**Qualitative transcription**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Code** | **Respondent 1** | **Respondent 2** | **Respondent 3** | **Respondent 4** | **Respondent 5** |
| **A1** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| **A2** | Social work services | Social work service | Social work service | Social work services | Social work services |
| **A3** | Female | Male | Male | Male | Male |
| **A4** | Generic social worker: duties services to children, vulnerable children, families and children such as foster care placement, child protection, family preservation services, services to persons living with disabilities, people infected and affected by HIV & Aids, substance abuse campaigns , VEP | Social worker doing Probation services, assessment of children in conflict with the law, attending court sessions, | Generic social worker: currently I am responsible for NGO services, monitoring of ECDs, DICS, and HCBC, registration of ECDs, assessment on six monthly basis and annual assessments, rendering services to people living with disabilities and older persons | Generic social worker: My responsibilities are general, I’m a generic social worker  Generic social worker perform all the programs within social work services | Generic social worker: duties rendering program social welfare service which include services to older person, person with disabilities, HIV and aids, substance abuse prevention programs, social behaviour change program, administrative services taking intake, assessments and also assisting in supervision the fact of the matter is I’m doing generic social work |
| **A5** | 8 years working experience | 7 years working experience | 10 years working experience | 10 years working experience | 7 years 6 months working experience |
| **B1** | **Mogalakwena Respondent**  I think it will make my performance to look better taking in to consideration some of my KRAs or the responsibilities that I am expected to carryout. For instance collaborate with com Dev as they are the once who usually do House hold profiling, because social workers don’t perform that and they are the once responsible for that and I believe they Identify a whole lot of problems and upon their return they are not even reported to the office or sw. so if they were to do that then after identifying those problems and they were to come back to us and tell us that they were to this area and they find out issues like this. Can’t you attend to them, meaning we were going to attend to cases that we were not even aware of. Duplication of work will be reduced or perhaps avoided. | **Mookgophong Respondent**  I really think it will impact it in a positive way, because it will reduce some of the work that you have to do in the case wherein you need to know and understand the community that you are dealing with you don’t have to personally go and Identify the resources that are needed in the community. You only have to find the information from colleagues from the sector of community development as they are the one responsible for House Hold Profiling. So the integration of services is important | **Lephalale Respondent**  You will agree with me that while we were at University we were taught of teamwork and in the very same department of social development teamwork and integration is very much necessary particularly with the section that I’m rendering of NGO monitoring. Wherein different sections such as community development finance and support is very necessary for one to can be able to discharge his responsibilities or perform very well. Because with the current monitoring tool its need integrated services for one to perform better. This integration will be an abler to our work. | **Thabazimbi Respondent**  I think it will have a positive impact in the sense that, duplication of services will be avoided and time spent on certain things will be reduced, because that information that ought to receive from the same family could get it from others. | **Modimolle Respondent**  Ok thank you very much this are the things I am actually interested in the integration of services and also multidisciplinary part of it. like I’m having the background in the hospital, but currently in the department if taking into consideration the hospital level of which I previously worked wherein clinical manager and social work manager working together for the betterment of the patient, but currently if you check you are having section of community work, section of social work even within social work we are having colleagues actually dealing with ECD, all of us we are dealing with the matters that impact a child, but we are doing those things in isolation like we do not integrate that. So at times is repetition of services or at times is non accountability because we do not know who is doing what a certain time, but if we were having an integrated services let’s take example of ECD approach I am the one who is providing child protection services, Ngo coordinator is actually dealing with administrative level of ECD and community development dealing with issues of NPOs. So if the three of us go to a centre like both of us we integrate I think the performance will be very much clear I don’t have to hear from CDW/Ward counsellor that a child is suffering coz we could have identified that child at ECD. So if we can integrate those services I think we can perform much better complimenting each other rather than competing. |
| **B2** | It can be possible only if there was willingness from employer and employees or teamwork, communication between us and one spirit that we belong to one employer. I think if we have that within us I think it can be possible | The integration is possible, because what we need to do is to look at the size of the department at local level and as the local level is the fundamental phase because is where operation takes places. | In my view currently is not possible, hence the finance people are based particularly at the district office. If each office was having its own HR or support staff I then think it was going to be possible, but with the current situation is not possible. | Yes it can be possible in the sense that, programs within the department are not wide apart from each other. Both social work and community development we talking about information which is more like the same, if you check what community development requires from their clients is more like the same to what social workers requires. So is not like they are too different things is more like the same information. The difference can only be when it comes to intervention. | Very much possible..very much possible if I will give you example, if we were able to integrate HRM and HRD at provincial level to be one thing, because the other one deal with development and the other with management of performance. That means even in the operational level like in our level we can still integrate it and have better services. Like for now we have a program for social relief of distress and community development is also having a program of community mobilization at times they distribute food parcels, at time we distribute food parcels and it seems as if we are competing, but if we were integrating I think it was going to be very much proper..i can and I think is possible. |
| **B3** | It will take me to my previous answer/respond. If we were one thing or united, currently one ought to acknowledge that in our department we still have shortage of resources and say for example transport if we had that thing that we are one thing, there was not supposed to be a transport issues in terms of saying this car is belonging to com dev and this car is for social workers. If they are available and they are not using the transport if they could easily say the transport is available so that we can be able to utilize it. It will sort of relief the department of the burden of scarcity of resources. | Having indicted earlier that you might not have to duplicate what has been done by you other colleagues might make some of the resources available because both social workers and community development practitioner will not going to the same place using different vehicles at different times and dates. One will not have to waste stationary printing the same report with similar data, but from different programs. save time by not duplicating House Hold profiling services | In line with PFMA I think there will be no unnecessary expenditure like is the case now. Currently what we are doing the community development officers more or similar work in different way. For example we go to ECDs centres for monitoring and they also do their own monitoring, the following day social work services also go to the same ECD for monitoring and finance people will also go and do their own things. However if we can be integrated and use one mode of transport I think we will be adhering to PFMA policy so that we do not do the unnecessary expenditures for the department. Meaning currently there is duplication of services. | Number one it will lead to proper planning and proper planning on itself it positively impact on small resources the one is having. It also allows the general population of the department an opportunity to develop a working relationship, because they share planning, resources and any other things that they are utilize to the maximum collectively. | That’s very good question and I think is going back to what I have actually said earlier, but look we are having two vehicles the community development practitioner is taking the vehicle to ECD, NGO Coordinator is taking this vehicle to ECD and I need a vehicle to go to home visits in the same area, so if we were to integrate the services actually the three of us can use one vehicle and actually be efficient and effective, because we will be doing services to the maximum impact to the clients we are serving. So if we integrate I think it will be very easy, we do not need to do what actually we call first come first serve to compete for the resources. Actually we can integrate we will save fuel, save time and save a lot of things, so it will assist a lot. |
| **B4** | I wouldn’t say yes, but I can only say sometimes meaning is not consistent as sometimes it happens and sometimes not, but most of the time it does not happen. | With my experienced within the municipality that I’m working integration does not takes place and we work in isolation each sector doing its work the way it sees. For instance you fine that in the case of NPO’s submission of portfolio of evidence for children accessing ECD you find the social work services is requiring that information from them at the same time the community development services is also requiring it from the same NPO’s. Remember this are the two programs working for the same department. | Like I said before the integration is partially taking place and it only takes place when the auditor general has given instruction for us to verify or monitor one particular organization. If one NGO is picked AG that is having some questionable issues that when we perform integration of services. But beside that is not happening currently. | Recently integration is not taking place, sections are functioning differently and we are encountering challenges of duplication of services, families being visited by two programs at different times, organizations being monitored two times by two programs working for the same department. |  |
| **B5** | Is either I won’t perform because for instance cases if not reported to my office after they came back from HHP meaning I will not be having clients and therefore seating in the office doing almost nothing as our work and there are interdependent. | For me it affects it in a negative way because might end up committing fraud. Because when the department was structured was structured in a way that both social work services and community development services will complement each other, but they are not wherein the community development is doing the work being done by social work service, which at times its create a burden with limited time. | It’s really affecting my performance because I’m not rendering quality services. Because the monitoring tool that we have adopted in this financial years 2019 in fact it enforces the implementation of integration services, but hence since we don’t have resources and we don’t work as a team it really affect one to not produce quality work. | It does because it reduces and exposes the weakness of scares resources, because the little that is there is also split into different programs. | Actually I can say it affect it so much because, like I will go to the same example, the community development practitioner is my colleague and is not driving, Ngo Coordinator is not driving in state of us going the same thing you have to take one individual go and monitor the ECD and tomorrow you take the other one that means I’m no longer productive I am now dealing with the driving aspects. Another issue is we are doing repetition at times I do not report with those children, because someone else reported them, so if we do not integrate it means I did not perform in fact I done it. |
| **B6** | There is no support no they just want report it doesn’t matter how you have worked to achieve that. They just expect month end you should report, but during the month there is no support whether you need what or what. So I will basically say there is no support beside the numbers that they want. They don’t even care as to how employees reach to those numbers all they want is number and nothing else unless you remind the supervisor of her responsibilities. Even the supervision sessions they are missing element of support but more of educational. | You can say yes and no in a sense that when you support me you must make the resources available. You may say you support me but when are no resources for me to perform my functions for me that is not support. It is not in a form of encouragement support, but in a form of wanting targets to be met. The concern is not how you are doing, but on targets and nothing else. Is not only as per my expectation, but should be as per standard of supervision, because supervision is to be providing support at all aspects to ensure the employees are having everything that they need to perform their functions. | I don’t receive that support that one in actual or in the real workplace must receive. I don’t know if is overwhelmed and even the style of supervision remember we have supervision framework which is says one supervisor to six social workers if I’m not mistaken, but currently one supervisor is to 13 social workers. She is unable to discharge her supervisory support services as required to every one of us. I don’t receive supervision as my expectation seating one on one with supervisor on daily, weekly, monthly and quarterly basis. | Support is there even though is not sufficient, because it goes together with resources. So scarcity of resources makes it difficult for support from supervisor to make an impact on the services that is rendered. When you talk about psychosocial support or supervision in the sense that one is expected to be exposed to maybe in services trainings or any other trainings that will smoothen the implementation of services I can say is little bit lacking, because support is not talking to services that are expected to be rendered. For instance if you get training on a program which is not falling within your operational plan makes it difficult. You can say you have support, but irrelevant support. I don’t receive them as per my expectations or as mandated by the policy on PMDS. | I will say.., and he paused for a while…I think our supervisors I will related to them like absent fathers, because they are forever in the meetings and they are too much attached to administration than support and supervision principle that they have to perform. Maybe is because of luck of integration, because they have to report to municipal level, report to district level and do not have time for us. So we have learned to cope at times that am here and am on my own and do things and if we actually have real supervision and real support, I think some of the things could have done them better. So the issues of workload other things we understand, but they are more of administrators than supervisors to the employees. I can really say I do not receive it, I don’t remember anytime I received support and I felt like really this people assisted me with this thing to attain my target or whatever goal that I have. Like, at time you have to do your own arrangements outside the work so that you can be able to attain some goals that you want to. |
| **B7** | I think it is important because it makes the work easier and maybe even quicker. It is a difficult question but it does happen with others with others it doesn’t, but I don’t think it is affecting my work or my performance. I think performance wise some are not doing well and some they understand why they are at work and carry out their responsibilities. | It assist me well because, we coordinate some of the programs together, work in a team and working in a team in a way is a positive thing. There are some of the things that will need you to work as team, because in social work is not everything that you can achieve in isolation alone as an individual. | Like I said if we were doing the actual work the integrated part we were going to produce positive and quality results particularly to the benefit of mass clients we are serving. Currently the only program that we are close to is social auxiliary since we are the one supervising them, but community development is having their own directorate working parallel that side of which is affecting the work that we are doing. The community development is partially referring clients to social workers and they were supposed to refer. After they conducted House Hold profiling they were supposed to analyse the data and refer to social workers and other key stakeholders such as psychologist, SASSA,OD and others, but currently they don’t do that. They don’t refer clients. | Work relationship it does even though is not fostered by the manner in which we are operating. Because at times scarcity of resources forces us to squeeze our services in such a way that it will accommodate us broadly. So whenever we work together it does have an impact on services delivery, because we are more likely to render services timeously without many hassles. | I think I have learned the hard way to navigate well with people and accepted that we are at the work environment and people are different, so I have learned to interact with them although knowing that there will always be conflicts we are human beings. But the relationship with my colleagues is helping a lot, even though we are not integrated we are trying by all means to integrate and assist each other. Like I said I drive them to home visit, do monitoring and that working relationship actually make it easy for them to perform and me to also perform that lesson the tensions. |
| **B8** | I honestly think I’m satisfied in terms of resources, because mostly is just a matter of typing reports and I do have computer and printer and I’m fine with that. In terms of transport to do home visits previously it was a challenge but not a major challenge. I think with proper planning a transport issue can be dealt with and everyone can have opportunity to utilize government if there is good management in terms of transport. I think poor planning sometimes results in people saying we don’t have the resources from both employees and employer. | In some instance you may say so, but resources of the department are very limited. For instance in the case of Probation officers you find one receives a call to assess a child in conflict with the law and don’t have a car, therefore disabled to perform your function by not responding to a call and this child need to be assessed before appearing before the court and at times the police want to communicate to you and you don’t have a cell phone and is after hours. For me the resources will disable you to perform your functions. | No we don’t have resources in the department. I can say the whole Waterberg we don’t have resources. For instance we don’t have proper office structure or accommodation and in one office we are seating being three, we don’t have tools of trades such as laptops, vehicles and cell phones remember our work we do office and field work. For instance if you are lost conducting home visit you will be able to call client for directions. They are expecting miracles from us and I think this particular problem we can’t say is HR problem but lack of political will with the current government so that they can release the resources so that we can work. | We still have challenges of tools of trades which are century behind and negatively impact on the service delivery. For instance you speak of information which will remind you of cases that need to be attended to. At times the system is still very much behind, sometimes you talk to tool of trade that speaks to what use to be a problem, but currently is not a problem. There is a mismatch when it comes to tools of trade. | I will say eh for my side although resources are limited, but I think that I have the tools that I need to do my work. I never struggled for a car for three days, I never struggled for laptop for two days, I never struggled for.. it will be issues of stationary of which a pen is something I can get at any time. So but the tools of trade that I have now is an office is a chair is whatever things and I think those are this that I need, but other things which relate to..and also internet connection it make matters of sending emails simple. So I can say I have tools of trade that actually assist me to perform at optimum level. |
| **B9** | I think they are trying to train us once in a while, but I feel like they repeat the same workshops. They don’t introduce or come with new trainings for other issues we deal with us social workers. For instance children’s Act workshop I personally attended that workshop I think three times and I know even some of my colleagues who even attended it more than two times and not only children’s Act but they are money which are repeated. This even led to reluctance of attending workshop, coz knowing it will the same thing. It could be as a result of poor recording and failure to work on what the employees identified to be their development or shortcomings in PA. It simply mean they disregard that the development plans of employees in others ways I could be assisting them to know which one need which type of workshop in order for that particular person to grow. | I don’t think so because the employer is not concerned with the professional development. Because in the part of development in performance agreement there is instances wherein the employees identify gaps where they need to bedeveloped and they receive trainings not based on what they have requested, but what they assume to be the needs. You will just receive a call that you should attend training on something that you did not requested or identify as skills gap. Sometimes they do training for the purposes of consuming allocated budget. I believe this is because HRD of the department is not well capacitated, as they are the once receive this performance agreements and check what training does individual employees needs and try to respond to that need. For instance in our department we don’t have person who is appointed based on the merit to be in the office of HRD or responsible to manage performance. They will just take a person who is convenient to them from any section not even related to HRM just to occupy the position. You find that this person doesn’t have knowledge of the responsibilities of HRD personnel. | If we were working in the real world or passionate with our work as social workers, for example were we work we don’t have library and the curriculum is changing you can see even the fourth industrial revolution is taking place right now. But if you go district level we don’t have a library and when you come to local level the same is happening where one can go back to theory and integrate it into the report, but we don’t have such things. | The employer uses the method of capacitating workers based on the workshop, in service training and conferences, but generally they are also not talking to expectations from the operational plans, the departmental business plan. There is a gap between people who identifies the shortcomings and impose that to workers. For instance providing workers with training of something which has got nothing to do with expectations of departmental business plan. | That’s very much good, I think the employer ensures that, like I will say I have received internal bursary which is through the grant of HWseta to actually ensure that I upskill myself in the relevant field of HIV and AIDS management and also in the program. But the challenged I’m having is I feel like am underutilized, because the job description does not change actually when you attain skill. I don’t think the employers is having a database showing that we have trained this person for this skill and how can we actually give him better or more relevant responsibilities rather doing just a generic work like altogether. At times you will actually try to sell yourself and sell your skills, but remember you are reporting to someone whom might not have acquired those skill and will actually have issues of tensions with your supervisor, because it will mean you know something that he/she don’t know. So at time you try to low down because you don’t want to be seen as someone who want to be too smart or undermine your superiors. |
| **B10** | No it’s a no for me, because I think there is no fairness in how they measure the performance. Even after they have decided that you don’t qualify for bonus, there are no means to come back to you and say your performance is not satisfactory and try to look for the reasons that leads you not to perform. So that they find the problem so that they can assist you to improve on that, but they don’t do that. They system is used mostly to discourage the employees and it was fair enough at least tell you that you are not performing, but at the same time come down from wherever they are and have courage to give you reasons why they think you are not performing. Also find a way of assisting me to perform well. | The problem is that I am not sure of the intended purposes of the system; because when you look at it the way is implemented it looks like it had been created just for the purpose of money. Because now every time we talk of PMDS we talk of money and when there is no monitory value attach to performance people will rather not perform and not care of the performance regardless of the performance they have signed with the employer. The purpose is being diluted and I think when the performance is based on money you miss the point. Because this employees must perform whether money or not and it’s a requirement.  If there was an appreciation whether is money or certificate or something that will continuously influence the employees to perform, but once you attach money you miss the point, because that’s where the problem comes. | No the current performance management system doesn’t achieve its intended purposes. For example if we were really achieving its intended purposes remember each financial year we sign performance agreement and at the last two pages of the agreement there is part for development where we identify area we like to be capacitated on. The very same HR or PMDS directorate it doesn’t take those things into consideration and now we are towards the end of the financial year, but no one went for training they identified. | No its not because the method used is not true reflection of individual employees performance. The method used is not true mirror of individual employee’s performance. So it’s not talking to performance its assessing something which is outside the performance. | I will really say it is not and is not going to if we do not change how things are done. Because firstly you if you are to use the same tool and give us numbers just distribute numbers say you are going to measure on that it can’t work. But I don’t think is also used for the development because the policy is part and parts of development, but I think currently PMDS is being abused as punitive instrument, as an instrument I will say to reward a good behaviour or reward behaviour that seem to be good to the once that are having power. We are using it to settle personal score; we are using it to settle personal vendettas of which are very much wrong. Even the moderating part of it is very much wrong because, they just look at it and look at the names decide on the fade. If you are raising you argument and opinion and questioning some of the things including the same PMDS, if you are going to question how they are doing it and you must know next time you are not going to get it. so being assertive, outspoken and speaking you mind will lent you into trouble in line with PMDS. |
| **B11** | I think they are not honest and I think they are intimidated by some of the employees. Because the assessment takes place in private place between supervisor and supervisee. I think some intimidate supervisors and if they are intimidated they will score them high scores, some is not intimidations per se, but how they present themselves with confidence that I have done this and you are not going to reduce my scores. If you don’t have the strength and the ability to push that your own scoring remains as they are then you will be compromised.  Maybe, maybe not I think there was a workshop concerning the PMDS. Some of the things are not transparent with employees, especially with information that benefit them. But policies and other information that threaten employees they are not selfish to share them. I wouldn’t say I know much of the processes. | My experience will inform me to say big no, because when we implement line managers look at the personal relationship with the individual employee and if we don’t have a good relationship you are sure you will not get the bonus but be prejudiced or rather punished. Mainly because you are not in good terms with them, therefore the policy in that instance will not be implemented fairly. For example there was an instance where we had a breakdown of a relationship and in terms of the policy when you asses an employee and you are not in agreement your matter should go to overseer which is the person managing the supervisor on two or three consecutive years I had indicated that I don’t agree on the scores I have been rated on and the understanding and the policy says if the is disagreements the overseer must come in and seat with both parties involved and try to reconcile the two and see how we can reach a compromise. But in the period that I have indicated that has never happened and I never heard from the overseer ever since a lodge a grievance. There is no fairness because it even reaches the office of human resource management. Even today I don’t know what they have captured on my performance because you can’t conclude on a disagreement. At the end of the process there must be agreement, so they went on without the agreement being reached. At times I don’t think the supervisors and the overseer have a clear understanding of what the policy seeks to achieve in broader terms. Even the training of the PMDS is not intensive as we are trained for an hour for a workshop which requires five days’ workshop. | Truly speaking she is unable to because of human resource challenges in the department, but she is willing to. She is unable to render in service trainings, unable to adhere to PMDS policy because of the environment that we are working in doesn’t allow her to do that. It is beyond her control she can’t be able to perform all the processes in this type of environment. | No there is still gaps facilitation and implementation there is more that could be done from the side of supervisors. I think if maybe supervisors could be more capacitated about expectations from them it will be better compared to now that their roles are at times overlapping so that’s why there is this imbalance. | I think my immediate supervisor is not well conversant with PMDS policy. Actually I will say it will depend on how much you put, not on what the policy says, but it will be a matter of how much you are arguing your point whether the policy say what or what. At times you can work and then the supervisor don’t report on your work, then come the review time the supervisor will be saying I did not report on that meaning I cannot review you on that. Because he did not report on it due to his technical errors or challenges. But because the office had underperformed that means there was mistake on the reporting of his, so now due to technical errors am now penalised. So those are some of the things that I will say it really demoralise me. So at time you just don’t perform or you just perform for the sake of doing things, but really are stressful. |
| **B12** |  |  | The HRM directorate is not fair, like you rightfully said that the agreement is only bending on our side not on the employer. If indeed they were taking PMDS policy serious they will be on monthly and quarterly basis be perform sides visits to make it a point that it is adhered to, but such is not happening. That’s where part of it comes | The HRM section is designed in such a way that is not talking to expectation from the workers, it is designed in such a way that it is general uniform, but not specifically talking to programs as they are unfolded on daily basis. That’s the reason it create loopholes of rewarding people who worked less instate of rewarding those who worked more who deserve it, because there is a gap in terms of assessment of performance. | I think that question is very much relevant if you can ask me who are the HR and people who is responsible for doing that, but if you can ask any other employee here around, they might not even know who are the HR people, because the HR people they only know them as people responsible for the collection of leave forms and leave register. But in terms of performance and your PMDS everything they are not there. Even the person who is responsible you might find that is a person from other section just assisting. That’s how the policy is not taken serious. No based on my opinion he doesn’t qualifies, even if you can question him on simple matters he will tell you that no my work is just to collect and coordinate, actually he is not going to answer anything even if you are having a frustration. He is just going to give you the letter and is not going to respond to anything cos he will tell you I don’t know anything. So the person given the position is not qualified and actually is not conversant with the same policy claiming to be coordinating so that’s a challenge we are having. |
| **B 13** | I am honestly against it, because it simply mean there high likelihood that one might not do his/her job thoroughly or without good quality as we will be chasing numbers and fabrication of those numbers. | My take is that there is nothing wrong with the usage of numbers and I will only have a problem if, we are only concern with numbers but not with the quality of work that we have done on those numbers that we are reporting about. We should also be concerned with the follow-ups of the numbers reported to see to it that we are concern of the services that the clients receives and try to understand what impact did our services make in their lives then they will be no problem. The department will only want to see how many people did you see and the rest is not important, but in the fundamental issues of social work that you have to do such as cases that will take you long before termination they don’t consider that and the efforts are watered down. At some instance you might arrive at the conclusion that we might be the one creating damages to the community. Because there are interventions that need to be continuous, but then even if you are interested in doing that you end up not being able because the time that you have is limited. As you are to chase targets for the other months and quarters. | Our managers are social workers, but at times I asked myself as to where did they acquire their qualifications because right now we behave as if we are working for statistic south Africa. Social work on its own is a helping profession and is a profession that we change lives of ordinary people, vulnerable people; however they tend to come up with targets. We are no longer rendering quality services we are rendering quantity services, coz what they are interested on is quantity than quality of which we are doing injustice to the people on the ground. | Qualitative method can be the best method to be used, because obsession with quantity is always driven by the current system, where people have to do more regardless of the quality that they are doing. So it is the best method that can be used to assess the performance of employees. | I think the quantitative method which is in use currently is not working. Actually we are just doing..i will give you an example if you go to school and give pupil attendance register as long as you are having that number. Whether what you made had an impact or it was effective or you were actually conversant with what you were saying, coz you can go to get people and get number so what? You just got numbers, does it really mean you have performed I can get 10 people, speak with them and make them understand, but you seated with 100 to 200 people in two second just cram the message pass and vomit everything to them but you don’t even capture a single person, but you are saying you have performed coz of attendance register. So is just a matter of number, so the quantitative method is not working. |
| **B14** | They should look at the quality of work and the processes I went through , because with quantitative method we do a whole lot of shorts cut and chasing numbers which compromises quality |  | I think we should go back to the basics and deceased from using numbers, but we can use numbers in terms of reporting, however we cannot use the numbers to review one’s performance and we must look at the quality of work that one performed at the end of the week, at the end of the month and quarter. Maybe by going to the ground checking with services beneficiaries and the community that one is serving and check if they are receiving quality services as opposed to quantity. | It can be many different ways for instance we can have daily dairies, where the usurers/clientele is assessing the type of services that they have received and then you integrate that with the current system, but taking out the element of quantity trying to balance the two wherein you give clientele opportunity and also doing internal measures in place. | That’s what I like very much, look we are social workers we are trained to work with individuals and groups and communities. The processes that you use, that you follow, the techniques that you have used, then I should be required to produce the qualitative report of what I have done without numbers to show if I have followed proper processes. You will understand that I have worked because I will quote the theories, swot analysis and I will actually detail the community processes that I have done in those reports. Even if I can see five people, but if I have followed the correct community work processes like I made you need identification, your collaborative, collected information from people and conducted community profile very well that means I have performed. But if you don’t have that qualitative report and you only have those numbers. What if got people from tavern and give them attendance registers? Meaning it will be a malicious reporting and is not helping the department. |
| **B15** | No, where it suite them they do, otherwise is number. Is either you fake the number based on the pressure. | You don’t have managers who are concerned on how our services are impacting on the lives of the clientele. Even the intervention is no longer informed by the needs. | They are partially concern, if they were really concern they were going to make it a point that firstly each and every sub offices is rendering quality services, is having tools of trades and the officers in such particular offices they will be able to discharge their responsibilities effectively and efficiently.. | I think generally the intension was to provide quality services, unfortunately because of the system it reward quantity in other words the system in place does not have any reward for quality, but it reward quantity therefore quality is being compromised unintentionally by quantity. | In my opinion the employer is not concern with the quality the employer is concerned with the quantity. Yes is because we have shifted from social work principles to service delivery principles and we actually dealing with how many people have we met and how many people have received our services. I mean the real change we need to make is quality. We need to deal with the how part of it, like how did you achieve it. We should not only measure the output, but we should also measure the outcome and impact on the long run. If we measure the outcome, immediately after rendered the services you do the follow-up, have evaluation reports and those are the things we need to know. Outcome is not of a concern to them as long as you with a list you will be fine, but if you are to go to one community and say I’m working then you are going to have a problem. So if you have reported with a community you need to move on coz in the next quarter we need to report with different names. But if we were to do qualitative work I will go to this community this quarter check and re-check and actually evaluate how are things, coz of expect to say a change process will be an event or change is a process it does not happen overnight, so it cannot happen on one awareness campaign. |
| **B16** |  | I extremely believe that targets impact negatively towards the quality of services rendered. The social work services offered to the clients in social development I don’t think is pure social work; basically we are not doing social work as required by council or as I was trained. You don’t have managers who are concerned on how our services are impacting on the lives of the clientele. Even the intervention is no longer informed by the needs. Remember money is attached to this thing so everyone needs to reach the targets in order to get bonuses. Though I have never conducted any study on this but 70% to 80% of employees what they report about on weekly and monthly basis in not true reflection of what is happening on the ground is just the information that is there because is required. Which is for malicious compliance and benefit of the employee because once are reaching them you will be rewarded. | It is not possible to produce quality services on those abnormal targets meaning it will tempt one to take registers to church, and social clubs in order to reach those abnormal targets. Employees end up faking to have conducted the campaigns and as a result impact negatively to service delivery. |  | I will give practical example I have to place four child in a quarter and the people are not coming and they are saying the father is known or maybe the father is unknown you have to advertise and you are having this target, the advert are not coming fourth that means you are not going to perform well based on those numbers. So you are no longer conducting thorough investigations by screening the best suitable person, but in respect of time and target you will go for whatever that is before you. If the person available is having everything required for the child/ren to be placed in foster care placement you will use that person. Without having to make thorough assessment as you are pressured to reach target of four. Meaning the best interest of the child/ren will be compromised on the basis of reaching target. |
| **B17** |  | The policy for me its silence when it comes to teamwork and in my opinion I believe it doesn’t promote that because I am still going to be rated as an individual and there are no instances where teamwork efforts are assessed. But we are only measured on an individual basis and even the targets given are for individual employees. | PMDS on its own makes employees to be selfish for instance currently few people were rewarded, but doing the same job. It makes people to be selfish and discourage teamwork. It influences people to be selfish in the department and to perform their work on their own than teamwork efforts. I think it must be balanced if people are rewarded let all of them qualify. Because it cannot be correct that the district had perform well but people who have done the work are not all rewarded. There is nowhere in the review were team efforts are being reviewed. | It discouraging it, because people are rewarded individually and at the same time it creates unhealthy competitions, because the scares resources that we have if we work together they are going to search for who contributed more so that they can be rewarded at the expense of those who contributed moderately. In other words teamwork is compromised by others as per current system. | PMDS does not encourage teamwork an effort is actually dealing with every man for himself. The policy itself is encouraging competition rather than complementing. Actually it encourages conflicts I will say coz for you to reach targets that’s means you must use resources more often than others and if you can be on equal level with others that’s means you are not going to perform maximum as you are supposed. If you are having one vehicle you have to go to home visit so that you can place the children and you do not find the family maybe on Monday then you are going to take the car on Tuesday so that you can find them. You no longer mind if whether others will get the opportunity or not. So it creates a competition than a teamwork and team efforts, it does not reward it. |
| **B18** | Target are given without consulting social workers and without taking into consideration the challenges faced by the community | In the past targets were just decided somewhere and we did not have the understanding of what informs the targets, we asked and could not get the answers. Early this year there was a session in our office and we were engaged on the targets to check targets that we think are affordable for us to do quality work which I think it was a move in a right direction. They were looking at the baseline of work that we have done to say out of this number if we have received 50 clients how much can we say we can give each per office. So they will allow us space to determine the numbers. But they later changed and came with their numbers as they usually used to do. Well it is not being informed by the volume of work that comes to the office is just decided from province or the district that we are going to give Mokgopong office this number of cases for placement in this quarter. It does not matter how many people you received in the previous quarters that will not determine given numbers. That is why we are having people who were not supposed to be placed in foster care being placed. | I don’t know where do they or maybe they consult with statistics SA or maybe the parliamentarians are the one coming with those numbers. Really I don’t know what informs them to come up with those numbers. Targets are not being informed by the actual baseline on the ground and they are being imposed to the ground. | actually they are distributed in such a way that in other municipalities they are not even speaking to social illness that a particular municipality is facing. The one municipality is used to benchmark others, programs are not talking to what the clientele is generally crying about and it is what the department think is bothering the clientele not necessarily what the clientele is saying | Ok previously I thought it is a research matter, to say this area we must give target because of this amount of substance abuse, but is not like that is not evidence-based targets. Is just emotional targets coming from province, so the province allocate to the districts and districts divide them amongst supervisors and the supervisors divide the targets amongst the employees. Some of the target does not make sense, for instance you give a social worker with one school the same targets with those with more than two. So for that person to attain the target given need to go to the same school maybe more than three times so that he/she can get that number. So it is not informed targets and is just numbers from the sky, we are told the more we reach them the more they will be increased in the next financial year. So to avoid that you need to keep your reporting low so that you can get low target. But the fact of the matter is we are not being engaged. The targets don’t speak directly to the real challenges of the communities or rather informed by need. |
| **B19** | Targets are not allocated fairly and shared equally without taking into consideration the size of social workers per office. | Targets are not allocated fairly based on numbers of social workers per each municipality, because for example many social workers have left the municipality and I can count more than six and they were never replaced. But targets are still the same and they will not even reduce they will go up. So you can’t say that is considered in my view is not being considered. | Targets are not distributed fairly without taking into consideration the number of social worker per each municipality**.** | No targets are not distributed fairly and actually they are distributed in such a way that in other municipalities they are not even speaking to social illness that a particular municipality is facing. The one municipality is used to benchmark others, programs are not talking to what the clientele is generally crying about and it is what the department think is bothering the clientele not necessarily what the clientele is saying. Targets allocated to per municipalities are not research based in other ways they are not informed by anything tangible | I don’t think those targets are allocated fairly in the municipality and even in office level. You find social worker having one area, but have the same targets with social workers with more than one area under their jurisdiction. For example distribution of social relief of distress, you find social workers working in township who don’t actually have high number of destitute family, but they will be allocated the same target with social workers working at rural area where most of the poor of the poorest families are situated. If the targets were allocated based on the capacity we were actually going to achieve a lot and make a change. |
| **B20** | I think for those whom never tested the incentive it will not be a problem per ser, because they were the once robbed by the system and this are the people who might actually deserve to receive it in the first place and unfortunately they didn’t get them. So it wouldn’t really affect their performance, because they came to a point that they conform themselves that they are not doing this for any reward but for the love of their work and the clientele, but not to please anyone or not to get anything in return. So unfortunately for those who were used to it, it might be a problem and even affect their performance and they might drag their feet and it might impact them in a negative way as their performance was purely based on a reward. | It’s a problem because they have created a culture of giving people money. So it might be a problem, people might say well we are not measured and we are not going to be compensated with money, people will decide we don’t care. So like I indicated this culture of money that they have introduced years back is a problem. So for me it might not be a challenge because when I sign the contract I did not signed it for performance bonuses, but for some people is going to be a problem that I believe may result in some protests. It may even demoralise the employees because people were growing salary wise. Those who were deem to be performing well after every five years were getting grade progression. People were protesting when the bonuses were not paid in time so when you stop it totally is going to be a serious problem.  I will say if it was possible, you know in social worker for you to be a supervisor you need to have huge years of experience if they can reduce that to four years’ experience and also advertise supervision post as the department is not complying with supervision framework. You fine one supervisor supervising more than 15 people and that should not happen. Also that within certain particular of years one grow from one level to another. They prior learning should be recognised and when one acquired qualification should get promoted. In department you can study and be master of social work by remain at the same level or even have PhD and but be at the same level with entry level employees | I think it will demoralise workers and if workers are demoralised they are not going to perform efficiently and effectively so. I think they commit an error by abolishing aspect of incentive. I think it was encouraging because it was rewarding and if you reward an employee with resources such as money I think it makes them to perform. But at the end of the day I disagree with it because there was no proper consultation to the ground or unions but even unions did not consult with us, but we only heard and seen it through media.  My submission is the very same performance bonuses on carryon and be implemented and start to be distributed to all employees within the department on flat rate irrespective because when you see the department has performed its means all people employed had contributed, because it does not single out coz it was supposed to say other employees doing generic social work performed. But the statement implies that all employees from management down to support services had performed outstandingly so. | I think good performance can be rewarded by maybe bursaries for those who which to further their studies and it will be serving two purposes of having more knowledgeable team and in return they will utilize the knowledge and skills acquired in the department. | Thank you very much, although I indicated earlier to say eh the performance and the numbers doesn’t really indicate performance per ser, but I think people are going to relax, like even those that we know are lazy, but because of this performance bonuses need something at the end they will rather push themselves to attain certain goals. But now if you do away with bonuses people are going to relax and wait for their salaries and thirteen cheques, because bonuses was actually one of the motivating factors to the people to actually perform. So if you remove bonuses people will not see any necessity to go extra mile. I can work on issues of awards to reward best performing employees, work on issues of holidays like other the department are doing, car allowances and furniture allowance something that will motivate people even if is not monetary value, or the employees who perform best should actually be given study bursaries as part of incentives and that will work and people will perform, because most of employees want to further their studies but they are unable to due to black tax. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**THEMES**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Codes** | **Recurring words, concepts, ideas and themes** | **Categories** | | **Themes** | |
| **B1** | **Positive impact to performance, reduce duplication of services, enhance reporting, improve collaboration and teamwork, complementing vs competing, safe time and improve referral systems, shared responsibility, address identified problems** | * **Impact on individual performance** * **Impact on teamwork** * **Impact on reporting and referral** * **Cost effective effects** * **Reduces duplication of services** | | * **Positive contribution towards teamwork, referral system and organizational performance** | |
| **B2** | **It is possible to integrate, both programs at operational level renders more like the same services** | * **Readiness for integration** | |  | |
| **B3** | **Reduce duplication, address transport challenges, enhance use of common transport, address resources challenges, cut costs, make resources available, save stationary and time, proper planning, impact positively on scares resources, improve working relationship and be efficient and effective, reduces competing for usage of resource, save fuel** | * **Effect on duplication of services** * **Cost effective effects** * **Effect on tools of trade challenges** * **Impact on planning** * **Impact on teamwork** * **Impact on efficiency and effectiveness** | | * **Impact positively on effective and efficient utilization of resources** | |
| **B4** | **There is no integration of services, partially integrated, working in isolation and duplication of services** | * **Services are disintegration** * **Programs partially integrated** * **Services are duplicated** | | * **Programs are functioning parallel to each other** | |
| **B5** | **It affect performance negatively, reduces the quality of work, exposes scarcity of resources and reduce productivity , duplication of services** | * **Negative Effects of disintegration on performance** * **Negative Effects of disintegration on service delivery** * **Negative Effects of disintegration on utilization of resources** | | * **Leads to unavailability resources and exposure of scares resources** | |
| **B6** | **Subordinates neglected, on their own, all the want is number, No support, little bit lacking, not receive it as per my expectation or as mandated by policy PMDS, irrelevant support, supervision session missing elements of support, overwhelmed supervisors, more administrative than supervisors, absent, only concern with targets, no availability of resources, not sufficient, no engagement between supervisor and supervisee, not talking to service to be rendered and** | * **Effects of Lacking support from supervisors** * **Effects of misaligned support from supervisor to supervisee** * **Effects of supervising many social worker on support** * **Effects of scares resources on support** * **Effects of administrative roles on supervision** | | * **A form of neglect to subordinates by their supervisors** | |
| **B7** | **It is important, makes work easier and quicker, affect performance negatively depending who you are, enhance teamwork, affecting working relationship negatively, impact on quality of work and effectiveness and efficiency and makes work easy, not consistent and not fostered** | * **Effects of working relationship on performance** * **Impact of working relationship on teamwork** * **Impact of working relationship on service delivery** * **Impact of working relationship on effectiveness and efficiency of work** | | * **It enhances teamwork and effectiveness and efficiency of services** | |
| **B8** | **Satisfactory resources, tools of trade century behind negatively impact on service delivery , addressing what used to be challenge, resources used to be challenge not major challenge now, proper planning and good management could address transport challenges, poor planning result in people saying there are no resources, limited resources disabling one to perform their duties, no proper office accommodation, over crowded in offices, limited laptops, cars and cellphones, mismatch of tools of trade with the challenges, although resources are limited but satisfied, never struggled for car, laptop for two to three days** | * **Impact of scares resources on service delivery** * **Impact of proper planning on management of resources** * **Mismatch of tools of trade on service delivery** | | * **Limited resources hinders employees to perform as required** | |
| **B9** | **Repetition of the same workshops, no introduction of new workshops, attending workshop more than two times, poor records of people who attended particular workshops, failure to train employees on what they identify to be their training needs, workshops for the purposes of consuming allocated budget, HRD not capacitated, incompetent people occupying positions, appointments not based on merit, lack of libraries, training not talking to expectations of operational plan, gaps between skills gaps and trainings offered, lack of database for people trained and lack of recognition of prior learning** | * **Effects of gaps between skills gaps and training offered** * **Effects of proper recording of training attended** * **Impact of incompetent HR personnel** * **Mismatch between training offered and training needs** | | * **Poor recording of trainings conducted and employees capacitated leads to repetition of same trainings and to the same employees** | |
| **B10** | **No fairness in measuring performance, not concerned about causes of poor performance, poor performer not given support, no performance improvement plan, used to discourage employees, purpose is diluted for money making scheme, purposes not known to employees and those championing it, money determines scoring, aspect of development not considered, only bending employees, system doesn’t give true reflection of employees’ performance, not measuring what was intended to measure, used punitively, abused, used as bargaining tool, used as disciplinary tool, to silent employees and settle scores** | * **PMDS policy intensive training effects** * **Importance of fairness** * **Abuse of the system** * **Concerns of money** * **Diluted purpose of PMDS policy** * **Importance of development** * **Importance of support for poor performance** * **Overlapping of reviewing panel** | | * **Lack of intensive training on PMDS policy to both employees and supervisors leads to poor implementation.** | |
| **B11** | **No honesty in implementation, supervisors being intimidated, system lacks transparency, processes are not known, processes are not properly followed, supervisors not conversant with their responsibility, grievances not addressed, lack of intensive training, supervisors lacks what policy seeks to achieve, no fairness, unable to follow proper processes, working environment not allowing, beyond their control, not adhering to the policy, no there is facilitation and implementation gaps, supervisor still need capacitation, supervisors overlap their roles, not conversant with the policy** | * **Lack of transparency** * **Poor facilitation and implementation of processes** * **Proper processes not followed** * **Lack of capacity** * **Un-enabling environment** * **Unknowledgeable supervisors** | | * **Lack of capacity from supervisors leads to improper facilitation and implementation of PMDS policy** | |
| **B12** | **HR not fair, their strategies not aligned to the needs of employees, incompetent people are appointed, appointment not based on merit, policy not taken serious, HR not playing over side role, not familiar with the policy, their responsibility not known, their strategies not aligned to operational activities,** | * **Lack of an oversite role or overseer** * **HR strategies not align to operational needs** * **Incompetent HR personnel/not appointed based on merit** * **Unfamiliar with the policy** | | * **Appointments of unqualified HR personnel at district office compromises fair implementation of PMDS policy** | |
| **B14** | **It compromises quality, encourages fabrication of numbers, impact less important, lead to early helping process, improper investigations, quantity driven than impact driven** | * **Negatively impact service delivery** * **Encourages falsifying data** * **Output oriented vs outcome and impact** * **Quantity driven than impact driven** | | **The quality of compromised as data is falsified and employees do not conduct thorough assessments** | |
| **B15** | **Be reviewed on processes followed, impact evaluation, service users assessments, daily diaries, and qualitative reports indicating process, techniques followed.** | * **Assessment based on output processes** * **Service users assessment** * **Outcome and impact evaluation** * **Daily diaries** | | **Performance to be measured through output processes, service user assessment and outcome and impact evaluation** | |
| **B16** | **Not concerned, partially concerned, concerned with numbers, impact no matters, will ensure effective and efficient services, provide tools of trade, reward quantity, quality compromised unintentionally, concerned with quantity, outcome and impact compromised** | * **Targets driven** * **Not concerned with outcome and impact** * **Negatively impact efficiency and effectiveness** * **Rewards of quantity** |  | | **Quantity driven type of approach** |
| **B17** | **Targets negatively impact services, intervention service, interventions not informed by need, impact lives of clients, impact reliability and validity of data reported, malicious compliance, impossible to produce quality services, abnormal targets, falsifying campaigns, poor assessments, and wellbeing of clients compromised** | * **Negatively impact delivery of services** * **Negatively impact intervention services** * **Negatively impact reliability and validity of data** * **Lead to malicious compliance** * **Encourages falsifying data** * **Compromises wellbeing of clients** | **Lead employees to falsify data and malicious compliance** | | |
| **B18** | **No aspect of teamwork, discouraging teamwork, encouraging selfishness, creating competitions, unhealthy competitions and conflicts, teamwork not measured and discourage complementarity** | * **Lack of teamwork indicators** * **Teamwork efforts not measured** * **Creating unhealthy competition** * **Encourages selfishness** * **Creating conflicts over scares resources** | **Non-inclusion of teamwork indicators leading to conflicts and unhealthy competition** | | |
| **B19** | **No proper consultation, not informed by needs, not research based, not evidenced based, or anything tangible, not talking to challenges of community, not informed by actual baseline, emotional target, imposed, not informed by needs, targets from sky** | * **Targets not evidenced based** * **Not informed by actual baseline** * **Not talking to societal ill** * **Targets are imposed** * **Targets not researched based** * **Lack of employees engagement** | **Targets not evidenced and research based** | | |
| **B20** | **Not shared fairly, not considering size of office, not considering number of social workers, not considering nature of area, number areas served, use one municipality to benchmark others,** | * **Targets not shared fairly based on capacity per office** * **Targets not considering numbers and size of areas served** * **Single municipality used to benchmark others** | **Imbalanced distribution of targets to social workers** | | |
| **B21** | **Create problem, demoralise, protests, relax, not perform effectively and efficiently, relax and wait for salaries and thirteen cheques** | * **Impact negatively on the moral** * **Negatively impact performance** * **Lead to protests** | **Aggrieved employees and low morale** | | |