
**SOCIAL WORKERS' EXPERIENCES WITH THE SOUTH AFRICAN
POLICY MANUAL ON FAMILY PRESERVATION SERVICES**

Zodwa Mosoma

Manager Social Work Policy, Department of Social Work Services
Correctional Services
Zodwa.mosoma@dcs.gov.za

Gloudien Spies

Associate Professor, Department of Social Work and Criminology
University of Pretoria
Gloudien.spies@up.ac.za

ABSTRACT

Worldwide, changes in the family have become more evident and families in South Africa are no exception as they are also faced with various challenges. In responding to these challenges, the Department of Social Development (DSD) developed a Manual on Family Preservation Services (Manual) (DSD 2008b), with the aim of training social service professionals to deliver family preservation services. This article, therefore, addresses the questions of whether the Manual adheres to the requirements of a policy document and also analyses the experiences of social workers regarding the formulation and implementation of the Manual. The researchers adopted an explanatory design, which is a form of mixed methods research. The quantitative empirical results revealed some limitations in the formulation of the Manual which were also confirmed by the social workers who were interviewed. The study also revealed a vital role played by social workers in the implementation of family preservation services, despite challenging circumstances of their work environment, which included limited resources and high caseloads.

Keywords: family preservation services, families, Manual on Family Preservation Services, Draft National Family Policy, Social Work Service Professionals, social workers

INTRODUCTION

The South African Department of Social Development produced the *Draft National Family Policy* (DSD, 2008a) and accordingly developed the 2008 *Manual on Family Preservation Services* (DSD, 2008b) with the aim of training social service professionals to deliver services to families from a family preservation perspective. In order for the programme to be implemented efficiently, the *Norms and Standards Policy on Developmental Social Welfare Services* (DSD, 2007) mandates the roll-out of the training and education by all provinces. Thus all social service professionals are mandated to implement family preservation services as stipulated by the *Norms and Standards Policy on Developmental Social Welfare Services* and the *Draft National Family Policy*.

Family preservation is defined in the *Manual* (DSD, 2008b) as a strategy, an approach or a philosophy based on the belief that family members need their family in order to develop to their full potential. According to Helton and Jackson (1997), family preservation services are services that aim to preserve families over time, regardless of any disruption. In some cases, it may be necessary to place a child in foster care, but this does not necessarily mean that the service model has failed (Cash, 2001). One of the authors was responsible for monitoring the implementation of family preservation services in all provinces as one of her key performance areas in DSD. Through her interactions with social service professionals in the provinces, the inadequacy and inconsistency in reporting of family preservation services among social service professionals was observed. Two experts who are coordinating the implementation of family preservation services in the South African provinces were consulted and they shared the same sentiments.

These challenges are also reflected in the Annual Report of the financial year 2013 of the Department of Social Development which shows an increase of 31% (157 024) in the number of children accessing foster care services from 4 - 7% (23 873) during the 2011/12 financial year (Department of Social Development, 2013). The researchers were therefore motivated to investigate these challenges further.

The goal of this study was to analyse the formulation of the *Manual* and the experiences of social workers regarding the *Manual's* formulation and implementation to draw conclusions and make recommendations regarding the further formulation and implementation of the *Manual on Family Preservation Services*.

The outcome of this study is to improve service delivery to families, by ensuring that recommendations are made regarding the formulation and the implementation of the *Manual* and presented to the Department of Social Development for implementation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theory is defined as “a set of statements that explains why a particular phenomenon occurs” (Benokraitis, 2011:32). It is also viewed as “an attempt to explain and/or predict a particular phenomenon” (De Vos, 2005b:36). With regard to family preservation services, a theoretical framework is useful for practitioners to analyse and interpret family issues and enable them to locate these issues in the broader society (DSD, 2008a). The **system's perspective**, a theoretical framework relevant to this study, attempts to specify the mechanisms by which families adapt to their internal and external conditions (Eshleman

and Bulcraft, 2010). Although the Manual does not mention the system's theory as its theoretical framework, social workers valued this theory's contribution in the implementation of family preservation services. This is in line with Goldenberg and Goldenberg's (1998) views that it provides counsellors with a way to organise their thinking about people and the origins of people's dysfunctional behaviour. However, it is important that practitioners use more than one theoretical framework because reality is complex and family issues are diverse.

Family dynamics can be analysed according to the phases of **the family life cycle model**. This life cycle model was implemented in this study as a way to understand the different challenges that families encounter in their lifetimes. According to Becvar and Becvar (2006), there is ample evidence that family stresses, which are likely to occur around the life cycle transition points, create disruptions of the life cycle, and produce symptoms and dysfunction. When a sense of motion becomes lost or distorted, intervention can involve restoring a sense of life as a process and as movement (McGoldrick, Carter and Garcia-Preto, 2011). The *Manual* aligns itself with this model and the implementers of family preservation services referred to this model as very useful in locating family's dysfunctional behaviour.

Family preservation has been used to describe a variety of programmes that are intended to provide services to children and families (*Evaluation of Family Preservation and Reunification Program: Interim Report*, 2001), and South Africa is no exception, as family preservation is described "as services to families that focus on family strengths in order to keep them together as far as possible" (DSD, 2008a:47). Various authors share similar views with regard to the nature of these services that they are family centred, have a crisis orientation, being of short duration and delivered in the home (Strydom, 2010; Berry, 1999; Puyenbroeck, Loots, Grietens, Jacquet, Vanderfaeillie, and Escudero, 2009 and DSD, 2008b). Due to several broad definitions presented in the *Manual*, the study revealed that social workers reflect vague knowledge and understanding of the definition of the concept of family preservation services. Thus, a clear and precise definition of family preservation services should be provided for the South African context.

In order to analyse the formulation of the *Manual* and precisely respond to the study question of whether the *Manual* is formulated according to the policy requirements, it became important and necessary to include the **stages of the policy cycle** in the literature review. Tshishonga and Mafema (2010) explain that policy processes may seem different, but all have the same goal, namely identifying the problem and finding solutions. Chambers (2000:83) also advises that "if objectives are to be of maximal use, they must specify clearly who is to be affected, what is to be changed, or whose circumstances or surroundings are the target of the change efforts". The study revealed that the objectives are omitted in the *Manual* and this has been identified as a limitation with regard to effective execution of family preservation services.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this study, an **explanatory mixed methods research design** appeared to be the most appropriate design, because the researchers began by collecting and analysing quantitative data on the formulation of the *Manual* using a checklist. In order to increase the validity and reliability of the meanings of the characteristics and descriptions included in the

checklist, as recommended by Strydom and Delpont (2005), two officials from DSD, who were among the people responsible for the formulation of the *Manual*, were interviewed. With the consent of the participants, the researchers then collected and analysed qualitative data while maintaining confidentiality throughout the research study. Semi-structured interviews were used to collect the qualitative data, because this method does well at bringing a researcher to an understanding of complex issues and is particularly useful for examining contemporary, real-life situations (Soy, 2006). However, in order to enhance the credibility of the study, research procedures and findings were discussed with several colleagues who were outside the context of the study as a form of peer debriefing (Babbie and Mouton, 2011).

Two **populations** were used in this study: first, the *Manual*, and second, social workers who are involved in the implementation of the *Manual*, specifically in the Social Development sector in all provinces. A population is referred to as the “totality of persons, events, organisations units, case records or other sampling units with which the research problem is concerned” (Strydom, 2005:194).

The researchers regarded the *Manual* as one type of the population because they were interested in analysing its formulation, as it is the only *Manual* focused on family preservation services that is used by social workers in the DSD. The *Annual Report* of the DSD (2009) indicated that training on family preservation services was provided to 40 service providers in each province on all levels of service delivery. This means that the expectation was that the number of 360 service providers trained rolled out the training to their respective districts. Based on the assumption that such training had been carried out, three main criteria were used to define the population of social workers to participate in this study – the population consisted of social workers who:

- worked in the Social Development Sector, in other words, were employed by the DSD and/or employed by the NGOs subsidised by the DSD;
- were trained on the *Manual*; and
- were implementing family preservation services.

With regard to the document sample, the researchers analysed only the *Manual*, therefore, no sample or sampling method was required, as it was the only document involved.

For this study, the researchers designed a checklist to analyse the formulation of the content of the *Manual*. Delpont (2005:179) defines a **checklist** as a “type of questionnaire consisting of a series” of statements or themes. In this study, as recommended by Delpont (2005), the checklist was designed to analyse whether the *Manual* was formulated according to the requirements of a policy document. In order to analyse the processes, influences and outcome of the policy documents, Gray and Sewpaul (1998) recommend the use of Gil’s (1992) framework as a guide. In designing the checklist, the researchers used the *Draft National Family Policy* as a policy document that guided the development of the *Manual*. Gil’s (1992) framework was also used as a guide in the development of the checklist, as recommended by Gray and Sewpaul (1998).

The researchers also employed a semi-structured interview schedule to explore the experiences of twenty (20) social workers regarding the formulation and implementation of the *Manual*. This is a small sample in terms of representing social workers in the country.

In total 37 social workers were originally interviewed, but because it transpired that 17 had never attended any training on the *Manual*, their data were excluded from the empirical study, even though they are implementing family preservation services. The researchers used stratified random and simple random sampling, both categorised under probability sampling, to select social workers involved in the implementation of the *Manual* in nine provinces.

After using latent coding for content analysis, as recommended by Babbie and Mouton (2011), the researchers employed quantitative data analysis methods to manually assess the formulation of the *Manual*. Characteristics in the checklist were individually explained and interpreted. In the qualitative data analysis, the researchers adopted Creswell's model of data analysis. According to De Vos (2005a), this model contains a series of steps namely, data collection; data management; reading and memoing; description, classification and interpretation; and representation and visualisation.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The discussion on the research findings will be presented in two sections namely:

- The **quantitative empirical results**, which were collected by means of the content analysis; and the **qualitative themes** which were identified through the semi-structured interviews will be presented in the form of tables
- Discussion of the main themes from both quantitative and qualitative findings will be presented and supported by narratives from the transcribed interviews and also be complimented by a literature control.

The quantitative findings of the *Manual* can be summarised as follows:

Table1: Scores obtained on the *Manual on Family Preservation Services*

No	Characteristics	Descriptions	Scores
1	Definition: The <i>Manual</i> defines family preservation services objectively as a policy directive	Clearly	0
		Operationally	0
		In measurable terms	0
2	Aim: The <i>Manual</i> specifically states the aim of family preservation services	Clearly	1
		In broad terms	1
3	Objectives: The <i>Manual</i> specifies the objectives	Clearly	0
		Specifically	0
		In measurable terms	0
		In an operational manner	0
4	Theoretical framework: The <i>Manual</i> stipulates how the development of the <i>Manual</i> is standardised according to the different theoretical frameworks cited in the <i>Draft National Family Policy</i>	Life cycle	1
		Systems approach	0
		Social development approach	0
5	Characteristics: The <i>Manual</i> indicates how the key interventions of the <i>Draft National Family Policy</i> are executed	Family strengthening	1
		Enhancing family resilience and family preservation	0
		Focusing on families at risk and providing care to vulnerable members	1
		Engaging traditional and religious structures	0
		Provision of social services	1
		Peace and security programmes	1
		Human rights and democracy advocacy	0
		Linking family strengthening to the moral regeneration campaign	0
		Growing the economy and sustaining human development	1
Employment creation	0		

No	Characteristics	Descriptions	Scores
6	Target group: The <i>Manual</i> states whose circumstances or surroundings are the target of the change efforts	Families at risk	1
		Families in crisis	1
		Families in transition	1
7	Role players: The <i>Manual</i> states critical role players required for the implementation of the family preservation services	Relevant government departments	1
		Social service practitioners	1
		Volunteers	0
		Civil society	1
8	Implementation instruments: The <i>Manual</i> states the required tools for the implementation of family preservation services	Budget	0
		Infrastructure / physical facilities	0
		Organisations	1
		Personnel	1
		Policy and legislative framework	1
9	Process: The <i>Manual</i> guides the implementation of family preservation services through a specific process cited in the <i>Draft National Family Policy</i>	Identifying the needs and challenges of a family	1
		Recognising the resources that the family has	1
		Identifying family strengths and priorities	1
		Coordinating the roles of various agencies involved	1
		Identifying unmet needs, gaps and support	1
		Developing strategies for intervention	1
10	Implementation challenges: The <i>Manual</i> clearly indicates how it intends to respond to possible challenges during the implementation process	Clients and coalitions	0
		Capacity	1
		Commitment	1
		Context	1
		Content of the policy	1
		Top-down approach	1
		Bottom-up approach	0
11	Monitoring and evaluation: The <i>Manual</i> lists individuals, groups or organisations which will participate in the monitoring and evaluation of services	Target groups	0
		Programme managers	0
		Evaluation and research individuals	0
		Stakeholders	0

The qualitative findings of the manual can be summarised as follows:

Table 2: Themes and sub-themes

Theme	Sub-theme(s)
Theme 1: Definition of the concept of family preservation services	
Theme 2: The aim of family preservation services	
Theme 3: The objectives of family preservation services	
Theme 4: Perceptions regarding the quality of the formulation of the <i>Manual</i>	
Theme 5: The theoretical framework of family preservation services	
Theme 6: The process followed in enabling families to access family preservation services	
Theme 7: The process followed to assess the developmental needs of a family	
Theme 8: The process followed to develop a family developmental plan	
Theme 9: The intervention process employed during the implementation of family preservation services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement of other stakeholders
Theme 10: Views on the role of social workers in the implementation of family preservation services	
Theme 11: The availability of resources to support the implementation of family preservation services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficiency of funds
Theme 12: Experiences regarding the implementation process of family preservation services	
Theme 13: Views on training needs for social workers in the implementation of family preservation services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for further training

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The following is the discussion of the main themes, drawing on both quantitative and qualitative empirical findings.

Definition

According to Roux (2000), policy documents are expected to define an issue under review in detail, using clear, operational and measurable terms. Jann and Wegrich (2006) also emphasise the importance of formulating a clear definition of a social problem. For Fouché

(2005), the problem that a policy document wants to address should be defined in clear and measurable terms so that the reader will understand what the focus of the services need to be. The quantitative results indicated that the definition of family preservation as presented in the *Manual* is too broad to be measured, and therefore is not clear and operational. This finding was also confirmed by the experiences of the social workers who were interviewed. Through qualitative findings, it was found that most social workers' responses regarding the definition of family preservation reflected a vague understanding, as they could not define the focus of their services beyond "keeping families together" or "preserving" families. Their responses made this evident:

"It is a process of keeping families together and avoiding removal of any member of the family."

"It is a way of keeping families together, not necessarily staying together or physical unity, but keeping the structure and it extends beyond nuclear family."

"To make sure that family stick together, as they are a focal point of society."

The researchers attribute this vague understanding to the broad definition of family preservation services as presented in the *Manual*. Thus the manner in which the *Manual* defines family preservation may cause confusion among implementers of family preservation services.

Objectives

Emphasising the importance of specification of objectives, Gil (1992) states that the objectives of social policies constitute key criteria for the evaluation of their social significance and the analysis of their effectiveness. Tshishonga and Mafema (2010) also caution that a statement of the problem leads nowhere if clear goals and objectives are not identified and formulated. The quantitative results revealed that the objectives are omitted in the *Manual on Family Preservation Services*. However, the qualitative findings indicated that the social workers conflated the stated aims with objectives (they states the aims when they were asked about the objectives). This became clear from responses such as the following:

"It is to keep families together and strengthen family relationships that are what I can think of."

"I am not sure, it is to keep families together, avoid removal of family members from their families."

The confusion among these social workers regarding the objectives confirmed the quantitative findings. The researchers are of the opinion that objectives are supposed to give direction to the implementation process. Therefore, the omission of explicit objectives in the *Manual* undermines many processes that could lead to the successful implementation of these services.

Theoretical framework

Gil (1992:79) points out that "once the objectives and value premises of a policy are clarified, theories or hypotheses underlying policy strategy should be made explicit".

In the quantitative data analysis, it was found that the *Manual* recommends the family life cycle model, a developmental approach, family preservation and an integrated approach. By contrast the *Draft National Family Policy* recommends the life cycle model, a systems approach and social development as the theoretical frameworks to be considered in rendering services to families. Thus, the life cycle is the only model that the *Draft Policy* and the *Manual* have in common.

Not surprisingly, then, the responses of most participants showed a lack of clarity on the theoretical frameworks mentioned in the *Manual*, because some spoke of a systems approach, which is only mentioned in the *Draft Policy*, while others also referred to theories that are not even listed in the *Manual*. Only a few participants mentioned the family life cycle model, which is in the *Manual*. Given that the *Draft Policy* is the key document that informed the development of the *Manual*, these differences with regard to the theoretical frameworks have the potential to pose challenges to the implementers of family services. This is reflected on the following responses:

“A life cycle helps us to know where we are as a family.”

“I think it is all the approaches, like the systems approach and I am not sure about other approaches.”

“Family life cycle approach and systems theory.”

Some authors propose and/or discuss different models for family preservation services which are also different from the *Manual*, namely a crisis intervention model, a home-based model, and a family treatment model (*Evaluation of Family Preservation and Reunification Program*, 2001; Hepworth, Rooney and Larsen, 2002; Nelson, Landsman and Deutelbaum, 1990).

The *Manual* also fails to distinguish clearly between a model and a theoretical approach. For example, the family life cycle is a useful model for family therapists, because it assists in the processes of understanding and assessing the functioning of families. A theoretical approach on the other hand, refers to the way the professional person will think and approach a person, family or system (Goldenberg and Goldenberg, 2002). The *Manual* refers to a model and a theoretical approach as if they were the same concept. De Vos (2005b:39) explains that the difference between a theory and model is that “a model springs from theory” as they bear a number of important similarities. It is therefore vital that a distinction be made between the models and the theoretical frameworks for the benefit of the implementers.

Implementation instruments

The quantitative analysis showed that the *Manual* does not refer to any specific human resources, infrastructure or financial means of implementing family preservation services. The participants also reported that no disaggregated funds are allocated for family preservation services. The funding provided to NGOs was regarded as limited, and participants indicated that such funding was paid irregularly. Brynard, Cloete and De Coning (2013) indicate that capacity with regard to policy implementation obviously refers to the availability of and access to concrete and tangible resources (human, financial, logistical and technological resources). Regarding implementation instruments, Rushefsky (1996) argues that there needs to be an organisation with appropriate resources (people,

funding, and facilities) to carry out the implementation process. Mamburu (2004) mentions financial and human resources, as well as plans of action as important aspects for policy implementation.

It is of great concern that, when participants were asked about their experiences of the implementation of family preservation services, and about the accessibility of family preservation services to families, most participants stated that family preservation services are not implemented as they are supposed to be. They attributed this failure to implement these services properly to high case-loads and other operational demands on the social workers. Some participants mentioned that family preservation services are not easily accessible due to high case-loads among social workers and the fact that priority is given to programmes other than family preservation services. Some of these responses are reflected on the following page:

“It is actually not easy for families to access family preservation services because of the overload of cases among social workers. The priority is given to urgent cases.”

“Resources are not enough: as an NGO the only funding that was received were only stipends for volunteers and the bookkeeper.”

“I don’t know because my NGO has not been funded until now.”

“What normally happens is that our province decides on the programmes to be funded and it is usually R100 000 per programme and family preservation is currently funded in three areas.”

These findings are in line with Strydom’s (2010:195) findings as she pointed out that “a further obstacle to the implementation of preventative social services ... is a lack of people power, which is linked to the fact that there is insufficient funding of welfare services”. The issue of high case-loads is directly linked to a shortage of social workers, as well as high turnover among social workers in NGOs (Strydom, 2010).

Training and capacity building

As one of its aims, the *Manual* states that it seeks to “train social service professionals to deliver services to families from a family preservation perspective”. In order for the programme envisaged by the developers of the *Manual* to be implemented efficiently, the *Norms and Standards Policy on Developmental Social Welfare Services* (Department of Social Development, 2007) mandates the roll-out of appropriate training and education by all provinces. Thus all social service professionals are mandated to implement family preservation services as stipulated by the *Norms and Standards Policy on Developmental Social Welfare Services* and the *Draft National Family Policy* (Department of Social Development, 2008a).

The qualitative data analysis revealed that there was a very serious policy gap with regard to the implementation of the *Norms and Standards Policy on Developmental Social Welfare Services* (Department of Social Development, 2007). The researchers found that 17 participants out of the 37 who were initially interviewed had never attended any formal training on family preservation, even though they were instructed to implement such services in practice. Due to this limitation, these 17 participants’ data were excluded from the empirical findings, because including their data might present skewed conclusions

regarding the formulation and implementation of family preservation services. Other potential participants listed in the sample frame could also not be included in the research study because they were also not trained on the *Manual on Family Preservation Services*. The need to exclude such a large number of participants because they had not been trained on the *Manual* indicates a serious gap with regard to the training and capacity building of the intended implementers of family preservation services.

The responses of all 20 participants who attended the training also reflected a need for further training in order to keep up with new developments as follows:

“I attended training on family preservation services and I also had to roll it out but we never made any follow-ups with regard to refresher courses to those social workers. I also feel that I do need a refresher course and I think that they might be new developments.”

“I attended the training and it improved my knowledge and skills, but because of new developments, I will always need further training, it is easy to think that you know everything meanwhile there is a lot that is happening.”

Rushesky (1996) cautions that policies and their intentions are very often changed or even distorted if they are not interpreted for those who must implement them. Similarly, Jann and Wegrich (2006) assert that an ideal process of policy implementation would include the proper interpretation of the policy or programme. The researchers agree with the views of these authors because proper training on the *Manual* for all the implementers would minimise implementation challenges and increase efficiency and effective implementation of family preservation services.

Role players

There are many role players who participate in the public policy-making process and the eventual implementation. The *Draft National Family Policy* mentions relevant government departments, social service practitioners, volunteers and civil society. The quantitative results show that the *Manual* does not refer to the important role of volunteers in the policy-making process, but the qualitative results confirmed the role of volunteers with regard to possible beneficiaries' access to family preservation services in communities. Most participants indicated that families who need to access family preservation services are often identified by volunteers through door-to-door campaigns and are then referred to social work offices. They explained the process as follows:

“We do have caregivers in the area who go door-to-door to campaign or market the services of the Department including family preservation and they refer difficult cases to social workers for intense interventions.”

“We have six volunteers and three community caregivers who go door-to-door identifying families that are at risk, and they would refer them to our offices.”

Meyer and Cloete (2000) assert that community participation in the policy process can be achieved through the direct involvement of ordinary members of the community, who can be considered volunteers. Thus, the exclusion of the role of volunteers is a serious gap.

Monitoring and evaluation

Cloete (2000) indicated that policy evaluation refers broadly to the process of finding out about a public policy in action, the means being employed to implement it and the objectives being served. According to Pulzl and Treib (2006), policy-making is supposed to contribute to problem-solving or at least to a reduction of the problem load. Rossi, Lipsey, and Freeman (2004) advise that early in the planning process, evaluators should give explicit attention to the nature of the primary stakeholders. The findings of this study indicate that the *Manual* does not refer to a monitoring and evaluation plan for family preservation services and the *Manual* has also omitted the primary stakeholders who are supposed to play a significant role in the evaluation process.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In respect of the quantitative data, the findings revealed limitations in the formulation of the *Manual on Family Preservation Services*. These limitations are an unclear and broad definition of what family preservation entails, some confusion on the theoretical frameworks and models which are supposed to guide family preservation services, the omission of explicit objectives from the *Manual*, a lack of clarity on the process of resource allocation with regard to finances, on the role of volunteers and on a monitoring and evaluation plan. It is, therefore, highly recommended that a revision of the *Manual* by DSD should address the limitations identified, as this will enhance the understanding and execution of the programme.

The qualitative data collected also exposed an unclear definition of family preservation and the related services, confusion due to the omission of explicit objectives, a lack of clarity on a theoretical frameworks underpinning services, a lack of dedicated implementers for family preservation services, as social workers reported high case-loads which are linked to a shortage of social workers, and poor coordination of on-going training and capacity-building on family preservation services. A lack of clarity with regard to financial resources is another challenge that has a negative impact on effective implementation of family preservation services.

Although the correct processes are being followed with regard to families' accessing of family preservation services, it is recommended that consideration be given to the case-loads of social workers rendering family preservation services in order for them to be able to prioritise these services. The provision of more human and financial resources should also be considered. For effective implementation of family preservation services, it is recommended that both policy formulators and implementers collaborate with each other and coordinate services in order to identify and address gaps in service delivery. The authors also recommends that continuous training be provided at least on an annual basis to keep implementers abreast with new developments in the field of family preservation.

The challenges facing South African families necessitate urgent reconsideration of the effective formulation and implementation of family preservation services. Evaluation of the formulation and implementation process of family preservation services with a bigger sample could add more value to this study and can therefore be regarded as a limitation to the study. Furthermore, an analysis of best practices and the challenges thereof with regard to the formulation and implementation of family preservation services would provide

further insight on the efficiency of the formulation and the implementation of these services.

REFERENCES

Babbie, E. and Mouton, J. (2011). *The Practice of Social Research* Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Becvar, D.S. and Becvar, R.J. (2006). *Family Therapy: A Systemic Integration* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Sixth Edition.

Benokraitis, N.V. (2011). *Marriages and Families: Changes, Choices, and Constraints* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Seventh Edition.

Berry, M. (1999). "Family Preservation Practice" in Franklin, C. and Jordan, C. (Eds.). *Family Practice: Brief Systems Methods for Social Work* New York, NY: Brooks/Cole.

Brynard, P., Cloete, F. and De Coning, C. (2013). "Policy Implementation" in Cloete, F. and De Coning, C. (Eds.). *Improving Public Policy* Pretoria: Van Schaik, Third Edition.

Cash, S.J. (2001). "Family Preservation Services: The Casey Family, a Chronology" *Journal of Family Social Work* 6(2):43-54.

Chambers, D.E. (2000). *Social Policy and Social Programs: A Method for the Practical Public Policy Analyst* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Third Edition.

Cloete, F. (2000). "Policy Evaluation or Assessment" in Cloete, F. and Wissink, H. (Eds.). *Improving Public Policy* Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Delpont, C.S.L. (2005). "Quantitative Data-collection Methods" in De Vos, A.S., Strydom, H., Fouché, C.B. and Delpont, C.S.L. (Eds.). *Research at Grass Roots: For the Social Sciences and Human Service Professions* Pretoria: Van Schaik, Third Edition.

Department of Health and Human Services, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Washington, DC. (2001). "Evaluation of Family Preservation and Reunification Program: Interim Report", <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/fampre94/index.htm> (Accessed on 15/09/2011).

Department of Social Development (DSD). (2007). *Norms and Standards Policy on Developmental Social Welfare Services* Pretoria: Department of Social Development.

Department of Social Development (DSD). (2008a). *Draft National Family Policy* Pretoria: Department of Social Development.

Department of Social Development (DSD). (2008b). *Manual on Family Preservation Services* Pretoria: Department of Social Development.

Department of Social Development (DSD). (2009). *Annual Report* Pretoria: Department of Social Development.

- Department of Social Development (DSD). (2013). *Annual Report* Pretoria: Department of Social Development.
- De Vos, A.S. (2005a). "Qualitative Data Analysis and Interpretation" in De Vos, A.S., Strydom, H., Fouché, C.B. and Delpport, C.S.L. (Eds.). *Research at Grass Roots: For the Social Sciences and Human Service Professions* Pretoria: Van Schaik, Third Edition.
- De Vos, A.S. (2005b). "Professional Research and Professional Practice" in De Vos, A.S., Strydom, H., Fouché, C.B. and Delpport, C.S.L. (Eds.). *Research at Grass Roots: For the Social Sciences and Human Service Professions* Pretoria: Van Schaik, Third Edition.
- Eshleman, J.R. and Bulcroft, R.A. (2010). *The Family* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Twelfth Edition.
- Fouché, C.B. (2005). "Writing the Research Proposal" in De Vos, A.S., Strydom, H., Fouché, C.B. and Delpport, C.S.L. (Eds.). *Research at Grass Roots: For the Social Sciences and Human Service Professions* Pretoria: Van Schaik, Third Edition.
- Gil, D.G. (1992). *Unravelling Social Policy: Theory Analysis and Political Action towards Social Equality* Rochester, VT: Schenkman.
- Goldenberg, H. and Goldenberg, I. (1998). *Counseling Today's Families* Belmont, CA: Thomson Higher Education.
- Goldenberg, H. and Goldenberg, I. (2002). *Counseling Today's Families* Belmont, CA: Thomson Higher Education, Fourth Edition.
- Gray, M.M.M. and Sewpaul, V. (1998). "Critique of the Policy Proposals of the Interministerial Committee on Young People at Risk" *Social Work/Maatskaplike Werk* 34(1):12-27.
- Helton, L.R. and Jackson, M. (1997). *Social Work Practice with Families: A Diversity Model* London: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hepworth, D.H., Rooney, R.H. and Larsen, J. (2002). *Direct Social Work Practice: Theory and Skills* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole-Thomson Learning.
- Jann, W. and Wegrich, K. (2006). "Theories of the Policy Cycle" in Fischer, F., Miller, G.T. and Sidney, M.S. (Eds.). *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics and Methods* Boca Raton, FL: CRC.
- Mamburu, D.M. (2004). "Evaluation of the Poverty Relief Programme in the Limpopo Province within the Context of the Reconstruction and Development Programme: A Social Work Perspective" (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis) Pretoria: University of Pretoria, Department of Social Work and Criminology.
- McGoldrick, M. Carter, B. and Garcia-Preto, N. (2011). "Overview: The Life Cycle in its Changing Context: Individual, Family and Social Perspectives" in McGoldrick, M., Carter, B. and Garcia-Preto, N. (Eds.). *The Expanded Family Life Cycle: Individual, Family and Social Perspectives* MA: Allyn and Bacon, Fourth Edition.

- Meyer, I.H. and Cloete, F. (2000). "Policy Agenda-setting" in Cloete, F. and Wissink, H. (Eds.). *Improving Public Policy* Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Nelson, K.E., Landsman, M.J. and Deutelbaum, W. (1990). "Three Models of Family-centered Placement Prevention Services" *Child Welfare League of America* 69:3-21.
- Pulzl, H. and Treib, O. (2006). "Implementing Public Policy" in Fischer, F., Miller, G.T. and Sidney, M.S. (Eds.). *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics and Methods* Boca Raton, FL: CRC.
- Puyenbroeck, H.V., Loots, G., Grietens, H., Jacquet, W., Vanderfaeillie, J. and Escudero, V. (2009). "Intensive Family Preservation Services in Flanders: An Outcome Study" *Child and Family Social Work* 14(2):222-232.
- Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M.W. and Freeman, H.E. (2004). *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, Seventh Edition.
- Roux, N.L. (2000). "Policy Design" in Cloete, F. and Wissink, H. (Eds.). *Improving Public Policy* Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Rushefsky, M.E. (1996). *Public Policy in the United States: Toward the 21st Century* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Second Edition.
- Soy, S. (2006). *The Case Study as a Research Method* Austin, TX: University of Texas.
- Strydom, H. (2005). "Ethical Aspects of Research in the Social Sciences and Human Services" in De Vos, A.S., Strydom, H., Fouché, C.B. and Delpont, C.S.L. (Eds.). *Research at Grass Roots: For the Social Sciences and Human Service Professions* Pretoria: Van Schaik, Third Edition.
- Strydom, H. and Delpont, C.S.L. (2005). "Sampling and Pilot Study in Qualitative Research" in De Vos, A.S., Strydom, H., Fouché, C.B. and Delpont, C.S.L. (Eds.). *Research at Grass Roots: For the Social Sciences and Human Service Professions* Pretoria: Van Schaik, Third Edition.
- Strydom, M. (2010). "The Implementation of Family Preservation Services: Perspectives of Social Workers at NGOs" *Social Work/Maatskaplike Werk* 46(2):192-207.
- Tshishonga, N. and Mafema, E.D. (2010). "Policy Development for Service Delivery through Community Development Workers Programme in South Africa: Exploring the Implications of Placing a Cart before the Horse" *Journal of Public Administration* 45(4):561-583.