

https://dspace.org/

Outcome evaluation of eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme in Hillbrow South, Johannesburg, South Africa

Pooe, Mpolokeng Felicia

2016

http://hdl.handle.net/10539/21578

Pooe, Mpolokeng Felicia (2016) Outcome evaluation of eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme in Hillbrow South, Johannesburg, South Africa

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

Outcome Evaluation of eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme in Hillbrow South Johannesburg, South Africa

Mpolokeng Felicia Pooe
WITS Graduate School of Governance

Thesis presented in partial fulfilment for the degree of Master of Management (in the field of Public & Development Management) to the Faculty of Commerce, Law, and Management, University of the Witwatersrand

May 2016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis is dedicated to my late grandparents Ernest. M and Innocentia. M Setsubi for instilling in me their stern values of Christianity, good education and family for it is through these values that my life is centred. I will forever be grateful to various people who kept me grounded and kept me going through this process, among them my two children Babatle and Khanya who help me learn new things about myself every day and their ability to inspire me. A special thank you to Johannesburg Housing Company for partially funding my studies and this research. eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme for agreeing to participate in the study. Lastly, my sincere gratitude to my research supervisor Dr Kambidima Wotela for his dedication throughout this research.

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis/dissertation titled *Outcome Evaluation of eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme in Hillbrow South* is my own, unaided work. I have acknowledged and referenced all sources that I have used and quoted. I hereby submit it in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Management (Public & Development Management) at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. I have not submitted this report before for any other degree or examination to any other institution

Mpolokeng Felicia Pooe
Johannesburg
May 2016

ABSTRACT

Author: Mpolokeng Felicia Pooe

Thesis title: Outcome evaluation of eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme in Hillbrow South

The study aimed to conduct an output evaluation of eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme in Hillbrow South, an intervention which was set up in 2004 to advance safety, cleanliness and welcoming behaviour among residents in a historically perilous and unpopular neighbourhood. Hillbrow South is the first precinct to conduct this intervention within Hillbrow and even with the expansion of the intervention to the broader part of Johannesburg, the niggling factor since eKhaya's implementation has always been whether there is any value for this type of intervention to the stakeholders, whether the intervention is worth the support of funders who can potentially carry this programme forward through adequate funding. Such stakeholders require convincing indication that the programme is working hence an output evaluation study.

The research interrogates various literatures to find the ones used to guide this study. In this regard, Howarth (1998) and the Housing Development Agency (2012) are the two literatures identified for this purpose.

Through self-administered questionnaires and focus groups, data was collected from existing tenants who are beneficiaries of the intervention. A t-test was used to analyse data and content analysis or narrative analysis for the analysis of focus group data.

The research findings in both the survey and focus group are in-sync and show a positive outcome among residents. One of the lessons learned from this study indicate the need for continued research on the impact of the programme. These findings are accompanied by recommendations on how to improve the programme in various areas.

Johannesburg

May 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements ii
Declaration iii
Abstract iv
Table of contents v
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1
1. Background 1
1.2 Hillbrow South, Johannesburg South Africa 1
1.3 eKhaya Neighbourhood Development programme 1
1.4 Problem statement 3
1.5 Purpose statement 3
1.6 Research questions and hypothesis 3
1.7 Justification of the research 4
1.8 Delimitations 5
1.9 Conclusion 5
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW 6
2. Literature review 6
2.1 A description of the research setting, Hillbrow South 6
2.1.1 Map of Areas Where Intervention Is Implemented 7
2.2 The Outputs, Outcomes and Aspirations of the eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme Intervention 7
2.3 Methods, Data, Findings and Conclusions of Studies on Evaluations of Urban Upgrading Intervention 8
2.4 An Introduction To Monitoring And Evaluation And Its Components 11
2.4.1 Monitoring 12
2.4.2 Evaluation 13
2.4.3 Applying monitoring and evaluation on Ekhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme 14
2.5 Key Variables of Development Interventions 14
2.5.1 Impact, Outputs, Outcomes, Activities and Inputs 14
2.6 The Results Chain, Results Framework and Theory of Change Informing the eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Intervention 16
2.6.1 Results chain 16
2.6.2 Indicators, Baselines, Targets, Assumptions and Risks 18
2.6.2.1 Result framework 19
2.6.3 Theory of change 21

2.7 Evaluating eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme in Hillbrow South, A Conceptual Framework 23
2.8 Conclusion 24
3. Research Methodology 25
3.1 Research Strategy 25
3.2 Research Design 26
3.3 Research Procedure And Methods 26
3.3.1 Data collection instruments 26
3.3.2 Sampling 28
3.3.3 Ethical considerations 30
3.3.4 Data collection methods 32
3.3.5 Data collection procedure 32
3.3.6 Data storage 33
3.3.7 Data processing 34
3.3.8 Data analysis 34
3.3.9 Describing the respondents 36
3.3.10 Reliability And Validity 37
3.3.11 Limitations 38
3.3.11.1 The intervention 38
3.3.11.2 Time constraints 38
3.3.11.3 Data collection instrument 38
3.3.11.4 Number of participating respondents 39
3.4 Conclusion 39
CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS 40
4. Findings 40
4.1 Presentation of survey findings 40
4.1.1 Findings on public and private investment in the area 40
4.1.2 Findings on satisfaction levels 41
4.1.3 Findings on operational municipal investment 41
4.1.4 Findings on crime levels in the area 42
4.2 Presentation of focus group findings 43
4.3 Conclusion 44
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS 45
5. Survey and focus group results 45
5.1 Relating findings to the theoretical framework 45
5.1.1 Relating satisfaction levels to theoretical framework 45
5.1.2 Relating municipal operational investment to theoretical framework 45

5.1.3 Relating crime levels in the area to theoretical framework 46
5.1.4 Relating public and private sector investment to theoretical framework 46
CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 48
6. Discussion 48
6.1 Summary 48
6.2 Recommendations 48
6.3 Conclusion 48
REFERENCES 50
APPENDIX A: BRIEF CURRICULUM 53
APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM FOR SURVEY 54
APPENDIX C: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE 56
APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR FOCUS GROUP 58

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1. Background

This study evaluates a community level intervention that is meant to make a specific neighbourhood secure and appealing. The research is conducted in Hillbrow South and shows how various stakeholders have collaborated in an effort to change negative perceptions about their neighbourhood and most importantly, whether their efforts are paying off. In terms of stipulations set out for the degree of Master of Management: Public & Development Management, this report is worth 25%.

1.2 Hillbrow South, Johannesburg South Africa

Hillbrow is an area located approximately 2km from the inner city of Johannesburg and covers nearly one square kilometre of the inner city of Johannesburg and Hillbrow has a population estimated at 100, 000 inhabitants (Venables: 2010). It mainly consists of dilapidated residential flats and hotels where over 34 nationalities reside. Many of the residents living in Hillbrow are not legal citizens of South Africa and some are South African citizens from the rural areas who have moved into the area because it is regarded as a low cost area to live when compared to other neighbourhoods in Johannesburg. Most of these inhabitants arrive in Hillbrow to look for employment in Gauteng Province. For at least 20 years Hillbrow has been affected by crime, filth and congestion (Venables: 2010, Mbatha & Ally: 2013). Hillbrow South, which is the focal point of this study, is an area located closer to Berea in Johannesburg. This is where the eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme was introduced as an intervention in late 2004.

1.3 eKhaya Neighbourhood Development programme

Johannesburg Housing Company (Also referred to as JHC) was established as a section 21 company to facilitate access to low rental housing within the inner city of Johannesburg. The company is the central instrument behind the establishment of eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme (Also referred to as eKhaya), through JHC's community development company Makhulong A Matala (Also referred to as Makhulong). Makhulong A Matala is a minor company of Johannesburg Housing Company that specialises in community development within the JHC tenant community. At the time the neighbourhood programme was set-up, JHC owned two buildings along Peterson and Edith Cavell Streets in Hillbrow. A diagnostic analysis conducted by eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme prior to being initiated concluded that although JHC buildings were reputably clean and safe due to JHC's strict house rules that are enforced in all its buildings, the surrounding areas were characterised by chaos and general disorder in terms of safety and cleanliness in the neighbourhood (eKhaya Constitution: 2005).

According to the Johannesburg Housing Company's End of the Beginning – The First 5 Years (2000), Johannesburg Housing Company and other property companies each own several buildings in Hillbrow.

Under their management, the buildings in Hillbrow and other areas in the CBD were overhauled and then converted into residential rental housing for lower and middle income groups. All these buildings are well maintained in an effort to breathe new life into the inner city of Johannesburg.

eKhaya was then established in 2004 as part of JHC strategy to revamp the Johannesburg inner city through the provision of accommodation in a safe, clean and family oriented environment (Makhulong A Matala 10 Year Book: 2010). JHC along with its subsidiary company Makhulong mobilised other property owners within close proximity in Hillbrow to jointly form a neighbourhood development programme called eKhaya Neighbourhood Programme (Makhulong A Matala 10 Year Book: 2010).

The Makhulong A Matala 10 Year Book (2010), further cites some of eKhaya achievements as including the disembowelling and cordoning of lanes that previously served as hide-outs for criminals. A guarded park was also opened in 2009 where the community can now associate without fear of being attacked or mugged. However, despite these and many other achievements, eKhaya has not been able to gather palpable evidence on whether the observed positive change in Hillbrow residents' behaviour and the area is a result of this intervention.

JHC initially received opposition upon approaching nearby property owners who at the time did not envision value in the need to resuscitate the neighbourhood. Hillbrow has challenges not even a bigger structure like the City could not resolve on its own as evidenced by congestion of illegal foreign nationals as well as the lack of safety in the area thus obtaining a buy-in from the said property owners was resisted with scepticism about the effectiveness and success of the programme. A buy-in meant each property owner would contribute an agreed small percentage of their revenue towards maintaining the programme. In the occurrence of high arrear rates among tenants such a proposal would not be sustainable. Thus when the first eKhaya precinct was set-up, it was on a trial basis proviso that should there be no improvements owners could pull out of the proposed programme. Following the success of the initial precinct, two more precincts of eKhaya were established one in Joubert Park and another in Troyeville (Makhulong A Matala 10 Year Book: 2010).

eKhaya South is the first of four CID (City Improvement District) precincts for eKhaya and this research focuses on this specific programme which has now been in existence for close to ten years. JHC owns buildings in eKhaya precincts as per attached map in chapter 2.

eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme provides the identified precincts with security guards that are located in specific areas during the day only, residents living in these buildings are encouraged to clean-up their neighbourhood, not to litter and to practice good behaviour which does not endanger other residents (Makhulong A Matala 10 Year Book: 2010). There is major security personnel guard presence in the neighbourhood to ensure residents feel safe not just within their buildings but in the neighbourhood as well.

1.4 Problem statement

An evaluation of the effectiveness of the eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme in Hillbrow South which is situated along Plein and Petersen streets with the aim of determining its value and inform the continuation of the programme.

According to a report by The Housing Development Agency (2012) the problem with the programme currently is that despite the programme having been in existence for nearly a decade, there has not been any empirical study to assess its impact.

1.5 Purpose statement

The research is an explanatory research which measures cause and effect. According to Babbie and Mouton (2010) quantitative research is a philosophical system that restricts itself to data of experiences and rubbishes any form of speculation. It relies heavily on the ontological assumption that a systematic analysis of relationships and explanations about reality can be quantified (Walliman: 2005). The cause and effect (also called the stimulus – response or magic– bullet or hypodermic needle theory) is a theoretical assumption in quantitative research.

The research relies heavily on data gathered from beneficiaries of eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme by examining whether the viewed improvements in Hillbrow South are indeed the effects of the activities which are being implemented in the area. For instance, an increase in the number of entrepreneurs and tenants tend to stay longer in the Hillbrow buildings.

In view of the above, the purpose of this research is to evaluate whether the activities currently being implemented have yield any effect or success of the eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme. The research sought to establish whether the initiative added substantive value and whether the beneficiaries yield any value in the programme. The research findings may be used to shape future interventions and assist in building an understanding of what works and what does not.

An outcome evaluation study would enable the programme to attract the needed funding from funders should the findings of the research yield a positive outcome in the area. Funders typically are easier to convince if programmes are able to prove value for money for their investment.

1.6 Research questions and hypothesis

The research questions below are structured using literature themes and are aimed at ultimately addressing the main research problem and responding to the qualitative aspect of the research. According to Babbie and Mouton (2010) a hypothesis is a prediction of an outcome regarding the relationship between two or more variables. Hypotheses can be classified into research/alternative (***H a***) and null (***H o***) hypotheses. Each of the research questions below also cover research and null hypothesis. A hypothesis in this research is more applicable to the qualitative part of the research while the research questions apply to a quantitative research which is a survey since the research at hand is a mixed – method research.

Public and private investment in the area– has there been an increase in investment towards the programme since its inception?

> ***H o***: There has not been any evidence of an increase in public and private investment in Hillbrow South following the programme
>
> ***H a***: There is evidence of an increase in private and public investment in Hillbrow South since the intervention

Satisfaction levels – What are the satisfaction levels with the programme in terms of safety, cleanliness and increase in the number of tenants choosing the area for residence? What are the vacancy levels in the area?

> ***H o***: Satisfaction levels about the programme in areas of safety, cleanliness, and an increase in the number of people who choose Hillbrow South as a place of residence are minimal.
>
> ***H a***: Satisfaction levels about the programme in areas of safety, cleanliness, and an increase in the number of people who choose Hillbrow South as a place of residence are significant.

Municipal operational investment– Has the response time by the City improved on reported problems in the area e.g ambulance, police etc?

> ***H o***: Municipal operational investment which relates to response times on problems reported in the area have not improved
>
> ***H a***: Municipal operational investment which relates to response times on problems reported in the area have improved significantly after the programme

Crime levels–Whether the levels of criminal activity have changed since the programme inception

> ***H o*** : Crime levels in Hillbrow South are still the same as before the programme was initiated
>
> ***H a***: Crime levels in Hillbrow South have declined since the programme implementation

1.7 Justification of the research

According to The Housing Development Agency (2012) one of the challenges identified with the programme is the lack of work done to measure impact as well as outcome of the eKhaya Neighbourhood Development programme since its inception in all precincts which implemented the programme. The one main consequence of this gap in research is that potential funders could be cynical about the programme and view it as another money making scheme by property owners.

Where the programme showed to be useful to residents, investment in the area may improve and not just private investment i.e more businesses, but also municipal investment will improve. With regard to

municipal investment the area has for a long time suffered in terms of service delivery such as timeous response times by police, EMS and effective policing as criminal activities happen even with the Hillbrow Police Station within close proximity.

1.8 Delimitations

According to Simon (2011) delimitations are choices made by the researcher which should be mentioned. They describe the boundaries that have been set for the study. This is the place to explain and these are factors within the researcher's control. The researcher states what will be included and that which is excluded in the research. Choices can pertain to methodological procedures, research questions or even population chosen for the investigation. Delimitations should be restricted to the things that a reader might realistically expect the researcher to do but which, for clearly explained reasons, has decided not to do (Simon: 2011).

For this research the delimitation is the option to evaluate Hillbrow South specifically even though the programme is implemented in other areas in Hillbrow and Jeppestown. The reason for this is because Hillbrow south is a first Hillbrow which was launched in 2004. It is imperative to assess if the programme has any success before more funding is injected into the programme. The other delimitation is the type of design being used which is a quasi – experimental design and in this regard other forms of this type of methods such as the test-control method of the intervention as this would be time consuming and more applicable in a longitudinal study.

1.9 Conclusion

The rest of this research report comprise of three main chapters followed by the summary and conclusion. Chapter two details various literatures on urban renewal, neighbourhood development programmes and most importantly impact and outcome evaluation studies from other areas outside South Africa. It includes a discussion of the research setting, concepts, attributes, methods and theories relevant to the study and end with a conceptual framework. Impact evaluation studies for instance show that various models exist to measure output such as observations made before and comparing it with those made after an intervention. Chapter three outlines the research strategy which includes research methods, data collection methods among others. Chapter four present data collected from the focus group and the survey questions. Data analysis and interpretation is provided in chapter five. The last chapter provides a summary of major findings, recommendations for the programme and a conclusion.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2. Literature review

Literature review comprise of scholarly text, that provide existing knowledge including fundamental findings, as well as theoretical and methodological contributions to a specific topic in research. Literature reviews mainly use secondary sources, and do not report on new or original experimental work(Webster & Watson: 2002).

2.1 A description of the research setting, Hillbrow South

All precincts in Hillbrow where eKhaya Neighbourhood Development programme was and continue to be implemented are historically 'whites only' areas in terms of the Group Areas Act of 1950. Most buildings were thus previously owned by the white population. Morris (1999) posits that caretakers and cleaners who tended to these buildings were black migrants who had permits to be in the city and they lived in their respective buildings which they cared for in rooms at the top of these building. In the 1950s Hillbrow was a highly multicultural neighbourhood within the city of Johannesburg and an attraction to European countries like Hungary, Czechoslovakia and other countries and in those days Hillbrow was renowned for its vibrant night life with coffee shops, Italian, Greek, Portuguese, French restaurants and book shops (Morris: 1999).

According to Kruger (2001), in the 1960s, a major housing boom in the northern suburbs saw the white population which previously lived in Hillbrow and Johannesburg inner city moving to the northern suburbs. By the end of that decade the vacancies in Hillbrow had risen out of control due to tenants leaving Hillbrow for the upmarket northern suburbs. As a result of these vacancies landlords wriggled to pay their rates and taxes to the City. The mounting economy meant there was a demand for accommodation in the inner city by white collar workers who worked as cashiers, bank tellers, nurses and people who were escaping the unrest in the townships(Gaylard: 1997). This meant the previously white entrepreneurs were soon replaced by tenants who were mostly black and needed to be closer to their work areas. The Landlords accommodated these tenants to fill up the high vacancies in their buildings even though black tenants were not a desirable choice in terms of apartheid laws (Gaylard: 1997). As such these new tenants would characteristically pay higher rent and this meant leaseholders brought in sub-tenants in order to afford rent payments. Maintenance of the buildings was no longer a priority for most landlords as it was when white tenants lived there. Thus slowly the buildings and the area around it became second-rate while evictions were quite common without following proper legal processes. In 1982 the famous Goldstone judgement meant the Group Areas Act was stopped. Over the next years Hillbrow would see a tenant community which could not afford to pay rent, landlords who were unable to pay their taxes to the City, municipal services cut off. All this led to an area which became vulnerable to building hijackings, high crime levels, and dilapidated buildings and by the 90s practically all landlords

had abandoned their buildings. They had gone to the northern suburbs while others went back to their native countries (Kruger: 2001).

2.1.1 Map of Areas Where Intervention Is Implemented



The above map covers some areas of the Johannesburg CBD, Hillbrow, Berea and Troyeville. These are locations where eKhaya Neighbourhood Development programme is being implemented. The numbered red circles on the map represent the total number and locations of buildings owned by Johannesburg Housing Company, an organisation which is the main brain behind this intervention. There are other buildings in these areas owned by other property owners though these are not shown in the map but which are participating in the programme. For instance, next to building 12, 18, 4 and 22, there are other buildings in the vicinity and the intervention is carried out along a street or streets where JHC and other property owners have buildings. The numbers inside the red dots simply indicate the chronological order which JHC attained its buildings. Number 1 represents the first building ever purchased by the company, with the company currently owning 35 buildings in the CBD and greater Johannesburg though others do not appear on the map since the intervention is currently not implemented in all areas where JHC has buildings for now.

2.2 The Outputs, Outcomes and Aspirations of the eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme Intervention

The eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme was first implemented in 2004 and its main purpose was to resuscitate Hillbrow into becoming the beautiful and safe city that it once was by assisting the landlords or property owners, the City of Johannesburg with challenges of crime, building maintenance and cleanliness in the area though the programme was cognisant of the fact that it would be impossible to duplicate the area into what it was in the 1950s since a new type of population lived there(eKhaya Constitution: 2005).

At the time the neighbourhood programme was set-up, JHC owned two buildings along Peterson and Edith Cavell Streets in Hillbrow. A diagnostic analysis conducted by eKhaya Neighbourhood prior to being initiated concluded that although JHC buildings were reputably clean and safe due to JHC's and a few other property owners strict house rules which are enforced in all its buildings, the surrounding neighbourhood areas were characterised by grime, lawlessness and general disarray (eKhaya Constitution: 2005). These were some challenges which warranted the intervention. Since tenants typically assess the area which they live in prior to moving into a neighbourhood, improving the neighbourhood and not just the building would attract relevant stakeholders in the neighbourhood i.e tenants, businesses and municipal investment.

eKhaya South is the first CID precinct for eKhaya and this research focuses on this specific newly established programme which has now been in existence for close to two years.

eKhaya Neighbourhood Programme provides identified precincts with security guards that are located in specific areas for 12 hours during the day, residents living in these buildings are encouraged to clean-up their neighbourhood, not to litter and practices a generally improved livelihood in the area (Makhulong A Matala 10 Year Book: 2010).

For eKhaya Neighbourhood Development programme the challenges identified by the HDA (Housing Development Agency) of which measuring outcome is the focus of this research.

Rogers (2012) argues that outcome evaluation investigates changes resulting from an intervention regardless of the scale and nature of the programme. The type of evaluation most commonly requested by foundations is called outcome and impact evaluation. Outcome evaluations measure the effectiveness of a programme in creating change. Outcome evaluations concentrate on challenging questions that enquire what happened to programme participants and how much of a transformation the programme made for them (Linnell: 2005).The expectant results of an intervention are an important part of an outcome evaluation, but it is also important to also investigate unexpected results.

Further, an intervention has to have clear indicators and by definition indicators are a measure used to determine change in a situation, or the progress in, or results of, an activity, project, or programme (UNICEF: 1997). Since indicators are quantifiable they can be either quantitative or qualitative though in most cases they are quantitative. In this specific research indicators include the level of cleanliness, crime statistics, tenant retention (meaning tenants who stay longer in buildings within eKhaya precincts), improvement in municipal operational investment, public and private sector investment.

2.3 Methods, Data, Findings and Conclusions of Studies on Evaluations of Urban Upgrading Intervention

Since the research topic at hand involves evaluating outcome (programme outcome evaluation), a few studies relating to monitoring and evaluation as well as impact and outcome evaluation specifically in

neighbourhood development programmes are covered in this review. The literature is ordered chronologically according to year of publication of study from earliest to most recent. The reason for this sequence is earliest work to date showcases the evolution of evaluation and urban upgrade. Some literature does not directly relate to neighbourhood development, but it is included to demonstrate the concept of evaluation in research.

The first literature focuses on usage of outcome evaluation though this is in a different context. It is suggested that outcome evaluation studies in the areas of alcohol and drug abuse suffered from design problems. The lack of control groups, prospective designs, adequate outcome measures, and sufficient follow-up has presented the major difficulties. Through content analysis, this article reviews all such studies reported in 50 major journals between 1969 and 1979 and compares them to outcome evaluations on other mental health topics reported in the same journals and found that significant problems remain in each of these areas. In general, drug abuse studies employ the least satisfactory methodologies. Alcohol evaluations are approximately as arduous as other mental health evaluations. A major finding is the lack of thoroughness found in all types of outcome evaluations. Attention must be paid to these issues if outcome evaluations are to remain credible and able to secure continued support (Goldtein, Surber & Wilner: 1984).

The next article about the concept of evaluation and it studies how this concept has evolved in 25 years between 1960 and 1984.During the golden age of evaluation, the field was dominated by the randomised, controlled paradigm. The golden age saw evaluations becoming inclusive.From focusing on stating the effects of an intervention, evaluations started to pay more attention to why the effect was present and later evaluation studies focused on the importance of implementation research in overall evaluations (Rossi & Wright: 1984).

In this literature Howarth (1998) studies outcome evaluation of neighbourhood centres in Ontario. The evaluation entailed among others; soliciting ongoing client feedback, holding key – informant and focus group discussions about the programme achievements and identifying gaps in the services provided. The literature argues that outcome evaluation work needs the time and expertise if it is to be successful. It recommends an in-depth evaluation rather than gauging the outcome of every programme thus limited resources could then be effectively focused (Howarth: 1998).

The next study deals with looking at policy evaluation. The reason we look at policy evaluation is as part of the literature review is because policies inform evaluation studies and we specifically choose this one because it relates to urban rejuvenation. This literature argues that the challenge with the mid-1980s monitoring and evaluation of policy initiatives put in place by the British government is that there is little indication showing that new rejuvenation efforts are developed based on lessons learned from past evaluation studies. The approach of government to evaluation of neighbourhood rejuvenation efforts

focuses on value for money and thus limits the scope and importance of evaluation (Ying Ho: 1999). It is argued that there is a need to reconsider the limitations of the approach used and to look at other approaches. The study conducted in Britain explores the possibility of the realist approach in its application of the assessment of urban rejuvenation programmes. Numerous issues are raised for further debate. The purpose of the argument is to discover further enhancement of the said approach and to consider over some possibilities with regard to problems in the actual research design (Ying Ho: 1999).

In a study conducted in Toronto on monitoring and evaluation, we see traces of the Task Force's vision which recommends that all neighbourhoods will have a reactive blend of services and facilities that meet local needs and resonate with both the size and type of people living in the area (United Way of Greater Toronto [na]). Monitoring and evaluation exercises should pinpoint places where community services and facilities have not kept pace with the emerging demographics, the Task Force analysed whether neighbourhoods have the services and facilities (libraries, schools, hospitals, community based services) needed most is within reach. In all of the above facilities, the Task Force examined whether they were within proximity of the residents who would require them (United Way of Greater Toronto [na]).


The next article deals with research conducted on evaluating urban policy over two decades. The study was conducted in Manchester and applies the concepts and ideas used to discuss the regeneration of a city by expanding discussions into discipline of geography. The study was based on content analysis of available data and the findings suggested that in order to regenerate the city as whole and retain its population, it is necessary both socially and economically to attract people back into the city centre. The study also found that there has also been a recent resurgence of the emphasis on community (Bradford: 2003).

The last study is by the Housing Development Agency (2012), an organisation based in Johannesburg, South Africa which conducted a preliminary exploratory study on eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme in 2012. All aspects of the programme were studied i.e recreational activities, safety, cleanliness and overall assessment of how the programme has changed the lives of the people in the eKhaya precincts. Focus groups and one-on-one interviews were conducted with a purpositive sample and through this study it was found that more research needed to be conducted in the areas of impact and various strengths and weaknesses of the programme were identified. This study was crucial in setting the foundation for future studies on eKhaya Neighbourhood Programme.

The overall implications of these studies show how evaluation studies have evolved in various settings whether it is on policy, how the evaluations have been conducted in various studies and most importantly how the concept of evaluation entailed at as time progressed. Evaluation researches were conducted differently and yielded unexpected results. The articles also indicate that evaluation as a discipline is still underdeveloped as most researchers. In relation to the study of eKhaya the implications are that an

evaluation study such as this one needs to be explicit regarding what the meaning of evaluation is interpreted here.

2.4 An Introduction To Monitoring And Evaluation And Its Components



Monitoring and evaluation refers to important management tools used to track progress and facilitate decision making. It involves continued gathering of information and its analysis to assist in determining if progress has been made with regard to pre-planned goals and objectives. It also identifies any unintended effects of the project and its activities whether these are positive or negative. Thus monitoring and evaluation forms an integral part of the project cycle and shows good management practice (Sera & Beaudry: 2007).

Shapiro (1996) posits that concepts of monitoring and evaluation are closely related though these are distinct, they are also complementary. Shapiro (1996) further states the purposes of Monitoring and Evaluation as 1. Accountability to donors, taxpayers, beneficiaries and implementing partners to show that expenditure, actions and results thereof are those which were agreed on prior to the project or programme and the results are those which can be reasonably be expected in the situation 2. Operational management /implementation by provision of information required to coordinate the human, financial and physical resources that are committed to the project thus improving performance and 3. Strategic management by providing information which informs the background and adjusting objectives where necessary 4. To provide confidence of beneficiaries as well as organisational learning and adaptive management.

Shapiro (1996) further outlines benefits of monitoring and evaluation as those which include providing and showing any need for 'mid-course' corrections, identifying problems early on in order to impose solutions by reviewing progress, monitoring access to project services and outcomes to those which the project is intended for and finally providing evidence for the basis of building consensus between stakeholders.

Many organisations view monitoring and evaluation as a donor prerequisite as opposed to a management tool. Though donors are entitled to know if their money is being spent well, the most important use of

monitoring and evaluation should be for the organisation itself to assess how it is doing against the set objectives, whether it is having any impact, working effectively and to learn other ways of doing it better, whether the activities implemented have any impact, working efficiently and learning ways of doing it better next time (Public Service Commission: 2012)

Though plans are considered important during monitoring and evaluation, these should not be cast in stone in that if a plan is not working it should be flexible enough to allow for changes especially when circumstances change. In essence one will monitor and adjust several times before the process of evaluation and preplanning can occur. Evaluators should note that monitoring and evaluation are not magic wands that can be waved to make problems disappear, cured, or miraculously change situations without a lot of hard work injected in the project (Public Service Commission: 2012)

The next subheading unpacks the concepts of monitoring and evaluation by describing each concept individually.

2.4.1 Monitoring

According to Bartle (2011) monitoring refers to the constant observation and recording of activities taking place in a project or programme. It is a process of gathering information about the project on all aspects by checking how the project activities are progressing. Monitoring involves systematic and purposeful observation. Though this is not explicit in its definition, monitoring suggest a series of observations made over time. During the process of monitoring one regularly gives feedback about the progress of the project to stakeholders such as donors, implementers and beneficiaries of the project while reporting enables gathering valuable information to be used in decision making which is aimed at improving project performance. (Davis: 1995) posit that since most scholars would often define the process of monitoring in different ways which boils down to semantics, the best way to define monitoring is to provide a clear statement which outlines the purpose of monitoring to be conducted.

Bartle (2011) further describes the process of monitoring as similar to watching where one is going while riding a bicycle i.e you can adjust as go along to ensure that you are still on the right track and this process is crucial for project planning and implementation. Other purposes include providing information which can be used to analyse the situation in the community and its project, determining whether inputs of the project are being optimally utilised, identifying challenges facing the community or project and finding solutions thereof, ensuring that all activities are carried out properly by the right people and in time, utilising lessons from one project to another and finally determining whether the way the project was planned is the most suitable method of resolving challenges at hand.

Components of monitoring can be summed up as trend monitoring which refers to measurement conducted on regular, well-spaced intervals to determine a particular trend which may be developing, baseline monitoring whose intention is to capture temporal variability of the constituents of interest, implementation monitoring which assesses whether activities were carried out as planned, effectiveness

monitoring which is used to assess not just whether an activity was carried out as in implementation monitoring but also examines whether the activity had any effect, project monitoring measures overall effectiveness and other mitigation factors associated with the project, validation monitoring which refers to the quantitative evaluation of the proposed model and compliance monitoring which monitors whether the specified criteria of the model are being met (Davis: 1995).

2.4.2 Evaluation

Evaluation on the other hand can be described as an objective and systematic assessment on an on-going and often complex project, programme or policy, and its design, implementation as well as results (Sera & Beaudry: 2007). The aim of evaluation is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of the objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. The process of evaluation should ideally give information that is credible and useful to necessitate the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision making process for both recipient and donor. Like monitoring, evaluation has components and these can be divided into three. These are formative, process and summative evaluation and each of these are discussed as follows;

Formative evaluation (sometimes referred to as internal) is a method for judging the worth of a program while the program activities are forming (in progress). This part of the evaluation focuses on the process (Striven: 1991). According to Striven (1991) formative evaluation is a bit more complex than summative evaluation. It is conducted with a small group of people to test. By comparison it is similar to the process of editing in English since the aim is to have another set of eyes go through your work during the development phase to pick up issues which you may have missed or another way of achieving the same objective.

According to Striven (1991) formative evaluation is often conducted during the development or improvement of a programme or product and it is intended for in-house personnel who are privy to the programme with the intention to improve it. While the reports generated regarding formative evaluation normally remain in-house, this can also be an outsourced service.


Process evaluation on the hand is aimed at improving the current programme by understanding it comprehensively. It assesses what is being done by the programme and identifying the beneficiaries of the programme being developed. In other words, during the process evaluation an evaluator checks whether the programme meets the required standards as per set objectives (Sera & Beaudry: 2007).Process evaluation is undertaken for a number of reasons among these for accountability by asking whether the programme is achieving what was intended, for programme development and improvement by asking how the programme can be improved and also show where there may be duplications. The other reasons include helping others set up similar services especially if the programme achieves tremendous success others may want to duplicate it thereby serving as a model.

According to Scriven (1991) summative evaluation is a direct opposite of formative evaluation in that by definition it refers to the provision of information on the product's efficacy. In other words its ability to achieve what it is designed to be achieved. Formative evaluation is similar to when the cook tastes the soup and the guests taste the soup. In other words, with formative evaluation the emphasis is on critical evaluation happens internally whereas with summative it occurs externally. By using an example from learners Striven (1991) argues that with summative evaluation the learner is assessed on how they performed by examining how the learner did, it helps the evaluator know whether the product teaches what it is supposed to teach. In addition, summative evaluation is often quantitative in nature in that through usage of numeric scores or letter grades to assess achievement.

2.4.3 Applying monitoring and evaluation on Ekhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme

Basic principles of monitoring and evaluation will be inherent during the programme especially those which allude to continuous monitoring and assessing whether objectives of the programme are being met. However, for evaluation this research will be focused on one specific component out of the three mentioned by Scriven (1991), namely summative evaluation. As a recap summative evaluation focuses on the programme efficacy by measuring whether activities meet the set objectives of the programme. With eKhaya, the most important objective of the programme is to ensure the programme improves the livelihood of the community in Hillbrow in terms of safety, cleanliness and other areas within the neighbouhood.

2.5 Key Variables of Development Interventions



Key variables of the intervention are impact, outcome, outputs, activities and inputs and these will be described briefly as some of these were already defined under 2.2 above. Further, indicators, baselines, targets, assumptions and risks would be provided for each in the context of the research. However, their individual definitions are provided under 2.5.1 and 2.5.2 of the discussion below in order to understand their applicability on the results chain further in the discussion.

2.5.1 Impact, Outputs, Outcomes, Activities and Inputs

Impact refers to effectives of the programme which is measured over a long term once the programme has been implemented (Montague: 1997). In the eKhaya research what the programme aims to change is the perception which outsiders have of Hillbrow.

Also relevant to this research are concepts "outputs", "outcomes" and 'targets". The former refers to explaining what the intervention is and what it does whereas outcomes refer to expectant results. Most interventions focus on what they do, who they reach in order to impress funders (outputs). Whereas what funders and most other stakeholders often ask themselves "what difference does it make" (outcomes), the value of impact evaluation is to explain the outcomes of the intervention. Outcomes should be clearly specified prior to any intervention so that in the end any type of evaluation is conducted against these outcomes on whether they have been achieved.

Outcomes must be articulated as short term, medium/intermediate term, or long term. Long-term outcomes are often called impacts. Whatever you choose to call the effects of the programme, the concept chosen needs to be consistent instead of using the terms interchangeably as it confuses the reader and mean slightly different things. What a researcher is looking for as an outcome is change–in learning; in behavior; in conditions. This change is measured in the target audience–individuals, groups, communities, etc. Having explained the research for eKhaya is an outcome evaluation research since I will be looking for a change in the area after the programme was implemented (Patton: 1997). For this study the programme aims to achieve a change in behavior and to make Hillbrow a safe and clean neighbourhood to reside in.

Outputs are often classified into two parts–first, participants (or target audience) and the second part, activities that are conducted. Typically (although not always), those activities are counted and are called bean counts. Outputs are necessary and not sufficient to determine if a programme is being effective (Torvan: 1998). The outputs applicable for eKhaya are funding and support from key stakeholders.

Activities are actual deliverables which are conducted to bring about the change in a programme. These are often actuals deliverables and in this research the activities would be the cleaning of the area in specific lanes, employing 24 hour security to ensure safety not just within the buildings but mostly outside in the neighbourhood, recreational activities (Montague: 1997). Activities that ensure that the objective for eKhaya is achieved are small but critical activities which are done on a daily basis in the area such as 24 hour security, community participation in cleaning and partaking in recreational activities.


Inputs–are those resources one needs to conduct the programme. Typically, they are lumped into personnel, time, money, venue, equipment. Personnel cover staff, volunteers, partners, any stakeholder. Time is not just your time–also the time needed for implementation, evaluation, analysis, and reporting. Money (speaks for itself). Venue is where the programme will be held. Equipment is what stuff you will need–technology, materials, gear, etc. In this case inputs entail the funds invested in the area on a continuous basis, staff employed, the time to attain planned activities and so forth (Torvatn: 1998). So far the programme for this research depends on donor funding which is often not sufficient as there is a lot

to be done. It also depend on time spent on this intervention by various players including the community, donors and management of eKhaya as well as the areas where the intervention is being implemented.

2.6 The Results Chain, Results Framework and Theory of Change Informing the eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Intervention

For one to conduct data analysis, it is required that we establish the angle or lens from which results would be interpreted and in this research monitoring and evaluation tools and concepts were applicable in the eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme research. To this end, concepts of results chain, results framework and theory of change are used and the application of these concepts is inter-twined as all three are very similar.

2.6.1 Results chain



Sequence of Results Chain for an intervention

In the outcome evaluation study of eKhaya Neighbourhood Development programme the two variables are the observed changed in Hillbrow South and assessing whether these are due to the other variable i.e the programme. In other words a cause – effect relationship was observed in this research.

The concept of results chain is of equal significance and is tantamount to the above is. Kessler and Sen (2013) delineate a result chain to express how programme activities elicit various levels of changes leading eventually to the desired impact of a programme. The above diagram designed as a hierarchy is a basic depiction of a result chain that shows how distinct changes at each level will ultimately lead to a desired change. Each box in the result chain indicates all critical changes which are arranged in a logical manner, demonstrating how the selected intervention leads to the achievement of programme outcome. These changes indicate details of each level and these are measured quantitatively or qualitatively.

Ultimately the results chain aims to accomplish through an easy sketch as the one above to credibly demonstrate reasons for the programme, how impact will be achieved as well as the foundation for measuring the extent to which the observed change has taken place (Kessler & Sen: 2013).

Relating the results chain to the eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme research starts with the application of the input and here the research needs to describe what has been used to conduct the work in the programme. The first resource was to mobilise a buy in from property owners within the areas where the programme was being implemented. Without their buy in and commitment, the programme would not move forward because even though this programme was being spearheaded by JHC on the account of having one or two buildings in the area, the surrounding neighbourhood consists of other buildings in the area. The next resource to carry the programme forward is funding as the running of the programme depends on it. For instance, eKhaya has a few staff personnel that manage the running of the programme and they require an income. Security personnel employed in the neighbourhood are being paid by a monthly stipend received from JHC and the neighbouring property owners. There are regular projects such as cleaning campaigns and recreational projects aimed at making the lives of this community better. Participation of the community is another resource without which if not obtained may render the programme worthless (Makhulong 10 Year Book: 2005).

Activities – next I unpack the concept of activities carried out to meet the objectives of the programme and these as previously stated are to provide 24 hour security in the neighbourhood to ensure safety of residents. Security personnel work closely with the police in that in the event of apprehending a criminal, they hand over the criminal to the police. Cleaning the neighbourhood is a huge part of the programme. One can recall the annual tradition of throwing furniture out of the windows to celebrate new year which has now stopped completely. It took regular education of the community for the trend to come to a halt. As Hillbrow is notorious for drug abuse, the programme found it necessary to find means of protecting children and the youth from this habit and in this regard a park which has a netball and football facility was first opened in 2009. There have been smaller parks within the vicinity which are converted to accommodate the youth in the area (Makhulong 10 Year Book: 2005).

Outputs – at output level the programme accomplishes the planned activities and this yield certain noticeable results that were intended and in the eKhaya intervention, they have been noticeable change in the behaviour of the community which entail a mind shift of how they would like to be viewed by the outside world. This of course includes volunteering in regular projects and their willingness to drive the programme. Most security personnel employed in the area are also residents of these areas and because of their efforts criminal activities such as mugging or hijackings in these areas have become very rare (Makhulong 10 Year Book: 2005).

Outcomes – as outputs are observed, consequently outcomes should be observed. The research focus is to establish if there have been any outcomes with the result chain so far i.e inputs, activities and outputs. The research would like to assess whether municipal investment has improved in the area for instance, whether the response times by EMS services or policing has improved, whether small businesses have erupted in these areas with the advent of improved security (Makhulong 10 Year Book: 2005).

Impact – the above are short term results but in the long run the programme should be able to establish impact by assessing the effectiveness of eKhaya through areas such as checking whether funders are more willing to inject funds on such a project owing to its success, whether perceptions are changing about Hillbrow, whether more people feel they can live in the area not because it is a low cost area but also because of its homely feel as it were in the 1950s.

With all the components of this chain having being realised, the result chain would be complete.

2.6.2 Indicators, Baselines, Targets, Assumptions and Risks

Indicators refer to instruments which provide one with information. They can be quantitative or qualitative which provides an easy and reliable means to measure achievement, to reflect changes linked to an intervention or to assist in assessing the performance of a development actor (Manual Project Cycle Management:2001). It is a variable whose purpose is to measure change in a situation and that which helps you understand where you are, which indicates the direction you are headed and how far you are currently compared to where you want be (Manual project cycle management: 2001).

To make a change in the community, one of the first things one needs to do is figure out how much of the different factors and trends that are being examined are happening. Baselines try to find out how prevalent any problems and positive tendencies are, how often things happen, the duration and intensity of most incidents, etc (Tirnauer: 2010). The things one keeps track of in order to obtain this type of information are called baseline measures. In other words, the baseline is the standard against which you will measure all subsequent changes implemented by your programme. They are called baselines because they are usually shown as lines in graph form to easily show changes over time (Tirnauer: 2010).Thus the baselines can be defined as the value of a performance indicator before the implementation of projects or activities.

Targets by contrast from baselines are specific, planned level of result to be achieved within an explicit timeframe. They assist in justifying a programme by describing in concrete terms what the investment is expected to produce. They orient stakeholders to the task which is to be accomplished and motivate individuals involved in a programme to give their best to ensure the targets are met (Tirnauer: 2010).

Assumptions–assumptions can be defined as unproven connections between levels in a design hierarchy, the theory of change, or project context. They focus on how change will work and advantages of one approach over another. They are often framed as positives whereas risks which are discussed below are framed as negatives (Manual Project Cycle Management: 2001). With regard to the study at hand the assumption is that with the programme implementation, there will be positive change in the area over time.

Risks–Risk on the other hand is the result of uncertainty on objectives. Risks are logical frameworks that have the potential logical barrier to the achievement of each level in the design hierarchy (Manual Project Cycle Management: 2001). The risk for the study linked to the assumption above is the fact that there is no absolute certainty that the positive result which resulted could be directly attributed to the intervention as there could be other unknown factors causing the positive change which have very little to do with the programme. These factors can be the evolution of the population that tend to reside in Hillbrow may become more elite and not hamper any developments in the area.

These concepts can best be illustrated in the context of the results framework below.

2.6.2.1 Result framework

According to Stout & Khattri (2012) a results framework refers to the graphic expression of the different levels or results chain expected from an intervention or programme. Just like the results chain, it captures the critical components of the rational and anticipated cause – effect relationships in terms of indicators, baselines, targets, assumptions and risks.

According to USAID (2010) the results framework is a strategy designed to obtain a specified objective in a cause and effect logical manner. It is a model which clearly shows how change will occur in a programme. It aids many organisations in creating an actual strategy and also help decision makers have clarity around key objectives and ultimately setting not just a sound footing for a strategy but also for other various management and planning functions along the way in monitoring and evaluation. In essence a results framework is part and parcel of a broader strategy.
The results framework for eKhaya is outlined below:

Indicators (what is to be achieved)	Baselines (info on situation which programme aims to change)	Targets (what the programme needs to achieve)	Assumptions (positive)	Risks (negative)
Achievement of a clean and safe neighbourhood in Hillbrow: • Cleaning and cordoning of specific lanes in the neighbourhood where the community tends to litter. • Employment of 24 hr security to ensure safety of residents.	• State of cordoned lanes before intervention i.e lack of cleanliness • Evidence of mindset shift by showing community tendency to litter and against behaviour after intervention • Provision of crime stats stats before intervention in order to compare this with after the intervention was implemented	• Practice of clean habits by residents, participation in cleaning projects • Increased security personnel and their compensation thereof	The assumption is that with all stakeholders on board (including property owners who have not joined and the broader Hillbrow area where the programme is not rolled out will join in to ensure a clean, safe and inviting neighbourhood.	Risks associated with this assumption is that as the area starts begins to show improvement, Hillbrow may become an even more populated due to amenities in the neighbourhood.
Help change the negative perceptions about the Hillbrow area to the outside world • Find publicity for all positive work achieved via the media and word of mouth	• Evidence of public perception towards area prior the intervention	• Increased positive exposure (via media and all relevant channels) and coverage of regular activities in order to change perception	More people will learn about the good work happening in the area and gradually perceptions will shift into focusing on positivity in the area.	The risk is that perceptions are difficult to change especially when it comes to certain neighbourhood in SA. Even with improvements they continue to be regarded as substandard.
Attracting adequate funding from various donors as a result of providing a valuable service to the community • Set targets for all activities and develop reports or evidence of change before and after programme	• Show balance sheet when compared to the needs of the programme to indicate the apparent need for cash flow	• More funders need to contribute especially the private sector companies within SA.	With more funding the programme scale will grow; more personnel, more activities etc	As funding increases the programme runs the risk of being viewed as a money making scheme and other areas may copy the model for profit

2.6.3 Theory of change

A theory of change (ToC) can be defined as a specific type of method for forecasting, partaking, and evaluation that is used in various sectors to advance social change. Theory of change outlines intermediate and long-term goals and then charts backward to define necessary prerequisites (Mclaughlin & Mitra: 2001). Connel and Kubisch (1998) add that it is a theory regarding how and why an initiative works. This definition express that the key towards an evaluation process is in identifying the activities necessary to obtain these anticipated outcomes but more importantly, the contextual factors that could affect implementation and their likelihood of bringing about preferred outcomes. A theory of change requires that those undertaking it are clear about eventual outcomes and impacts and also how these would be accomplished.

By developing a theory of change upfront and getting consensus from all stakeholders, chances of challenges related with causal attribution of impact. A theory of change needs to specify precisely the activities which will lead to interim and longer term outcomes and identify the contextual factors that may affect them (Connel & Kubisch: 1998).

Below is a theory of change graph whose focus is on the contextual factors as well as interim and long term outcomes. The activities have already been described in the results chain above and these will merely be listed by extracting key words from their description on the results chain.

THEORY OF CHANGE

Activities	Contextual factors	Interim outcomes	Long term outcomes
1. Ensure secured neighbourhood 2. Improve cleanliness in neighbourhood 3. Recreational activities to deter children from drug abuse and crime	1. Policy improvement that supports neighbourhood development	1. Municipal investment improves i.e quicker response by police, EMS. 2. Community feel safer in the area and visible mindset change about cleanliness of neighbourhood e.g tenants take initiative to clean neighbourhood	1. Increase in donor funding 2. Negative perception changes e.g media no longer portrays area as dodgy

2.7 Evaluating eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme in Hillbrow South, A Conceptual Framework

A conceptual framework of the research comprise of the system of concepts, assumptions, expectations, beliefs, and theories that support and inform a research (Walliman: 2005). It is a key part of the design. The conceptual framework can be outlined graphically or narratively as long as it allude to main concepts and variables derived from the literature which should be studied and applied in the research (Walliman:2005).

Firstly we recap research problem for the study by describing the development of eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme to advance the lives of the tenant community in Hillbrow. As indicated, the area is mainly made up of rental property where the community had often felt safer in their buildings and unsafe as soon they left the premises. Thus the intervention's aim is to alleviate these issues so that the community lives in a safe, clean and homely environment. A number of activities were introduced to this end and these have already been discussed at length. What follows next and what is also the focus of this study is to measure the success of this programme through outcome evaluation in order to ascertain that the programme if valuable not just to residents but to funders and stakeholders within this area (Makhulong 10 Year Book: 2005).

In this research the conceptual framework is derived from the literature which is the most applicable literature model or theory to be applied in this research in order to answer the research problem and that which is more relatable.

The Housing Development Agency (HDA) conducted research with regard to the programme and its focus was to look at successes and challenges of the programme will be used in this study. As previously indicated in chapter 1, some of the successes observed with the intervention were the opening of a new park, upping security in the area and cleaning the neighbourhood. Among identified challenges is the lack of participation by that once some residents saw improvements in the area, their interest grew. Perhaps the one major weakness of this research is that it is too descriptive in the sense that it highlights what has happened and what has not happened (Housing Development Agency: 2012). Perhaps the research could have expanded more on explaining causes of the challenges and how these would be addressed going forward. The Housing Development Agency (2012) or HDA study is the only existing study similar to what is being researched now. The current study addresses some of the concerns identified by HDA of measuring impact, though the focus here is output evaluation, it is a step closer to addressing issues of impact. Thus there is a gap in research with regard to studies on evaluation and this makes the current study more invaluable (Housing Development Agency: 2012).

Other theories are derived from literature by Howarth (1998) which pertains to the output evaluation of neighbourhood centres. The theory is selected for its similarity to what the study of eKhaya aims to

evaluate in that both use outcome evaluation and both are intended for neighbourhood programmes. We also derive from Howarth (1998) that he suggest similar research methodology as those being used in this research i.e focus group as well as measuring the satisfaction levels of residents (Howarth: 1998).

Howarth (1998) cites that major donors frequently ask organisations to show that they do, in fact, make a positive difference in the community as opposed to simply having just good intentions. Key donors of community services according to Howarth (1998) work with agencies to establish the type of social change, accountability or human behaviour questions they want to study. In turn agencies have come to learn that the first step in outcome evaluation is to outline expected outcomes and indicators for any programme.

He further stresses that outcome evaluation requires the dedication of time and expertise in order for it to have any worth. Neighbourhood Centres may draw from previous outcome evaluation researches efforts to support alleged links between their short – term programme outcomes as well as long term outcomes.

Thus theories from both the study by HDA and Howarth (1998) were used in this study, each where it is applicable.

Also the most important concepts and variables which emanate from the literature review and will also be applicable in this research are listed. The most important concepts arising from the literature are neighbourhood development, output evaluation as well as monitoring and evaluation. These concepts are used cautiously in the study of eKhaya and as in the literature review and their meaning is understood as the same to the ones used in the research.

2.8 Conclusion

In this chapter, a brief background of the research setting which is Hillbrow is provided by detailing the history of the area that has resulted in the area becoming dilapidated and the onset of eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme in Hillbrow South. The concept of impact evaluation is placed within the broader field of monitoring and evaluation by relating the research to concepts of monitoring and evaluation. These are theory of change, result framework as well as indicators, baselines, targets, assumptions and risks. The entire discussion contextualizes the whole research in the broader field of monitoring and evaluation.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3. Research Methodology

A research methodology is a roadmap for conducting research by outlining all the steps to be followed in order to achieve the research objectives. The research methodology outlines the strategy, design, procedure, methods and limitations, among others, which will be used in the research (Du Plooy: 2001).

3.1 Research Strategy

A strategy is a business approach to a set of competitive moves that are designed to generate a successful outcome. It is a method or plan selected to bring about a desired future, such as the achievement of a goal or solution to an existing problem. (Summer: 2009). Organisations often define strategy as a map designed at the beginning of a defined period, often the financial year and which is used to guide activities within the specified period. In research the concept of strategy is used interchangeably with that of a paradigm by various scholars such as Babbie & Mouton (2010), Bryman (2012).

There are three main strategies in research namely; qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods strategy. Qualitative research approaches human action from the perspective of social actors. Thus its main purpose is to describe and understand human behaviour through an interpretivism philosophy (Babbie & Mouton: 2010, Bryman: 2012). In contrast to qualitative research strategy, quantitative research strategy restricts itself to positivism philosophical system which focuses on data of experiences and rejects any form of speculation about the state of reality (Bryman: 2012). In terms of the positivist philosophy and quantitative research strategy follows the school of thought that reality is pre – existing and just need to be discovered by a researcher (Du Plooy: 2001). The mixed methods research strategy is a combination of both qualitative and quantitative research strategy. As described by Murphy and Maguire (2011) in their study on evaluating clinical trials by using the mixed methods approach. They argue that the value of mixed methods is in its ability to neutralise any bias inherent in a particular data source, investigator or even method.

As an example which depicts monitoring and evaluation an article by Vernooy, Qiu and Jianchu (2006) is provided. The article examines the capacity-building experiences of two research teams in Yunnam and Guizhou which strengthen their development research, particularly in the area of natural – resource management. The said authors then attempted to incorporate monitoring and evaluation practices in their work and which according to the article proved challenging and they concluded that monitoring and evaluation as a discipline still has a long way to go in so far as using it in research.

The next article is compiled by the World Bank and it sketches a new system for monitoring and evaluation in support of a programme on new bank practices in civic engagement, empowerment, and respect for diversity in the World Bank. The article suggests that monitoring and evaluation must be context sensitive and it must take into account differences and changes in context (Brunner: 2004). For

instance, indicators of success or failure, and assumptions about responsibility cannot be specified reliably in project agreements prior to implementation (Brunner: 2004).

The study at hand on evaluating outcome of eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme in Hillbrow South, uses a mixed methods research paradigm i.e both qualitative and quantitative research paradigms are combined.

Under qualitative paradigm focus groups will be held with a group of residents while a survey will be conducted to fulfil the quantitative approach. The mixed method is discussed in detail under the section of data collection methods and procedures.

3.2 Research Design

A research design refers to the general strategy that the researcher chooses to incorporate the different components of the study in a coherent and logical way, thereby, ensuring that the research problem is effectively addressed; it constitutes the blueprint for the collection, measurement, and analysis of data (Walliman: 2010). The different types of research design are discussed below and the one which specifically applies in this research.

In terms of the time-dimensions Babbie and Mouton (2010) argue that research can be conducted either at a single point in time or over a long period of time. Cross – section studies are studies conducted at a single point in time. A single census, for example, is the type of research aimed at describing the South Africa population at a given time. Even though cross – sections typically try to understand causal processes that occur over time, conclusions made are of observations made at a single point in time.

The design followed for this study is quasi – experimental since this is a quantitative research. A quasi – experimental research involves making a change in the value of an independent variable and observing the effect of the change on the dependent variable (Walliman: 2010).

For the study at hand, a cross- section was conducted since the intention was to at a specific point in time. The data collection was conducted over one month and this was done by administering interview questionnaires which asked for the views of residents in that particular point in time.

3.3 Research Procedure And Methods

3.3.1 Data collection instruments

A data collection instrument is a tool used by researchers to gather data in research and one often used to gather data from a sampled population (Bryman: 2012).Researchers collect data by asking questions, collecting self-report or behavioural observation data. In most cases, units of analysis are often individual persons. Thus researchers collect data that describes their abilities, opinions, attitudes, beliefs and knowledge of a particular topic or issue (Du Plooy: 2009). Where units of analysis are artefacts as in newspapers or policy documents, researchers combine survey research with content analysis. Asking

questions to collect data can be used in survey research such as questionnaires. Focus groups interviews are often used in field research, in experimental research as well as observational research (Walliman: 2005).

Research that involves face-to-face situation i.e between the researcher and subject necessitates observations which in most instances amount to participant observation (Bryman: 2012). In research, the standard types of data collection instruments are interviews, questionnaires and observations and these are discussed as follows:

Observation schedule mainly refer to the role played by the researcher in data collection. In most cases this is participant observation which refers to the type of data collection where the researcher actively participates in a group. An example would be a researcher who willingly enters a prison cell to experience a day in the life of prisoners. The researcher may opt to play a detached role while observing instead of actively participating (Bryman: 2012).

Questionnaires which are often referred to as self – administered questionnaires are regularly questionnaires that are often sent to respondents by mail and comprise of close – ended questions containing a fixed number of answers from which a respondent selects a single option. The options provided are often (poor, fair, average, good and excellent or strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree). Other than close – ended questions, questionnaires have paired – comparison question where the responded has to select one of the two alternatives at a time (Du Plooy: 2009).

Interview Schedules are conducted on a face –to – face level with the respondents and can be managed to have structured, semi – structured and unstructured questions during the interview. Structured interviews comprise of questions that are prepared in advance and which are asked in a logical manner one after the other, whereas semi – structured interviews questions allow for the respondent to elaborate or be asked a follow up question from the previous question. Unstructured interviews means questions are used merely to start a conversation between the researcher and respondent (Bryman: 2012).

Related to these three types of data collection instruments are the concepts of structured, semi-structured as well as unstructured questions which apply to the above but mostly during interviews and questionnaires.

Unstructured – unstructured interviews are synonymous with open – ended questions where the interviewer may have the main question to start the conversation between the subject and interviewer which are formulated prior to the interview. Unstructured interviews allow questions based on the subject's responses and proceeds like a friendly, non- threatening dialogue where the subject is able to

elaborate and provide their opinions. While the advantage of this is the obvious matter of allowing comprehensiveness of responses, the disadvantage is that with this method, another researcher may not be able to replicate the study due the manner in which the questions were asked (Reja, Manfreda, Hlebec & Vehovar: 2003). Unstructured interviews are ideal for face-to-face interviews and even in observation research.

Semi-structured interviews allow minimum control for open conversation on the part of the researcher in that questions need to be asked in standardised order. The only time the researcher allows the respondent to elaborate is to clarify the question and also to ensure that the respondent understood the question and is responding to what was asked. For instance, the researcher may ask "do you have a tertiary qualification?" and further explains that a tertiary qualification applies to any education received after secondary school (Harrell & Bradley: 1997).

Structured – These are questions which are tantamount with close – ended questions in that the questions asked require a fixed response from the respondent. Structured questions are also ideal for self – administered questionnaires which are sent out to respondents. They are designed is such a manner that the respondent may not misinterpret the question as the researcher is not on sight to clarify. They follow a standardised order and are ideal for quantitative research as they enable easy data analysis. They include questions such as "how many" "How often" and so forth (Reja, Manfreda, Hlebec & Vehovar: 2003).

The most applicable method for collecting data in this research is firstly, through self – administered questionnaires. Since the information being collected aimed to confirm or dismiss a pre-existing reality based on answers relating to attitudes and knowledge about the programme. A questionnaire that was used for data gathering is attached along with this report. Further the questionnaire contains close-ended questions which are structured.

Since this was a mixed method research focus groups were used as well with open-ended which are semi – structured. Open- ended questions allowed for detailed response from respondents so that data collected may be all-inclusive when combining both focus groups and questionnaire data. In other words, each is meant to enhance the other.

Annexure C is a questionnaire with close – ended questions for the survey while Annexture D is an interview schedule for focus groups which contains open- ended questions.

3.3.2 Sampling

A discussion of the target population is provided by first deciphing the concept of target population then providing details of how this was utilised in this research.

The target population is the whole combination of respondents that meet the chosen set of conditions. This is everyone who qualifies to be part of the study in the sense that the findings can be generalised to this population. The target population in research is an entire set of units for which the research data is able to be used to make conclusions. Thus, the target population defines those units for which the findings of the research are meant to generalise. Their demographics (e.g age, gender, educational level), geographic and temporal characteristics of the target population need to be outlined (Lavrakas: 2008).

Following the target population Du Plooy (2001) further expand on the concept of accessible population and this is a population which the researcher has access to from the target population.

The target population of the study are residents of Hillbrow South. These are tenants within JHC and other properties at eKhaya. An estimated 2000 tenants reside in this area and this is the population size for the study which comprise of men and women between ages of 18 and 50 years. Since the target population may limit the generalisation of the findings in that the study can only be generalised to this specific population and any other with similar population parameters as in Hillbrow. This target population are people of low and middle income groups with a monthly earning averaged at R13 000. Meaning they work in call centres, filling stations, restaurants and factories around the Johannesburg CBD. The levels of education in this area are people who have reached high school. Some have completed high school and even tertiary qualifications. However, this is a small fraction of the population.

Sampling also distinguishes between probability and non- probability sampling. Probability sampling is a sampling technique in which the chance of being part of a sample is equal for every member of the target population. Nonprobability sampling does not meet this standard. Nonprobability sampling techniques cannot be used to conclude from the sample to the general population in that not everyone in the population has an equal chance of being selected for the study (Bryman: 2012).

Du Plooy (2001) assert that while probability methods are suitable for large-scale studies concerned with representativeness, non-probability approaches are more suitable for in-depth qualitative research in which the focus is often to understand complex social phenomena.

Since probability sampling comprises selecting cases that have a probable chance of being representative of the target population (Du Plooy: 2001), the usage of probability sampling is good for external validity in that the study can be repeated if the same rules are followed. eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme in Hillbrow South benefits some tenants in Hillbrow South more than others due to their level of involvement in the programme. For instance, there are tenants who are more involved in recreational programmes than others. Others participate in cleaning the area more than others since not everyone can be forced to participate. Others have benefited more due to their length of stay in the precinct thus a purposive sample would have been ideal (Du Plooy: 2001).

Having defined probability and non-probability sampling, the next stage is to differentiate between random and non-random sampling. Non-random sampling is a type of non – probability sampling. It is a sub-division of non-probability sampling which is more specific in that non- random sampling, the units of analysis can be chosen by the researcher without using a sampling frame or giving everyone an equal chance of being chosen. The purpose of non-random serves the needs of the researcher in terms of time and convenience (Bryman: 2012).

Judgemental sampling or purposive sampling– The researcher selects the sample based on who they think would be appropriate for the study. This is used primarily when there is inadequate number of people that have expertise in the area being researched. Such samples are biased because prominent experts may differ from other, equally expert, less prominent persons (Bryman: 2012).

Random sampling is a sub-division of probability sampling in that everyone is chosen randomly and therefore has an equal chance of being part of the study Du Plooy (2001).Stratified random sample is a sample which is divided into differing but in important ways on the basis of their grouping which is known in advance by selecting a random sample within each stratum(Bryman:2012, Walliman: 2005).

The probability sample in this research will use a form of random sample known as a stratified random sample. Thus a stratum will be selected in 3 or 4 buildings which is representative of the population within that street/s or area. Both JHC and non– JHC buildings will form part of the sample. In each stratum a random sampling will be selected using a sampling frame which includes all number of units/flats in the area.

Next I provide an abstract from a journal article which has used stratified random sampling to demonstrate its usage. The study was designed to investigate the efficiency of Neyman allocation procedure over equal and comparative allocations. The data used for the study was collected from ten markets in Abeokuta, Ogun state, Nigeria on the prices of Peak milk which was Nigerian made. Each market stood as a stratum and from each stratum an independent sample was drawn randomly based on equal, proportional and Neyman allocation procedure. Neyman allocation procedure was found to be the best and most efficient (Mathew, Sola, Oladiran & Amos: 2013).

3.3.3 Ethical considerations

Ethical considerations are concerned with research activities generally and the conduct of a researcher in particular (Bryman: 2012). They are moral principles that govern the researcher's behaviour during research particularly during data collection. They are the researcher's ability to conceptualise what is right and wrong. It is the ideal human character and moral duty (Bryman: 2012).

Various scholars including (Babbie & Mouton: 2010) assert that there are no rules determining the extent to which the research issue is ethically acceptable or unacceptable. However, if participants voluntary

participation and informed consent cannot be obtained, if their privacy cannot be protected, if the principle of not harming participants or exposing them to danger, then the researchers' conscience must prevail in these circumstances.

Informed consent – As opposed to obtaining a mere signature on the consent form, this relates to informing respondents about the details of the research which may include direct or substitute consent. Substitute consent is even more applicable where children are involved as respondents. Their parents or guardians need to be informed about what the research is for and who will read the research results. Informed consent involves disclosing all information which may be relevant to the respondent and could potentially harm them if they are not privy to it. For instance, the researcher may be collecting data from the elderly persons and in this case their intellectual capacity need to be ascertained as to whether they understand the implications of their involvement since most elderly people's thinking capacity may be declining with age. Therefore legal and cognitive competency needs to be ascertained (Du Plooy: 2001).

Privacy –Issues of privacy are most applicable when dealing with sensitive information. This is true if a researcher's respondents are HIV positive for example and in this case respondents may need you to explain to what lengths will their anonymity and privacy could be protected as some may not have told their loved ones about their status. The same applies to research which deals with gays and lesbians who have not come out of the closet for instance. The last thing these recipients need is to have a research report with their information in the public domain. Ensuring privacy is even more applicable to field observations, focus groups or ethnographic research as this might be easy for the researcher to overlook the issue of privacy. In the event that the researcher makes use of a video camera for instance to aid in data collection, it is imperative that all recipients are aware of them being recorded. Prisons in South Africa do not allow recording of prisoners within their premises and it is just as bad to show a prisoner who may not be part of the research but may happen to be walking past through the camera by accident during recording (Walliman: 2010).

Harming participants –This entails not causing physical uneasiness, emotional stress, shame or even embarrassment to participants in research. Though the idea of harm to participants is prevalent in experimental research that involves testing in the laboratory for instance, where respondents are used as guinea pigs to test for new medication without disclosing the full dangers or side effects of the medication being administered, the idea of harm also applies to other types of research. Harm may come in the form of embarrassment or emotional distress where certain uncomfortable questions arise during the course of the interview and in this case these respondents need to be advised in advance of their right to pull out of the interview (Babbie & Mouton: 2009).

In this research participants' consent to partake in the study was obtained. This includes alerting participants that they would not be paid to participate and that they are answering research questions voluntarily and at any given time they may withdraw from the study should they so wish. The research would be cautious to different cultural, religious and political affiliations and questionnaire has been desined with this in mind. The research does not foresee the issue of harm to recipients and privacy as primary ones in this research because the subject matter at hand is not in any way a sensitive one.

Where the data collection does not involve people for instance in content analysis issues such as plagiarism contribute to bad ethics in research.

At the end of this proposal, Appendix B is enclosed and it contains the consent form which will be used in the study and this is preceded by Appendix A which is a brief CV of the researcher.

3.3.4 Data collection methods

There are three ways in which to collect data in research and these are through observations, focus groups and interviews. The discussion below describes a focus group since it is the only method used in this research (Bryman: 2012).

Focus group as a method of collecting data is a type of group interview where the researcher has a group of several participants to interview while their role is to facilitate the session. Focus groups comprise of 7 – 12 people in a group and these people have some knowledge of the subject matter for the research. Procedurally the facilitator aims to record the session by taking notes, using a tape recorder or even a video camera. Introductions are made and these include ensuring the necessary paperwork is signed by all participants such as a consent sheet. The facilitator ensures that no one in the group is discriminated in terms of religious belief, sexual orientation and so forth by the nature of conversation during the interview. To begin the session the facilitator starts off with general questions to ease any tensions and move on to specific questions regarding the research topic at hand. The session may not last longer than an hour (Walliman: 2010).

In the case of this research, the focus group was aimed at a group of beneficiaries of the eKhaya programme living in Hillbrow South. These participants comprised at least two people from buildings that reside in the area.

3.3.5 Data collection procedure

Data collection procedure is a step – by – step process regarding how the researcher intends to collect data in order to respond to the main research problem (Babbie & Mouton: 2010).

For the research at hand, participants were contacted in advance once they had been sampled and because these are respondents from JHC buildings, self-administered questionnaires were delivered and due for collection on a specified date from respondents. Respondents would be called telephonically first to

request them to complete a questionnaire. With regard to the structure of the self – administered questionnaire for the survey, a five point linkert scale which asks the level of agreement or disagreement with a close – ended question or statement. The recipient can either "strongly disagree', "disagree", "neutral", "agree", "strongly agree" with a statement. Questions or statements were derived from the research questions and the hypothesis. This way, the study is provided answers for the study.

The procedure which was followed for the research was to send questionnaires to 50 sampled participants (with 10 sampled from each stratum since a stratified random sampling was used). The strata was chosen from each building participating in the eKhaya neighbourhood and these buildings would have been selected using a simple random sample. The sample could be increased by including 10 more participants to allow for a poor response rate. Questionnaires had a deadline for collection by the researcher.

For focus groups a similar procedure was followed by calling the respondents first to request an appointment and also briefly advise them of the nature of the research, location for the meeting and time of meeting. Similar questions as those used in the survey were asked. The main difference in the interview schedule for focus groups is that questions were open ended to allow members of the groups to provide an elaborate answer as opposed to agreeing or disagreeing. In this way the research is also qualitative in that the researcher probes and follows up on questions in the interview schedule. Notes were taken to record the session and participants of eKhaya who are residents in the neighbourhood as well as one or two personnel was interviewed for the session. Location for the interview was in one of the JHC building learning centres. A simple random sample of 12 respondents was used. This sample is neither too small to allow to get sufficient views nor is too big to the extent that the group is unmanageable during the session. The focus group schedule questionnaire is attached here as Appendix D at the end of this document. Moderating focus groups requires an intricate set of skills that amount to the following and these were applied in eKhaya research; moderating without participating meaning the moderator or facilitator must only ask or guide questions and join in the views. A moderator needs to be ready for views which differs with his or her personal opinion on the matter and they must be willing to listen without judging. The moderator needs to be themselves and natural in order to make participants feel at ease (Gill, Steward, Treasure & Chadwick: 2008).

3.3.6 Data storage

Data storage and backup in research is important because correctly storing data is a way to protect your research investment. Data may need to be accessed by other researchers to explain or change future research. Other researchers might wish to evaluate or use the results of the research. Stored data can establish precedence in the event that similar research is published (Bryman: 2012). Since the consent form which contains the confidentiality of respondents is involved, data will be stored securely especially that which contain names of respondents. This would only be made available to the research team

including the research supervisor. Once the report is published respondents will be assured that their names would not appear in the research report.

3.3.7 Data processing

According to Walliman (2005) data processing involves the cleaning, editing and coding of data in order to draw conclusions from eligible data. Firstly, by identifying discrepancies such as incomplete questionnaires and incoherent answers to questionnaires and by tallying of results so that it can be analysed. As previously stated, the target was to distribute 50 questionnaires, however only 31 respondents ended up agreeing to participate. This is still adequate as this proportion fits an area which has an estimated 900 – 1200 tenants. The reason for the low turnout includes respondents who have since moved out and new ones who are still not familiar with the area or any programmes in the in the proximity as the area is mainly for rental and tenants move in and vacate frequently.

Processing of data from eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Survey is under the heading "Presentation of findings" the number of respondents who gave a specific response is summed up.

To process data from focus groups, the method of coding was utilised. According to Strauss (1987) a code in qualitative research refers to a word or phrase which is symbolically ascribes a combined, salient, essence – capturing and suggestive attribute for a portion of data in research. The portion of data which is coded can be a single word or even a sentence or even an entire page.

3.3.8 Data analysis

Qualitative and quantitative data differ in the following manner when it comes to data analysis; the focus on meanings as opposed to quantifiable phenomena, collection of many data cases rather than few data on many cases, research in depth and detail the predetermined categories rather than focusing on analysis and categories determined in advance, understanding context rather than looking for collective generalisations as well as rich descriptions rather than measurement of specific variables (Taylor –Powell & Renner: 2003).

The four most common types of data analysis in qualitative research are conversation analysis, narrative analysis, grounded theory and qualitative comparative analysis and these are concisely discussed below:
Conversation analysis – emphasis is on how reality is formed as opposed to defining it. This means interaction is progressively arranged and the act of talking can be analysed in terms of the process of social interaction rather than in terms of motives or social status. Talk is context based and is both shaped by interaction and it also creates the social context of that interaction (Baskas: 2011).

Narrative analysis (content analysis)–the analyst focuses on how participants causing order on the flow of experience in their lives and thus make sense of events and actions in which they have participated (Taylor –Powell & Renner: 2003). Narrative analysis is used in interviews, documents and observations to analyse narrative (Taylor –Powell & Renner: 2003).

Grounded theory – it refers to building up a methodical theory inductively based on observations by first providing succinct observations which are turned into conceptual groups followed by testing the rationality of these categories directly to the research setting with more observations. Ultimately the researcher refines and links the categories until a theory is formed (Baskas: 2011).

Qualitative comparative analysis – this can be defined as a method used for analysing data sets by itemising and calculating all the groupings of variables observed in the data set, then applying rules of logical insinuation to establish which descriptive insinuation or suggestions the data supports (Baskas: 2011).

Quantitative data analysis on the other hand comprise of the following methods or types of analysing data:
Correlation data analysis – this is a method for determining the covariance of two random variables in a matched data set. The covariance is usually stated as a correlation coefficient of two variables x and y. The correlation coefficient is a unit less number that varies from -1 to +1. The level of the correlation coefficient is the standard degree of association between x and y. The sign is the direction the association which can be positive or negative (Du Plooy: 2001).

T-test –a t-test is a method of analysis which is used to compare the two values of the means from two samples and test whether it is possible that the samples are from populations with different mean values. When samples are taken from the same population it is very unlikely that the means of two samples will be identical. When two samples are taken from populations with very different means values, it is likely that the means of the two samples will differ. The challenge is how to differentiate the two situations using only data from the samples (Walliman: 2010).

Computer software data analysis – This refers to the usage of computer based software to analyse data which has become popular in social research and especially in quantitative data analysis. The most well-known types of softwares for analysing data are SPSS, Nvivo and CAQDAS. Data can also be analysed using Microsoft excel and for the eKhaya research the easiest method to analyse data will be through a t-test.

For a survey, data was tallied and entered into an excel spreadsheet followed by the usage of a t-test. The t-test usage is described in detail under section 4.

For the focus groups, content analysis was conducted following the conversation analysis as described in the above discussion since the focus groups comprises conversation which are context based. The


context is eKhaya Neighbourhood i.e responses which share a similar view were grouped together and interpreted. This type of analysis is provided on Chapter 4 below.


3.3.9 Describing the respondents

Respondents participating in the survey are existing tenants where the programme is being implemented. These include both JHC and other property owners. The research will exclude respondents who are minors as these will not be able to provide the requisite information. Respondents will be men and women from ages 16 years upwards. Respondents will be people who are familiar with the eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme. For instance tenants who have just moved into the area are not likely to know about the programme. Respondents will also be both South Africans and non South Africans who have basic understanding of the English language since questions will be asked primarily in English.

Detailed demographics are provided below as collected from the respondent:

DEMOGRAPHICS	
Average age	35 years
Gender	18 males and 13 females
Home language	isiZulu, Xhosa, Venda and foreign languages
Marital status	A mixture of single parent household, nuclear families and extended families
Employment status	66% of respondents are employed, 14% are unemployed and the rest did not indicate employment status
Race	29 Black and 2 Whites





3.3.10 Reliability And Validity

According to Bryman (2012) reliability is concerned with issues of consistency or stability of the measure in research. For instance if the weight scale which gives you extremely varied results each time you step on it on the same day may not be considered reliable as it is unable to provide a true reflection of how much you weigh.

The three types of reliability are stability, internal reliability and inter-observer consistency and these are discussed briefly below.

Stability refers to whether a measure will still yield the same results over time in order for the researcher to be confident that results from a measure do not fluctuate (Handley: 2001).
Internal reliability refers to whether indicators that make up the scale are consistent with scores that are still the same when used on a different indicator (Handley: 2001).
Inter-observer consistency refers to a situation where there may be a chance of lack of dependability of decisions as a result of having more than one observer involvement, for instance, in recording observations (Handley: 2001).

For this research, internal reliability will be used wherein the Split-Half Reliability will be used by dividing questions in the questionnaire in half and administering these to the same group. The questions on the second half would still be the same but arranged slightly different and if the scores are related in both halves then we assume that the measure is reliable but if the group scores high in one half of the questions and low on another half then the measure will be regarded as unreliable.

Validity refers to whether an indicator which measures a concept in research actually measures that concept. For instance, in this research one would need to question whether the questions in the questionnaire and the focus group schedule indeed addresses the issue of outcome evaluation of this intervention (Du Plooy: 2001). Du Plooy (2001) further expands that threats to validity can be internal or external. The former deals with the degree to which the design can account for all factors that could possibly affect the outcome of the hypothesis or research questions. For instance, the involvement of the

researcher need not be unobtrusive, disrupts or interfere on the matter being researched. External validity refers to the extent to which findings can be generalised to the target population. Measurement validity is the degree to which a measurement measures what it is meant to measure. In this research the measurement validity would be the questionnaire by determining whether questions phrased in it measures the problem or something else (Babbie & Mouton: 2010).

Also linked to the concept of external validity is environmental validity which refers to whether the research is of any significance to anyone (Babbie & Mouton: 2010). Earlier on it was explained that funders of the programme want to continue funding the intervention provided the programme is regarded as useful to residents and other stakeholders. This is because there is scepticism about such programmes as some neighbourhood development programmes are regarded as cash cows for property owners. Thus, it is imperative for an intervention to distance itself from this perception by proving usefulness.

3.3.11 Limitations

Limitations are influences that the researcher cannot control. They are inadequacies, circumstances or influences that cannot be controlled by the researcher and that place limitations on theme methodology and conclusions. All weaknesses that may influence the findings need to be mentioned (Walliman: 2005). Limitations of the research include all the factors in research which are restrictive and weaknesses in the study are described below:

3.3.11.1 The intervention

Since the research will seek views of people who have been involved in the programme by way of participation in one way or another, there is a risk that some participants may not give an objective view of how the programme or intervention has changed their lives. In other words there may be some bias in giving the true reflection of the status quo therefore questioning the reliability of the findings whereas if the study depended solely on statistics such as those received from the SAPS showing a decline in the number of criminal activities since the inception of eKhaya in the area.

3.3.11.2 Time constraints

Since the study is being conducted at a single point in time, meaning at the time of data collection, the sample which eventually participates may only provide a view of the programme performance which is based only in the present reality and this may not give a true reflection of the programme performance which disregard its value in the previous months.

3.3.11.3 Data collection instrument

Another limitation relate to the self- administered questionnaire wherein the chosen sample may disregard the sample. It is common knowledge that people generally ignore surveys unless there is a catch such as money or some form of compensation. The one way this limitation will be minimised is to ensure the

questionnaire is not too lengthy to the point where the respondent see it a tedious to complete but this will be balanced with ensuring that all the key questions are included.

3.3.11.4 Number of participating respondents

By this, we mean that although the research attempted to distribute self-administered questionnaires to the sampled respondents, the researcher cannot guarantee that all of them would respond and this can affect the sample size. One simply cannot force people to participate in the survey.

3.4 Conclusion

The research methodology chapter gives effect to the purpose of the research by outlining the research design and this is a combination of the survey and focus group. Questionnaires for each can be found as appendix C and D at the end of the research. By perusing these, one get a sense of the exact type of questions, that were posed, to respondents. The number of participants is detailed as well as data collection instruments used and why these were most applicable. For analysis of data content analysis is selected to give rich information about what the various members in the focus group responded.

CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

4. Findings

Below is the presentation of findings based on data collected from respondents who participated in the research. The findings are divided into two sections i.e those for survey results and the ones for the focus groups. Under survey findings are four sub-sections as follows:

Section 1 relates to public and private investment in the area, Section 2 pertains to satisfactions levels, Section 3 is municipal operation investment and lastly Section 4 presents findings regarding crime levels in the neighbourhood.

The focus group results give detailed descriptions of what was discussed in the group.

4.1 Presentation of survey findings

Underneath are findings from the survey. 31 participants responded to the self –administered questionnaire. For each statement in the questionnaire, the number of respondents who provided a specific option on the linkert scale is provided below. Then a t-test was used to analyse the results and below is a presentation of the t-test.

The purpose of the t-test is to measure how the sample differs from "an average population. In this regard, a value was set in the test followed by how much the results differed from that. The average with which to compare was set at 3. The value 3 was set because this is the midpoint or a neutral value on the 5 –point scale. In other words how much does the data differ from a neutral point.

Then one looks at the column that says Significant 2-tailed result top to see if the results differ significantly from the average or neutral results.

The data shows a significant difference from neutral on all the questions, and the column that shows Mean Difference shows that the data is "more positive" because it differs towards the positive side (in other words towards 1 which is the most positive. This means in all the questionnaire statements where respondents were required to either strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree or strongly disagree, respondents tended to agree or strongly agree with the statements in the questionnaire. This result of agree or strongly agree applied to the majority of respondents who responded to each statement. In other words this is how frequently each statement scored.

Below are findings based on the t-test and according to each research question?

4.1.1 Findings on public and private investment in the area

This question asked if there has been an increase in investment towards the programme since its inception and the findings showed a significant increase over the years as per t-test results below. The improvement was observed in the escalating number of small businesses who have opened in the area.

	Test Value = 3					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
On average 4 - 5 new small businesses have been opened in my neighbourhood in the last year	-5,657	30	,000	-1,032	-1,40	-,66
There is support of local businesses by the community in the area	-3,816	28	,001	-,862	-1,32	-,40
Businesses in the area operate safely in the area without incidents of crime	-4,523	27	,000	-,929	-1,35	-,51
The new businesses have created job opportunity for the local community	-3,843	24	,001	-,800	-1,23	-,37
Businesses feel safety in the area needs improvement	-3,508	20	,002	-,952	-1,52	-,39

4.1.2 Findings on satisfaction levels

The research question asked what the satisfaction levels are with the programme in terms of safety, cleanliness and increase in the number of tenants choosing the area for residence and the length of stay for tenants in the neighbourhood. There was significant improvement in the number of tenants who prefer the neighbourhood because of its cleanliness and a sense of involvement by community members in the wellbeing of their area.

	Test Value = 3					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
I am satisfied with the level of cleanliness in my neighbourhood	-6,499	25	,000	-1,077	-1,42	-,74
The community take it upon themselves to clean the neighbourhood	-4,202	28	,000	-,931	-1,38	-,48
I would recommend my neighbourhood to anyone looking for a place to live	-6,265	29	,000	-1,167	-1,55	-,79
The building I live in is almost always full with tenants	-4,201	28	,000	-1,000	-1,49	-,51
The area I live in is cleaned properly inside and outside the building	-8,839	29	,000	-1,267	-1,56	-,97
Tenants tend to stay longer in areas where there is eKhaya in Hillbrow (3- 5 yrs)	-7,734	28	,000	-1,345	-1,70	-,99

4.1.3 Findings on operational municipal investment

This research question asked if the response time by the City had improved on reported problems in the area in terms of response times and service delivery on ambulance, police etc and the findings showed a positive and significant improvement of the City's involvement in the area. The response time had minimum improvement when compared to the customer service improvement in these areas.

	Test Value = 3					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
The response time is good when an ambulance is called in area	-3,937	26	,001	-,815	-1,24	-,39
There are atleast 3 public centres within 5km i.e school, clinic, police station, a park, library etc	-6,075	28	,000	-1,000	-1,34	-,66
Public centres in this area are equipped like in any other neighbourhood	-6,360	29	,000	-1,033	-1,37	-,70
I am not happy with municipal services in my neighbourhood i.e refuse collection, electricity and water supply	-4,749	28	,000	-1,000	-1,43	-,57

4.1.4 Findings on crime levels in the area

This research question asked whether the levels of criminal activity have changed since the programme inception and in this regard, the findings indicated a steady decrease in the crime levels relating to theft, mugging and killings resulting from these. Police and eKhaya Neighbourhood Programme visibility and involvement showed significant increase both during the day and police visibility was more prominent at night.

	Test Value = 3					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
There is police presence (metro police)in my neighbourhood regularly	-4,916	29	,000	-1,000	-1,42	-,58
I feel safe in my neighbourhood during the day when eKhaya security is on guard	-3,292	27	,003	-,750	-1,22	-,28
I feel safe in my neighbourhood at night when eKhaya security is not on guard	-2,862	28	,008	-,655	-1,12	-,19
At least 1 serious crime is committed a week in my area e.g robbery, mugging, fighting	-2,241	28	,033	-,517	-,99	-,04
Most crimes which are reported are committed by people living in this area	-1,915	28	,066	-,517	-1,07	,04
There is adequate police present in my area	-6,360	29	,000	-1,033	-1,37	-,70
There is adequate eKhaya security guards present in my area	-9,696	28	,000	-1,241	-1,50	-,98
Crime levels have decreased in my area when compared to last year	-3,785	29	,001	-,833	-1,28	-,38


4.2 Presentation of focus group findings

The findings below are based on coded information that alluded to the same thing. The codes (descriptive code) of satisfaction levels, crime, public and private investment and municipal operational investment were used as derived from the research question or hypothesis. Notes were taken during the discussion with the 12 participants who are mostly made up of eKhaya officials who work as security guards in the vicinity. Findings are discussed in detail in the next chapter.

In Chapter 3 (3.3.8), I previously mentioned that out of the four types data analysis i.e conversation analysis or narrative analysis (content analysis), grounded theory and qualitative comparative analysis, content analysis would be used through the usage of themes and this shows how often a desired combination of phrases was picked up during the group discussion. We say a combination because during a focus group setting two different respondents may articulate the same response differently, thus we look for a combination of expression alluding to the same thing. Thus for each question asked phrases picked up from respondents.

On questions that assessed the group's participation in activities hosted by eKhaya, some group members said they participated in sports activities regularly while a small fraction said they did not have the time to do so. Others said they were not informed about upcoming sports activities such as soccer.

When asked to assess the security levels in the area, most members in the group said they felt safer than they did in the past year. Women in the group said they previously felt unsecured when going to work in the early hours of the morning (for those who worked shifts). As this young lady is quoted:




The group was asked whether they take it upon themselves to clean their neighbourhood or if they participated in cleaning campaigns that are organised by eKhaya officials to which the answer was mixed with participants saying though they wanted to partake in these activities, their busy schedules often do not allow for this to happen. The question on whether participants took part in sporting events or allowed their children to take part, this was the response of one participant, which was echoed by most of the group members




On asking whether police, EMS and other municipal services improved in terms of presence and response times within the past two years. Participants were unsure whether there has been any change. Any change that occurred was not significant.

On questions about whether there had been an increase in the number of small businesses that have opened in the area the response below by another participant was echoed by the majority of group members:



Participants were further asked if they would recommend the neighbourhood to a prospective tenant to live in the area to which one participant gave this response:



4.2 Conclusion

A T – test was used to analyse the findings for the survey. Just to recap the purpose of the t – test which is to measure how the sample differs from "an average population". A value was set in the test followed by how much does the results differ from that. The set average with which to compare is 3. This was decided on the value 3 because this is the midpoint or a neutral value on the 5 –point scale. In other words how much does the data differ from a neutral point.

Then one looks at the column that says Significant 2-tailed result top to see if the results differ significantly from the average or neutral results. The findings of the survey are analysed in the next chapter.

For the focus group, the results are presented as content analysis as well as direct extracts from respondents and these are analysed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

5. Survey and focus group results

Results from the survey and focus group correspond and thus are discussed concurrently in this chapter. The discussion centres on discussing findings for each main research question which was initially formulated under 1.6 followed by relating it to the theoretical framework formulated under 2.7 of this report.

5.1 Relating findings to the theoretical framework

5.1.1 Relating satisfaction levels to theoretical framework

Questions and statements relating to satisfaction levels in the survey and focus group include enquiring about the degree of satisfaction, whether residents take responsibility to clean their neighbourhood, whether they would recommend the neighbourhood to outsiders, the level of cleanliness in their respective buildings and the length of stay among residents in Hillbrow. The majority of respondents responded in the affirmative in both the survey and focus group. This findings concurs with a theory by the Housing Development Agency (2012) that the programme is held in high regard by the community especially those who stayed in the area long enough to know about the programme.

During the focus group respondents also added that though the outside neighbourhood was regularly cleaned, there is more work to be done in ensuring that residents who move into the neighbourhood do not bring with them bad habits of littering. The study by the Housing Development Agency (2012) was not explicit in this latter regarding and this adds new insight into their study. There is a need for continuous education on the part of the tenants and for landlords to form partnerships to promote the neighbourhood instead of working in silos. Some members in the focus group even suggested the development of a newsletter which is distributed to all the community members and the newsletter would cover positive initiatives by community members which would encourage others to be proud of their neighbourhood. The consistency in spreading good news about the neighbourhood instead of reporting on bad news alone can even increase how the neighbourhood is viewed not just by exiting residents but also outsiders can be attracted to the neighbourhood.

5.1.2 Relating municipal operational investment to theoretical framework

In terms of questions and statements relating to availability and proximity of municipal services which include clinics, libraries, pick 'it up etc, response times by municipal services, whether municipal centres were sufficiently equipped, respondents strongly agreed that these were in order though as in the Housing Development Agency (2012) respondents acknowledged that these were not often effectively utilised by the public. There is a significant difference between an average perception and this population as per results of the t-test. This finding is in line with the Howarth (1998) report conducted in Toronto which alludes that the impact of a neighbourhood programme among others is determined by how close community centres are to the community and whether these are effective. Thus, a theory by Howarth

(1998) and the findings of this study are in consensus. What came out of focus groups is that the response times by some services such as ambulances still needed improvement. The response times could be attributed to a number of things including the fact that the nearby hospital does meet the demand of high populated area such as Hillbrow in that there may be few ambulances to service the community. Another finding which adds on to previously held theories by both the Housing Development Agency (2012) and Howarth (1998) is the issue of some police officials who accepted bribes from drug lords in Hillbrow and thus their priority became to protect the known criminals in the area in return this hampered efforts of the programme. With regard to public health facilities in the area; these were rated to be improving in terms of administration e.g patients come on different days for easily communicable diseases like TB. While primary health care and babies were seen on different days to minimise cross infections. However, like many public clinics there were often long queues at the clinics causing nurses to refer patients to other clinics or turn back some patients after working hours.

5.1.3 Relating crime levels in the area to theoretical framework

The crime levels in the area relate to questions or statements in the questionnaire or focus group discussion about frequency of the crimes. Adequate eKhaya security during the day in the area and whether crime seemed to be increasing or decreasing. Findings indicate that respondents were positive about the crime rates in the area. Few responses indicated disagreement with the suggestion that the area is completely safe though respondents acknowledged that the levels of safety would not be the same if there was no eKhaya security and regular policing altogether. The Housing Development Agency (2012) cites low crime levels which can directly be linked to a neighbourhood programme such as eKhaya. This theory is in agreement with findings of the study even though this perception was held by a small number of respondents. The focus group revealed that criminal activities such as murder, robbery are higher in areas where there are no eKhaya security personnel. There was still a problem of car hijackings in the late afternoon as well as drug problems that normally occur within the flats that were not managed properly. It appears that crime in itself has not subsided completely but there was a shift in the types of crimes that have escalated and these are domestic violence, drugs and so forth whereas robberies have slightly declined. Even though dodgy passages of the neighbourhood have been cleaned and barricaded, criminals chose to live in buildings that were not well managed or deserted in the area. Notable crimes, which have been dealt with successfully, include the annual ritual of throwing furniture out of the windows during New Year 's Eve and this has completely stopped and this is believed to have been brought about by police and security visibility on new year's eve in the area. Illegal brothels have also subsided when compared to ten years ago as result of police and eKhaya visibility in the area.

5.1.4 Relating public and private sector investment to theoretical framework

There is a significant difference between an average perception in this population, and it is significantly positive because the mean difference is towards the positive side of the scale of the t-test. Meaning there is an agreement with the assertion that small businesses have increased and operate safely now than in the

past in the area. There was a general interlink between the survey results and results gathered from the focus group discussion. However, focus group respondents had reservations about attributing the increase in businesses to eKhaya specifically as they felt this increase of small businesses could be attributed to other factors such as a growing appetite for specific services which supersede safety concerns. In terms of relating this to the theoretical framework, both literatures i.e Housing Development Agency (2012) and Howarth (1998) are silent on this issue and therefore the finding cannot be found to be relatable to a specific literature which could be found. For this reason, the finding is inconclusive as it cannot be supported or rejected by existing literature in the literature review.

An overview of the findings for all the research questions show a general positive outcome evaluation of the programme though respondents all agree that eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme can be improved further.

5.2 Conclusion

In this chapter we analysed both the survey and focus group by relating it to the theoretical framework. This has been achieved under four sub-categories of satisfaction levels, municipal operational investment, crime levels and public and private sector investment. In all four categories there is significant positivity regarding each category wherein findings indicate that in order to improve satisfaction levels of tenants in the community landlords need to form a forum such as newsletter which can focus on good news in the area. If satisfaction levels are deemed to be positive for residents, funders are most likely to come to the same conclusion.

CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

6. Discussion

Underneath is a the rundown of what we aimed to achieve, whether this was achieved and lessons that can be learned from this study under the headings Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations

6.1 Summary

To recap on the important elements of this research; the purpose was to conduct an outcome evaluation of the eKhaya Neighbourhood Programme in the Hillbrow South. An intervention aimed at addressing issues of safety and cleanliness in the neighbourhood in order to determine if the programme has any value to justify its continuation.

Out of the literature review two theories inform this study and these are literatures by The National Development Agency (2012) and an article by Howarth (1998). These theories are further applied to each of the key findings in the study.

A survey as well as a focus group were conducted to assess output and to effect this, a number of literatures were reviewed in addition to the ones which served as theories for the study. The purpose of conducting a literature review is to determine if such a study was conducted before (Du Plooy: 2001)

Lessons learned from this study highlight the importance of public participation if such interventions are to succeed as well as the key role played by partnerships with relevant stakeholders in the neighbourhood.

6.2 Recommendations

The first recommendation would be to work on forming partnerships with key stakeholders in the area such as the City of Johannesburg, though this requires willingness by the City of Johannesburg. However, should a good relationship be achieved, combined resources can ensure eKhaya may be in a good position to be more effective in its work, making it less dependable on donors. Partnerships with the City can extend eKhaya's work to minimising drug trafficking which has long been a source of all evils in the area.

Secondly, community engagement is key to sustaining the good work already obtained by eKhaya especially seeing that the area see constant people moving in and out due to it being predominantly a rental area. This will address the concern of new tenants who are not familiar with this programme and who may backtrack and undermine work already undertaken.

6.3 Conclusion

To conclude the research a summary of the entire research is provided. The first chapter introduces the research and provides the background of the study. Here the topic of research is defined as well as its

purpose which is to conduct an outcome evaluation of a community based programme called Ekhaya Neighbourhood Development which has been implemented since 2005 in specific precincts in Hillbrow. The idea was to make Hillbrow a safe and clean living area not just inside the units where property owners have more control but outside the buildings where residents often had criminal incidents. The purpose of the research was to conduct output evaluation on whether there is value in the programme activities to address the Hillbrow neighbourhood and this is posed through a number of research questions and the development of a hypothesis.

In chapter 2 we look at a number of articles on neighbourhood development and evaluation in order to identify the one or those which can be used as theoretical framework to support the research and in this this regard the article released by the Housing Development Agency (2012) and the Howarth (1998). The HAD (2012) highlights measuring impact as one of the gaps in their research and which requires further study while Howarth (1998) is selected due to its similarities in methodology for research on neighbourhood development. For this reason both literature are regarded as applicable and also for gaps in research some of which this study has attempted to address. Other than this aspect of the chapter we peruse a substantive amount of literature on Theory of change and Results Chain to contextualise the study.

Chapter 3 has to do with the research methodology used and how data was collected to bring effect the purpose of the research. The research design used is a mixed method in order for one type to supplement the other. A survey and focus groups were used to collect data. Ethical considerations made include ensuring that each respondent signs a consent form to participate in the research. A sample of 31 people was selected and the findings discussed in chapter 4 and 5. For the survey a t-test was used whereas for focus group content analysis was applicable. The findings of both the survey and focus group concurred in that there was significant positivity of the programme, meaning that respondent felt the programme activities were adequate for addressing the needs of Hillbrow, though some improvements could be made. Some highlights of the findings were among others the decline in certain types of crimes in the area where the intervention was addressing these.With more work, resources and partnerships from relevant stakeholders Hillbrow can be a safe and cleaner neighbourhood. This is indicated by responses which suggest an ambivalence towards any contribution made by other partners such as those by specific areas within the municipalities such as response times by EMS.

A key area of concern is that Hillbrow may remain stigmatised even with efforts made by eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme. The other concern is that certain types of crimes seem to be declining while others are on the rise and this impacts the total crime levels in the area as it would appear, at least to an outsider that nothing has changed in the neighbourhood.

REFERENCES

Babbie, E & Mouton, J. 2010. *The practice of social research.* Cape Town: Oxford university press

Bartle, P. 2011. *The nature of monitoring and evaluation: definition and purpose*

Baskas, RS. 2011. *Applying knowledge of quantitative design and analysis.* Walden University

Bradford, M. 2003. Regenerating the city and the discipline. *Geographical association.* 88: 1 (15 – 22)

Brunner, RD. 2004. *Context –sensitive monitoring and evaluation for the World Bank.*37:2 (103 -136)

Bryman, A. 2012. *Social research methods.* Cape Town: Oxford university press

Connel, JP & Kubisch, AC. 1998. *Applying a theory of change approach to the evaluation of comprehensive community initiatives: progress, prospects, and problems.*Washington DC, USA: Aspen Institute

Du Plooy, GM. 2001. *Communication research: techniques, methods and applications.* Landsdown: Juta

Harrell, M & Bradley, MA. 1997. *Data collection methods: semi – structured interviews and focus groups.* National Defence Institute

Handley, C. 2001. 2001. *Validity and reliability in research.* Maryland, Baltimore: Natco

Howarth, R. 1998. *Outcome evaluation for neighbourhood centres.* Coalition of neighbourhood centres

Gaylard, R. 1997. *Crossing over: stories of the transition, or "history from the inside".* Literator: University of Stellenbosch. 18:3 (103 – 117)

Gill, P, Stewart, K, Treasure, E & Chadwick, B. 2008. *Methods of data collection in qualitative research: interviews and focus groups.* British dental journal. 204: 6 (291-295)

Goldstein, MS, Surber, M & Wilner, DM. 1984. *Outcome evaluations in substance abuse: A compilation of alcoholism, drug abuse and other mental health interventions.* Los Angeles: University of California

Johannesburg Housing Company. (2005). *eKhaya Constitution.*(pp 1-11). Johannesburg: Johannesburg Housing Company

Johannesburg Housing Company. (2000). *Johannesburg Housing Company End of the Beginning – The First 5 Years.* Johannesburg: Johannesburg Housing Company

Kessler, A & Sen, N. 2013. *Guidelines to the DCED standard for the results measurement: articulating the result chain.* DCED

Khattri, N & Stout, S. 2012. *Designing a results framework for achieving results: the how-to-guide.* Independent evaluation group strategy, learning and communication: Washington DC, USA

Kruger, L. (2001). Theatre, crime, and the edgy city in post-apartheid Johannesburg. *Theatre journal.* 53: 2 (223 – 252)

Lavrakes, PJ. 2008. *Encyclopedia of survey research methods.*

Makhulong A Matala. (2010). *Makhulong a matala 10 year book.* Johannesburg: Johannesburg housing company

Mclaughlin, M & Mintra, D. 2001. *Theory – based change and change – based theorygoing deeper, going broader.* 2: 301 - 323

Mathew, OO, Sola, AF, Oladiran, BH & Amos, AA. 2013. *Efficiency of Neyman allocation procedure over other allocation procedures in stratified random sampling.* 2:5 (122-127)

Mbatha, M & Ally,Y. (2013). *Some communities imagined.* Pretoria: Histories of the present press

Morris, A. (1999). Race relations and racism in a racially diverse inner city neighbourhood: a case study of hillbrow, Johannesburg. *Journal of southern african studies.* 25: 4 (1- 29)

Reja, U, Manfreda, KL, Hlebec, V & vehovar, V. 2003. *Open – ended vs close – ended questions in web questionnaires.* Faculty of Social Sciences: University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Rossi, PH & Wright. 1984. Evaluating research: an assessment .*Annual Review of sociology.* 10 (331 – 352)

Sera, Y & Beaudry, S. 2007. *Monitoring & evaluation.* World Bank

Sriven, M. 1991. *Evaluation thesaurus.* Sage

Taylor – Powell, E & Renner, M. 2003. *Program development & evaluation: analysing qualitative data.* University of Wisconsin.

The housing development agency. (2012). *Regenerating a neighbourhood: lessons learnt from eKhaya.* Johannesburg: HAD

Thomson, H, Atkinson, R, Petticrew, M, & Kearns, A. (2005). Do urban regeneration programmes improve public health inequalities? A synthesis of the evidence from UK policy and practice (1980 – 2004). *Journal of epidemiology and community health (1979-).* 60: 2 (108 – 115)

UNICEF. (1997). Guide to gender sensitive indicators. *CIDA.* pp1- 3

Venables, E. (2010). Gendered hillbrow, healthy hillbrow? men's involvement in clinical trials in Johannesburg, South Africa. *UJ sociology, anthropology & development studies*. (pp 1-16). University of Johannesburg: Kingsway campus

Vernooy, R, Qiu, S & Jianchu, X. 2006. *The power of participatory monitoring and evaluation: insights from south – west China*. 16:5 (400-411)

Walliman, N. 2005. *Your Research Project: A Step-by-Step Guide for the First-Time Researcher*. Sage

Webster, J & Watson, R. 2002. *Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature review*. MIS Quarterly. 26: 2(pages xiii-xxiii)

APPENDIX A: BRIEF CURRICULUM

My name is Mpolokeng Felicia Pooe (Maiden name Setsubi). I am originally from a small town called Matatiele in the Eastern Cape, South Africa but I live in the west rand Johannesburg.

I obtained my **Honours BA degree in Organisational Communication** from the University of South Africa (UNISA) in 2012. By profession I am currently the Marketing Manager at Johannesburg Housing Company, an NGO in the CBD which specialises in social housing rentals. Before this I started my career working for the South African Human Rights Commission as a PA to the CEO for four years. I then moved on to a B2B company called Europ Assistance Worldwide where I found my niche in marketing, media and communication. I stayed just for one year before moving on to the current organisation which I have been with now for close to five years. Though my immediate and extended family members serve in the public sector and politics, I have chosen to follow a different route to make a mark in smaller, most often forgotten smaller organisations which have equally made a huge difference in the country and with the choices of organisations I have worked for I believe this dream gradually being realised.

End

APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM FOR SURVEY
INFORMATION SHEET AND CONSENT FORM

Who am I

Hello, my name is Mpolokeng Pooe. I am a student at the University of the Witswatersrand.

The reason for requesting you to complete this form

As part of my studies, I am conducting research which focuses on the outcome evaluation of the eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme in the Hillbrow south area. Ekhaya neighbourhood is being run in certain areas of Hillbrow as well. For this programme to be spread to more areas, it is important that we get the views of those currently involved in the programme to assess its impact in their neighbourhood.

I will be asking for your views regarding the programme by conducting an interview with you on the difference this programme has made if any. You are only requested to spend an estimated 5 minutes in order to respond to questions in the questionnaire relating to the research. Please note that your participation in the research is voluntary. Also note that at any given time that you feel uneasy to answer questions relating to the study, the interview will be discontinued.

Confidentiality

Please note that any information disclosed during the interview is confidential and only people conducting and those directly involved in supervising and marking the research will have access to the interview.

Risks/discomforts

Presently, no risks have been identified by regarding your participation in the study. However should you feel that there any risks associated with you part-taking in the research, you are welcome to contact me or my supervisor on the following contact numbers.

Benefits

There are no direct benefits directly related to you but by participating in this study the benefit is that of adding to knowledge for me to advance my studies and will add to knowledge which may or may not advance the project.

Anonymity

If you would like to remain anonymous or use a different name to identify me during the study, this will be arranged

Consent

I hereby agree to participate in the research which evaluates the impact of eKhaya Neighbourhood Development Programme.

I understand that I will be participating voluntarily and I will be allowed to discontinue should I feel that the research is risky. I understand that there is no real benefit to me and that my participation will be kept confidential and anonymity will be enforced

..... **.....**

Signature **date**

APPENDIX C: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questionnaire is intended to find out more about your experience of your neighbourhood.

Please take a few minutes of your time to answer the following questions by selecting one option.

Questions	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. Satisfaction levels					
1.1 I am satisfied with the level of cleanliness in my neighbourhood					
1.2 The community take it upon themselves to clean the neighbourhood					
1.3 I would recommend my neighbourhood to anyone looking for a place to live					
1.4 The building I live in is almost always full with tenants					
1.5 The area I live in is not cleaned properly					
2. Municipal operational investment					
2.1 There is police presence in my neighbourhood day and night					
2.2 The response time is good when an ambulance is called in area					
2.3 There are atleast 3 public centres within 5km i.e school, clinic, police station, a park, library etc					
2.4 Public centres in this area are equipped like in any other neighbourhood					
2.5 I am not happy with municipal services in my neighbourhood i. e refuse collection, electricity and water supply					
3. Crime levels					
3.1 I feel safe in the area day and night					
3.2 At least one serious crime is committed a week e.g robbery, mugging, fighting					
3.3 Most crimes which are reported are committed by people living in this area					
3.4 There is adequate police and security guards present in my area					
3.5 crime levels have increased in my area when compared to last year					
4. Public and private investment in the area					
4.1 On average 4 - 5 new small businesses have been opened in my neighbourhood in the last year					
4.2 There is support of local businesses by the community in the area					
4.3 Businesses in the area operate safely in the area without incidents of crime					
4.4 The new businesses have created job opportunity for the local community					

4.5 Businesses feel safety in the area needs improvement					

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR FOCUS GROUP

1. What do you think is the purpose of having eKhaya Neighbourhood Development in your area?

   ……
   ……
   ……

2. Which projects which are run by eKhaya have you participated in. For example, cleaning campaigns, recreational activities etc

   ……
   ……
   ……

3. How often have you participated in ekhaya programmes?

   …….

4. Are you satisfied with the programmes offered by eKhaya or would you like to see improvements? And if so in which areas of the programme?

   ……
   ……
   ……

5. Do you feel safer now with the presence of eKhaya 12hr security guards than before?

   ……
   ……

6. Do you think the regular cleaning programmes are making any difference in the area? And is there a noticeable mind-shift regarding cleanliness among the community?

   ……
   ……
   ……..

7. Has the police, EMS and other municipal services improved in terms of presence and response times within the past two years? If yes what do you think is the reason for such improvement?

……
……
……

8. What about small businesses in the area? Have these increased and if yes why do you think more small business than before operate in the area?

……
……
……..

9. Would you recommend your neighbourhood to other people looking for a low cost place to stay? If yes why?

……
……
……

10. Do you think your neighbourhood as it is now would still be the same without the eKhaya intervention?

……
……
……

The researcher asks each group member to fill out the demographic tick-sheet, this will provide a picture of the make-up of a group and collect the sheets before people leave.

End of the interview and thank you for your participation in this interview