

https://dspace.org/

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

Henna, Thembinkosi Elliot

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

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

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Brief overview of the study

This study focuses on the perceptions about the effectiveness of the programme monitoring and evaluation of the development centres in the Gauteng North Region. It is my understanding from a social work point of view, that the Department of Health and Social Development has not put sufficient emphasis on programme monitoring and evaluation of government-funded programmes, and this has contributed to the failure of many community projects. The Department of Health and Social Development has since established a special unit with the main function of monitoring and evaluation of government-funded programmes, thereby providing skilled personnel to conduct the monitoring and evaluation of projects and tracking the progress thereof. In 2004 the Gauteng Provincial Department of Social Development introduced the Development Centre model for community development which requires, among other things, that all of the programmes of the Department of Social Development must contain an element of poverty-reduction. Income-generating projects are one of the pillars of service delivery. The main focus of these projects is to bring people together into groups to establish cooperatives after they have gone through skills development training. The development centre is able to supply them with small funding in the form of a start-up pack to start their own businesses and generate income and also contribute to the economy. Since then, very little research has been done that focuses on the effectiveness of programme monitoring of the income-generating projects – hence the need for this study. This chapter will give a background to the rationale of the study, its purpose, and an overview of the research methodology.

1.2 Statement of the problem and rationale for the study

The Department of Social Development (2006) reported that the eradication of poverty is the biggest challenge in South Africa. The Department of Social Development (2006) states that through its component called Sustainable Livelihood, since 2003, a new strategy for poverty alleviation was formulated. A Development Centre Model was developed as one of the poverty alleviation strategies aimed at empowering South Africans towards achieving self-reliance and implementation, and is taking place at a regional level (Department of Social Development, 2006). Development centres were established to implement programmes that

will assist people to get out of poverty. There is an expectation by the present government to halve poverty by 2015(Department of Social Development, 2006). Although this coincides with the Millennium Development Goals, there are only two years left to achieve this goal, and progress is not sufficient. It is against this background that the researcher would like to engage in this study, in order to establish the perceptions about the effectiveness of programme monitoring and evaluation rendered to the development centres by the Department of Social Development in the Gauteng North Region. It is hoped that the necessary information on the perceptions of the beneficiaries, development centre managers, evaluators and the departmental officials on programme monitoring and evaluation will be gathered. This study also seeks to emphasis the role of the beneficiaries in monitoring and evaluation of projects. “One that are overlooked by project managers is the role of communities in the monitoring and evaluation of development projects” (Kibuuka, Malunga, Mannya and Mmakola, 2000, p. 15). It is clear from the literature that for monitoring and evaluation to be effective, all stakeholders have to be involved and participate. Furthermore, the researcher would like to establish if beneficiaries’ exclusion from monitoring and evaluation could be a contributing factor to the slow progress or termination of projects. According to De Beer and Swanepoel (2002) community development is mainly project-based and residents should voice their own needs and have the opportunity to participate in defining the content of development projects. It is in this light that the researcher decided to make an in-depth social and scientific inquiry into the phenomenon of the effectiveness of programme monitoring and evaluation with special reference to the income-generating projects in Gauteng North Region. The issue under investigation is the perception of different stakeholders about the effectiveness of programme monitoring and evaluation rendered to development centres by the Department of Social Development in Gauteng North Region.

It should be noted that the Department of Social Development fulfils the role of programme monitoring and evaluation of different programmes offered by the development centres. The researcher felt that the study was relevant in that ever since the process of programme monitoring and evaluation was adopted by Social Development in Gauteng, no research that focuses on the perceptions about the effectiveness of programme monitoring and evaluation has been conducted.

1.3 Research Methodology

A qualitative research approach that was exploratory in nature was applied or employed. Bless, Higson-Smith and Kagee (2006, p. 184) define qualitative research as a "research conducted using a range of methods which use qualifying words and descriptions to record and investigate aspects of social reality". According to Cormack (1996, p. 133) "the uniqueness of qualitative research lies in the fact that it does not focus primarily upon the identification and explanation of facts, but upon the illumination of people's interpretation of the facts". Therefore, qualitative research enables researchers to establish the understanding and motivation of the participants.

The research design was a multiple case study. A multiple case study is when a researcher studies one or more cases; they often differ in certain key ways (Leedy and Ormrod, 2006).

1.4 Significance of the study

The significance of this research study is the contribution it makes to the theoretical knowledge base of the people-centred approach of the South African government. The research findings that have been generated have the potential to steer more progressive beneficiary debates about the extent to which development initiatives need to be decentralised to enhance people-centred development. Based on the nature of the findings, recommendations are made on how the Gauteng North Region development centres could be enhanced to maximise the effectiveness of intervention methods. The findings might be of use to other development centres and other national organisations which are involved in similar income-generating projects. Additionally, these research findings might be of use in helping to transform current approaches to development, in order to maximise development benefits to the people. One also cannot overlook the fact that this research might have laid the groundwork for potential further research on issues of effective programme monitoring and evaluation in social development projects in South Africa.

1.5 Definition of terms

i) Monitoring and Evaluation

Bless, Higson-Smith and Kagee (2006, p. 48) state that the terms "monitoring' and "evaluation" are often confused. They are actually entirely different enterprises relying on different methods, and have different objectives. **Project monitoring** is a tool for managing

the on-going implementation of a project. It is important that the monitoring framework is established during the planning phase of a project. Furthermore, to be effective, this framework must be in place before the implementation phase begins. Bless et al, (2000, p. 49) state that "the method of social science can be used to assess the design, implementation and usefulness of social interventions". According to Suchman (1967) cited in De Vos (2005, p. 367) "A model called the Integrated Model Programme Evaluation (IMPE) which comprises six phases is used". Each phase may be executed by means of the implementation of a suggested process of programme evaluation, as conceptualised by McKendrick (1989), and which is based on the designated literature sources. The six phases of programme evaluation are: needs assessment, evaluation assessment, programme monitoring, impact assessment, cost-benefit studies and utilisation evaluation.

ii) Development centres

The Department of Social Development (2006) states that the concept of development centres refers to multi-purpose, non-profit, community-managed organisations which are funded by the Department of Social Development whose objectives are to implement various poverty alleviation programmes such as skills development, income generation, social programmes, and information and referrals programmes. The core mandate of the development centres is to serve as incubators and bridging stepladders from a state of poverty to a state of self-enrichment (Department of Social Development, 2006).

iii) Development programmes

Paul (1987, p. 13) notes that "The terms "projects" and "programmes" are often used interchangeably. Project orientation often dominates because aid agencies tend to design and promote pilot projects or limited-area projects. However, major institutions such as the World Bank have been involved in broader, on-going activities. The development and management of national and regional programmes to replicate pilot project results are usually the responsibility of the government". There are four developmental programmes for all the development centres, namely: social programmes, information and referral programmes, skills development and income-generating projects (Department of Social Development 2006).

iv) Social Development

Midgley (1995, p. 25) defines Social Development as "a process of planned social change designed to promote the well-being of the population as a whole in conjunction with a dynamic process of economic development". This is supported by Kaeane's (2009, p. 7) argument that, "the goal of social development is the promotion of social welfare and is the key shared agenda of all the sectors of government of the country as an aspirant developmental state".

v) Developmental Social Welfare

Social welfare services are focused on the provision of socially integrated services. The emphasis is on the empowerment and capacity building of human beings and the promotion of social justice. Furthermore, it is concerned with the development of strengths and capabilities to improve human livelihood and the well-being of people (Patel, 2005).

vi) Sustainable Development

Noyoo (2003) states that although sustainable development is sensitive to the environment, it is also concerned with programmes that promote the social and economic welfare of citizens and the interdependence of social, economic and environmental objectives in the development process. Kaeane (2009) argues that sustainable development is a developmental activity that seeks to allow human beings to meet their present needs without compromising the opportunities for future generations to do the same (World Bank, 1992 cited in Kaeane, 2009).

Sustainable development is not only concerned with the needs of the present generation, thus, current efforts in developing communities should not compromise the survival of future generations.

The researcher will adopt a Social Development Approach. Midgley (1995, p. 13) indicates that, "social development may be viewed as an approach for promoting people's welfare (or social well-being). Social development maybe contrasted with approaches such as social philanthropy, social work and social administration". Given this argument, one must ask how effective is the monitoring and evaluation of the development programmes as a response to poverty alleviation, which is the biggest problem facing South Africa although it's been 15 years since the end of apartheid and the dawn of democracy. The annual report of the

Department of Social Development (2005/06) argues that, South Africa has taken on an integrated social development approach to service delivery, with the focus of the Department of Social Development over the past ten years being largely on social security, to the disadvantage of the integrated development programmes included other development programmes and social welfare services(Department of Social Development, 2006).

1.6 Organisation of the report

This chapter provides the background and contextualises the area of the study. Chapter Two will focus on the review of the related literature and theoretical framework that informs the study. Chapter Three describes the research methodology in detail and Chapter Four provides the presentation and an in-depth discussion of the findings that emerged from the study. The major findings, recommendations and conclusions are presented in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

The main focus of this chapter is on literature review and the theoretical framework relevant to the monitoring and evaluation of income-generating projects. The establishment of income-generating projects by development centres is a strategy by the Social Development department to eradicate poverty. According to the South African Year Book (2007/08) more than half of the world's population lives in cities and most will do so by 2050. In this chapter, different perspectives on project monitoring and evaluation of income-generating projects by different authors and scholars are highlighted, compared and integrated. Broader views on social development in South Africa are discussed within which the practice of participatory monitoring and evaluation will be addressed. This chapter also refers to the adoption of the Millennium Declaration Goals of the year 2008, where the international community, with the inclusion of South Africa, pledged to spare no effort to free men, women and children from the dehumanising condition of extreme poverty.

Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) capture the development aspirations globally. These goals incorporate collectively accepted human values and rights and are not only development objectives.

That said, it must be noted that noticeable progress has been made towards the achievement of the eight goals, but governments are not fully on course to fulfil these obligations (Millennium Development Goals Report, 2008).

2.2 Poverty in Africa

The Millennium Declaration calls for special attention to Africa. For more than 15 years the Hunger Project's highest budget priority was and is Africa. More than 41% of the people in sub-Saharan Africa live on less than $1 per day, and 32% are undernourished (http:www.thp.org/where_we_work/Africa?gclid=CTiTzeXU36QCFVNY2god8gtYJQ 2010/03/21). It appears that the six main social conditions that give rise to poverty in Africa are, the marginalisation of women; disregarding food farmers; inadequate leadership; too little energy spent in developing people's gifts and abilities in rural areas; HIV and AIDS and gender inequality. In addition, it is stated that to change the conditions and empower the

people of Africa to meet their basic needs on a sustainable basis, The Hunger Project has pioneered its Epicentre Strategy. This is a unified, people-centred approach that has proven effective in other countries such as Benin, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Ghana, Malawi, Mozambique, Senegal and Uganda. Furthermore, it is argued that this strategy also integrates training in micro-finance programmes and credit and savings programmes for Africa's most important producers (HIV and AIDS and Gender Inequality Workshop htt://www.thp.org/what-we-do/key-initiatives/microfinance/overview accessed 2011/04/12).

2.3 Poverty in the South African context

With the attainment of independence and the establishment of democracy in South Africa in 1994, the new government has suddenly been confronted with the mammoth task of redressing the disparities and segregations of the past. It is stated by Chikadzi (2009, p. 7), that "Colonialism and apartheid in South Africa left behind a legacy of appalling levels of inequality, deprivation, neglect, and immense disparities in wealth, health and opportunity that condemn millions to lives of desperation today" . As part of the rebuilding process, soon after the formation of a national government, the African National Congress (ANC) published its Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) (African National Congress, 1994). Chikadzi (2009) further notes that the RDP as a policy framework advocated for a developmental approach to welfare, which resulted in the draft White Paper for Social Welfare, in 1996. After its adoption, the White Paper was subsequently regarded as an official government policy which led to the renaming of the Welfare Department to the Department of Social Development. According to the United Nation (1996) cited in Patel (2005, p. 52), " South Africa is one of the countries that have adopted a developmental approach to social welfare in line with the United Nations World Declaration on Social Development". Although we have had 18 years of democracy in South Africa, poverty still remains an obstacle to adequate development in the country.

2.4 A Developmental Approach

A Developmental Social Welfare Approach is an integrated approach to rendering developmental services to individuals, families, groups and communities. It is concerned with the promotion of social justice, facilitation of empowerment and development of human capability to improve human livelihood and ensure quality of life for all citizens. Furthermore it alludes to sustainability as an integral part of this approach (Patel, 2005).

Midgley (1995, p. 25) defines social development as “a process of planned social change designed to promote the well-being of the population as a whole in conjunction with a dynamic of economic development”. This notion is supported by Kaenae (2009, p. 7) who states that “the goal of Social Development is the promotion of social welfare and is the key shared agenda of all the sectors of government of the country as an aspirant developmental state”. Kaenae (2009) further supports Midgley’s definition about social and economic objectives being intertwined when referring to social development. However, Noyoo (2003) states that although sustainable development is sensitive to the environment it is also concerned with programmes that promote the social and economic welfare of the citizens, and the interdependence of the social, economic and environmental objectives in the development process. That said, the annual report of the Department of Social Development (2005/06) states that South Africa has accepted an integrated social development approach to service delivery, however, with the focus of the Department being predominantly on social security, it is unfortunately to the disadvantage of the integrated development programmes.

2.5 Poverty Alleviation Strategies Implemented by the Department of Social Development in Gauteng

A nationwide campaign to reduce poverty among the country’s poorest citizens in the interim through the development of a comprehensive anti-poverty strategy was launched in 2008. The most applied strategies were the financing of small, medium and micro enterprises, the extended public works programme, social security, agricultural starter packs and skills-training programmes. However, these strategies were not enough to address poverty and a development centre model was then designed, developed and established. The Department of Social Development (2006) states that this concept of development centres refers to multi-purpose, non-profit, community-managed organisations which are funded by the Department of Social Development, whose objectives are to implement various poverty alleviation programmes, which are referred to as the “four pillars” of the development centre model.

According to the Department of Social Development’s development centre operations manual (2004) these are:

1. Information, Advice and Referrals;
2. Social Programmes;
3. Skills development; and

4. Entrepreneurial development

In the Development Centre Model, income-generating projects are one of the core pillars of service delivery. These income-generating projects are projects where beneficiaries come together in groups after they have gone through skills development training at the development centres, with the aim of establishing cooperatives or small businesses through which the development centre is also able to exit them with a small funding in the form of a starter-pack. It should be noted that the Department of Social Development is tasked with reducing the poverty rate and unemployment through poverty alleviation programmes and that one of its roles is to make sure that government funded programmes are monitored and evaluated so as to track progress.

2.6 Poverty alleviation programmes

One of the main poverty alleviation strategies in South Africa is the social security system. It is a rather controversial matter and an deliberation has been evolving over the purpose and scope of the system which comprises two complementary benefits: cash and in-kind transfers (Gary, 2006, cited in Hölscher 2008-Hölscher notes that social security is the only success story of the present government, which succeeded the apartheid government. Poggenpoel and Oliver (2005) cited in Hölscher and Sewpaul (2006) conducted a study on service users and departmental spending with regard to poverty relief programmes. They assert that 82.3% of service users seeking help at the government welfare offices do so in relation to social grants, 22.1 % requested individual assistance by social workers and only 2.4 % approached the department in connection with poverty relief projects. In the same vein, Hölscher and Sewpaul (2006) support these findings; they maintain that statutory services and institutional care continues to constitute the bulk of welfare work and that services in relation to poverty alleviation and developmental services remains minimal. According to Poggenpoel and Oliver (2005) cited in Sewpaul (2006) the Department of Social Development has been unsuccessful in spending its budget appropriately. These authors maintain that unless efforts are made to include the poor in the delivery process, it is possible that poverty alleviation programmes will turn out to be programmes run without the beneficiaries inputting to the conceptualisation, implementation and evaluation process. According to Naidoo (2008) poverty in South Africa and the lack of sustainability in poverty alleviation programmes needs to be studied in relation to the apartheid era. A democratic government has been in power for over 16 years and yet poverty alleviation programmes are not even close to

reducing poverty. This is a clear indication that the effects of apartheid cannot be generalised to the present context of poverty and that poverty in the present context must also be viewed in relation to many other factors including family structures, unemployment, crime, education, as well as issues of health and disease. However, a study on socio-economic conditions of the poor by Midgley and Hall (1986) indicates that many politicians and social scientist ignore issues related to privilege or structural inequalities as the cause of poverty. Although South Africa has grown economically during the past ten years; relatively high levels of poverty are still in evidence.

The budget on poverty alleviation programmes is minimal and often government is reluctant to expand this expenditure, insisting that this would be unaffordable to the country. .A study on the influences of poverty was conducted by Strydom and Tlhojane (2008), and it was evident that poverty causes a number of problems such divorce, violence and alcoholism. However, while acknowledging that poverty can indeed be a causal factor in these social pathologies, a critique of this theory is that divorce, violence and alcoholism occur across all social strata and that often poverty is used as an excuse to explain negative social behaviour. Lastly, Zungu (2006) explored elements influencing the success or failure of income-generating projects in KwaNongoma and KwaZulu-Natal and the methodology that he utilised focused on four cases of income-generating projects for comparison purposes. His main findings were that successful community development projects helped poor women in rural areas to earn a living through income-generating activities. These poor women became self-reliant and self-sustaining. The limitation of his study, however, was that the researcher used only his prior knowledge and experience of working with income-generating projects to choose a purposive sample of projects for the focus of his study. The present study endeavours to expand and build on Zungu's (2006) research by focusing on the monitoring and evaluation of these income-generating projects in Gauteng North Region.

2.7 Challenges facing the Gauteng Department of Social Development

According to the Department of Social Development, one of the leading roles of social development is to provide a safety net for the vulnerable. In addition, the Department is faced with the challenges of reducing the levels of poverty prevalence that impact on social functionality, and the development of families and communities (Department of Social Development, 2006-2009). These challenges are as follows:

- Increasing migration from other countries and provinces to Gauteng is impacting on service delivery. As a result, South Africans in Gauteng and elsewhere are intimidated by those who come from neighbouring countries and provinces, thus leading to the xenophobic attacks on foreign nationals in May 2008 (Kaeane, 2009).

- Drug and human trafficking and drug abuse have increased since 1994, and have been linked to organised crime.

- There is a high prevalence of HIV and AIDS in Gauteng Province.

- There has been non-inclusion of people with disabilities within the communities (Department of Social Development 2006).

In light of the above-mentioned challenges, the Gauteng Provincial Government (GPG) aligns itself with the MDGs by aiming at reducing poverty and unemployment by half by 2015, providing applicable skills required to grow the economy and guaranteeing that all South Africans are able to take up their constitutional rights and experience the full dignity of their freedoms (Department of Social Development, 2006-2009).

2.8 Income-generating projects as an enterprise strategy to social development

According to the development centre operations manual (2004) cited in Chikadzi (2009) income-generating projects are envisioned and are one of the strategies being used by the Gauteng Department of Social Development as a poverty reduction initiative. Fighting poverty in South Africa does not require only the services offered by our government but need all the sectors of the economy including those individuals who are categorised as poor have to participate in poverty alleviation programmes. These projects are established not only to be community driven but community owned. Chikadzi (2009) further note that the manual offers guidelines on how the concept of development centres should be applied in the province. As described in this manual, the term “income-generating projects” is used to denote initiatives that lead to the accumulation of monetary gain in the form of profits by those involved in the projects. However, it should also be noted that the Department of Social Development regards its role in poverty alleviation as one of reaching out to the majority of the poorest of the poor (Kaeane, 2009).The income-generating project objectives as per the development centre operations manual (2004, p. 27) are set down as follows:

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

Gauteng’s Department of Social Development’s development centre operations manual (2004) explains the role of development centres with regard to income-generating projects in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Role of Development Centres

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

Source: Adapted from the Development Centre Operations Manual of July 2004

2.9. Programme Monitoring and Evaluation

Projects in communities which attempt to facilitate community development have to be monitored and evaluated to understand the challenges experienced, progress made and successes achieved. Swanepoel and de Beer (2006, p. 201) argue that "because community development is a learning process and because it strive towards clear concrete goals within a murky reality, it needs to make course adjustments during the project from time to time". Seeing that community development programmes or projects often take place within different environments where there might be a variety of uncertainties, measures should be considered to monitor and evaluate the process continuously in order for the programme to yield the required results (Swanepoel & de Beer, 2006).

Programme monitoring is defined by Rossi, et al. (2004) cited in Lewis, Packard & Lewis (2007,p. 232) as "the system documentation of aspects of program performance that are indicative of whether the program is functioning as intended or according to some appropriate standards. Monitoring generally involves program performance in the domain of program process, program outcome or both". In addition to this Kettner, Moroney & Martin (1990) argue that when programme planning is effectiveness- based and monitored regularly, it is straightforward to provide useful information about the successfulness of programmes in relation to objectives set. Access to this kind of information allows different role players like implementing staff members and their supervisors, managers and administrators of organisations and board members to understand and share common concerns and interests.

Swanepoel and de Beer (2006, p. 204) state that "evaluation is an integral part of a project. It forms part of the survey-it evaluates the reality or situation through the information obtained and it evaluates the information to ensure that it is legitimate and correct. It is also tied up with needs and resources identification by seeking the fit between needs and resource. It is an important part of planning- it tests the situation specificity and the feasibility of the planning. It is necessary during implementation-it assesses the action group' ability to operationalise the plan.

Evaluation is actually a continuous process throughout the life cycle of a project or a programme. To qualify this point, Swanepoel & de Beer (2006, p. 204) postulate, "this larger continuous part can be regarded as keeping the finger on the pulse of a project and is called monitoring".

The final part of evaluation is completed at the end of a project. This is a retrospective view of doing a SWOT analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats during the lifespan of a project. Furthermore, it allows for determining whether the project objectives were successfully met and how successful it was as a learning process (Swanepoel & de Beer, 2006).

Authors like Lewis, Packard & Lewis (2007) and Sartorius (2008) highlighted different aspects of monitoring and evaluation but Swanepoel & de Beer (2006, p.204) alluded to "components such as…appropriateness or fit, feasibility and effectiveness of the objectives…" as three crucial criteria to be applied in monitoring and evaluation. *Appropriateness or fit* refers to the suitability of the objective. *Feasibility* implies the practicability of the objective and *effectiveness* means that the objective has a desired impact or result.

2.10 Different approaches to programme monitoring and evaluation

There are different approaches or a combination of approaches that might be applied when programmes are monitored and evaluated. Two of the most applicable models will be explained.

2.10.1 The Logic Model

The logic model process is a tool, which has been used for more than 20 years by programme managers and evaluators to determine and describe the effectiveness of the programme implemented. The model describes the logical linkages among programme resources, activities, outputs, target audiences, and short, intermediate, and long term outcomes related to the objectives formulated for a specific problem or situation. Once a programme has been described according to the logic model, McCawely (2013, p. 1) states that "critical measures of performance can be identified" .The most important elements of this model as mentioned by McCawely (2013) are the clarity of the inputs and outputs seeing that these inform the outcomes of the programme. In addition to this, external factors and influences such as the institutional, community and public policies that are either supportive or non-supportive to the programmes also play a role. Given the importance of these elements as explained by McCawley (2013) inputs, outputs and outcomes will be elaborated on.

Inputs refer to tangible and non-tangible aspects that are invested into a programme, for example, knowledge, skills and/or expertise. The description of programme inputs contributes to and provides an opportunity to communicate some of the quality standards of the programme.

Outputs are the deliverables of a programme. Examples are products, goods and services delivered to beneficiaries of programmes as well as reports or feedback to sponsors or decision makers. Describing outputs allow for establishing the link between the situation and the planned or expected influence on or outcomes of the programme.

Outcomes of programmes can be short-term, medium -term or long-term. Outcomes answer *the what* happened as a result of the programme. Monitored and evaluated outcomes allow for communication to beneficiaries and sponsors of programmes and assist with establishing change and sustainability. McCawley (2013, p. 4) stated that, "developing appropriate and measurable indicators during the planning phase is the key to a sound evaluation".

2.10.2 Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation systems

Development Centres, are programmes of the Gauteng North Department of Health and Social Development which is one of the main attempts to alleviate poverty. These programmes are then monitored and evaluated so as to track progress, achievements and challenges experienced. Funds that are provided by government for any project or programme need to be monitored and evaluated to ensure accountability in terms of how the tax payers' money is spent. The question then arises as to who is responsible for monitoring and evaluation of these project and or programmes.

Different monitoring and evaluation systems are explained in the literature. Swanepoel & de Beer (2006) propose that the monitoring and evaluation system has to have a participatory self-evaluation as part of the process. Therefore, monitoring and evaluation is not only the responsibility of government officials or the centre managers, but an all-encompassing task of those involve in the programme and sometimes it even involves external people.

However, Sartorius (2008) indicates that although it is the ideal to have monitoring and evaluation knowledge and skills in-house, outsiders or 'experts' are mostly used to evaluate poverty programmes because only a few organisations have the know-how and skills of monitoring and evaluation in-house and even less organisations are able to design and implement effective programme monitoring and evaluation systems.

Additionally, Sartorius (2008) alluded to important contributions which the implementation of PME systems makes. These will be discussed in more detail.

a. The differences between PME and conventional approaches and the rationale for PME

Firstly, it is important to distinguish between PME and the conventional approaches to monitoring and evaluation. The table below, prepared by Narayan (1993), cited in Sartorius (2008, p. 2), gives a useful summary between conventional evaluations and participatory evaluations.

Table 2: Differences between conventional and participatory evaluation

Conventional Evaluation		**Participatory Evaluation**
Why	Accountability, usually summary judgements about the project to determine if funding continues.	To empower local people to initiate, control and take corrective action.
Who	External experts.	Community members, project staff, facilitators.
What	Predetermined indicators of success, principally cost and production output.	People identify their own indicators of success.
How	Focus on "scientific objectivity" distancing of evaluators from other participants; uniform complex procedures; delayed limited access to results.	Self-evaluation; simple methods adapted to local culture; open immediate sharing of results through local involvement in evaluation processes.
When	Mid-term and completion	Any assessment for programme improvement; merging of monitoring and evaluation, hence frequent small evaluations.

Source: Adapted from a Paper by Rolf Sartorius, Social Impact, 2008

With reference to the rationale for PME, it appears that it allows for improving the performance of development and poverty alleviation programmes such skills development programmes e.g. government internships and social grants, e.g. child support grants. It also provides for capacity building and development of decision making, financial management and business management skills. The process facilitates building partnerships and allowing community members to take ownership of projects or programmes. Opportunities are provided for entering into conversation and reaching consensus about the goals and objectives of projects. This might lead to the merging of projects or the establishment of cooperatives to ensure effective cost and time management of programmes.

Sartorius (2008, p. 1) state that "PME is not a single philosophy, approach or methodology. Rather, it is a broad constellation of approaches and methods meaning different things to different people at different points in time, and is highly context-specific".

b. Designing PME Systems

When designing a PME system it might be appropriate to do it in conjunction with the more traditional results-oriented approaches to programme management. It is likely that this might strengthen the programme. Sartorius (2008, p. 2) argues that "A good place to start with PME is to design PME systems for new poverty alleviation projects and programs. This is especially true of projects that have a philosophy of participatory management and partnership with local stakeholders. Designing PME systems into these projects during the inception stage increases the likelihood that PME is not an afterthought, that PME is fully integrated into project operations and that important PME benefits, such as participatory learning and action aimed at project improvement are realised throughout the project life".

It might be useful to tap into the experiences of other projects and agencies who are applying a similar approach that is flexible and already has a working framework for designing programme monitoring and evaluation system. Sartorius (2008, p. 2) postulates that this must happen at the beginning of the process and "be done with all stakeholders and followed by the training and capacity- building and support in order to implement the PME system".

When designing a PME system, a collaborative team approach, a PME worksheet, an annual project self- assessment and a written PME plan are elements which according to Sartorius (2008) have to be included. These will be explained briefly.

A collaborative team approach: Some programmes are so big and no single person can carry out the monitoring and evaluation process. For example, the public works programmes in South Africa are big and have been implemented for about two to three years. Such a programme requires a number of professional people from different professions to monitor and evaluate the programmes. Some of these massive programmes include building bridges or freeways. A collaborative team representing members with applicable knowledge and skills is needed to monitor and evaluate programmes of magnitude. Sartorius (2008, p. 3) confirms that "A group made up of the project and partner organization staff have shared responsibility for PME, not just one person. The team should be comprised of key PM&E stakeholders-- people who are committed to PME and who are willing to take responsibility for it. Individual roles and responsibilities for each team member are spelled out in the M&E plan". This view is supported by Lewis, Packard & Lewis (2007, p. 220) who agree that "a sizeable proportion of the evaluators that takes place in human services organizations is performed by professional evaluators, researchers who use their skills either within the evaluation and research departments of large agencies or as external consultants offering specialized assistance".

The PME worksheet: Most companies use a worksheet in their operations. This worksheet is drafted by supervisors as a guide to give direction to their subordinates as to what needs to be done by whom, how and for how long. A worksheet fulfils a very important role in executing duties. Sartorius (2008, p.3),argues that "the centrepiece of the approach is a planning worksheet **derived from the project's logframe,** used to assist the team in identifying and organising the key information needed in the M&E plan". Furthermore to him, this assists the stakeholders to reach consensus on project objectives and expected outcomes. During planning meetings the facilitator helps the team to carefully consider "the details of whom will participate in each stage of PME, how information will be used to improve the project and how lessons will be shared (Sartorius, 2008, p. 3). This worksheet can also be used to trace the progress of the work and it serves as proof that certain activities did or did not take place as schedule.

Annual project self-assessments: Doing self-assessments annually appears to be valuable seeing that this provides opportunity to reflect on what worked well and what could have been done differently. The idea is to include participants in the project or programme and have or develop the skill in-house seeing that getting an expert from outside might incur unnecessarily cost. As Sartorius (2008, p. 4) explains "self-assessment using participatory

workshops and data gathering through the participatory monitoring system … provide a chance for reflecting on the project activities and gaining insights on what aspects of the project have worked well, what aspects have not worked well and why. Self-assessments are conducted by project staff and partners, and may or may not involve outside resource people".

A written PME plan: A written PME plan details every step that should be taken over a period of time. It gives direction and indicates how the different activities described in the worksheet have to be executed. Sartorius (2008, p.4) recommends that the project team" develops a brief written, PME plan through a series of planning meetings; a PME plan that all participants are aware of and agree on. To him, ideally, these meetings should take place during the project start-up phase when the major stakeholders, including project staff, are in place".

c. Conducting Participatory Evaluation and Project Review

Project reviews happen when projects are not progressing according to plan and when it appears that the objectives are not going to be achieved. A review implies that new objectives might have to be set or the project should be stopped. To Sartorius (2008, p.5), "Participatory evaluations can offer many of the benefits of PME systems, however, if taken as one time only events, they will do little to build sustainable capacity for local learning and collaborative action".

Before PME is implemented, it is suggested by Sartorius (2008) that the following has to be considered:

Determine whether PME is appropriate for your programme: Due to the size and time frame, some programmes may not necessarily require programme monitoring and evaluation. An example is a community food gardening. Such programmes are controlled by the community members themselves. People may be given seeds and tools, and it is up to them to make sure that they plough, plant and grow crops. As such monitoring takes place on daily basis. Unlike big programmes such as development centres where the control of funds lies with the department. However this does not mean that evaluation is not important but it can take place at the end or mid-term of the programme. Food gardening is constantly monitored and if anything goes wrong it can be picked up as when and where it occurs and corrective measures can be applied.

Begin with stakeholder analysis: It is very important for any evaluator to know and understand all the role players in a programme and this should be done during the planning phase of the programme when all the role players have been identified.. Information regarding their educational levels, backgrounds skills, expectations should be collected. Most importantly, stakeholder's analysis should also be about gaining information about the role player's understanding of the evaluation process.

Become (or recruit) an Evaluation Facilitator: An evaluator should possess the necessary knowledge and skills to carry out an evaluation. He/she should be willing to impart knowledge and skills about evaluation to the stakeholders. A facilitator is also a person who is willing to coordinate the session of evaluation through sharing information and receiving information and give credit where it is due. Should there be a lack of evaluation skills among the stakeholder the evaluator should facilitate the evaluation process.

Use variations of the Logical Framework approach where appropriate: Variations of the logical model is the combination of inputs and outputs that equate to outcomes. The advantage of this approach is that evaluation is carried out through the participation of the community members see it fit. Unlike the conventional evaluation approach that emphasis the use of external experts at a given period like on mid-term and on completion of the programme.

Less extractive, less formal approaches are better: Programme monitoring and evaluation may not necessarily be understood by everybody participating in the programme. Some member or stakeholder may contribute little information and might be less educated. It is thus important to use simple and less formal approaches in evaluating and monitoring programmes. It will be best to get information from the stakeholders and structure it in the best possible way to make sense of what PME is all about and what it seeks to achieve. This system of PME should not be imposed on stakeholders, they should be given an opportunity to share what they know and in that way they will experience and have a sense that they own the process.

Your Personal Attitudes Count: There is no person that is perfect, we all make mistakes and sometimes we are influence by external factors, however as an evaluator one is regarded as a leader and as such people expect him or her to lead by example. Attitudes have to be positive towards achieving a desired goal. Negative attitudes may destroy or hinder achievement of the desired goal of making evaluation as interactive as possible for all in the group. It is

therefore important for anyone who does evaluation to have a positive attitude at all time during and after evaluation

2.11 Purpose of Evaluation

The purpose of evaluating projects or programmes plays a critical role in determining the success or failure of that project or programme. Evaluation provide information as to why the project or programme has failed and gives direction as to how best other similar projects and or programmes should be implemented, it is like a yardstick. Evaluation serves a specific purpose when you work with community development programmes as Lewis, Packard & Lewis (2007, p. 217) argue that "Evaluation can be used to aid in administrative decision making, improve currently operating programs, provide for accountability, build increased support for effective programs and add to the knowledge base of the human services".

Administrative decision making is informed by evaluation because it grants more information on daily activities of the programme and the interaction of the participants, resources and the community that it serves. Evaluation also contributes to *improving the operations of programmes* by depicting how the programmes perform and thereby assisting in improving the running of existing programmes and help to shape how other programmes should be implemented. *Accountability* is a major requirement when programmes are implemented. With evaluation, it is clear how, when, what and by whom has a certain action be taken or need to be taken (in terms of contributing to accountability). *Building increased support for programmes* also benefit from evaluation. It allows for introspection as well as retrospection with regard to existing and needed skills. Finally, evaluation provides for lessons learnt from different programmes and this expands *the knowledge base of human services*.

The knowledge gained is valuable in terms of practice and provide for identification of opportunities to do research and improve or do some aspects differently (Lewis, Packard & Lewis, 2007).

2.12 Summary

This chapter has provided a detailed discussion on the practice of participatory monitoring and evaluation. It should be clear by now that if development is to have a significant change in people's lives there is a need for ordinary citizens to take charge of the development processes, including monitoring and evaluation, in making crucial decisions about their own welfare. It is therefore important that the people, for whom the development initiatives are

meant, be the main role players in deciding the nature of these development projects and how they should be implemented. In this chapter the participatory monitoring and evaluation of development projects and other related issues are outlined. However, Chapter Three will focus on the research design and methodology applied during the research study.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

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

3.2 The research question

What are the perceptions of different role players on income-generating projects regarding the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation as rendered by the Department of Social Development to income-generating programmes of the development centres?

3.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study was to establish the perceptions of different role players on the income-generating projects regarding the effectiveness of programme or project monitoring and evaluation. The study was conducted at the development centres in Gauteng North Region with the beneficiaries, centre managers, monitors and evaluators and departmental officials.

3.4 Primary aim and secondary objectives of the study

The primary aim of the study was to explore the perceptions of different role players about the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation of income-generating projects rendered to the development centres by the Department of Social Development in Gauteng North Region.

The secondary objectives of the study were:

a. To explore the different role players understanding of monitoring and evaluation of income-generating projects.

b. To establish which role players participate actively in the monitoring and evaluation of the income-generating projects.

c. To determine the challenges different role players are experiencing with monitoring and evaluation of income-generating projects.

3.5 Research strategy and design

The researcher adopted a qualitative research approach that is exploratory in nature. Bless, Higson-Smith and Kagee (2006, p. 184) define qualitative research as "research conducted using a range of methods which use qualifying words and descriptions to record and investigate aspects of social reality". According to Cormack (1996, p. 133) "the uniqueness of qualitative research lies in the fact that it does not focus primarily upon the identification and explanation of facts, but upon the illumination of people's interpretation of the facts". Therefore, qualitative research enables researchers to establish the understanding and motivation of the participants. The research design is a multiple case study. A multiple case study is when a researcher studies one or more cases; often cases are different in certain key ways (Leedy and Ormrod, 2005).

3.6 Sampling procedure

Bless et al., (2006) defines sampling as the group of elements drawn from the population that is considered to be representative of the population and which is studied in order to acquire some knowledge about the entire population. The sample was intended to have been drawn from six development centres in Gauteng North Region. However, only five development centres fitted all the criteria. The failure to draw six development centres can be attributed to the fact that the list of development centres provided by Health and Social Development showed only five centres that were funded consecutively from the 2009/2010and 2010/2011 budgets. Non-probability purposive sampling was used in this study. A purposive sampling method is based on the judgment of a researcher regarding the characteristics of a representative sampling (Bless et al., 2006). Strydom and Delport (2005) further note that, in qualitative studies, non-probability sampling methods are utilised and, in particular, purposive sampling techniques rather than random sampling techniques. The sample was drawn from all races, tribes and religious affiliations. The criteria for sampling were that all participants had to be directly involved with income-generating projects at the development centres for at least two years, and that the development centres as well should have been funded for at least two consecutive years. A total of thirteen participants involved in the development centres were interviewed. The sample consisted of five beneficiaries, five development centre managers, two programme evaluators and one departmental official.

3.7 Research Tool

Two different semi-structured interview schedules consisting of open-ended questions were used during the study. One for the beneficiaries of income-generating projects and the other for development centre managers. However, two more semi-structured interview schedules were added which are a shorter version of the semi-structured interview schedule for development centre managers. Some questions on the afore-mentioned semi-structured interview schedule became irrelevant to the evaluators and the departmental official, and hence to the moderation thereof. Information on interesting issues was gathered. According to the International Development Research Centre (module 10B) one of the advantages of semi-structured interview schedules with open-ended questions is that it allows you to probe more deeply into issues of interest being raised(http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev/56614-20-1-DO-TOPIC.htmlretrieved2011/04/20).

3.8 Pre-testing the research tools

Pre-tests are preliminary measures which are used prior to administration of the final version of the data collection tool. These are important for improving reliability (Neuman & Kreuger, 2003) cited in Kaeane (2009). Both the semi-structured interview schedules were pre-tested with two people who were not part of the actual research study. The pre-test was done to determine potential areas that might have been overlooked, and to establish whether the interview schedule would elicit the relevant responses that would enable the researcher to meaningfully explore, describe and understand the phenomenon under study. Participants were given an opportunity during the pre-testing of the research tool to make comments and suggestions to change questions that were not clear or useful.

3.9 Data collection

Data was collected through face to face semi-structured interviews with participants. Greeff (2002 p. 292) states that “interviewing is one of the predominant methods of data collection in qualitative research”. The pre-determined set of open ended questions guided the interview and did not control the flow. This contributed to the researcher’s flexibility to follow up interesting leads, and participants gave a richer and more complete version of issues under discussion. According to Greeff (2002) semi-structured interviews are more suitable when the researcher is particularly interested in the complexity or process, or where an issue is controversial or personal. Due to the contentious nature of the topic under study and the

complexities involved, it was anticipated that the utilisation of semi-structured interview schedules would probably facilitate the best outcomes. Bless et al., (2006) has identified some limitations of using interviews as a method to collect data. Participants may not hear the question through the same meaning/frame as that of the interviewer or other interviewees. Secondly, the participants may have their own personal and hidden reasons for responding in a particular way and lastly, participants are motivated to disguise the meaning of at least some of their feelings and actions.

The duration of every interview was approximately 45 minutes. The researcher's own observations at the sites where income-generating projects were located were also considered. Observations during data collection also contributed to the richness of the information given by the participants because the researcher could probe with a view to elicit more information from the interviewees. Creswell (2003) noted that taking field notes on data observed from the research site is informative and that different roles can be assumed by the researcher, being either that of a participant or non-participant observer. The latter is true for this research study.

The researcher also observed and gathered information from the meetings arranged before the actual interviews. Meetings with the managers were held in some development centres. They included skills co-ordinators on the recommendation of development centre managers. The purpose of these meeting was to make appointments for the interviews and to get more information about what each development centre offers. During these meetings some important information was shared by managers and coordinators alike. Due to the sensitivity of the information it was not to be shared during the actual interviews. A tape recorder was used to capture and record data. Tape recording assisted in managing data as the researcher would not be able to remember everything said during the interview process. Tape recording might be a useful tool during interviews or it might be disturbing should participants feel uncomfortable about the use during interviews. If the informants accept the argument that the researcher would not be able to remember everything said, nor be able to write it all down, it is an asset (International Development Research Centre, module 10B).

The researcher did not encounter any problems from participants about tape recording the conversations. All participants were comfortable and rather eager to be tape recorded. Data collected was used only for the purpose of the study and only the researcher and his supervisor had access to the data. The collected data will be kept in a safe place for two years

should any publications flow from the study; however, should there be no publications the raw data will be destroyed after six years.

3.10 Data analysis

According to De Vos (2005, p. 335) “data analysis in a qualitative inquiry necessitates a twofold approach. The first aspect involves data analysis at the research site during collection and the second aspect involves being away from the site following the period of data collection”. Data collected was analysed through the use of thematic content analysis which refers to a process of bringing order, structure and meaning to the mass of collected data (DeVos et al., 2005).

According to Terre Blanche, Durrheim and Painter (2006) in order to construct a thematic framework, it is crucial to gain an overview of the data covered and become thoroughly familiar with the data set. Creswell (1998) states that data analysis in a case study typically involves the following steps:

1. *Organisation of details about the case.* The specific “facts” about the case are arranged in a logical (e.g. chronological) order. The researcher begins to make sense of the responses that were given by participants using the research aims and objectives as a backdrop or framework.

2. *Categorisation of data.* Categories are identified that can help cluster the data into meaningful groups. The researcher managed and organised the data into four categories, namely, the beneficiaries, centre mangers, evaluators and the departmental official. This helped to ensure that data was complete and that a fuller version of the data was collected, which was achieved. This is a relevant step to be achieved in the data analysis process. De Vos et al., (2005) note that the organisation of data or handwritten field notes offers an opportunity to the researcher to become immersed in the data during the transition between fieldwork and full analysis, and also helps in getting a feel for the cumulative data as a whole.

3. *Interpretation of single instance.* Specific documents, occurrences, and other pieces of data are examined for the specific meaning that they might have in relation to the case. Familiarisation and preliminary writing starts when the researcher has listened to the collected data from all the tapes several times and has started to list themes and categories. DeVos et al., (2005) supports this process by arguing that the researcher must read the data transcripts in their intensity several times and get immersed in the data by breaking it into

parts. During this process, the researcher is guided by an attempt to answer the research questions in order to achieve the aims and objectives of the research study.

4. *Identification of patterns*. The data and their interpretations are scrutinised for underlying themes and other patterns that characterise the case more broadly than a single piece of information can reveal. A description of the setting and the people as well as a decision on the major categories and themes of the research follows. As mentioned by Creswell (2003) this kind of analysis is useful in designing detailed description for case studies.

5. *Synthesis and generalisation.* An overall portrait of the case is constructed. The last stage in data analysis is the report writing. Marshall and Rosman (1999) cited in De Vos (2005) state that writing up the research report signifies the choice of words to be used in summaries and reflects the complexity of the data. At this stage the researcher is engaged in the interpretive act of lending shape and giving meaning to a massive amount of raw data.

6. As this stage is regarded as the final stage of data analysis process, the researcher attempts to support findings by integrating relevant literature answered in the research questions, and related the findings to the aims and objectives of the research study. Conclusions are drawn that may have implications beyond the specific case that has been studied.

3.11 Data verification

During data verification, trustworthiness of the research findings is often a problematic issue in qualitative research, where the research is bound to be biased. DeVos, Strydom, Fouche and Delport (2005) noted that credibility is an alternative to internal validity, in which the goal is to demonstrate that the inquiry was conducted in such a manner as to ensure that the researcher cross-checked comments with participants in all the categories. Where there are contractions, an in-depth verification was made to gather as accurate information as possible, which ensured credibility of the research findings.

The transferability of the qualitative research findings to other settings may also be problematic. Even though there are other development centres in Gauteng, (e.g. North Region) embarking on similar projects, their approach or developmental model might slightly differ from the one used in the study.

3.12 Limitations and delimitations of the study

De Vos (2005) notes that every study has limitations and that the researcher has to be cognisant of all those potential weaknesses and at the same time be mindful of, and capitalise on, the strengths of the research. The following were the anticipated limitations and delimitations of the study:

1. The scope or sampling size of the study was limited to 13 participants recruited through non-probability sampling from development centres in a particular region. This means that the results cannot be generalised to other development centres with different characteristics or geographic areas, as the sample does not represent the entire population under investigation.

2. The study was also limited to participants involved in income-generating projects and did not afford the opportunity to other beneficiaries to participate in the study.

3. The research tool was pre-tested, but some questions remained unclear to some participants, thus representing a further weakness to the study.

4. Limitations can also be found in the thematic content analysis. The subjective pre-occupation of the researcher could have influenced the way in which collected data was interpreted. However, the researcher made a considerable effort to be as objective as possible by eliminating all preoccupations, and approached data interpretation with an open-minded attitude of enquiry.

5. The participants might have given the researcher answers that are socially desirable and/or withheld information that is of vital importance to the study, which they may have viewed as sensitive. The fact that the researcher had assured participants that the information they shared was confidential does not guarantee that participants provided all the necessary information.

6. Participants may also have discussed the anticipated questions and prepared or discussed answers while they were waiting to participate in the interviews.

7. It is also possible that the research tool used to collect and to record data might not have been sufficiently effective and exhaustive to elicit information on all aspects vital to the research questions. Although the researcher pre-tested the research instrument and made the necessary adjustments, there is no guarantee that the research instrument was effective and exhaustive to the study.

8. Dependability is also one of the major concerns of qualitative research. Dependability refers to the degree to which a reader can be convinced that the findings did occur as the researcher says they did. The researcher has attempted to enhance dependability through providing rich detailed descriptions of the data collected through tape recording, and also by providing a frank statement of the methods used to collect data (Terre Blanche, Durrheim & Painter 2006).

3.13 Ethical considerations

Permission to undertake the study was requested from the Department of Social Development. An ethics clearance was also sought from the Ethics Committee (non- medical) of the University of the Witwatersrand. Strydom (2005) cited in De Vos et al., 2005, p. 69) defines research ethics as "a set of widely accepted moral principles that offers rules for and behavioural expectations of the correct conduct towards experimental subjects and respondents, employers, sponsors, other researchers, assistants and students". In view of the above statement, an informative consent form was developed for participants to sign before engaging in the research. This was an acknowledgement that their rights were protected. This form includes the right to participate voluntarily and to withdraw unconditionally, as adapted from Creswell (2003, pp. 64-65). It also includes the avoidance of malfeasance and harm, where participants will not be harmed emotionally or physically. Coercion and perverse incentives: where participants were not coerced into giving consent and participating. Deception: where participants were not deceived or misled in any way. Violation of privacy/confidentiality: where participant's privacy and identity was safeguarded. Actions and competence of the researcher: where the researcher refrained from passing judgement on the behaviour of people from other cultural groups or areas of work and lastly, where feedback was given to all the participants.

3.14 Summary

This chapter provided an in-depth outline of the research methodology applied when the research was undertaken. An attempt was made to clearly delineate the probable strengths and shortcomings of the research methodology and design employed. The ethical considerations were described in detail. Chapter Four will focus on presenting and discussing the actual findings of the research study.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter mainly focuses on the presentation and the discussion of the research findings in relation to the literature on the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation of income-generating projects as it relates to the research questions, aims and objectives.

The research findings are presented and discussed under two sections. Section A is composed of and reflects the summarised data collected, as given by all the participants as role players in the four different categories of the research, namely: beneficiaries of income-generating projects, development centre managers, evaluators and the departmental official. In this section, reflection on the summarised data will be presented as per projects. Section B is composed of and describes the findings of the research study, which is in relation to the primary aim of the study. Various themes that have emerged during the analysis of the data are presented in their applicable sections.

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

4.2.1 General observations

The researcher noted that even though there were similarities in the recruitment process of beneficiaries, there were also some differences in some of the Gauteng North Region development centres. Some development centres require a contribution from beneficiaries as a way of committing themselves, and to be accepted into certain skills training. Some beneficiaries signed contracts to pay back the money they would receive in the form of start-up packs to start their own businesses, yet some do not have to pay back anything. However, the commonality of these development centres is that there is no particular educational standard or grade set as an entry requirement. All the participants joined the development centres in different ways. Some were recruited, while others were put on the database of these centres. The researcher also observed that some centres were not founded based on the development centre model; some had been in existence before this model existed and may not have been following any guidelines from the development centre model, but they were still able to be part of the development centres in Gauteng North Region since 2003. They all

have management structures in place to manage the day to day running and coordination of activities of the centre and all have boards with board members. The membership remains open to any community member who is living in Gauteng North Region and wishes to join, subject to meeting all the requirements.

4.2.2 The Catering Project

Five participants were interviewed but only two interviews are reflected in these findings. The reason for this omission is that three of the participants interviewed did not qualify for inclusion as they were taking part in a form of focus group which did not fit well with the research approach of this study, and thus do not form part of the sample size. The Beam Africa Network was established in 2006 and registered as a Section 21 company in 2008.Some of the projects offered by the Beam Africa Network are computer training, nail technology, sewing, bricklaying, forklift operating, cashier, call centre operator and bead work. Participants interviewed on this particular project were the beneficiaries and the skills coordinator, who represented the centre manager. This centre's operation is based on the four pillars of the development centre model, as outlined in the literature review (Department of Social Development, 2004). The Catering Project relates to the entrepreneurial development as one of the four pillars. When asked how participants became part of the project, one of the beneficiaries replied:

"I got information from community members that they are looking for people to train and I then put my name on the database as a prospective candidate".

This is just one way in which many beneficiaries got involved in the development centre. Some beneficiaries are recruited due to the skills and experience they already possess. Most participants seem to be in agreement on the experience that they have gained. When asked about what experience participants have gained, one of the beneficiaries said:

"I have gained a lot of experience because now I feel like a business person who can run and manage my own business. I am also able to pay for my children's fees and can put food on the table".

This can be attributed to the fact that one of the Department of Social Development's objectives is to have people empowered. When asked about the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation of income-generating projects, one participant, who is a beneficiary said:

"It is effective because one can see where they are going and the mistakes can be picked up, and as for me, I have been trained in business management. I can do my own books, count money that has gone out and the money that I have received, pay two salaries to the people I have employed, including my own salary".

When the same question was asked to the skills coordinator as to the effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation, she responded: *"Monitoring and evaluation of projects is effective because people can see where they are going, but only if it is done more often and if the problems faced can be addressed immediately by the parties involved"*.

When asked what she would do differently in terms of monitoring and evaluation she said: *"If there can be a time frame about monitoring and evaluation, when it is going to take place, there can be a lot of difference.*

Evaluators are social workers from within the Department of Social Development; they do not come from outside. There were two participants in this category. When asked about the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation one participant replied:*" Monitoring and evaluation is very important and effective because we can trace the progress and we are in a position to see also how the money is spent"*.

The second evaluator said that: *"Evaluation and monitoring is a very effective process especially for people to account for how the project is doing and not only that, but also to fully account for the public funds. If they do not use it they must send it back, or if they misuse it they must they account for their actions"*.

The departmental official's response to the question on what can be done differently for monitoring and evaluation was*:*

"I think the way things are going as of now is good, there is nothing I would change with the present system except to employ more people to do monitoring and evaluation. It is really a demanding job to do".

Some of the challenges beneficiaries are experiencing were identified as follows: *"The challenge is the small amount that you are given as a start-up pack. My business has grown but I still cannot afford the transport as I am now preparing for two weddings. The tent and chairs that I must rent pose a problem as there in no money, and the cooking stove is only one. If I could have a sponsor maybe things will be different"*. The development centre

manager commented that: *"We need some more funders to come on board and also we need help to market our products and skills"*.

4.2.3 The Toilet Paper Project

Kungwini Development Centre was established in 2006 as a non-profit organisation. It offers different services to its community and has two satellite offices in Rethabiseng and Zithobeni. Some of the services offered by this centre are sewing, toilet paper-making, leather-making and farming. Two participants were interviewed about the toilet paper project.

The main objectives of this centre are to train people in social and technical skills, and to create development opportunities for the families and communities surrounding Kungwini. The location is of easy access as is situated in the township. Marketing of the project is a problem as it is not exposed to the outside world. When the beneficiary was asked about how he got involved with the centre, his response was:

"I got information about the centre though my friend and I was put on the centre's list or database and I got a call, then I was told that I had been selected as a candidate". On what experience he has gained, he responded by saying: *"I got a lot of experience because they took us for training to know how business is run and now we are three who have our own company to do not just toilet paper, but everything that has to do with paper*".

When the beneficiary was asked about the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation, the response was:

"I can say it is effective due to the fact that you can see mistakes and you can make changes, but you need to inform the department before your changes. It could be more effective if they would come and see the problems we are facing and not only read our report, for it is just a paper and cannot talk for itself".

About the challenges faced by the beneficiaries, this participant responded as follows: *"We are having a lot of challenges. There is no market for our product and the start-up pack to start our own business is very little. We cannot get money from the business as income and hence other people, they fall along the way"*.

The centre manager also agreed that monitoring is effective for any business as long it achieves what it is meant to achieve:

"It should be a process not a destination, follow ups and the physical engagement with the project is of paramount importance to the success of these centres". With regard to challenges faced by the centres, the manager responded as follows:

"The department has come up with these centres for poverty alleviation, which is a good thing; however, there seems to be little money that is pumped into them. The market for the product is also a major problem. The sustainability and lack of income for the beneficiaries is the result of people withdrawing from the project. Something needs to be done if these centres are to survive".

During the interview with the official from the department, when asked about challenges she made special mention of a specific development centre:

"This centre was doing very well in the beginning but now there are challenges facing it. I do not think it will survive due to lack of active participation from the community members and other challenges".

4.2.4 The Cane Project

Two participants were interviewed about the cane project. This project is offered by the Olieven Development Association which was started by the community members for HIV and AIDS awareness in 2002, but stopped working due to problems encountered. Since 2008 it has operated as a development centre with the help of the Department of Social Development. The name was changed, but the centre still operates under its old name. The centre does not have its own building and is renting from the church, but has been given one month to leave the premises. It offers training not only in cane products, but also in training the youth in security. When the beneficiary was asked how he had become involved with the centre his response was: *"I was recruited by some senior members of the centre as they knew that I can do cane baskets. I was trained by my father on this job, so when I came here I already had experience"*. As the participant had alluded to the fact that he already has experience, the question still remains as to what other experience he got from the centre. The response was: *"I have my own experience. The only thing I got from the centre is the skill to start a business and yes, the other thing is to have experience on how to do quality control. We got help from a person from the department, but that person said we are doing a good job so we must carry on"*.

When asked about the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation the response was that: *"It is not working properly as the person who monitors and evaluates projects hardly comes to do the job. They do not listen to us at all and what is happening when that person comes, she hardly spends ten minutes and she does not sit down and she is always in a hurry"*.

When asked about the challenges, both the participants and the centre manger seem to agree that for them, this monitoring and evaluation is not effective. How effective is monitoring and evaluation? The response from the manager was:

"Monitoring and evaluation is an effective process only if done correctly by the people who at least should listen to our problem and try to find a solution. Here, I even do not remember when was the last time we got such a person, so it is ineffective in that way". According to the department, monitoring and evaluation should happen at least once a week. The beneficiary mentioned that their project is faced with a lot of challenges. Transport for the delivery of their products, and also the issue of raw materials, were burning issues for the participant, as outlined in this quote: *"The raw material is a problem to get as we must order it from Durban, which is the only supplier of cane. The time to arrive here is long and people's orders can take too long to deliver and also the issue of transport of the product is a major concern as we need a bigger transport for the product"*.

The manager cited problems from the administrator's point of view and her response to the question on challenges was different from that of the beneficiary. She said: *"The biggest challenge for our centre is space, or land to operate on. For example, we are operating in a small place and this is not even our place; we were given a chance by the church and now we are being given a month to vacate the place, and where we are going, we have to rent. The space is also not secure and the equipment is not safe, it would help if the department can help us find a piece of land where we can operate"*. There is no money to provide for food during training as promised by the Department, which demoralises the beneficiaries.

4.2.5 The Health Products Project

At the Health and Products Projects, two participants involved in the project were interviewed. This project is offered by the Remmogo Suppliers Primary Cooperative. They produce primary health care products for hospitals and other primary care institutions. This project involves the manufacturing of health products like soap and other liquid products for hospital use. The role players of this development centre were given training on business

management and related skills. It is not clear when the project started but it is clear that it has been in operation for a few years and has also been funded for the past two years. The place where it is situated is far from the community and it is surrounded by other big business in an industrial park. From observation, the people of this centre are just sitting about with nothing to do and hoping that something new is going to come that will take away their frustration. When you enter the place you see full boxes just sitting on the floor, and one is concerned about the expiry date. When the beneficiary was asked how she became part of the programme, her reply was: *"Like we made enquiries from other projects and we were trained at Bahoma Chemicals"*.

It is clear that people come to be part of the programme through various processes, as we have seen in this study. The people of this centre were helped by the Department of Social Development to become part of the development centre. It seems that people expect much from the department as can be seen in how they answer the question on the challenges of gaining experience. Most participants agree that they have gained some experience by being with the centre, such as this participant on the question of experience gained:

"I have gained a lot of experience but it is still difficult to get marketing for our project and now we are just sitting, there is no money coming in from the project".

When asked about the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation, the beneficiary said: *"I can say it is not effective because the department hardly comes to visit and see our problems, like now they have come once and we do not know when they are coming again, maybe it is a secret"*.

The researcher could see the frustration on the face of this person and this frustration is also evident in the response from the centre manager on responding to the same question: *"It seems that we are forgotten because those people only came once last year and we never saw them again. Look at the finished product that is just sitting here. It seems to me that they are only concerned about how we have spent the money, and not about our efforts."*

The manger was also asked about the challenges they are facing, and the response was as follows:

"*The most important challenge is marketing our products. At some hospitals where we want do promotion of our product we are being sent from pillar to post with no one really taking the responsibility of giving us time to do promotions. The department is the one that needs to*

help in this regard by referring us to the relevant persons, and help us to secure tenders but that is still a long way off to achieve. We are just told to submit reports on how the money was used, and that is it. We are also questioned about why we give ourselves salaries when we are not doing anything".

4.2.6 The Sewing Project

Two participants were interviewed about the sewing project. POPUP was started by different churches and follows a holistic approach to empower the disempowered of Tshwane. It was established during 2000, before the government showed any interest in the programmes. However, people who started their income-generating projects did so in 2010, in sewing and arts and crafts projects. From observation one can tell that it is thus far one of the most well-established development centres in this region. Its track record and the fact that in 2010 they have celebrated their 10th anniversary is testament thereof. POPUP offers programmes such as skills development and training, job placement, social support services and medical services. Most of the funding comes through several churches in the form of donations. When the beneficiary was asked how she became part of the programme her answer was:

"I was best in a class of 22, which is why I was chosen to start my own sewing project which now I can manage by myself. I do can do a lot of things in running my business and sometimes the skills coordinator does come and to check how I am doing".

When the skills coordinator was asked how people become part of the programme, her answer was: *"People are encouraged to register with us. They must bring along with them an ID, a detailed CV and their education certificate, then we do an interview for selection purposes, and they may be placed on a waiting list and there is an enrolment fee payable per skills programme that is R50.00".*

This fee is also requested by other centres, just like the Beam Africa Development Centre however, not all the development centres require this fee. The beneficiary was then asked about the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation and her answer was:

"*I think it is a very good thing to do as one can see the successes and the failures of your business. But now that I have my own business, they have not told me when they will come, but the skills coordinator does visit sometimes and they also send people like tourists to come and see how my business is doing".*

The skills coordinator, who answered on behalf of the centre manager when asked about the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation, replied:

"While they are here with us, monitoring and evaluation happens on daily and weekly bases, and while they are on their own premises it will be from three to eight months. People who are helping us to do monitoring of the two projects are mainly from the University of South Africa, from their financial department, and some are arts and crafts and sewing facilitators".

The skills coordinator did not mention anything about the evaluators coming from the Department of Social Development. Even though this development centre maybe better established than the others, it serves the same purpose of empowering the disempowered and has more funding than other development centres. It has the advantage of having been established long before the other centres. This centre is also faced with challenges. When the participants were asked about the challenges they face, the skills coordinator said:

"Mainly marketing and new jobs, there are no opportunities and also there is lack of funds and human resources, there are no new opportunities for the products, and those are the major challenges we are facing".

The response from the beneficiary was: *"Lack of opportunities for people to buy our stuff, no marketing is available".*

4.2.7 Gauteng North Development Centre Managers

Five development centre managers were interviewed by the researcher, one from each development centre. Three of the managers agreed that monitoring and evaluation of income-generating projects is effective. However, they were concerned at the way it is being conducted, such as a follow-up. One manager said:

"Finance is also a problem for these projects to sustain and this has a negative impact on the aspirations of the beneficiaries, as some just stop being active. The other issue is that most beneficiaries expect to get income ".

Another manager commented:

"From these projects beneficiaries expect to get some money, but hardly see anything coming to them and I do not think they will be sustainable if they are run this way".

This was the concern of almost all the managers; the sustainability of these projects.

4.2.8 The Evaluators

Two participants from the evaluator category were interviewed. The researcher gathered that the development centre relied on the Gauteng Provincial Department of Social Development to provide them with evaluators. One evaluator was asked about the effectiveness of monitoring and his reply was:

"It is effective because we can then trace how money was used in relation to the signed service-level agreement and the purpose of the funding".

The other evaluator was doing monitoring and evaluation according to the operations of the projects and when asked about the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation and as to what challenges they face, he said:

"Monitoring and evaluation is effective for any project, this is where we judge the success and the failure of the project, and the challenge we are facing is the shortage of staff to do evaluation. If there were more people to help me it would be great".

They are happy with the way monitoring and evaluation is done, but said that staff numbers need to be beefed up in order to achieve the goals set out in the operational manual of the development centres.

4.2.9 The Departmental Official

One departmental official was interviewed and made mention that *"Monitoring and evaluation is twofold, in that there is a unit that is mainly concerned with how the money is spent by the development centres, which is more like auditing the financial books. This unit looks at how the money was used in relation to the business plan submitted and the other unit looks at the operations".*

It has also emerged that each development centre is required to conduct research on what projects the community needs. Thus, the skills possessed by the people conducting that research, and their ability to conduct it, are of concern. This research may simply be needs assessment being conducted by community members without the proper skills.

The department expects the development centres to train people and help them to start their own businesses. Its role is one of monitoring and evaluation, thereby supervising the whole

process, but little has been gathered as to how this supervision unfolds. The official said: *"Our mandate is to make sure that these development centres operate according to the development centre operations manual. We expect that beneficiaries are trained in all spheres of business management, including monitoring and evaluation."* This is confirmed by the guidelines in the development centre operations manual (Department of Social Development, 2004).

4.3 Section B: Discussion of findings in relation to the primary aim of the study

The primary aim of the study was to establish the different views of the role players about the effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation of income-generating projects. Most beneficiaries agree that monitoring and evaluation is effective. They also actively participate in the monitoring process through submission of reports. Also, most of these beneficiaries are uncertain about when the evaluations take place. Again, most of the beneficiaries seem in agreement that the process of monitoring and evaluation is focused on financial spending. Lastly, all beneficiaries are of the view that monitoring and evaluation should be based on more visits and this would mean the evaluator would spend more time listening to problems encountered, rather than just accepting what is reflected in their reports. The process of more direct contact with beneficiaries by visiting sites regularly will also help them understanding better what their role is in monitoring and evaluation of their projects. The beneficiaries feel that more emphasis is placed on how the government's funding is spent, than on overseeing the projects step by step. The researcher is aware that those participants who have already started their businesses are not sure about when to expect visits from evaluators, as there are no guidelines to follow on this process, but at least they have sufficient business management training to keep monitoring their own businesses. However, the researcher's view is that this situation might be problematic given that effective monitoring and evaluation requires a timeframe of the project from the initial stage, and not only to the finishing stage but also to the exit stage, when the development centre will permanently hand over the project to the community. It is important that the project belong to the community and therefore full ownership needs to be transferred to the community. The current situation in Gauteng North Region is that development centre staff monitors the project and the department comes to evaluate progress. The beneficiaries are not passive in this process; rather, they assume a more active role through monthly report-writing, detailing their successes, challenges, financial status and anything else that may happen within the project. The challenges the development centres face are the problems attached to effectively monitoring and evaluating

income-generating projects, such as not having any departmental official to intervene in order solve a problem on time, as is required by the development centre operations manual (Department of Social Development, 2004).

4.3.1 The views of Development Centre Managers on monitoring and evaluation of income- generating projects.

The researcher has interviewed five development centre mangers and in some cases the skills coordinator acting on behalf of the manager. The researcher has noted that most development centres are managed by women. Out of five managers, four were women, equalling 90% of the mangers interviewed. Development centre managers play a significant role in project monitoring and evaluation. Women have thus become active participants in projects and programmes. Previously, women were among the marginalised group of our society. Chikadzi (2009) notes that the deprived status of women has been one of the central issues in development today, and many institutions now require, or impose quotas on their composition which prescribe a mandatory number of women to be included. However, the researcher did not focus on the number of women to be involved in development centres. This discovery is also supported by Chikadzi (2009) in his research report. Most development centre mangers are congruent that monitoring of projects is effective. They support their point by referring to the way reports are being submitted, and to the process of evaluation of the projects. However, most still feel that the way the process is being conducted is not making any impact. Most managers feel that it is only the money that is being evaluated, and not the actual project. Problems encountered are not being addressed, as the evaluators are not readily accessible to be asked to do so. Also, the participants expect to see some kind of a report after evaluation which is not being cascaded down to them and hence, some evaluators are seen as being harsh when doing evaluation. The managers are actually at the forefront of the process of monitoring and evaluation and all they need is support from the department. In conclusion, the researcher is heartened by the number of women taking leadership positions in society today.

Rahman (1990) cited in Shepherd (1998) supports the inclusion of women as a hallmark of participation, arguing that one of the indicators by which participation can be measured is the progress made for women to articulate their point of view, and the evolution of gender relations toward equality, as assessed by women themselves.

4.3.2 The opinions of evaluators as role players in monitoring and evaluation of income-generating projects

Two people were interviewed by the researcher. One of the evaluators seemed to have been involved with monitoring and evaluation of income-generating projects for more than eighteen months. This gives the impression that evaluators used in development centres have some experience. The researcher has also noted that the evaluators are in agreement that monitoring and evaluation is effective. Their role is to check on how the money was used, comparing this against the service-level agreement signed by the beneficiaries and development centres. The challenge pointed out is the shortage of staff to effectively monitor and evaluate projects. The staff shortage is a point that did not come across clearly from the beneficiaries, who expect the department to provide people who will conduct monitoring and evaluation at least more often than is now being done. However, the issue that evaluators only evaluate how money is used seems to be incongruent with what the managers alluded to. The service-level agreement seems to be the driving force in monitoring and evaluation of projects, instead of it being the main aims and objectives as set out in the development centre operations manual(Department of Social Development, 2004). One evaluator also made mention of the fact that since the establishment of a unit to conduct monitoring and evaluation, a number of achievements have been realised by the department.

4.3.3 The views of departmental officials as role players in monitoring and evaluation of income-generating projects

One departmental official was interviewed. A role of the department is to see that the monitoring and evaluation process is supervised and to see if the aims and objectives of the development centres model are achieved. A main focal point of the department is the fulfilment of establishing co-operatives as a way of decreasing the rate of unemployment and making people self-reliant through earning an income. It appears that the departmental officials involved in monitoring and evaluation of development centres have been involved with this process for more than four years. This fact gives the impression that these people have the required skills to conduct this process. The same sentiments shared by the evaluators are also shared by the departmental officials. They are of the view that monitoring and evaluation is effective. It also appears that there are differences in the way monitoring and evaluation is conducted. The Sustainable Livelihood unit has its own template for the conduct of monitoring and evaluation, and development centres are required to train people for a

period of at least twelve months, including how to conduct monitoring and evaluation of projects. The M&E unit only focuses on checking how money is spent in relation to the signed service-level agreement. For Sustainable Livelihood, monitoring and evaluation is broad-based in that it monitors and evaluates projects from their implementation to their resource management. This enables them to track performance of these centres, and if there are any challenges they are able share them with the centres and can agree on changes if there any to be made. However, the challenges of the department are capacity-building of the beneficiaries to sustain projects, business management, project management and leadership skills. The departmental official felt that there is a gap in capacitating people who start their own businesses. He mentioned that:

"Some of these people do not have the necessary skills to help the beneficiaries with their problems and they need to be empowered".

4.4 Summary

This chapter focused on findings in respect of the role players in income-generating projects; their integrated perceptions regarding the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation of income-generating projects, the perceived impact of monitoring and evaluation, challenges and the recommendations by the role players on how best to conduct monitoring and evaluation in income-generating projects. The main findings that emerged, conclusions and recommendations will be presented in the final chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE

MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

Based on the results set out in the previous chapter, the major findings, conclusions and recommendations will be presented in this chapter.

5.2 Summary of the main findings

A summary of the main findings of the study is as follows:

Firstly, the development centre model used by the Gauteng North Region of the Department of Social Development is viewed to be effective in project monitoring and evaluation, though there are challenges. The objectives of this model are to establish whether the centres act as an appropriate response to poverty alleviation and to establish the nature of projects and programmes provided by the centres. The development centre model is one of the international best practice community development models as per Lavela construction and Investment close cooperation,(2010). It is argued that this model was researched both locally and internationally before being adopted and implemented in South Africa. This model, however, fits the developmental needs of the South African population living in poverty. According to the development centre operations manual, all centres, in meeting the model's standards, are expected to provide services to all the pillars, namely:

Pillar 1: Information, Advice and Referrals

Pillar 2: Social Programmes

Pillar 3: Skills Development

Pillar 4: Entrepreneurial Development

Not all development centres offer the full suite of these services and to the benefit of this study, the researcher will not further elaborate on this issue. Suffice to say that some centres are more focused on a specific pillar than focusing on all the pillars at once.

Secondly, the objective of this service delivery model is the establishment of the effectiveness of each programme and each development centre. It has been established that the head office developed an operational manual for the development centre model. Furthermore, this is a very informative document which guides daily administrative issues within the centres. The manual is meant to benefit all the centres in guiding them on operations and policies and activities to be rendered under each pillar. However, the manual falls short on the design of the model for effective monitoring and evaluation.

This is due to the fact that in the manual, indicators for evaluation are not properly defined. It has also been established that there is a template in place for monitoring and evaluation, but this template was adopted by the department only after the 2009/2010 financial year. This template is meant to improve the quality of reporting but challenges which still persist in accurate reporting were identified. Also, the lack of skills in business management and project management approaches to the model design and implementation created competency gaps at all levels. Lastly, the lack of marketing for a proper business take-off has also been of major concern.

Thirdly, it also emerged from the study that the monitoring and evaluation is effective, but the way it is carried out is not satisfactory to the beneficiaries. It is not clear if the community actively participates in the development process during the monitoring and evaluation phase. During this phase beneficiaries of income-generating projects take the responsibility of record keeping, which includes weekly and monthly progress reports, financial records and listing the challenges that beneficiaries might be facing, which should then enable them to consult with the staff from the development centre who in turn should assist and support them in finding a solution. Even though monitoring and evaluation is seen as being effective, more engagement needs to take place and be driven by the Department of Social Development. While the development centre model is used in Gauteng North Region, there are still barriers that limit the realisation of effective monitoring and evaluation. The reporting of the results emanating from monitoring and evaluation should be cascaded down to all the role players.

5.3 Recommendations for the development centres

Based on the findings generated in the study it is recommended that: The Gauteng Provincial Department of Social Development needs to revisit their strategy on monitoring and evaluation of income-generating projects, so as to enhance effectiveness. Skilled and more committed personnel should train the development centre managers on how to be self-reliant

so as to effectively monitor and evaluate the projects. Gauteng North Region needs to expand its funding on projects to prevent them from being dependent on only one source of funding by availing them more financial resources, and to promote their growth to successful independent enterprises. This will enable the beneficiaries to receive the full amount of needed capital rather than being partially funded, as they need to give back the capital they received at the outset. Government departments can also help by pursuing a policy of preferential procurement of goods and services from small-scale enterprises such as income-generating projects. This is likely to stimulate faster growth, given that these enterprises cannot compete equally with well-established manufacturing industries.

5.4 Recommendations for future research

The findings of this study are not conclusive because of a rather small non-probability sample that has resulted in precluding the generalisation of findings from the broader population living below the poverty line who are participating in income-generating projects at some of the development centres. It is therefore recommended that possible areas for further research on the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation of programmes at the development centres be explored and compared to others that are managed by the Gauteng Provincial Department of Social Development, and also with those that are managed by non-governmental organisations. The development of a monitoring and evaluation timeframe for income-generating projects offered by Department of Social Development might be research of value.

Another opportunity for research could focus on the in-depth exploration of the challenges faced by development centres by focusing on income-generating projects.

5.5 Conclusions

In conclusion, this chapter has given a summary of the major findings and recommendations of the research. The development centre model can be viewed as a progressive step taken by the Department of Health and Social Development in Gauteng, focusing not only on poverty alleviation but also on enhancing community development through the establishment of development centres. Chikadzi (2009) notes that it is clear that some more creative thinking needs to take place if the initiative of community-based income-generating projects is to become sustainable and beneficial to the communities served.

REFERENCES

African National Congress (1994). *Reconstruction and Development Programme*. United Nations, Annual Report.

Bless, C., Higson-Smith, C. & Kagee, E. (2006). *Fundamental Social Research Methods*: An African Perspective. (3rd ed.). Cape Town: Juta and Co.

Chikadzi, V. (2009). *An analysis of community participation, income-generating projects at the Tembisa/Kempton Park Development Centre*, Research Report, University of Witwatersrand: Unpublished.

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

Delport, C. S. L., & Fouche, C.B. (2011). *Research at Grassroots for the Social Sciences and Human Service Professions* (4th ed.). in A. de Vos., H. Strydom., C. B. Fouche., & C. S. L. Delport. (2005). Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

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

Department of Social Development (2006a). *Five Year strategic Plan 2006-2009.*U npublished document.

Department of Social Development (2006b). *Impact and Effectiveness of Poverty*

Programmes in Gauteng. Unpublished document.

de Vos, .A. S., Strydom, H., Fouche. C. B., & Delport. C.S.L. (2005). *Research at Grassroots for the Social Sciences and Human Service Professions*: (2nd ed.). Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

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

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

Hölscher. D., & Sewpaul. V. (2006) *Ethics as a site of resistance: The tension between social control and critical reflection.* In N. Hall(Ed.). Social Work*: Making a Difference. Social Work around the World. The year of IFSW's 50th jubilee*. International Federation of Social Workers and Fafo. London: Sage Publication.

Kaeane, I.R.M. (2009). *Perceptions of the Beneficiaries Regarding Income-Generating Projects at Gauteng Department of Social Development. Sedibeng Region* (MA Dissertation). University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa: unpublished research report.

Kettner, P. M., Moroney, R.M., & Martin, L.L. (1990). *Designing and Managing Programs*. An Effective- Based Approach. London: Sage Publications.

Kibuuka. P., Malunga. V., Mannya. P., & Mmakola. D. (2000). .*Involving communities in the delivery and maintenance of infrastructure and utilities.* The paper for the conference. Windhoek: Namibia.

.Lavela Consulting & Investment CC. (2010). *The impact of development centres on poverty alleviation,* Development impact evaluation Report, Gauteng Provincial Government: South Africa.

Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2006). *Social Research Planning and Design* (9th ed.).New York. Macmillan Publishing Co.

Lewis, J. A., Packard, T.R., & Lewis M.D. (2007). *Management of Human Service Programs* (4thed). Thomson Brooks/Cole Co. Belmont, CA: United States of America.

McCawley, P. F. (n.d.). *The Logic Model for program Planning and Evaluation,* Associate Director, University of Idaho Extension. Retrieved March, 21, 2010 from http:www.thp.org/where_we_work/Africa?gclid=CTiTzeXU36QCFVNY2god8gtYJQ, pdf.

Mc Kendrick, B.W. (*1989). Introduction to Social Work in South Africa*. Pine Town: South Africa. Owen Burgess Publishers.

Midgley, J. (1995). *Social development,* The Developmental perspective in Social Welfare, London: Sage Publications.

Millennium Development Goals Report (2008). New York: United Nations. Retrieved September 11, 2013 from http://www.uiweb.uidaho.edu/extension/LogicModel.pdf.

Naidoo, K. D. (2008). *Living on the Edge, Socio-Economic Conditions and Their Perceived Impact on the Quality of Life of Persons Living in the Informal Settlement of Etwatwa Eas*t. (Bachelor of Social Work Research Report), University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.

Noyoo. N. (2003). *Social Welfare Policy, Social Work Practice and Professional Education in a Transforming Society* (Doctoral thesis). University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.

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

Paul. S. (1983). *Community participation in development projects,* The World Bank Experience. Washington: The World Bank.

Sartorius, R. (2008).*Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation System*: Improving the Performance of Poverty Reduction Programs and Building Capacity of Local Partners. Retrieved April 02, 2011, from http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev/56614-20-1-do-TOPIC.HTML.pdf.

South African Year Book. (2007/08). GCIS. (5th ed.). Johannesburg: Formerset Printers.

Strydom, C., & Tlhojane, M. E. (2008). Poverty in Rural Area. The Role of the Social Worker. *Social Work/Maatskaplike Werk, 44* (1), 34-51.

Swanepoel, H., & de Beer, F. (2006). *Community development*: *Breaking the cycle of poverty* (4thed.). South Africa: Juta and Co.

Zungu, Z. M. (2006*). An investigation into Factors contributing to the Success or Failure of Income-Generating Projects in Nongoma,* (Master Research Report). University of KwaZulu Natal.

APPENDIX A

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Good day

My name is Thembinkosi Elliot Henna. I am undertaking a study as a course requirement foraMaster of Arts in Social Development at the University of the Witwatersrand. The study aims at establishing the perceptions of the effectiveness of programme monitoring and evaluation rendered to the development centres by the Department of Social Development. It is hoped that this information may enhance the department and social workers understanding of the experiences of people involved in monitoring and evaluation of development programmes.

On the basis of the findings of this study, I hope to make recommendations for future interventions and service delivery improvement. The result of the study will be written up in the form of a research report and will be made available for reading at the development centres.

I therefore wish to invite you to participate in my study. Your participation is entirely voluntary and refusal to participate will not be held against you in any way. If you agree to take part, I shall arrange to interview you at a time and place that is suitable to you. The interview will last approximately one hour. You may withdraw from the study at any time and you may also refuse to answer any questions that you feel uncomfortable answering.

With your permission, the interview will be tape recorded. No one other than my supervisor will have access to the tapes. The tapes and interview schedules will be kept for two years following any publications arising from this study or for six years if no publications emanate from the study. Please be assured that your name and personal details will be kept confidential and that no identifying information will be included in the final research report.

Please feel free to ask any questions regarding the study. I shall answer them to the best of my ability. I may be contacted on 071 606 4510. Should you wish to receive a summary of the result of the study; an abstract will be made available to you on request.

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

Yours sincerely

Mr Thembinkosi Elliot Henna

APPENDIX B

CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE STUDY

I hereby consent to participate in the research project. The purpose and procedures of the study have been explained to me. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may refuse to answer any particular items or withdraw from the study at any time without any negative consequences. I understand that my response will be kept confidential.

Name of Participant: _____

Date: **_____**

Signature: **_____**

APPENDIX C

CONSENT FORM FOR AUDIO-TAPING OF THE INTERVIEW

I hereby consent to the tape recording of the interview. I understand that my confidentiality will be maintained at all times and that the tapes will be destroyed two years after any publication arising from the study, or six years after completion of the study if there are no publications.

Name:_____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

APPENDIX D

SEMI- STRUCTURED INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR BENEFICIARIES OF INCOME-GENERATING PROJECTS

1. How old are you?
2. What is your educational level?
3. Describe the nature of the project you are involved in.
4. What criteria were followed for you to become a beneficiary in the project?
5. Why did you specifically get involved in this project and not in the other projects?
6. Briefly explain your role in the project
7. What is your understanding of project monitoring and evaluation?
8. What is your perception on the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation?
9. Are there any other projects or activities that you would like to be involved in that are not offered at the centre?
10. Who directs and take responsibility for the day to day managing of activities in the project?
11. How is it managed when beneficiaries disagree on the way forward in managing the project?
12. Describe the role of management in the project in which you are involved.
13. Who in your view has more influence in making key decisions in the running of the project?
14. How has the project changed your life?

15. What could be done differently to improve the project's performance?

16. What positive experiences have you had during your involvement in the project?

17. Are you involved in the project monitoring and evaluation?

18. If not, which project would you have preferred to be involved in, and why?

APPENDIX E

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR CENTRE MANAGERS

1. For how long have you been involved in the income-generating projects?
2. Can you briefly explain the background of the project?
3. What is your role in programme monitoring and evaluation?
4. How is monitoring and evaluation implemented or practiced?
5. What are the challenges of programme monitoring and evaluation?
6. Can you briefly explain your role in programme monitoring and evaluation
7. When does monitoring and evaluation take place?
8. Who are involved in programme monitoring and evaluation?
9. What are the values of programme monitoring and evaluation?
10. What is your opinion on the effectiveness of programme monitoring and evaluation?
11. What do you think is positive in the way projects are run?
12. What in your view could be done differently in programme monitoring and evaluation?

APPENDIX F

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR THE EVALUATORS

1. For how long have you been involved in the development centres?
2. What role do you play in the centres?
3. How would you implement monitoring and evaluation of income-generating projects?
4. In your view, how effective is monitoring and evaluation of income-generating Projects?
5. What do you think is positive in the way projects are run?
6. What, in your view, could be done differently in the way income-generating projects are run?

APPENDIX G

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR THE DEPARTMENTAL OFFICIAL

1. For how long have you been involved in the development centre?
2. What role do you play in these centres?
3. How would you implement monitoring and evaluation of income-generating projects?
4. In your view how effective is monitoring and evaluation of income-generating projects?
5. What in your view could be done differently in the way income-generating projects are run?

APPENDIX H

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, JOHANNESBURG

Division of the Deputy Registrar (Research)

HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE (NON MEDICAL)
R14/49 Henna

CLEARANCE CERTIFICATE **PROTOCOL NUMBER H100 1109**

PROJECT Perceptions about the effectiveness of programme monitoring and evaluation rendered to the development centres by the department of social development in Gauteng north region

INVESTIGATORS Mr TE Henna

DEPARTMENT Social Work

DATE CONSIDERED 12.11.2010

DECISION OF THE COMMITTEE* Approve Unconditionally

NOTE:

Unless otherwise specified this ethical clearance is valid for 2 years and may be renewed upon application

DATE 22.12.2010 **CHAIRPERSON** .....
(Professor R Thornton)

cc: Supervisor : Dr E Pretorius

DECLARATION OF INVESTIGATOR(S)

To be completed in duplicate and **ONE COPY** returned to the Secretary at Room 10005, 10th Floor, Senate House, University.

I/We fully understand the conditions under which I am/we are authorized to carry out the abovementioned research and I/we guarantee to ensure compliance with these conditions. Should any departure to be contemplated from the research procedure as approved I/we undertake to resubmit the protocol to the Committee. **I agree to a completion of a yearly progress report.**

_____
Signature

PLEASE QUOTE THE PROTOCOL NUMBER IN ALL ENQUIRIES

Umnyango wezempilo no Kuthuthukiswa Komphakathi
Lefapha la Maphelo le Tshebeletso le Ntshetsopele ya Sechaba
Department of Health and Social Development
Departement van Gesondheid en Maatskaplike Ontwikkeling

Enquiries : Refilwe Makapela
011 355 7676 ; Cell No. 082 469 3127
Sub-directorate Research and Policy Co-Ordination
Dir.: Research and Demography
CD: Development and Research

Dear Mr. T.E. Henna

RE: YOUR APPLICATION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT

Thank you for your application to conduct research within the Gauteng Department of Health and Social Development.

Your application on the research on ***"Perceptions about the Effectiveness of Programme Monitoring and Evaluation rendered to the Development Centers by the Department of Social Development in Gauteng North Region"*** has been considered and approved for support by the Department as it was found beneficial to the Department's vision and mission.

The approval is subject to the Departmental terms and conditions as endorsed by you on

May I take this opportunity to wish you well for the research.

Looking forward to a value adding research and a fruitful co-operation.

With thanks.

(ACTING HOD)
DR KAMY CHETTY
HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

DATE 4/11/2010

Bank of Lisbon Building
37 Sauer Street
JOHANNESBURG
2000

Private Bag X085
MARSHALLTOWN
2000

Telephone number: (011) 355-7600 / (011) 355-3000