

**INCOME GENERATING PROGRAMMES  
IN MAHLABATHINI DISTRICT:  
AN ASSESSMENT OF THE FUNDING  
FORMULA**

**BY**

**ZODWA VIOLA MTSHALI**

**INCOME GENERATING PROGRAMMES IN MAHLABATHINI DISTRICT  
: AN ASSESSMENT OF THE FUNDING FORMULA**

**SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
OF MASTERS DEGREE IN COMMUNITY WORK**

**IN THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK  
UNIVERSITY OF ZULULAND**

**BY**

**ZODWA VIOLA MTSHALI**

**SUPERVISOR : MRS C.S.M. FAKU  
DATE OF SUBMISSION : NOVEMBER 2005**

**UNIVERSITY OF ZULULAND  
LIBRARY**

ISSN 110.....

10.....

**DECLARATION**

**I declare that the study on Income Generating Programmes in Mahlabathini District : An assessment of the funding formula is my work and all resources I have used quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete reference.**

  
**ZODWA VIOLA MTSHALI**  
**NOVEMBER 2005**

**DEDICATION**

**I dedicate this work to my parents ( Mr & Mrs E. Dhlodhlo ), my friends ( Jabu Cele and Lindiwe Mbonambi ) and my children Vulindlela and Athule Mtshali.**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

**I would like to acknowledge with gratitude the following persons whose love, moral support, interest, encouragement and assistance have enabled me to complete this study.**

- 1. The Lord Almighty, for the life, love, mind and direction that he gave me.**
- 2. My supervisor, Mrs C. S. M. Faku for her support and valuable guidance, without which the study would not have been successful.**
- 3. My parents Mr and Mrs E. Dhlodhlo for their love and support.**
- 4. My brother, my sisters and our children as sources of inspiration and support.**
- 5. My friends and colleagues Jabulile Cele and the late Lindiwe Mbonambi who contributed in one way or another to the study.**
- 6. Miss Nelly Mlotshwa and Miss Sibongile Mchunu for typing this work so successfully.**
- 7. Mahlabathini community members and my colleagues for their willingness and interest to participate as respondents in the study.**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title of study	(i)
Declaration	(ii)
Dedication	(iii)
Acknowledgements	(iv)

### CHAPTER 1

#### ORIENTATION TO THE STUDY

1.1 Problem statement.....	1-2
1.2 Background of the study.....	2
1.3 Motivation of the study.....	2
1.4 Objectives of the study.....	3
1.5 Value of the study.....	3
1.6 Hypothesis.....	3
1.7 Literature review.....	3-4
1.8 Operational meaning of terms.....	4
1.9 Research methodology and procedure.....	4
1.10 Data analysis and interpretation.....	4
1.11 Dissemination of research results.....	5
1.12 Structure of the study.....	5

### CHAPTER 2

#### LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction.....	6-7
2.2 Conceptual framework.....	7-8
2.2.1 Community.....	7

2.2.2	Community development.....	7-8
2.2.3	Funding.....	8
2.2.4	Funder.....	8
2.2.5	Poverty alleviation programmes.....	8
2.2.6	Income generating projects.....	8
2.2.7	Profit bank account.....	9
2.2.8	Youth.....	9
2.2.9	Adult.....	9
2.2.10	Cooperative.....	9
2.2.11	Non Profit Organisation.....	9
2.3	Theoretical framework – The social development approach.....	10-11
2.4	The move to social development.....	11-12
2.5	Government intervention.....	12-13
2.6	Assessment of projects/funding criteria.....	13
2.6.1	Programme purpose.....	13
2.6.2	Programme design.....	14-16
2.6.3	Programme/organisational capacity.....	16
2.6.4	Programme/organisational linkages.....	17
2.6.5	Sustainability.....	17
2.6.6	Monitoring, evaluation and reporting.....	17-18
2.7	Summary.....	18-19

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

3.1	Introduction.....	20
3.2	Population.....	20
3.3	Research design.....	21
3.4	Sampling procedure.....	21-22
3.5	Sample size.....	22
3.6	Methods of data collection.....	22-23

3.7	Validity and reliability.....	23
3.8	Limitations of the study.....	23
3.9	Ethical procedures.....	23
3.9.1	Voluntary and informed consent.....	23
3.9.2	Confidentiality.....	24
3.10	Summary.....	24

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION**

4.1	Introduction.....	25
4.2	Identifying Particulars.....	25
4.2.1	Distribution of respondents` sex.....	25
4.2.2	Distribution of respondents` ages.....	26
4.2.3	Distribution of respondents` period of involvement.....	26
4.2.4	Distribution of roles played by members.....	27
4.3	Programme purpose/focus.....	27
4.3.1	Distribution of types of projects applied for.....	28
4.3.2	Distribution of people who identified the project.....	28-29
4.3.3	Respondents` views on whether the programme applied for addressed the poverty needs and specific vulnerable groups.....	29
4.4	Programme design.....	29
4.4.1	Availability of programme operational plan.....	30
4.5	Programme/organisational capacity.....	30
4.5.1	Responses on the issue of project registration.....	30
4.5.2	Responses to the question on capacity building training.....	31
4.6	Programme/ organisational linkages .....	31
4.6.1	Responses on community awareness on the programme.....	32
4.7	Project sustainability.....	32

4.7.1	Responses on the availability of profit making strategy.....	33
4.7.2	Responses on the availability of budget.....	33
4.8	Monitoring, evaluation and reporting.....	34
4.8.1	Responses on whether the monthly progress report were submitted.....	34

## **DATA ANALYSIS IN PRESENTATION – GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS**

4.9	Identifying particulars.....	35
4.9.1	Distribution of respondents` sex.....	35
4.9.2	Distribution of respondents` ages.....	35-36
4.9.3	Distribution of respondents` period of involvement.....	36
4.9.4	Distribution of respondents` roles.....	36-37
4.10	Programme addressing specific poverty needs and objectives.....	37
4.10.1	Respondents` views on whether the programme applied for addressed specific poverty needs.....	37
4.10.2	Availability of programme operational plan.....	38
4.11	Programme capacity .....	38
4.11.1	Skills of officials to run the programme.....	38-39
4.11.2	Responses on what the funder did about the issue of unskilled staff and organisation members.....	39
4.12	The Department ensuring that the programme funded is known to the entire community.....	39
4.12.1	Funder ensuring programme funded is well known to the community..	40
4.13	Programme budget.....	40
4.13.1	Programme having a clearly developed budget.....	41
4.13.2	Programme funded according to the budget.....	41
4.14	Programme sustainability.....	42
4.14.1	Programme sustainability ensured.....	42
4.15	Programme evaluation and reporting.....	42
4.15.1	Responses on programme evaluation.....	43
4.16	Adequate assessment of funded projects.....	43
4.16.1	Responses on adequate assessment of funded projects.....	44
4.17	Summary.....	44

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

5.1	Introduction.....	45
5.2	Restatement of the problem.....	45
5.3	Objectives of the study.....	45-46
5.4	Findings of the study.....	47
5.4.1	Programme purpose.....	47
5.4.2	Programme design.....	47
5.4.3	Programme/organisational capacity.....	48
5.4.4	Programme/organisational linkages.....	48
5.4.5	Programme budget.....	48-49
5.4.6	Sustainability.....	49
5.4.7	Programme evaluation and reporting.....	49
5.4.8	Adequate assessment of funded projects.....	49
5.5	Conclusion.....	50
5.6	Recommendations.....	50-51
6.	Bibliography.....	52-53

**APPENDIX 1** - Interview schedule – community members

**APPENDIX 2** - Questionnaire – Officials from the Departments of Welfare,  
Agriculture and Local Government

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **ORIENTATION TO THE STUDY**

#### **1.1 PROBLEM STATEMENT**

The researcher identified the problem that most projects which were funded for the purpose of poverty alleviation in Mahlabathini District could not be sustained successfully because there seemed to be poor needs assessment on the part of the funder and the communities during the initial stages of the project. The White Paper for Social Welfare ( 1997 : 18 ) mentioned that Social Welfare policies and programmes would be developed and these would target poverty alleviation. It would promote development of people's capacity to take charge of their own circumstances in a meaningful way.

Poverty is the greatest problem in Mahlabathini and this affects family lives in the area. Non Governmental Organizations in Mahlabathini tried to involve community members in skills training projects like sewing to deal with a problem of poverty. These attempts were unsuccessful due to the fact that Non Governmental Organizations did not have funds to sustain themselves.

Poverty coincided with racial, gender and geographic or spatial determinants, and these would be taken into account in the targeting of programmes. While poverty is widespread throughout South Africa, African people were most affected. Low levels of literacy and a lack of capacity to access economic and social resources often accompanied poverty. Poverty was also of the most important causes of hunger and malnutrition. It seemed as if projects were funded because they had submitted good and well written business plans and not according to their needs.

It had also happened that the funder requested communities to submit business plans that would correlate with the budget that the funder had. For instance the funder might have budget for aged, youth, HIV/AIDS, etc. Communities might request funding and shape their needs to meet the requirements of the funder. Even community workers that were employed by the funding Government Department began to know those

communities whose funding had been approved as long as their applications correlated with the budget that the funder had. Their role as community workers began when they had to monitor the projects and provide social support.

## **1.2 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY**

The emphasis on the practice of Social Work Profession has been on the shift in the practice paradigm to the development approach for the survival of individuals rather than providing food parcels, maintenance grants, and providing handouts to people which promotes dependency. In this case the researcher felt that it was important that the needs of the community be well assessed so that they could be addressed effectively. Mahlabathini District is deep rural area in nature. Illiteracy level is 30% and 35% are individuals who have only reached Grade 7. This District experiences less economic growth due to scarcity of resources and it is poverty stricken. A lot of incomes generating activities were initiated in Mahlabathini areas to try and alleviate poverty. These activities are vegetable gardens, poultry farming, block making, sewing, etc.

The Department of Social Development prepared Poverty Relief Programmes Operations and Procedures Policy in order to assist communities to access funding for the initiation of income generating projects. These projects were aimed at assisting communities to eradicate poverty.

## **1.3 MOTIVATION OF THE STUDY**

The researcher was motivated to undertake such a study because of the experience with different projects as she discovered that most projects fall apart especially at the expiry of the funding period. Projects then become unsustainable. The researcher also felt that poverty alleviation programmes could not address the problem of poverty (income generating projects).

## **1.4 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The specific objectives of the study were also as follows:

- 1.4.1 To identify policies in place for funding of projects.
- 1.4.2 To identify problems encountered by the funders in providing funding.
- 1.4.3 To assess the impact of projects on the economic and social life of individuals participating in poverty alleviation projects.
- 1,4.4 To discover what should be done to assist in ensuring the sustainability of community development projects.

## **1.5 VALUE OF THE STUDY**

Community development is a component of social work. This study was important to the researcher in that if perfectly conducted, the information gained would be used to develop facts and upgrade the community development field and social work as a profession and study. The study would also contribute to the future planning of community projects towards sustainable development.

## **1.6 HYPOTHESIS**

The hypothesis of the study was as follows:

“Poor needs assessment in funded projects under Mahlabathini District leads to unsustainable project development”

## **1.7 LITERATURE REVIEW**

Midgley ( 1998,23 ) states that community development is a process that aims at the upliftment and enhancement of the quality of life of people. It is about helping people assume full responsibility for their lives. The involvement of Government in funding the income generating projects is about ensuring self – sufficiency and project

sustainability. Mc Kendrick (1997) mentions that a project must follow a set of pattern that will keep the motivation and enthusiasm going and repeat the learning opportunity as many times as possible

The major aspects of the study were community development, funding and income generating projects and reviewed further in Chapter II, i.e literature review.

Midgley J. (1995: 23) mention that Statists believe that Government is collectively owned by it citizens and represent their interests. The state is therefore, the ultimate collective. Governments also have the authority to ensure that social development policies are implemented, and that social and economic policies are harmonized.

### **1.8 OPERATIONAL MEANING OF TERMS**

The major terms that appeared in the study are defined in Chapter II, those terms are community, community development, funding, funder, poverty alleviation programmes, income generating projects, profit bank account, youth, adult, non profit organisation and cooperatives.

### **1.9 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE**

The research will be an evaluative research design. Grinnel (1988:57) argues that the measurement of social programmes impact on its clients is inextricably intertwined with the values underpinning the programme and values of the clients and the programme evaluators themselves. An interview schedule will be prepared for funded poverty alleviation projects in Mahlabathini District. A questionnaire will be prepared for officials in Government Departments such as Social Welfare, Agriculture, Traditional and Local Government working in the Development Components.

### **1.10 DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

The researcher will analyze data using Microsoft and Excel to draw tables.

## **1.11 DISSEMINATION OF RESEARCH RESULTS**

The research results will be disseminated through oral presentations during workshops and meetings. It will also be published in the newsletter, newspapers and social work / maatskaplikewerk – a social work journal with the widest circulation in the country.

## **1.12 STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY**

### **CHAPTER 1**

General orientation to the study.

### **CHAPTER 2**

Literature Review

### **CHAPTER 3**

Research Methodology

### **CHAPTER 4**

Presentation, analysis and Interpretation of data

### **CHAPTER 5**

Findings, conclusions and recommendations

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter will focus on the social development strategy and its historical background.

The White Paper for Social Welfare (1997:6) mentions that “the objective of Social Welfare is to promote the well being of individuals, families and communities.

Welfare services are part of a broad strategy of provision of Social services which aim at enhancing the quality of life of South Africans and which provide an enabling environment for women, youth, children, families and the aged to achieve their aspirations.”

Social welfare services and programmes are amongst a range of measures to achieve social development objectives (including health services, nutrition programmes, education, housing, job creation programmes, rural and urban development projects and land reform).

In the context of a social development paradigm, citizens, government and service providers are co-responsible for building a better quality of life for all.

In view of the widespread rural poverty, the Department of Welfare in consultation with all the relevant role players will develop a rural development strategy, and this will increase access of rural people to development of Social Welfare programmes. Mahlabathini area or District is chosen for this study because it is a remote rural area and it has received a lot of funding from the Department of Welfare and Agriculture in an effort to help alleviate poverty there.

The Social Welfare Services delivery has shifted from inequality to conscious targeting of inequality together with a strong anti-poverty focus in all services. A

number of initiatives towards implementing the recommendations of the White Paper for Social Welfare have taken place over the past couple of years. Currently the new financing approach has even shifted from financing of fragmented, specialized, or isolated services to financing of integrated services. There has also been a shift from an individualist bias in financing to recognition of collective approaches. In this way financing will support individual organisation as well as “collectives”. This means that financing will be allocated to a network of organisations as well instead of only individual organisation or to a community in addition to individual persons or groups in the community.

There has also been a shift indicated in the White Paper for Social Welfare i.e. from top down delivery to a participatory approach. Currently, provinces and organisations decide on whether a service is needed or will be provided without the participation of those for whom the services is intended. Use of a developmental assessment process and individuals should take place.

Community development is a process that aims at the upliftment and enhancement of the quality of life of people. It is about helping people assume full responsibility for their lives. The involvement of Government Departments in funding the income generating projects is about ensuring self-determination, self-sufficiency and project sustainability.

## **2.2 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

### **2.2.1. COMMUNITY**

Mitchel in Mckendrick (1987:85) defines the community as “people within a geographically bounded area, involved in social interaction with one or more psychological ties with each other and with the place they live in”. The concept will be used to refer to people belonging to Mahlabathini District.

### **2.2.2. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

Johnson (1982:11) cited by Mckendrick (1997:10), defines community development as “a process designed to create conditions of economic and social progress for the

whole community with its active participation and the fullest possible reliance on communities initiatives”.

This concept will be used in this study to refer to activities that are undertaken by Mahlabathini District people to uplift themselves socially and economically and Government Department prior and during the period of funding.

### **2.2.3. FUNDING**

Funding refers to the Government intervention in the form of money to meet a certain need or solve a particular problem either to an organisation or a group of individuals.

### **2.2.4. FUNDER**

A funder is, according to the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (1984; 303), refers to “a person/s who provide financial support for a cause or to an organisation in order to achieve certain goals or solve a certain problem”. In the study a funder will be referring to Government Department such as Welfare, Agriculture, Local Government, etc.

### **2.2.5. POVERTY ALLEVIATION PROGRAMMES**

Poverty alleviation programmes refer to strategies that are used by the Government to fight poverty and promote social and economic development. Involvement of communities themselves is of utmost importance. Programmes can be poultry farming, gardening, block-making, etc. These projects alleviate poverty not only through provision of food for communities, but also through the creation of job opportunities for many members of the communities.

### **2.2.6. INCOME-GENERATING PROJECTS**

Income generating projects refer to those projects that should be initiated by communities, funded by a Government Department and then generate profit for the project. Such projects differ from one another; they can be poultry farming, sewing, block-making, etc.

### **2.2.7. PROFIT BANK ACCOUNT**

A profit bank account is a second bank account that is opened by the project members. In this account the project members deposit the profit they have made out of the project products, i.e. vegetables, chicken, etc. This account is used as a savings account, which is intended to assist in sustaining the project.

### **2.2.8. YOUTH**

Longmans' English Dictionary defines "youth as young men and women in the period between being children and being fully-grown. This means that they are between the ages of sixteen (16) and thirty-five (35)."

### **2.2.9. ADULT**

Longmans' English Dictionary defines an adult as "a fully-grown person". In this study an adult is a male or female above the age of eighteen (18) to fifty-five (55).

### **2.2.10 COOPERATIVE**

Longmans' English Dictionary defines a cooperative as "a group of persons coming together to share skills in a cooperative manner so as to create a common livelihood from which they can all benefit."

### **2.2.11 NON PROFIT ORGANISATION**

A non profit organisation is defined by the N. P. O. Organisations Act 71 of 1997 as "a trust, company or an association of persons established for a public purpose in the income and property of which are not distributable to its members or office bearers except as reasonable compensation for services rendered."

## **2.3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

### **THE SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT APPROACH**

Social development does not deal with individuals by providing them with goals or services or by treating or rehabilitating them but it also focuses on the whole society, and on wider social processes and structures. The social development approach is also according to Midgley (1995; 23) comprehensive and universalistic. Social development does not cater only for needy individuals but seeks to enhance the well-being of the whole population.

Social development's most distinctive feature is its attempt to link social and economic development efforts. Within the process of development social and economic development form two sides of the same coin. Social development cannot take place without economic development and economic development is meaningless unless it is accompanied by improvements in Social Welfare for the population as a whole. The attempt to integrate social and economic policies and programmes in order to promote people's Welfare distinguishes social development from the other approaches.

In Mahlabathini community development projects were initiated with the view to uplift the social and economic status of the community. There is therefore an interrelatedness of social and economic development in the projects being handled in Mahlabathini.

Social development has an interdisciplinary focus which draws on the insights of the various social sciences hence; there is a great stress on intersectoral collaboration. This means that social development or organisation is brought together to try and solve a particular problem or need. In Mahlabathini the Department of Welfare relies on the Department of Agriculture for the provision of technical support to their projects such as garden, poultry farming and sewing. The Department of Health also assists the Department of Welfare in their projects such as home based care. The Department of Labour also assists in providing capacity building and business skills training on projects funded by any department.

Social development invokes a sense of process. Social development is a dynamic concept in which the notion of growth and change is explicit. The very term development explicitly connotes a sense of positive change. It is envisaged that the change in the economic situation of the Mahlabathini people will take place gradually, change will not occur within a short time.

Social development goals are fostered through various strategies. These strategies seek, either directly or indirectly to link social interventions with economic development efforts. The income-generating projects at Mahlabathini have tried to foster economic development efforts in the manner that if a project is a vegetable garden, the project members sell the garden produce to the local community members and then save the money in the profit bank account. In the projects that do not have a profit bank account, the money would be used to buy seeds and generally sustain the project. For those projects that save their income in the bank, the project members meet and agree on the month and date to withdraw money and divide it amongst one another.

#### **2.4. THE MOVE TO SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT**

The term “development” is widely used today. For most people it connotes a process of economic change brought about by industrialization. The term according to Midgley (1998; 3) also implies a process of social change resulting in urbanization, the adoption of a modern lifestyle and new attitude. Further, it has a welfare connotation which suggests that the development enhances people’s incomes and improves their educational levels, housing conditions and health status. For most people, development means economic progress.

Grinding poverty still characterizes the lives of many millions of ordinary people in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Housing conditions in many third world cities are atrocious, the specter of starvation haunts millions of rural dwellers, homeless children roam the streets, too many young people still die of premature deaths and labour exploitation of both adults and children is wide spread (Midgley 1998;3). There is evidence to show that the gains recorded in the decades following the Second World War have slowed and in some cases have been reversed. Official reports reveal

that the incidence of poverty increased in many parts of the world. The phenomenon of persistent poverty in the midst of economic affluence is one of the problematic issues of development today.

This situation is also found in South Africa especially in rural and underdeveloped areas like Mahlabathini.

The belief that social development can best be promoted by Governments, their specialized agencies, policy makers, planners and administrators form the basis of the statist approach to social development. Drawing on collectivist ideology, advocates of the statist strategy believe that the state embodies the interests of society as a whole and that it has a responsibility to promote the well being of all citizens; (Midgley 1995; 29).

In the White Paper for Social Welfare (1997), chapter two focuses on the National developmental Social Welfare strategies (the war on poverty). Section 21 indicates clearly that “Social Welfare policies and programmes will be developed which will be targeted at poverty prevention, alleviation, reduction and the development of people’s capacity to take charge of their own circumstances in a meaningful way.”

Section 24 of the White Paper (1997) deals with funding of Social Welfare programmes, indicating that the National Department of Welfare will develop national guidelines on the financing of Welfare programmes. These guidelines will be developed in consultation with stakeholders. A discussion on these guidelines will be given in the next topic of the funding criteria.

## **2.5 GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION**

According to the Poverty Alleviation/Relief Programme Operations and Procedures manual (2001) for social development, “the department will facilitate and identify income generation projects in impoverished communities, with a special emphasis on rural areas and women, which integrate the needs, economic and social capacities of the disabled.”

In this respect the Department conducts a comprehensive training and support needs analysis of all projects funded. On this basis the Department will give and/or commission support from relevant institutions, non-governmental and governmental organisation and departments to give support and/or train project members in organizational, business, community development processes and management needs identified.

The department will provide ongoing strategic and targeted support in marketing, business skills, organizing, financial management and bookkeeping and other related skills to support projects and programs funded.

## **2.6 ASSESSMENT OF PROJECTS/FUNDING CRITERIA**

The Department of Social Development manual of 2001:35 on poverty relief programs, stipulates that in order to be able to sense whether a project is worth funding, one has to consider if the departmental objectives contained in the Business plan of the department will be met by the project. This information is usually contained in the project Business Plan of the potential project. There are seven categories which are the check list for programme assessment to ascertain whether the project is worth funding:-

### **2.6.1 PROGRAM PURPOSE**

The program should be aligned to the overall poverty alleviation/relief program objectives. The objectives of the program should be clearly stated. The program should address specific poverty needs and specific vulnerable groups (e.g. youth, women, unemployed etc.). The program should also be in line with the integrated rural development strategy, which prescribes among others that the beneficiaries should be from the disadvantaged group and should be unemployed.

In Mahlabathini this is not always the case. In some of the projects advantaged groups benefit from the project and in some projects people from the disadvantaged groups do not benefit.

## 2.6.2 PROGRAM DESIGN

Here, the specific objectives of the program should be clearly stated and the expected results of the program should be clearly articulated and be realistic. The implementation steps of the program should be logical. This means that the operational plan or strategic planning of the project should be compiled in such a way that there is order of activities to be undertaken.

The time frame to achieve program results should be realistic and the program should have sufficient details. The operational plan of one of the Department of Welfare – Mahlabathini District projects is an example to explain clearly what a programme design entails:-

### OPERATIONAL PLAN

Name of Project : Ekushumayeleni Development Programme.  
 Project Number : 16981  
 District : Mahlabathini  
 Objectives : To enhance programme self sustainability.  
 : To improve economic living conditions of individuals in kwa-Mdumela and Ekushumayeleni Areas.

OUTCOME	OUTPUT	ACTIVITY	INDICATOR	RESPONSIBILITY	TIME FRAME
Enhanced programme self-sustainability	Operatives on irrigation scheme, poultry farming and sewing activities.	Acquiring quotations from the engineer for water installation and wait for approval.	Quotations availability.	Engineer District Co-coordinator Regional Office.	12/12/02
Improved economic living conditions in kwa-Mdumela and		Acquiring quotations for the tractor with a view to	Quotations availability and approval from Regional Office.	Project Committee.	31/01/03

Ekushumayel eni Area.	prepare land in respect of irrigation scheme.	Skills Development in project members.	Dept. of Labour. District Co- ordinator.	31/03/03
	Linking the programme with the Dept. of Labour for skills developmen t.	Structure completion.	Project committee. Contractor.	31/03/03
	Getting the contractor to complete sewing and poultry structure and do financial reconciliatio n.	Quotations availability.	Project committee.	31/01/03
	Acquiring quotations to buy material/equ ipment to be placed in the poultry and sewing structure.	Technical support from the Agriculture.	Project members. District Co- ordinator.	Monthly
	Ensuring constant contact with the Dept. of Agriculture for technical support.	Project registration.	Dept of Trade and Industry. Project members.	30/06/20 06
	Assist programme members to get to the registration process as	HIV/AIDS awareness in project members.	District Co- ordinator HIV/AIDS Co- ordinator.	31/03/03
		Monthly progress reports. Consolidated report.	District Co- ordinator.	Monthly

		co-operatives.  Organizing HIV/AIDS educational talk for project members.  Monitoring project process and provide social support.			
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--

**2.6.3 PROGRAM/ORGANISATIONAL CAPACITY**

The organisation that applies for funding should be appropriately registered or known officially. Here, the Department of Social Development requires an organisation which applies for funding to apply as non-profit organisation (NPO's). Registration of a Non Profit Organisation is done in Pretoria by the Department of Social Development. Organisations that need to be registered fill in the registration forms that are obtainable from any Welfare Department office and have to send them to Pretoria for approval. Registration of cooperatives is also done in Pretoria by the Department of Trade and Industry.

The members of the organisation should also have necessary skills and knowledge to run the program. If there are no skills they should indicate how they plan to acquire capacity building skills. The organisation should have a governance structure to manage the program (i.e. project executive committee, etc). The organisation should also have appropriate policies and systems to ensure stability (this refers to the project constitution which is regarded as a legal document of the project).

#### **2.6.4. PROGRAM/ORGANISATIONAL LINKAGES**

The organisation should be well known to the community in which it is operating and should be well rooted in appropriate community structures. For instance, the project should also be known to the local leadership, izinduna, ward councilors, etc., and should be known to the local municipality. The community benefiting from the program should also be well represented. The organisation should have a good plan of their products marketing strategy so as to ensure profit making.

#### **2.6.5 SUSTAINABILITY**

The program should have chances of self-financing after the expiry of the grant period. The program should be likely to raise/generate other income and should have sufficient plans for generating income such as getting market to sell program products and open a profit bank account. The program should show that it is not able to raise other income but should remain highly relevant to the beneficiary groups. The program should be profitable.

#### **2.6.6 MONITORING, EVALUATION AND REPORTING**

The program should clearly articulate how it will measure its success, (e.g. whether through profit made etc). The program should have developed a program of reporting progress (e.g. by submitting progress reports and bank statements, etc). The program should have a viable communications and marketing plan. Monitoring reports can provide the program with basic process indicators of the grantee's success in accomplishing measurable objectives.

Grinnell (1988;402) mentions that program evaluation has been defined as “a collection of methods, skills, and sensitivities necessary to determine whether a human service is needed and likely to be used, whether it is conducted as planned, and whether the human service actually does help people in need. Program evaluation is very important because errors in its findings and recommendations can lead to major consequences.”

The demand for program evaluation was generally due to economic conditions. Another factor for program evaluation is the consumer movement. Clients are starting to demand quality services and appropriately so. The funder needs to evaluate the programs in order to ensure that funds disbursed to the communities are utilized appropriately.

According to the Department of Social Development poverty relief programme manual on operations and procedures (2001), there are seven categories which are a checklist for program assessment to decide whether the project is worth funding.

Burke (2000; 49) argues that the “selection of the right project for further investment is a crucial decision for the long- term survival of a particular agency. The selection of the wrong project may well precipitate project failure leading to agency liquidation.”

In Mahlabathini most projects seem to have been funded just for the sake of funding. No thorough research or needs assessment was conducted before the project was approved for funding.

## **2.7 SUMMARY**

This chapter looked at the conceptual framework in defining terms that will be used frequently in the study, theoretical framework with social development as the base of the study, the move to social development, government intervention and the checklist to assess projects for funding.

Pottier (1993:138) indicates that it is necessary to search out and listen to the mass of the rural poor, who are intended participants in development efforts. This must happen at the earliest possible opportunity and has to be the major consideration in drawing up plans for development projects. Secondly, the involvement to date of professionals in development has primarily been to give information rather than learn from potential project partners.

This shows that it is important that the beneficiaries themselves should be active and take a leading role in the initiation of development projects. The government officials/professionals should be able to learn from the beneficiaries and not dictate projects to them.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 INTRODUCTION**

In this chapter the researcher highlights the methodology that was used in data collection, why and how it was used. This includes population, research design, sampling procedure, sample size, methods of data collection, how validity and reliability was ensured.

Bailey ( 1987:37 ) defines research methodology as the philosophy of the research process. This includes the assumptions and values that serve as a rationale for research and standards or the criteria the research uses for interpreting data and reaching conclusions.

#### **3.2 POPULATION**

*A population is the group from which the sample is taken.*

Grinnel ( 1988: 241 ) also defines a population as the totality of persons, events, organisational units, case records, or other sampling units with which the research problem is concerned. The total set from which the individuals or units of study are chosen is referred to as population.

The researcher used the unemployed youth and adults who had been involved in funded development projects in the Mahlabathini areas of Northern KwaZulu Province.

### **3.3 RESEARCH DESIGN**

“A research design is a plan which includes every aspect of a proposed research study from the conceptualisation of the problem right through to the dissemination of findings” ( Grinnel 1988:220 ). This study used an evaluative research design.

Babbie E. ( 1998:334 ) mentions that “ Evaluation research sometimes called program evaluation refers to a research purpose rather than a specific research method. This purpose is to evaluate the impact of social interventions such as new teaching methods, innovations in parole, and a wide variety of such programs. “ Evaluation is a form of applied research method intended to have some real world effect. Evaluation research is appropriate whenever some social intervention occurs or is planned. In its simplest sense, evaluation research is a process of determining whether the intended result was produced.

The evaluation research draws on many different theories of Social Development. One purpose of evaluation research is to focus on the theories of change implicit in social programmes, to analyse the ways in which those involved in social programmes go about their work, the issues they deal with and the manner in which they confront these issues. The central goal of the programme evaluation is focused on answering specific practical questions about social programmes and their development.

### **3.4 SAMPLING PROCEDURE**

The purposive sampling method of non – probability sampling was used. Non-probability according to Bailey ( 1987:92 ) means “ a sample in which the probability of selection of each case is not known” The non-probability is less complicated, much less expensive, and may be done on a spur – of – the moment basis to take advantage of available and perhaps unanticipated respondents without the statistical complexity of a probability sample”.

“Purposive method can only be used when the researcher has sufficient knowledge related to the research problem to allow selection of “ typical ” persons for inclusion in the sample ”, ( Grinnel 1988:252 ). The researcher uses his or her own judgement

about which respondents to choose, and picks only those who best meet the purpose of the study ( Bailey 1987:94 ).

The characteristics of the target population in this study were (i) people who were involved in Mahlabathini District funded projects and (ii) Government officials who worked as *Development Workers in funded projects*.

### **3.5 SAMPLE SIZE**

A sample according to Grinnel ( 1988:241 ) “ is a small portion of the total set of objects, events, or persons which together comprise the subject of the study. The researcher used purposive sampling method as a third type of non probability sampling procedure. Grinnell (1988:252) mentions that “purposive sampling can only be used when the researcher has sufficient knowledge related the research problem to allow selection of typical persons for inclusion in the sample. The researcher sample selected persons who were involved in community projects of Mahlabathini District because they were typical with regard to the researcher’s study’s variables.

The researcher used effectively the sample size of forty (40) respondents. Thirty ( 30 ) respondents were community members involved in development projects and ten (10) respondents were Government Officials working with funded development projects. The Government Departments were Welfare, Agriculture, Traditional Affairs and Local Government.

### **3.6 METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION**

Face-to-face interviewing using the interview schedule was used as a method of data collection. One interview schedule was prepared for thirty (30) community members involved in development projects and a questionnaire was prepared for ten (10) government officials. Closed and open-ended questions were drawn in the questionnaire for the respondents to be able to elaborate on issues pertaining to the research study.

The researcher drew interview schedules in English and interpreted questions to the respondents in Zulu where necessary.

### **3.7 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

A pilot study was undertaken to ensure that questions asked were relevant, clear and that effective responses were to be received. Four respondents were interviewed, three (3) from community members involved in funded projects and one (1) from the Welfare Government Department. The researcher discovered that the respondents were happy about interviews and questions. They were able to respond to all the questions asked.

Grinnel ( 1988:314) mentions that “ the pre-test is not concerned with the respondents’ answers to the questions per se, rather with the difficulties the respondents may have in answering the questions.”

Pre-testing the instrument can give a true indication of how well respondents in the actual study will understand the question.

### **3.8 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

The research was conducted in Mahlabathini in most respondents were illiterate so they could not write down their comments. The researcher had to elaborate some questions to their understanding during the interview. The researcher could not meet all the respondents in one point as they were selected from different areas of Mahlabathini District.

### **3.9 ETHICAL PROCEDURES**

#### **3.9.1 VOLUNTARY AND INFORMED CONSENT**

The researcher obtained full permission from the participants before they were interviewed. The researcher explained the whole research to the subject and the kind of participation she required from them.

### **3.9.2 CONFIDENTIALITY**

The researcher ensured that confidentiality was maintained within the participants. The researcher interviewed one participant at a time in a private corner of the respective project site.

### **3.10 SUMMARY**

This chapter looked at research methodology, which served as a guiding of how data were collected. It described the research population, research design and sampling procedure. It also discussed the sample size, and methods of data collection, how validity and reliability was ensured. The chapter finally indicated the limitations of the study and ethical procedures that were used.

## CHAPTER 4

### PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETAION

#### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

The researcher in this chapter presents, analyses and interprets the responses by the people who were and are still involved in community development projects. Responses of the officials employed by Government Departments of Welfare, Agriculture and Traditional Affairs and local government are also analyzed and interpreted.

The analysis is done both quantitatively and qualitatively. It is done quantitatively as it shows the numbers of responses and qualitatively as it indicates feelings and perceptions of responses.

Data presentations were in the form of tables. The total number of respondents was forty.

#### 4.2 IDENTIFYING PARTICULARS – COMMUNITY MEMBER SAMPLE

Identifying information establishes sex, age, period of involvement in funded community projects and roles played in the development project process. The purpose of identifying particulars is to get and give profile of the respondents.

**TABLE 4.2.1 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS' SEX**

SEX	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Male	13	43%
Female	17	57%
Total	30	100%

The table shows the higher number of female respondents than males.

**TABLE 4.2.2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONENTS' AGES**

<b>AGE</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Youth 18-25 years	4	13,3%
26-35 years	7	23,3%
36-45 years	13	43,4%
46-55 years	6	20%
Total	30	100%

The table reflects the majority of respondents being the adults above thirty five years ( 35 ). There is also a low percentage of the youth involved in community development projects.

**TABLE 4.2.3 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS' PERIOD OF INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY PROJECTS**

<b>PERIOD OF INVOLVEMENT</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Ten ( 10 ) years back	2	7%
Eight ( 8 ) years back	3	10%
Five ( 5 ) years back	3	10%
Three ( 3 ) years back	9	30%
Still involved	13	43%
Total	30	100%

The above table reflects the majority of respondents still involved in the funded community projects. This shows that the projects of this nature are not very old as there were fewer respondents who were involved ten years to five years back.

**TABLE 4.2.4 DISTRIBUTION OF ROLES PLAYED BY MEMBERS DURING COMMUNITY PROJECT PROCESS**

<b>ROLE PLAYED IN THE COMMUNITY PROJECT</b>	<b>FREQUENCY</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Committee member	17	57%
Project member	10	33%
Community member	3	10%
Other	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100%</b>

The above table shows the majority of respondents who played the role of project committee in the funded community projects. This indicates that community project committee members tend to lead communities in the community project process.

#### **4.3 PROGRAM PURPOSE/FOCUS**

The program purpose is one of the major aspects in this study. In the program purpose the researcher looked at the type of project/program the respondents applied for, how the project was identified and the target group.

**TABLE 4.3.1 DISTRIBUTION OF TYPES OF PROJECTS APPLIED FOR**

<b>TYPE OF PROJECT</b>	<b>FREQUENCY</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Vegetable garden	5	17%
Poultry farming	11	37%
Cooperative / small business	0	0%
Other	14	46%
Total	30	100%

The above table shows the majority of respondents (46%) who had applied for funding of other projects such as block-making, sewing and arts and craft. There is also a lesser percentage (17%) of respondents who had applied for funding of vegetable garden project. The Poverty Relief Programme operations and procedures manual states that the program applied for should be aligned to the overall poverty alleviation/relief program objectives.

**TABLE 4.3.2 DISTRIBUTION OF PEOPLE WHO IDENTIFIED THE PROJECT**

<b>CATEGORY OF PEOPLE WHO IDENTIFIED THE NEEDED PROJECT</b>	<b>FREQUENCY</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
<i>The committee</i>	7	23%
The community	20	67%
Traditional leader	0	0%
Community worker	3	10%
Total	30	100%

The table shows the majority of respondents indicating that the projects they involved themselves in, were identified by the community.

**TABLE 4.3.3 RESPONDENTS VIEW ON WHETHER THE PROGRAM APPLIED FOR ADDRESSED THE POVERTY NEEDS AND SPECIFIC VULNERABLE GROUPS SUCH AS YOUTH, WOMEN, UNEMPLOYED, ETC**

<b>PROGRAM ADDRESSING POVERTY NEEDS</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Yes	22	73%
No	6	20%
Uncertain	2	7%
Total	30	100%

The majority of respondents viewed the program/project they applied for as addressing the poverty needs and specific vulnerable groups' needs. Community development is a process that aims at the upliftment and enhancement of the quality of life for all disadvantaged people.

#### **4.4 PROGRAM DESIGN**

The program design is one of the requirements for funding. The organisation should state clearly its objectives, implementation steps and expected results.

**TABLE 4.4.1 AVAILABILITY OF PROGRAM OPERATIONAL PLAN**

<b>OPERATIONAL PLAN</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Yes	14	47%
No	16	53%
Uncertain	0	0%
Total	30	100%

The above table shows that the majority of respondents who applied for funding did not have an operational plan. The fourteen i.e ( 47% ) that had an operational plan indicated that the operational plans were drawn up for them by the development workers and sometimes consultants.

#### **4.5 PROGRAM/ ORGANISATIONAL CAPACITY**

The researcher asked the respondents whether their organisations were known officially or legally registered and whether capacity building training was received as this is one of the criteria that should be used by the funder when assessing the program for funding.

**TABLE 4.5.1 RESPONSES ON THE ISSUE OF PROJECT REGISTRATION**

<b>PROJECT REGISTRATION</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Yes	10	33%
No	20	67%
Uncertain	0	0%
Total	30	100%

This table indicates a majority of respondents with programs that were not registered during their application for funding.

**TABLE 4.5.2 RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION ON CAPACITY BUILDING TRAINING**

<b>CAPACITY BUILDING TRAINING RECEIVED</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Yes	9	60%
No	18	30%
Uncertain	3	10%
Total	30	100%

The above table indicates that the majority of respondents did not receive training before they received funding. 30% of the respondents mentioned that the funder organised training for them after they had received funding.

#### **4.6 PROGRAM/ORGANISATIONAL LINKAGES**

The program/organisational linkages is also important in that it stresses the importance of the organisation being known to the community and by the local leadership.

**TABLE 4.6.1 RESPONSES ON COMMUNITY AWARENESS ON THE PROGRAM**

<b>COMMUNITY AWARENESS</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Yes	23	77%
No	3	10%
Uncertain	4	13%
Total	30	100%

The above table shows the high percentage of responses mentioning that their project was known to the local community.

#### **4.7 PROJECT SUSTAINABILITY**

Project sustainability is very important when assessing the program for funding. It stresses that the program should have chances of self-financing after the expiry of the grant period. The researcher also wanted to know if the respondents did prepare a budget for their projects to indicate their needs and costs.

**4.7.1 RESPONSES ON THE AVAILABILITY OF PROFIT – MAKING STRATEGY SUCH AS PROFIT BANK ACCOUNT**

<b>AVAILABILITY OF PROFIT BANK ACCOUNT</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Yes	8	27%
No	22	73%
Uncertain	0	0%
Total	30	100%

The above table indicates a high percentage of respondents who mentioned that they did not have profit bank account to save their profits.

**TABLE 4.7.2 RESPONSES ON THE AVAILABILITY OF BUDGET**

<b>AVAILABILITY OF BUDGET</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Yes	5	17%
No	25	83%
Uncertain	0	0%
Total	30	100%

The above table shows the high percentage of respondents who did not prepare budget for the programs they applied for.

#### **4.8 MONITORING, EVALUATION AND REPORTING**

It is important for the program to indicate how its success will be measured and also by giving progress reports to the funder. The researcher wanted to know if the respondents did submit monthly progress reports like bank statements, etc after the funding was granted.

**TABLE 4.8.1 RESPONSES ON WHETHER THE MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORTS WERE SUBMITTED**

<b>SUBMISSION OF MONTHLY PROGRESS REPORT</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Yes	22	73%
No	8	27%
Uncertain	0	0%
Total	30	100%

The above table shows a high percentage of respondents agreed that they submitted monthly progress reports to the funder.

## **DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION – GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL SAMPLE**

### **4.9 IDENTIFYING PARTICULARS**

Identifying information here established sex, age, period of involvement and role played in the development project process.

The purpose of identifying particulars is to get and give profile of the respondents.

**TABLE 4.9.1 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS' SEX**

<b>SEX</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Male	4	40%
Female	6	60%
Total	10	100%

The table shows a higher number of female respondents than males.

**TABLE 4.9.2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS' AGES**

<b>AGE</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
18-25	0	0%
25-35	8	80%
35-45	2	20%
45-55	0	0%
Total	10	100%

The table reflects the majority of respondents being the adults above twenty five ( 25 ) and below thirty six ( 36 ).

**TABLE 4.9.3 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS' PERIOD OF INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY PROJECT**

<b>PERIOD OF INVOLVEMENT</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
1994 – 2004	0	0%
1996 – 2002	0	0%
1994 – 1999	0	0%
1999 – 2001	6	60%
Still involved	4	40%
Total	10	100%

The above table indicates the high number of officials who have been involved in community projects since year 1999. This shows that Government Departments implemented the development strategy in the year 1999.

**TABLE 4.9.4 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS' ROLES IN THE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS**

<b>ROLE</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Funder	3	30%
Community worker	7	70%
Other	0	0%
Total	10	100%

The above table shows the high number of respondents who play a role of community worker in the development projects and 30% of respondents who are funders. This shows that there are many community workers / field workers than development officers i.e those officials that specifically deal with development administration.

#### **4.10 PROGRAM ADDRESSING SPECIFIC POVERTY NEEDS AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES**

When funding the program, the funder should ensure that the program applied for does address the specific poverty needs and specific vulnerable groups e.g. youth, women, unemployed and disabled.

The program should also have a proper operational plan, which will indicate how the program objectives can be achieved.

**TABLE 4.10.1 RESPONDENTS VIEW ON WHETHER THE PROGRAM APPLIED FOR ADDRESSED SPECIFIC POVERTY NEEDS AND SPECIFIC VULNERABLE GROUPS SUCH AS YOUTH, WOMEN, UNEMPLOYED, ETC**

<b>PROGRAM ADDRESSING POVERTY NEEDS</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Yes	9	90%
No	1	10%
Uncertain	0	0%
Total	10	100%

**TABLE 4.10.2 AVAILABILITY OF PROGRAM OPERATIONAL PLAN**

<b>OPERATIONAL PLAN</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Yes	6	60%
No	4	40%
Uncertain	0	0%
Total	10	100%

The above table shows that the high percentage of respondents indicated that most projects they assessed for funding had operational plans.

#### **4.11 PROGRAM CAPACITY**

Program capacity stresses that the official/funder representative or member of the organisation should also have necessary skills and knowledge to run the program. The researcher wanted to find out if the applicants did have such skills and knowledge to run the project, if not what did the officials do about that.

**TABLE 4.11.1 SKILLS OF OFFICIAL TO RUN THE PROGRAM**

<b>KNOWLEDGE/SKILLS</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Yes	4	40%
No	6	60%
Uncertain	-	-
Total	10	100%

The above table shows the high percentage of respondents who had no skills or knowledge to run the program.

Most of the respondents mentioned that they were social workers by profession and they were seconded by the Department of welfare to monitor the funded projects. They also mentioned that they had done general community work while they were at tertiary level and did not learn further courses on it.

**TABLE 4.11.2 RESPONSES ON WHAT THE FUNDER DID ABOUT THE ISSUE OF UNSKILLED PROJECT AND ORGANISATION MEMBERS**

<b>FUNDER RESPONSE</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Arranged training	8	80%
Suspended funding	0	0%
Uncertain	2	20%
Total	10	100%

Most responses indicated that basic training had to be arranged during the funding process after it was discovered that the organisation members could not account for their activities in the project. This shows that in most cases there were delays in the process of providing training to the project members. Basic financial management training should be provided prior to the disbursement of funds.

#### **4.12 THE DEPARTMENT ENSURING THAT THE PROGRAM FUNDED IS KNOWN TO THE ENTIRE COMMUNITY**

The organisation should be well known to the community in which it is operating and should be well rooted in appropriate community structures.

**TABLE 4.12.1 FUNDER ENSURING PROGRAM FUNDED IS WELL  
KNOWN TO THE COMMUNITY**

<b>PROGRAM KNOWN</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Yes	10	100%
No	0	0%
Uncertain	0	0%
Total	10	100%

The above table shows that all respondents agreed that the funder ensured that the program was well known to the community. They mentioned that the projects were introduced to the local traditional leaders. The respondents however mentioned that there were no guarantees that the community would benefit from it, because some individuals tend to dominate more in a project, which makes it difficult for other community members to involve themselves.

#### **4.13 PROGRAM BUDGET**

This criterion emphasizes the importance of a developed budgeting system which should also be realistic. Here the organisation indicates their needs and the costs towards those needs.

**TABLE 4.13.1 PROGRAM HAVING A CLEARLY DEVELOPED BUDGET**

The researcher wanted to know if the respondents received applications, which had a clearly developed budget

<b>PROGRAM HAVING A DEVELOPED BUDGET</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Yes	3	30%
No	7	70%
Uncertain	0	0%
Total	10	100%

The above table shows that the majority of respondents received applications, which had no clearly developed budget.

**TABLE 4.13.2 PROGRAM FUNDED ACCORDING TO THE BUDGET**

<b>PROGRAM FUNDED ACCORDING TO THE BUDGET</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Yes	3	30%
No	4	40%
Uncertain	4	30%
Total	10	100%

The majority of respondents indicated that the programs were not funded according to their budget. The respondents explained that in some cases consultants were outsourced to assist in aligning projects' budget after they were approved for funding.

#### **4.14 PROGRAM SUSTAINABILITY**

For the program to be sustainable it should have chances of self – financing after the expiry of the grant period.

**TABLE 4.14.1 PROGRAM SUSTAINABILITY ENSURED**

<b>PROGRAM SUSTAINABILITY ENSURED</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Yes	3	30%
No	3	30%
Uncertain	4	40%
Total	10	100%

The above table indicates that the majority of respondents were uncertain that the program sustainability was ensured. The respondents mentioned that consultants and project officers assisted some projects in finalising their business plans so the applicants themselves did not have a clear plan of ensuring sustainability. The funders also had not started linking projects for sustainability.

#### **4.15 PROGRAM EVALUATION AND REPORTING**

In program evaluation, the program should clearly articulate how it will measure its success. Funders need to evaluate the programs in order to ensure that funds disbursed to the communities were utilised appropriately. The researcher wanted to know if the funders did conduct the program evaluation after the funding was exhausted and to look at the progress made during the funding process.

#### 4.15.1 PROGRAM EVALUATION CONDUCTED

<b>PROGRAM EVALUATION CONDUCTED</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Yes	5	50%
No	3	30%
Uncertain	2	20%
Total	10	100%

The above table indicates the majority of respondents agreed that the program evaluation was conducted after the funding was exhausted, but they did not know what criteria were to be used for evaluation.

The respondents mentioned that the funders ensured that monthly reports were submitted which indicated the progress and the financial status of the program. The Development Officers did monitor programs even after the funding was exhausted. However no specific inspection was conducted with the intention of improving funded projects for future.

#### 4.16 ADEQUATE ASSESSMENT OF FUNDED PROJECTS

The researcher wanted to know from the respondents whether they thought the program was adequately assessed prior to its funding.

**TABLE 4.16.1 ADEQUATE ASSESSMENT OF FUNDED PROJECTS**

<b>ADEQUATE ASSESSMENT OF FUNDED PROJECTS</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Yes	3	30%
No	4	40%
Uncertain	3	30%
Total	10	100%

The above table indicates a high percentage of respondents who felt that the funded projects in their view were not adequately assessed.

#### **4.17 SUMMARY**

This chapter presented data that has been analysed and interpreted from the total number of forty respondents. Data was analysed both qualitatively and quantitatively. The next chapter will summarise the findings, conclusions and recommendations in relation to the study.

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **5.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter concludes the study that has been undertaken. The researcher restated the problem of the study, the objectives and further discussed the findings of the study and drew conclusions and recommendations based on the findings.

#### **5.2 RESTATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The researcher was concerned about the problem of most projects, which were funded for the purpose of poverty alleviation in Mahlabathini District that could not be sustained effectively. This seemed to be caused by poor needs assessment on the part of the funder during the initial stages of the project. Mahlabathini District is a poverty stricken District and is a high rate of illiteracy, with less amenities such as income generating activities.

#### **5.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

- **TO IDENTIFY POLICIES IN PLACE FOR FUNDING OF PROJECTS**

In order to meet this objective the researcher studied:

- (i) The Department of Social Development – Poverty relief programme, operation and procedures manual of 2001,
- (ii) The condensed guide to the Department of Agriculture and Environmental Affairs Development projects policies in 2001,

(iii) The white paper for Social welfare 1997.

(iv) Documents prepared for the Traditional Government and Local Affairs Development Officers.

- **IDENTIFY PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED BY THE FUNDERS IN PROVIDING FUNDING**

*In order to meet this objective the researcher had to prepare questionnaires for the officials representing funders.*

- **TO ASSESS THE IMPACT OF PROJECTS IN THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL LIFE OF INDIVIDUALS PARTICIPATING IN POVERTY ALLEVIATION PROJECTS**

The researcher here conducted an interview with community members whereby questions relating to the objective were asked.

- **TO DISCOVER WHAT COULD BE DONE TO ASSIST IN ENSURING THE SUSTAINABILITY OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.**

The researcher looked at the whole study and gave recommendations on the findings as they will be outlined thereafter.

## **5.4 FINDINGS OF THE STUDY**

### **5.4.1 PROGRAM PURPOSE**

In mentioning program purpose the researcher means that the program should address specific poverty needs and specific vulnerable groups. The beneficiaries of the program should also be from the disadvantaged group and should be unemployed.

The researcher discovered that the majority of people (43,4%) who are actively involved in the community projects are people between 36-45 years. Females (which are 57%) also participate more in community projects than males. The youth are less involved in projects. They form 13,3% of the distribution of respondents' ages as very few of them were found in projects. The researcher feels that the youth got "bored" by the type of projects that were being run in the years 1994-2003.

According to the researcher's observation most projects that are funded did address poverty needs but to the researcher they sort of addressed short-term needs. This could be because projects were granted limited funding and there were lots of expectations out of the limited funding.

### **5.4.2 PROGRAM DESIGN**

The specific objectives of the program should be clearly stated and the expected results of the program should be clearly articulated and be realistic.

The researcher discovered that most projects that applied for funding did not have projects' operational plans and most communities did not even know how to draw the operational plans. The officials were the ones who drew operational plans for the projects. This indicates that officials had more say on the activities to be undertaken by project members than project members themselves.

### **5.4.3 PROGRAM/ORGANISATIONAL CAPACITY**

The researcher found that 67% of projects were not officially registered for example as Non-Profit Organisations or as Co-operatives. The project committees do not have the capacity to run the projects effectively. That is, they were not trained on capacity building and financial management. Basic training had to be arranged once they had received funding.

### **5.4.4 PROGRAM/ORGANISATIONAL LINKAGES**

It is important that the program to be funded is well known to the community.

The community that is to benefit from the project should also be well represented.

The researcher discovered that the program is well known to the community. This was mostly because in rural areas no one has a right to initiate something or erect a structure without having got an authority from local leadership

( Izinduna/Amakhosi ). The respondents however mentioned that there were no guarantees that the community could benefit from that project.

### **5.4.5 PROGRAM BUDGET**

The researcher found that 70% of the respondents did not have a well-developed budget. They only submitted proposals, which did not clearly indicate their needs and costs towards those needs. Most funding proposals stated that they needed for example R 150 000.00 funding without splitting that R 150 000.00 to the required line items.

Some respondents mentioned that in some cases consultants were outsourced to assist in aligning projects' budget after they were approved for funding.

This proves the point that communities were not capacitated in drawing funding proposals. This should be added as a task or a responsibility of the funding Department.

#### **5.4.6 SUSTAINABILITY**

The researcher discovered that 40% of the respondents were not sure about the sustainability of their projects. Most respondents did not have a separate profit account where they could save their profit. They also did not have a plan of how they would sustain their projects.

Most officials responding to the questionnaire were also not sure that the programs funded had chances of self – financing after the expiry of the grant period. The funders also had not started linking up projects for sustainability.

#### **5.4.7 PROGRAM EVALUATION AND REPORTING**

In program evaluation the beneficiaries should submit monthly reports, monthly bank statements, etc in order to measure the program's success.

Most respondents mentioned that they did submit monthly bank statements to the Development Officials and in most cases they gave a verbal monthly reporting. However no specific inspection was conducted with the intention of improving funded projects for future.

#### **5.4.8 ADEQUATE ASSESSMENT OF FUNDED PROJECTS**

Here the researcher discovered that 40% of the respondents who were officials agreed that assessment of projects prior to funding was inadequate.

## **5.5 CONCLUSION**

The researchers' conclusions were as follows:

- Adults are more serious and want to be involved in community projects than the youth.
- Community Development projects cannot run effectively without the support of the Development Officials since they provide social and technical support to the project.
- Community Development Project members rely on the Community Development workers in the drawing of projects' operational plans and budgets. This is mostly because project members do not receive capacity building training in time. There is also a problem of illiteracy among the project members.
- Community Development projects are used to address present problems like hunger. This makes project not to have future plans for sustaining their projects.
- Policies for funding projects are reasonable and sound (such as those of the Department of Social Development) but somehow funders do not follow them completely.
- Lack of capacity building, marketing of programmes, illiteracy and general apathy are still factors which have left communities trapped in the cycle of poverty.

## **5.6 RECOMMENDATIONS**

5.6.1 Youth programs be encouraged and funded so that the youth can be drawn to the development projects.

5.6.2 Programmes have to be suited for various age levels and they have to be identified by the perspective groups themselves.

- 5.6.3 Departments that have community development sections arrange workshops in communities even before they apply for funding. Workshops should equip communities with capacity building skills and they should be awarded with accredited certificates as proof of such training.
- 5.6.4 Funders should ensure that the community applying for the funding has long term plans for sustaining their projects before they are funded. Formal registration of community organisations or co-operatives should be done locally with communities involved. Communities experience problems when they have to communicate directly with offices in Pretoria for follow ups and registration as such.
- 5.6.5 Researchers and Senior officials should conduct evaluation of a funded project after two years in order to discover gaps and challenges.
- 5.6.6 Social Development Programmes are a new innovation in Black rural Communities and a lot is still needed for purposes of adding more knowledge about the current situation and charting the way forward Policy-wise, particularly to achieve sustainability of Programmes.

## **6. BIBLIOGRAPHY**

1. Babbie E (1998). *The practice of Social Research (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition)* Carlifonia,  
Wardsworth Publishing Company
2. Bailey K. ( 1987 ) *Methods of Social Research ( 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition )*  
The Free Press, London.
3. Burke R. ( 2000 ) *Project Management, Planning and Control techniques*  
( 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition ) PROMATEC International
4. Department of Social Development ( 2001 ) *Poverty Relief Programmes,*  
*Operations and procedures manual* Pretoria Government Printers
5. *Department of Social Welfare ( 1997 ) The White Paper for Social Welfare Notice*  
*1108 of 1997* Pretoria Government Printers
6. Department of Social Welfare and population Development ( 2002 )  
*Province of KwaZulu-Natal Draft Strategy Document.*
7. Grinnel A. ( 1988 ) *Social Work Research and Evaluation*  
3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, F. E. Peacock Publishers, USA
8. Mckendrick B. W. ( 1987 ) *Introduction to Social Work In South Africa.*  
Owen Burgess Publishers, Pinetown
9. Midgley J. ( 1995 ) *Social Development, The Developmental Perspective*  
*in Social Welfare, SAGE Publishers Ltd, Thousand Oaks.*
10. *NPO Organisations Act 71 of 1997.*
11. Pottier J. (1993) *Practising Development: Social Science Perspective.* Routledge
12. Ross G. (1967) *Community Organisation, theory, principles and practice*  
Harper International Edition.
13. Swanepoel H. ( 1995 ) *Community Development, Putting plans into action,*  
Jutas & Co. Ltd.

**Appendix A**

**INTERVIEW SCHEDULE – COMMUNITY MEMBERS**

**1. SEX**

Male	
Female	

**2. AGE**

18-25 Years	
25-35 Years	
35-45 Years	
45-55 Years	

**3. PERIOD OF INVOLVEMENT IN PROJECTS**

1994 (10 Years back)	
1996 ( 8 Years back)	
1999 (5 Years back)	
2001 (3 Years back)	
Still involved	

**4. YOUR ROLE IN THE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

Committee member	
Project member	
Community member	
Other	

SPECIFY.....

**5. WHAT WAS THE FOCUS OF THE PROGRAM THAT YOU APPLIED FOR?**

Vegetable garden	
Poultry Farming	
Business	
Other	

SPECIFY.....

**6. WHO IDENTIFIED THE PROJECT?**

The committee	
The community	
Traditional leader	
Community worker	
Other	

EXPLAIN.....

**7. DID YOUR PROGRAM ADDRESS POVERTY NEEDS AND SPECIFIC VULNERABLE GROUPS SUCH AS YOUTH, WOMEN, UNEMPLOYED, ETC.?**

Yes	
No	
Uncertain	

PLEASE EXPLAIN.....

**8. DID YOUR APPLICATION HAVE AN OPERATIONAL / IMPLEMENTATION PLAN, INDICATING CLEARLY STEPS THAT WILL BE TAKEN AND THE EXPECTED RESULTS?**

Yes	
No	
Uncertain	

PLEASE EXPLAIN.....

.....

**9. WAS YOUR ORGANISATION REGISTERED AS EITHER A NON-PROFIT ORGANISATION OR OTHERWISE?**

Yes	
No	
Uncertain	

**10. DID YOUR ORGANISATION RECEIVE CAPACITY BUILDING SKILLS TRAINING?**

Yes	
No	
Uncertain	

**11. WHAT DID THE FUNDER DO ABOUT THE ISSUE OF CAPACITY BUILDING?**

.....

.....

.....

**12. WAS THE PROJECT WELL KNOWN IN THE COMMUNITY?**

Yes	
No	
Uncertain	

**13. DID YOUR APPLICATION STATE YOUR NEEDS AND YOUR COSTS TOWARDS THESE NEEDS (BUDGET)**

Yes	
No	
Uncertain	

**14. DID YOU HAVE A PROFIT BANK ACCOUNT TO SUSTAIN THE PROJECT ONCE THE FUNDING WAS EXHAUSTED?**

Yes	
No	
Uncertain	

PLEASE EXPLAIN.....

**15. DID YOU SUBMIT MONTHLY REPORTS TO THE FUNDER ON THE PROGRESS OF THE PROJECT AFTER FUNDING WAS GRANTED?**

Yes	
No	
Uncertain	

**16. DID THE FUNDER COME BACK TO THE PROJECT TO EVALUATE THE SUCCESSES AND ERRORS OF THE PROJECT?**

Yes	
No	
Uncertain	

**17. IN YOUR VIEW WAS YOUR PROJECT PROPERLY ASSESSED BEFORE IT WAS FUNDED?**

PLEASE EXPLAIN.....

.....

**18. WHAT IN YOUR OPINION ARE AREAS THAT NEED TO RECEIVE ATTENTION SO THAT THE PROJECT CAN BE SUSTAINABLE?**

.....

.....

**Appendix B**

**QUESTIONNAIRE – FOR OFFICIALS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE, AGRICULTURE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT**

**1. SEX**

Male	
Female	

**2. AGE**

18-25 Years	
25-35 Years	
35-45 Years	
45-55 Years	

**3. PERIOD OF INVOLVEMENT IN PROJECTS**

1994 - 2004	
1996 – 2002	
1994 - 1999	
1999 - 2001	
Still involved	

**4. YOUR ROLE IN THE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

Funder	
Community worker	
Other	

SPECIFY.....

**5. DID YOU ENSURE THAT THE ORGANISATION THAT APPLIED FOR FUNDING ADDRESSED THE SPECIFIC POVERTY NEEDS AND SPECIFIC VULNERABLE GROUPS (E.G. YOUTH, WOMEN, UNEMPLOYED, DISABLED, ETC.)**

Yes	
No	
Unsure	

PLEASE EXPLAIN.....

.....

**6. DID THE PROGRAM HAVE SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES AND THE PROPER IMPLEMENTATION PLAN IN THEIR APPLICATION?**

Yes	
No	
Uncertain	

PLEASE EXPLAIN.....

.....

**7. DID YOU AS A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE FUNDER ENSURE THAT MEMBERS INVOLVED IN THIS ORGANISATION HAVE ADEQUATE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS TO RUN THE PROGRAM/PROJECT?**

Yes	
No	
Uncertain	

PLEASE EXPLAIN.....

.....

**8. IF THE MEMBERS OF THE PROJECT DID NOT HAVE THE SKILLS, WHAT DID YOU DO ABOUT IT?**

Arranged training	
Suspended funding	
Other	

PLEASE EXPLAIN.....

.....

**9. DID YOUR DEPARTMENT ENSURE THAT THE PROGRAM FUNDED IS KNOWN TO THE COMMUNITY AND THAT THE COMMUNITY WILL BENEFIT FROM IT?**

Yes	
No	
Uncertain	

PLEASE EXPLAIN.....

.....

**10. DID THE PROGRAM HAVE A CLEARLY DEVELOPED BUDGET?**

Yes	
No	
Uncertain	

**11. IF YES WAS THE PROGRAM FUNDED ACCORDING TO THE BUDGET?**

Yes	
No	
Uncertain	

PLEASE EXPLAIN.....  
.....

**12. WAS THE PROGRAM SUSTAINABILITY ENSURED?**

Yes	
No	
Uncertain	

PLEASE EXPLAIN.....  
.....

**13. WAS THE PROGRAM EVALUATION CONDUCTED AFTER THE FUNDING WAS EXHAUSTED TO LOOK AT THE PROGRESS MADE DURING THE FUNDING PROCESS?**

Yes	
No	
Uncertain	

**14. IN YOUR OWN VIEW DO YOU THINK THE FUNDED PROJECTS WERE ADEQUATELY ASSESSED?**

Yes	
No	
Uncertain	

PLEASE EXPLAIN.....  
.....

**15. WHAT WILL BE YOUR INPUT WITH REGARD TO DECISIONS TO BE MADE REGARDING THE FUNDING OF PROJECTS IN THE FUTURE?**

.....

.....

.....