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ABSTRACT


Student: Corlie Susann Nel
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. A. Lombard
Department of Social Work
University of Pretoria

The Financing Policy for Developmental Social Welfare Services in South Africa (1999:15), which is currently under revision, aims to address and eliminate the current imbalances in service delivery by promoting equitable distribution of finances, services and infrastructure for all people in need of social services. In order to achieve these aims, the Financing Policy for Developmental Social Welfare Services (hereafter referred to as the Financing Policy) proposes a shift in service delivery from a remedial approach towards a developmental focus by 2004. As a social worker working in communities with other social service providers at grass-roots level, the researcher found little evidence that transformation to developmental welfare services was indeed taking place. Service providers working in communities do not know how to transform their services. The aim of this research study was to evaluate the impact of the Financing Policy for Developmental Social Welfare Services on service delivery in the Nellmapius community in the Gauteng Province. This research study formed part of a team research where the impact of the Financing Policy was studied in three different communities in the Gauteng Province.

The researcher utilized a combined research approach whereby the qualitative research approach was more dominant than the quantitative approach. The researcher utilized a personal administrated questionnaire (quantitative) with the service providers working in Nellmapius. Focus group discussions (qualitative) were conducted with service beneficiaries in Nellmapius. From the research findings derived out of the data analysis,
the researcher was able to make valuable recommendations with regard to the improvement of service delivery at grass-roots level. The final recommendation of this study is to integrate the findings of this study with the findings of the other three studies (respectively in Tembisa and Atteridgeville). This integration could then be utilized as a policy analysis towards writing the new planned policies to address funding, transformation and monitoring of social welfare services in South Africa.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL ORIENTATION

1. INTRODUCTION
The Financing Policy for Developmental Social Welfare Services in South Africa (1999:15) aims to address and eliminate the current imbalances in service delivery to community members by promoting equitable distribution of finances, services and infrastructure for all. In order to achieve these aims, the Financing Policy for Developmental Social Welfare Services (hereafter referred to as the Financing Policy) proposes a shift in service delivery from a remedial approach towards a developmental focus by 2004. The implementation of the Financing Policy started in 1999. Very little guidelines were available to organizations on how the transformation should take place. In 2001 government saw that the Financing Policy was not operating as it was expected. Transformation did not take place as planned. Therefore the Minister of Social Development, Dr Zola Skweyiya decided to halt the implementation of the Financing Policy in 2001. However, according to the then Chief Director of Social Service in Gauteng, Mrs Janet du Preez (telephonic interview in September, 2003) it was decided that in Gauteng the implementation of the Financing Policy will continue.

This research study aimed to evaluate the impact of the Financing Policy for Developmental Social Welfare Services on service delivery after three years of implementation in the Nellmapius community in the Gauteng Province. This research study is part of a team research and will make valuable recommendations with regard to the improvement of service delivery at grass-roots level. The research study will also serve as an analysis that will assist the government with its drafting of new policies to address funding, transformation and monitoring of social welfare services in South Africa.

2. MOTIVATION FOR THE CHOICE OF THE TOPIC
The motivation for the choice of the topic is embedded in the researcher’s practical experience, the lack of data on the progress of the implementation of the Financing
Policy, no clear guidelines with regard to how to transform to a developmental approach, and finally, a team effort to provide more in depth data on the research topic. These motivational aspects will subsequently be outlined:

- The researcher is currently working at Heartbeat, a community development organization. The focus of the organization is on grass-roots communities who are in need of support services. The first project initiated by Heartbeat was in Khutsong, a community near Carletonville, where HIV/AIDS prevalence is very high. Heartbeat established a Community Home Based Care model, where the community was mobilized into a Child Care Forum that looks after the interests of women and children. Currently Heartbeat is involved in 10 communities of which Nellmapius, the focus of the study, is one. Heartbeat works in partnership with various service providers, and the researcher has practically experienced that service providers have problems in conforming to the standards set out in the Financing Policy (1999). The service providers had to invest time, energy and resources in order to implement a developmental model in practice.

- There is limited information or research data available on the assessment of the implementation of the Financing Policy, and thus on what the progress of the implementation of the policy is thus far. The proposed transformation of service providers in order to be able to implement the developmental approach in service delivery, is thus not on track. This has serious consequences for communities. Whilst service providers are trying to interpret the application of a developmental approach in communities, the people in the communities struggle to survive and their basic needs are not being properly met. No direction is therefore provided through evaluation of the implementation process.

- In order to have a greater impact in terms of valuable recommendations to the Department of Social Services and Population Development, this study has been based on a team approach. The team consists of four social workers with hands-on experience of working in communities and with service providers. The focus has been on urban communities in the Gauteng Province. The combined research findings of
the empirical study will have a greater impact in order to make recommendations that can direct the improvement of social service delivery within a developmental approach at grass-roots level.

3. PROBLEM FORMULATION

The Financing Policy is a transformative instrument of critical importance to bring the welfare sector closer to achieving the visions as set out in the White Paper for Social Welfare and the Reconstruction and Development Programme (Financing Policy, 1999:44). The vision for Social Welfare as set out in the White Paper for Social Welfare (1997:15) is a welfare system that facilitates the development of human capacity and self-reliance within a caring and enabling socio-economic environment. The goal of social welfare is to promote the wellbeing of individuals, families and communities (Financing Policy, 1999:5).

Within the context of a social development paradigm, community members, government, non-governmental and community-based service providers are co-responsible for building a better quality of life for all (Financing Policy, 1999:5). According to the Financing Policy (1999:11), the financing of welfare services should create an environment in which the paradigm shift towards a developmental approach can be made. It should also ensure that transformational shifts are consciously supported and encouraged through the Financing Policy and related mechanisms. The Financing Policy (1999:15-16) aims to:

- Meet the government’s agenda to address and eliminate the current imbalances in service delivery to community members;
- Include service organizations previously excluded from receiving financial assistance from the state;
- Target financing to the highest strategic priorities;
- Promote equitable distribution of finances, services and infrastructure;
- Include flexible and varied financing options;
- Facilitate the emergence of a network of accessible services for all in need; and
- Promote the capacity and sustainability of organizations.
In the Financing Policy (1999) broad guidelines are stipulated as to what the shift to developmental welfare services should look like. One of these guidelines includes Developmental Quality Assurance (DQA) as the core developmental monitoring tool for ensuring effective service delivery which is in line with the transformation vision and goals (Financing Policy, 1999:35). It is stipulated that partners will require support with regard to capacity building needs, such as understanding the new policy and paradigm, designing plans and the management of service delivery (Financing Policy, 1999:33). According to the Financing Policy (1999:42), a transformation management team was to be established at national and provincial levels of government to manage the transformation of social welfare services. In Gauteng a transformation team was established to manage the transformation of social welfare service delivery in the province.

The Financing Policy (1999:41) prescribes activities that should take place throughout the transformation process:
- Ongoing review and commitment to focus areas determined by government,
- Ongoing reprioritization,
- Incremental phasing in of appropriate programmes according to the new criteria,
- Capacity building and reorientation of personnel and organizations.

As a social worker working in communities with other service providers at grass-roots level, the researcher found little evidence that transformation to developmental welfare services was indeed taking place. The actions stipulated in the policy are not adhered to, especially at grass-roots level. Service providers working in communities do not know how to transform their services. The researcher has in fact experienced that after four years of implementing the Financing Policy, services are still very specialized, with only a small focus on developmental and integrated, holistic services. Little developmental work is currently taking place, because social workers at grass-roots level are overwhelmed by a huge caseload, which in turn leaves no time for developmental work.
Contributing to this scenario is the lack of procedures or guidelines to transform social services to a developmental approach. Without procedures to guide service providers in their transformation to more holistic and integrated services, the task becomes more complicated and difficult. The transformation of services is not a matter of choice for service providers; it is rather a requirement from government to ensure adequate and equal distribution of service delivery. Social service providers and caring professions countrywide have been grappling with the question of how and to what extent transformation should occur in their organizations to align themselves better with the government’s strategic initiatives to restructure the country’s social delivery system (Ludik and Nel, 2001: 49).

In summary, with a history of social services focusing primarily on the individual and families, and with an overload of crisis management, service providers find it difficult to transform services to a developmental focus. According to Ludik & Nel (2001: 48), the failure to transform themselves from primarily being providers of a single service to a professional body that offers a holistic social service could lead to their demise. The uncertainty perceived and experienced among service providers at grass-roots level makes it difficult to deliver quality services to community members. In the end, communities are the ones that will suffer the most. In Nellmapius, which is a low-income urban community in Gauteng, the researcher found that very little service providers are rendering developmental services to the community. Most of them are still preoccupied with statutory work and casework.

According to Ludik & Nel (2001: 49), no political democracy can survive and flourish if most of its community members remain in poverty, without their basic needs being met and without an opportunity to enhance their prospects of a better life. It is this struggle to cope with transformations and still deliver quality services that the researcher perceives as a problem. According to Bless & Higson-Smith (1995:29), a well-formulated problem is already a half-solved problem. The problem for the purpose of this study can be formulated as service providers grappling to comply with government requirements for transformation as set out in the Financing Policy for Developmental Social Welfare.
Services. This causes unequal and inadequate service delivery to the majority of community members who are still marginalized because their basic needs are not met and because they do not have an opportunity to enhance their quality of life. To address this problem, it is important to evaluate the impact of the Financing Policy on service delivery after three years of implementation, targeting service beneficiaries at grass-roots level.

4. GOAL AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY
The goal of the study was to determine the impact of the Financing Policy for Developmental Social Welfare Services (1999) on service delivery in the Nellmapius community.

According to Fouché (2002a:119), the objectives should be specific, clear and achievable. In order to achieve the goal, the following objectives for the study were formulated:
- To conceptualize social service delivery within the theoretical framework of developmental social welfare and social development.
- To identify the service providers and service beneficiaries in Nellmapius and determine their perception and understanding of the implementation of the Financing Policy in Nellmapius.
- To determine the impact of the Financial Policy on service delivery in Nellmapius in terms of effective, equitable and accessible developmental services.
- To draw conclusions on the strengths and limitations of the implementation of the Financing Policy (1999) in Nellmapius.
- To make recommendations, based on the research findings, on the implementation of the Financing Policy (1999) in Nellmapius within a developmental context.

5. RESEARCH QUESTION
According to Bless & Higson-Smith (1995:29), a research problem is expressed as a general question about the relation between two or more variables. It is stated in the form of a question. According to Tutty, Rothery and Grinnell (1996:26), a well thought through focus for the study is important and influences the study’s success. The
researcher wanted to explore what the impact of the Financing Policy is on service delivery at grass-roots level in Nellmapius.

In conducting the empirical study, answers to the following questions were investigated:
- How much transformation has taken place after three years of implementation of the Financing Policy for Developmental Social Welfare Services?
- What services are delivered to community members at grass-roots level?
- What is the impact of the transformation proposed in the Financing Policy in Nellmapius?
- Are the services aimed at the most vulnerable target groups in society?
- On what levels are services rendered to the community?

6. RESEARCH APPROACH

Mouton and Marais (in De Vos, 2002a:363) view the quantitative approach as highly formalized, as well as more explicitly controlled than the qualitative approach, with a range that is more exactly defined and relatively close to the physical sciences. Within the qualitative approach, the procedures are not strictly formalized, while the scope is more likely to be undefined and a more philosophical mode of operation is adopted.

The researcher decided on a combination of the qualitative and quantitative approach to the study. Although De Vos (1998:358) clearly states that combining the two approaches is highly problematic, the researcher still decided to use a combination of the two. A combination of the qualitative and quantitative approach provided for a more comprehensive study and assured that a wider spectrum of data would be gathered. It is much more comprehensive than either a qualitative or a quantitative study on its own.

When using a combination of the two approaches, it is important to realize that there can be different degrees of combination of these two approaches. Cresswell (1994:177) describes three models of combining the qualitative and quantitative approaches into one approach. One of the three models he describes is the dominant-less-dominant design, whereby the researcher presents the study within a single dominant paradigm with one
small component of the overall study drawn from the alternative paradigm. According to De Vos (2002a: 366), the greatest advantage of this model is that it presents a consistent paradigm picture in the study and still gathers limited information to probe one aspect of the study in detail.

The researcher used the dominant-less-dominant design for this study, where the qualitative approach was more dominant than the quantitative approach. Hence, qualitative data collection methods were used, with a smaller focus on quantitative data collection methods. This ensured the gathering of scientific information from which sound recommendations could be made. Where the qualitative approach is more dominant, it implies the gathering of data that are more descriptive and supported by statistical data.

7. TYPE OF RESEARCH
Research can be either basic or applied. The goal of applied research is to develop solutions for problems and applications in practice, while the goal of basic research is to develop theory and expand the social work knowledge base (Grinnell, Rothery, & Thomlison, 1993:14-16). This study focused on applied research.

The type of research applicable to this study is evaluative research. According to Bless & Higson-Smith (1995:47), evaluative research is the method of social science that can be used to assess the design, implementation and usefulness of social interventions. Evaluation research can be divided into three types, namely diagnostic, formative and summative. The researcher focused on formative research.

Formative research, according to De Vos (2002b:377), is conducted when the concern is to improve a programme or policy. This form of evaluative research helps to improve the policy at those points where the policy does not seem to meet the criteria originally set out by its initiators (De Vos, 2002b:377). Bless & Higson-Smith (1995:49) states that formative evaluative research aims to shape a policy so that it will have the greatest beneficial impact upon the target community. Formative evaluation research is therefore
an appropriate choice for measuring the impact of the Financing Policy on service delivery at grass-roots level. This type of research will efficiently guide the process to assure that the best results are obtained and that the impact, effectiveness and utility of the policy are measured and adjusted if necessary.

8. RESEARCH DESIGN AND STRATEGY

In this research study, a combination of the phenomenological strategy (qualitative) and the exploratory design (quantitative) was used to gain insight and to help with the evaluation of the policy. Although a research strategy is also a research design, Fouché (2002b:272) proposes that for qualitative research, a research strategy should be formulated.

A research strategy can be defined as the option available to the qualitative researcher to investigate certain phenomena according to certain formulas suitable for the specific research goal (Fouché, 2002b:272). In qualitative research, the researcher's choices and actions will determine the strategy. Cresswell (1998:27) identifies five strategies of inquiry that could be used as a research strategy, namely biography, phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography and case studies.

The researcher decided that phenomenology was the best option available to reach the research goal. Cresswell (1998:27) views phenomenology as a study that describes the meaning that the experience of a phenomenon, topic or concept has for various individuals. Leedy & Ormrod (2001:153) explain phenomenology as a person’s perception of the meaning of an event, as opposed to the event as it exists externally to the person. Thus a phenomenological study attempts to understand the perceptions, perspectives and understandings of community members in a particular situation.

Phenomenology aims at understanding and interpreting the meaning that subjects give to their everyday life. The product of this strategy, according to Fouché (2002b:273), is a description of the essence of the experience being studied. This is an ideal way to determine what the community members’ opinions on service delivery are. By utilizing
this strategy for this study, the community members expressed their opinions in a scientific way and enabled the researcher to draw valid conclusions from their data.

The aim of this research study was to investigate and interpret the experiences of members of the Nellmapius community concerning the impact of the Financing Policy on service delivery at grass-roots level. The researcher is of the opinion that the community members are the people who really know what is happening in terms of service delivery. For this reason, it was important to the researcher that their opinions be expressed.

Thyer (in Fouché & De Vos, 1998:123) views research designs as a blue print for how a research study is to be conducted. According to Mouton (1996:109), a research design is like a route planner. The research design can be understood as the planning of any scientific research from the first step to the last (Bless & Higson-Smith, 1995:63). Thus the research design can be viewed as the plan of action that the researcher will follow in the empirical study. Bless & Higson-Smith (1995:42) states that the purpose of exploratory designs is to gain insight into a situation, phenomenon, community or person. Together with phenomenology (qualitative), the exploratory design (quantitative) guided the empirical study.

According to Fouché & De Vos (2002:139), exploratory designs can be divided into five types, namely one-shot case study, one-group posttest-only design, longitudinal case study, multi-group posttest-only design, and ex post facto design. According to Fouché & De Vos (2002:140), the one-shot case study can be described as a design in which a single person, group or event is studied only once, subsequent to some agent or treatment to cause change. Adequate knowledge of the history of the unit is important in order to provide a sound perspective. To be able to support the qualitative data collected through the phenomenological strategy, the researcher regards the one-shot case study as applicable to the study. Nellmapius is seen as one case study on which the research will be conducted.
9. RESEARCH PROCEDURES AND STRATEGIES

9.1 Data collection methods

The researcher first conducted a personal questionnaire with the service providers in Nellmapius. The information gained from the questionnaire was used as a baseline for the subsequent focus group discussions. Following the personal questionnaire, a focus group discussion was held with respondents selected from the Nellmapius community. In this way, the researcher gathered rich and reliable data from the respondents.

As indicated, the researcher used personal questionnaires for the quantitative data collection. According to the Terminology Committee of Social Work (1995:51), a questionnaire can be defined as a set of questions on a form, which is completed by the respondent in respect of a research project. Different types of questionnaires exist, of which the personal administered questionnaire is one. According to Delport (2002:173), a personal questionnaire is handed to the respondent who completes it on his/her own, but the researcher is available in case problems are experienced. The researcher limits her/his own contribution to the completion of the questionnaire to the absolute minimum. Therefore, the researcher remains largely in the background and can only encourage the respondent in a few words to continue with his/her contribution or lead him/her back to the subject.

It is important to remember that questionnaires can only be used if the respondents are able to read, and if they are knowledgeable about the topic (Delport, 2002:175). The researcher considered the following guidelines from Delport (2002:175) when drawing up the questionnaire:
- Time limitations
- Financial aspects
- Availability of manpower, and
- Infrastructure.

As indicated, the researcher used focus groups as qualitative data collection method. The quantitative data collection method (personal administered questionnaires) supported the
primary data collection method, namely focus groups (qualitative data collection method). Leedy & Ormrod (2001:153) are of the opinion that interviews are the most appropriate data collection method in conducting a phenomenological study. Focus groups can be described as a type of interview (Greeff, 2002:291) and Greeff is of the opinion that interviewing is the predominant mode of data or information collection in qualitative research. Participants in a focus group are selected because they have certain characteristics in common that relate to the topic of the focus group (Greeff, 2002:305). Greeff further states that the group is focused in that it involves some collective activity. Greeff goes on to say that the purpose of focus groups is to promote self-disclosure among participants. This implies that, for this study, the researcher wanted to get to the core of the feelings of respondents around the impact of the Financial Policy, especially at grass-roots level.

The researcher recruited the respondents for the focus groups according to the following strategy as outlined by Greeff (2002:311):

- The researcher made contact with the respondents one month in advance of conducting the research. This enabled the respondents to diarize the research date and helped the researcher with effective planning and keeping of time frames.
- Two weeks before the group session, the researcher made contact with the participants to remind them of the research.
- One week before the session, they received a letter of confirmation from the researcher stating the venue, time and what would be expected from them.

9.2 Data analysis

According to Leedy & Ormrod (2001:153), the central task of the data analysis of qualitative research is to identify common themes in community members’ descriptions of their experiences. According to Leedy & Ormrod (2001:154), the following steps need to take place for successful data analysis: interviews need to be transcribed, statements that relate to the topic need to be identified, statements must be grouped into “meaning units”, divergent perspectives must be highlighted, and a composite must be constructed.
Greeff (2002:318) says that the analysis of the data begins with the purpose of the study. The collected data represent the reality of experiences of the group members. The aim of analysis is to look for trends and patterns that appear within a single focus group or among various focus groups. According to Greeff (2002:318), the analysis must be systematic, sequential, verifiable and continuous. It will require time, and it seeks to enlighten the topic. Greeff states that the analysis must not only focus on the group. The discussion in the focus group depends on individuals and the dynamics of the group as a whole. This must also be considered when analyzing the data.

The questionnaires provided quantitative data which were analyzed according to relevant quantitative data analysis methods using frequency distributions and graphic presentations. Most of the data are presented in a graphical manner for visual interpretation in Chapter 3.

10. PILOT STUDY
A pilot study can be defined as the process whereby the research design for a prospective survey is tested (Terminology Committee for Social Work, 1995:45). Bless & Higson-Smith (in Strydom, 2002b:211) define a pilot study as a small study conducted prior to a larger piece of research to determine whether the methodology, sampling, instruments and analysis are adequate and appropriate. Bless & Higson-Smith (1995:43) states that it is often useful to assess the feasibility of a research project, the practical possibilities to carry it out, the correctness of some concepts, and the adequacy of the method and instrument of measurement by doing a pilot study. Thus the pilot study can be seen as a way of preparing for the actual empirical study to take place. The pilot study includes the following areas:
- Literature review
- Consultation with experts
- Feasibility of the study, and
- Testing of the questionnaire/measuring instrument.
10.1 Literature review

According to Fouché & Delport (2002a:127), a review of literature is aimed at contributing towards a clearer understanding of the nature and meaning of the problem. In qualitative research, a thoughtful and informed discussion provides a logical framework for the research that sets it within a tradition of inquiry (Fouché & Delport, 2002b:266). Cresswell (1998) places the literature review for a qualitative research study at the beginning of the research process, so that the researcher will be able to go into the field with a strong orientation of what will be investigated and how it will be investigated. He states that the orientation is more a philosophical perspective than a distinct social science theory.

The researcher looked at concept definition, background information to the problem, and information on the progress of the implementation of the Financing Policy. Other related topics were also reviewed, to make sure that the theoretical framework encompasses all the elements of the research topic. The researcher used the following literature sources:
- Articles in professional journals.
- Government documentation for example policy documents and progress reports.
- Relevant books.
- Other relevant references, including research reports and media releases.

10.2 Consultation with experts

Monette (in Strydom, 2002b:212) states that as much as possible should be learned from the experience of others. Strydom (in De Vos, 2002b:212) agrees with Monette, saying that the field of social work is very broad and people tend to specialize. Therefore, an increasing number of people are trained in a specialized area. It is therefore extremely valuable to prospective researchers to use these resources. For the purpose of this study, the researcher identified the following experts and consulted with them on the progress and the impact of the Financing Policy for Developmental Social Welfare Services (1999):
- Rev. S. Pienaar, General Manager of Heartbeat, an organization dealing with HIV/AIDS orphans and vulnerable children. Rev. Pienaar is an expert in policy-
making and policy implementation. She gave inputs concerning policy issues in the Financing Policy not yet achieved and especially on developmental social services in communities.

- Prof. CSL Delport, expert on social research, Department of Social Work, University of Pretoria. Prof. Delport guided the researcher concerning research methodology.

- Ms Janet du Preez, the then Chief Director of Social Service, Gauteng Province, guided the researcher through a telephonic interview with regard to the progress made on the implementation of the Financing Policy and the envisaged target dates for implementation.

10.3 Feasibility of the study

To conduct focus groups and personal questionnaires, arrangements must be in place to ensure that all respondents attend the group sessions. Thus a great deal of planning needs to go into focus groups (Greeff, 2002:308). The research took place in a community which the researcher is familiar with. Community members and service providers were easily accessible, which ensured that the research was feasible.

Community members were respondents for the two focus groups. They were included in the study because of their experiences of service delivery in their community. Each focus group was conducted based on the same interviewing methods. On the other hand, service providers were respondents for the personal questionnaire due to their expert knowledge on service delivery in communities and in particular in the Nellmapius community.

Strydom (2002b:219) states that information emerging from a pilot study can enable a tentative estimate to be made of the cost and length of the main study. It took some time to recruit respondents, because of logistical problems, especially with community members. Once respondents were selected, the process moved fast and data were collected in a short period. Thereafter the analysis of the focus group data took time, because of the transcription of all the sessions. The analysis of the questionnaires was more time effective.
Conducting the research was not costly. Venues for group sessions in the community were not a problem. The only costs that the researcher had were the copying of the questionnaires and transport. Therefore this research can be regarded as cost effective. The community was well informed about the purpose of the research and this helped to get more respondents from the community.

10.4 Questionnaire and focus group interview schedule
According to Strydom (2002b: 216), certain modifications can be made for the main study. All material to be used in the main study must be pilot tested to ensure that it is understood in the main investigation. Therefore one respondent for the questionnaire and the interview schedule respectively went through a pilot test stage. These two respondents had similar traits to the respondents selected for the study. The pilot study helped determine whether the instruments were applicable and effective. The pilot study was executed in the same manner as the main study.

11. POPULATION AND SAMPLING
According to Strydom & Venter (2002:198), the term “sample” always implies the simultaneous existence of a population or universe. Leedy & Ormrod (2001:211) states that samples are microcosms. Thus it can be seen as representative of the population. A “universe” refers to all potential subjects who possess the attributes in which the researcher is interested (Strydom & Venter, 2002:198). A universe encompasses populations.

A population refers to a set of boundaries on the study units (Strydom & Venter, 2002:198). According to Bless & Higson-Smith (1995:87), a population is a set of elements that the researcher focuses upon and to which the results could be generalized. Therefore, it is very important to specify the target population clearly. The universe of the study was the five communities in Gauteng where Heartbeat is working. The population was a specific community, namely Nellmapius, just east of Pretoria and near Mamelodi. Currently Nellmapius has a population of approximately 150 000 people. Heartbeat intervenes in approximately 500 people’s lives.
There are two main types of sampling, namely probability and non-probability sampling. The researcher decided on probability sampling as the main sampling plan for the study. Probability sampling occurs when the probability of including each element of the population can be determined. Seaberg (in Strydom & Venter, 2002:203) states that a probability sample is one in which each sampling unit in the population has the same known probability of being selected. Leedy & Ormrod (2001:211) states that in probability sampling, the researcher can specify in advance that each segment of the population will be represented in the sample. Thus by conducting probability sampling, the researcher ensured that all the people in the population had the same opportunity to be part of the study.

Probability sampling can be divided into random sampling, systematic sampling, stratified random sampling, cluster sampling and panel sampling (Strydom & Venter, 2002:203). For purposes of this study, the cluster sampling method was used to select the community members. For the service provider respondent group, the whole population was included, because of too little available service providers in Nellmapius to select them by means of the systematic sampling method.

Cluster sampling can be used when no name list is available for potential participants (Strydom & Venter, 2002:205). Leedy & Ormrod (2001:216) stresses that if a large area is to be covered and a name list is impossible to compile, a map of the area may be obtained, showing political boundaries or other subdivisions. From here, the cluster sampling method can be implemented. Thus based on the first sample, a new population is considered, and a new sample is determined. This process continues until the population to be investigated is reached and a final sample is drawn.

The researcher recruited 26 community members for two focus groups, each pertaining to between 10 and 15 members in the group. The service providers were 6 individuals and they completed the personal administered questionnaire. In total there were 31 respondents for the study.
12. ETHICAL ISSUES
According to Strydom (2002a:62), the fact that human beings are the objects of study in the social sciences brings unique ethical problems to the fore that would never be relevant in natural sciences. For researchers in the social sciences, the ethical issues are pervasive and complex, since data should never be obtained at the expense of human beings.

The following ethical issues were identified and discussed as relevant to the study (Strydom, 2002a:64):
- The researcher addressed harm to experimental respondents by ensuring that respondents clearly understood what the research is about, and what is expected from them. The whole process was communicated to the respondents and they had time to ask questions. They also had time to withdraw from the research should they find that they did not want to participate.

- Informed consent was addressed by informing the respondents of the research goal, and the methodology to be followed. The respondents who agreed to participate signed a letter of consent (see Addendum A). This was a way of protecting the researcher against any claims of respondents not being informed.

- The researcher avoided the deception of respondents at all times. No incorrect information was communicated and respondents were not pressurised to continue with the research if they felt uncomfortable.

- All respondents were informed that anonymity was essential to the study and that no media would be used without their consent as it could bring violation of privacy. The researcher communicated this to the respondents at the start of the study.

- The actions and competence of the researcher were ensured by conducting the research in an ethical way. The researcher ensured that she was competent to conduct the study by studying relevant research material and consulting regularly with her research supervisor. No value judgments were made under any circumstances. All views of respondents were respected and considered as confidential.
- The findings of the study will be released or published in a written format. The research results will be shared with the respondents in an objective manner, without violating confidentiality.

- A debriefing session was planned beforehand with the respondents where all misperceptions and the learning experiences of respondents would have been shared. This was not required, however.

13. CONCEPTUALIZATION OF KEY CONCEPTS

For the purposes of this study, the following key concepts are relevant to provide a theoretical framework for the research study:


- **Community:** The Terminology Committee for Social Work (1995:11) defines a *community* as a composition of community members who live within a geographically bounded area, who are involved in interaction and who have a bond with each other and their place of residence. Communities can thus be seen as people living in the same geographical area with some kind of bond among each other. The White Paper for Social Welfare (1997:93) states that a distinction should be made
between a community as locality and a community of interest (functional community). The former refers to a community with clear geographical boundaries, whilst the latter refers to groups of community members who share a common interest, need or problem.

Derived from these two definitions it is clear that a community is bound together by relationships, and that it exists in a specific geographical area. For purposes of this research study, the researcher refers to a community as a group of people living in a specific geographical area.

- **Grass-roots level:** The researcher could not find a clear definition of *grass-roots level*. However, for the researcher it means delivering services at community level where people live, work and interacts. Community members are in a position to participate and make decisions on issues concerning their lives. This implies that services are delivered to the community members most in need and at the lowest level of society.

- **Service delivery:** Johnson & Schwartz (in Potgieter, 1998:14) states that social service and social care supply non-monetary help that increases people’s ability to function better in society. The Terminology Committee for Social Work (1995:59) defines social services as programmes designed to help people to solve social problems and promote their social functioning. From the researcher’s point of view, service delivery within a welfare context can be seen as all services on different levels delivered to community members in accordance with their needs at a specific time. These services aim to help people to function better in society and can be delivered by Government, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), Community Based Organizations (CBOs), and Faith Based Organizations (FBOs).

- **Evaluation:** Suchman (in De Vos, 2002b:374) states that *evaluation* means the general process of weighing or assessing the value of something. The Terminology Committee for Social Work (1995:22) defines evaluation as a process whereby the
efficiency and effectiveness of social work assistance is appraised according to specific criteria.

For purposes of this study the researcher defines *evaluation* as a process of weighing the value of something according to specific criteria relevant to a particular situation. In this study the evaluation focuses on service delivery according to the Financing Policy (1999), and on the perception the service beneficiaries in Nellmapius have of service delivery.

- **Impact:** According to Rossi & Freeman (in De Vos, 2002b:383) *impact* can be seen as the extent to which a programme causes change in the desired direction. It implies a set of specified, operationally defined objectives and criteria of success. According to De Vos (2002b:384), impact evaluation is important when there is an interest in either comparing different programmes or testing the utility of new efforts to ameliorate a particular community problem. For the purpose of this study, the researcher views impact as the extent to which a programme caused change, thereby testing the utility of the Financing Policy in Nellmapius.

- **Developmental Social Work:** Gray (1996:11) states that *developmental social work* is a type of social work which affirms the social work profession’s commitment to the eradication of poverty; recognizes the link between welfare and economic development; and construes welfare as an investment in human capital rather than a drain on limited resources. Midgley & Tang (2001:244) states that the notion of developmental welfare is rooted in vintage beliefs about social progress, the desirability of change and the prospect of social improvement. They link social welfare with economic development, and define social development as actively promoting the overall wellbeing of society in conjunction with an ongoing process of economic development. Derived from these two definitions, it is clear that developmental social work entails the social and economic development of individuals, groups and communities.
- **Nellmapius**: Nellmapius is a small community on the outskirts of Pretoria East, close to Mamelodi. It consists of approximately 150 000 community members. They have been removed from informal settlements in other communities and given Reconstruction and Development Programme homes in Nellmapius. However, there is also an informal settlement in Nellmapius. Nellmapius is in its developmental shoes, in that infrastructure is not yet established. The community has existed for about 7 years, and is thus very new. Community bonding is only now starting to materialize.

- **Heartbeat**: Heartbeat is an NGO that facilitates change in impoverished communities so as to alleviate the suffering of the poorest of the poor, namely children orphaned mainly as a result of HIV/AIDS. Heartbeat designs strategies in which the problems that children encounter could be addressed. The sheer numbers of these children and Heartbeat’s belief that communities should take responsibility for their own growth, prompted Heartbeat to start mobilizing already impoverished communities to provide care and support for these children.

14. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

It is important to know the limitations of the study in order to have a better understanding of the research process. This study had the following limitations:

- The researcher planned that after the 6 service providers working in Nellmapius completed a questionnaire, focus groups would be held with them. This did not realize because the service providers never pitched for any of the pre-arranged meetings. Each time the service providers agreed to the date, but when the focus group was supposed to start only one respondent came, or none at all. The quantitative data could have been enriched if the social service providers in Nellmapius could have had face to face discussions.
15. DIVISION OF THE RESEARCH REPORT

The research report follows the following structure:

CHAPTER

Chapter 1  Introduction and general orientation to the research study
Chapter 2  Theoretical framework for developmental social welfare service delivery
Chapter 3  Empirical findings and interpretation
Chapter 4  Conclusions and recommendations
CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR DEVELOPMENTAL SOCIAL WELFARE SERVICE DELIVERY

1. INTRODUCTION
According to Cresswell (1994:20) the literature in a research study serves the purpose of providing a framework for establishing the importance of the study as well as a benchmark for comparing the results of a study with other findings. This chapter will contextualize and conceptualize the theoretical framework for developmental social welfare services. The Financing Policy (1999), as instrument for implementation of social welfare services in South Africa, will be contextualized within this theoretical framework. This chapter covers the following aspects:
- Developmental Social Welfare.
- World Summit on Social Development, Copenhagen (1995).
- Developmental Social Welfare in South Africa.
- Policy Analysis.

2. DEVELOPMENTAL SOCIAL WELFARE
Internationally, development is conceptualized as a comprehensive attack against poverty based on political, economic and cultural goals; and “development is concerned with constant improvement that involves the participation of ordinary people” (Gray, 1996:9). Gray argues that development is based on the ideal of equity and that justice is based on the notion of rights which goes beyond the notion of needs. This can be linked to social welfare in that equity, rights and needs are basic principles of welfare.

Lombard (1996:164) states that social welfare reflects a condition that connotes economic, social, political, physical, mental, emotional, spiritual, economic and recreational prosperity, well-being and health, as well as an opportunity for the development and self-actualization of the nation, i.e. individuals, families, communities and societies. Social welfare will bring about sustainable improvements in the well-being
of individuals, families and communities. It is intrinsically linked to other social service systems through which people’s needs are met, and through which people strive to achieve their aspirations (White Paper for Social Welfare, 1997:15).

Social welfare services are therefore part of a range of mechanisms to achieve social development, such as health, nutrition, education, housing, employment, recreation, rural and urban development and land reform. Gray (1996:9) states that for welfare to move to a development paradigm, it has to give up its dominant role as the instrument of government caring for those in need through the delivery of services and it must recognize the link between welfare and development.

Midgley (1995:25) links up with Gray and Lombard by stating that the goal of social development is the promotion of social welfare. A social development approach can be seen as inclusive of helping individuals, groups, families and communities to develop human resources and where possible facilitate and enhance economic development (Lombard in Fouchè & Delport, 2000:65). Gray (1996:10) argues that social development is a macro-policy perspective that aims to eradicate poverty in society. She argues that by definition social development brings all sectors in society into interaction with one another requiring that they work co-operatively to achieve the best results.

Maas (in Billups 1990:19) states that social development is the processes through which people become increasingly able to interact competently and responsibly in an increasing array of social contexts. Billups (1986:43) goes further by arguing that social development is an activity conceived as versatile, and a multi-level set of intricate and interrelated human processes. Midgley (1995:25) 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”.

It is argued in the White Paper for Social Welfare in South Africa (1997:10) that social and economic development is two interdependent and mutually reinforcing processes. Equitable social development is the foundation of economic prosperity, while economic
growth is necessary for social development. The welfare of the population will not automatically be enhanced by economic growth. Economic development has to be accompanied by the equitable allocation and distribution of resources if it is to support social development. Elliott (1993:29) emphasizes that social development is interdisciplinary and holistic.

The researcher argues that social development is based on principles such as human dignity, equality and social justice. Social development focuses on the welfare and well-being of the people, together with a strong link with economic development. Thus the goal of social development can be the improvement of people’s well-being through various activities. According to Castells (1998:14) social development leads to cultural development, which leads to innovation, which leads to economic development. Economic development fosters institutional stability and trust, and thus underlies a new synergistic model that integrates economic growth and the enhancement of quality of life. It can be concluded that social development is a process of change within a whole society, with social and economic development in harmony with each other.

Social development can occur on three levels. Billups (1990:20) explains these levels as follows:

- **Micro-social development** is oriented to the facilitation of the progress of individuals or families while they venture through various life phases and tasks in a constant interaction with a growing number of human environments (Maas in Billups, 1990:20).

- **Mezzo-social development** is closely related to micro-social development in that it refers to efforts to initiate, design, create, influence, manage, and evaluate programs and policies that are affecting people’s lives locally (Turner in Billups, 1990:20).

- **Macro-social development** grows out of the above processes (Billups, 1990:20). Maas (in Billups, 1990:20) refers to it as planned social change in communities or nations, that affects residents’ quality of life and includes the formation and growth of social services and other components of society that can improve community life. The
Financing Policy (1999) can be seen as policy made on the macro social development level.

Social development has much potential for Third World countries, such as in the African countries. South Africa can benefit immensely from this framework. The United Nations World Summit on Social Development (Copenhagen, 1995) created a way in which the First World countries can assist Third World countries with social development. This United Nations World Summit on Social Development in Copenhagen (1995) had a major influence on the formulation of the White Paper for Social Welfare (1997) and the Financing Policy (1999) in South Africa and will subsequently be discussed.

3. WORLD SUMMIT ON SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, COPENHAGEN (1995)

The World Summit on Social Development (1995) was a way of getting delegates of all countries together to brainstorm social development and interventions as well as the evaluation thereof. The progress of social development is continuously reviewed. The latest review took place in South Africa (Johannesburg, 2002). As a result of the World Summit on Social Development in Copenhagen (1995) policies concerning social development were formulated in South Africa. Some basic principles for countries were set out and all delegates were asked to pledge their countries’ support. With the Copenhagen World Summit on Social Development (1995), all attending delegates were asked to sign a document containing the following 10 commitments with regard to social development globally (Social development, 2002):

1. “We commit ourselves to creating an enabling economic, political, social, cultural and legal environment that will enable people to achieve social development.

2. We commit ourselves to the goal of eradicating poverty in the world, through decisive national actions and international co-operation, as an ethical, social, political and economic imperative of humankind.

3. We commit ourselves to promoting the goal of full employment as a basic priority of our economic and social policies, and to enabling all men and women to attain secure and sustainable livelihoods through freely chosen productive employment and work.
4. We commit ourselves to promoting social integration by fostering societies that are stable, safe and just and based on the promotion and protection of all human rights and on non-discrimination, tolerance, respect for diversity, equality of opportunities, solidarity, security and participation of all people, including disadvantaged and vulnerable groups and persons.

5. We commit ourselves to promoting full respect for human dignity and to achieving equality and equity between women and men, and to recognizing and enhancing the participation and leadership roles of women in political, civil, economic, social and cultural life and in development.

6. We commit ourselves to accelerating the economic, social and human resource development of Africa and the least developed countries.

7. We commit ourselves to ensuring that when structural adjustment programmes are agreed to they should include social development goals in particular of eradicating poverty, promoting full and productive employment and enhancing social integration.

8. We commit ourselves to increasing significantly and/or utilizing more efficiently the resources allocated to social development in order to achieve the goals of the Summit through national action and regional and international co-operation.

9. We commit ourselves to an improved and strengthened framework for international, regional and sub-regional co-operation for social development in a spirit of partnership through the United Nations and other multilateral institutions.

10. We commit ourselves to attaining the goals of universal and equitable access to quality education and to basic health services without distinction by race, national origin, gender or age, and to preserving and promoting our rich and varied cultural heritage as indispensable bases for people-centred sustainable development.”

South Africa also signed the declaration of these ten commitments. This implies that the government of South Africa is responsible to the world, and especially to South Africans, for ensuring that these commitments are realised. One initiative in this regard was the drafting and formulation of the White Paper for Social Welfare in South Africa (1997). This in turn led to the formulation of the Financing Policy (1999). Thus the Financing Policy (1999) is an extension of South Africa’s commitments to Social Development.
The next section will focus in more depth on developmental social welfare in South Africa, including the White Paper for Social Welfare (1997).

4. DEVELOPMENTAL SOCIAL WELFARE IN SOUTH AFRICA

The White Paper for Social Welfare in South Africa (1997) provides a policy framework for developmental social welfare in South Africa. South Africa has experienced low economic growth rates over the past two decades. This means that individuals and families are vulnerable and do not have enough resources to overcome their situation. Unequal income distribution is hampering the development in South Africa, especially to people living in rural areas. Unemployment issues are common in South Africa, but it is most severely affecting the women and young people under the age of 24 years (White Paper for Social Welfare, 1997:9).

The White Paper on Social Welfare proposes a new developmental approach to social service provision along with a new Financing Policy to fund social service providers and other caring professions. Two key issues are involved, namely social service providers will need to refrain from specialization and offer an integrated holistic service, and funding from the government will in future be based on the extent and the nature of the integrated services rendered (Ludik & Nel, 2001:49).

The vision for developmental social welfare in South Africa is stated as “a welfare system which facilitates the development of human capacity and self reliance within a caring and enabling socio-economic environment.” (White Paper for Social Welfare, 1997:15) The mission is to “serve and build a self-reliant nation in partnership with all stakeholders through an integrated social welfare system which maximizes its existing potential, and which is equitable, sustainable, accessible, people-centred and developmental” (White Paper for Social Welfare, 1997:15).

According to Ludik & Nel (2001:48) South Africa is standing on the precipice of major transformation with regard to its own social service delivery system. “Social service provision is currently inadequate and unequal in its distribution of service delivery,
which leaves the majority of its target group even more marginalized. The new government envisages that its new proposed social welfare programme will begin to address these imbalances.” (Ludik & Nel, 2001:49). The Minister of Social Development, Dr. Z.S.T. Skweyiya, has launched a ten-point plan in January 2000 which reflected the priorities that will be addressed by the Department over the next five years in South Africa. This ten-point plan is briefly outlined in the Strategic Plan of the Department of Social Development (2003/4-2205/6:14) and reads as follows:
- Rebuilding a family, community and social relations;
- Implementing an integrated poverty eradication strategy;
- Developing a comprehensive social security system;
- Responding to the brutal effects of all forms of violence against women and children;
- Providing community-based care and support for those infected and affected by HIV/AIDS;
- Developing a national strategy to reduce youth criminality and unemployment within the framework of the National Crime Prevention Strategy;
- Making social welfare services accessible and available to all people and ensuring equity in service provision;
- Redesigning services for people with disabilities in ways that promote their human rights and economic development;
- Basing welfare work on a commitment to co-operative governance; and
- Train, educate, redeploy and employ a new category of workers in social development.

This ten-point plan of the national Department for Social Development links up directly with the principles for developmental social welfare services in the Financing Policy (1999:8) which will be discussed in the next section.

4.1 Principles for Developmental Social Welfare Services
Developmental social welfare policies and programmes should be based on basic principles. The principles discussed in the White Paper for Social Welfare (1997:16-17)
provide a foundation for the proposed transformation. These principles correspond with the principles set out in the Financing Policy (1999:8-11) and are as follows:

- **Accountability**: The Terminology Committee for Social Work (1995:1) defines accountability as the: “Obligation of a social worker and welfare agency of being answerable to client systems, donors, management bodies, the public and specific government institutions for the range and quality of services rendered, the allocation and use of resources and the realization of objectives.” According to the Financing Policy (1999:9) accountability is applicable to all who intervene with the target groups, namely children, youth, families, women and older persons. These organizations should be held accountable for the delivery of an appropriate and quality service.

- **Empowerment**: Lombard (2002:1) describes empowerment as a “process whereby people gain control over their lives, first on a personal level, then on an interpersonal and finally on a political level. Empowerment is the outcome of capacity building since the more people grow and develop their capacity, the more they will gain control over their own lives, have more options for choices and have the freedom to choose.” The Terminology Committee for Social Work (1995:21) defines empowerment as the “Process whereby individuals or groups attain personal or collective power which enables them to actively improve their living conditions”.

Barker (1988:49) elaborates on empowerment and states that in community organization and social activist social work, the process of helping a group or community to achieve political influence or relevant legal authority is empowerment. The resourcefulness of each target group should be promoted by providing opportunities to use and build their own capacity and support networks and to act on their own choices and sense of responsibility (Financing Policy, 1999:9).

- **Participation**: The United Nations (1999:8) define participation as the rural poor, including the very poorest, and not just their leaders in community development programmes. It refers to the participation of the rural poor in all phases of the
programme. Craig & Mayo (1995:1) states that community participation is a means of enhancing the development process. The Human Development Report (in Craig & Mayo, 1995:2) defines participation in terms of people having constant access to decision-making and power, as well as in terms of economic participation.

Within a social welfare context participation can be seen as citizens and stakeholders participating in decision-making on social welfare policies, programmes and priorities. Craig & Mayo (1997:2) states that participation has become the central issue of our time. It is seen as central to cost-effective strategies for regeneration in urban, industrialized contexts. Craig & Mayo (1995:4) goes on by stating that community participation is part of a wider strategy to promote savings, target services towards those who have been identified as being mostly in need of them, and to shift the burden away from the public sector towards communities.

Galjart (1995:19) suggests that participation is one continuous process, and the costs and benefits of participation differ greatly from one stage to the next. According to the White Paper for Social Welfare (1997:11) participation was one of the critical problems identified within the welfare system. Therefore the Financing Policy (1999:9) states that target groups should be actively involved in all stages of the intervention process.

- **Family-centred:** The Terminology Committee for Social Work (1995:24) defines a family as the "smallest social unit in society". The researcher experience that the concept "family" changes to fit with changes in society. This means that services that are family-centred should be focused on family members and their interrelationships with each other. Services should be contextualized within the family, the extended family and the community, and support and capacity building to families should be provided through regular developmental assessment and programmes which strengthen the family’s development over time (Financing Policy, 1999:9).
- **Community-centred**: Services should be contextualized within the community environment and support and capacity building to communities should be provided through regular developmental assessment and programmes which strengthen the community’s development over time (Financing Policy, 1999:9). According to The Terminology Committee for Social Work (1995:11) a *community* may be defined as a “composition of people who live within a geographically bounded area, who are involved in interaction and who have a bond with each other and with their place of residence”. A community centred approach to welfare is thus focused on support and help given to individuals within the broader community context in which they live.

- **Continuum of care and development**: Care is defined as “provision for people’s physical, psychological and material needs where they are unable to provide these for themselves”, while development is defined as “a process which suggests the desired direction in which a group or community moves in order to accomplish economic progress, political participation and social reconstruction” (The Terminology Committee for Social Work, 1995:6 & 18). Bringing the two concepts together implies that care and development should be the core and ongoing focus of welfare services delivered to all who need them. The target groups should have access to a range of differentiated and integrated services on a continuum of care and development, ensuring access to the least restrictive, least intrusive and most empowering environment and/or programme/s appropriate to their individual development and therapeutic needs (Financing Policy, 1999:9).

- **Integration**: Plug, Meyer, Louw & Gouws (1993:158) states that integration means the combining of parts into one unit. The White Paper for Social Welfare (1997:97) explains social integration as policies and programmes which foster stable, safe and just societies and protect disadvantaged, vulnerable groups and people with special needs. This definition implies that a holistic view should be utilized where services are delivered to target groups. Therefore an individual should be seen as being more than the sum of separate parts. The Financing Policy (1999:9) states that services to
the target groups should be holistic, inter-sectoral and delivered by an appropriate multi-disciplinary team wherever possible.

- **Normalization**: According to Plug, Meyer, Louw & Gouws (1993: 238) an individual can have a desire to strive towards truth, justice and responsibility. This striving can be seen as normative, giving meaning to the individuals’ life. The Financing Policy (1999:10) clarifies this principle as follows: “Target groups should be exposed to normative challenges, activities and opportunities, which promote participation and development”.

- **Effectiveness and efficiency**: Plug, Meyer, Louw & Gouws (1993:70) states that effectiveness and efficiency can be seen as the extent to which a worker performs a specific task successfully. Services to children, youth, families, women and older persons (target groups of government as set out in the Financing Policy) should be delivered in the most effective and efficient way possible (Financing Policy, 1999:10).

- **Person-centred**: Person-centred or non-directive therapy is defined by Plug, Meyer, Louw & Gouws (1993:236) as an approach whereby the therapist tries to distance him/herself from providing the client with advice and guidance. To be able to deliver person centred services to individuals, families or communities, it is important to remember not to compare individuals with each other. Each individual, family or community has its own dynamics and should be dealt with in its own unique way. Positive developmental experiences support and capacity building should be ensured through regular developmental assessment and programmes that strengthen the target group’s development over time (Financing Policy, 1999:10).

- **Rights**: Barker (1988:14) defines rights as follows: “The obligation of society to each of its members; that which is legally or morally due to an individual by just claim.” The Financing Policy (1999:10) states that the rights of the target groups are of vital importance and will be protected.
- **Restorative justice**: The approach to target groups in trouble with the law should focus on restoring societal harmony and putting wrongs right, as opposed to punishment. The person should be held accountable for his/her actions and where possible make amends to the victim (Financing Policy, 1999:10).

- **Appropriateness**: According to the White Paper for Social Welfare (1997:92) appropriate social welfare services and programmes can be seen as methods and approaches that are responsive to the needs and problems of the people and are accessible and responsive to social, cultural, economic and political conditions. The Financing Policy (1999:10) emphasizes that all services to the target groups should be the most appropriate for the individual, the family and the community.

- **Family preservation**: Beebe (1995:973) explains family preservation as follows: “Family preservation services are intensive services generally delivered in the client’s home over a brief time-limited period. These services were developed to help prevent unnecessary out-of-home placements, keep families together and preserve family bonds. These services are targeted for families at imminent risk of having a child removed from the home. The underlying assumption is that many children could remain at home safely if services were provided earlier and more intensively.” Family preservation services demonstrate a belief in and a commitment to families as partners in the helping process (Beebe, 1995:980).

The Financing Policy (1999:10) states that all services should prioritize the goal to have the target groups remain within the family and/or community context wherever possible. When a young person, woman or older person is placed in alternative care, services should aim to retain and support communication and relationships between the person and their family, and maximize the time which the person spends in the care of his/her family.

- **Permanency planning**: Every young person within the continuum of care and development should be provided with the opportunity to build and maintain lifetime
relationships within a family and/or community context within the shortest possible time (Financing Policy, 1999:11).

The principles discussed in the above paragraphs provide guidelines as to what transformation should adhere to. It is necessary for each organization to measure itself against the principles set out by government in the White Paper for Social Welfare (1997) and in the Financing Policy (1999). The financing shifts in the Financing Policy (1999) states how transformation in organisations should look like. In the next section these shifts will be mentioned briefly.

4.2 FINANCING SHIFTS

The Financing Policy (1999:16-19) sets out financing shifts that need to take place in order to meet the aim of the Financing Policy, namely: “To meet government’s agenda to address and eliminate the current imbalances in services to citizens”. These shifts are as follows:

- **Shift 1:** From a narrow focus on quantitative services to a focus both on qualitative and quantitative services. This implies that the focus will be on how many persons have been attended to as well as on how effective the services are in meeting the needs and ensuring the well-being of children, youth, women and older persons within the context of families and communities.

- **Shift 2:** From per capita financing to programme financing. This shift will be towards the financing of holistic service programmes.

- **Shift 3:** From a focus on financing specialist organizations and services to financing of holistic services with specialist components integrated. Thus financing will be given to services at one or more of the service levels.

- **Shift 4:** From supporting racially-based structures and practices to supporting those services that promote social integration, diversity and equity. Thus this shift will ensure that services demonstrate social integration of race and gender and a strong respect for diversity, and that services will be provided to all South Africans in need on the basis of equity.
- **Shift 5:** From financing on the basis of entitlement, to financing on the basis of necessary and effective services. Financing decisions will be based on the compatibility of policies and plans with identified needs and the provision of an effective service that meets minimum standards.

- **Shift 6:** From a skewed allocation of resources to prioritizing services and ensuring a more balanced resource allocation. The new system will require that programmes and resources are re-prioritized towards needs which are identified as being of high local importance and significance.

- **Shift 7:** From financing of organizations and services that disregard indigenous rights and cultural practices, to financing of organizations that respect diversity and indigenous rights and cultures. This means that financing will be directed to those organizations who are re-organizing their operational environment to respond to the diversity of South Africa.

- **Shift 8:** From financing based on arbitrary, “thumb suck” criteria, to financing based on principles, value based criteria and an output/outcomes orientation. This shift will ensure that services reflect in policy and practice the principles and values of the new developmental social welfare service system. Specific financing criteria linked to minimum standards and principles will be the basis of financing decision-making.

- **Shift 9:** From an individual bias in financing to recognition of collective approaches. Financing will support individual organizations as well as collectives. For instance, financing may go to a network of organizations rather than an individual organization, or to a community rather than an individual person or group. The interlinkages between social assistance and financing of welfare services will be reviewed to promote greater synergy between the two and greater value-added.

- **Shift 10:** From financing of fragmented, specialized or isolated services to financing of “one-stop” integrated services. This requires that integrated holistic services be provided to communities, individuals and families.

- **Shift 11:** From social assistance separate from social services to financing social services that are linked to social assistance. Financing will encourage social services to take in consideration social assistance and vice versa. In this arrangement, no child support grant should be delivered in isolation of services to the family.
- **Shift 12:** From top-down delivery to a participatory approach. If a developmental assessment process is followed, full participation of families, communities and individuals should take place.

If these shifts are implemented, transformation will take place more in line with the government’s vision and time frame. The phasing in of the policy commenced in April 1999 and is linked to the government’s Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF). It is expected to be fully operational by the financial year 2003/2004 (Financing Policy, 1999:4). According to the then Chief Director of Social Service, Mrs Janet du Preez (telephonic interview in September, 2003), 2004 is no longer a target. Government is currently looking at dividing the Financing Policy into three different policies, namely a transformation policy, a funding policy and a monitoring policy. The Chief Director of Social Service also indicated that Gauteng was the furthest with the transformation of service delivery. Contrary to what the Chief Director of Social Service alleges, the researcher believes that organizations currently delivering welfare services to people in Gauteng are by a large extent not yet transformed.

As already indicated, this study focused on the effectiveness of the implementation and transformation as set out in the Financing Policy (1999) in Nellmapius, Gauteng. The next section provides a closer look at policy analysis as a process of establishing the effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation of the Financing Policy (1999) in South Africa.

**5. POLICY ANALYSIS**

**5.1 POLICY**

Hogwood & Gum (1986:18) states that *policy* involves a process over a period of time. Friedrich (in Anderson, 2000:4) states that policy is “a proposed course of action of a person, group or government within a given environment providing obstacles and opportunities which the policy was proposed to utilize and overcome in an effort to reach a goal or realize an objective or a purpose.” Anderson (2000:4) links up with Friedrich
by giving the following concept of policy: “A relative stable, purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors in dealing with a problem or matter of concern.”

Parsons (1995:14) agrees with all the above mentioned authors by saying that “the modern meaning of policy is that of a course of action or plan, a set of political purposes – as opposed to ‘administration’. It is that of a rationale, a manifestation of considered judgement”. Therefore it can be concluded that policy indicates a process with a purposive course of action to be implemented over a period of time.

Policy can be divided into two main categories, namely public policy and private policy (Bekker, 2002). The Financing Policy is a public policy and will therefore be the focus of the discussion. Anderson (2000:4) states that public policy can be seen as policies developed by governmental bodies and officials. Hogwood & Gum (1986:24) states that “for a policy to be a ‘public policy’ it must to some degree have been generated or at least processed within the framework of governmental procedures, influences and organizations.”

Parsons (1995:3) elaborates on public policy by stating that “it has to do with those spheres which are so designated as ‘public’, as opposed to a similar list we could make of expressions which involve the idea of ‘private’. The idea of public policy presupposes that there is a sphere or domain of life which is not private or purely individual, but held in common. The public comprises that dimension of human activity which is regarded as requiring governmental or societal regulation or intervention, or at least common action”. The researcher concluded that public policy is developed by governmental bodies and organizations and is applicable to all citizens.

Booysen & Erasmus (in Venter, 2001:236) distinguishes between three types of public policy, namely:
- Distributive policy, which brings tangible benefits to individuals or groups.
- Regulatory policy, which either increases or diminishes the options that individuals or groups can exercise.
- Redistributive policy, which represents attempts on the part of government to direct the allocation of wealth and other benefits to different social groups.

For the purpose of this research, the Financing Policy can be seen as a redistributive policy, because it attempts to allocate resources equally and justly too all vulnerable target groups in society.

Public policies that affect the welfare of citizens are known as social policies (Midgley 2000:4). Hill (1997:1) defines social policy as policy activities that influence welfare. It is primarily used to define the role of the state in relation to the welfare of its citizens. Levin (1997:25) sees social policy as policy of government with regard to action as having a direct impact on the welfare of its citizens. Midgley (2000:4) refers to social policy as the actual policies and programmes of governments that affect people’s welfare. According to Midgley (2000:4) governments can affect the welfare of people through social policies in many different ways, namely formulation of policies that are specifically intended to enhance people’s welfare, affecting social welfare indirectly through economic, environmental or other policies that have an impact on social conditions, and they may affect people’s welfare in unforeseen and unintended ways, for instance a policy focused on one group may in fact bring unintended benefits to another group.

The researcher concludes that social policy influences the welfare of the citizens of a country. The Financing Policy (1999) is one of the most important instruments from which social welfare should be implemented and influences the welfare of the citizens in South Africa. Therefore the Financing Policy (1999) can be seen as a social policy.

5.2 Policy analysis
The purpose of policy analysis is to provide a framework for the researcher to evaluate the impact of a policy on service delivery, in this case of the Financing Policy (1999). Policy analysis can be defined as the activity of creating knowledge of the policy-making process (Dunn, 1994:1). This implies that knowledge must be gained on the causes,
consequences, and performance of policies. Anderson (2000:2) states that policy analysis has an applied orientation and seeks to identify the most efficient alternative for dealing with a current problem.

Parsons (1995:55-56) associates policy analysis with the use of a variety of techniques to improve, or make more rational, the decision-making process. It is therefore concerned with improving the methods by which problems are identified and defined, goals are specified, alternatives evaluated, options selected and performance measured. As such, it is a field which focuses on knowledge based interventions in public policy-making. Hart (1995:24) defines policy analysis as a systematic way of unpacking and understanding policy choices, and comparing possible outcomes.

Anderson (2000:2) adds to the abovementioned paragraphs on policy analysis by saying that evaluation research is a variant of policy analysis. Evaluation research assesses how well policies attain their goals as well as the other societal effects they may have. Thus policy analysis is a way to understand policy choices while considering all the information about a specific problem.

Social workers implement the Financing Policy at grass-root level; therefore social workers play an important role in policy analysis and policy implementation. Jansson (1994:73-74) lists four skills that social workers can use in policy analysis, namely:

- Analytical skills
- Political skills
- Interactional skills
- Value clarifying skills.

The current reality is that social workers are so overloaded with cases that they do not have the time to implement the Financing Policy. They also lack the know-how to perform the implementation effectively. They do not know how to use the policy analysis skills to perform policy analysis. The Financing Policy (1999:12-13) states for example that interventions should be transformed to more prevention and early intervention
services, but the current reality, in the opinion of the researcher, is that most social workers do not have time to perform services on level 1 (prevention) and level 2 (early intervention). They are too busy with their statutory cases to even perform interventions with groups and especially with communities.

If the government wants transformation it should provide the necessary capacity building programmes and training to social workers to assist them in the process. The researcher maintains that more social workers focusing on prevention and early intervention will be of great value to the progress of the transformation of services. To reach this goal, many things need to be in place, for example more social work posts need to be available to assist the current social work force in the field. By focusing more on prevention services in a community will leave social workers with more time to comply with the government’s requirements in the Financing Policy. Policy makers should take note of this and know that there should be some change in the social worker’s work environment if they seriously desire a new focus on intervention with communities with a primary focus on prevention and early intervention.

Dunn (1994:1) argues that policy analysis is “an activity of creating knowledge of and in the policy-making process. In creating knowledge of policy-making processes policy analysts investigate the causes, consequences, and performance of public policies and programmes.” According to Dunn (1994:14) policy analysis can be divided into 5 procedures, namely:

- **Problem structuring** that yields information about the conditions giving rise to the policy problem.
- **Forecasting** that supplies information about future consequences of acting on policy alternatives.
- **Recommendation** that provides information about the relative value or worth of these future consequences.
- **Monitoring** that yields information about the present and past consequences of acting on policy alternatives.
- *Evaluation* that provides information about the value and worth of these consequences in solving the problem.

The process of policy analysis is a series of intellectual activities carried out within a process comprised of activities that are essentially political. These political activities can be described as the policy-making process (Dunn, 1994:15).

According to Booysen & Erasmus (2001:245) policy-making in South Africa is an ongoing, interactive process that can be assessed in terms of a contextualized, cumulative “stream” of actions combined to deliver policies and directives for their implementation. Combined with the “stream” approach, a participatory approach in decision-making can be used in policy-making. Renn, Webler, Rakel, Dienel and Johnson (1993:189) explain this approach as combining technical expertise and rational decision-making with public values and preferences. It is an attempt to integrate expertise, values and concerns of stakeholder groups and preferences of citizens into a procedural framework that enables the generation of consensual policy suggestions. Thus for the Financing Policy to be successful, the participatory approach in decision-making is important. It is of the utmost importance to consult with all social workers who are supposed to implement the policy.

Correct consultation should make a difference to the policy-making process. Dunn (1994:15) states that policy-making comprises of 5 phases, namely:

- Agenda setting;
- Policy formulation;
- Policy adoption;
- Policy implementation; and
- Policy assessment.

Policy analysis is a pre-requisite to policy formulation or amendments of existing policies. Inherent to policy analysis and the policy-making process is to identify gaps and shortcomings in an existing policy such as the Financing Policy. In the next section the Financing Policy (1999) is discussed in more detail with a purpose to analyze the
intended outcome of the policy in relation to where it currently is. This policy analysis is of significant importance in evaluating the impact of the Financing Policy as is the purpose of this study.


Budgetary reform in government became a reality with the introduction of the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) in 1996 (Financing Policy, 1999:41). The MTEF is an operational plan to give substance to the government’s reconstruction and development endeavours for spending plans through a three year budgetary cycle. Within this broader process of budgetary reform, developmental welfare services will be delivered according to a new framework for financing services. Budgeting for service delivery is output- and outcomes- based and are suppose to enable the analysis and allocation of resources according to stated purposes and results (Financing Policy, 1999:15). According the then Chief Director of Social Service in Gauteng, Mrs Janet du Preez (telephonic interview in September, 2003), money in the Gauteng Province is now allocated to specific projects which address the identified target groups and adhere to the principles as set out in the Financing Policy (1999).

The principles (as earlier discussed) formed the foundation for the framework for the Financing Policy (1999). The framework for the Financing Policy can be divided into five categories, namely:

- Service delivery levels.
- Special development areas.
- Target Groups.
- Resources.
- Monitoring and evaluation.

Each of these categories is discussed in depth in the following sections.
6.1 SERVICE DELIVERY LEVELS

The Financing Policy (1999:12) gives a framework of service delivery levels that should be delivered to the target groups. The basis for decision making in service delivery is a developmental assessment of the person. The framework consists of four levels of service delivery, namely:

- **Level 1** Prevention
- **Level 2** Early intervention
- **Level 3** Statutory processes
- **Level 4** Continuum of Care and Development

According to the Financing Policy (1999:12) services on the first level, namely “prevention”, should include any strategies and programmes that will strengthen and build the capacity and self-reliance of families, communities, children, youth, women and older persons.

The second level (*early intervention*) targets youth, families, children, women and older persons as being vulnerable or at risk. The aim is to ensure that they do not experience statutory intervention of any kind.

Level 3 (*statutory process*) addresses the client who has become involved in some form of court case. These services are aimed at supporting and strengthening all target groups. It is based on a strong recognition that specific services needs to be available (Financing Policy, 1999:13).

Service delivered on level 4 (*continuum of care and development*) ranges from community based care to shelters, restricted environments and residential care. These services should be very effective and must be delivered from a prevention and early intervention perspective to ensure no further deterioration. These services should maximize development and well-being and should integrate the individual within a family and community context in the shortest possible time (Financing Policy, 1999:13).
It has been the researcher’s practical experience that services are still more focused on level 3 (statutory processes). It is difficult for social workers at grass-root level to transform services to be focused more on prevention and early intervention in a four-year period, as proposed by government. According to the researcher this is not a viable option for successful implementation of the Financing Policy. More time should be allowed and government should take into consideration that, in reality, there will always be a need for statutory services, no matter how important prevention and early intervention might be.

6.2 SPECIAL DEVELOPMENTAL AREAS

The framework for the Financing Policy integrates special development areas such as HIV/AIDS, poverty alleviation, crime prevention, substance abuse, and disability within each level and across the target groups (Financing Policy, 1999:14).

6.2.1 HIV/AIDS

HIV/AIDS can be seen as one of the most overwhelming diseases of the new millennium. According to Whiteside & Sunter (2000:69) South Africa is already ahead of projections. “The latest estimate for 2000 is about 4,2 million HIV-positive adults and children compared to the figure of 3,6 million. South Africa was only expected to reach 4,2 million in 2002. The number of orphans in South Africa is forecast to reach close to two million by 2010.” HIV/AIDS affects all groups of society and have a major impact on the family structure as well as social and economical resources.

The South African government set out a strategy to address this area. However, in reality, the problem is much bigger than even the government realized. Organizations over all spectrums should take hands and stand together in the fight against HIV/AIDS and its implications.

6.2.2 Poverty alleviation

Lipton (1996:3) in the United Nations Report (1998) defines poverty as follows: “A person is poor in any period if, and only if, her or his access to economic resources is insufficient... to acquire enough commodities to meet basic material needs adequately.”
May (1998:1) links up with Lipton by defining poverty as “the inability to attain a minimal standard of living, measured in terms of basic consumption needs or the income required to satisfy them.” May (1998:1) elaborates on poverty in South Africa by stating that the distribution of income and wealth in South Africa is amongst the most unequal in the world, and that many households still have unsatisfactory access to clean water, energy, health care and education.

According to May (1998:16), the welfare system plays a vital role in alleviating poverty, and this must be strengthened and sustained. Welfare and safety nets must form an integral part of government’s strategy for responding to poverty (May, 1998:24). The White Paper for Social Welfare in South Africa (1997:18) states the government’s intention to fight poverty: “Social welfare policies and programmes will be developed which will be targeted at poverty prevention, alleviation and reduction and the development of people’s capacity to take charge of their own circumstances in a meaningful way.” Although the increase of the Child Support Grant (CSG) by the Department of Social Development early in 2003 is significant in helping to eradicate poverty it is not creating an enabling environment where people take charge of their own lives.

6.2.3 Crime prevention

According to the White Paper for Social Welfare in South Africa (1997:83) crime in South Africa is a serious impediment to sustained harmonious development. Child and youth crime is on the increase, and there is a need for the transformation of the child and youth care system to prevent children from getting into trouble with the law. Martin Schönteich (in Whiteside and Sunter, 2000:96) of the Institute for Security Studies in Pretoria predicts a bleak future. He warns that “AIDS and age will be significant contributors to an increase in the rate of crime in South Africa over the next ten to twenty years. Moreover, in a decade’s time every fourth South African will be aged between 15 and 24. It is within this age group where people’s propensity to commit crime is at its highest.”

6.2.4 Substance abuse
According to the White Paper for Social Welfare (1997:81) substance abuse is recognized as one of the greatest health and social problems in South Africa. The Department of Social Development realised this fact and the necessary legislation was changed to address this issue. The prevention and treatment of drug dependency Act of 1992 provides for the establishment of a central drug authority, the establishment of programmes for the prevention and treatment of drug dependency and other regulations. This Act was amended in 1996 to extend the application of the Act to the whole of South Africa and in 1999 to establish the Central Drug Authority. The Central Drug Authority is charged with the responsibility to effect the National Drug Master Plan (Department of Social Development, 2003/4-2205/6:14).

6.2.5 Disabilities
According to the White Paper for Social Welfare (1997:76) people with disabilities face extreme levels of inadequacy and discrimination. “Different social, economic and political factors interact and create underdevelopment, marginalization, unequal access to resources and lack of service provision for this sector of the population. It is estimated that the number of people with physical and mental disabilities is 8,5% of the total population or approximately 3,4 million people.” Therefore, government decided to include it as a special development area in the Financing Policy.

Out of the above discussion on the special developmental areas in the Financing Policy, it is clear that government decided to take on these areas as priorities. They worked to set a strategy in place to address these special development areas, and they are focussing there services on these areas.
6.3 TARGET GROUPS

According to the Financing Policy (1999:14) any service delivered to the target groups may be at one or more of the service levels and should ensure that special development areas are integrated where they are relevant to the service participants. No welfare organizations should be structured around or focus exclusively on any one of the special development areas. However, welfare organizations could be structured around and provide services to one or more of the target groups. All services delivered should reflect the principles as set out in the Financing Policy (1999).

The Financing Policy (1999:14) identifies the target groups as follows:
- Children (0-18 years)
- Youth (19-35 years)
- Women
- Families
- Older persons (above 50 years old).

Each of these target groups is discussed in the next section.

6.3.1 Children

Bosman-Swanepoel & Wessels (1995:13) defines a child as “a person under the age of 18 years.” A child does not know or understand its world, and cannot make choices and carry responsibility for their choices. The government views a child as vulnerable and easy to misuse or abuse, therefore children need to be protected and cared for.

In the Strategic plan of the Department of Social Development (2003/4-2205/6:16) children is seen as a priority for intervention. Children, especially those who live under conditions of severe poverty, are the most vulnerable group in South Africa. Since 1994 the government has put in place a number of measures to promote and protect the rights of children in South Africa (Department of Social Development, 2003/4-2205/6:16). The report on the state of South Africa’s children reflects uneven progress in the realisation of children’s social and economic rights. Therefore the Department of Social Development
will prioritise children in its programmes over the next three years (Strategic Plan of the Department of Social Development, 2003/4-2205/6:14).

6.3.2 Youth
A juvenile can be defined as a minor under the age of either 18 or 21 years. Youth as a target group of government are persons who take part in harmful activities not necessarily out of their own choice. Circumstances many times force them to take part in harmful activities. They usually do not know how to escape from this vicious circle. The youth is the future of the country and need to be taken care of. The department of Social Development started youth development centres to, amongst other things, provide life skills programmes to the youth (Department of Social Development Progress Report, 2003:18). The Department of Social Development has gone a long way in discharging the obligations placed upon it by the National Youth Commission (Department of Social Development Progress Report, 2003:18).

6.3.3 Women
Slightly more than half of the South African population is women (White Paper for Social Welfare, 1997:73). “While their experiences are diverse and differ according to race and class, commonalities between them do exist regarding gender inequality. Illiteracy and poverty are major obstacles to women’s advancements. Female unemployment is higher than male unemployment and women account for only 45% of those employed in the formal sector.” Women are included in the Financing Policy as a target group especially because they are vulnerable and suppressed. They need protection and upliftment and need to be recognized as being equal to men.

6.3.4 Families
As is earlier defined, a family can be seen as a social unit consisting of people living together by choice and who are usually blood related. A major contributor to family problems and breakdown in family functioning is the increasing economic stress facing households. Those living below the poverty line as well as single parent families are the worst affected. Family dysfunction sets in when poverty is combined with environmental
stress and feelings of powerlessness and frustration. This contributes to social problems which affect the capacity of the family to function optimally.

The well-being of children depends on the ability of families to function effectively. Not only do families give their members a sense of belonging, they are also responsible for imparting life skills and values. Families are faced with many new demands and challenges as they attempt to meet the needs of their members. As a result of the increasing pressure on families, they are often unable to fulfil their parenting and social support roles effectively without the active support of the community, the state and the private sector (White Paper for Social Welfare, 1997:58).

The majority of South African families and children live in unhealthy, unsafe, disadvantaged communities. Overcrowding, a lack of housing and basic amenities such as sanitation and recreational facilities and a lack of transport have serious consequences for the stability and security of families. This impacts on the quality of social services and facilities and results in insecure and unstable family life. The Department of Social Development (Progress Report, 2003:18) is pursuing its strategic priority to develop a National Policy for Families. However, there is a lack of research on families in South Africa. Therefore the Department of Social Development formed a partnership with the Human Science Research Council (HSRC) to conduct research on family life. The Department also arranged a national training model on family preservation for stakeholders in the different provinces. Five provinces are already trained on this model (Department of Social Development Progress Report, 2003:18).

6.3.5 Older persons
The White Paper for Social Welfare (1997:70) states that the current dispensation on ageing in South Africa does not take demographic realities into account. Demographic projections indicate that over the next 20 years the proportion of elderly people will increase. The estimated percentage of people aged 80 years and older is increasing. People older than 80 years are particularly vulnerable. There is an unrealistic emphasis on
institutional care for older persons. Currently, about 61% of the total national welfare budget is spent on social security and social welfare services for the elderly.

Economic conditions in South Africa are unfavourable, and few job opportunities exist. There are not enough incentives for financial provision for retirement and old age. It is as a result of these factors that elderly persons are vulnerable and are often in need of social support. There is a lack of appropriate and affordable accommodation for the elderly. Older people are generally also nutritionally vulnerable. The Department of Social Development is focusing on developing legislation for older people. A Draft Policy and a Draft Bill on the status of older people have been developed (Department of Social Development Progress Report, 2003:19).

Out of the above discussion on the target groups of government, as set out in the Financing Policy, the researcher discovered that there is a lot of transformation already taking place. Children are prioritised by government for the next three years and life skill programmes are provided to the youth. Because of no statistics available on families, the Department of Social Development looks into research on families in South Africa. Currently legislation for older people is drafted. All this indicates that government is concerned about its people and are putting strategies in place to address target groups.

6.4 RESOURCES

According to the Financing Policy (1999:12) resources are divided into the following categories:
- Human resources
- Finance resources
- Minimum standards
- Social assistance
- Quality assurance
- Information.
Resources should be distributed equally at all times amongst organizations that focus on the target groups, as well as to the target groups themselves. Resources should be managed, monitored and evaluated to ensure that equality is considered and taken into account.

*Human resources* can be seen as the people and professionals delivering the service to the society. Thus organizations should have enough trained and experienced human resources available to be able to deliver a quality service to the society. The Financing Policy (1999) regulates the *financing resources* from government to organizations that deliver services to the target groups and who abide to the regulations as set out in the Financing Policy.

*Minimum standards*, i.e. training and capacity building, for service delivery are set out in the White Paper for Social Welfare (1997) and should be adhered to at all times, especially when services are delivered to the target groups. *Social assistance* should be accessible to all people in society and should be equally distributed amongst its members.

*Quality assurance* of services should be performed at all times. In the next section Developmental Quality Assurance (DQA) will be discussed as a tool to monitor and evaluate service delivery in South Africa. *Information* should not be withheld from any member of society. An effort should be made to ensure that information is shared and that it reaches each member of society.

According to the researcher, resources are valuable in the executing of services to people. A larger focus should be placed on the equal distribution of resources to all who needs it. Government and other social welfare service providers should take hands with the private sector and other relevant stakeholders to combine resources and to distribute it equally and fairly to all those in need.
6.5 Monitoring and Evaluation

According to the Financing Policy (1999:35), the Developmental Quality Assurance (DQA) is the core developmental monitoring tool for ensuring effective service delivery in line with the transformation vision and goals. This tool also ensures that the annual welfare services receive the maximum benefit from government financing. It is an ongoing process, until the service no longer requires financing. The DQA will replace any form of monitoring and inspections currently used by the national and provincial departments with regard to social welfare service delivery.

The DQA model has three cornerstones, according to the Financing Policy (1999:35). They are: policy principles and minimum standards, Financing Policy and procedure, and capacity building. The DQA cannot be effective without the existence of developmental minimum standards. The principles and minimum standards form the developmental assessment framework for social welfare service organizations and programmes. The whole model is in essence about assessing the developmental needs of the organization and monitoring minimum standards and human rights practices. The processes and procedures are then supposed to result in an organizational developmental plan (ODP) which is then facilitated and monitored between DQA assessment or reviews by a competent mentor from either the Department of Welfare or an appointed NGO.

According to Ms. Janet du Preez, the then Chief Director of Social Service in Gauteng Mrs. Janet du Preez (telephonic interview in September, 2003), the DQA tool is very ambitious and expensive to implement. Government did not manage to meet the quota of visits because of too little time available. However, at the time of the telephonic interview with Ms. Janet du Preez (September, 2003) she states that those organizations subjected to a DQA visit had transformed their service delivery. Ms. Du Preez states that the tool is good for monitoring because it is developmental in nature. The operationalising needs refining, especially as to how to implement it in practice. Ms. Du Preez indicated that this would be taken into consideration when drafting the new monitoring policy.
Set out in the Financing Policy (1999:36) are some objectives of the DQA procedures and processes, which can be summarized as follows:

- To ensure that welfare financing is effectively and efficiently used to bring about transformation of welfare services.
- To develop the capacity of the national and provincial departments of welfare and NGOs with respect to DQA and quality service delivery.
- To ensure that individuals, families and communities are receiving effective and efficient services and are satisfied with the quality of service they receive.
- To ensure that the South African Constitution and international instruments ratified by South Africa are upheld and reflected within practices at all levels of the developmental social welfare service system.
- To ensure that appropriate legislation and regulations with regard to the target groups are upheld within the system.
- To enable departments, organizations or projects to strive towards meeting policy and minimum standard requirements through support, mentoring and capacity building.
- To record, monitor and report to the Minister and MECs for Welfare any individual or organization that permits the violation of human rights, directly abuse the target groups or fails to report the abuses of children or women as required by the relevant legislation.
- To make recommendations to the national Minister for Welfare and the national Director General with regard to legislation, policy and minimum standards on developmental social welfare services.

According to the Financing Policy (1999:41) it is imperative that the implementation of the policy results in the optimal utilization of financial and infrastructural resources to achieve maximum results. According to the then Chief Director of Social Service Mrs. Janet du Preez (telephonic interview in September, 2003), the implementation of the Financing Policy is viable in South Africa. The implementation will be characterized by the application of a combination of financing choices and options.
Throughout the transition, the Financing Policy (1999:41) states that the following activities should be in place:
- Ongoing (annual) review and commitment to focus areas as determined by government.
- Ongoing reprioritization to confirm whether the resource allocations are aligned with the service framework.
- Incremental phasing in of appropriate programme “service baskets” financed according to the new criteria, accompanied by a commensurate phasing out of the present financing approach.
- Capacity building and reorientation of personnel and organizations.

The Financing Policy (1999:42) suggests that a Transformation Management Team (TMT) will be established at the national and provincial levels of government to manage the transformation of social welfare services. The transformation of welfare financing is an important component of this change management process. The team will consist of a group of people specifically dedicated to managing and facilitating transition and transformation through specific activities. According to the then Chief Director of Social Service, Mrs Janet du Preez (telephonic interview in September, 2003), this team did not reach their quota of visits because of too little time and too few money available to implement this team assessment as part of DQA. The monitoring tool for transformation of services will be revisited during the drafting of the new monitoring policy currently underway.

7. SUMMARY
The Financing Policy (1999) is a developmental social welfare policy designed to guide social welfare service delivery in South Africa. Policy analysis is a process of determining the effectiveness of a policy such as the Financing Policy. The implementation of this policy has been halted in 2001 all over South Africa, except in the Gauteng Province. The Gauteng Province went ahead with the transformation of services and is currently the furthest with regard to transformation as stated in the Financing Policy. Currently three new policies are in the process of being drafted. These policies,
the funding policy, the monitoring policy and the transformation policy will replace the Financing Policy (1999).

In Chapter 3 the empirical research findings are presented, interpreted and discussed.
CHAPTER 3
EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

1. INTRODUCTION
The aim of the study was to evaluate the impact of the Financing Policy (1999) on social service delivery in the Nellmapius community. It was indicated in Chapter 1 that although the Financing Policy was halted by the Minister for Social Development, Gauteng Province, in which the Nellmapius community falls, continued to implement the policy. The findings of this study are applicable to the Nellmapius community and, due to the exploratory design of the research study; cannot be generalized and said to apply to other communities.

This chapter presents the empirical findings of the qualitative and quantitative research. A brief overview of the research methodology will form the first section of the chapter. This will be followed by the presentation of the qualitative and quantitative data.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
2.1 RESEARCH APPROACH
The research study was based on the dominant-less-dominant design, whereby the qualitative research approach was more dominant than the quantitative research approach. The study was conducted in two phases. The first phase (quantitative research) entailed a personal administered questionnaire (Addendum B) completed by the service providers in the Nellmapius community. For the second phase (qualitative research) focus groups were held with community members who are beneficiaries of social services in Nellmapius. (See Addendum C for the interview schedule). The quantitative data collection method (personal administered questionnaires) supported the primary data collection method, namely the focus groups (qualitative data collection method).

2.2 TYPE OF RESEARCH
The study was based on formative evaluation research where the concern was to analyse the Financing Policy with a view to improving the policy. Formative evaluation research
2.3 RESEARCH DESIGN AND STRATEGY

A combination of the phenomenological strategy (qualitative) and the exploratory design (quantitative) was utilized in this study. The researcher found that the phenomenological study helped her to understand the perceptions, perspectives and understandings of beneficiaries on social service delivery in Nellmapius. To be able to support the qualitative data collected through the phenomenological strategy, the researcher used the one-shot case study as a type of exploratory design to guide the quantitative approach. Nellmapius was seen as one case study on which the research was conducted.

2.4 RESEARCH PROCEDURES AND STRATEGY

The researcher selected twenty-six (26) beneficiaries of social services to create the two focus groups as part of the qualitative research. Each group consisted of between ten to fifteen members. The six service providers from NGOs in the Nellmapius community were included in the quantitative research and completed the personal administered questionnaire. In total thirty-one (31) respondents took part in the research. With regard to the quantitative study the researcher had a 100% response rate.

As the qualitative research formed the dominant part of this study, the qualitative findings will be presented first. The focus group discussions were transcribed. From the transcription the researcher identified recurring themes in the discussions. These themes were categorized and are discussed in the next section.

3 QUALITATIVE DATA

3.1 BIOGRAPHIC PARTICULARS OF RESPONDENTS

The qualitative data represented in this section were derived from the focus groups held with the beneficiaries of social services. Of the respondents 81% were females while only 19% of the respondents were males. The respondents were made up of children ranging from 12 to 18 years, and adults ranging from 19 to 80 years of age. Twenty-six (26)
respondents participated in the focus groups as part of the qualitative data. The two focus groups were conducted in exactly the same way. The analysis of the findings integrates perspectives of the emerged themes.

3.2 Respondents’ views on the impact of the Financing Policy (1999) on service delivery in Nellmapius

During the focus group discussions the following themes emerged:
- Social welfare services
- Educational services
- Health care services
- Accessibility of services.

The White Paper for Social Welfare (1997:15) states that social welfare services are part of a range of mechanisms to achieve social development, such as health, nutrition, education, housing, employment, recreation, rural and urban development and land reform. The themes presented by the respondents indicated that they experienced social services not only as social welfare services, but also as health, education, recreation and other services. Therefore the researcher presents and discusses the respondents’ views and experiences on social welfare, health, education and recreational services in this section.

3.2.1 Social welfare services

The discussions on social services yielded five subthemes, namely poverty relief, emotional services to the respondents, people with disabilities, skills development and the sharing of information.

- Poverty relief

The respondents indicated that social services in Nellmapius were generally “good”. Nellmapius benefits from poverty relief programmes which focus on the distribution of clothing and food. The respondents indicated that their most basic needs were food and clothing and they expected these from service providers. Respondents indicated that for
certain target groups poverty relief was available, for example orphaned children. One respondent responded as follows:

“...now we feel like normal children, although we are orphans...”

Poverty relief is one of the key issues outlined in the White Paper for Social Welfare (1997) and is a special developmental area in the Financing Policy (1999). May (1998:16) states that for the welfare system it is vital to prioritise poverty and strategies to address poverty must be strengthened and sustained. May (1998:15) elaborates that the eradication of poverty and inequality and the meeting of basic needs are primary goals of government: “Government is committed to poverty reduction...” This implies that government would like to prioritise poverty and do everything in its power to sustain poverty relief programmes.

- **Emotional services to the respondents**

The respondents indicated that they were not receiving counselling services and have no therapeutic sessions. They do not know where to find these services and whether there are such services available in Nellmapius. They said that they really did need counselling services to cope with their problems and circumstances. The respondents indicated that they did not have a support group where they could share their concerns and feelings and where they could find support from other people going through the same experiences. The following quote from one of the respondents indicates their concern and their need for social workers to assist them:

“*People don’t know if there is a social worker in Nellmapius. Where are the social workers...?*”

The concern behind the above statement is that it seems that social services are not known to the community.

However, the respondents indicated that other services were available from social workers at the clinic, including the following:

- Foster care
- Social security, and
- Therapeutic sessions.

As indicated earlier in Chapter 2, the Financing Policy stipulates that services need to be equally distributed. In Nellmapius all services are centralised at one point, namely at the clinic situated on the outskirts of the community in Extension 1. This implies that the services cannot be distributed equally, because not even half of the Nellmapius community in need of services are able to access these services. The services are not located at a central point from where everybody is able to access them.

When the respondents were asked whether social welfare services made any difference in Nellmapius in the last three years, they indicated that there was no difference. In their own words:

“...I do not see the difference...Promises never come true...”

When they were asked about changes in their personal lives because of services they received, mixed opinions emerged. Most of them said that nothing had changed. However, one respondent shared a story of hope to the group. Her story is as follows:

“...I was in primary school. I lost a close friend. I was going through a hard time. Then the school brought in a social worker. Since then it is easier and not hard to communicate with other children. I could not trust them. I was too scared to talk to them. Scared to come too close to them, because I was afraid I’m going to loose another friend again. Counselling, it helped me...”

This respondent indicated that there were some people in Nellmapius that cared about children and their emotions. Emotional wellbeing can be divided into love, acceptance, care and support. The emotional wellbeing of children and other people is of vital importance for their social functioning.
When the respondents were asked to indicate what services were available for the different target groups, most of them responded by saying that they did not know of services for women, youth and people with disabilities. Some of them said that there are services available for families, children and older people. One respondent even said:

“...no service. They didn’t make research for Nellmapius. No services for a lot of people...”

This indicates that there is a lack of services available in Nellmapius, especially to women, youth and people with disabilities. Government states in the Financing Policy (1999:14) that women, youth and people with disabilities are target groups for service delivery. Thus in Nellmapius this gap in service delivery needs to be addressed to ensure that the resources and services are spread equally between all target groups who really need them.

- **People with disabilities**

Services for disabled people, especially children with disabilities, are of major concern to the respondents. They indicated that there were no services for this group and that they had come across situations where children are locked away in their home. Parents do not want to be associated with these children. One respondent shared the following with the group:

“... Some people they lock a child away, because they are afraid to expose themselves with a disabled child...”

Another respondent stated:

“...I was a foster parent to a disabled child. I used to train her to do a lot of things. She could not move like a normal child...So the parents took the child away. If you go there now, the child is sitting and can’t eat. They are not training or doing anything to improve her life...Everyone here is concerned about those children...”
These stories show the reality of little or no services available to people who really need them. People with disabilities are a target group of government, as stated in the Financing Policy (1999:14). The respondents’ indication that there are little or no services for people with disabilities shows their real concern. Furthermore, this issue was discussed for about 15 minutes, which indicates that they really care about people with disabilities and want to do something about the situation.

- **Skills development**

Skills development is another theme which recurred during the focus group discussions. One respondent stated it as follows:

"...Skills for all people in Nellmapius. Teach us to catch the fish, not to give the fish on top of the table, to give to others..."

Skills development is an important aspect of social services in a community such as Nellmapius. Where Nellmapius is a rather new community, a focus on poverty relief and unemployment is important. Skills development is a way of assisting people in improving their lives and their circumstances. This will empower people to take responsibility for their own life. These skills can also be utilised for job applications. Skills development is related to economic development. As Midgley (1995:25) indicates, a dynamic process of economic development is a critical part of social development. In social development the focus is to capacitate and empower people to be able to lead a better quality of life. Therefore skills development is seen as a crucial part of economic development and as such of social development. The fact that the respondents themselves indicated that they need skills development is a concern that cannot be ignored. Skills development will facilitate economic development and human development, which in turn will improve their lives as a whole.

- **Sharing of information**

The sharing of information forms an intrinsic part of skills development. In the context of the respondents’ discussion, they were focused on the sharing of information to the
Nellmapius community. An example is the knowledge of where to go to get counselling. As one respondent stated:

“...problem here is that people do not know where to go for help. Spread the message. People do not get the message...We don’t know where to find them...”

According to the respondents, they do not receive the messages, even though some of the respondents said that messages do get posted on traffic signs and even trees. The problem still remains that the people do not get the message and therefore they do not know about the services available to them. Another problem is that messages get mixed up between people and are confusing. Some of the messages are contradictory and the result is that nobody knows what to believe anymore. To be able to deliver effective and efficient services, a principle in the Financing Policy (1999:10), it is important that all information is communicated clearly and that information about services is shared and made known to the community.

3.2.2 Educational Services

In general, the respondents experienced educational services positively. They have experienced that some organisations assist the children to go to school. One group indicated strongly that they need a library. The reason was that:

“...it is too far to go to Mamelodi East Library. It is dark if I come back. It is not safe...”

They also mentioned the availability of computers for school children. This will help them to do their school work whilst they can learn some computer skills at the same time. One respondent indicated that education is the key to success. Most of the respondents agreed that they needed another school. A new school is currently being built in Nellmapius, but no one knows whether it will be a secondary or a primary school. They actually need both. This is what some of the respondents had to say about it:
“...two more schools are being built in extension 3 and 4. There was only one school. Pupils attended 3 hours so that they can give a chance to other pupils...”

It is important to look at educational services as part of social development. Education is the key to human and economic development. Educational services available to children will provide them with a head start on their way to being employed citizens and participating in economic development. For the Nellmapius community it is important to know which type of school is being built. This directly influences their quality of life. If the goal of social development is to promote the wellbeing of people (Midgley, 1995:25), educational services also need to receive high priority in the Nellmapius community.

3.2.3 Health services

There is one clinic in Nellmapius. It is located on the western border of Nellmapius. The respondents said that they could get to the clinic but that it was difficult for the older people because they cannot walk that far. Most of the people who really need the clinic stay in extension 3 and 4 on the other side of Nellmapius. The respondents suggest that another clinic be built in a more central place so that people who really need the clinic can get to it more easily. Some of the respondents were concerned because there is little medication available in the clinic to treat the people. They need a better clinic with services accessible to everyone. When medication is available they do receive free medicine, free TB treatment and free HIV/AIDS testing services.

Some of the respondents said that they were not allowed at the clinic. They were shown away to Mamelodi East, approximately 20 km away, because they were old enough to get there. When they arrived at Mamelodi East, they were sent back to Nellmapius because that is where they stay. The result is that no one wants to go to the clinic anymore because they get sent away every time.

Health services form an integral part of social development. When health services are not accessible or available in a community, the functioning of the people is seriously
affected. Health services imply a holistic approach to development in a community and promote the wellbeing of people. This is directly in line with a social development approach as promoted by government in the Financing Policy (1999).

3.2.4 Accessibility of social services

Services are not accessible to all people in Nellmapius. Some of the respondents said that they had access to other services at the clinic, for example social security. Most of the social services are located at the clinic. It almost functions as a one stop centre.

However, as the clinic is on the western border of Nellmapius, it makes it difficult for older people and children to get to the clinic. According to the respondents, the services need to be located in a central place to be accessible to all people. The respondents suggested that a building in the middle of Nellmapius be erected where all people can access it. They had no suggestions as to how to raise the money for the building. One respondent said that:

“...Old people cannot walk and they do not have money to travel to Extension 1 to get information. That social welfare department, maybe they can build something like a venue in a central place ...”

The respondents said that money was needed to go to the clinic or to Denneboom, near Mamelodi, to pay the electricity bill and other services. They are mostly unemployed and do not know where money for survival will come from. One respondent said that:

“...it looks like we are in a desert...”

Another respondent stood up and said that:

“...I spend a lot of money to go to high school in Mamelodi East because I have to catch 2 taxis to school...”

This respondent stays in a child-headed household with no source of income at all. For social services to be available and accessible to all, it needs to be in a central place. To have services in one corner of the community only does not serve the purpose of serving
the community. All target groups need to be taken into consideration when a central place or one stop centre are planned for a community. For example, older people and people with disabilities do not have the ability or money available to access services far away from them. This implies that services are not targeted at them and therefore two of the target groups of government as set out in the Financing Policy (1999:14) are not reached.

3.3 CONCLUSION
The key findings derived from the analysis of the qualitative data can be summarised as follows:

- Existing social welfare services in Nellmapius need to be strengthened and sustained in order to ensure that social development will take place and be sustainable in Nellmapius. An example is the existing poverty relief programme that delivers food and clothing to the community. For this programme to be effective and efficient, support and resources from government, NGOs and the private sector are important.

- There is a lack of social service to women, youth and people with disabilities in Nellmapius. The respondents indicated that this is a concern for them. To comply with the requirements in the Financing Policy, it is important to ensure that these target groups also receive services.

- Skills development forms an integral part of economic and social development. The respondents raised it as a concern that they do not receive skills development services. As an integral part of social development, this issue needs serious attention.

- Information distribution and communication is not effective in Nellmapius. The necessary information does not reach the people who really need to know about it. If the people in Nellmapius do not know that services are available, for example at the clinic, they will not even attempt to access these services.

- Educational services form part of the broader holistic view of human and social development. If people do not receive educational services, they will not be able to promote their wellbeing, which is the goal of social development. In the end they will not have employment and therefore no income, which does not promote their functioning in Nellmapius.
- Health services are not available to all people in Nellmapius. When some respondents arrived at the clinic, they were sent to Mamelodi East to access services there. This implies that, for instance, disabled people will not be able to access health services at all. This has serious implications for their quality of life, which is a primary focus of social development.

- Social services are not accessible to all people in Nellmapius, especially older persons and people with disabilities. This is an integral requirement of the Financing Policy, especially to ensure that services are available and equally distributed to all people in Nellmapius.

The quantitative data is gathered through a personal administered questionnaire. The findings of the quantitative data will be presented mostly in visual format.

4. QUANTITATIVE DATA

4.1 BIOGRAPHIC PARTICULARS

The biographic particulars give an indication of the composition and character of the respondents that completed the personal questionnaire. It gives background information on the respondents, which is relevant for the analysis of the data. All the respondents were social workers delivering a service in Nellmapius. In this section the gender, age, and working experience of the respondents will be discussed.

4.1.1 Gender of respondents

In the social work profession one generally finds very few males. Nellmapius is no exception. The respondents were asked to indicate their gender. All six (100%) of the respondents were female.
4.1.2 Social work experience of respondents

The respondents were asked to indicate how long they had been working as a social worker, which is reflected in Figure 1.
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Figure 1: Social work experience

Two (34%) respondents indicated that they were working for 0-3 years, two (33%) others indicated 4-6 years and the last two (33%) indicated that they had been working social workers for more than 10 years. Figure 1 indicates that four (66%) of the respondents have more than 3 years of social work experience. Most of the respondents were therefore working as a social worker when the Financing Policy was implemented in 1999.
4.1.3 Respondents’ working experience in specific organisation

Respondents were asked how long they had been working in their current organisation. Figure 2 shows their working experience in the organisations.

Figure 2: Working experience in specific organisation

Figure 2 shows that three (50%) respondents indicated 0-3 years experience in their specific organisation, while the other three (50%) respondents indicated 4-6 years. Thus, three of the respondents had worked for a specific organisation for more than three years. For the researcher this data shows that the respondents should have at least some knowledge of how their respective organisations are operating. Thus the respondents would have had some knowledge of the extent to which their respective organisations implemented and transformed their services according to the Financing Policy (1999).
4.1.4 Age of respondents

The respondents were asked to indicate their age group.

Figure 3: Age of respondents

Figure 3 shows that all six of the respondents were younger than 40 years of age. Three (50%) respondents indicated their age as between 20 and 30 years, while the other three (50%) indicated they were 31-40 years old. No respondents fell into the 41-50 years or 51+ years bracket.
4.1.5 Main focus of respondents’ organisations

The respondents were asked to indicate the main focus of their organisation. Table 1 presents their responses.

Table 1: Main focus of respondents’ organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of organisation</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Child and family welfare</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Elderly people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. People with disabilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Community development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Counselling services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Therapeutic sessions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 1 it can be derived that most of the organisations have more than one main focus. Three (50%) respondents indicated that their organisation focused on child and family welfare, community development and counselling services. Two (33%) respondents indicated that they focus on people with disabilities and on therapeutic services, while one (16%) respondent indicated that her organisation focused on elderly people only.

From Table 1 it is clear that counselling services, community development and child and family welfare services are the main focus areas of most of the respondents’ respective organisations. These focuses are within the guidelines stated in the Financing Policy (1999). Table 1 corresponds with the qualitative data, where the respondents indicated that there were little specific services available to women, youth and people with disabilities. It also correlates to the sharing of information, which the respondents in the focus groups experience as not happening.

A contrast in the data emerges from a comparison between Table 1 and the qualitative data. The service providers indicated that they did have services for people with disabilities, but the service beneficiaries experienced that there were no services available
to disabled people. This might be because the specific beneficiaries of social services (respondents) were not aware of such services. In order for social service rendering to be effective and efficient, the service beneficiaries must know about the available services in order to access them. This was clearly indicated by the beneficiary respondents in the qualitative study.


The Financing Policy (1999) was implemented from 1999. In this section the respondents’ knowledge of the Financing Policy (1999) will be reflected and discussed.

4.2.1 First contact with the Financing Policy (1999)

The respondents were asked to indicate when they first heard about the Financing Policy. Table 2 presents their responses.

Table 2: First contact with the Financing Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four (66%) of the respondents indicated that they first heard about the Financing Policy (1999) in 1999. One (17%) respondent indicated that she had heard of it in 2000, while one (17%) respondent heard of the Financing Policy in 2001. The findings indicate that most of the respondents have been aware of the Financing Policy (1999) for the last three years. This indicates that welfare organisations are at least aware of the existing criteria for social service delivery as outlined in the Financing Policy (1999), and that social workers are informed about this service delivery framework.
4.2.2 Respondents’ knowledge on the aims of the Financing Policy

The respondents were asked to indicate what they knew about the aims of the Financing Policy (1999). Table 3 presents the aims as mentioned by the respondents:

Table 3: Respondents’ knowledge on the aims of the Financing Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aims of the Financing Policy which respondents are familiar with</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target groups</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on poverty</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible services to previously more disadvantaged people</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformation of services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on early intervention and prevention services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability of programmes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of service delivery levels</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 3 it is clear that all the respondents knew about at least one aim of the Financing Policy. However, this is clearly not sufficient to ensure effective service delivery according to the framework in the Financing Policy (1999).

4.2.3 Respondents’ knowledge on a developmental focus for social welfare service delivery

The respondents were asked in an open-ended question to indicate what they understood about developmental social welfare service delivery. The respondents’ views of a developmental focus for social welfare service delivery were as follows:

- Two respondents indicated that skills development is vital to a developmental focus on social welfare services.
- One respondent indicated that service delivery is on a one-to-one basis.
- One respondent indicated that social workers should be motivated to deliver more effective services and to promote self-reliant communities.
- One respondent said that sustainability of income generating projects to alleviate poverty is important for a developmental focus on social welfare service delivery.
- One respondent indicated that early intervention and prevention services are part of a developmental focus on service delivery.

Not all of the remarks are in line with the Financing Policy. The Financing Policy (1999) aims for a welfare system that will facilitate the development of human capacity and self-reliance within a caring and enabling environment. Its aim is thus to maximise the potential of individuals, families, groups and communities. Some of the respondents still work within the old social welfare paradigm where the focus of social services was more on a one-to-one basis. This indicates that in some of the organisations transformations of service delivery has either not yet taken place or it is clearly not understood what the shift from individuals to communities entails.

4.3 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FINANCING POLICY

As indicated in Chapter 2, government originally planned for the implementation of the Financing Policy to occur over a four-year period ending in the 2003/2004 financial year. In the next section, the respondents’ respective views on the implementation phase will be presented. The themes to be discussed include:

- Training with regard to the implementation of the Financing Policy
- Difficulties with implementing the policy
- Service delivery levels
- Special developmental areas and principles in the Financing Policy.

4.3.1 Training with regard to the implementation of the Financing Policy (1999)

The respondents were asked to indicate whether they received training in the implementation of the Financing Policy. Only one respondent indicated that she had received training by means of a two-day workshop, jointly presented by the Department of Social Development and her own organisation. The other five (83%) respondents indicated that they had not received any training, neither from government nor from their own organisation.
From this data the researcher derives that training opportunities on the implementation of the Financing Policy were not available to all the relevant organisations. It might also be that training was optional, as the Financing Policy is not a legislative framework that can be forced onto organisations. In this context organisations might not have regarded training as that important for social service delivery.

4.3.2 Difficulties with regard to the implementation and transformation of the Financing Policy (1999)

The respondents were asked to indicate whether their organisations experienced any difficulties with regard to the implementation of the Financing Policy and the transformation of their services according to the guidelines as set out in the Financing Policy (1999).
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Figure 4: Difficulties with regard to the implementation and transformation of the Financing Policy (1999)

Three (50%) respondents indicated that their organisations do experience problems, while the other three (50%) indicated that they do not experience any difficulties with the implementation and transformation as set out in the Financing Policy (1999). The organisations that experienced difficulties responded as follows:
- Service delivery is still focused on clients.
- The case load is too heavy; therefore there is no time to initiate community projects.
- The transformation from statutory services to prevention services is difficult.
- One respondent indicated that she had no idea of the Financing Policy or how it should be implemented.
- There is a lack of training on the implementation of the Financing Policy.
- The people-centred approach is difficult.
- The government has its own expectations, which are not properly communicated to the organisations.

From the findings it is clear that social workers and organisations experience various difficulties in complying with the Financing Policy. It could also be that the three respondents, who did not experience difficulties do not implement the Financing Policy (1999) to the same level or depth as those that indicated that they experience difficulties.

4.3.3 Respondents’ opinion of government’s time frame with regards to the transformation of social welfare services

The respondents were asked whether, in their view, government was on track with the implementation phase of the Financing Policy (1999).

Three (50%) respondents agreed that government was on track, while the other three (50%) said that government was not on track. The respondents gave the following reasons of why they thought government was not on track with the implementation phase:
- Services are decentralised.
- Government’s paper work is on track, but in practice it lacks behind schedule.
- The social workers’ workload is too high.
- Organisations do not know how to transform their services and no guidance was given on how the transformation should take place.

The findings indicate that some transformation is evident, although still limited. According to the researcher, the limited transformation of services may be due to the fact that organisations do not really know how to transform their services to comply with the Financing Policy. This links up with the findings discussed in point 4.3.1, namely that a lack of training contributes to the slow implementation and thus transformation of social service delivery within government’s time frame.

4.3.4 Target groups of respondents’ organisations

The respondents were asked to indicate the time that they spend on delivering services to all applicable target groups of their respective organisations. These respondents are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Target groups of respondents’ organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target groups</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children (0-18 years)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth (19-30 years)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older persons (above 50 years)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: HIV affected</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All six (100%) of the respondents’ organisations focus on children and families. Five (83%) organisations focus on youth. Four (67%) organisations focus on women and on
older people, while three (50%) of the organisations focus on HIV-affected people. Only two (33%) organisations focus on people with disabilities, while one (17%) organisation focuses on dependency problems.

To the researcher, Table 4 indicates that children and families are the main focus of service delivery in the respondents’ organisations. This is in line with government’s focus on children and the strengthening of families (Department of Social Development, 2003/4-2205/6:16). Although all of the organisations focus on some of the target groups as set out in the Financing Policy, the focuses are unevenly spread. This is understandable, considering the fact that these organisations have only six social workers in total to work in the Nellmapius community.

4.3.5 Estimated percentage of respondents’ organisations focusing on the following target groups

The respondents were asked to rank their organisations’ focus on the target groups by attaching an estimated percentage to the time spent with regard to the respective target groups.

Table 5: Estimated percentage of the respondents’ organisations focusing on the target groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target group</th>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81+%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children (0-18 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth (19-30 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older persons (above 50 years)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: HIV-affected Dependency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four of the respondents indicated that their organisation focused more than 81% of their time on children, while two respondents indicated that their organisations focused only 41-60% and 61-80% of their time on children respectively. Three of the respondents indicated that the youth receive 61-80% of their time, while two of the respondents indicated the 41-60% time bracket, while one indicated the bracket of 81% and more.

Four of the respondents indicated that their organisations focus more than 81% of their time on families, while one of the respondents indicated the 41-60% bracket. Of the six respondents, only five indicated that they spent time with families. This is contrary to the data presented in point 4.3.4 where all respondents indicated that families are a target group of their organisation. However, the percentage of time spent with delivering service to people will differ from organisation to organisation as they have various core focuses.

Three of the organisations focus more than 81% of their time on women, while the other three indicated the 41-60% bracket. Two of the respondents indicated that they focus 0-20% of their time on older people, whilst another two indicated the 21-40% bracket. Only one organisation focuses a larger percentage of its time on older people (61-80%). This is in synergy with the fact that the organisation delivers a specialised service to older people.

Three of the respondents indicated that their organisation focuses more than 81% on people with disabilities, whilst the other three indicated the 0-20% bracket as their organisations’ focus on people with disabilities. Two organisations indicated that they focus on HIV affected people, whilst one organisation focuses on dependency problems.

On average, children and families are the largest focus of the organisations’ service delivery to people in Nellmapius, as apposed to a minor focus on services for youth, women and people with disabilities. These findings correspond with the qualitative data where the focus group discussions revealed that little services were available to these target groups. From the data presented in Table 5 it is clear that holistic service delivery
has a place in social development. It is evident that organisations do not focus solely on one target group. Social problems cannot be divided strictly into categories and human beings therefore need to be approached in a holistic, integrative manner. They spread their focus to different target groups in order to be more in line with the requirements for transformation as set out in the Financing Policy (1999).

4.3.6 Social welfare services delivered to Nellmapius

The respondents were asked to indicate the social welfare services that their organisation delivers to Nellmapius.

Table 6: Social welfare services delivered to Nellmapius

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social welfare services</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselling</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster care and reconstruction services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty relief</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness projects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six (100%) respondents indicated that their organisation delivers counselling services. Five (83%) respondents indicated that they deliver community development, court work and foster care services to Nellmapius. Four (66%) respondents indicated that their respective organisations deliver support groups and poverty relief services, while one organisation indicated HIV/AIDS. Two organisations focus on rehabilitation services and awareness projects respectively.

The highest focus of service delivery in Nellmapius is on counselling, court work, foster care and reconstruction services. The service providers still spend most of their service
delivery on level 3 (statutory services) and level 4 (continuum of care and support). Table 6 indicates that some transformation has taken place within some of the organisations. The high focus on community development indicates that it is priority to service providers to comply with government’s requirements in the Financing Policy.

4.3.7 Respondents’ organisations’ estimated focus on the four service levels in the Financing Policy (1999)

The respondents were asked to indicate the service delivery level that their organisation was currently focussing on.

Table 7: The respondents’ organisations’ estimated focus on the four service levels in the Financing Policy (1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service level</th>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81+%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prevention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Early intervention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Statutory services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Continuum of care and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four of the respondents’ organisations focus on levels 2 (early intervention) and 3 (statutory services). Two respondents indicated that their organisations focus on level 1 (prevention) and on level 4 (continuum of care and development). The process of transformation is progressing in the respective organisations because of a larger focus on early intervention, but it also indicates to the researcher that after 3 years of the implementation of the Financing Policy, services in the Nellmapius community are still not transformed to a primary focus on level 1 (prevention) and level 2 (early intervention).
4.3.8 Respondents’ organisations’ focus on special developmental areas

The respondents were asked to indicate their organisations’ focus on the special developmental areas as set out in the Financing Policy. Table 8 presents their responses.

Table 8: Organisations’ focus on special developmental areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special developmental area</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special protection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivor support and development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime prevention</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 indicates that five (83%) respondents’ organisations focus on HIV/AIDS, whilst four (66%) organisations focus respectively on special protection, survivor support and development and poverty. Two (33%) respondents’ organisations indicated their focus on disability, crime prevention and substance abuse. The highest focus indicated was on HIV/AIDS (five respondents), followed respectively by four respondents each, special protection, poverty and survivor support and development. This does not correlate with the data presented in point 4.3.6, where only one respondent indicated that they focus on HIV/AIDS. Disability, crime prevention and substance abuse had the lowest focus, two respondents each respectively. To the researcher this indicates that the organisations that render social services in the Nellmapius community do focus on the special development areas as set out in the Financing Policy (1999).
4.3.9 Social services alignment with the principles in the Financing Policy

The respondents were asked whether their organisation met the principles as set out in the Financing Policy.
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Figure 6: Organisations meeting the principles in the Financing Policy (1999)

The respondents agreed that seven of the principles (effectiveness and efficiency, empowerment, family-centred, family preservation, participation, person-centred, and rights) are met completely by their respective organisations. Three principles (African renaissance, normalisation and restorative justice) had a lower focus in the organisations, whilst the other seven principles (accountability, appropriateness, community-centred, continuum of care and development, continuity of care and development, integration, and
permanency planning) had an average focus in the respective organisations. Their responses with regard to these principles were as follows:

- **Accountability**: Five of the respondents indicated that their organisation is accountable for the services they deliver, while one respondent indicated that they do not experience that their organisation is accountable for their services. Respondents indicated that social workers are responsible for their own work and therefore are expected to deliver accountable and high quality service.

- **Appropriateness**: Five of the respondents were of the opinion that their services are appropriate, as opposed to one respondent who indicated that the services are not appropriate. They mentioned that their organisations do a situational analysis in order to be able to prioritise the needs of the community and that they then plan accordingly.

- **African Renaissance**: Three of the respondents indicated that they do comply with this principle, while the other three indicated that they do not think that their organisation complies. Some of the respondents indicated that they do not understand the meaning of the principle and that the term is confusing, which explains why only three respondents’ organisations adhere to this principle.

- **Community-centred**: Five of the six respondents indicated that they do comply with this principle. They indicated that they comply because their offices are accessible to the community. The community is capacitated and involved in the planning of projects. The community is consulted on their needs and on the appropriate services to address them.

- **Continuum of care and development**: Five of the six respondents indicated that their organisation is community-centred. The five respondents indicated that their organisation provides care and development but that people in need of therapy are referred to other organisations. They work from a holistic viewpoint.
- **Continuity of care and development**: Five respondents indicated that there is continuity in their care and development, while one respondent indicated that there is not continuity in their care and development in Nellmapius. The five respondents indicated that their organisation is always available in the community and that networking is done to ensure continuity of services.

- **Effectiveness and efficiency**: All six respondents agreed that their organisations deliver an effective and efficient service to Nellmapius. Their services are constantly evaluated in terms of their impact on the community. This relates closely to the respondents’ indication of the accountability of their services. Accountability, effectiveness and efficiency go together and are interrelated with each other.

- **Empowerment**: All six respondents indicated that their organisations comply with this principle, especially through skills development, training and related information. These activities help the organisations to be more independent.

- **Family-centred**: All six respondents indicated that their organisations focus on the family by recognising family strengths and having family meetings and training.

- **Family preservation**: All six respondents indicated that family preservation is important. The children are cared for in the community and they provide parenting skills, groups and marital counselling to the community. Removing the child from the family is seen as the last resort. As indicated in point 4.3.4 and 4.3.5, families remain the main focus of the respondents’ organisations.

- **Integration**: Five of the six respondents indicated that their services are integrated. Respondents indicated that a multi-disciplinary team is important and that family reunification and reconstruction services are important.
- **Normalisation:** Two respondents indicated that their services comply with this principle, while four respondents indicated that they are unsure and do not think that their respective organisations comply.

- **Participation:** All six respondents indicated that their organisation strives to get the community to participate in projects. Community involvement is important and people are involved right from the planning stage in the organisations’ intervention activities.

- **Permanency planning:** Five of the respondents indicated that this is important to their organisations, while one respondent indicated that it is not important. Some respondents indicated that the children stay in the community and that their future is planned for. This relates to the qualitative data presented earlier in this chapter at 4.3.6, where the respondents indicated that family and reconstruction services are important.

- **Person-centred:** All six respondents agreed that their services are person-centred. They see each person or community as unique, although there was a remark that delivering person-centred services was difficult.

- **Restorative justice:** One respondent indicated that her organisation complies with this principle, while four other respondents indicated that they do not adhere to this principle. One respondent did not answer this question. Four of the respondents indicated that they will refer to other organisations and do not deliver such services themselves.

- **Rights:** All six respondents indicated that rights are very important to their organisation. The care of services is based on children’s rights, and they respect everyone’s human rights.
According to Figure 6 most of the principles are adhered to by more than 50% of the organisations. This implies that the organisations involved in service delivery in Nellmapius have in principle made a shift towards transformation of services.

4.3.10 Respondents’ partnership with other organisations

The respondents were asked to indicate whether their organisations usually work in partnerships with other organisations. Five (83%) respondents indicated that they do form and have partnerships with other organisations. One (17%) respondent did not answer the question. It is evident that most of the respondents’ organisations prefer to work in partnership with other organisations in the Nellmapius community.
4.3.11 Kind of partnership organisations

The respondents were asked to indicate the kind of organisations that their respective organisations have partnerships with.
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Figure 7: Kind of partnership organisation

Four (67%) respondents indicated that their respective organisations formed partnerships with organisations such as social welfare organisations, non governmental organisations and different government departments; whilst one respondent indicated that they also formed partnerships with civic organisations and community-based organisations.

Most of the organisations formed partnerships with other social welfare organisations, government departments and non governmental organisations. The different government departments indicated, include the following:
- Social Welfare
- Health
- Labour
- Agriculture
- Education.

4.3.12 Proposed transformation within the government’s time frame

The respondents were asked if they foresee that the transformation proposed in the Financing Policy (1999) will take place within the time frame (2003/2004) proposed by the government.
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Figure 8: Proposed transformation within the government’s time frame

Four (80%) respondents indicated that they thought this was not possible, while one respondent indicated that it could happen. One respondent did not answer the question. The respondents were asked what they thought was necessary to ensure that the transformation does take place. They gave the following solutions:

- There are no programmes in place to shift from statutory services on level 3 to services focused on levels 1 (prevention) and 2 (early intervention). Statutory services make up 90% of social service delivery. This correlates with the respondents’ responses in point 4.3.7, where they indicated that most of their services are focused on levels 2 and 3. Statutory services are important and cannot be ignored or reduced because the government expects it to happen.

- There should be more social workers in the field to lighten the burden of heavy case loads on social workers currently working in the field.
More funding should be made available by government and the private sector to enable projects to continue their work in the longer term.

Social workers should be motivated to stay on in practice.

More training is needed from the government on transformation of services.

Government’s implementation strategy on the Financing Policy should be revisited.

The Child Support Grant (CSG) is not a permanent solution to alleviate poverty; instead it creates more problems and leads to an increase in the population and dependency. There is no supervision as to whether the CSG provides or assists the children as expected. This correlates to what the researcher discussed in Chapter 2 on the CSG as no permanent solution to poverty. In addition to the CSG, sustainable and developmental programmes should be implemented to impact on poverty reduction.


As with any other policy, it is important that the Financing Policy be evaluated. An important tool that government developed to assist with the monitoring and evaluation of the Financing Policy is the Developmental Quality Assurance (DQA) tool. In the last section of the questionnaire, the respondents had to indicate their knowledge on the DQA and on the monitoring and evaluation of the Financing Policy. Their responses will be interpreted and discussed in the following section.
4.4.1 Respondents’ knowledge about DQA

The respondents were asked if they know about DQA.

Three (60%) respondents indicated that they do not know about DQA, while two (40%) respondents indicated that they do know about the DQA. One respondent did not answer the question. It is evident that not many respondents know about DQA and thus also do not know how the process is supposed to operate in practice.
4.4.2 Government team visiting respondents’ organisations

The respondents were asked if their organisation received a visit from a government team.
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Figure 10: Government team visiting organisations

Five (80%) respondents indicated that no government team visited their organisation to evaluate their services. Only one of the respondents indicated that a government team planned to visit their organisation. This respondent indicated that the visit had not yet taken place. The government’s monitoring system is clearly not well in place with regard to the Nellmapius community.

4.5 Conclusion

Of the organisations that currently render social services in the Nellmapius community, the key findings derived from the analysis of the quantitative data can be summarised as follows:

- Counselling, community development and child and family welfare services are the main focuses of the respondents’ organisations.
- The consultative and implementation processes of government with regard to the Financing Policy are not well planned for.
- Respondents have a good understanding of the aims of the Financing Policy (1999).
- Organisations do not undertake training for social service providers on the transformation of their service delivery. It is not seen as a priority to the service
providers. As a result the respective organisations experience a lot of difficulties with regard to the implementation of the Financing Policy.

- Although almost all of the principles of the Financing Policy are adhered to by the respondents’ organisations, practice indicates that their services are not yet fully transformed according to the requirements as set out in the Financing Policy (1999).

- Throughout the presentation of the quantitative data it is clear that children and families are the main target groups for social service delivery in Nellmapius. This is in line with the government’s strategy to prioritise families and children for the next three years (Department of Social Development, 2003/4-2205/6:16).

- Services are focused on level 3 (statutory services), but the transformation is filtering through with an equally strong focus on level 2 (early intervention services). This indicates that the organisations are striving to make a shift to transform their services in the required direction of the social service delivery framework of the Financing Policy (1999:14). More training opportunities are needed to provide the necessary guidance to the organisations.

- The organisations focus mostly on special protection, poverty and survivor and support services, which is in line with the special developmental areas as set out in the Financing Policy (1999).

The next section gives a summarised comparison of the key findings from the two sets of data.

5. SUMMARY

The findings indicate some agreement on aspects of social service delivery between service providers and service beneficiaries, for example in the areas of:

- Strengthening of existing social services in Nellmapius.
- More focused service delivery on women, youth and people with disabilities.

However, on other aspects, such as the accessibility and availability of services, there is clear evidence that service beneficiaries and service providers experience social service delivery in different ways. This discrepancy clearly calls for questioning the extent to
which the Financing Policy (1999) has succeeded to impact on the transformation of social service delivery in the Nellmapius community.
CHAPTER 4
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. INTRODUCTION
The literature study (Chapter 2) and the analyses and interpretation of the data gathered during the empirical investigation (Chapter 3) assisted the researcher to identify key findings and make conclusions and recommendations. In this chapter the researcher will indicate how the research goals and objectives were achieved and how the research question guided the research process. This will be followed by the key findings and conclusions of the study. Finally, recommendations will be made as a result of the research outcomes.

2. RESEARCH GOAL
The goal of the study was to determine the impact of the Financing Policy for Developmental Social Welfare Services (1999) on service delivery in the Nellmapius community. This goal was achieved through the following objectives:

- Conceptualization of social service delivery: Social service delivery was conceptualized within the theoretical framework of developmental social welfare and social development through the literature review.

- Identification of service providers and service beneficiaries in Nellmapius: Service providers were identified by using the systematic sampling method, whilst the service beneficiaries in Nellmapius were identified through cluster sampling. Their perception and understanding of the implementation of the Financing Policy in Nellmapius were determined through a personal administered questionnaire (service providers) and focus group discussions (service beneficiaries).

- Determining the impact of the Financing Policy on service delivery in Nellmapius: The impact of the Financial Policy on service delivery in Nellmapius in terms of effective, equitable and accessible developmental services was determined by ways of analysing the personal administered questionnaire and the focus group discussions. The research findings were presented in Chapter 3.
- **Conclusions and recommendations**: The conclusions and recommendations on the impact of the Financing Policy in Nellmapius will be made in the next sections. The key findings from Chapter 3 were utilized to make valuable conclusions and recommendations.

3. **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

The problem statement for the purpose of this study was that service providers struggle to comply with government requirements for transformation as set out in the Financing Policy for Developmental Social Welfare Services (1999). Based on the problem statement the following questions were asked:

- How much transformation has taken place after three years of implementation of the Financing Policy for Developmental Social Welfare Services?
- What services are delivered to community members at grass-roots level?
- What is the impact of the transformation proposed in the Financing Policy in Nellmapius?
- Are the services aimed at the most vulnerable target groups in society?
- On what levels are services rendered to the community?

This research study was guided by these questions as the following key findings will indicate.

4. **KEY FINDINGS**

From the analysis of the empirical data (Chapter 3) and the literature review (Chapter 2) the researcher identified six key findings, namely:

- Poverty relief is a priority need experienced by the Nellmapius community (see Chapter 3, point 3.2.1). The service providers indicated that it was also a priority for them (see Chapter 3, point 4.2.2). This implies that to address poverty in the Nellmapius community, service providers will have to work in partnership with the service beneficiaries. This is in line with the government’s commitment and signature to the commitments made in Copenhagen at the World Summit for Social Development (see Chapter 2, point 3, commitment 2).
- The qualitative data indicated that the respondents experienced a lack of social service delivery to target groups such as women, youth and people with disabilities; whilst the quantitative data indicated that there are services available to these target groups. However, the quantitative data also indicated that the services delivered to these target groups were limited, and therefore need more attention. If this is compared with the discussion on target groups (Chapter 2, point 6.3) it is evident that women, youth and people with disabilities are vital target groups of government. However, there are only six service providers delivering a service to the community and therefore it cannot be expected of them to deliver services to all the target groups.

- Skills development is of vital importance for economic and social development in Nellmapius. Skills development was indicated as a gap in service delivery by the respondents of the focus group discussions, which is in line with the Financing Policy (1999:14) where it is mentioned that services should be more focused on levels 1 (prevention) and 2 (early intervention). According to Castells (1998:14), economic development fosters institutional stability and trust, and thus underlies a model that integrates economic growth and enhances the quality of life. Therefore, skills development can be seen as economic development that forms an integral part of social development.

- A contradiction in the data emerged on the accessibility and availability of social services in Nellmapius. The respondents of the focus groups indicated that they did not know of specialised social services or where to find them (see Chapter 3, point 3.2.3). The service beneficiaries indicated that they did know about the CSG, and about counselling services that are available at the clinic in Nellmapius. However, the services are not accessible to especially older and disabled people. The service providers indicated that they delivered social services to Nellmapius (see Chapter 3, point 4.3.6). The findings (Chapter 3, point 3.2.1) indicated that the service providers did not make their services known in the community, which in turn results in nobody knowing or accessing these services.
- The consultative and implementation processes of government with regard to the Financing Policy were not well planned. Little training was available for the social service providers, resulting in organisations who want to comply with the requirements of the Financing Policy (1999:14) but do not know how to go about it. Therefore only limited transformation took place in most of the organisations.

- Service providers are in line with the Financing Policy with regard to the principles, the aims of the Financing Policy, special developmental areas, and target groups (see Chapter 3, points 4.2.2, 4.3.4-5, 4.3.8-9). The findings indicated that they are on track with regard to transformation as far as a shift from levels 3 (statutory work) and 4 (continuum of care and development) to a more intense focus on levels 1 (prevention) and 2 (early intervention) is concerned. However, from the findings it is clear that the social development approach remains an uncertainty for most service providers (see Chapter 3, point 4.2.3).

5. CONCLUSIONS

From the key findings the researcher came to the following conclusions:

- A lack of social services to women, youth and people with disabilities are experienced by the community. This indicates that the service providers need to focus more of their service delivery and manpower on these target groups.

- Service delivery needs to be more focused on level 1 (prevention) and level 2 (early intervention) to address the gap in service delivery with regard to skills development and poverty relief programmes. Guidelines as to how to make the shift is not in place.

- All social services need to be more centrally situated in Nellmapius to make them more accessible to especially older people and people with disabilities. This is in line with the Financing Policy (1999:5), which states that services need to be accessible to all people. The challenge facing Nellmapius is how to communicate these services to the people so that they will know how to access the services.
Some of the respondents only heard of the Financing Policy in 2000 and 2001, which indicates that the organisations did not inform their social workers about the transformation that ought to take place within their services. However, the findings (see Chapter 3, point 4.1.2) indicate that some of the respondents could have only started working as a social worker when the Financing Policy was implemented in 1999. It indicates further that while the Financing Policy was supposed to reach its first time frame in 2001, some of the respondents did not even know of its existence. The little training opportunities that were available to service providers were either not utilised or not sufficient to transform their services according to the requirements of the Financing Policy within the government’s time frame. Social workers neglect to become involved in policy analysis and policy formulation. As a result, they are not aware of policies and do not utilise them in practice. This contributed to the service providers’ limited knowledge of how the policy is supposed to be implemented and what the transformation entails.

Although service providers struggle to comply with the requirements of the Financing Policy, some transformation is apparent, namely in their adhering to the principles and aims of the Financing Policy, as well as in their focus on the special developmental areas and target groups of government. The service providers are still struggling with the transformation of their services from level 3 (statutory work) to a primary focus on level 1 (prevention) and level 2 (early intervention). These findings (Chapter 3) correspond directly with Ludik & Nel (2001:49) who indicated that social service delivery was still inadequate and unequal. This is the case, not necessarily because they do not understand the importance of the transformation of their services, but because social workers carry a too heavy case load and in addition, limited guidance from government as to how the shift should be made.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS
Following the research findings and conclusions of the study, the researcher made the following recommendations:
Service providers need to take up the challenge of improving the communication channels in Nellmapius with regard to service delivery. This can be done by holding community meetings and by involving important stakeholders in their planned service delivery. This will lead to services reaching the more needy people in the community which could assist them to build a better quality of life.

The case load of social workers in Nellmapius needs to be lightened by employing more social workers in order to ensure that they will have more time available to focus their services on levels 1 (prevention) and 2 (early intervention). More posts need to be created in order to address the increasing need that arrives from levels 3 (statutory work) and 4 (continuum of care and support) and to ensure that the developmental focus on social services is sustainable.

Service providers in Nellmapius need to improve and change their services to include women, youth and especially people with disabilities. They need to focus more on these groups, as the respondents of both the qualitative and the quantitative approaches indicated that they did not receive sufficient services. A one stop centre, where integrative services are available, could be a good solution.

A one stop centre in the middle of Nelmapius will address the problems of accessibility and availability of social services. Community participation in the way of raising funds for a building will ensure that everybody knows about the one stop centre and that they take responsibility for it. However, for the one stop centre to be effective and sufficient, partnerships with local government and important stakeholders are important. Social workers need to take up the responsibility to initiate a project, such as the one stop centre, that will be to the benefit of all service beneficiaries.

Government should provide more guidance and training to assist the service providers in the transformation of their services. Therefore, government needs to revisit its
current training programme with regard to the implementation of transformation policies such as the Financing Policy.

- Currently the DQA model is not working as effectively as it should be, therefore government should seriously investigate the improvement of the DQA model or should look at other monitoring tools to assist the existing organisations in their service delivery to communities and in the transformation process of these organisations.

- More evaluation research needs to take place during the implementation of a policy such as the Financing Policy. This will provide service providers with clearer guidelines on how their transformation of services should take place. It will also speed up the transformation process to meet the requirements in the set time frame and will assist the policy implementation process by identifying gaps that can be addressed immediately, as opposed to three or four years into implementation.

- The current revision of the Financing Policy with a view to develop new funding, monitoring and transformation policies should answer the following questions:
  
  o How can service providers effectively transform their service to adhere to the requirements as outlined in the White Paper for Social Welfare (1997) and the Financing Policy (1999)?
  
  o What practical difficulties do service providers experience and how will government guide and assist them to adhere to transformation of social service delivery?
  
  o Is the DQA tool practical for the South African nation and if, how will government monitor the DQA tool?
  
  o How will a balance be found in South Africa on a continuum where there is a need for social development on the one hand, and on the other hand, the increasing demand for remedial social work?
This research study was part of a team effort to evaluate the impact of the Financing Policy in the Gauteng Province. The researcher strongly recommends that this study should not be seen in isolation. In order to obtain an overall view of the impact of the Financing Policy in Gauteng, the findings of the other three studies (two in Tembisa and one in Atteridgeville) should be integrated and utilised for the analysis of the Financing Policy (1999) and recommendations for new policies as a replacement of the Financing Policy.
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ADDENDUM A

CONSENT LETTERS
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH PROJECT (SERVICE BENEFICIARIES)

PARTICIPANTS NAME: _____________________ DATE: ________________

Researcher: C. S. Nel

INFORMED CONSENT

1. TITLE OF THE STUDY

2. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY
The purpose of the study is to determine the impact of the Financing Policy for Developmental Social Welfare Services (1999) on service delivery in the Nellmapius community.

3. RESEARCH PROCEDURE
I will be invited to be part of a focus group discussion to determine the impact of the Financing Policy on service delivery in Nellmapius. The duration of a focus group session will be approximately one hour. I will be advised of the time and venue of the discussion groups.

I understand that the focus group discussion will be audio taped. The cassettes and transcripts will be kept in a secure place and will be heard only for research purposes by the researcher. Once the research has been completed, the cassettes and transcripts will be destroyed.

4. RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS
I take note that there are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research project.

5. BENEFITS
I understand that there are no direct benefits for me for the participation in this study. However, the results of the study may provide insight and knowledge for service providers in Gauteng on how to transform and better their services in communities.

6. PARTICIPANTS RIGHTS
I understand that my participation is voluntarily, that I can choose not to participate in part or the entire project, and that I can withdraw at any stage without being penalized or disadvantaged in any way.
7. **CONFIDENTIALITY**

The questionnaire will be completed anonymously to protect my confidentiality.

8. **DISCLOSURE**

As this is a focus group, each participant agrees not to disclose confidential information of any other participant. I agree to use my best efforts to prevent inadvertent disclosure of confidential information. I will treat such information with at least the degree of care that I treat similar material and information of my own.

I understand my right as research subject, and I voluntarily consent to participate in this study. I understand what the study is about and how and why it is being done. I do not give up any legal right by signing this informed consent form. I will receive a signed copy of this consent form.

I understand that I will not receive any compensation for participating in this research.

____________________   ____________________
Subject’s Signature    Date

____________________
Signature of Researcher
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH PROJECT (SERVICE PROVIDERS)

PARTICIPANTS NAME: ____________________ DATE: ________________

Researcher: C. S. Nel

INFORMED CONSENT

9. TITLE OF THE STUDY

10. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY
The purpose of the study is to determine the impact of the Financing Policy for Developmental Social Welfare Services (1999) on service delivery in the Nellmapius community.

11. RESEARCH PROCEDURE
I understand that I will be requested to (1) fill in a questionnaire in a group setting on various aspects of service delivery in Nellmapius; (2) take part in a focus group discussion with other service providers, to determine the impact of the Financing Policy on service delivery in Nellmapius.

The questionnaire will take approximately 45 minutes to complete and during that time, the researcher will be present to assist me with the completion of the questionnaire if necessary. The focus group discussion will take approximately one hour, and the researcher will be present as facilitator.

I understand that the focus group discussion will be audio taped. The cassettes and transcripts will be kept in a secure place and will be heard only for research purposes by the researcher. Once the research has been completed, the cassettes and transcripts will be destroyed.

12. RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS
I take note that there are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research project.

13. BENEFITS
I understand that there are no direct benefits for me for the participation in this study. However, the results of the study may provide insight and knowledge for service providers in Gauteng on how to transform and better their services in communities.
14. PARTICIPANTS RIGHTS
I understand that my participation is voluntarily, that I can choose not to participate in part or all of the
project, and that I can withdraw at any stage without being penalised or disadvantaged in any way.

15. CONFIDENTIALITY
The questionnaire will be completed anonymously to protect my confidentiality.

16. DISCLOSURE
As I will be part of a focus group, I agree not to disclose confidential information of any other participant. I
agree to use my best efforts to prevent inadvertent disclosure of confidential information. I will treat such
information with at least the degree of care that I treat similar material and information of my own.

I understand my right as research subject, and I voluntarily consent to participate in this study. I
understand what the study is about and how and why it is being done. I do not give up any legal right
by signing this informed consent form. I will receive a signed copy of this consent form.

I understand that I will not receive any compensation for participating in this research.

_____________________    _____________________
Subject’s Signature    Date

_____________________
Signature of Researcher

______________________________________________
Please fax back to the researcher at (012) 803 9712 and bring the original to the first meeting.
ADDENDUM B

PERSONAL ADMINISTRATED
QUESTIONNAIRE
1. **General Arrangements**

   Please complete the questionnaire honestly. Mark the applicable blocks with a X. For example: Male [ ] Female [X] It will take approximately 45 minutes to complete the questionnaire. If there are questions that are unclear, please ask the researcher for personal assistance.

2. **Biographic Information**

   2.1 How long have you been working as a social worker?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-3 years</th>
<th>4-6 years</th>
<th>7-9 years</th>
<th>10+ years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

   2.2 How long have you been working for the specific organization that you are working for now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-3 years</th>
<th>4-6 years</th>
<th>7-9 years</th>
<th>10+ years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

   2.3 What is the main focus of your organization?

   **Focus of Organization**
   
   1. Child and Family Welfare
   2. Elderly people
   3. People with disabilities
   4. Community Development
   5. Counseling Services
   6. Therapeutic Services

   2.4 How old are you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20-30 years</th>
<th>31-40 years</th>
<th>41-50 years</th>
<th>51+ years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

   2.5 Gender?

   [ ] Male    [ ] Female

3.1 When did you first hear about the Financing Policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3.2 What do you know about the aims of the Financing Policy?

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

3.3 What do you regard as a developmental focus for the delivery of social welfare services?

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

4. **Implementation of the Financing Policy**

4.1 Did you receive any training with regards to the implementation of the Financing Policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.2 If *Yes* on question 4.1, what medium(s) were used for your training? Indicate all the applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MEDIUM</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. One day workshop by Department of Social Development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Two/more days workshop by Department of Social Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. One day training workshop by your organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Two/more days training workshop by your organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Does your organization experience any difficulties with regards to the implementation and the transformation prescribed in the Financing Policy (1999)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
4.4 If Yes on question 4.3, what are the difficulties that your organization experience with regards to the implementation and the transformation prescribed in the Financing Policy (1999)?

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

4.5 After three years of implementing the Financing Policy, do you think that the Government is on track with the transformation of social welfare services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.6 If No on question 4.4, why do you say so?

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

4.7 What groups are targeted for services by your organization? Indicate all applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGET GROUPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children (0-18 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth (19-30 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Persons (above 50 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8 What estimated percentage of your organization’s work is aimed at the following target groups?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81+%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children (0-18 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth (19-30 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Persons (above 50 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9 What kind of social welfare services does your organization deliver to Nellmapius?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care and Reconstruction Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty relief, such as food parcels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.10 What estimated percentage of your organization’s work is focused at the four levels as stated in the Financing Policy (1999)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81+%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Early intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Statutory Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Continuum of care and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.11 In what special Developmental areas do your organization focus? Indicate all applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIAL DEVELOPMENTAL AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivor Support and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.12 According to you, do the services rendered by your organization meet the principles as set out in the Financing Policy (1999)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>How?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Renaissance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuum of care and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity of care and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness and Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Centered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanency Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-centered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorative Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.13 Does your organization work in partnership with other organizations?

| Yes | No |

4.14 If Yes, at 4.12 please indicate the organizations with which you have partnerships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Welfare Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.15 The government planned to have the Financing Policy implemented fully by 2004. This implies that it is expected that most of the service delivery will focus on prevention and early intervention and that statutory services should only form a small part of the total service delivery of an organisation. With this background in mind, do you foresee that the transformation proposed in the Financing Policy will take place within the government’s timeframe?

| Yes | No |

4.16 If No in question 4.14, what do you think is necessary to ensure that the transformation of services takes place?

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________
5 Monitoring and Evaluation of the Financing Policy (1999)

5.1 Do you know about the Developmental Quality Assurance (DQA) tool that forms part of the strategy to implement the Financing Policy?

Yes | No

5.2 Did any government team visit your organization to evaluate your services?

Yes | No

5.3 If Yes on question 5.2, when did the DQA team visit your organization?

__________________________________________________________________

5.4 What was the outcome of the DQA visit?

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

5.5 If you have any additional comments on the transformation of social service delivery in your organization, please indicate those in the open space below.

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your time and cooperation.
ADDENDUM C

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
IMPACT OF THE FINANCING POLICY FOR DEVELOPMENTAL SOCIAL WELFARE SERVICES (1999) ON SERVICE DELIVERY IN NELLMAPIUS

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
(Service Beneficiaries)

1. What is your experience of social welfare services in general?

2. What do you expect from service providers who provide services in your community, such as CMR, Mental Health, Heartbeat, etc?

3. Which of the following services do you receive from the government?
   - Foster Care
   - Social Security
   - Therapeutic sessions
   - Counseling
   - Support groups
   - Poverty relief
   - Food Parcel
   - Income Generating Projects
   - Community Development
   - Anything else? ________________________________________________

4. What difference do you think did social welfare services make in Nellmapius in the last three years?

5. How have social welfare services facilitate change in your life?

6. What services are rendered in Nellmapius with regard to the following target groups:
   - Women
   - Youth (19-30 years old)
   - Children (0-18 years old)
   - Families
   - Older persons (above 50 years)
   - People with disabilities

7. How accessible are the services delivered by service providers in your community?