

**The Reconstruction and Development Programme in Post-Apartheid South Africa: A  
study of public perceptions of the housing service delivery in Chris Hani Park Block 3  
Township, East London.**

**a mini-thesis submitted by Cewuka G. Thembakazi**

**in partial fulfilment of the degree**

**Masters in Rural Development**

**at the**

**University of Fort Hare**

**Supervisor: Dr A. S. Kwizera**

**2013**

## **Declaration**

**I Thembakazi G. Cewuka declare that this research project is a product of my own work and where I have used the ideas and words of others, I have referenced these correctly.**

**Student Number:            201110957**

**Sign.....                      Date.....**

**Supervisor's Confirmation**

**I confirm that the thesis of the following student is supervised by me and has been submitted with my authorization.**

**Student Name:                   Thembakazi G. Cewuka**

**Student number:               201110957**

**Department:                   Sociology**

.....

.....

**Supervisor**

**Date**

## **Acknowledgement**

**I would like to acknowledge the contribution of my lecturers who have moulded and supported me throughout this course and my supervisor for this project, Dr Alice Stella Kwizera for her abundant support and assistance. If it was not for her I would not have finished my studies in time.**

**I would like to thank my sisters for their kind words of encouragement, my daughter, Zenande, and my son, Lunje, for their considerable support and understanding.**

**I would also like to thank the RDP housing beneficiaries of Chris Hani Park Block 3 for agreeing to participate in my research.**

**Last but not least, I thank God for guiding me throughout my studies and making me fulfil my dreams and potential.**

**God Bless You All!**

## **Abstract**

This research sought to understand the perceptions of the township dwellers who are the beneficiaries of the RDP houses in a selected township, Chris Hanani block 3 in Mdantsane, East London, in the Eastern Cape. The study specifically sought to establish whether the houses delivered to the residents through the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) adequately meet the basic standards prescribed by the relevant housing policy of South Africa.

During the apartheid era black South Africans were marginalised, their development was separate from that of whites and they had no say in what was provided for them, hence they were inadequately housed. On coming into power, the post-apartheid government undertook through legislation to provide sustainable, adequate housing that would address the needs of the historically disadvantaged citizens/poor people of South Africa.

The main finding of this study conducted on a sample of ten RDP housing beneficiaries, through personal interviews is that, the RDP is a good programme; however, its implementation is characterised by corruption and greed. The people, whom the programme is meant to benefit, have never been involved in their own development with the results that the houses provided to them, are of a sub-standard quality. The houses do not adequately address the housing needs of the people. The housing policies are also not adequately implemented. It is the author's hope that the recommendations made by this study, if implemented, will improve the standard of the RDP houses provided to the poor people of South Africa.

**KEYWORDS:** post-apartheid, service delivery, public perception, sustainable, involvement

## **Table of contents**

<b>Declaration</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Supervisor's Confirmation</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Acknowledgement</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Acronyms</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1. 1. Introduction and Background of the Study</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1. 2. Statement of the Problem</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1. 3. Research Questions</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1. 4. Research Objectives</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1. 5. Significance of the Study</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>1. 6. Conclusion</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Chapter 2: Literature Review</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2. 1. Introduction</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2. 2. Policy Framework on the Transformation of South Africa in the Post-Apartheid Era</b>	<b>10</b>

<b>2. 2. 1. The Beneficiaries of the RDP Houses</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2. 3. The Housing Challenges in the Post-Apartheid era</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2. 4. Conceptual Framework</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>2. 4. 1. Public Participation</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>2. 4. 2. Sustainability</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>2. 5. Conclusion</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Chapter 3: Research design and Methodology</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>3. 1. Research Design</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>3. 2. Research Methodology / Paradigm</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>3.3. The Study Population</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>3. 4. Sample</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>3. 5. Data Collection</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>3.6. Data Analysis</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>3. 7. Ethical Issues in Research</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>3. 8. Limitations of the Study</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>3. 9. Conclusion</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Chapter 4: Presentation and Interpretation of Data</b>	<b>27</b>

<b>4. 1. Introduction</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>4. 2. Description of the Research Sample</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>4. 3. Results</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>4. 3. 1. Perceptions towards RDP housing programme</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>4. 3. 2. Effectiveness of the RDP programme in addressing the housing needs of the township dwellers</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>4. 3. 3. Effectiveness of the prescribed housing policy regulations in the implementation of the RDP houses</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>4. 6. Conclusion</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Chapter 5: Discussion of findings</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>5. 1. Perceptions towards RDP housing programme</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>5. 2. Effectiveness of the RDP programme in addressing the housing needs of the township dwellers</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>5. 3. Effectiveness of the prescribed housing policy regulations in the implementation of the RDP houses</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Chapter 6: Conclusion and Recommendations</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>6. 1. Conclusion</b>	<b>46</b>

<b>6. 2.Recommendations</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>Appendix 1: List of Interviewees</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Interview Guide</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Appendix 3: Data from Interviews</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Appendix 4: Pictures</b>	<b>85</b>

## **Acronyms**

ANC – African National Congress

BESG – Built Environment Support Group

COGTA – Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs

DLG – Developmental Local Government

GEAR – Growth Employment and Redistribution

IA – IJ – Interviewee A – Interviewee J

MDGs – Millennium Developmental Goals

NU – National Unity

NU – Native Unit

PHP – People’s Housing Process

RDP – Reconstruction and Development Programme

UDHR – Universal Declaration of Human Rights

UN – United Nations

WCED – World Commission on Environment and Development

## **CHAPTER 1: Introduction and Research Problem.**

### **1. 1. Introduction and Background of the Study**

Before South Africa became a democracy in 1994, black South Africans were overwhelmingly marginalised from political and economic rights while whites, who had rights and were favoured by the apartheid government, were racially discriminating against black South Africans (Southall, 2007, p. 66). Colonisation that was complemented by apartheid left the indigenous people of South Africa bereft and dispossessed of their valuable possessions, especially land and cattle, the mainstay of their economy (Milton, 1989, p. 6 and Thompson, 2000, p. 265). The main aim was white supremacy through the application of racially based laws that gave the whites control over the black South Africans (Thompson, 2000, p. 189). The indigenous people of South Africa drifted away onto the Boer farms where they sold their services as herdsmen and house maids (Milton, 1989, p. 6).

Among the plethora of legislation that include the Reservation of Separate Amenities Act (1953), the Group Areas Act (1950), the Bantu Education Act (1953), the Asiatic Land Tenure Act (1946), the Illegal Squatting Act (1951), the Native Building Workers' Act (1951) and others that were applied during the apartheid era, some were enacted specifically to racially discriminate, oppress and segregate the black South Africans. They brought about a situation whereby white privilege existed alongside black poverty and deprivation in every respect of life (Thompson, 2000, p. 190, 194 and 196; Davenport & Saunders, 2002, p. 378 and 390; and Davids, Theron & Mapunye, 2005, p. 18). Apartheid comprised a whole multiplicity of phenomena in the social, economic and political spheres of life, with a focus on white supremacy (Davenport et al., 2002, p. 392).

Lalloo (1998, p. 43) states that apartheid was rooted in forced segregation through the homeland policy that entailed forced removals of Africans from white farms, towns and cities where the black Africans had gravitated after they were bereft and settled within designated homelands. The policy resulted in three particularly exploited and disadvantaged groups of citizens, namely, migrant workers, long distance commuters and rural women. Three forms of depressingly impoverished settlements were formed, namely, single sex hostels for migrant workers in white urban areas, the displaced urban settlement or dormitory towns in homelands, and the rural homes where women were confined (Lalloo, 1998, p. 43).

Apartheid negatively affected almost everything in South Africa including the education of the black South African children. According to Thompson (2000, p. 196) African education was left to the Mission Institutions during the colonization period, constrained by lack of funds because of a large black South African population. It was taken over by the apartheid government under the Bantu Education Act of 1953 managed by the Bantu Board.

The quality of education varied according to race, a high standard of education for whites and an inferior standard of education for black South Africans. In black South African schools, the syllabus was differently designed to limit them. Black South Africans would not be allowed to study further except to have a special place in society (Davenport et al., 2002, p. 389-391 & Thompson, 2000, p. 96).

Since independence a large number of developing countries have made a transition from authoritarian rule to democracy hence the rebirth of civil societies and the enthusiastic celebration of new freedoms and liberties (Heller, 2001, p. 131). This study is an enquiry into the role played by the post-apartheid government in the transformation of South Africa in terms of the provision of housing to the low income earner citizens of the country.

Laloo (1998, p. 36) states that the land and housing policy in South Africa was conceived in post 1994 to address the legacy of apartheid and deprivation of black citizenship through erosion of property rights and restrictions on access to white settlement areas. The analysis pays attention to the kinds of settlements and forms of citizenship that were apartheid generated. These include the African locations or townships, the migrant labour hostels, the displaced border towns of the African reserves, and the rural homesteads. It is not surprising that the post-apartheid African National Congress (ANC) government turned to these issues as a vehicle for the redemption and restitution of citizenship.

Black South Africans have suffered the scars of apartheid in the areas of housing, among others. Human settlement is a major problem that needs to be addressed in the post-apartheid South Africa.

The housing provision for low-income families was stated as one of the key pillars of the post-apartheid transformation during the transition period when the leadership of the first black President, Nelson Mandela and the post-apartheid Ministry of Housing set a target of providing one million low-cost houses to low-income homeless families within a period of five years from 1994 to 1999 as an integral part of the policy (Oldfield, 2000, p. 858).

The sudden change and improvement of the material conditions for the victims of segregation is another related matter (Thompson, 2000, p. 282). Because the segregation victims have suffered alienation in development, the transformation in the post-apartheid South Africa has to focus on the quality not the quantity of development and service delivery.

According to Havenga, Menaha, & Visagie (2011, p. 12271) & Davids et al. (2005 p. 43), the ANC issued a Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) which became an official policy of the government of National Unity (NU) with the aims and objectives of establishing integrated, coherent socio-economic policy frameworks that sought to mobilise all people and resources towards the final eradication of apartheid and to build a democratic, non-racial South Africa with the local government playing the major role in the transformation of historically disadvantaged people. The RDP programme has accommodated the participation of the South African citizens in their development in order to get what they want and to acquire skills so that they could become self-reliant.

Much has been done by the post-apartheid government in the transformation of the South African state although government has invested in “quantity more than quality”. The development of low-income houses continued to be a political imperative and an urban reconstruction priority for the post-apartheid state (Oldfield, 2000, p. 858) since 1994. Nearly two million low-cost houses have been built since 1994. However many of these houses were rudimentary buildings. Electrification has reached the targeted households with an improved water supply and transport for such black populations and an urban reconstruction priority for the post-apartheid South African state (Szeftel, 2004, p. 197) & (Bryceson et al., 2001, p. 8). The historically disadvantaged South Africans have also been provided with health care in the form of clinics and public hospitals including the rural periphery where doctors were scarce during the segregation period. These populations also have access to education that is of the same standard as that of the white people compared to the apartheid era (Thompson, 2000, p. 283-284) & (Bryceson et al., 2001, p. 8).

However the South African government did not have the capacity to respond to the enthusiasm for change at grassroots level. The leadership of the first black president, Nelson Mandela, abolished the people-centred development programme, RDP.

Three months later, its successor, the Growth Employment and Redistribution (GEAR) strategy, was adopted. GEAR focused on economic growth rather than major improvement to the lives of the poor (Thompson, 2000, p. 281 & Davids et al., 2005, p. 43). Hence the RDP houses that were built from the beginning of the RDP housing program, post 1994, are of low standard when they are compared to the houses that were built during the segregation era.

The quality of the RDP houses provided to the poor people of South Africa has been questioned on a number of counts; however people are still not happy about the RDP houses provided to them.

The euphoria of transition has passed; however, people are beginning to pose the sobering questions, including whether democracy can help redress the severe social and economic inequalities that characterise developing countries and what difference democracy makes to the development process (Heller, 2001, p. 131).

## **1. 2. Statement of the problem**

The Homeland policy that entailed forced removals of black South Africans from white areas and resettling them in designated areas was the root cause of ill-housed black South Africans. That has resulted in depressingly impoverished towns and townships that include single-sex hostels for migrant workers and displaced urban resettlement or dormitory towns in homelands (Thompson, 2000, p. 266 & Lalloo, 1998, p. 37). The apartheid government built a number of townships based on a site and service programme whereby people owned homes but not the site in designated areas (Davenport et al., 2002, p. 390).

The houses that were built by the apartheid government in townships for black Africans were sub-standard compared with those for whites in white residential areas because black Africans had no rights during the segregation era, and they had no say in what was provided to them (Davenport, 2002, p. 389).

Those townships built by the apartheid government for black South Africans include Mdantsane located outside East London in the Eastern Cape, Umlazi located outside Durban in KwaZulu Natal, Botshabelo located outside Bloemfontein in the Free State, Kanyamazane located outside Nelspruit in Mpumalanga, Soweto located outside Johannesburg in Gauteng, and others (Thompson, 2000, p. 193).

Thompson (2000, p. 283) acknowledges that although the post-apartheid government has managed to build 75 percent of the targeted 1million low-cost houses for the poor since 1994, many of them are rudimentary buildings. Heller (2001, p. 147) asserted that while the government has achieved some fairly impressive delivery targets, the quality, cost effectiveness and sustainability of service delivery are increasingly in doubt.

The pressure to deliver housing units rapidly and within the predetermined cost structure has resulted in the perpetuation of the old apartheid township type development (Lalloo, 1998, p. 42).

The RDP houses that are delivered to the low-income earner citizens of South Africa are of an even much lower standard than the houses that were delivered by the apartheid government during the segregation era. This study seeks to understand the perceptions of the township dwellers who are the beneficiaries of the housing development programmes, RDP, specifically seeking to establish whether such housing adequately meets the basic standards they require. The focus of this study is on selected township in East London as detailed in the research design and methodology section.

### **1. 3. Research Questions**

This study seeks to obtain answers to the following questions:

- How do township dwellers in Chris Hani Park Block 3, perceive the housing development programme within the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP)?
- Do the RDP houses provided to the township dwellers in Chris Hani Park Block 3 adequately address the housing needs of and basic housing standards for these people?
- Does the implementation of the RDP housing in Chris Hani Park Block 3 meet the prescribed policy regulations?

### **1. 4. Research Objectives**

The study endeavours to achieve the following objectives:

- To understand the perceptions of township dwellers regarding the delivery of housing to the South African poor, by the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP), with specific reference to Chris Hani Park Block 3, Mdantsane, East London.
- To examine the effectiveness of the RDP programme in addressing the housing needs of and basic housing standards for the township dwellers in Chris Hani Park Block 3, Mdantsane, East London.
- To examine the effectiveness of the prescribed policy regulations in the implementation of the RDP housing in Chris Hani Park Block 3.

### **1. 5. Significance of the study**

This study is of great importance to the South African community at large, the researchers and scholars, government, the Department of Housing and other policy makers and stakeholders.

It offers a platform to the RDP and other housing beneficiaries to express their views about matters regarding their development that include their housing concerns. Furthermore, it is helpful to the community by creating awareness among the poor low-income earners who are awaiting the RDP housing on issues relating to the standard of houses delivered by the post-apartheid government directed at addressing the socio-economic problems of the historically disadvantaged South African citizens.

The findings add to the existing information from other scholars and researchers in the discourses on housing development programmes such as RDP in the post-apartheid South Africa. The findings of the study further assist government, the Department of Housing and the policymakers to understand how township dwellers perceive the RDP and other housing development programmes and whether the RDP houses address the housing challenges of the township dwellers. This paves the way to identify the shortfalls and failures of the private developer-driven construction approach.

At the same time the study provides a better opportunity for comparison between the services provided by the private developers and the people-centred development approach that empowers people to become self-reliant in the long term (Davids et al., 2005, p. 43).

The findings can also help the Department of Housing and policymakers to reflect back to the post 1994 low-income houses that were delivered to redress the social inequalities that were the outcomes of the apartheid legacy in order to assess their own achievements in terms of improving the quality of life of black South Africans.

## **1. 6. Conclusion**

This chapter has provided the objectives and the core argument of the study and it is noted from the empirical evidence that the black Africans were marginalised during the apartheid era. As apartheid developed in South Africa, it deepened the uneven development and distribution of resources. The post-apartheid government promised the new beginnings, 'housing for all'. The principles that everyone was entitled to housing and that the state was responsible for providing such housing, represented a radical shift from the past. Despite the stated intentions to create housing for all, housing delivery has not proceeded as planned, backlog around the country has grown as well as the community exclusion and unawareness of the housing development initiatives which have resulted in unwanted houses.

## **Chapter 2: Literature Review**

### **2. 1. Introduction**

Scholarly research involves a process of proceeding from the known to unknown with the use of literature review and conceptual framework to build the intended platform.

South Africa is facing some challenges concerning housing the poor in the post-apartheid era. Scholars have researched these problems at the greatest length, however, problems persist. This study reviews the literature on delivery of the RDP and other housing development programmes implemented by the post-apartheid government. That information will be the foundation on which this research is based. The purpose of reviewing literature in this study is to understand the perceptions of the township dwellers who are the beneficiaries of the RDP housing development programme, specifically seeking to establish whether such houses adequately meet the basic housing standards required.

### **2. 2. Policy Framework on the Transformation of South Africa in the Post-Apartheid Era**

According to Choguill (2006, p. 143-144) the United Nations (UN) in its Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and the adoption of the International Covenant provides the right for everyone to an adequate standard of living as well as food, clothing and housing and continuous improvement of living conditions. The UN Millennium Developmental Goals (MDGs) commit member nations to improve the lives of people by maintaining slum-free cities by 2020 (Choguill, 2006, p.143-144).

Havenga, Menaha & Visagie (2011, p. 12272) assert that during the segregation era in South Africa, the local government was characterised by oppression, illegitimacy, inefficiency and fragmentation, with the exception of white local authorities.

Therefore, the urgent task that was the response to the UNMDGs undertaken by the post-1994, democratically elected South African government was the transformation of the municipalities by introducing a system of Developmental Local Government (DLG) in 1998. The DLG is committed to working with people at the grassroots to find sustainable ways that meet their social, economic and material needs and improve their quality of life in order to make them more accountable and financially sustainable (Havenga et al., 2011, p. 12272; Parnell, 2005, p. 21; Ramutsindela, 2001, p. 69 & Atkinson, 2007, p. 1).

Bryceson & Bank (2001, p. 8) report that in 1994 there was intense pressure to redress the imbalances whereby black South Africans were poorly housed; however, the post-apartheid government was bound up in delivery of development in the form of basic infra-structure, provisioning of transport, improved housing and water, and electricity supplies for the black population on a massive scale.

According to Ramutsindela (2001, p. 74), the RDP emerged in 1993 as a jointly planned attempt to devise a set of social, economic and political policies and practices that could transform South Africa into a more just and equal society. The development of low-income housing continues to be a political imperative, and an urban reconstruction priority and a key pillar for the post-apartheid transformation of the South African state.

It includes the people benefits that involve the location of jobs, skills and development. The other related benefits of the RDP include substantive improvements in quality of life which can be linked to secure land and housing tenure, structurally sound housing and access to services such as water, sanitation and energy supply, and social amenities such as health, education, recreation and economic opportunities (Oldfield, 2000, p. 858 & Napier, 2005, p. 8).

Szeftel (2004, p. 193) & Thompson (2000, p. 282) state that the post-apartheid government entered governance in 1994 with hopes and expectations of many people weighing on its shoulders but it was clear that no quick fix could alleviate the suffering of the victims of apartheid, it would take generations to undo the damage as South Africa represents an extreme case of uneven development. According to Lalloo (1998, p. 40) even the narrow focus on social transformation by the ANC government on the target of building 1 million houses within a period of 5 years has not made any change.

There is a slight change in the post-apartheid South Africa concerning social development since 1994, however, that has affected both the better-off and the poor South Africans. That might be interpreted as a sign of disappointment with the new dispensation (Moller & Dickow, 2002, p. 288).

South Africa has one of the most enlightened Constitutions which support the advancement of the historically disadvantaged South African citizens and guarantees basic human rights (Moller & Dickow, 2002, p. 267); however, discrimination that includes class, gender and generational bias, has continued in various forms to the extent that most features of urban life today embody yet more severe inequality and uneven development than occurred under apartheid (Bond, 2003, p. 2).

### **2. 2. 1. Beneficiaries of the RDP Houses**

Pottie (2004, p. 607) states that after the democratic elections in 1994, the policy framework associated with the apartheid housing delivery on a racial basis was replaced with an income-based housing capital subsidy, targeted at the South African poor. Applicants had to be South African citizens to qualify for consideration (Pottie, 2004, p. 608).

The national policy for housing provides a one-time subsidy to households that are in need and have never received state assistance for housing (Oldfield, 2000, p. 859-860).

Many projects have been approved for people who earn in the salary category R0 to R3500 per month since the inception of the Housing Subsidy (Napier, 2005, p. 8). In South Africa the housing subsidies are structured in the form of a lump sum or capital subsidy allocated to every individual household that covers the purchase of the land, the cost of the necessary planning procedures, the infrastructure development and the house (Huchzermeyer, 2006, p. 11). Provincial government manages the subsidy programme while the local government facilitates the building of approved subsidy-based projects (Oldfield, 2000, p. 860).

### **2. 3. The Housing Challenges in the Post-Apartheid Era**

Napier (2005, p. 3) asserted that the post-apartheid government embarked on addressing the challenge of housing the nation through progressive access to tenure in order to redress the housing challenges, including the fact that the poorest were inadequately housed, as well as located furthest from economic opportunities. Security to tenure or occupation as well as access to adequate services and ensuring safe living environments can secure the life chances of low-income urban dwellers by a security to tenure, and thus people's well-being and livelihood opportunities are closely linked to where they are as well as to what they do (Beall, Crankshaw & Parnell, 2000, p. 834).

Bond (2003, p. 4) argues that the neo-liberal approach to low income housing delivery had several unfortunate consequences, including disempowerment of communities by generally being left out of project planning, as well as their more general needs for organisational capacity not being met which, in turn, led to unwanted housing products as well as an increasing gap between developers and community expectations.

According to the Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA) (2009, p. 7) in Section 26 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996), everyone has the right to have access to adequate housing; however, it is the government's duty to provide reasonable legislative and other measures within its available resources to achieve the progressive realisation of this.

Amoateng & Richter (2007, p. 8) & Burger & Cloete (1998, p. 8) argue that the politics of exclusion gave rise to a huge problem of dependency through engendering widespread poverty; therefore, the involvement of people must replace the top-down structures in order to ensure that housing beneficiaries participate in the process and do not just passively receive completed products. Government must also encourage more collaboration and less direct exertion of authority. Oldfield (2000, p. 858) asserts that housing delivery to poor communities has been uneven, poorly targeted and generally insufficient to alleviate the desperate conditions in which many homeless families find themselves.

As South Africa strives to overcome the social, economic and political devastation caused by separate development for black South Africans during the apartheid era, and its psychological impact, the concept of development has been redefined and the integrated, people-centred development approach has become the most important in development circles (Davids, Theron & Maphunye, 2005, p. 19).

Contrary to the above, if we can reflect on the RDP programme in South Africa during the period 1994 to 1999, the development of low-cost houses for the poor, low income earners was a developer-driven process rather than a people-centred process. Oldfield (2000, p. 258) argues that the role of the state in housing and, more broadly, in urban reconstruction and development, appeared to be the state as 'provider' with the state as 'facilitator' of housing for the low income houses.

As a result, in 1998 the South African government decided to adopt a new housing delivery alternative that is people driven called the People's Housing Process (PHP), whose main objective was to ensure that communities are at the centre of the construction of their homes (Mani, 2009, p. 10).

According to Pottie (2004, p. 608), the goal of one million houses in a period of five years proved elusive prior to the 1999 elections but remains an impressive achievement in quantitative terms. Government is criticised for an excessively narrow focus on the quantitative dimension in relation to the provision of housing subsidies (Gelb, 2003, p. 57). The Built Environment Support Group (BESG) (1999, p. 8) defines adequate housing as one that provides shelter from the elements, provides suitable living space for the inhabitants, is located within a pleasant living environment, and is well located for economic and social opportunities, such as shops and places of employment.

According to the definition of adequate housing provided by BESG (1999, p. 8), the low income houses that are the outcome of the RDP housing programme implemented during 1994 to 1999 do not meet the standard of adequate housing.

Those RDP houses that were built to overcome the inequalities and the marginalisation of black South Africans were sub-standard when compared to the houses that were provided by the segregation government. The quality of these low cost houses has been called into question on a number of counts (Casale & Desmond, 2007, p. 78).

Subsidies are seen to be too low and housing quality undervalued, while the diversity of housing demands is overlooked together with the need to locate housing development in the context of broader processes of community development (Gelb, 2003, p. 57).

The market centred approach to low-income housing delivery had several unfortunate consequences that include the low rate of delivery compared to what was feasible, witnessed by the growth in the housing backlog (Koelble & LiPuma, 1999, p. 561). Koelble et al. (1999, p. 561) asserted that fifteen years after the arrival of the democratic dispensation, many people still lacked access to the most basic of necessities. In addition, most of the efforts devoted by International institutions and governments to solve the housing problems of the world have failed to produce the kind of results that they have promised (Choguill, 2006, p. 144).

According to Pottie (2004, p. 609), following the 1994 elections, the premier of Gauteng Province, Tokyo Sexwale (quoted in *The Star*, 20 May 1994) struck a populist note when he argued that;

We shall not be part to any scheme or plan whose eventual outcome ... is to create serviced informal settlement in the name of housing. People deserve to live in proper low-cost houses.

The scholars and analysts have researched a great deal about the RDP housing programme discourses but attention is needed on the weakness and failure of the post-apartheid government in accelerating RDP housing development during the period of 1994 to 1999 in order to redress and alleviate the racial imbalances between the historically advantaged South African citizens and the marginalised black South Africans. The outcomes of the RDP housing development happen to be the worst. The low income houses are sub-standard and unfavourably poor when they are compared to the houses that were provided by the segregation government. Therefore, the RDP housing programme has failed to achieve its objectives.

This study sought to understand the perceptions of the township dwellers who are the beneficiaries of the RDP houses towards housing development programmes such as the RDP. The study sought to establish whether the houses received through this programme adequately address their housing requirements and standards. The focus of the study is on a selected township in East London, as detailed in the research design and methodology section.

## **2. 4. Conceptual Framework**

### **2. 4. 1. Public Participation**

According to Davids, Theron & Mapunye (2005, p. 19) public participation should be understood in the sense of participation in decision-making, implementation of development programmes and projects, and the monitoring and evaluation of development programmes and projects, as well as sharing the benefits of development.

According to McNaghten & Jacobs (1997, p. 5-6) public participation is the involvement of ordinary citizens in both decisions about and the implementations of social and economic change. McNaghten & Jacobs (1997, p. 5-6) further explain that the emphasis on public participation has two sources. One source is value based: participation is seen as an end in itself; indeed, it has increasingly become one of the core principles by which sustainable development is defined.

The second source of public participation within the sustainability discourse is instrumental only if ordinary citizens are themselves prepared to live sustainably so that the necessary social and economic changes can be secured (cited from WCU, 1991).

According to Davids et al., (2005, p. 19) the centrality of participation in development policy since the fall of apartheid is clear from the following statement cited from RDP White Paper (1994, p. 7):

The RDP is well aware that the birth of a transformed nation can only succeed if people themselves are voluntary participants in the process towards the realisation of these goals they have themselves helped to define.

Feldman & Westphal (1999, p. 34) argues that these empowerment practices place participation in the context of grassroots activism to understand the assets that people bring through their effort, how people are already handling their own problems, what activities and outside resources are necessary to further peoples' own aims and how their current efforts extend their capabilities for future action. McNaghten & Jacobs (1997, p. 6) argue that only if ordinary members of the community, particularly those in disadvantaged groups, take part in decision-making processes can the outcomes of those processes be regarded as good (cited from Agenda 21, 1992).

Feldman et al. (1999, p. 34) argue that participatory design and planning can help restore the balance of power in favour of people who typically have had the least power to effect environmental decision-making and exert control over the physical settings of their everyday lives. When misapplied, participation may become just another part of the status quo, and practitioners interested in social justice may unwittingly sabotage a social change; therefore, empowerment-oriented practices help avoid this trap (Feldman et al., 1999, p. 34).

Davids et al., (2005, p. 20) as cited in Khosa, (2000, p. 227) state that potential benefits of public participation give people a chance to have that sense of belonging to the programme or project and ownership that can promote sustainable development, and can motivate people to accept responsibility for their own development.

### **2. 4. 2. Sustainability**

According to Chiu (2002, p. 156) sustainable development is defined by the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) as the development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (cited from WCED, 1987; Chiu, 2002a). Burger & Cloete (1998, p. 521) state that sustainability entails the longer term continuation of an acceptable state of development. The physical environment is a dominant dimension of sustainability because short term development activities may result in the exhaustion of natural resources or damage to the natural environment and therefore can make natural threats in future too great to overcome.

Sustainability also refers to physical development structures that include housing and infrastructure, which as assets must resist the test of time and not gradually become liabilities that once again trap residents in a degenerating environment (Burger & Cloete, 1998, p. 521; Bryant & White, 1992, p. 17 & Burger, 1994, p. 25).

Chiu (2004, p. 65) defines sustainable housing development as housing development that meets the housing needs and demands of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs and demands. Housing is, nonetheless, more than meeting accommodation demands; it is simultaneously an important measure of social development, a key economic concern and a cultural element. Thus the sustainability of housing development embraces the environmental, social, cultural and economic aspects (Chiu, 2004, p. 65).

Chiu (2002, p. 156) argues that development that is sustainable should be able to enhance both current and future potential to meet human needs and aspirations.

According to Chiu (2002, p. 156), social sustainability of housing should also be investigated based on the three interpretations of social sustainability, and should relate to the social preconditions conducive to the production and consumption of environmentally sustainable housing, equitable distribution and consumption of housing resources and assets, harmonious social relations within the housing system and an acceptable quality of housing and living environment (cited from Chiu, 2002a).

As a key component of the built environment, housing plays a crucial role in the sustainable development of cities and, therefore, the primary purpose of housing development is to meet housing needs and to improve housing conditions (Chiu, 2004, p. 65). Apart from environmental sustainability other strands of sustainability, namely, social sustainability, cultural sustainability and economic sustainability should also be recognised because they are also key dimensions of development (Chiu, 2004, p. 65).

This is the conceptual framework that guided the study. People participation in their own development is of great importance to ensure the fulfilment of their needs. While the new South Africa promised some new beginnings, achieved some fairly impressive delivery targets, the quality, cost effectiveness and sustainability of service delivery are increasingly in doubt, due to the lack of people involvement.

## **2. 5. Conclusion**

This chapter has reviewed the housing literature in South Africa. In this regard, it seems particularly significant that the present government's commitment to the perhaps overly idealistic objectives of the RDP is being questioned. It is desirable that the marginalised poor people of South Africa have shelter in a healthy and safe environment that is sustainable and in accordance with their needs. The following chapter provides the research design and methodology of the study.

## **Chapter 3: Research Design and Methodology**

### **3. 1. Research Design**

This is an empirical study that utilized primary data gathered by the researcher. The study is designed to be a qualitative one that limited its focus to one township, namely, Chris Hani Park Phase 3 as a case study. Qualitative design includes interactive studies such as ethnography, case study, phenomenological, grounded theory or critical (Maree, 2007, p. 34).

### **3. 2. Research Methodology/Paradigm**

This study used a qualitative methodological paradigm to select the sample and to collect and analyse its data.

Maree (2007, p. 51) & Leedy & Ormrod (2001, p. 147) define qualitative research as one that studies people by interacting with the participants where they live and focuses on the meaning and interpretations of their social lives. According to De Kock & Hanyane (2005, p. 44), the researcher is the tool to collect data, namely, the information in the form of words and pictures; however, the information has to be analysed to give a clear picture about the situation of the participants (cited from Van der Merwe, 1996, p. 283; Oliver, 1997, p. 17; Berg, 1998, p. 7 & Friedman, 1998, 40).

The objectives of this study were to understand the perceptions of the township dwellers regarding the RDP housing development programme, specifically seeking to establish whether the RDP houses adequately address the housing requirements of the township dwellers at Chris Hani Park Phase 3 in Mdantsane, East London.

Therefore, the research case study approach, which is a qualitative approach, was deemed suitable as the research explored the problem of the RDP houses in the Chris Hani Park Block 3, based on methodological aspects in a natural setting. The research also had to give a clear picture about the problem, analyse the problem and give a report (De Kock & Hanyane, 2005, p. 44-45). The study had also employed the methodology that brings out the inner subjective feelings of people who are the beneficiaries of the programme under evaluation.

### **3. 3. The Study Population**

The apartheid government built townships in each homeland during the apartheid era, namely, Mdantsane outside East London in the Eastern Cape, Umlazi outside Durban in KwaZulu Natal, Botshabelo outside Bloemfontein in the Free State, Kanyamazane outside Nelspruit in Mpumalanga, Soweto outside Johannesburg in Gauteng, and others (Thompson (2000, p. 193).

Mdantsane is the second biggest township after Soweto outside Johannesburg in the Gauteng Province. It is divided into Native Units (NU) 1-17. This study chose Chris Hani Park Phase 3 to be the site for the study.

Chris Hani Park Block 3 consists of the Reconstruction Development Programme (RDP) houses that were built in 1998 and the place is located in a flat area at NU 11'A' in Mdantsane township. There are 31 RDP houses and 105 shacks that have been on the waiting list for RDP houses since 1998. The population of Chris Hani Park Block 3 is 450 people. Unlike the other RDP houses that are situated in designated areas, Chris Hani Park Block 3 is situated near amenities that include transport, shops, clinics, schools, a police station and a train station. It is 35 kilometres from the city of East London.

The sampled participants in Chris Hani Park Block 3 are two married males and the majority are single males and females from the age of 24 years old. According to the respondents, unemployment is the major problem in Chris Hani Park Block 3. Four respondents are depending on social grants that amount to R250.00 per child per month, two respondents depend on an old age pension that amounts to R1200.00 per month. Three of them are hawkers and one respondent is working for government as a PR councillor.

Each household accommodates six or fewer members of the family; thus poverty in this area is in extreme. Most people are illiterate. The highest standard of education attained by anyone in the area is Standard Eight (Grade 10) although only two participants achieved the standard.

This study chose Chris Hani Park Block 3 as the case study. Mdantsane is one of the apartheid-created townships thus that made for an easy comparison between the apartheid-created township four roomed houses and the post-apartheid low-income RDP houses.

### **3. 4. Sample**

In this study ten township dwellers were interviewed in ten different RDP households of Chris Hani Park Phase 3 because qualitative research involves smaller sizes of sample than quantitative research studies (Maree, 2007, p. 79).

This study employed purposive sampling where participants were selected who possessed some characteristics that includes being the RDP house owners in Chris Hani Park Block 3, however that made them holders of the data and had the information relevant to the study (Schreiber & Asner-Self, 2011, p. 83 & Maree, 2007, p. 79). There were no limitations with regard to race, gender, education, disability and background. However, it was necessary for the interviewees to be members of the community of Chris Hani Park Block 3.

### **3. 5. Data Collection**

A semi-structured, face-to-face interview was conducted with the interviewer working from an interview guide. Semi-structured interviews gave the interviewer a chance to get more information, including incidents that had happened in the past (Maree, 2007, p. 87). In addition, the interviewee had a chance to shape the information (Wilkinson & Birmingham, 2003, p. 45). According to Johnson & Christensen (2008, p. 208), the interviews allowed the interviewer to obtain clarity or additional information by the use of probes and prompts.

An introduction and a brief background to the research as well as its objectives were given to the interviewees. The researcher personally visited the ward councillor to ask for permission for the research to be undertaken in his ward. The ward councillor was furnished with the research details, purpose and the subjects to be covered, as well as the expected duration of the interview and the envisaged ethical issues. The same procedure was followed in each house of the interviewee on the day of an interview before it took place. The interviews were strictly between the interviewer and the interviewee, the RDP houses beneficiaries; no other member of the house was allowed to participate. In the case of the child-headed homes, the eldest of the beneficiaries who are 24 years of age and above were allowed to be part of the study sample.

The interview was conducted in a suitable location where the interviewee was free to talk. The responses were recorded with an audio tape-recorder. Photographs were taken to supplement the data.

### **3. 6. Data Analysis**

According to Leedy & Ormrod, (2001, p. 160), the researcher begins with a large body of information but has to sort and categorize it according to the themes through inductive reasoning. This study employed content analysis that is a process whereby the keys need to be identified in the text that would help us understand and interpret the raw data by looking from different angles (Maree, 2007, p. 101). Maree (2007, p. 101) further explains that sometimes content analysis is used when working with narratives such as diaries or journals, or to analyse qualitative responses to open-ended questions on surveys, interviews or focus groups.

The data for this study was sorted according to the commonalities and differences arising from the responses of the interviewees and the questions, based on the themes that were followed in the semi-structured interviews.

### **3. 7. Ethical Issues on Research**

Ethical issues play a vital role in research in order to give participants a right to privacy, confidentiality and anonymity. The researcher focused on protection of respondents from harm, not exposing research participants to unprotected incidents, and the people in this study participated strictly on a voluntary basis. The respondents had a right to withdraw anytime (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001, p. 107).

The fully voluntary and informed consent of all the people participating in this study was obtained before it was undertaken, and confidentiality and anonymity of respondents was respected (Maree, 2007, p. 42).

The findings are reported in a complete and honest fashion without misrepresenting the information gathered from the respondents (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001, p. 108).

The respondents have been provided with the research report as a reward for taking part in the research interviews.

### **3. 8. Limitations of the Study**

Maree (2007, p. 42) defines limitations as the challenges that could affect the research, which include time limitations and access to participants. The challenge for this study was the access to participants because they were preparing for Christmas. Also the participants tended to limit the information, fearing a lack of anonymity and confidentiality.

To overcome the limitations, the researcher tried her best to get access to the participants and made appointments at convenient times for them. The researcher strictly considered the ethical issues that included anonymity, privacy, confidentiality and others. The researcher and the respondent made sure that the place that was chosen for the interview was suitable and free from interruption before the interview took place.

### **3. 9. Conclusion**

This chapter has provided insight on the planning and process of the study including the research design and methodology, the study population, sample, data collection and data analysis strategies and ethical standards observed in the research. The results of the study are presented in chapter 4.

## **Chapter 4: Presentation and Interpretation of Data**

### **4. 1. Introduction**

This chapter presents and interprets data collected from the participants in the research study that examined the public perceptions of the RDP and its accompanying housing service delivery in the Chris Hani Park Block 3 in East London. To achieve the objectives of the study three questions had to be answered, namely:

1. How do township dwellers perceive the housing development programmes such as RDP housing in Chris Hani Park Block 3?
2. Do RDP houses provided to the township dwellers in Chris Hani Park Block 3 adequately address the housing needs and basic housing standards of these people?
3. Does the implementation of the RDP housing in Chris Hani Park Block 3 meet the prescribed policy regulations?

Ten people who are the owners of RDP houses in Chris Hani Park Block 3 were selected, one from each house, and interviewed to collect data that would answer the above research questions. Interviewees were allocated codes (as names) from Interviewee A (IA) to Interviewee J (IJ) (see Appendix 1).

### **4. 2. Description of the Research Sample**

The ten participants in this study were the beneficiaries of RDP houses in Chris Hani Park Block 3 as has already been discussed in chapter 3 (The study population).

The sample also includes one Interviewee who was allocated a house that he qualified for according to the requirements of the housing policy, but who at present is working for the municipality. He was sampled as one of the RDP house beneficiaries.

The interviewer observed that this Interviewee may have responded to the interview questions in a way that seemed protective of government as such his responses might differ from those of others.

### **4. 3. Results**

In order to summarise the data meaningfully, themes that emerged from the analysis were formulated to correspond to the research questions. Interviewees' responses are therefore reported according to these themes.

#### **4. 3. 1. Perceptions towards RDP housing programme**

The interview items relating to this theme according to the interview guide were numbered question 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 11. The emerging reports can be categorised under seven sub-themes with items 1 and 6 constituting the first sub-theme; item 4 making up the second sub-theme; item 5 making up the third sub-theme; item 3 and 7 falling under the fourth sub-theme; item 8 the fifth sub-theme; item 9 making up the sixth sub-theme and lastly item 11 constituting the seventh sub-theme.

##### **4. 3. 1. 1. Sub-theme 1: Knowledge and involvement in decisions regarding RDP housing issues**

The majority of interviewees reported having heard about RDP housing *from the ward councillor, the ward committee and the private developer*, with the exception of interviewees IA and IB who said they heard this “ *through the media, including newspapers, radio, television, and conversations with people who have been provided with RDP houses in other areas.*”

All the interviewees stated that they were involved in the selection process of those who qualified to receive a house.

They were called to the meetings where the process and procedures that were to be followed were explained to them, including the requirements to qualify for the RDP house. The feedback was given in community meetings where the ward committee would invite various stakeholders, including the private developer, government officials and the delegation of politicians from various areas.

#### **4. 3. 1. 2. Sub-theme 2: Choice of area where the RDP houses are built**

The majority of the interviewees point out that, *the community of Chris Hani Park Block 3 chose the area; we were allocated sites to build our shacks in 1992 long before we were told about the RDP houses that were to be built in that area. The private developer liked the area because it is near the road, it would market his work to other people who were waiting for the RDP houses, and it would be easily accessed by the government officials, with the exception of II who reported knowing nothing about the reason they chose that area to build their houses.*

#### **4. 3. 1. 3. Sub-theme 3: Backlog on RDP houses**

The respondents asserted that the majority of people have been waiting for the RDP houses since 1998. Out of 136 shacks, only 31 houses have been built. *The shack dwellers are not happy: their shacks are leaking, others are collapsing and when other RDP houses were built, these people were assisting by collecting the building material for the builders and they were not paid. That has caused a major division between us and the shack dwellers. They have no basic facilities; therefore, we are fighting over electricity. They connect illegally to the pylons that supply electricity to our houses.*

#### **4. 3. 1. 4. Sub-theme 4: Waiting period for the delivery of houses**

*“The process for the selection of people who qualified for RDP houses has taken four years for the RDP houses to be built but the building process has taken a short period for the houses to be finished,”* reported ID, IE and IF. The majority of the respondents also agreed that the process for selection of people who qualified for RDP houses has taken a long time but they did not remember the number of years.

Majority of the interviewees reported that, *the houses were built and finished in 1998 by the private developer and coloureds from the Karoo region.*

#### **4. 3. 1. 5. Sub-theme 5: The views of the township dwellers regarding the way the RDP programme is run**

IA had this to say about the programme, *“I don’t like the way the RDP housing programme is running. The RDP has failed because the houses it has built have major defects. They are of a very low standard. They are not the same as the show house that was the true reflection of how the houses were supposed to look (see picture 1 & 2 in Appendix 4). We were provided with letters after the RDP houses were finished. Those letters needed to be signed to confirm that we are happy about the houses. We have complained and insisted that, before we signed the ‘happy’ letters, the houses should be assessed by an inspector, but somehow the ward committee reported to us that RDP houses have been assessed by the inspector but the private developer had those sub-standard RDP houses rated a success. The process of assessment of houses was done without our involvement. Immediately after we occupied the houses, six houses were blown away by the wind and were left without roofs. No one from the Department of Housing has come to intervene. Four RDP occupants renovated their houses, while two beneficiaries moved back to the shacks.”*

The majority of the respondents expected the RDP housing development programme to build proper houses that were of a higher standard than those that were built by the apartheid government. The houses that were built by the apartheid government were properly built and more secure. The roofs were solid because they were built of a quality material; there were burglar-bars in the doors and windows (see picture 3 in Appendix 4).

According to IJ, *“The RDP houses are built with cheap material; therefore, the roofs are not rigid and there is no burglar proofing at all on the windows and doors.”*

*“The RDP has to utilize the people’s labour so that they can get income and acquire skills. People have to be involved in their development,”* said IA.

#### **4. 3. 1. 6. Sub-theme 6: Feelings of people regarding the RDP houses allocated to them**

IA, IC, ID and IE state that they appreciate at least what the RDP has done because they are no longer living in shacks. They have their own houses, although they have got a lot of problems. IG and IH report that they are not happy about their RDP houses.

*“The post-apartheid government is humiliating us because the RDP houses we are provided with are of a very low standard,”* reported IB.

IF added that, *“I don’t see any difference between my house and a shack, except for the building blocks with which the shack that I lived in was built.”*

II pointed out that, *“These houses were provided to the poor, but their low standard is making us even poorer because we have to renovate these RDP houses although we are unemployed.”*

IJ added that, *“My house was blown away by the wind immediately after it was finished (see picture 5 in Appendix 4). It has never been renovated or rebuilt.”*

*Therefore, the post-apartheid government has provided me with a house I will never occupy because I cannot afford to renovate or rebuild it.”*

#### **4. 3. 1. 7. Sub-theme 7: Evaluation of the RDP housing programme**

The majority of the interviewees stated that they are not happy about the way the RDP housing development programme operates; it does not involve people in their development; therefore, they are provided with houses that are of a low standard. Few respondents that included IA, IC, II and IJ gave this remark.

IA, said, *“I am not happy about the material used to build our houses, including the standard of the houses.”*

IC, *“I do not see any change that has been brought by the RDP housing programme because, out of 136 shacks, only 31 RDP houses were built in Chris Hani Park Phase 3, and those houses are of an inferior standard.”*

II, *“The RDP housing programme has brought divisions and fights over the basic facilities between the RDP occupants and the shack dwellers.”*

IJ, *“The RDP is a good housing programme. It has brought many changes to other places but in many places including Chris Hani Park Block 3, it is corrupted by the private developers. The RDP has, thus, not brought change in this area.”*

#### **4. 3. 2. Effectiveness of the RDP programme in addressing the housing needs of the township dwellers**

The interview items relating to this theme according to the interview guide include numbers 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17.

The emerging reports are categorised under 5 sub-themes with item 12 and 13 constituting the first sub-theme; item 14 making up the second sub-theme; item 15 making up the third sub-theme; item 16 making up the fourth sub-theme and lastly item 17 making up the fifth sub-theme. The results on the different sub-themes are reported below:

#### **4. 3. 2. 1. Sub-theme 1: Number of occupants in the allocated RDP houses**

Interviewees state that some of them live with their children. IC, IE and IJ have families of 4, ID and IF are 5 member families , IG and IH have families of 2, IA is a 6 member family , IB has a family of 8, and II lives alone, he (II) reported *“My mother passed away a few years ago, and I am left alone.”*

The majority of the participants stated that their two bedroom RDP houses do not have enough space to accommodate their families and visitors; however, they are not allowed to build shacks to extend their houses. IE, IH and IJ state that their two bedroom RDP houses are big enough to accommodate their families since they are only four in the house. II states that, *“The house is big enough for me because I live alone.”*

#### **4. 3. 2. 2. Sub-theme 2: Basic facilities available in the RDP houses**

All the interviewees confirmed that, *the RDP house has running water, electricity and a toilet inside.*

#### **4. 3. 2. 3. Sub-theme 3: The security of the RDP houses**

Both IA and IE agreed that, *“The RDP houses in Chris Hani Park Block 3 are safe because they are not shacks which could easily catch fire. They are built with blocks although they do not have burglar proofing on windows and doors.”*

The majority of the respondents asserted that, *the houses are not safe because of the cheap material they were built with; therefore, they are a danger themselves. They do not have burglar proofing on windows and doors, and there is no fence.*

#### **4. 3. 2. 4. Sub-theme 4: The standard and quality of the houses**

All the interviewees agreed that, *the standard of the RDP houses is very poor. They were not properly built and the material used was very cheap, hence the building blocks of the inside toilets are collapsing* (see picture 8 in Appendix 4). *Some of RDP houses were blown away by wind in 1998 as soon as they were finished; hence some people left their houses and moved back to the shacks because they did not have money to renovate the houses.*

*Water penetrates between the building blocks* (see picture 7 in Appendix 4); *hence the RDP occupants are plastering the houses themselves, and that is a big challenge to those who are unemployed because they cannot afford to do this.*

*The houses cannot withstand rainy and windy weather. The roofs are supported with heavy stones and old tyres* (see picture 6 in Appendix 4). Therefore the RDP houses are far below the apartheid government houses in terms of quality.

#### **4. 3. 2. 5. Sub-theme 5: Intervention from Housing Department**

IA who is an occupant and also a worker of the Municipality as a PR Councillor, stated that, *“We have reported our housing problems to the ward committee and the ward councillor. Steps have been taken because Chris Hani Park Block 1, our neighbour is in the process of being renovated.”*

The majority of respondents argue that, *we have reported our RDP housing problems to the ward committee and the ward councillor; however, since the houses were built, promises of renovations have been given but nothing has been done. Lately it is difficult to find the ward councillor in his office.*

#### **4. 3. 3. Effectiveness of the prescribed housing policy regulations in the implementation of the RDP houses**

The interview items relating to this theme according to the interview guide include numbers 2, 10, and 16 (16 is also included in sub-theme 4 below). The emerging reports are categorised under three sub-themes with item 2 constituting the first sub-theme; item 10 making up the second sub-theme and lastly item 16 making up the third sub-theme. The results on the different sub-themes are reported below:

##### **4. 3. 3. 1. Sub-theme 1: Who qualifies for an RDP house?**

All of the interviewees stated that, *the RDP houses were provided to people who were not working.* However, participants IB, ID, IF, IG and IH added that, *the RDP houses were also provided to people who were working but earning a salary that could only sustain them on a hand to mouth basis.* Therefore, all of the interviewees stated that they qualified for the RDP houses because they were unemployed.

##### **4. 3. 3. 2. Sub-theme 2: Involvement in the actual building of the RDP houses**

According to the majority of the interviewees, *the private developer has never involved us in the actual building of the RDP houses; except his workers from the Karoo region. The committee who were representing us had no input in the actual building process and decision making, the private developer was just reporting what is to be done, the structure of the house without our involvement.*

*The involvement of the committee was just to help collect the building blocks for the bricklayers and monitoring the building material after hours. However, the committee has done the work that was allocated to them by the private developer properly, nothing was stolen because of the ward committee's assistance.*

ID further added that, *"The committee has done their role correctly although they were blinded by excitement and desperation for houses. The private developer noticed that excitement and took advantage."*

#### **4. 3. 3. 3. Sub-theme 3: The quality of the RDP houses**

All the interviewees agreed that, *the standard of the RDP houses is very low. They were not properly built and the material used was very cheap, hence the building blocks of the inside toilet are collapsing. Some of the houses were blown away by wind in 1998 as soon as they were finished, hence some people left their houses and move back to the shacks because they do not have money to renovate the houses.*

IC added that, *"Water penetrates between the building blocks; hence the RDP occupants are plastering the houses themselves. And that is a big challenge to those that are unemployed because they cannot afford."*

IH asserted that, *"The houses cannot withstand rainy and windy weathers. The roofs are supported with heavy stones. Therefore the RDP houses are far below the apartheid government houses in terms of quality."*

#### **4. 4. Conclusion**

This chapter analysed the data from the fieldwork undertaken with, the objective, among others, to understand the effectiveness of the RDP housing programme for the South African poor citizens. The discussion of findings is presented in Chapter 5.

## **CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS**

This chapter discusses the main findings of the study and relates them to the conceptual framework and the reviewed literature in order to highlight similarities and /or differences.

The discussion follows a similar ordering of the main themes as they appear in the results chapter. The themes were derived from the research questions and correspond to the objectives of study.

### **5. 1. Perceptions towards RDP housing programme**

According to the responses of the interviewees regarding knowledge and involvement in decisions pertaining RDP housing issues, people who are waiting for the RDP houses should have been educated by the Department of Housing about the RDP and related issues, including the criteria to select people who qualify for the RDP houses, and their involvement in the steps of the development, such as planning, decision-making, implementation and evaluation prior to the process of the RDP house allocation, so that they could easily deal with problems they experience during the project. According to the general principles of housing development, the three spheres of government must promote education for people who are waiting for RDP houses on RDP and related issues to protect consumers by empowering them with knowledge and skills in order for them to be able to deal with the problems of their development (Housing Act of 1997, S2 (e) (i)).

All of the interviewees were happy about their involvement in the selection process of people who qualify to receive RDP houses. The process, procedures and feedback, where necessary, were given in community meetings.

The process and procedures include the criteria to select people who qualify for RDP houses, and the allocation of people to the sites where the houses were to be built.

Regarding the choice of area where the RDP houses are built, the community of Chris Hani Block 3 chose the area themselves long before they were told that their area will be provided with houses. Although the private developer for his own personal reasons and interests liked the area, the area meets the standard for adequate housing because it is located within a pleasant living environment Built Environment Support Group (BESG, 1999, p. 8); it is well located for social opportunities such as shops, schools, clinics and hospitals, police stations and public transport.

According to the interviewees' reports, there is a backlog in the delivery of RDP houses in Chris Hani Block 3 because the majority of people lack proper houses since 1998. The RDP on housing was supposed to bring change to the historically disadvantaged poor people of Chris Hani Park Block 3 but it has brought misery and a huge division between the shack dwellers and RDP beneficiaries. Oldfield (2000, p. 858) asserted that housing delivery by the state to poor communities had several unfortunate consequences that included the low rate of delivery and uneven and poorly targeted delivery. It has also failed to alleviate the desperate conditions of the homeless families. Koelble & LiPuma (1999, p. 561) asserted that the majority of people still lack access to basic needs in the period of fifteen years after the arrival of the democratic dispensation.

Therefore, it will be impossible for the South African government to fully meet the United Nations (UN) Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) target to replace slums with proper houses, and the post-apartheid South African government's own target of eradicating informal settlements by 2014.

Interviewee reports on waiting period for the delivery of houses show that the houses were built and finished in 1998, therefore, the building process has taken a short period though only a few houses were built.

According to Pottie, (2004, p. 608), the target of one million houses in a five year period proved elusive prior to the 1999 elections but in quantitative terms, it remains an impressive achievement. On the contrary, in the case of Chris Hani Park Block 3, the goal was not an impressive achievement in quantitative terms because the majority of people in Chris Hani Park Block 3 were left homeless with only 31 low-standard houses built.

The views of the township dwellers regarding the way the RDP programme is run, were that, there are some challenges that include the lack of involvement of communities in their development by the private developers. Some of these challenges could have been avoided if the beneficiaries participated in the planning process and decision making regarding housing delivery. For legitimacy reasons as well as sustainability, it is important that the beneficiaries own their process of housing delivery. Private contractors were not monitored by the government officials regarding the development they rendered to the communities in terms of inspection. In cases where the inspection took place, the inspector had the services rendered by the private developer declared a success whether the RDP houses were sub-standard or not. According to the people-driven principle of RDP, the RDP programme is based on the development approach that is driven by people as they are the most important resource. People should be empowered with skills and knowledge in line with the government's committed to maximum transparency and inclusivity towards people (White Paper, 1994, p. 8). Therefore, people are expecting to be involved in their development so that they can get exactly what they want.

According to IA, IC, ID and IE on the feelings of people regarding the RDP houses allocated to them, even though the houses have many defects and are generally substandard, they are much appreciated. IA is working for the municipality so he could afford to renovate the house. The researcher discovered that, IC, ID and IE lack knowledge about what is right for them regarding their basic needs.

They were in desperate need for the houses; hence they overlooked their rights for adequate as well as sustainable houses and appreciate the least they could get. South Africa has one of the most enlightened Constitutions in the world which guarantees basic human rights and supports the advancement of the historically disadvantaged South African citizens (Moller & Dickow, 2002, p. 267). Therefore the citizens of South Africa including the community of Chris Hani Park Block 3 have the right to proper houses.

Cooperate Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA), (2009, p. 7) adds that everyone has the right to have access to adequate housing; however, it is the government's duty to take reasonable legislative and other measures within its available resources to fulfil this right but, according to the responses of IB, IG, IH, IF, II and IJ, those RDP houses do not meet the standards of adequate houses.

People are provided with houses they are not happy with because the houses are of a very low standard. According to Tissington (2011, p. 62), the White Paper on Housing aimed to ensure the participation of emerging, largely black contractors despite a lack of resources and an adequate track record. There have, however, been a number of problems concerning this model whereby the private developer ends up building the RDP houses with very cheap materials, with the result that poor quality houses are built.

On the evaluation of the RDP housing programme, the interviewees asserted that, the RDP is a good housing programme because it was meant for the poor people of South Africa who were previously disadvantaged and inadequately housed. The programme, however, has been changed by the private developers because of corruption and greed. The respondents do not see any change that has been brought about by the RDP housing programme, although some of them appreciate the least they have.

According to Lalloo (1998, p. 40), government had a narrow focus on social transformation on the production of shelter in a quantitative form. Lalloo (1998, p. 40) adds that the development of low-income houses over the period of 5 years from 1994, has done no changes to homeless people of South Africa. They became a major weakness in the post-apartheid policy as the result of the inferior standard.

(Moller & Dickow, 2002, p. 288) asserted that the poor low-income earners are disappointed with the new dispensation because of the sub-standard of the RDP houses that were provided to them.

## **5. 2. Effectiveness of the RDP programme in addressing the housing needs of the township dwellers**

On the issue of the number of occupants in those RDP houses, only four respondents, IE, IH, II and IJ have enough space in their houses for their families. The majority of respondents declared the houses very small. The space is not enough for their families.

The space needs to be enlarged in order to accommodate most of the families. Therefore, the housing policies need to be adjusted in terms of the area or size of the RDP houses. According to Tissington (2011, p. 60) the housing subsidy in 1994 was R12 500 but in 1998 it was adjusted to R15 000. The amount is still too low to build a proper and sustainable three bedroom houses that will address the needs of the previous disadvantaged South African citizens

According to the Interviewees regarding the basic facilities available in the RDP houses, the houses have all the basic facilities that include running water, electricity and a toilet inside.

One of the principles of the RDP White Paper was fulfilled in a way that people were promised with basic needs and the building of the infrastructure that included electricity, water, telecommunications, transport, health education and training for all (White Paper, 1994, p. 8). The majority of people are still waiting desperately for the RDP houses, and they need water, electricity and roads.

Interviewee reports on the security of the RDP houses, few respondents stated that the houses are safe, however, the majority were adamant that the houses are not safe. IA and IE stated that they appreciate the least that was provided to them because they are no longer in shacks (As they have indicated in sub-theme 6 of Theme 2), irrespective of the standard of the RDP houses and their right to basic needs. The standard of the houses makes it a danger to the occupants and they lack of burglar proofing; therefore the majority of the interviewees declared the RDP houses not safe. The RDP houses are the opposite of what is said by the policies that every citizen of South Africa has the right to have access to adequate housing (Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs, COGTA, 2009, p. 7). Therefore the houses in Chris Hani are not adequate including security on houses. Oldfield (2000, p. 858) and Napier (2005, p. 8) add that the RDP beneficiaries are left with sustainable benefits, the structurally sound housing. On the contrary, poor low earners of Chris Hani Park Block 3 were left with the sub-standard houses, thus, government is not properly implementing the policies.

Regarding the standard and quality of the RDP houses, the participants reported that the RDP houses were not properly built because of the cheap material that was used to build houses for the people of Chris Hani Park Block 3. Lack of involvement in their development has resulted in the provision of sub-standard RDP houses.

Housing delivery policies should aim at providing products of a quality which will ensure living standards conducive to development that is inclusive to previously marginalised recipients (Burger & Cloete, 1998, p. 2). On the contrary, Casale & Desmond (2007, p. 78) state that the quality of the low-cost houses provided by the post-apartheid government has been called into question on a number of counts. Subsidies are seen to be too low, although they were raised from R12500 in 1994 to R15000 in 1998; hence the housing quality is under-valued (Gelb, 2003, p. 57).

According to the responses of the interviewees on intervention from Housing Department, although they have reported their RDP house problems, nothing has been done so far, despite the promise by the Minister of Human Settlement in 2009 to focus heavily on the issue of the quality of RDP houses and to demolish and rectify badly constructed houses (Tissington, 2011, p. 80).

### **5. 3. Effectiveness of the prescribed housing policy regulations in the implementation of the RDP houses**

Regarding the sub-theme on who qualifies for the RDP house, the criteria used to select the beneficiaries of Chris Hani Park Block 3 were correct. According to Oldfield (2000, p. 859-860) the households that had never received state assistance for housing were provided with a one-time subsidy by the national policy. Oldfield (2000, p. 859-860) added that a graded subsidy was provided to people in the income category R0 to R3500 per month. Huchzermeyer (2006, p. 11) states that the subsidy covers the purchase of land, the cost of necessary planning procedures, the infrastructure development and the house (cited from Department of Housing, 2000).

In terms of involvement of beneficiaries in the actual building of the RDP houses, people have never been involved in their development whatsoever because the private developer built the RDP houses with people who knew nothing about the housing needs of the community of Chris Hani Park Block 3. The ward committee as well as the community of that area were not empowered about the RDP and related issues as well as what is their right regarding the basic needs.

South Africa has struggled to overcome the social, economic and political marginalisation caused by separate development and its impact, however, the integrated people centred development has become the most important in development circles after the concept of development has been redefined (Davids, Theron & Maphunye, 2005, p. 19). On the contrary, the neo – liberal approach to low income housing delivery had several unfortunate consequences that include disempowerment of communities by generally being marginalised concerning the project planning, decision making and the actual building of houses which in turn led to unwanted housing products as well as an increasing gap between developers and community expectations (Bond, 2003, p. 4).

In connection with the quality of the RDP houses, the participants said their RDP houses were not properly built because of the cheap material that was used to build houses for the people of Chris Hani Park Block 3. Lack of involvement in their development has resulted in provision of sub – standard RDP houses. Housing delivery policies should aim at providing products of a quality which will ensure living standards conducive to development that is inclusive to previously marginalised recipients (Burger & Cloete, 1998, p. 2). On the contrary to what was prescribed by the housing policies, Casale & Desmond (2007, p. 78) argue that the quality of the low cost houses provided by the post-apartheid government has been called into question on a number of counts.

Subsidies are seen to be too low, although they were raised from R12500 in 1994 to R15000 in 1998 hence the housing quality is undervalued (Gelb, 2003, p. 57).

## **CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **6. 1. Conclusion**

This chapter gives a brief summary of chapter 5 by concluding the findings of the study that attempted to answer the three research questions provided in chapter one. The chapter also provides a section on the recommendations that might bring about positive change in the implementation process of the housing policy and for future research. In line with the findings of the study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. A. The housing related RDP is a good housing programme because it was meant for the poor people of South Africa who were previously disadvantaged and inadequately housed. The programme, however, has been changed by the private developers because of corruption and greed. The respondents do not see any change that has been brought about by the RDP housing programme, although some of them appreciate the least they have. It has brought misery and a huge division between the shack dwellers and RDP beneficiaries in Chris Hani Park Block 3, as the majority of people have been lacking proper housing since 1998.

B. People who are waiting for the RDP houses lack knowledge on the housing programme to which they are beneficiaries. In addition, the ward committee as well as the community of Chris Hani Park Block 3 were not educated about the RDP housing development and related issues, as well as what their rights are regarding the basic needs so that they can easily deal with problems they experience during the project. The neo-liberal approach to low-income housing delivery has had several unfortunate consequences that include disempowerment of communities by generally being marginalised concerning the project planning, decision-making and the actual building of houses which, in turn, have led to unwanted housing products as well as an increasing gap between developers and community expectations (Bond, 2003, p. 4).

C. People have never been involved in their development whatsoever because the private developer built the RDP houses with people who knew nothing about the housing needs of the community of Chris Hani Park Block 3. They have reported their RDP house problems but nothing has been done so far, although the Minister of Human Settlement did promise in 2009 when he came to office, to focus heavily on the issue of the quality of RDP houses and to demolish and rectify badly constructed houses (Tissington, 2011, p. 80). Therefore, according to the responses of the participants, the study concludes that people lack knowledge and they have never been involved in their development, including planning, decision-making, implementation and evaluation prior the process of the RDP house allocation.

2. A. According to the Cooperate Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA, 2009, p. 7) everyone has the right to have access to adequate housing but it is the government's duty to take reasonable legislative and other measures within its available resources to fulfil this right. Therefore, those RDP houses do not meet the standard of adequate houses because they have many defects. The community of Chris Hani Park Block 3 lack knowledge about what is right regarding the basic needs. They were in desperate need for the houses; hence they overlooked their rights for adequate and sustainable houses and appreciate the least they could get.

B. The RDP houses are not safe, the standard of the houses makes it a danger to the occupants and there is no burglar proofing. Those RDP houses were not properly built because of the cheap material that was used to build them.

Lack of involvement in their development has resulted in the provision of sub-standard RDP houses with which the community of Chris Hani Park Block 3 are not happy.

The White Paper on Housing aimed to ensure the participation of emerging, largely black, contractors despite a lack of resources and an adequate track record; however, there have been a number of problems concerning this model whereby the private developers end up building the RDP houses with very cheap materials; hence poor quality houses are built (Tissington, 2011, p. 62). Therefore, Casale & Desmond (2007, p. 78) state that the quality of the low-cost houses provided by the post-apartheid government has been called into question on a number of counts.

C. Subsidies are seen to be too low, although they were raised from R12500 in 1994 to R15000 in 1998 so the housing quality is undervalued (Gelb, 2003, p. 57 & Tissington, 2011, p. 60). The amount is still too low to build a proper and sustainable house with three bedrooms that will address the needs of the previously disadvantaged South African citizens. The space needs to be extended in order to accommodate most of the families.

According to the responses of the participants, the study concludes that the RDP houses provided to the township dwellers in Chris Hani Park Block 3 do not adequately address the housing needs and basic housing standards of these people.

3. A. The study concludes that, in some cases, the policies were correctly applied in the RDP housing development in Chris Hani Park Block 3. The beneficiaries were selected according to the criteria of the policy. Oldfield (2000, p. 859 – 860) added that a graded subsidy was provided to people in the income category R0 to R3500 per month and people who had never received state assistance for housing, were provided a one-time subsidy by the national policy.

B. The area meets the standard for adequate housing because it is located within a pleasant living environment, as it is mentioned in chapter 3 (Built Environment Support Group (BESG), 1999, p. 8). It is well located for social opportunities such as shops, schools, clinics and hospitals, police stations and public transport.

C. In most cases, government has failed to properly implement the policies for housing. The community of Chris Hani Park Block 3 has never been involved in the development whatsoever. The private developer built the RDP houses with people who knew nothing about their housing needs. According to the people-driven principle of RDP, the RDP programme is based on the development approach that is driven by people as the most important resource and people are empowered with skills and knowledge whereby the government is committed to maximum transparency and inclusivity towards people (White Paper, 1994, p. 8).

D. The RDP houses are the opposite of what is said by the policies. They are sub-standard, whereas it is stated that every citizen of South Africa has the right to have access to adequate housing (Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs, COGTA, 2009, p. 7). Koelble & LiPuma (1999, p. 561) assert that the majority of people still lack access to basic needs in the period of fifteen years after the arrival of the democratic dispensation.

Therefore, it will be impossible for the South African government to fully address the United Nations (UN) Millennium Development Goal 7 task 11 (MDGs) target to replace slums by proper houses by 2020 (Choguill, 2006, p. 143-144) because the majority of people in Chris Hani Park Block 3 live in shacks. Few of them were provided with RDP houses which are of a very poor standard; however, the whole community lives in slums.

According to the responses of participants, the study concludes that the housing policies are not properly implemented.

## **6. 2. Recommendations**

1. The study recommends education of people by the Housing Department on RDP housing and related issues in order to be empowered with skills and knowledge so that they will be able to deal with housing development issues in their area as well as the involvement of communities in their development.
2. The study recommends that people be provided with adequate and sustainable houses that are big enough to accommodate families; the houses have to address adequately the housing needs and basic housing standards for poor people. Therefore the housing subsidy is too low to achieve that; hence it needs to be revised.
3. The study recommends that the housing policies should be properly implemented in order for the communities to be adequately and sustainably housed.

## References

1. Amoateng, A.Y. & Richter, M.L. (2007). *The social and economic context of families and households in South Africa*. Pretoria: HSRC Press.
2. Atkinson, D. (2007). *Taking to the streets: Has Developmental Local Government failed in South Africa?*
3. Beall, J., Crankshaw, O. & Parnell, S. (2000). *Victims, villains and fixers: The urban environment and Johannesburg's poor*. London: Routledge.
4. Built Environment Support Group (BESG), (1999). *Towards the right to adequate housing*. Durban: BESG.
5. Bond, P. (2003). *The degeneration of urban policy after apartheid*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.
6. Bryceson, D.F. & Bank, L. (2001). *End of the era: Africa's development policy parallax*. London: Routledge.
7. Burger, J. & Cloete, F. (1998). *Assessing housing management in terms of development objectives*. London: Routledge.
8. Casale, D. & Desmond, C. (2007). *The economic well-being of family: Households access to resources in South Africa 1995-2003*. Pretoria: HSRC Publishers.

9. Chiu, R.L.H. (2002). *Social equality in Hong Kong special administrative region: A social sustainability perspective*. Hong Kong: John Wiley & Sons.
10. Chiu, R.L.H. 2004. *Socio-cultural sustainability of housing: A conceptual exploration*. Hong Kong: Taylor & Francis.
11. Choguill, C.L. (2006). *The search for policies to support sustainable housing*. Riyadh: Elsevier Ltd.
12. Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA) (2009). *State of the local government in South Africa*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
13. Davenport, R. & Saunders, C. (2002). *South Africa: A modern history*. London: Great Britain Publishers
14. Davids, I., Theron, F. & Maphunye, K. J. (2005). *Participatory development in South Africa: A development management perspective*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
15. De Kock, D. & Hanyane, B. (2005). *Fundamentals of research II*. Florida: Technikon South Africa.
16. Feldman, R. M. & Westphal, L. M. (1999). *Participation for empowerment: The greening of a public housing development*. Berkley: College of Environmental Design.

17. Gelb, S. (2003). *Inequality in South Africa: Nature, causes and responses: DFID policy initiative on addressing inequality in middle income countries*. Braamfontein: The Edge Institute.
18. Havenga, W., Menaha, V. & Visagie, J.C. (2011). *Developing a national cadre of effective leadership towards sustainable quality service delivery in South Africa*. Johannesburg. <http://www.academicjournals.org/AJBM>.pp12271-12282. Accessed, 05 May 2012.
19. Heller, P. (2001). *Moving the state: The politics of democratic decentralisation in Kerala, South Africa, and Porto Alegre*. *Politics and Society*, 29(1), pp131-163
20. Housing Act 107 (1997). *Housing Act 107 of 1997*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
21. Huchzermeyer, M. (2006). *Challenges facing people-driven development in the context of a strong delivery-oriented state: Joe Slovo Village, Port Elizabeth*.
22. Islam, N. (1996). *Sustainability issues in urban housing in a low-income country: Bangladesh*. Dhaka: Elsevier Science.
23. Johnson, B & Christensen, L. (2008). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed approaches*. (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
24. Koelble, A. T. & LiPuma, E. (1999). *Institutional obstacles to service delivery in South Africa*. London: Taylor & Francis.

25. Lalloo, K. (1998). *Arenas of contested citizenship: Housing policy in South Africa*. Great Britain: Elsevier Science Limited.
26. Leedy, D. & Ormrod, J. E. (2001). *Practical research: Planning and design*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
27. Mani, M. E. (2009). *Who has been driving the people's housing process? A case study of Vosloorus Extension 28 and Ivory Park Ward 78 PHP Projects in Gauteng Province*. Johannesburg: University of Witwatersrand.
28. Maree, K. (2007). *First steps in research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers
29. Mcnaghten, P. & Jacobs, M. (1997). *Public identification with sustainable development: Investigating cultural barriers to participation*. Great Britain: Elsevier Science.
30. Milton, J. (1983). *The edges of war: A history of frontier wars (1702 - 1878)*. Kenwyn: Juta & Co. Ltd.
31. Moller, V. & Dickow, H. (2002). *The role of quality of life surveys in managing change in democratic transitions: The South African case*. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
32. Napier, M. (2005). *A macro-perspective on the first decade of South African-using delivery and its contribution towards the formation of sustainable settlements and communities*. Pretoria

33. Oldfield, S. (2000). *The centrality of community capacity in state low-income housing provision in Cape Town, South Africa*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
34. Parnell, S. (2005). *Constructing a developmental nation: The challenge of including the poor in the post-apartheid city*. Michigan: Michigan State University Press.
35. Pottie, D. (2004). *Local government and housing in South Africa: managing demand and enabling markets*. London: Routledge.
36. Ramutsindela, M. F. (2001). *Down the post-colonial road: reconstructing the post – apartheid state in South Africa*. Sovenga: Elsevier Science Ltd.
37. Schreiber J. B. & Asner-Self, K. (2011). *Educational research*. United States of America: John Willey & Sons, Inc.
38. Southall, R. (2007). *Does South Africa have a ‘racial bargain’? : A comparative perspective*. Roger.southall@wits.ac.za. Accessed, 02 July 2012.
39. Szeftel, M. (2004). *Two cheers? South African democracy’s first decade, Review of African political economy*. London: ROAPE Publications.
40. Tissington, K. (2011). *A resource guide to housing in South Africa. Legislation, policy, programme and practice, 1994-2010*. <http://www.escri-net.org/sites/default/files/SERI-A-Resource-Guide-to-Housing-in-South-Africa-Fe> Accessed, 08 January 2013.

41. Thompson, L. (2000). *The history of South Africa*. United States of America: Yale University Press.
  
42. White Paper, (1994). *White Paper on Reconstruction and Development*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
  
43. Wilkinson, D. & Birmingham, P. (2003). *Using research instruments: A guide for researchers*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

## Appendices

### Appendix 1: List of Interviewees

<b>Interviewee</b>	<b>Age</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Marital Status</b>	<b>Education Level</b>	<b>Number of children</b>	<b>Income Source</b>	<b>Employment Status</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>STD 8 (Grade 10)</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Working</b>	<b>PR Councillor</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>STD 2 (Grade 4)</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>Pension</b>	<b>Unemployed</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>STD 4 (Grade 6)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Hawker</b>	<b>Unemployed</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>STD 6 (Grade 8)</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Social Grant</b>	<b>Unemployed</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>STD 6 (Grade 8)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Pension</b>	<b>Unemployed</b>
<b>F</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>STD 5 (Grade 7)</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Social Grant</b>	<b>Unemployed</b>
<b>G</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>STD 6 (Grade 8)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Hawker</b>	<b>Unemployed</b>
<b>H</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>STD 5 (Grade 7)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Social Grant</b>	<b>Unemployed</b>
<b>I</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>STD 7 (Grade 9)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Hawker</b>	<b>Unemployed</b>

<b>J</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>STD 8 3</b> <b>(Grade</b> <b>10)</b>		<b>Social</b> <b>Grant</b>	<b>Unemployed</b>
----------	-----------	----------	----------	---	--	-------------------------------	-------------------

## **Appendix 2: Interview Guide**

1. How did you get to know about RDP and related housing issues?
2. How did you get to be allocated the house?
3. How long did you wait for the RDP house?
4. Why did they choose that area to build your houses? Were you happy about that?
5. Are there people who awaiting RDP houses? How long? How do they feel?
6. Were you at all involved in the decisions leading to your receiving the house? How does the information regarding this issue get circulated?
7. When were the RDP houses built in Chris Hani Park Block 3?
8. How do you feel about the way the programme is run? How do you expect it to run?
9. How do you feel about the house you have received?
10. Who were involved in the process of planning and implementing the actual building of the houses in Chris Hani Park Block 3?
11. What can you say about the housing development programme such as the RDP in Chris Hani Park Block 3? What change has the RDP housing programme brought?
12. How many members of the family live in your house?
13. Does the RDP house have enough space to accommodate your family? Why do you say so?
14. What basic facilities does it have?
15. What can you say about the security of the house?
16. What can you say about the RDP houses in terms of quality? Are there any problems so far?
17. Have you reported your housing problems? To whom? What has been done?

### Appendix 3: Data from Interviews

#### Interviewee A

Questions	Response
Q1	In media that includes newspapers, radio, television and through conversation with people from other areas.
Q2	The houses were allocated to people who were not working, so I qualified for one.
Q3	The process has taken a long time before the houses were built. I am not sure about the number of years.
Q4	We were already chosen that area, allocated the sites and the private developer liked the area because it is near the road and would market his work.
Q5	Yes, out of 136 shacks only 31 houses were built. They are not happy that this has caused a major division between the RDP occupants and the shack dwellers. They also have no basic facilities, therefore we have fights over the electricity they connect illegally from the pylons that bring electricity to the RDP houses.
Q6	We were involved in the decisions leading to our receiving the houses; we were called in meetings where we were told about the process and the procedures that were to be followed. The feedback about the RDP houses in Chris Hani Park Block 3 was given to the community in a meeting situation whereby the ward committee would invite various stakeholders including the private developer, the administration and the delegation of politicians from various areas.
Q7	The RDP houses were built and finished in 1998 by the private developer and his Coloured workers.
Q8	I don't like the way the RDP programme is running.

	<p>Our houses were built with major defects and were not the same as the show house that was a true reflection of how our houses were supposed to look like. We have complained and insisted that, before we signed the happy letters the houses should be inspected first but somehow the private developer had the development rendered a success. And immediately after the houses were built they were blown away by the wind and left without roofs. We expected the RDP to build proper houses for us, create jobs and not to focus on providing houses only. It had to utilize the people's labour so that they can get income, and acquire skills, hence people are renting their houses to foreigners to alleviate poverty.</p>
Q9	<p>I appreciate the house that was given to me because it is a shelter and I am no longer living in a shack. I have to renovate it because I am working for the municipality.</p>
Q10	<p>The private developer brought his own workers that were the Coloured people from the Karoo region. Our committee who were representing the community was only helping by collecting the building blocks for the bricklayers.</p>
Q11	<p>People are not happy with the programme but they appreciate the list they have. I recommend a people housing process where people are involved in their development. The RDP has brought a slight change in our community because we are no longer living in shacks, we have houses even though we are not happy with the quality of the material used and standard of the houses. The roofs are leaking, the walls are not properly built, water penetrates easily through the blocks, the doors and frames are cheap material not a good quality.</p>
Q12	<p>I live with my wife and four children.</p>
Q13	<p>The space is not enough for my family because the house has only two small</p>

	bedrooms.
Q14	It has water, electricity and a toilet inside.
Q15	The house is secured because it is not a shack, but burglars have to be installed in windows and doors.
Q16	The standard of the houses is very low, the material used was cheap. They cannot withstand rainy and windy weather. We have to support the roofs with heavy stones. Water penetrates between the building blocks, hence we are plastering the houses on our own and that is a challenge to those who are unemployed because they cannot afford. The RDP is far to what we had been promised in the Freedom Charter, that there shall be houses and security for all because that has never happen.
Q17	We have reported our housing problems to the ward councilor and the ward committee, they have taken steps because Block 1 is in the process of renovations. Therefore we are waiting for the renovations.

## **Interviewee B**

<b>Questions</b>	<b>Response</b>
Q1	I heard about the RDP from our ward councilor, the committee and the private developer, telling us that 31 houses were to be built in our community for those who qualify.
Q2	It was meant for those who were unemployed, and earn less salary from hand to mouth. I was also unemployed so I qualified for one. The process was done by the ward councilor and the ward committee.
Q3	The process of looking for people who qualify has taken a long time before the houses were built. I don't remember the number of years.
Q4	The area was chosen by us and allocated sites. The private developer also liked the place that is near the road because the RDP houses were the pilot project. It would be easily accessible to government officials etc.
Q5	There are some people that are still waiting for the RDP houses and they are not happy, they are causing problems for people who are in RDP houses. For an example, they do not attend meetings concerning people in RDP houses. The two parties are fighting with electricity because they are illegally connecting to it causing the regular electricity cut.
Q6	The ward councilor and the committee involved us by explaining the requirements for the person who qualifies to be allocated the RDP house. They usually gave us the feedback in community meetings.
Q7	I don't remember the year.
Q8	I don't approve the way the RDP operates because it provides smaller houses and yet people are not allowed to build shacks in their yards.

	We were expecting big and better houses, with roof tiles and ceilings from the post - apartheid government development.
Q9	The post - apartheid government is humiliating us, my house is in a very low standard. I am not happy about the house. It has got cracks, the windows are not tightly fitted They knew that they were building houses for the poor and we cannot afford to renovate the houses. Our health is at stake.
Q10	The private developer has never involved the community in planning or the actual building of the houses, he was just reporting and we had no say. He also gave false information about the house that was to be built to the ward councilor, the committee and the community at large.
Q11	This RDP has brought a slight change to our community; it has taken us out of the shacks to the RDP houses although it has disappointed us by building houses that are in a very low standard. It is not right because it does not give people a chance to air their views about their development.
Q12	I live with my wife and six children.
Q13	The house is very small for my family, it is two bedrooms and we are not allowed to build shacks in our yards to extend the houses.
Q14	The house has got water, electricity and a toilet inside.
Q15	There is no security in those RDP houses because of the cheap material it has built with; the house is a danger itself. It has no burglars at all and it has cracks everywhere.
Q16	The houses are very poor in terms of quality. They are collapsing, the roofs are leaking with rust, and other roofs were blown away by the wind. These are the outcomes of the cheap material that was used to build the houses.
Q17	We have reported to the ward councilor, but nothing has been done.

	We wish the houses could be renovated into a better standard.
--	---

## Interviewee C

Question	Response
Q1	I have heard about the RDP houses from the ward councilor, the ward committees and the private developer who built RDP houses in our community.
Q2	These RDP houses were provided to people who were unemployed, so I qualified for one.
Q3	We have waited for a long time for the RDP houses to be built, because they looked for people who qualified to obtain a house. I am not sure about the number of years.
Q4	We have chosen the area and allocated sites long before the houses were built. The private developer liked the area where our shacks were built because it was near the road. He wanted the RDP houses to be seen easily by the government officials.
Q5	There are people who are still awaiting RDP houses from 1998. They are not happy about that. We wish they can be provided with basic facilities that include water, electricity and toilets because they are in desperate need.
Q6	We were involved in that, the ward councilor and the committee were reporting every step they take in a community meeting.
Q7	The houses were built and finished in 1998 by a private developer and his own workers.
Q8	We are not happy about the way the RDP operates. We were allocated houses that were meant for the poor but these houses are in a very low standard that they need to be renovated and that is a huge challenge for the community of Chris Hani Park Block 3.

	We wish the RDP could have built the proper and quality houses with all the basic necessities required.
Q9	I appreciate the list the RDP has done for the community of Chris Hani Park Block 3; I am no longer in a shack. I have my own house although it has got problems. We wish our houses could be renovated, especially the leaking rusty roof.
Q10	The ward committee was partially involved in the implementation stage of development, although they had no say. The private developer was reporting not asking to the ward committee. The committee was democratically elected by the community members. They have done their work excellently.
Q11	For the moment I don't see any change that is brought by RDP housing programme except they could provide houses to 105 shacks that are awaiting houses and renovate or rebuild our houses
Q12	I live with 3 kids.
Q13	The space is not enough for us because the house is two bedrooms.
Q14	It has water, electricity and a toilet inside.
Q15	The house is not secured because of the cheap material that is built with, and the standard has made it to be a danger to ourselves. It has no burglar doors and windows.
Q16	The RDP houses are made out of cheap material hence they are in a very low standard. The apartheid government houses are far better than the RDP houses in terms of quality. In RDP houses the roofs are not properly built, they rust, we had to put heavy stones on top of the roof to support it from the wind, the water penetrates through the wall in rainy days and the building blocks in toilets are collapsing inside the house.

Q17	We have reported these problems to the ward councilor since the houses were built, they were promising renovations but nothing has been done.
-----	---

## Interviewee D

Questions	Response
Q1	I heard about the RDP houses from the ward committee and the private developer who came to our shacks in Chris Hani Park Block 3 to address us about the RDP houses that were supposed to be built for people who qualify. He showed us the house plan for the RDP house he can built, and later built a show house as a reflection of how our houses were going to look like.
Q2	The RDP house was allocated to people who were unemployed and those who earn salaries, from hand to mouth. Therefore I qualified because I was unemployed.
Q3	We have waited a long time, almost four years.
Q4	We had chosen this area, and allocated sites. The private developer also liked this area because it is near the road, it would be easily accessed by the government officials and people from other areas.
Q5	The majority of people in Chris Hani Park Block 3 are awaiting houses since 1998 because out of 136 shacks, only 31 RDP houses were built. These people are unhappy because their shacks are leaking, collapsing and they need the basic facilities especially water and electricity. There are fights between the RDP and shack dwellers because of electricity. The shack dwellers are called 'Izinyoka' for illegally connecting to the pylons that supply electricity to the RDP houses and thereby causing regular electricity cut.
Q6	The ward councilor and the committee were involved, and would report back to the community meetings.
Q7	The houses were built and finished in 1998 by a private developer and his

	Coloured workers.
Q8	I don't like the way the programme runs. Our houses are totally different to the house we had an agreement with. They are in a very low standard than the show house. When we were given the happy letters we have asked for the inspector to assess the standard of the RDP houses but we were surprised that the private developer passed the house assessment. The RDP does not involve people in their development. We expected better quality houses.
Q9	I appreciate the list I have because I am not in a shack although I am not satisfied because it has many problems.
Q10	We were represented by the ward committee in the implementation, the actual building of the RDP houses. They have done their role correctly although they were blinded by excitement and desperation for houses and the private developer has noticed that and took advantage.
Q11	I cannot say the RDP has brought changes to the community of Chris Hani Park Block 3 because the houses are in a very low standard, they need renovations but nothing has been done. The majority of people were awaiting RDP houses since 1998. We are experiencing problems with electricity, regular electricity cut because of the illegal connections done by people who live in shacks.
Q12	I live with four children.
Q13	The house is not spacious for my family because it has two bedrooms.
Q14	The house has running water, electricity and the toilet inside.
Q15	The house is not secured because of the cheap material used. It does not have windows or doors burglar proof.  My neighbour was raped and the rapist entered through the roof.

Q16	In terms of quality our houses are far below in standard to the apartheid government houses that are across the road in our area. I wish these houses could be renovated or rebuilt where necessary because they are rudimentary buildings.
Q17	We have reported to the councilor since the houses were built, they were promising renovations but to date nothing have been done.

## Interviewee E

Questions	Response
Q1	I have heard about the RDP houses through the media that include radio, television, newspapers. I also heard from people awaiting RDP houses and from the ward committee who addressed and told us that our area has been chosen to be one of the pilot projects. RDP houses were to be built for those who qualified.
Q2	The houses were provided to people who were unemployed, therefore I qualified for one. That was done by the ward committee assisting the government officials and gave the feedback in community meetings.
Q3	We have waited for the houses for four years.
Q4	The private developer liked this area because it is near the road it will be easily accessed by the government officials and he wanted to market his work to other areas that were awaiting RDP houses.
Q5	Many people are waiting for the RDP houses because these 31 houses were built as a pilot project. There are 105 shacks that are awaiting houses.
Q6	We were involved in the decision leading to our receiving the RDP houses. We were called in meetings where we were told about the process and procedures that were to be followed. The feedbacks were given in community meetings.
Q7	The RDP houses were built and finished in 1998 by a private developer and his workers, the Coloureds from the Karoo region.
Q8	We were happy about the RDP programme that has provided us with houses but as the time passed we realized that our houses are of poor quality compared to

	the RDP houses that have been built recently. Those houses are far better than ours. We expect better houses of better quality from the RDP.
Q9	We are not granted options in this RDP housing programme; therefore I am happy that I have a house although I am unemployed. Our RDP houses many problems that include a leaking and rusting roof, on windy days the roof is threatening to blow away.
Q10	We regularly meet the private developer but we knew nothing about the RDP and our rights except for the excitement and desperation we had about the RDP houses that are provided by government. We were not involved in the decision making and the actual building of the house in this way, everything was a report, and we had no say. The committee was just monitoring the building material from theft and thus, they have done their work properly.
Q11	The RDP has brought a change in a way; we are no longer in shacks although the houses have problems.
Q12	I live with my wife and two kids.
Q13	The house has enough space for my family because it has two bedrooms.
Q14	The house has running water, electricity and a toilet inside.
Q15	I can say we are secured because we are in houses not in shacks. The house does not have burglars in windows and doors.
Q16	Only the building blocks were of quality but the house as a whole is not a quality. The apartheid government houses are better than the RDP houses that were built for the historically disadvantaged people of South Africa.
Q17	We have reported these housing problems to the ward councilor but nothing has been done.

## Interviewee F

Questions	Response
Q1	We have heard about the RDP houses from the ward committee and the private developer who came to Chris Hani Park Block 3 in connection with the RDP houses that were to be built for the poor.
Q2	The RDP houses were allocated to people who are unemployed and those who earn salaries from hand to mouth. I qualified for the RDP house because I was unemployed
Q3	We have waited for four years.
Q4	We have chosen this area on our own, allocated sites and built our shacks. The private developer liked the place because it is near the road.
Q5	There are many people who are awaiting houses in so much that we are not in good terms. They have waited for fourteen years.
Q6	The councilor and the ward committee were involved in the decisions leading to our receiving the houses. They gave us the feedback in community meetings.
Q7	The RDP houses were built and finished in 1998 by a private developer and his Coloured workers from the Karoo.
Q8	I don't like the way the RDP works because it has built houses that are in a low standard, something that is far different to the show house. We don't see any change that has been brought by this RDP programme because immediately after the houses were built they were blown away by the wind. We are expecting government to do something about our RDP houses. These houses need to be rebuilt because everything is wrong with them including the walls, windows, doors and roofs.

Q9	Those houses are in a very low standard, so I don't see any difference between myself and people who live in shacks except for the building blocks that the shack I live in is built with.
Q10	The ward councilor and the committee were partially involved in the process of implementation of development, but the houses have many problems including, others are bigger, the quality of houses is very low, one of these RDP houses is built on top of the water pipe. Therefore we also blame the ward committee because they were involve in the building process at the beginning of the project
Q11	The RDP has not brought changes in this community because the problems we encounter in our houses are not different to those of a person who lives in a shack. The difference is that we are in shacks that are built with building blocks. There are no proper roads, everything is not right.
Q12	I live with four children in my house.
Q13	The house is not big enough for my family. The rooms are smaller.
Q14	It has running water, electricity and the toilet inside.
Q15	The house is not secured because there are no burglar proofs at all in doors and windows, the door and its frame are made with a cheap material, the house itself is dangerous to my family because lose building blocks in the toilet are collapsing inside the house.
Q16	Those RDP houses are not a quality even when they are compared with the apartheid government houses. They are in a very low standard.
Q17	We have reported the RDP houses problems to the councilor and the committee. There is no response; lately it is difficult to find him in his office.

## Interviewee G

Questions	Response
Q1	Our committee heard that other areas are provided with RDP houses, so we had meetings after meetings until we were approached by the private developer, who promised to build a better RDP house. The sample of our RDP house was built.
Q2	To qualify for the house, people that were unemployed and those who earn salaries from hand to mouth were considered. I qualified for the house because I was unemployed. That process was done by the government officials assisted by the councilor and ward committee.
Q3	The process has taken quite some time before the houses were built. I do not remember the years.
Q4	The houses were built in this area because we had surveyed sites with shack, and the private developer liked the area because it is near the road, it will be easily accessed by government officials and people from different areas.
Q5	The majority of people are waiting for the RDP houses because out of 136 shacks only 31 RDP houses were built. These people are not happy because they have waited since 1998. They desperately need basic facilities especially electricity.
Q6	We were involved in the decisions that were leading to our receiving RDP houses. The committee was working with the government officials on the issue of our receiving RDP houses and gave the feedback in community meetings.
Q7	The houses were built and finished in 1998.
Q8	The RDP has failed because the houses that are provided are in a very low standard. The private developer built houses that were totally different to the

	<p>show house that was reflecting the way our houses will look. No one from the Department of housing has come to intervene although we had reported the problems. We were expecting the better houses from the RDP programme as we were promised by the ANC government.</p>
Q9	<p>In 1998 I was very happy that were provided with RDP houses but when time goes on I discovered a lot of problems, hence I am not happy about this RDP house.</p>
Q10	<p>The committee who was elected by the community to represent us in the development process of our RDP houses has done their work, we complement them. The private developer has blinded us by promising something that he knew very well that it will never happen, the show house that was in a higher standard because after that he has brought his own workers.</p>
Q11	<p>I can say the RDP has brought a change in a way because we are no longer living in shacks. We have our own houses although they have many problems.</p>
Q12	<p>I live with one child.</p>
Q13	<p>The house is not big enough that it is difficult to accommodate visitors because it has got two bedrooms.</p>
Q14	<p>The house has got running water, electricity and a toilet inside.</p>
Q15	<p>In terms of security I can say the house is not secured because of the cheapest building material that include windows, corrugated iron and doors and frames as well as the burglar proofs that are not installed on windows and doors.</p>
Q16	<p>In terms of the quality, these RDP houses are in a very low standard when they are compared to the houses that were provided by the apartheid government. They have similar problems meaning that they were built on cheap material. They were blown away as soon as they were finished in 1998.</p>

	Some of them have collapsed, the owners have moved back to the shacks because they do not have money to renovate them.
Q17	We have reported these problems to our ward councilor, and there are many people who came and ask about these problems but nothing has been done.

## Interviewee H

Questions	Responses
Q1	We have heard about the RDP houses from the ward committee and the private developer .He promised to build a better RDP house with a roof tile, plastered in and outside walls, and big windows. We had an agreement that, if we want roof tiles the rooms will not be divided.
Q2	In order to qualify for the RDP house, one has to be unemployed. My mother qualified for a house because she was unemployed. The 31 RDP houses were built to the sites that were near the road. Therefore if you did not qualify for the RDP house you have to move to the back sites. The committee was the one who were looking for people who qualifies and allocated them to the sites that are to be built.
Q3	We have waited for a long time I do not remember the number of years.
Q4	The area was chosen because we had surveyed sites there. And the private developer liked the place.
Q5	There are many people who are awaiting RDP houses. They are unhappy because their shacks are leaking and it has been fourteen years waiting for their houses.
Q6	We were involved in the decisions leading to our receiving the RDP houses because our committee was working on that and report back in community meetings.
Q7	I am not sure about the year
Q8	I don't like the way the RDP works because the RDP houses it had provided to us had many problems, everything is collapsing.

	We were expecting better houses in good standard.
Q9	I am not happy about the RDP house allocated to me because of the standard.
Q10	The ward committee was involved in the building process by looking after the building material, collecting building blocks for the bricklayers.
Q11	I can say the RDP has brought a slight change in our community although the houses have plenty of the problems.
Q12	After my mother passed away, I am left with my younger sister.
Q13	The space in the house is enough for both of us because it is the two bedrooms.
Q14	The RDP house has running water, electricity and the toilet inside.
Q15	Our houses are not safe because windows, doors and frames can be broken easily. Above all, there are no burglar proofs on windows and doors.
Q16	Our RDP houses are in a low standard when they are compared with the houses that were built by the apartheid government. The majority of the houses have heavy stones on top to support the roof.
Q17	We have reported the problems about these houses to the ward councilor and committee, nothing has been done so far.

## Interviewee I

Questions	Responses
Q1	I heard about the RDP from the ward committee that we will be provided with RDP houses. Thereafter we were called in a meeting by the ward committee with the ward councilor and the private developer with issues related to the provision of RDP houses.
Q2	The focus was to the unemployed people. My mother qualified for the RDP house because she was unemployed. The selection process was done by the ward committee and the community.
Q3	We have waited for a long time before the houses were built.
Q4	I don't know why the private developer has chosen this area but we like it.
Q5	There are many people who are waiting for the RDP houses because the private developer has built 30 RDP houses for those who qualify.
Q6	We were involved in the decision leading to our receiving houses by our ward committee and provided with feedback in community meetings.
Q7	The RDP houses were built and finished in 1998, built by a private developer and his workers who were the Coloureds from the Karoo region.
Q8	I don't like the way the RDP operates. We were provided with 31 RDP houses out of 136 shacks. The majority of people are still suffering awaiting houses since 1998. Even those that are built have lots of problems, and are collapsing. Nothing has been done about those problems. We have no roads since 1998. We were expecting better houses in the post - apartheid era. The houses that are in higher standard than those that were built by the apartheid government.
Q9	I am not happy about my RDP house.

	These houses were provided to the poor people but they are making us even poorer because we have to renovate them ourselves although we are unemployed.
Q10	The ward committee was involved in the actual building of the RDP houses by observing the building process, collecting building blocks for the bricklayers, and was looking after the building material after hours although they were not paid.
Q11	I cannot say the RDP has brought change to the community of Chris Hani Park Block3 because the houses it has built are in a very low standard. I can say it has brought problems to the community, the division and fight over the basic facilities between people who live in RDP houses and those who live in shacks.
Q12	After my mother died I am left alone in this house.
Q13	The house is big enough for me because I live alone.
Q14	The house has running water, electricity and the toilet inside.
Q15	The RDP house is not secured because the doors and frame are not rigid. There are no burglar proofs at all in windows and doors.
Q16	Our houses are in a very low standard if they are compared to the houses that were built by the apartheid government.
Q17	We have reported the problems about these houses to the ward councilor but nothing has been done.

## Interviewee J

Questions	Responses
Q1	I heard about the RDP from the ward councilor and the committee that our area is chosen as the pilot project, we will be provided with RDP houses. The private developer came thereafter to tell us about the RDP houses that were to be built. The show house that was an image of our RDP houses was built.
Q2	To qualify, people who were not working and those who earn less salary, from hand to mouth were considered. I was unemployed hence I qualified for the RDP house. The process and procedures were done by the ward committee and some government officials.
Q3	It has taken a long time before the houses were built, unfortunately I do not remember the number of years.
Q4	The private developer has chosen this area because it was near the road and that would make things easier for him to market his work to people from other areas, the place would be easily accessible to the government officials.
Q5	There are many people who are waiting for RDP houses. they do not feel well because when our houses were built they were assisting by collecting the building material for the builders without payment.
Q6	We have never been involved in planning and decision making about the structure of the house. We have just seen the finished RDP houses not looking the same as the show house we had an agreement with.
Q7	I have forgotten the year they were finished.
Q8	In our area the RDP has not done well as per agreement we had with the private develop, and the way it works to other areas.

	<p>Our RDP houses are not divided into rooms inside. They are easily blown away by wind, others are collapsing. The majority of the houses have heavy stones on top to support the roof. We were expecting houses in good standard, built on quality material just like other places.</p>
Q9	<p>I am not happy about the RDP house that is allocated to me because it was blown away by the wind immediately after it was finished. It was never been renovated or rebuilt. Therefore the post – apartheid government has provided me with a house that I will never occupy because I don't afford to renovate or rebuild the RDP house.</p>

**Appendix 4: Pictures**



**Picture 1. (*The RDP show house*)**

**Picture 2. (*The RDP house*)**



**Picture 3. (*The house that was built by the apartheid government*)**

**Picture 4. (*The RDP house that was built by post 1994 government*)**



**Picture 5. (The RDP house with a roof that is blown away by wind)**



**Picture 6. (The roofs are not rigid that they are supported by heavy stones and old tyres)**



**Picture 7. (The wall is easily penetrated by water)**



**Picture 8. (The house is not properly built that the bricks in the toilet easily collapse)**