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FOREWORD

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa was adopted, among others, to “lay the foundations for a democratic and open society in which government is based on the will of the people ...”. This places citizens at the centre of good governance, and enjoins state institutions to proactively engage the public in determining and responding to their needs.

Since 2002 the Public Service Commission (PSC) has gone directly to the citizens with the purpose of surveying their needs and expectations regarding service delivery. The purpose thereof was also to establish an integrated instrument to measure and evaluate the performance of the Public Service. The PSC trusts that individual government departments will undertake similar surveys on a regular basis, and incorporate citizens’ priorities into their performance management systems and service delivery improvement plans.

This report is the third in the series and focuses on services rendered by the Departments of Agriculture, Land Affairs, and Water Affairs and Forestry.

I trust that these findings will enable the above departments to bridge the gap between citizens’ expectations and actual service delivery.

PROF. SS SANGWENI
CHAIRPERSON: PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
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DoA Department of Agriculture
DLA Department of Land Affairs
DWAF Department of Water Affairs and Forestry
DRA Development Research Africa
OPSC Office of the Public Service Commission
PSC Public Service Commission
HDI Historically disadvantaged individual
NGO Non-governmental organisation
PFMA Public Finance Management Act
SPSS Statistical Package for Social Scientists
SWOT Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats

Citizen The recipients of services from government departments are citizens and the clients of the departments. From the client lists of the departments, samples were drawn of clients/citizens to be interviewed. In some areas of the report the terms clients, users, respondents and citizens are used interchangeably to make the reading of the report meaningful.

Service A service is an action or activity provided by a department or component to a client dealing with the department to satisfy his or her needs and expectations. This client could either be an external consumer (public or other organisation) of the specific service being delivered or an internal consumer (own staff or management) of the specific service.

Abbreviations for services:
Cadastral Cadastral Surveys Information Supply Service
Deeds Deeds Registration
Land Reform Land Reform
Restitution Restitution of Land Rights
Surveys Surveys and Mapping
Billing Billing of Major Water Users
Forest Licensing of Activities on State Forest Land
Waste Authorisations for Waste Disposal
Water Authorisations for Water Use
Breeding Breeding Registration Certificates and Authorisations
Bursaries Bursaries, Internships and Experiential Training
Engineering Agricultural Engineering
Farmer Farmer Settlement
Import Import Permits
Executive Summary

Background to the Survey

In order to execute the mandate of the Public Service Commission (PSC) of promoting effective and efficient public administration, the PSC embarked on a series of surveys to assess the levels of satisfaction of citizens with the provision of services by government departments. These surveys hopefully will contribute to making government a more effective service delivery instrument.

This report focuses on the survey of citizen satisfaction with clients that used some services offered by the Departments of Agriculture, Land Affairs, and Water Affairs and Forestry.

Key Findings

Fourteen services across the three departments were surveyed. Overall satisfaction scores were based on the responses given by clients to questions about all aspects of service delivery. The analysis of the scores included the calculation of the gap between clients’ expectations of the services and the levels of service they had actually received. The key findings are summarised below:

Figure 1: Overall satisfaction scores for each service across the three departments

- The average satisfaction score across the identified services was the highest for the Department of Agriculture at 79%, followed by the Department of Land Affairs at 73%. The Department of Water Affairs and Forestry had the lowest average satisfaction score at 67%.
- On a service level, the highest-scoring services were Agricultural Engineering (81%), Breeding Registration Certificates and Authorisations (80%), Surveys (79%), and Licensing of Activities on State Forest Land (79%).
- The low-scoring services were Farmer Settlement (68%), Land Reform (68%), Restitution of Land Rights (62%), Authorisations and Department Services (77%), and Billing of Major Water Users (67%).
- The analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats facing each department clearly indicates that there are common strengths across all the departments, e.g. the majority of clients indicated that they had received individual attention when requesting the services.
- Clients were satisfied with most aspects and issues relating to the staff, and found them friendly, helpful and courteous. However, the availability of knowledgeable staff at some places was not satisfactory.
- The departments were rated as accessible and the operating hours were seen to be convenient in most cases. Clients who had visited physical service points, found them to be clean and safe environments, and the majority of them felt that the services they had received provided value for their money.
- The majority of clients indicated that they would receive the services they required the first time around. However, some service delivery gaps were identified between the levels of service clients expected and the levels of service they actually received. Many clients indicated that they experienced lower levels of service than they had expected, which influenced their level of satisfaction negatively.
- The overriding weakness of the services of all the departments related primarily to turnaround time. Although the average turnaround time for each service was different, clients were duly dissatisfied.
- The complexity of the application processes and the lack of availability of information about the services and processes, in particular, were also concerns for many of the clients across most services and all departments.
- The results also show that signage, and subsequent finding of the correct counters/assistance, at service sites was unsatisfactory.
- Although the number of complaints lodged by clients was not particularly high, an issue that is of great concern is that the majority of the clients who had lodged complaints were dissatisfied with the manner in which the complaints were handled.
- Overall, there was a low level of consultation with clients. Service delivery and the alignment of services with the needs of users can only be improved if clients are consulted.
- Record-keeping and accuracy was noted by both the clients and the researchers as deserving attention. Most service delivery components had poor record-keeping systems.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The citizen satisfaction surveys provided a situational analysis that examined the gap between expected and experienced service delivery. The extent of the gap can be used as a management tool to evaluate and monitor service delivery on an ongoing basis. A large gap between the expectations of clients and their rating of the actual services received will most likely lead to dissatisfaction. The ideal situation would be created if perceived expectations matched actual level of service delivery or are as close as possible.

The Departments of Agriculture, Land Affairs, and Water Affairs and Forestry can credit themselves with generally meeting many of the needs of the clients. However, without proper accurate and complete record-keeping the departments can not improve fully on service delivery.

Although clients regarded some services with satisfaction, general recommendations regarding improved service delivery are as follows:

- To address the gaps that exist between the expected and experienced service delivery, departments should hold frequent consultations with service users in order to determine their expectations.
• Application forms, and the processing thereof, have to be made simpler and the technical processing of applications should be explained to clients.

• Departments should evaluate their administrative processes in order to address the turnaround times of applications.

• Record-keeping and accuracy of information, as well as the tracking of applications and profiling of clients, should be enhanced in order to improve efficiency and effectiveness.

• To improve service delivery at service points the training must be extended to more staff.

• Signage needs to be improved in order to increase access to services and efficiency at service points.

• Access to the Internet and online services, as well as advanced technological data, will improve the availability of information and forms, and will streamline and accelerate the application process.

• The departments need to investigate ways of improving their complaint-handling mechanisms. Clients need to be informed of what redress they can expect and be provided with the assurance that the matter will be investigated. To this end complaints need to be recorded and monitored regularly.

• Ways and means need to be considered for a central process to coordinate the implementation of the above recommendations.

Service delivery as a whole needs to be monitored and evaluated on an ongoing basis, more specifically because more than half of the clients experienced some sort of problem with the services. The challenge is to utilise these surveys effectively for the improvement of service delivery. Departments should seek out opportunities to consult clients on their service needs in order to ensure service delivery improvement, alignment of services to client needs and compliance with the Batho Pele principles. This consultation process, for example through citizen satisfaction surveys, may be used as an opportunity to update clients’ records, such as their contact details and other relevant information. Client consultation in the form of satisfaction surveys could serve to monitor the effectiveness of departmental strategic plans and provide evidence for requests for further resources.
This report provides an overview of documented levels of expectations and satisfaction levels of citizens who utilised the services of the Departments of Agriculture, Land Affairs, and Water Affairs and Forestry. These three departments were chosen from the Economic and Infrastructure Services Sector as the services they render are related to land users and are comparable. A brief introduction to the study, including the constitutional mandate of the PSC and its interest in conducting citizen satisfaction surveys, is provided. This section draws on current satisfaction and service delivery theory and developments within the South African Public Service, and highlights the importance of citizen satisfaction surveys for strengthening governance and improving public service delivery.

1.1 Background to the Survey

The relationship between effective delivery of public services and good governance has increasingly focused on a citizen-centred approach. No longer can “services be designed and delivered simply in order to achieve service-specific objectives” 1. Hence, good governance is not perceived only as the ability of government to deliver basic services to the people. The Public Service needs to pay attention to the opinions of citizens, and particularly to how service delivery standards measure against citizens’ expectations. Government is therefore rated by its citizens for the way in which services are identified and delivered, as well as the extent to which the processes of service delivery are monitored, evaluated, and even funded. Increasing demands mean that Public Service managers have to be accountable to citizens as much as they are to Parliament and any other stakeholders involved in the business of providing public services.

The advent of “citizen-centred” service delivery is in line with trends that focus more attention on the performance of the public sector. The measurement of the effectiveness of the public sector is no longer focused only on its ability to produce outputs such as services. Key markers of success are the outcomes of service implementation. This approach therefore includes the manner in which citizens are included and considered in service development and service delivery.

The financial and budgeting management requirements introduced by the Public Finance Management Act (PFMA) 2 obliges Public Service managers to justify budgets, based on the services they intend to provide, and the outcomes to be achieved. The realisation of the budgetary process further encourages managers to consider the impact of every strategy from a client’s point of view.

The Treasury Regulations, coupled with the White Paper on the Transformation of Public Service Delivery 3, set out a dual mandate for Public Service accountability. This level of accountability underscores the need for a greater degree of transparency in the planning and operations of service delivery. Furthermore, benchmarks for service delivery, as outlined, in part, by the Batho Pele Principles, require greater alignment of responsibilities such as financial administration, consideration for the needs and opinions of clients, public participation and efficiency in the management of service delivery.

Table 1: Batho Pele Principles

The eight principles of Batho Pele are as follows:

1. Consultation: Citizens should be consulted about the level and quality of the public services they receive, and wherever possible, should be given a choice about the services they are offered.
2. Service standards: Citizens should be told what level and quality of public services they should receive, so that they are aware of what to expect.
3. Access: All citizens should have equal access to the services to which they are entitled.
4. Courtesy: Citizens should be treated with courtesy and consideration.
5. Information: Citizens should be given full, accurate information about the public services they are entitled to receive.
6. Openness and transparency: Citizens should be told how national and provincial departments are run, what are the costs involved, and who is in charge.

7. Redress: If the promised standard of service is not delivered, citizens should be offered an apology, a full explanation and a speedy and effective remedy, and when complaints are made, citizens should receive a sympathetic, positive response.
8. Value for money: Public services should be provided economically and efficiently in order to give citizens the best possible value for money.

The Public Service therefore needs to remain critically aware of their mandate, and continuously monitor and evaluate the manner in which services are designed and implemented.

The PSC and service delivery evaluations

As the cornerstone document for a democratic South Africa, the South African Constitution (section 196) 4 provides for the establishment of a body to ensure that the Constitutional objectives regarding public administration are met. The PSC is the body that was established as a result of this mandate, and has the responsibility to continuously monitor and evaluate public administration in terms of the Constitution and other government policies.

Considering the important shift towards a citizen-centred approach to service delivery and as part of its efforts to provide guidance and support to the public service, the PSC has developed a strategy of service delivery evaluations based on citizens’ satisfaction. Citizen satisfaction surveys are important indicators of the success of the Public Service in meeting the objectives of its mandate. The following are two important tenets of citizen satisfaction surveys:

1. Citizens have the opportunity to voice their opinions on service delivery and service delivery standards.
2. Public Service managers have an opportunity to assess the needs citizens have and to determine the degree of change to be made in service delivery in order to meet citizens’ expectations.

For the above reasons, the PSC has been commissioning citizen satisfaction surveys since 2002. To date, the PSC has commissioned surveys of more than 15,000 citizens on 34 services in 10 departments. This is the third survey of this nature. The first research project assessed the levels of satisfaction of clients in the social sector 5 and the second series addressed the criminal justice sector 6.

1.2 Research Brief

In an article entitled “Choosing Performance Measures”, Fedderke and Klitgaard (2004) reiterate that, while the focus of Public Service management is increasingly performance-driven, it begs the question as to what performance measures should be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the Public Service. In this light, and in line with government’s policies on the transformation of the Public Service and the Batho Pele principles, the PSC has prioritised citizen satisfaction surveys as one of the mechanisms which it uses to determine the effectiveness of service delivery.

A key benefit of citizen satisfaction surveys is that the process simultaneously enables consultation, needs analysis and the evaluation of service delivery. It is therefore crucial that appropriate research methodologies, measurements and data collection tools are designed. While the sections below provide more information on the research approach, it is important to indicate that the following issues were prioritised during the development of performance measurements and data collection tools:

- Input on previous citizen satisfaction surveys conducted by the PSC.
- Design of instruments and measurements that take account of international models of service delivery evaluations; performance assessments and satisfaction surveys.
- Design of instruments and measurements that include the evaluation of Batho Pele principles.

---

Consultation with senior representatives from the DoA, DLA and DWAF helped to guide the process, and provided opportunities for the departments to select the services that were to be included in the survey. In addition, the departments provided client lists for conducting the sampling and gave input into the development of the survey.

The validity of a citizen satisfaction survey lies in the drawing of an appropriate sample and the development of appropriate survey and data collection tools, such as questionnaires. In developing the questionnaires and the survey measurements, the researchers considered the way in which data would be analysed and reported, and how the findings would best inform public managers of the opinions of the clients that use the services of the three departments.

Research tools were developed that combined aspects of an international model of satisfaction measurement, SERVQUAL, with issues highlighted in various monographs on the relationship between service delivery and perceptions of good governance. Previous questionnaires developed for PSC citizen satisfaction surveys and the objectives of the transformation of the South African Public Service, as encapsulated in the Batho Pele principles, were also included. The application of a private sector model is intentional and considered pertinent in this context. The intention of the research was to align the evaluation of satisfaction with international trends, while measuring satisfaction against the indicators of transformation of the Public Service. Combining an approach that sets out to evaluate private sector customer satisfaction with the principles of administration of the public sector resulted in a research tool for citizen satisfaction surveys that was best poised to investigate, measure and document the following:

- The opinions of citizens on the service standards offered
- The levels of satisfaction citizens have of the services
- Aspects of the services citizens were more or less satisfied with
- The needs of citizens that were not adequately addressed by the services
- A comparison of citizens’ perceptions of the service standards of a particular service with their expressed satisfaction with other services.

Considering that the public sector endeavours to provide an effective service that is capable of meeting the needs and expectations of clients, citizen satisfaction surveys are undoubtedly a key tool for evaluating performance in the Public Service. The surveys provide valuable insights to managers in determining the optimal functioning of their services in the attempt to satisfy citizen expectations.

These surveys sought to evaluate whether the specific services included in the study met the needs and expectations of citizens. The information gathered would thus indicate areas of service delivery that had to be improved and prioritised. To this end, public managers are provided with an opportunity to address problematic areas. They are also informed directly by clients who use these services. Prioritising improvements in service delivery is therefore based on meeting the demands, needs and characteristics of the so-called “target market”. Furthermore, the targeted feedback allows managers to prioritise budgetary issues and have the greatest impact with the greatest cost-efficiency.

Although this research project does not evaluate whether the services met the Batho Pele principles, it is an advantage that these surveys were also able to measure client perceptions of the “Batho Pele principles in action”. Future citizen satisfaction surveys for other South African government departments could be developed to investigate the different levels of satisfaction and reasons for these. Such an understanding may assist researchers and Public Service managers to begin to compare satisfaction grades or scores across a range of services and departments. At this stage, however, the findings should be interpreted as specific to individual services - in this case the 14 services of the DoA, DLA and DWAF. The following section details the methodology and research approach upon which the validity of the findings was based.

---


11 Copies of previous questionnaires and reports provided by the PSC.

Chapter Two
Methodology
2.1 Project Scope

2.1.1 Objectives of the Survey

One of the chief aims of the PSC is to monitor and promote effective service delivery to meet the demands and expectations of clients. To determine whether these expectations were met, a citizen satisfaction survey was designed to highlight the differences between the type of service clients expected to get and the actual service they received. Information derived from this type of survey allows one to examine the gaps between expectations and actual service delivery and from this one can assess the levels of satisfaction, understand the strengths and weaknesses in the public service arena, and provide not only a baseline for future studies and monitoring, but also outline and prioritise possible recommendations for improvement.

The objectives of the survey were to:

- outline client expectations and provide examples of where service delivery standards could be aligned to citizens’ needs;
- assess the level of satisfaction experienced overall as well as of key components in the delivery of public services;
- document perceived strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats to the equitable delivery of public services;
- gather information from citizens on needs they have which the service does not adequately address;
- prioritise specific areas where services can be improved and
- provide tools that could be standardised and baseline information for future service satisfaction surveys in South African government departments.

2.1.2 Services identified

A process of extensive consultation, involving the OPSC, DRA, and senior DoA, DLA, and DWAF officials, resulted in the selection of 14 services across the three departments for inclusion in this survey.

The services of these departments are designed to cater for specific economic and infrastructure interest groups. An outline of the departments and their services is provided in Appendix A.

Table 2: List of services identified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Department of Agriculture | • Breeding Certificates and Authorisations  
| | • Import Permits  
| | • Farmer Settlement  
| | • Bursaries, Internships and Experiential Training  
| | • Agricultural Engineering Services |
| Department of Land Affairs | • Cadastral Surveys Information Supply Service  
| | • Surveys and Mapping  
| | • Restitution of Land Rights  
| | • Land Reform  
| | • Deeds Registration |
| Department of Water Affairs and Forestry | • Billing of Major Water and Forestry Users  
| | • Licensing of State Forest Land  
| | • Authorisations for Water Disposal  
| | • Authorisations for Water Use |

2.1.3 Clients identified

Once the services had been identified, the researchers contacted the various programme representatives responsible for the identified services and requested lists of clients who had made use of the relevant services within the twelve-month period prior to March 2005. These lists formed the basis of the sample frame from which citizens were randomly selected until the quota was reached or the lists were exhausted.

The clients included in the sample can be broadly classified as either external or internal clients, depending on the capacity in which they engage with the services. External clients (end-users of a product/service) are citizens who engage with the services in their capacity as natural persons or representatives of the private sector, non-governmental organisations or other bodies. Internal clients are facilitators in the delivery of a specific product or service. Internal clients were only interviewed for two services, namely Agriculture Engineering Services at DoA and Surveys and Mapping at DLA. A brief description of the types of clients who use the services surveyed is provided in Appendix B.

2.2 The Research Process

The entire research process took place over a period of a year. This phase was primarily consultative in nature. Many meetings were held between the OPSC, DRA, and the DoA, DLA, and DWAF. The primary objective of the meetings was to brief the three departments on the survey as a whole and to determine which services of the departments would be included in the citizen satisfaction survey.

Once the services had been identified, DRA and the OPSC had to gain access to the respective client flow lists for the various services. For some services, this took months. Poor record-keeping and communication with departmental role players (especially feedback on information requested) hindered the process, but lists were finally provided to DRA and the actual research began in March 2005.

The key steps of the survey are outlined in the table below, and descriptions of all processes, as well as the challenges, if applicable, have been highlighted under the respective headings.

Table 3: The key steps of the research process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consultation between the PSC, DRA, and departments to identify services to be included in the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Consultation and provision of client lists for sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instrument design based on international satisfaction surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Piloting of the research instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fieldwork/telephonic interviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Quality control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Data capturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Analysis and report writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 Every attempt was made to contact all clients on the client lists. Lists were exhausted when everyone who could be contacted had either been interviewed, moved, were not available or refused to participate.
2.2.1 Sampling

1) Sample size

The total sample for this survey was set at 4,500 interviews. A target of 1,500 interviews per department, with approximately 300 per service for the 14 identified services, was defined. A final sample of 4,454 citizens was realised. The main reason for the smaller realised sample was that, for some services, the client flows were too small to yield the desired 300 interviews per service. While the research team tried to make up for the shortfall by conducting more interviews for services with larger client flows, client lists were exhausted and the completed total fell short of the target by just less than one per cent.

The client lists received for the DLA’s services were larger than those for the DoA and DWAF, and hence a greater number of interviews were conducted with clients from this department. A total of 1,614 interviews were conducted with citizens who used the DLA’s services, compared to 1,425 for DWAF and 1,415 for the DoA.

In the case of the DoA, the client list from Agricultural Engineering consisted of 20 users, of whom 13 were interviewed, while the client list from Bursaries totalled about 100, of which 64 were interviewed. However, a bigger sample for Breeding (799), and Import (463) assisted in making up the deficits from the other services. In addition to this, the lists for the aforementioned two services were exhausted.

With regard to the DLA, all services except Surveys and Mapping yielded samples in excess of 300 citizens (Cadastral 436, Deeds 477, Land Reform 310, and Restitution 344). The 94 clients on the internal client list of Surveys and Mapping were the total number of posts for planners at the DLA, but only 47 interviews were successfully conducted due to vacant posts; planners not being available and staff not willing to be interviewed.

Although the intention was to interview clients from five services from each of the departments, only four services were ultimately selected for DWAF. The fifth service identified was Water Service Problems, but the main impetus of the service is to address complaints raised in and by the print media, and thus there were no actual clients who could be identified and included in the sample. Three of DWAF’s samples yielded more than the quota of 300 interviews. However, due to the limitations of the client lists for Licensing of Activities on State Forest Land, a sample of 208 clients was realised for this service. Furthermore, the exclusion of a fifth service limited the success of the project in attaining a sample of 1,500 (actual 1,425) for the entire department.

Bigger samples of 471 clients for Billing of Major Water Users, 311 clients for Authorisations for Waste Disposal and 435 clients for Authorisations for Water Use were obtained. The supplied client list was exhausted.

2) Sample selection - the client lists

No sample frame was available at the time of commissioning the study. This process thus had to be managed, and the sample design was affected accordingly. The most appropriate means of accessing the widest range of clients was to negotiate access to the department’s client lists for the relevant services. A large amount of time was spent discussing, debating and consulting with various departmental officials to determine not only which services should be included, but also to gain access to client lists.

Each department appointed coordinators from each service, who provided client lists to DRA. These client lists contained crucial information, specifically the names and contact details (addresses and telephone numbers) of clients who had made use of the services within the 12-month period prior to interviewing (i.e. March 2004 – March 2005). It was important that recent clients be interviewed, as they would still have a clear memory of the service they had received, and any changes in service delivery by the departments prior to March 2004 would not contaminate the findings.

The following challenges and obstacles were experienced in obtaining the client lists:

- The size of the client lists, the level and accuracy of the information and any unrecorded changes in clients’ details had a large bearing on the representivity of the survey by province, population group and gender.
- In some instances, the information was outdated and this may have introduced a bias into the findings.
- Protocols for maintaining and updating client records have not been standardised.
- A limited application of technology to assist in archiving, updating and reporting on client particulars jeopardises the effectiveness of various services in understanding the profile of their clients.
- Some services do not maintain active databases of their clients at all. As a result, the clients were drawn from independent sources, for example, a sample of surveyors for conducting surveys for Cadastral Surveys Information Supply Services was drawn from the South African Institute of Land Surveyors, who maintains a register of all South African Land Surveyors.

The full demographic profile of the clients interviewed is set out in Appendix C.

2.2.2 Instrument Design

The citizen satisfaction survey tools were specifically designed for the purposes of this study. The tools were designed to cater for the following functions:

- To evaluate each service according to international service satisfaction models
- To take account of specific aspects unique to each service
- To take account of the types of clients that use the services
2.2.5 Quality Control, Data Capturing, Analysis and Report Writing

All the questionnaires were checked for inconsistencies and missing data. The data was transferred to a Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and an analysis was done using SPSS and Excel, and reports were written on the findings.

2.2.6 The SERVQUAL Model

In line with the objectives of the study, the report outlines the expectations, experiences and overall satisfaction of the clients who used the 14 services.

A traditional assumption made about satisfaction surveys is that all clients have the same understanding of service delivery, come from a similar background or make certain similar assumptions based on their exposure to services they can compare. In the South African context, we cannot assert that all clients have the same orientation towards, or expectations of public services. The questions in the survey instrument have been designed in such a way that they enable researchers to compare the ratings and scores for different aspects of the services received across all groups, as well as across all services and departments. The strength of this research design comes from combining an international service satisfaction model (SERVQUAL) with the provision of the Batho Pele policy. The instrument and survey thus account for the different perceptions and experiences clients have of the services.

In presenting the findings, the researchers grouped the experiences of the clients according to the SERVQUAL model. This model was developed during the 1970s by researchers from the University of Los Angeles, California. It has been honed and refined since its initial development. Five basic criteria are used by clients (consciously or subconsciously) to assess satisfaction of a service. These are reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy and tangibles.

SERVQUAL Model: Clients Perception of Satisfaction

- **Reliability:** 32% - whether or not the product or service was most appropriate, whether the product functioned properly or conversely what problems were experienced in using the product or service
- **Responsiveness:** 22% - the attention clients were given and the overall efficiency of the service
- **Assurance:** 19% - the level of confidence that the service and/or service providers conveyed to the client
- **Empathy:** 16% - the empathy or type of attention the client was shown during the service interaction
- **Tangibles:** 11% - the state of the facilities and accessibility of services

During the development of the tools and measurements, the researchers consulted various international and South African standards for the measurement of satisfaction indicators. Measurements such as SERVQUAL,13 and principles guiding public service and administration were adapted and used in conjunction with questions and measures specifically designed for the study.

The primary objective of the study was to assess service delivery, and it was thus imperative that the research tool be service-specific. This meant that for the three departments, 14 different questionnaires were designed that catered for the specific “phrasing” of the various services. A few questions that were service-specific were included, for example “type of service user” or “type of service used within that department”. All demographic and other measurement questions pertaining to satisfaction ratings and expectations were the same. The primary difference lay in the wording of the questions that had to be “service-specific”. Although the questions asked the same things, reference to the specific services was made possible.

2.2.3 Piloting

Once the survey tools had been designed, the questionnaires were tested on citizens who used the services. This was done before the actual fieldwork started in order to assess the feasibility of the questions and content, and more specifically to assess how citizens would react to the type of questions asked.

2.2.4 Telephonic Interviewing and Fieldwork

Most clients who used the services were interviewed telephonically. The reasons for this were as follows:

- Clients of these services are largely officials or business people with access to resources such as telephones, the Internet and fax machines.
- Many of the clients are business people who have a limited amount of time, and therefore it is often difficult to meet these clients and complete interviews face-to-face.

Some interviews were conducted face-to-face. Certain groups of citizens, particularly those who engaged in Land Affairs issues in their capacity as natural persons, were more comfortable with face-to-face interviews. This is mostly due to language and to a limited extent, literacy barriers. The decision was also based on the assumption that people in rural communities, who had limited access to resources (such as limited telecommunication), would be biased if an alternative sampling procedure was followed. By the application of a combined face-to-face and telephonic method it was possible to expand the distribution of the sample. The sample of citizens who were interviewed therefore represents the actual client flows as deduced from the supplied client lists.

2.2.5 Quality Control, Data Capturing, Analysis and Report Writing

All the questionnaires were checked for inconsistencies and missing data. The data was transferred to a Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and an analysis was done using SPSS and Excel, and reports were written on the findings.

Figure 2: SERVQUAL Model Indicators with their standard weights

- **Reliability:** 32% - whether or not the product or service was most appropriate, whether the product functioned properly or conversely what problems were experienced in using the product or service
- **Responsiveness:** 22% - the attention clients were given and the overall efficiency of the service
- **Assurance:** 19% - the level of confidence that the service and/or service providers conveyed to the client
- **Empathy:** 16% - the empathy or type of attention the client was shown during the service interaction
- **Tangibles:** 11% - the state of the facilities and accessibility of services

SERVQUAL Model: Clients Perception of Satisfaction

- **Responsiveness:** 22% - the attention clients were given and the overall efficiency of the service
- **Assurance:** 19% - the level of confidence that the service and/or service providers conveyed to the client
- **Empathy:** 16% - the empathy or type of attention the client was shown during the service interaction
- **Tangibles:** 11% - the state of the facilities and accessibility of services

Chapter Three

Findings
The process of eliciting satisfaction forms… judgements for many respondents for whom none existed before. Moreover, many customers may perceive the process of participation in a satisfaction survey to be of value. In such cases, there is likely to be some positivity bias on account of participation – that is ‘since they care enough to ask, they must be really good’.

Through the process of interviewing, knowledge about the services is often conveyed, and hence the respondent acquires knowledge, in this case about the Public Service. Sharing knowledge and consulting with the client in this case increases positive feelings towards the service provider.

A more critical factor is to assess the percentage of clients who expressed less than satisfactory responses to this reliability indicator. The scores per service, showing the level of certainty of obtaining the right product or service the first time, can be seen in Figure 4.

The key findings for the 14 services of the DoA, DLA and DWAF are summarised below. Firstly, an indication will be given of how the citizen satisfaction survey findings rate in relation to the SERVQUAL indicators of reliability, responsiveness, empathy, assurance and tangibles (refer to Figure 2). Secondly, overall estimates of citizen satisfaction per service and across other surveys that have been conducted are represented. Thirdly, the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats that exist in the delivery of the four key services at a service and departmental level are discussed.

### 3.1 Findings in Relation to SERVQUAL Indicators

#### 3.1.1. Reliability

In this case, the SERVQUAL indicator of reliability seeks to test the level of confidence a client had in the products and services offered by the DoA, DLA and DWAF. The SERVQUAL model estimates that this is the greatest influencing factor when a client determines whether he or she is satisfied with a service. Accordingly, reliability accounts for 32% of a rating allocated to a service. Reliability was measured by assessing the confidence clients had in the service prior to receiving it, evaluating the gap between expectations and reports on actual service, and by looking at the frequency of problems experienced and the type of complaints clients had.

Firstly, it was measured by asking clients to indicate how certain they were that they “would get the right product or service the first time”. As a measure of reliability, this allows managers to determine the level of confidence that clients have in the services offered. The scores for “very certain” and “certain” were combined to form one category called “certainty”, and the scores for “uncertain” and “very uncertain” were combined to form one category called “uncertainty”.

The departmental scores that indicate the level of certainty clients had that they would obtain the right product or service the first time can be seen in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Certainty of obtaining the right product or service the first time (per department)

Generally, 80% of all the service users were certain that they would receive the right product or service the first time. DoA clients (87%) were the most confident that they would receive the correct service, while clients from DWAF (73%) were the least confident.

As with all results in this and similar satisfaction surveys, readers should be cautioned that clients have a tendency to overstate their satisfaction, especially in retrospect, as Dholakia and Morwitz (2002) indicate in their research on measurement effects in customer satisfaction surveys:

> “The process of eliciting satisfaction forms… judgements for many respondents for whom none existed before. Moreover, many customers may perceive the process of participation in a satisfaction survey to be of value. In such cases, there is likely to be some positivity bias on account of participation – that is ‘since they care enough to ask, they must be really good’.”

Through the process of interviewing, knowledge about the services is often conveyed, and hence the respondent acquires knowledge, in this case about the Public Service. Sharing knowledge and consulting with the client in this case increases positive feelings towards the service provider.

A more critical factor is to assess the percentage of clients who expressed less than satisfactory responses to this reliability indicator.

The scores per service, showing the level of certainty of obtaining the right product or service the first time, can be seen in Figure 4.

Figure 4: Certainty of obtaining the right product or service the first time (per service and department)

Generally, 80% of all the service users were certain that they would receive the right product or service the first time. DoA clients (87%) were the most confident that they would receive the correct service, while clients from DWAF (73%) were the least confident.

As with all results in this and similar satisfaction surveys, readers should be cautioned that clients have a tendency to overstate their satisfaction, especially in retrospect, as Dholakia and Morwitz (2002) indicate in their research on measurement effects in customer satisfaction surveys.

Figure 4 allows for further analysis of the confidence users felt in the service they were expecting to receive across services and departments. Users of Bursaries (94%), Engineering (92%) and Cadastral (92%) were most certain of the service they expected to receive, with these being the highest scores overall. The two lowest-scoring services in relation to confidence in expected service were Restitution services of DLA (61%) and Billing (55%), the lowest-scoring service overall from DWAF. The least confident clients of DoA were from Farmer Settlement (72%), and the most confident ones from DWAF used the services of Forest (87%).

The departmental scores that show the gap between expectations and perceptions of actual service received can be seen in Figure 5.

Figure 5: Service/product reliability (per department)
The larger the gap score, the more likely it is attributed to a variance between expectations and actual experience. As a rule of thumb, gap scores greater than 0.5 and less than 1 are of concern, but they do not require immediate attention. Any gap scores of -1 or more should be perceived as deserving immediate attention. The larger the gap score, the more likely it is attributed to a variance between expectations and actual service delivery.

Scores showing the gap between expectations and perceptions of actual services received, per service and department, can be seen in Figure 6.

Figure 5 illustrates the expectations of the clients, their experiences, and the gaps between expectations and experiences. The results show that the average gap between expectation and experience (for all DLA, DoA, and DWAF clients) was -1.2. This means that they expected the services to score 8.3 on a scale of 10, but that the average actual experience was scored at 7.0.

What is interesting here is that clients of the DoA and DLA generally had much higher expectations of services prior to using them (8.5 and 8.3 respectively) than those of DWAF. Even though these clients had higher expectations than clients of DWAF, the gap between expectations and experience was still lower for DWAF.

The gap between expectations and actual service delivery of the three departments indicate that, overall, they all require attention to improve service delivery.

The lowest number of DoA users who had experienced problems came from Breeding and Imports (30% and 38% respectively). Bursary (58%) and Farmer Settlement (55%) clients experienced more problems.

Services with gap scores between -0.6 and -1.0 should be monitored, and those over -1.0 deserve immediate attention. Surveys and Mapping at DLA displayed the lowest gap (-0.0) overall, which is positive, since the ideal is 0.0.

Figure 7 outlines the frequency and description of problems encountered by service users, and is an additional measure of service reliability. Reliability is determined by the confidence users have in the service, and if more problems are experienced, it may mean that they have less confidence.

Figure 8 shows that if one condenses the categories used for the frequency of problems experienced, it becomes clear that although 52% of users had never experienced a problem, almost half had (48%). Forest (DWAF service) had the lowest percentage of users who reported that they had experienced problems (28%). On the other hand, the Billing (DWAF) and Deeds (DLA) services had high numbers of users who reported having experienced problems (66% and 65% respectively).

The lowest number of DoA users who had experienced problems came from Breeding and Imports (30% and 38% respectively). Bursary (58%) and Farmer Settlement (53%) clients experienced more problems.

Overall percentages have been statistically determined and percentages have been rounded off to the nearest decimal place.
The five most common problems experienced by clients of the services provided by DoA are shown in Figure 10. A total of 695 problems were reported by the 238 users who stated that they had experienced problems with the services of the DoA. Of the top five problems noted, most were related to the time taken to issue authorisations, applications and claims (35.1%) and the availability of information (23.3%). The complexity of the application process, period of validity of authorisations and availability of forms were noted as high priority areas.

Other kinds of problems were related to poor telephone management, poor record-keeping and lack of knowledgeable staff, to name a few. There were also a number of “other responses”. Some of these responses were specific to the services being offered, for example Farmer Settlement users complained that “the farm workers are not doing their jobs properly”, “they need help maintaining property”, “farm stalls on both provinces both want rent from her”, and “people coming to chop trees without permission”. Import clients also had some very specific complaints, namely “a staff member wanted applicant to pay for bribe”, “consignment office would not extend permit”, “collusion with importers bringing of stuff illegally”, and “document was not given to a donor at the borders”.

The lowest percentages of DLA users who reported experiencing problems were clients of Land Reform (42%) and Surveys (38%), while the Cadastral and Deeds users reported experiencing problems more often (57% and 65% respectively).

Other kinds of problems were related to poor telephone management, poor record-keeping and lack of knowledgeable staff, to name a few. There were also a number of “other responses”. Some of these responses were specific to the services being offered, for example Farmer Settlement users complained that “the farm workers are not doing their jobs properly”, “they need help maintaining property”, “farm stalls on both provinces both want rent from her”, and “people coming to chop trees without permission”. Import clients also had some very specific complaints, namely “a staff member wanted applicant to pay for bribe”, “consignment office would not extend permit”, “collusion with importers bringing of stuff illegally”, and “document was not given to a donor at the borders”.

The second most commonly cited problem related to availability of information (27%) and the third was the complexity of the application process (18%). Many other problems were mentioned, but many were specific to the departments. Billing errors, for example, were related mainly to the Billing and Water services of DWAF, and the availability of maps and spatial information was primarily a problem of the DLA’s Surveys and Mapping services.

The five most commonly experienced with service delivery by clients of DLA are shown in Figure 11. 1429 problems were reported by the 870 users of DLA who claimed that they had experienced problems with the service. Of the top five problems reported, the primary problem experienced was the time taken to issue or process claims (53.4%). The other four main complaints were availability of information (28.2%), complexity of the application or ordering process (22.1%), communicating with a DLA representative (11.6%) and the availability of staff (9.3%).

Some of the other types of problems experienced related to the availability of maps or information and the availability of forms. Accuracy in the capturing of data/information, delays, lack of knowledgeable staff and poor record-keeping were also noted as problematic. In addition, there were some other complaints that were very specific to the individual clients using the services. There were specific complaints about Land Reform services, for example “no electricity during office hours”, “not being recognised by the government”, “not assisting with transport costs”. Restriction clients also had some very specific complaints, for example “can’t use the lift, I’m old and stairs are out of the question”, “vouchers for deceased people expire and family is left out”, “taxi fare not paid”, and “they are changing my family tree”.

Figure 9 shows that the most mentioned problem across all services and departments was the time it took to issue claims or authorisations or process applications (46%). This confirms the statement by the Minister of Public Service and Administration that “...members of the public are subjected to unnecessarily cumbersome processes when they interface with government.”

The five most commonly experienced with service delivery by clients of DLA are shown in Figure 11. 1429 problems were reported by the 870 users of DLA who claimed that they had experienced problems with the service. Of the top five problems reported, the primary problem experienced was the time taken to issue or process claims (53.4%). The other four main complaints were availability of information (28.2%), complexity of the application or ordering process (22.1%), communicating with a DLA representative (11.6%) and the availability of staff (9.3%).

Some of the other types of problems experienced related to the availability of maps or information and the availability of forms. Accuracy in the capturing of data/information, delays, lack of knowledgeable staff and poor record-keeping were also noted as problematic. In addition, there were some other complaints that were very specific to the individual clients using the services. There were specific complaints about Land Reform services, for example “no electricity during office hours”, “not being recognised by the government”, “not assisting with transport costs”. Restriction clients also had some very specific complaints, for example “can’t use the lift, I’m old and stairs are out of the question”, “vouchers for deceased people expire and family is left out”, “taxi fare not paid”, and “they are changing my family tree”.

The second most commonly cited problem related to availability of information (27%) and the third was the complexity of the application process (18%). Many other problems were mentioned, but many were specific to the departments. Billing errors, for example, were related mainly to the Billing and Water services of DWAF, and the availability of maps and spatial information was primarily a problem of the DLA’s Surveys and Mapping services.
The top five problems experienced with the delivery of services by clients of DWAF are set out in Figure 12. 1105 problems were reported by the 694 DWAF users who stated that they had experienced some type of problem. The majority of problems experienced were related to the time taken to issue authorisations (36.8%). Billing errors (22%), availability of information (21.2%), the complexity of the application process (14.1%) and responses to queries (12.9%) were the other four most mentioned problems. The latter was mostly specific to Billing services. Similar to the other departments, the period of validity of authorisations, poor record keeping, availability of forms, information and staff were noted as problematic. Other problems related to poor telephone management, lack of knowledgeable staff, poor decision-making skills and lack of feedback. Some responses were very specific to the clients who were utilizing the services. The following complaints were made about Water services: “cost of the dam has gone up since applied”, “did not put a pump on borehole”, “meter box is turning quicker than usual”, “sewerage was not repaired”.

SUMMARY OF RELIABILITY: According to Parasuraman, one of the most important aspects of service delivery is to “do what you say you are going to do”. While the majority of clients across services and departments was certain that they would receive the expected service first time around, service delivery gaps existed across all departments and for most services, and their expectations thus did not match the actual services received. This means that it cannot be assumed that service delivery overall is overly reliable, and this aspect requires attention.

In addition, almost half of the clients experienced problems with the various services. The three main problems affecting the reliability of services were promptness of service, availability of information and the complexity of the processes, although more service-specific problems emerged, such as billing errors in the case of Billing services of DWAF, which should explain the large service satisfaction gap for Billing (-1.7). These problems could also be the main contributors that led to the large gaps for Farmer Settlement (-2.6) of DoA, the DLA services of Land Restitution (-1.7) and Land Reform (-1.6), and the DWAF services of Water (-2.0), in addition to Billing. These problems caused dissatisfaction, and consequently the perceived reliability of these services was severely hampered.

The services requiring the most attention are Billing of DWAF, Farmer Settlement of the DoA and Land Reform and Restitution of DLA. Farmer Settlement, Land Reform and Restitution services are aimed at redressing past discrimination, and thus deal with emotive issues. It is not surprising that the clients who use these services will have much higher expectations of what should be provided in terms of service delivery, and will therefore be far more disappointed when what is promised is not delivered. If turnaround time is the primary problem, the departments need to focus on managing expectations over and above improving service delivery.

### Figure 12: DWAF – top five problems experienced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time taken to issue authorisations</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billing errors</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of information</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of application process</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses to queries</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The top five problems experienced with the delivery of services by the clients of DWAF are set out in Figure 12. 1105 problems were reported by the 694 DWAF users who stated that they had experienced some type of problem. The majority of problems experienced were related to the time taken to issue authorisations (36.8%). Billing errors (22%), availability of information (21.2%), the complexity of the application process (14.1%) and responses to queries (12.9%) were the other four most mentioned problems. The latter was mostly specific to Billing services. Similar to the other departments, the period of validity of authorisations, poor record keeping, availability of forms, information and staff were noted as problematic. Other problems related to poor telephone management, lack of knowledgeable staff, poor decision-making skills and lack of feedback. Some responses were very specific to the clients who were utilizing the services. The following complaints were made about Water services: “cost of the dam has gone up since applied”, “did not put a pump on borehole”, “meter box is turning quicker than usual”, “sewerage was not repaired”. The SERVQUAL model indicates that responsiveness - the attention given to service users and the overall efficiency of the service - accounts for 22% of the satisfaction rating allocated to a service.

In order to provide a comprehensive assessment of responsiveness, clients were asked a combination of questions on whether the services they received were rendered within a reasonable amount of time, and how long it took to render the services compared with how long they thought it ought to have taken. In addition, clients were asked to indicate their expectations of efficiency and consequent experience of the efficiency of the services of DoA, DLA and DWAF, as well as of the staff assisting them. At this point, it should be mentioned again that promptness of service was the main overall complaint of clients when asked to identify reasons for dissatisfaction, as discussed in the previous section under reliability.

### Figure 13: Services rendered within a reasonable time (per department)

The departmental scores that show the level of satisfaction with the time within which the services were rendered can be seen in Figure 13. Generally, across the three departments, 75% of all the users felt that the services they had received had been rendered within a reasonable time. Clients dealing with DWAF, followed by DLA, mostly indicated that services had not been rendered within a reasonable time (35% and 25% respectively). Although the majority of the problems experienced by users (as discussed under reliability) was related to the time taken to issue authorisations or claims, it should be noted that only 46% of service users reported that they had experienced problems with the delivery of services by the clients of DWAF. This means that it cannot be assumed that service delivery overall is overly reliable, and this aspect requires attention.

### Figure 14: Services rendered within a reasonable time (per service and department)

Overall percentages have been statistically determined and percentages have been rounded off to the nearest decimal point.

---

27 The top five problems experienced with the delivery of services by clients of DWAF are set out in Figure 12. 1105 problems were reported by the 694 DWAF users who stated that they had experienced some type of problem. The majority of problems experienced were related to the time taken to issue authorisations (36.8%). Billing errors (22%), availability of information (21.2%), the complexity of the application process (14.1%) and responses to queries (12.9%) were the other four most mentioned problems. The latter was mostly specific to Billing services. Similar to the other departments, the period of validity of authorisations, poor record keeping, availability of forms, information and staff were noted as problematic. Other problems related to poor telephone management, lack of knowledgeable staff, poor decision-making skills and lack of feedback. Some responses were very specific to the clients who were utilizing the services. The following complaints were made about Water services: “cost of the dam has gone up since applied”, “did not put a pump on borehole”, “meter box is turning quicker than usual”, “sewerage was not repaired”.

28 The SERVQUAL model indicates that responsiveness - the attention given to service users and the overall efficiency of the service - accounts for 22% of the satisfaction rating allocated to a service.

29 Although the problem of promptness of service is an issue of requirement, it does affect the overall reliability of services.
The scores showing the satisfaction with the time within which services were delivered can be seen in Figure 14. Although the clients of DoA overall reported that the time in which services had been rendered was most reasonable, the service with the highest score for delivery within a reasonable time was Cadstral services (95%) of DLA. In addition, the overwhelming majority of DoA users who utilised engineering services (91%) and DLA Survey users (88%) were satisfied with the time taken to render services. The DWAF services were overall not rated as high as those of the other departments, but out of all DWAF services, users of Forests (74%) and Billing (70%) were most satisfied with turnaround time. The least satisfied clients were from Restitution services of DLA (36% were satisfied) and Farmer Settlement of DoA (41% were satisfied).

Service delivery for Cadstral users (DLA) took approximately a few hours (median score). Clients expected this time to be around 33% shorter than expected. Restitution clients expected the service to take about 12 months or a year, which actually took 60 months or 5 years. FaA clients waited about 6 months for the service to be delivered, but the actual time taken was about 24 hours or 3,5 days.

Land Reform clients expected the service to take approximately 6 months; but the actual turnaround time was 2 years - 75% longer than expected. Restitution clients expected the service to take about 12 months or a year, which actually took 60 months or 5 years - 80% longer than expected.

Service delivery for Water users took approximately 88 days (median score). Clients expected this time to be shorter by approximately 50% – they thus expected to get their products within 44 days. Waste users expected to wait about 44 days for the processing of applications, but on average the process took about 88 days. There was thus a 50% variance between expectations and experience. The gap average for Forest users (33%) is smaller in comparison with Waste and Water: They expected the service to take about 10 days and the actual time taken was about 15 days.

The service efficiency by department is set out in Figure 16. To measure the efficiency of the three departments, clients were asked to rate their expectations and experiences of the efficiency of the services on a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 representing the least efficient and 10 the most efficient. The difference between expectations and experiences of services was then compared. The gap between the two indicates that, for all the services, users’ expectations were higher than their actual experiences of efficiency.

The scores indicate that there was less disparity between the expectations and experiences of clients who used the services offered by DoA (-1.1), although the gap is still a cause for concern. The greatest difference between expected and perceived service efficiency was reported by the clients of DWAF (-1.8). The gap for clients of DLA services was -1.3, which was close to the average of -1.4. The average score for experienced efficiency was 6.9, with only one department scoring less than that (6.1). Interestingly, all expected scores were around 8 points, which indicates that all clients had high expectations of the various services.

All three departments require immediate attention to service efficiency since the gap for all three was greater than -1.0.

As a rule of thumb, gap scores greater than 0.5 and less than 1 are of concern, but they do not require immediate attention. Any gap scores of 1 or more should be perceived as deserving immediate attention. The larger the gap score, the more likely it is attributed to a variance between expectations and actual service delivery.
Clients were asked to rate how efficient they expected and experienced the staff to be. The scores for staff efficiency show similar trends to those of service efficiency. Again, the greatest disparity between expectations and perceived staff efficiency was for services of DWAF (-1.4), while the average gap in efficiency of staff was scored as -1.2.

Figure 19: Staff efficiency gaps by service

Looking at the gaps between the expected and experienced staff efficiency as reflected in Figure 19, the same trends become apparent. The services with the largest gaps in staff efficiency are Farmer Settlement (-2.7), Water (-1.9) and Restitution (-1.8), followed closely by Billing (-1.7) and Land Reform (-1.6). The smaller gaps in staff efficiency were experienced by clients of Surveys (-0.4), Bursaries (-0.5), Imports (-0.5) and Forest (-0.5). Overall, staff efficiency was not rated favourably and improvement is required.

Figure 20: Comparison of efficiency gaps for service and staff

Comparing the gaps in departmental and staff efficiency in Figure 20, it is evident that in all instances, the difference between expectations and perceived experiences was slightly more for the general service efficiency of the departments than of staff, particularly in the case of DWAF.
Figure 22: Enough staff members on duty by service

Figure 22 shows the scores given by clients on their perception of the availability of staff. As stated above, about two thirds of all users felt that enough staff members were on duty. However, with regard to the individual services, only 43% of clients dealing with Restitution felt there were enough staff members on duty, and only 18% of clients dealing with Engineering agreed with this statement.

Figure 23: Opinion of staff for all categories by department

Figure 23 shows the satisfaction of clients with staff. To have a more in-depth look at each department, all the responses relating to staffing and personnel were condensed to reflect the positive, non-committal or negative responses of the clients interviewed. All the scores for all the staffing aspects (neatness and professionalism, helpfulness, friendliness, knowledgeability, sufficient assistance, sufficient staff) were aggregated to arrive at an overall score for staffing and personnel for each department.

Overall, 84% of the clients interviewed held favourable opinions of the personnel who delivered the services. Although there seemed to be no large difference between the services when looking at these overall scores, the scores were lower for users of the DLA (83%) and highest for users of the DoA (88%).
From Figure 25, reflecting the level of individual attention per service, it becomes clear that in most services, more than four out of five clients felt that they had received individual attention when dealing with the service. The most notable exception is the clients of Restitution, where only 69% felt that they had received individual attention. The services that scored the highest on individual attention were Cadastral and Forest, with 95% and 93% respectively.

The issue of empathy is even more crucial in services that are more "emotive". It can be assumed that issues of land, specifically the services of Farmer Settlement, Land Reform and Land Restitution, could be construed as slightly more emotive and personal than many of the other services rendered to institutions or professionals. With this in mind, clients of these services may require more personalised attention. Farmer Settlement and Land Reform users appear to be satisfied with the level of attention provided, but this was not the case for Restitution clients.

Figure 26: Informed about process

Figure 26 shows the departmental scores for clients being informed about processes. Although users largely agreed that they had been given individual attention, a third of the clients of the three departments did not feel that they had been informed about the processes. The scores across the services were very similar and no department as a whole was rated as having provided clients with sufficient information about the processes. A third of the clients of DoA, 35% of DLA and 32% of DWAF did not receive sufficient information on the processes.

The scores for clients being informed about the process, by service, are shown in Figure 27.

SUMMARY OF ASSURANCE: The staff on duty at any given time have to be knowledgeable, courteous and convey trust and confidence to let users feel assured and satisfied with a service. All departments scored well on assurance. Service users were satisfied with the general presentation (neatness and professionalism, helpfulness, friendliness, knowledgeability, sufficient assistance) of the staff. These positive scores would increase the confidence clients have in the services. However, one issue that may be linked to the apparent dissatisfaction with the promptness of services is that only two thirds of clients felt that enough staff members were on duty. This is an important consideration, given the previous gaps identified between expectations and actual levels of service received, as well as the link between staff efficiency and perceptions of service efficiency.

3.1.4 Empathy

According to the SERVQUAL model, empathy - or understanding - conveyed to a client during a service interaction makes up 16% of a satisfaction rating allocated to a service. The indicator therefore shows whether the client felt dignified during a service encounter and whether or not the service provider treated him or her with respect and provided the kind of service the client felt he or she deserved.

Clients of DoA, DLA and DWAF were asked to give their opinions on how they perceived the attention that had been given to them during the service encounter, how informed they had felt about the services being offered and whether they had been given sufficient information in order to get the service or product they desired.

Figure 24: Individual attention (per department)

Figure 24 shows that most users (88%) agreed that they had been given individual attention while using one of the 14 services of DoA, DLA and DWAF. However, clients dealing with the DLA’s services were slightly less likely to agree with this statement (86% agreed). In all services across all the departments, the proportion of users who disagreed with the statement was around 7%.

Figure 25: Individual attention by service

Figure 25 shows the level of individual attention per service, it becomes clear that in most services, more than four out of five clients felt that they had received individual attention when dealing with the service. The most notable exception is the clients of Restitution, where only 69% felt that they had received individual attention. The services that scored the highest on individual attention were Cadastral and Forest, with 95% and 93% respectively.

The issue of empathy is even more crucial in services that are more "emotive". It can be assumed that issues of land, specifically the services of Farmer Settlement, Land Reform and Land Restitution, could be construed as slightly more emotive and personal than many of the other services rendered to institutions or professionals. With this in mind, clients of these services may require more personalised attention. Farmer Settlement and Land Reform users appear to be satisfied with the level of attention provided, but this was not the case for Restitution clients.

Figure 26: Informed about process

Figure 26 shows the departmental scores for clients being informed about processes. Although users largely agreed that they had been given individual attention, a third of the clients of the three departments did not feel that they had been informed about the processes. The scores across the services were very similar and no department as a whole was rated as having provided clients with sufficient information about the processes. A third of the clients of DoA, 35% of DLA and 32% of DWAF did not receive sufficient information on the processes.

The scores for clients being informed about the process, by service, are shown in Figure 27.

Figure 27: Informed about the process by service
In most of the services, around two thirds of the users reported that they had been informed about the processes. Only three services scored well below the majority of services: 59% of clients dealing with the Farmer service and 60% of those dealing with Deeds and Billing reported that they had been informed about the processes. Particular attention should be given to all services to improve the availability and provision of information, since a lack of information may affect perceptions of overall service satisfaction.

Client satisfaction with the sufficiency of the information provided by the departments is shown in Figure 28.

**Figure 28: Sufficient information provided on services (per department)**

With regard to the information provided on services as a whole, the results were a little more encouraging. 78% of clients across the three departments felt that they had received sufficient information about the services. DLA users were most satisfied with the information supplied to them on the services (89%), while DWAF users were the least satisfied (72%).

**Figure 29: Sufficient information provided on services (per service)**

Client satisfaction with the sufficiency of the information provided per service is shown in Figure 29. Overall, nearly 80% of the users reported that the information they had received about the services was sufficient. The clients dealing with Engineering, Cadastre, Deeds and Surveys were most likely to mention that the information was sufficient. Farmer Settlement and Billing clients were least likely to have been provided with sufficient information about the services.

The levels of consultation with clients by departments are shown in Figure 30.

**Figure 30: Have been consulted by a departmental representative**

Clients were asked whether they or their professional organisation or society had ever been consulted by DoA, DLA or DWAF about the services rendered to them. Overall, 27% of the clients had been consulted or asked their opinion about the services rendered by the departments. However, more than seven out of 10 (73%) clients reported that they had not been contacted, nor consulted, by a departmental representative. This was particularly prevalent for DoA (77%) and DWAF (77%). A third of DLA’s clients (although this is not a large percentage) had been consulted by a representative.

**SUMMARY OF EMPATHY:** The provision of caring, individualised attention to clients, through the provision of sufficient information and a platform for consultation, will ensure satisfactory service interactions with clients. Clients seemed to rate the empathy of service providers high, with 88% believing that they had received individual attention. However, only two thirds (67%) of clients believed that they had been informed about the processes and 78% of clients across the three departments felt that they had received sufficient information about the services. Overall, 27% of the clients indicated that the departments had consulted them about the services rendered. Empathy is important, especially to individual clients who view services in emotional terms, as is the case with Land Reform, Farmer Settlement and Restitution. Restitution clients were not satisfied that they had received individual attention.

3.1.5 Tangibles

Tangibles tend to be the things most often considered for improvement when deciding to improve the level of satisfaction experienced by clients.

The SERVQUAL model suggests that tangibles, such as the appearance of the physical facilities, staff and communication material, and the sophistication of the service environment account for no more than 11% of a client’s overall satisfaction.

Clients were asked to evaluate the tangible aspects of the 14 services according to certain criteria, including accessibility, way-finding, the physical facilities and value for money.

With regard to the information provided on services as a whole, the results were a little more encouraging. 78% of clients across the three departments felt that they had received sufficient information about the services. DLA users were most satisfied with the information supplied to them on the services (89%), while DWAF users were the least satisfied (72%).
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Client satisfaction with the sufficiency of the information provided per service is shown in Figure 29. Overall, nearly 80% of the users reported that the information they had received about the services was sufficient. The clients dealing with Engineering, Cadastre, Deeds and Surveys were most likely to mention that the information was sufficient. Farmer Settlement and Billing clients were least likely to have been provided with sufficient information about the services.

The levels of consultation with clients by departments are shown in Figure 30.
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Clients were asked whether they or their professional organisation or society had ever been consulted by DoA, DLA or DWAF about the services rendered to them. Overall, 27% of the clients had been consulted or asked their opinion about the services rendered by the departments. However, more than seven out of 10 (73%) clients reported that they had not been contacted, nor consulted, by a departmental representative. This was particularly prevalent for DoA (77%) and DWAF (77%). A third of DLA’s clients (although this is not a large percentage) had been consulted by a representative.

**SUMMARY OF EMPATHY:** The provision of caring, individualised attention to clients, through the provision of sufficient information and a platform for consultation, will ensure satisfactory service interactions with clients. Clients seemed to rate the empathy of service providers high, with 88% believing that they had received individual attention. However, only two thirds (67%) of clients believed that they had been informed about the processes and 78% of clients across the three departments felt that they had received sufficient information about the services. Overall, 27% of the clients indicated that the departments had consulted them about the services rendered. Empathy is important, especially to individual clients who view services in emotional terms, as is the case with Land Reform, Farmer Settlement and Restitution. Restitution clients were not satisfied that they had received individual attention.

3.1.5 Tangibles

Tangibles tend to be the things most often considered for improvement when deciding to improve the level of satisfaction experienced by clients.

The SERVQUAL model suggests that tangibles, such as the appearance of the physical facilities, staff and communication material, and the sophistication of the service environment account for no more than 11% of a client’s overall satisfaction.

Clients were asked to evaluate the tangible aspects of the 14 services according to certain criteria, including accessibility, way-finding, the physical facilities and value for money.
Figure 33: Way-finding (per department)

Figure 33 reflects the information that was gathered to assess way-finding activities at service points. Clients who had visited the physical service points were asked how they had known where to go once they were at the service point. The findings indicate that, overall, asking an attendant (36%), following signage (27%) and asking a colleague (19%) were the most common means of way-finding. The remainder of users responded that they had asked another person, not a staff member, to show them where to go.

DoA clients used signage more (32%) than clients from the other departments, while DLA clients were less likely to use signage (24%). DWAF users reported that they had asked attendants (45%), as did 39% of DoA clients. DLA clients were more likely to ask a colleague for directions (27%).

Other responses (9%) were also recorded, for example, some of the users knew what to do and where to go because they used to study or work there, or called the department in advance and obtained directions.

Figure 34: Perceived safety and cleanliness of facilities

As tangibles are most often considered for improvement, clients were asked to rate the safety and cleanliness of the facilities. The perceived safety and cleanliness of facilities is shown in Figure 34. The clients rated the facilities favourably for safety (93%) and cleanliness (93%). In relation to the other services, the lowest score for cleanliness came from DLA users (92%) and the highest from DoA users (96%). The lowest scores for safety came from DWAF users (92%) and the highest from DoA (95%).
Clients were asked to state their preference for downloading forms and accessing services of the departments via the Internet. Although this question did not assess satisfaction levels, it is stated in the SERVQUAL model that communication material and the sophistication of the service environment are aspects that affect satisfaction. In line with this concept, Internet access can and will become a tangible facet of satisfaction, and this information can provide baseline data for future surveys. The ability to access forms and the necessary information via the Internet may improve the service satisfaction of clients due to the increased ease, accessibility and availability of information, and hence have an impact on more than one SERVQUAL indicator.

What is important here is that 67% of the clients from the three departments indicated a preference for Internet access. DLA's users were most in favour of using the Internet (71%), and users of DWAF and DoA least in favour (65% and 66% respectively) of this. It can, however, be a reflection of the type of clients using the services, and whether or not they have access to the Internet.

### SUMMARY OF TANGIBLES

The physical appearance and availability of facilities and equipment affect the satisfaction ratings of service users. Overall, tangibles scored highly for all departments. Clients rated the accessibility of services very positively (92%), as well as the operating hours (95%). Accessibility could be enhanced by improving Internet services, since 67% of the clients indicated a preference for this type of access. Of those who physically visited the facilities, the overwhelming majority felt that it was clean and safe. The majority also felt that the services offered value for their money. In terms of way-finding, 27% overall used signage to find their way, while the majority asked someone. This indicates that more could possibly be done to enhance way-finding. Overall, only a third of the clients did recall seeing the particulars of a duty manager on display. This, together with clear complaints procedures, can assist clients to know who is in charge and where to complain or report any misgivings.

### 3.2 Defining Satisfaction Estimates

Developing an overall estimate of citizen satisfaction is a useful tool for comparison between services or across departments. The scores provide the basis for understanding the satisfaction levels reported by the clients of DoA, DLA and DWAF, combining the five SERVQUAL indicators into a single expression. This number, however, does not indicate the percentage of clients satisfied with a service, but the percentage level of clients’ satisfaction with the service, e.g. it cannot be stated that 70% of DLA clients were satisfied with the service, but rather that the service scores 70 out of 100 for meeting citizens’ satisfaction. This is an expression of the services’ overall performance against the range of criteria applicable to citizen satisfaction surveys.

Satisfaction scores provide the basis for understanding the satisfaction levels reported by citizens. This is a useful, if not altogether objective, exercise, since benchmarking citizens’ perceptions of service and departmental delivery allows managers the opportunity to contextualise the individual scores for each aspect of satisfaction, as reported above.
The overall average is 71% for the institutions shown on the graph in Figure 37. Only DoA fell well above the benchmark average. The range of scores of the three departments (79 – 70) falls within the array of scores for other public sector services (58 – 71). Furthermore, the higher score of DoA compares favourably against the private sector. While the scores for private sector services were on average higher, poor service delivery in the private sector implies a loss of revenue. Competition is thus a motivating factor in maintaining higher service standards. (Although caution should be taken when comparing scores - the survey tools and methodologies were not identical - the comparison does give a general indication of the levels of satisfaction.)

To allow for the true comparison of scores, the methods of deriving the scores should be identical and the “conditions” under which clients offer satisfaction ratings should be consistent. This is not often possible, e.g. clients passing judgement on the service delivery of more stressful, life-threatening or life-enhancing services, such as health and emergency services, make their value judgement under very different conditions to those clients who routinely use administrative services. It is therefore not frequently possible to allow for a direct comparison between the levels of satisfaction awarded to individual services across different sectors and methods of citizen satisfaction surveys. However, a comparison of the scores for the three departments can be interpreted with confidence.

Figure 39: Comparing scores for public, private, service point, service delivery

To provide further context to the satisfaction scores on the scorecard, clients were required to provide comparative scores for the overall service delivery of each department when using a particular service, the service point they used, government departments in general and a hypothetical score for the private sector should the private sector begin to offer such services. These scores are shown in Figure 39.

The average scores for service delivery across the three departments and the service site were 71.1 and 70.0 respectively, while the average score for rating government departments was 5.4. The hypothetical private sector score (6.8) was higher than the one for government departments.

Table 5: Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction indicator</th>
<th>DoA</th>
<th>DLA</th>
<th>DWAF</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangibles</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction score</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instead of merely asking respondents to rate their level of satisfaction for overall service received, a “scorecard” was prepared for each department. The scorecard was derived from the following calculation:

- Scores are weighted according to the SERVQUAL indicators (reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy and tangibles).
- An average for each indicator was calculated by using the three departments’ scores.
- The scores are presented out of 100 to allow for comparison with previous satisfaction levels.

Satisfaction scores for the five SERVQUAL indicators were the highest on the whole for DoA (79%), in comparison with the other departments. DWAF scored the lowest (70%). The highest scores for reliability, responsiveness, assurance and tangibles were for DoA’s services (75%, 77%, 88% and 74% respectively), but DLA had the top-most score for empathy (80%).

Departments that scored overall lowest on the five SERVQUAL indicators were as follows: DWAF scored the least for reliability, responsiveness and empathy, while DLA scored the least for assurance and tangibles.

Figure 38: Satisfaction scores for South African public and private sector services

In benchmarking the satisfaction ratings, researchers referred to previously cited levels of satisfaction in the South African private sector and the initial round of interviews that were conducted for the Departments of Education, Health, Housing and Social Development, as commissioned by the PSC. The findings in this section provide a comparison that allows readers to contextualise the levels of satisfaction for the 14 services of DoA, DLA and DWAF more broadly.

Note that the scores in the table are satisfaction scores out of 10, and not percentages.
Figure 40: Service would be improved if offered by a private service provider

Figure 40 shows the perceptions of clients regarding whether or not the services would improve if they would be provided by the private sector. 41% of the users believed that there would be an improvement, although more clients from DoA and DLA (58% and 57% respectively) did not feel that services would improve if there were some competition from the private sector. There were a few clients who did not know if this would make a difference - 5% overall from the three departments - but DWAF clients did think that it would make a difference (49%).

Figure 41: Lodged complaint regarding service (per department)

Figure 41 shows the number of clients who have raised complaints. This is an important indicator of satisfaction. While overall only 16% of them reported that they had lodged complaints, it is important to be cautious when interpreting this figure. A low score does not necessarily indicate that this is a favourable position; one confounding factor may be that they had complaints about the complaints-handling process. Most clients who had lodged complaints were from DWAF (19%), with the least from DoA (13%).

Figure 42: Lodged complaint (per service)

Figure 42 shows the number of clients who lodged complaints on a service level. From the above figure, it appears that clients of DoA were more likely to lodge complaints. However, there are differences between the individual services. More than half the clients dealing with Farmer Settlement lodged complaints, whereas only 10% of clients dealing with Breeding did so. Engineering clients were also more likely to lodge complaints (38%). In DLA, clients of Land Reform lodged the most complaints (27%), and in DWAF, clients of Billing did (24%). The lowest number of complaints were lodged by users of Surveys (6%).

Figure 43 indicates the perceptions of whether the complaints that had been lodged, were dealt with in a satisfactory manner.

Figure 43: Complaint was dealt with in a satisfactory manner (per department)

Almost two thirds of the users across the three departments (60%) who had lodged complaints were dissatisfied with the way in which they were dealt with. The highest proportion of dissatisfied clients were users of DWAF’s services (67%), and the lowest number of clients dissatisfied with the way in which complaints were dealt with were DLA users (52%).
A SWOT analysis is as much about determining the weaknesses and threats as it is about considering the achievements of a service and the opportunities for strengthening service delivery. A SWOT analysis encourages managers to look at the institution that delivers the service from the outside. The key to successfully interpreting a SWOT analysis lies in the ability to compare the needs and expectations of clients with the resources and opportunities in order to align the services and the department with clients’ needs. The SWOT analysis enables the department to “produce a strategy that will balance its internal capabilities with its external environment.”

SWOT analyses are not designed to evaluate day-to-day management, but provide managers with key insights as to where their services are strong and weak.

Overall, various strengths have been identified by the citizen satisfaction survey. Comparing the findings to the key concerns of this study and the Batho Pele principles, it is positive to note that a number of the basic principles have been realised by the services of DoA, DLA and DWAF. Through these surveys, citizens have been given a voice and ability to share their perceptions of DoA, DLA and DWAF services and provide input into the analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of these services. The recommendations made by clients and presented in a SWOT analysis, can be used to assist Public Service managers and departmental officials in their decisions on the direction they feel service delivery should take in each department and service. Thus, knowing where a service or department has already achieved its objectives or where it can be improved provides key insights for the development of the service and the department, the service delivery mechanisms, and an opportunity to align these with the needs and expectations of clients of the service.

To this end, the National Treasury encourages the use of a SWOT analysis, among others, as a tool in the alignment of operating budgets and performance assessments. In the document “Treasury Guidelines on Preparing 2002 Budget Submissions”, the department clearly illustrates the link between integrating strategic planning and the budgeting process. Furthermore, this is underscored by section 38 of the PPFA, which requires that departments operate responsibly, ensuring the effective, efficient, economical and transparent use of resources. Hence, the objective is to align the outcome of services with the resources or outputs, while optimally delivering public services.

Even though the objectives of the survey were not to assess the services and their adherence to Batho Pele principles, many of the findings can be aligned with the basic tenets. Comparing the findings to the key concerns of the study with the compliance of Batho Pele principles, it is positive to note the following:

- Clients felt that they had been treated with respect and courtesy in that overall scores for the SERVQUAL indicator empathy were positive; thus emphasizing that clients felt that they had received the service they deserved. This was illustrated by the fact that although certain aspects can be fine-tuned, there is still much room for improvement.

- Clients did indicate that they had received information about the processes and the services. Although overall scores indicate favourable satisfaction with the information provided, clients did suggest that there was a need for wider, comprehensive information about the services and, in particular, the processes.

- Access to services, including operating hours, was rated well.

- Clients generally felt that the service had provided value for money. This is one of the tangible aspects of satisfaction, but an important facet for the Public Service, since the services should be provided in an economical and efficient manner.

- Generally, the gap between service expectations and actual service was not large. However, one should nonetheless strive to reduce the gap as there is always room for improvement. In this study clients generally displayed an understanding of the services they received, since they were largely aware of what to expect. This was in line with the Batho Pele principle of service standards and was addressed by the SERVQUAL indicator reliability.

SUMMARY OF SATISFACTION ESTIMATES: The departments generally received favourable scores for the five SERVQUAL indicators, with client satisfaction being the highest for DoA (79%) and lowest for DWAF (70%). Overall scores for the five indicators were above 70%, except for reliability at 68%. Assurance scored the highest at 84%.

In comparison to scores of the private sector and other government departments from previous surveys, DoA scored well above the average for satisfaction. DWAF scored below average, but not as low as other public service departments that had previously been assessed. These findings are positive and provide a good benchmark for the future monitoring and evaluation of the departments, although certain aspects can be fine-tuned. Furthermore, although overall scores are good, there is still much room for improvement.

There are two areas that require attention. Over a third of all clients would like to see the services rendered by the private sector, and although very few clients had lodged complaints, the majority of the complainants were dissatisfied with the complaints-handling mechanisms.

3.3 Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT)

Up to this point, the satisfaction levels in relation to the SERVQUAL indicators have been discussed and general satisfaction estimates have been provided. However, the analysis was also conducted at a service point level which indicated where the major differences occurred in each of the departments. In addition to documenting the satisfaction levels of departments and services, the surveys sought to indicate the observed strengths and weaknesses in service delivery and make recommendations, based on client needs and perceptions and an overall assessment of the findings.

A SWOT analysis is a tool that uses available information to indicate the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of a particular service. It is an important management tool, because it provides managers with large amounts of information about their departments, organised in a systematic way, and allows them to prioritise changes that may need to be made in the design and delivery of services.
While a low number of complaints were lodged, a large number of the complainants reported that the complaints had not been dealt with satisfactorily. The question arises can this mean that the reason for the low number of complaints being lodged may have been influenced by the process of dealing with complaints? The complaint mechanism might be a weakness of the department resulting in reluctance by clients to complain.

A summary of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats for each of the three departments is provided in the tables below. The observations made have been drawn from the gap between client expectations and the actual level of service they received during the service encounter. If the satisfaction gap for a service was greater than -1 (which indicates a need for improved service delivery), it was highlighted as a weakness or threat depending on the level of dissatisfaction. If the gap was less than 0.5, it was classified as a strength and, in some cases, an opportunity for improving service delivery.

The findings are presented in a matrix form to illustrate how citizens might perceive service delivery. The vertical side of the matrix ranks the findings based on the level of importance to them, while the horizontal side illustrates the progression, from the citizen’s point of view, from low to high satisfaction with services received. The latter means that strengths and weaknesses are the most immediate and important aspects in accessing services. On the other hand less importance is attached to longer term threats as their main concern is a better service now, i.e. in the short term. Similarly they attach less importance to opportunities for improvement of services since they often lack the detailed knowledge of the policies and processes being instituted by departments, without knowing or being aware that these opportunities can lead to higher satisfaction levels on the longer term.

### 3.3.1 Department of Agriculture

#### Strengths

- High confidence in expected service or product
- In some instances turnaround time is reasonable
- Overall staff and service delivery are efficient
- Individual attention is given to clients
- Facilities are accessible and operating hours reasonable
- Facilities are safe and clean
- Service received is value for money

#### Weaknesses

- Expectations and experienced service delivery do not match
- Commonly experienced problems:
  - Time taken to process claims/authorisations is too long
  - Information is not available
  - Application process is complex
  - Period of validity of authorisations is too short
  - Forms are not available
  - Telephone management is poor
  - Input accuracy is poor
  - Record keeping is poor
  - Staff lack knowledge about the service they deliver
  - In some instances turnaround time is not satisfactory
  - Staff on duty are not easily accessible
  - Insufficient information on the services and service process is provided to clients
  - Consultation by a DoA representative did not take place
  - Signage is poorly placed
  - Duty manager details are not on display
  - In some services many clients lodged complaints
  - Complaints-handling is not well managed

#### Opportunities

- The services are accessible through other means
- Clients are willing to access the service via the Internet

#### Threats

- Clients prefer the private sector as a service provider

Areas for improvement include, in order of priority, the following:

- Turnaround time of certain claims/authorisations
- Availability of information and forms
- Complexity of the application process
- Period of validity of authorisations
- Accuracy and record-keeping
- Complaints-handling process
- Telephone management
- Consultation with DoA representatives
- Signage
3.3.3 Department of Water Affairs and Forestry

**Strengths**

The overall satisfaction score was 71.

- Clients expressed confidence in expected service delivery
- Staff are helpful and courteous
- Clients receive individual attention
- Overall clients received sufficient information on the services
- Accessibility and operating hours are favourable
- Facilities are safe and clean
- Service received is value for money

**Weaknesses**

DWAF scored lowest on reliability, responsiveness and empathy

- Disparities exist between expected and experienced service delivery
- Most commonly experienced problems:
  - Time taken to issue or process claims or authorisations is too long
  - Information is not easily available
  - The application process is complex
  - Communication with a DLA representative – problems exist with language barriers and availability
  - Staff are not always available
  - Maps and spatial information are not available
  - Forms are not easily available
  - Record-keeping and accuracy are poor
  - Staff lack knowledge
  - Deeds are unnecessarily rejected
- In some instances turnaround time is unsatisfactory
- Overall staff and service delivery are not efficient
- Inadequate information is available on service processes and services as a whole
- Signage is poorly placed
- Duty manager details are not on display
- Complaints-handling is not well managed

**Opportunities**

- The services are accessible through other means
- Clients prefer the private sector as a service provider

**Threats**

- Clients prefer the private sector as a service provider
- Turnaround time
- Billing errors (Billing and Water)
- Information is not easily available
- The application process is complex
- Response to queries is poor (Billing)
- Period of validity of authorisations is not long enough
- Record-keeping and accuracy are poor
- Forms are not easily available
- Telephone management is poor
- Staff lack knowledge
- Staff have poor decision-making skills
- Staff and service delivery are inefficient
- Staff on duty are not always accessible
- Consultation by a DWA representative did not take place
- Signage is poorly placed
- Duty manager details are not on display
- Complaints-handling is not well managed

Areas for improvement include, in order of priority, the following:

- Turnaround time
- Availability of information, staff and forms
- Complexity of the application process
- Period of validity of authorisation
- Accuracy and record-keeping
- Service and staff efficiency
- Knowledgeable staff
- Complaints-handling process
- Telephone management
- Communication with DLA representatives
- Signage
- Knowledgeable staff and decision-making skills
- Complaints-handling process
- Telephone management
- Consultation and communication with DWAF representatives
- Signage
Conclusion
Measuring citizen satisfaction of service delivery is a vital component of performance management. These surveys contained measurements that incorporate the five SERVQUAL satisfaction indicators described and researched by Parasuraman et al. The indicators are reliability, assurance, tangibles, empathy and responsiveness. Furthermore, the tools designed for the citizen satisfaction surveys have incorporated seven of the Batho Pele principles, namely consultation, service standards, access, courtesy, information, redress and value for money.

The information gathered provided key insights on the services of the three departments selected for inclusion in this survey. They were the Department of Agriculture, Land Affairs and Water Affairs and Forestry.

The expectations of clients on various aspects of service delivery have been compared to their actual experiences. The gaps between expectations and experience were analyzed to determine whether these were reasonable or whether the services required immediate attention in specific service delivery areas. Findings indicate that, while the majority of clients was certain that they would receive the expected services first time around, service delivery gaps existed across all departments and for most services, and their expectations did not match the actual services received. The three main problems affecting the reliability of departments are promptness of the services, availability of information, and complexity of the processes.

Responsiveness is indicative of the willingness of staff to deliver prompt and efficient service. Responsiveness seems to be the biggest problem with citizen satisfaction in that clients generally expect a fast turnaround time or promptness of services. However, actual turnaround time is not in accordance with expectations. This deserves further investigation and improvement. In addition, there is a close link between service efficiency and perceived staff efficiency, which indicates that perceived problems of promptness are likely to be the result of perceived staff inefficiencies.

Assurance is the aspect of service delivery that inspires trust and confidence. It is underscored by client evaluation of frontline staff and the assessment of staff attitudes, behavior, level of knowledge and availability. All departments scored well on assurance. Service users were satisfied with the general presentation (neatness and professionalism), helpfulness, friendliness, knowledgeability, sufficient assistance) of the staff. These positive scores increased the confidence clients have in the services. However, one issue that may be linked to the apparent dissatisfaction with the promptness of services is that clients felt that there was not enough staff on duty. This is an important consideration, given the previous gaps identified between expectations and actual levels of service received and the link between staff efficiency and perceptions of service efficiency.

Empathy of a service provider is displayed by the care and individualized attention provided to clients. This is demonstrated by the information provided to service users, and attention and consultation they receive. Overall, most clients felt that they had received individual attention; but information provided to clients regarding the services and processes was insufficient and more consultation with service users is required by departments.

Tangibles are the things that are often considered for improvement, such as the appearance of physical facilities, staff and communication material, and the sophistication of the service environment. Generally, clients were satisfied with the accessibility and operating hours, cleanliness and safety of the facilities. However, areas deserving attention are signage, display of duty manager details and Internet access.

Furthermore, the satisfaction indicators have been used in developing an overall satisfaction score for each department. The overall scores have been tabled in a scorecard and represented in a graph, which has benchmarked these scores against satisfaction levels documented in the South African private sector and for other public services. Overall, the departments scored within the range of other government departments, and generally aligned with private sector services.

The expectations of clients on various aspects of service delivery have been compared to their actual experiences. The gaps between expectations and experience were analyzed to determine whether these were reasonable or whether the services required immediate attention in specific service delivery areas. Findings indicate that, while the majority of clients was certain that they would receive the expected services first time around, service delivery gaps existed across all departments and for most services, and their expectations did not match the actual services received. The three main problems affecting the reliability of departments are promptness of the services, availability of information, and complexity of the processes.

Responsiveness is indicative of the willingness of staff to deliver prompt and efficient service. Responsiveness seems to be the biggest problem with citizen satisfaction in that clients generally expect a fast turnaround time or promptness of services. However, actual turnaround time is not in accordance with expectations. This deserves further investigation and improvement. In addition, there is a close link between service efficiency and perceived staff efficiency, which indicates that perceived problems of promptness are likely to be the result of perceived staff inefficiencies.

Assurance is the aspect of service delivery that inspires trust and confidence. It is underscored by client evaluation of frontline staff and the assessment of staff attitudes, behavior, level of knowledge and availability. All departments scored well on assurance. Service users were satisfied with the general presentation (neatness and professionalism, helpfulness, friendliness, knowledgeability, sufficient assistance) of the staff. These positive scores increased the confidence clients have in the services. However, one issue that may be linked to the apparent dissatisfaction with the promptness of services is that clients felt that there was not enough staff on duty. This is an important consideration, given the previous gaps identified between expectations and actual levels of service received and the link between staff efficiency and perceptions of service efficiency.

Empathy of a service provider is displayed by the care and individualized attention provided to clients. This is demonstrated by the information provided to service users, and attention and consultation they receive. Overall, most clients felt that they had received individual attention; but information provided to clients regarding the services and processes was insufficient and more consultation with service users is required by departments.

Tangibles are the things that are often considered for improvement, such as the appearance of physical facilities, staff and communication material, and the sophistication of the service environment. Generally, clients were satisfied with the accessibility and operating hours, cleanliness and safety of the facilities. However, areas deserving attention are signage, display of duty manager details and Internet access.

Furthermore, the satisfaction indicators have been used in developing an overall satisfaction score for each department. The overall scores have been tabled in a scorecard and represented in a graph, which has benchmarked these scores against satisfaction levels documented in the South African private sector and for other public services. Overall, the departments scored within the range of other government departments, and generally aligned with private sector services.
Chapter Five

Recommendations
The results from the survey have been used to form the basis on which to make recommendations for improvements to the services of DoA, DLA and DWAF. Furthermore, these recommendations have drawn on the most common or serious service delivery challenges highlighted by clients who participated in the survey. The recommendations serve to provide guidelines for the prioritisation of service delivery improvement in the light of the Constitutional values and principles that govern public administration and the Batho Pele principles.

The areas that require further development and strengthening are as follows:

- In most service areas gaps exist between the expected and experienced service delivery. The departments need to address the service problems experienced and improve it to be more in line with user expectations. To be in line with the Constitutional value of ‘responsiveness to needs’ and the Batho Pele principle of the ‘setting of standards’, it is recommended that frequent consultations be held with service users in order to determine their expectations.

- Turnaround time needs to be given top priority in all the services. This issue has to be addressed, so that clients can have more confidence in the overall efficiency of the services promised and time is not wasted due to unnecessary errors and inefficiency. To be in line with the Constitutional values of ‘Efficiency, economy and effectiveness’ and ‘accountability’, as well as the Batho Pele principle of ‘service standards’, it is recommended that departments evaluate their administrative processes in order to post gains in service delivery enhancement.

- In line with the Constitutional and Batho Pele principles of ‘transparency’ and ‘information’, users should be provided with more information on the processes involved and the time taken to achieve their end goals. If expectations are kept in check in this way, many of the problems relating to turnaround time, reliability and inefficiency may be reduced. It is recommended that by the use of service standards, based on the priorities of citizens, departments ensure accountability in meeting client expectations.

- The availability of competent staff on duty needs to be investigated and improved. To adhere to the Constitutional and Batho Pele principles of ‘efficiency, economy and effectiveness’, ‘human resource management’ and ‘access’, it is recommended that more staff members have to be trained to improve competency, and their availability in and around the service points should be improved.

- In order to increase access to services and provide information, it is recommended that signage has to be improved.

- In line with the Constitutional values of responding to people’s needs and accountability as well as the Batho Pele principle of ‘redress’, it is recommended that departments attend to the rate of complaints, and in particular the complaints mechanisms and the use of complaint boxes and toll-free numbers. The details of an official or manager on duty should also be visible to all clients at all times.

- To further improve service delivery, it is recommended that departments who have not done it yet consider the access to the services via the Internet and advanced technology for which this is possible. This source could also be used to register clients and potential clients on a database, which would enable departments to distribute information to them.

- It is also recommended that in line with the Constitutional principle of ‘efficiency, economy and effectiveness’, departments consider the simplification of application processes. Making forms readily available and reducing the complexity of the application and ordering processes (using simple formatting and language on forms) may further streamline the process. As suggested above, increased communication may provide opportunities to disseminate information to clients, and mitigate any confusion that may arise.

- Many of the above recommendations can not be implemented properly without valid and updated records of clients. It is therefore recommended that attention be afforded to the development and application of workable recordkeeping systems/databases.

- It is finally recommended that departments consider ways and means to centrally and in a coordinated process, assist components to attend to the above recommendations.
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Appendix A

Description of Services
Table 6: The five services identified by the Department of Agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breeding Certificates and Authorisations</td>
<td>To prevent the contamination of agricultural livestock, whether for the purposes of consumption or not, those involved in breeding (including farmers, stud breeders, and agents operating on their behalf) are required to have authorisation to import breeding materials into South Africa. This includes the import of livestock, genetic products, embryos, semen, etc. As with Import Permits, all animal products that require transit through South Africa also require permits. This service falls within the ambit of Animal Health at the DoA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Import Permits</td>
<td>The government requires that any animal products brought into the country must have due authorisation. Importers need import permits for importing animals or any animal products (e.g., meat and dairy products). The clients of this service include farmers, large-scale manufacturers such as Nestlé (producing chocolates), supermarkets and agents operating on behalf of these clients. This service falls within the ambit of Animal Health at the DoA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer Settlement</td>
<td>The DoA owns State land that is intended for agricultural purposes. In line with South Africa’s programme to address the historic racially motivated economic imbalance, the DoA leases this land to farmers who are classified as previously disadvantaged. Farmers pay rental for the land and are expected to use it for agricultural purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursaries, Scholarships and Internships</td>
<td>In order to increase skills within the agricultural sector, the DoA provides bursaries and scholarships to scholars and students who intend to pursue studies that benefit the agricultural sector in South Africa. These studies include traditional agricultural studies such as farming, animal husbandry and agricultural engineering, as well as others, such as financial management, accounting and scientific research. In addition, the DoA provides internships in the agricultural sector. This service falls within the ambit of Communications at the DoA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Engineering Services</td>
<td>Agricultural engineering services provide technical support and advice to provincial and regional government managers. Through this service, the DoA provides strategic assistance in the construction of agricultural and, more specifically, irrigation and other water catchment projects, including boreholes and dams to collect run-off water.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: The five services identified by the Department of Land Affairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cadastral Surveys Information Supply Service</td>
<td>The Cadastral Surveys Information Supply Service provides information on the cadastral boundaries of land in South Africa. Clients included in the service are largely external (i.e., not working for a government department). Land surveyors and those developing land-based projects use the information. The service provides advice on boundaries on property disputes, information on the shifting of natural features, such as rivers, and provides outputs, including surveyor reports, maps and photographs. Surveyors employed by this service respond to queries by physically surveying the land at times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys and Mapping</td>
<td>Land surveyors in the public and private sector form the majority of this service’s client base. For the purposes of this survey, INTERNAL CLIENTS were interviewed. Surveys and Mapping provides maps and aerial photographs of South Africa. Maps include those delimited by political boundaries, cadastral boundaries and natural features. Aerial photographs provide cross-sectional information (i.e., at a specific point in time) and longitudinal assessments to track changes in the landscape over time. The latter service has been used to clarify the restitution of land rights claims for dispossessed communities. This department routinely maps the country’s surface by using aerial photography, but does not provide tailor-made solutions. Information supplied to clients is largely taken from records on file.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restitution of Land Rights</td>
<td>This service involves the process of investigating claims made by South African citizens who have been previously dispossessed of their land through forced removals. Claims are lodged with the Regional Land Claims Commission, and are then investigated. If proven accurate, a process of negotiated restitution (restoring) of land rights to the dispossessed is undertaken. The process involves negotiation between the State and the current occupants of the land. Claims tend to be on agricultural land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Reform</td>
<td>South Africa’s programme of Land Reform is geared towards a variety of scenarios, including the purchasing of land by the State for redistribution to mitigate the historic racially driven patterns of land ownership. This service also caters for labour tenants and provides security of tenure on agricultural land to populations of agricultural workers. In addition, the DLA works with local government to lease commonage to subsistence farmers at municipal levels. The clients of this service are applicants in the land reform process; they may not have ever had entitlements to land. The objective of this service is to balance the patterns of land ownership and tenure in South Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deeds Registration</td>
<td>The clients of Deeds Registration are from conveyance firms and their representatives. Title deeds are registered on the sale of all property in South Africa. Conveyancers are required to lodge formal applications for the title deeds, providing the particulars and identity numbers of the persons in whose names the land must be registered. The registration process is conducted to provide a legal framework to record the ownership of land and to protect the rights of the legal owner(s), should there be a dispute.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: The four services identified by the Department of Water Affairs and Forestry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Water Affairs and Forestry</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Billing of Major Water Users</em></td>
<td>DWAF sells water directly to a variety of clients. These clients include large industrial plants, agricultural projects and farms, and municipalities and water brokers for resale. These clients receive statements directly from DWAF and are required to pay the State for the water consumed. Representatives of these clients are professional and local government officials largely from the finance departments of the relevant clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Managers and accounting officers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External clients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Licensing of Activities on State Forest Land</strong></td>
<td>Certain groups of people require access to forestland that is owned by the State. Access to and activities on this land must be negotiated with the State. State Forest land includes rivers, parks and natural areas, but also all indigenous plants and trees in South Africa. Clients of this service may include scout groups, birding clubs, hikers who wish to access the land for non-consumptive purposes (e.g. birdwatching, camping or hiking), or those wishing to make use of the forest for consumptive reasons, including flower picking, timber collection and building of residential dwellings. A large proportion of the citizens interviewed in this survey were clients who had felled indigenous trees on their private properties. Citizens tended to be natural persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Citizens in their private capacity and representatives of community and other groups)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External clients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorisations for Waste Disposal</strong></td>
<td>This service investigates applications to dispose of water-borne waste and, where permitted, issue authorisation for such activities. The issue of this type of authorisation requires the client (usually businesses or municipal reticulation services) to complete a comprehensive application, which includes details on the capacity and frequency of waste disposal, and an identified site for the disposal. DWAF then investigates the potential impact of the volume, frequency and location of the disposals in light of environmental safety and other regulatory issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Private sector and municipal managers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External clients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authorisations for Water Use</strong></td>
<td>Authorisation is required for the introduction of new large-scale irrigation projects for agricultural activities and industrial purposes. Clients of this service are required to apply for authorisation to use water supplies on large-scale projects before commencing with them. These large-scale projects may include the reallocation of livestock grazing land to crops, the development of an industrial plant, or at local government level, the development of a new residential site. DWAF officials evaluate the applications, considering the available water supply and a projected future demand on the current water supply. If the application is considered favourably, an authorisation is issued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Agricultural, private sector and municipal managers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External clients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Description of type of Clients
Table 9: The types of clients of the five services identified by the Department of Agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Types of Clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breeding Certificates and Authorisations</td>
<td>• Large-scale commercial farmers (36.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Small-scale or emerging farmers (46.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=799</td>
<td>• Import agents (1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External clients</td>
<td>• Representatives of breeding societies (7.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Medium-scale commercial farmers (2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other (4.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other includes users such as vets, private and educational institutions, researchers and small-scale horse breeders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Import Permits</th>
<th>Types of Clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=463</td>
<td>• Members of the public (21.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External clients</td>
<td>• Large-scale commercial farmers (6.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Small-scale or emerging farmers (8.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Private business (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic institutions (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Specified for hunting purposes (1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Veterinarians (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other includes users such as public companies, abattoirs and the Johannesburg Zoo, a senior judge and shipping company.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farmer Settlement</th>
<th>Types of Clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=76</td>
<td>Citizen users of this service represent either themselves or a group of citizens who lease land from the DoA, mostly consisting of HDI farmers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External clients</td>
<td>• Individual (67.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Group (32.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bursaries, Scholarships and Internships</th>
<th>Types of Clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=64</td>
<td>Citizen users of this service were either awarded a bursary, an internship or experiential training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External clients</td>
<td>• Bursary citizens (99.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Experiential training citizens (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agricultural Engineering Services</th>
<th>Types of Clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=13</td>
<td>• Provincial representatives or project managers (46.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal clients</td>
<td>• Local government representatives or project managers (38.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other (15.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other includes a satellite station manager and a specialist scientist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restitution of Land Rights</th>
<th>Types of Clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=344</td>
<td>All citizens of this service were members of a trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External clients</td>
<td>• Chairperson (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Trustees (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Applicants (13.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Beneficiary (19.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Claimant (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Secretary (2.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other includes a CEO, a family member; a consultant and an advisor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Reform</th>
<th>Types of Clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=310</td>
<td>All citizens engaging with this service did so in their capacity as natural persons, applying for various grants offered by the land reform programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External clients</td>
<td>• Provincial representatives or project managers (46.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local government representatives or project managers (38.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other (15.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other includes property valuers, a housing officer, municipality offices, a sheriff of the court and a tax collector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deeds Registration</th>
<th>Types of Clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=477</td>
<td>• Conveyancers (49.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External clients</td>
<td>• Secretaries or personal assistants (25.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Administrative officers or messengers (3.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accounts personnel (2.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other includes property valuers, a housing officer, municipality offices, a sheriff of the court and a tax collector.

To meet the outlined criteria of the study, where possible researchers needed to identify at least one service where internal clients could be exclusively sampled. Based on the limited contact details of external clients Surveys and Mapping was identified as meeting this requirement sufficiently. Hence, it was agreed that only internal clients of Surveys and Mapping be included in this research project. The list of internal clients was drawn up from information supplied by Surveys and Mapping.
### Table 1: The types of clients of the four services identified by the Department of Water Affairs and Forestry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Types of Clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Water Affairs and Forestry</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Billing of Major Water Users**             | • Domestic (14%)  
  N= 471  
  External clients  
  Other includes an electrical technician and a conservation representative. |
| **Licensing of Activities on State Forest Land** | • General public (42.8%)  
  N= 208  
  External clients  
  Other includes power station and military base representatives. |
| **Authorisations for Waste Disposal**        | • Private individual (10.3%)  
  N=311  
  External clients  
  Other includes a church, hospital, prison, police station and a water supplier (not specified). |
| **Authorisations for Water Use**             | • Private individuals (1.1.3%)  
  N=435  
  External clients  
  Other includes an electrical technician and a conservation representative. |
A total of 4,454 clients across the three departments and 14 services were successfully interviewed. In most cases, the relevant department provided the research team with lists of clients who used the services, while in some cases lists had to be generated through sources external to the relevant component (e.g., regional offices). Hence, the sample size and distribution according to province, gender, and race was based on the client flows within each province and the information available for constructing a sample frame. A description of the realised sample in relation to the specific services provided by each department is provided in the tables below.

### Table 12: Distribution of sample by province and service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DoA %</th>
<th>DLA %</th>
<th>DWAF %</th>
<th>Overall %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final sample size</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>4454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Cape</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free State</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpumalanga</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest sample of clients was drawn from Gauteng (19%), the Western Cape (16%) and the Eastern Cape (14%). Fewer clients were interviewed from the other provinces, with the smallest number of clients interviewed from the North West (6%).

The majority of clients using the DoA’s services were drawn from Gauteng (19%), the Free State (16%) and the Western Cape (16%). While the majority of clients sampled for the DLA’s services were also drawn from Gauteng (27%), the second largest percentage of the sample was from the Eastern Cape (20%). The fewest clients that were interviewed were from the North West (3%). The majority of clients sampled for DWAF came from the Western Cape (22%), followed by KwaZulu-Natal (12%) and the Eastern Cape (12%). The fewest clients that were interviewed were from Limpopo (6%).

### Table 13: Distribution of sample by population group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population group</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DoA %</th>
<th>DLA %</th>
<th>DWAF %</th>
<th>Overall %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final sample size</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>4454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian/Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than two thirds of the overall number of clients who participated in the survey were White (68%), while a further fifth was Black/African (21%). 9% were Coloured and a very small percentage was Indian/Asian (2%). Note, however, that this was dependent on the type of services and needs of the specific interest groups that utilised the services of the three departments; for example, the overwhelming population group for Bursaries, Farmer Settlement, Land Reform, and Surveys and Mapping was Black/African, while for Restitution 63% was Coloured. For all departments the majority of clients interviewed was White. However, the greatest number of Black/African clients was sampled for the DLA (34%). Similarly, the greatest number of Coloured clients was also sampled for the DLA (17%).

### Table 14: Distribution of sample by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DoA %</th>
<th>DLA %</th>
<th>DWAF %</th>
<th>Overall %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final sample size</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>4454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30% of the sample was made up of female clients, while the majority of clients was male (70%). The largest sample of female clients was from the client lists of the DLA (38%) and the smallest from the DoA (23%).

### Table 15: Distribution of sample by educational status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest level passed</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DoA %</th>
<th>DLA %</th>
<th>DWAF %</th>
<th>Overall %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final sample size</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>4454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;grade 12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;grade 12</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of clients using these services had completed some form of tertiary education (65%). One fifth had only completed grade 12 (20%) and a further 15% had completed less than grade 12. The largest proportion of clients who had not completed grade 12 was from the DLA (29%).

### Table 16: Distribution of sample by home language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home language</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DoA %</th>
<th>DLA %</th>
<th>DWAF %</th>
<th>Overall %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final sample size</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>4454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndebele</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xhosa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedi/Northern Sotho</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesotho/Sotho/South Sotho</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setswana/Tswana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangaar/Tsonga</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swazi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The predominant language spoken at home by the clients was Afrikaans (53%), followed by English (27%). The most commonly spoken African language was Xhosa (6%). While for all departments Afrikaans is followed by English as the most commonly used languages, Xhosa is the most commonly spoken African language for the DLA (13%) and DWAF (4%), but Zulu (6%) for the DoA.
Table 17: Engineering - types of problems experienced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of staff and experts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time taken to process applications</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating with a DoA representative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 45: Breeding - types of problems experienced

Figure 46: Bursaries - types of problems experienced

Figure 47: Farmer Settlement - types of problems experienced

Figure 48: Imports - types of problems experienced
D.3 Department of Water Affairs and Forestry

Figure 54: Billing - types of problems experienced

Figure 55: Forest - types of problems experienced

Figure 56: Waste - types of problems experienced

Figure 57: Water - types of problems experienced
1. Buy-in from the departments and service components is crucial to the success of projects such as these. However, along with the endorsement of the departments comes a responsibility to disseminate information and communicate about the surveys with the research team. Frustration was experienced in acquiring the relevant information and input from the departments surveyed. This created delays in the process and ultimately a delay in the date when the final reports will be available.

2. Record-keeping in departments at national level is poor. In many cases, the research team had to obtain information at provincial and regional levels because the information was not available at a national level. The warehousing of information is an important concern in the efficient administration of any service and needs attention.

3. Much of the data gathered during the citizen satisfaction surveys could be collected effectively by the departments themselves. If a database of clients using the service is regularly updated, clients could be approached directly by a service or department.

4. Using one questionnaire in future surveys will make the process of analysis more efficient. The questionnaire could include all generic sections and guide particular clients to sections that are of relevance to them.

5. The telephonic method was very successful in gathering information from those with access to telephones. This was true for clients in urban and rural areas. Many rural clients who did not have landlines had cellular telephones and were contacted in this way. Furthermore, quality control is more closely monitored in a call centre environment than in fieldwork situations.

6. Overall, clients were most often happy to be interviewed. Clients see the survey process as a positive contribution to service delivery by the departments.

7. The following three issues stood out above others in the survey:
   • The time taken for applications and the processing of these
   • The importance of information to clients
   • The complexity of the application process.
Appendix F

Questionnaires
Example of the survey instruments
1.1.1 Have you been awarded land or the use of government land within the past 12 months?  
1 = Yes  
2 = No (conclude interview)  

1.1.2 What type of grant did you receive?  
1 = LRAD  
2 = ESTA  
3 = SLAG  
4 = Use of Commonage  
5 = Don’t Know Other (Specify)____________  

1.2 At which office did you apply for a grant?  
1 = Pretoria  
2 = Pietermaritzburg  
3 = Cape Town  
4 = Bloemfontein  
5 = Nelspruit  
6 = East London  
7 = Kimberley  
8 = Polokwane  
9 = Mmabatho Other (Specify)____________  

1.3 How long ago was your claim settled?  
1 = This week  
2 = Last week  
3 = Last month  
4 = Within last 3 months  
5 = Within last 6 months  
6 = Within the last 9 months  
7 = 9 months ago or longer  

1.4 Has more than one person from the Department of Land Affairs assisted you with your application and the processing of the grant?  
1 = Yes  
2 = No  

1.5 During your application/process, how many times have you ever engaged with the DLA representative(s)?  
Write in number  

2.1 Gender  
1 = Male  
2 = Female  

2.2 Population group?  
1 = Black/African  
2 = Coloured  
3 = Indian/Asian  
4 = White  
Other (Specify)____________________  

2.3 What is the highest level of education you have completed?  
1 = No schooling  
2 = Some primary school  
3 = Completed primary school  
4 = Some high school (less than grade 10)  
5 = Grade 10  
6 = Grade 11  
7 = Grade 12  
8 = Diploma  
9 = Degree  
10 = Postgraduate studies  

2.4 What province are you based in?  
1 = Western Cape  
2 = Eastern Cape  
3 = Northern Cape  
4 = North West  
5 = Free State  
6 = KwaZulu-Natal  
7 = Mpumalanga  
8 = Limpopo  
9 = Gauteng  

2.5 What is your home language?  
1 = English  
2 = Afrikaans  
3 = Ndebele  
4 = Xhosa  
5 = Ndebele/English/Northern Sotho  
6 = Sesotho/Setswana/South Sotho  
7 = Setswana/Tswana  
8 = Shinga/Tsonga  
9 = Swazi  
10 = Venda  
11 = Zulu  
Other (Specify)____________________  

2.6 During your most recent interaction with this service, were you assisted in your home language?  
1 = Yes  
2 = No  

3.1 Reason for refusal:  
3.2 Who returned the call?  

4.1 Appointment 1 (Day/Date/Time):  
4.2 Who returned the call?  

5.1 Appointment 2 (Day/Date/Time):  
5.2 Who returned the call?  

6.1 Appointment 3 (Day/Date/Time):  
6.2 Who returned the call?  

7.1 Reasons for refusal:  

8.1 Respondents’ Telephone Code  

9.1 Name of Fieldworker  

10.1 Date of interview (dd/mm/yyyy)  

11.1 Name of Quality Controller  

12.1 Date checked (dd/mm/yyyy)  

13.1 Name of Supervisor  

14.1 Date corrections checked (dd/mm/yyyy)  

15.1 Name of Office Quality Controller  

16.1 Date captured (dd/mm/yyyy)  

17.1 Name of 1st Capturer  

18.1 Date captured (dd/mm/yyyy)  

19.1 Name of 2nd Capturer  

20.1 Date captured (dd/mm/yyyy)  

I declare that I have asked this entire questionnaire as it is laid out and as I have been briefed. I declare that all the responses and answers recorded by me in this questionnaire were given to me by the correct respondent. This questionnaire has been fully checked by myself.  
PLEASE PRINT:  

First name  
Surname  
Signature  
Date  
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3.4.3 Did the person assisting you inform you of the process and when the duty manager were displayed?  1 = Y es  2 = No

3.2.2 If no, What one suggestion would you make to improve the accessibility of the service? i.e. 8-hour periods)

3.6.3 Y ou were given individual attention during your interaction with the service provider.       1 = Strongly agree  2 = Agree  3 = Neither agree nor disagree (or are undecided), disagree or strongly disagree with the following statements.

3.3.1 The facilities are safe.      1 = Strongly agree  2 = Agree  4 = Disagree  5 = Strongly disagree

3.5.4 If yes, what did they do?

3.4.2 There was enough staff on duty to handle the number of clients.  1 = Strongly agree  2 = Agree  3 = Neither agree nor disagree (or undecided), disagree or strongly disagree with the following statements.

3.5.3 Did the person serving you in any way add value to the service you received by going out of their way to assist you?  1 = Y es  2 = No

4.1 When accessing this service, what is one thing that frustrates you the most!

5.1.3 How satisfied did you expect to be, that the product you got is the best for the job?  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

5.2.1 How efficient did you expect the department to be?  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

5.3.2 How efficient is the staff?  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

5.4.2 How satisfied are you that the product you got is the best for the job?  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

4.3.1 Did the person assisting you inform you of the process and when services would be performed?  1 = Y es  2 = No

6.1.1 Thinking over all the times you have engaged with this service, how often would you say you have experienced problems with the service?

6.1.2 How often did you have to try more than once to get the service you expected?  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

6.1.3 How often did you have to wait long time to get the service you expected?  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

6.1.4 How often did you face any kind of problem in getting the service?  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

6.1.5 How many times you have had to go out of your way to complete the task?

6.1.6 How many times you have had to cancel the service?

6.1.7 How many times you have had to try more than once to get the service you expected?

6.1.8 How often did you have to wait long time to get the service you expected?

6.1.9 How often did you face any kind of problem in getting the service?

6.1.10 How many times you have had to go out of your way to complete the task?

6.1.11 How many times you have had to cancel the service?
6.1.2 What problems have you experienced?

(Read out options)

1 = Availability of forms
2 = Complexity of application process
3 = Time taken to process claims or applications
4 = Availability of information
5 = Communicating with a DLA representative
Other (specify)

6.1.3 Again, thinking about your entire experience during this process, would you say that you are satisfied or dissatisfied with the service received?

1 = Very Satisfied
2 = Satisfied
3 = Neither satisfied or dissatisfied
4 = Dissatisfied
5 = Very dissatisfied

6.2.2 Thinking about your entire experience at the Land Reform office, give the office a score out of 10 for service delivery. Again 0 denotes the lowest possible standard of service and 10 the highest possible standard.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

6.3 What are the best aspects of service delivery at the Land Reform office?

(Upto 2 answers allowed)

6.4 What aspects of service at the Land Reform office would you change or improve?

(Must give at least one answer)

(Upto 2 answers allowed)

7.1 Have you ever lodged a complaint during the Land Reform process regarding the service you have received?

1 = Yes
2 = No (skip to Q7.1.4)

7.1.2 How did you lodge your complaint?

7.1.3 Has your complaint been dealt with satisfactorily?

1 = Yes (skip to Q7.1.5)
2 = No (skip to Q7.1.4)

7.1.4 What is the reason that you have not lodged a complaint?

(Read out all options)

1 = Nothing to complain about
2 = Did not know how or where to lodge a complaint
3 = You felt it was not worthwhile as the system is flawed in some way
Other (specify)

7.1.5 Have you, or your professional organisation/society ever been consulted by Land and Tenure Reform about the service(s) to be rendered by them e.g. through a survey or other form of client contact?

1 = Yes
2 = No

Thank you for your time. Your contributions have been very valuable to the assessment of levels of client satisfaction in South African public service departments.

Thank you. Enjoy the rest of your day.