory nature of the development model used at the Tembisa Kempton Park Development Center.

Participation through resource contribution- Resource contribution as a form of participation by the community happens in three different ways.

Material resource contributions as a form of participation by beneficiaries was showed by the contribution of material resources that members made like the sewing machines that were used in the sewing project.

Financial contributions as a way of participation by beneficiaries were evident in their contribution of money in their projects.

Labour contributions as a form of participation by beneficiaries refer to the fact that they are employees in their own projects and they are responsible for determining and providing labour for all their business activities.

Participation during monitoring and evaluation- It also emerged from the study that the community actively participates in the development process during the monitoring and evaluation phase. During this phase beneficiaries of income generating projects take the responsibility of record keeping which includes weekly and monthly progress reports, financial records and also listing the challenges that beneficiaries might be facing which then enables them

to consult with the staff from the Development Center who in turn assist and support them to find a solution.

5.3 Independence in running the projects

It was also established in this study that minimal progress has thus far been attained in trying to transform the projects into successful and independent business entities. This is not a very healthy and desirable situation. Some of the projects are dependent on the Development Center for help in securing business tenders and they may struggle to obtain tenders on their own. In some of the projects the Development Center staff has been unable to effectively help the beneficiaries in securing a market for their products and services, most of the beneficiaries lack education and business skills therefore they have not been successful. Given the low formal and informal levels of education of the beneficiaries, they are not able to run their projects independently. While the Development Center staff has enabled some beneficiaries to attend basic business management training it seems that there are still skills gaps especially in translating theory into practice. It can therefore be argued that, beneficiaries are not adequately empowered and capacitated to manage the projects independently and in a sustainable way.

5.4 Funder expectations

One of the research questions was to establish how funder expectations influence the development process of income generating projects at the Development Center. It was discovered that the Gauteng Provincial Department of Social Development currently acts as the sole funder of the all the operations at the Development Center. Contrary to the widely held notion of negative funder prescriptions, the researcher established that funder expectations ensured that the funded organization- the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center becomes more accountable and better equipped to deliver services to the community. There were guidelines in terms of the structure and operation of activities; however no prescriptions that negatively affected community participation.

5.5 Barriers to effective community participation

While the development model used by the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center is largely participatory there are still challenges that are limiting the realization of effective community participation.

The *Institutional barriers* that were identified as shortcomings of the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center that impede on the development process of income generating projects, are the lack of administrative capacity and applicable skills among staff to handle the complex duties required of the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center. There is also over-reliance on one funder by the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center. Therefore resources are in short supply and have to be shared by many projects at the expense of quality of these projects. Another hindrance is that the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center does not involve the beneficiaries when they decide on the allocation of resources. The fact that the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center seldom connects and network with other organizations which will benefit their initiatives is rather limiting. The projects offered are focused on poor people and exclude the educated and affluent. This limitation on total community participation might prejudice success of the projects, because the inclusion of affluent educated people might have contributed the needed business skills and resources needed to ensure that the projects are successful and independent. Poor people with mediocre business skills, limited resources and education are not on their own capable of attaining extra ordinary achievements.

Some *social barriers* identified where status and education. One of the trends noted regarding the participation of beneficiaries in income generating projects was that beneficiaries participate in different ways. Some actively participated and dominated while others passively followed, the more learned and street wise members became more articulate and dominated others in the projects.

Education was also noted as one of the major barriers to participation. This is largely due to the fact that beneficiaries need to be competent in business management if their projects are to

become successful; however given the very low levels of formal and informal education, it becomes a huge impediment towards attaining meaningful community participation.

The *structural barriers* that were noted were factors within the macro-economic environment that hinder effective community participation. One of the major challenges within the macro-economic environment is that the macro-economic policy prescriptions in South Africa are more favorable towards large scale business enterprises. This is evident in access to financial capital and other resources and also the unregulated competitive environment within the capitalist driven economy of South Africa is also not fair for small-scale business enterprises given the fact that the playing field is not level. Lastly while the country has immensely benefited from some of the merits of globalization, its negative effects have also been harming the prospects of small scale business enterprise development like income generating projects at the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center.

5.6 Recommendations

Based on the findings generated in the study it is recommended that:

- The Gauteng Provincial Department of Social Development needs to reconsider their funding policy of the Development Centers. Should all the positions be subsidised and market related salaries offered at the Development Centers; skilled personnel who will improve the administrative capacity of the organization could probably be attracted.

- The Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center staff needs to expand their fundraising efforts and strategies. This will attract more funds to the organization rather than depending on only one funder. It will also avail more financial resources to the projects and promote their growth into successful independent enterprises.

- The targeting policy also needs to be revisited. If the targeting policy is more flexible it may give opportunity to all community members to join these development initiatives. This will benefit the projects because the less educated and experienced members can learn from their more educated counterparts if they are partnered together. The chances for growth and success of the projects will also be likely to increase.

- It should be ensured that the projects are not run on a charitable basis. Thus beneficiaries need to repay the amount of start -up capital given to them at the beginning of the project. Firstly, this will increase the responsibility of the beneficiaries to work harder and create a sense of ownership. Secondly, the Development Center will become financially sustainable and able to assist more. Lastly, this is likely to remove the stigma surrounding welfare provisions. The beneficiaries can receive the full amount of needed capital rather than being partially funded since they will give back the capital.

- Government departments should pursue the policy of preferential procurement of goods and services of small scale enterprises like income generating projects. This is likely to stimulate faster growth given that these enterprises cannot equally compete with well established manufacturing industries.

- Government should initiate the development of a regulatory framework within the macro-economic environment that will promote and enable small scale business enterprises to flourish.

5.7 Areas for further research

- Possible areas for further research could be to explore and compare development models of Development Centers that are managed by the Gauteng Provincial Department of Social Development and those that are managed by non governmental organizations (NGOs).

- Another area for further research could be to explore the challenges facing Development Centers focusing on income generating projects.

5.8 Conclusion

This chapter has given a summary of the major findings of the research that are linked to the aims and objectives of the research as set out in the first chapter of the study. The major conclusions in the study as set out in the discussion of findings in Chapter Four have been that the development model utilized by the Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center largely encourages participation of beneficiaries within the development process. The model while being

largely participatory is however not without challenges some of which can be addressed by the Development Center's staff whilst other challenges need to be addressed by government intervention on a macro-level. It is clear that more creative thinking needs to be done if the initiative of community based income generating projects is to become sustainable and beneficial to the communities served. The engagement in evidence based research to ensure that social development practitioners keep abreast with current opportunities, challenges and strategies seems to be an important requirement for the promotion of social development.

References

Babbie, E., & Mouton, J. (2001). *The Practice of Social Research*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Bowen, A. G., & Coker, E. M. (2007). An analysis of citizen participation in anti-poverty programmes. *Oxford University Press Community Development Journal*,*43*, 1, 65-78.

Burkey, S. (1993). *People First: A Guide to Self-Reliant, Participatory Rural Development*. London & New York: Zed Books.

Chambers, R. (1997). Whose reality counts- Putting the first last. London: Intermediate technology publications.

Cresswell, J.W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and mixed Methods Approaches*. (2nd ed.). New Delhi: Sage Publications.

de Beer, F., & Swanepoel, H. (2000). *Introduction to Development Studies*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Department of Social Development (2004). *Development Centre Operations Manual July 2004*. Gauteng Provincial Government.

Department of Welfare and Population Development (1997). White Paper for Social Welfare. *General notice 1108 of 1997*. Pretoria: Government printers.

de Vos, A. (2005). Qualitative data analysis and interpretation. In de Vos, A., Strydom, H., Fouche, C. B., & Delport, C.S.L. (Eds.). *Research at Grass Roots: for the social sciences and human service professions*. (3rd ed.). Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Fouche, C. B. (2002). Research strategies. In de Vos, A., Strydom, H., Fouche, C. B., & Delport, C.S.L. (Eds.). *Research at Grass Roots: for the social sciences and human service professions*. (2nd ed.). Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Fouche, C. B., & Delport C.S.L. (2002). Introduction to the research process. In de Vos, A., Strydom, H., Fouche, C. B., & Delport, C.S.L. (Eds.). *Research at Grass Roots: for the social sciences and human service professions*. (2nd ed). Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: The Seabury Press.

Graig, G., & Mayo, M. (1995). *Community empowerment (a reader in participation and development).* South Africa: Zed books Ltd.

Greeff, M. (2002). Information collection interviewing. In de Vos, A., Strydom, H., Fouche, C. B., & Delport, C.S.L. (Eds.). *Research at Grass Roots: for the social sciences and human service professions*. (2nd ed). Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Ife, J. (1995). *Community development: creating community based alternatives-vision, analysis and practice.* Pearson Education Australia Limited.

Ife, J. (2002). *Community development: community based alternatives in the age of globerlisation.* Pearson Education Australia Limited.

Korten, D. (1990). *Getting to the 21st Century*. West Hartford: Kumarian Press.

Korten, D.C., & Carner, G. (1984). *Planning frameworks for People-Centered Development.* West Hartford: Kumarian Press.

Lovell, H. C. (1992). *Breaking the cycle of poverty: the BRAC strategy*. West Hartford. USA: Kumarian Press.

Masanyiwa, Z. S., & Kinyashi, G. F. (2008). *An analysis of community participation in projects managed by Non Governmental Organisations: A Case of World Vision in Central Tanzania*. Institute of Development Studies, UK: Eldis Document Store.

Manilla Declaration on people's participation and sustainable development. (1989). Philippines. ANGOC.

Mathie, A., & Cunningham, G. (2003). From clients to citizens: Asset-based Community Development as a strategy for community-driven development. Development in Practice, Volume 13: 5 474- 486.

Midgley, J. (1997). *Social Welfare in a global context.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Midgley, J., Hall, A., Hardian, M., & Narine, D. (1986). *Community Participation, Social Development and the State.* New York: Methuen & Co. Ltd.

Nelson, N., & Wright, S. (1995). *Power and Participatory Development: theory and practice.* Intermediate Technology Publications.

Nieman, A. (2006). Social Capital and Social Development. *Social Work/ Maatskaplike Werk* 2006:42(2).

Patel, L. (2005). *Social Welfare and Social Development in South Africa.* Cape Town, South Africa: Oxford University Press Southern Africa (Pty) Ltd.

Racelis, M. (1986). *Metropolitan growth: poverty eradication through popular participation.* Habitat International.

Shepherd, A. (1998*). Sustainable Rural Development*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Sinclair, M.R. (1990). *Hope at last: A guide to Grant making in South Africa*. South Africa: Henry, J. Kaiser family foundation.

Strydom, H., & Venter, L. (2002). Sampling and sampling methods. In de Vos, A., Strydom, H., Fouche, C. B., & Delport, C.S.L. (Eds.). *Research at Grass Roots: for the social sciences and human service professions*. (2nd ed). Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Terre Blanche, M., Durrheim, K., & Painter, D. (Eds.). (2006). *Research in Practice: Applied methods for the social sciences.* (2nd ed.). Cape Town: UCT Press.

Theron, F. (2005). Public Participation as a micro-level development strategy. In Davids, I., Mapunye, K. J., & Theron, F. (2005). *Participatory development in South Africa: A Development Management perspective.* Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Theron, F. (Eds). (2008).*The development change agent: a micro-level approach to development.* Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Wagnaraja, P., Hussain, A., & Wagnaraja, G.S. (1991). *Participatory development learning from South Asia.* Tokyo : United Nations University Press.

Whitley, D. M., White, K. R., Kelly, S. J., & Yorke, B. (1999). Strengths based case management: The application to grandparents raising grandchildren. *Families in society: the Journal of Contemporary Human Services*., 80(2), 110-119, pp110-111.

Yunus, M. (1997).Rural Credit in Bangladesh. In Krishna, A., Uphoff, N., & Esman, M. J. (Eds) *Reasons for Hope: Instructive Experiences in Rural development*. West Hartford: Kumarian Press

Appendix A: Participant information sheet

Good day

May name is Victor Chikadzi, I am a registered student at the University of Witwatersrand for a Master of Arts Degree in Social Development. As part of the requirements for this degree, I am conducting a research that focuses on the analysis of community participation in income generating projects at Tembisa/ Kempton Park Development Center. It is hoped that this research may provide important information about the importance of participatory or people-centered development in social development projects.

I therefore wish to invite you to participate in my study. Your participation is entirely voluntary and your refusal to participate will not be held against you in any way. There are also no financial or material benefits that you will get from participating in the study. If you agree to take part, I shall arrange to interview you on a date, time and place most convenient for you. The interview will last approximately an hour and you may refuse to answer any question that you feel uncomfortable with answering without any negative consequences.

The interview will not be tape recorded; however, I shall make brief notes of the most important aspects during the interview. Your personal details will however be kept confidential and no identifying details will be included in the interview schedule and final report. All raw data will be kept in a locked cabinet and will be destroyed two years after publication of the final report or six years after completion of study.

Please feel free to ask any questions regarding the study. I shall answer them to the best of my ability. I may be conducted on cell 0849084562. A copy of the research findings will be availed to you at your request upon completion of the study.

Thank you for taking time to consider participating in the study.

Yours sincerely

Victor Chikadzi

Appendix B: Consent form for participation in the study.

I…….. hereby confirm that I have read the participant information sheet and fully understand the nature, aims and objectives of the study. I agree to take part in the study and understand that my participation is entirely voluntary. I understand there will be no financial benefits or remuneration when participating in the study and that I may refuse to answer any particular questions that I feel uncomfortable with or withdraw from the study at anytime without any negative consequences. I understand that the process notes taken from my responses will form part of the research report. I understand that although the information from this report may be published, my identity will however remain confidential and all raw data will be destroyed two years after publication of the final report or six years after the completion of the study.

Name of participant…….

Signature…….Date…….

Appendix C: Semi-structured interview schedule for funders of income generating projects at Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center

1. What criteria are used to fund income generating projects?
2. What specifications have to be followed by the Center when you fund the income generating projects?
3. What expectations do you have from the Center and beneficiaries of income generating projects when you provide them with funding?
4. Apart from funding what other role do you play in the managing of income generating projects?
5. Would you fund any projects that community members may want to initiate?

Appendix D: Semi-structured interview schedule for beneficiaries of income generating projects at Tembisa / Kempton Park Development Center

1. Describe the nature of project you are involved in?
2. What criteria where followed for you to become a beneficiary in the project?
3. Why did you specifically get involved in this project and not in other projects?
4. Briefly explain your role in the project?
5. Are there any other projects or activities that you would like to be involved in that are not offered at the Center?
6. Who directs and takes responsibility for the day to day managing of activities in the project?
7. How is it managed when beneficiaries disagree on the way forward in managing the project?
8. Describe the role of management in the project in which you are involved?
9. Who in your view has more influence in making key decisions in the running of the project?
10. How has the project changed your life?
11. What could be done differently to improve the project performance?
12. What positive experiences have you had during your involvement in the project?
13. Are you involved in the project of your preference?
14. If not which project would you have preferred to be involved in and why?

Appendix E: Semi-structured interview schedule for management staff at Tembisa / Kempton Development Center

1. For how long have you been involved in managing income generating projects at the Center?
2. Can you briefly explain the back- ground to the projects?
3. Briefly comment on the overall performance of these projects?
4. What criteria are you using to choose beneficiaries to become involved in the income generating projects?
5. Can you briefly describe the criteria used to decide how participants become involved in a particular project and not the others?
6. Is it possible for beneficiaries to initiate projects of their own liking?
7. How does the organization respond to the unique needs of each participant?
8. Can you briefly explain your role in managing of the projects?
9. At what stage does a beneficiary exit the project?
10. Who decided on these particular projects that are currently operational at the centre?
11. How are decisions made about the day to day managing of the projects?
12. Who would you say has more influence in the managing of the projects?
13. Who are the main funders of the projects?
14. How do funders give direction or guidelines in the way the projects are to be managed?
15. What do you think is positive in the way projects are run?
16. What in your view could be done differently to enhance the success of the projects?

Appendix F

Letter of permission from Tembisa / Kempton Development Center

Appendix G

Letter of permission from Gauteng Provincial Department of Social Development

Appendix H

Ethics clearance certificate