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ABSTRACT
The Reconstruction Development Programme (RDP) housing program was instituted to provide South Africans with quality housing that meet their basic needs. For people, fortunate enough to receive RDP houses, numerous complaints were raised. With government’s focus on quantitative housing delivery, there have been qualitative shortcomings and the perceptions are that the constructed houses are of very low quality and do not meet the needs of the occupants. Consequently, the quality of housing constitutes the physical condition of housing as well the perceptions of occupants. However, since perceptions of housing quality are context specific and differs from one person to the other and across cities/countries, what therefore constitutes as housing quality is highly subjective. Also, despite the increased discussion on the quality of housing and people’s perception of it, most empirical research on housing has been undertaken in the larger metro areas while there is not much focus on housing in small towns. The purpose of this the study was to explore the perceptions of RDP beneficiaries on the housing quality in the small community of Nollothville, Northern Cape. Since housing is important as it satisfies many different human needs, a case study approach was adopted and Abraham Maslow’s hierarchy of needs was used as a theoretical framework to guide this study.

Research conducted in Nollothville reveals that the RDP houses especially the first phase of the RDP houses are of sub-standard quality. Both primary and secondary resources were used to obtain data. The study used a semi-structured interview guide as a data collection tool while the questionnaire was used to solicit the magnitude of RDP beneficiaries’ perceptions of the RDP houses and, lastly, observations were conducted to validate these findings. Findings revealed that although the RDP houses were well received by the recipients, many complained about the sub-standard quality of these houses and that the houses do meet the criteria for quality housing. The following perceptions raised by most of the study participants regarding the quality of the houses included unstable foundation, poor quality roofing; poor quality doors or no doors inside the house; cracking floors; no bath or shower, weak and poor-quality toilets. Also, since many of the houses were in such bad conditions there was a struggle to cope with the financial upkeep of the houses. Based on previous research conducted in other provinces, the study concludes the RDP houses are the of the same sub-standard quality as the houses found in the other provinces.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

1.1. Introduction
The provision of public housing is firmly placed on the global and national agenda; it is an issue that has taken an importance in the contemporary context of rapid urbanization. While the provision of public housing, or lack thereof, has been widely researched, the quality of public housing has not received as much attention. This research study seeks to contribute to our understanding of the quality of housing provision by analysing beneficiary perceptions of the quality of public housing in the small town of Port Nolloth in the Northern Cape province of South Africa.

1.1.1. Background and contextualisation
Housing is important as it satisfies different human needs. The issue of adequate housing is a highly discussed and contentious topic as it is generally considered that housing should be of a good quality because it provides more than simply a shelter or a physical structure which protects people (Landman, 2005). Discussions on the quality of housing often highlights terms such as ‘suitable,’ ‘adequate,’ ‘standard’ or ‘good’ housing (UN 1977; Baqutayan, et al, 2015). Since the right to adequate housing is enshrined in the Constitution of South Africa and many international Human Right laws, it is discouraging to know that close to 2 billion people around the world still do not live in good quality houses (UN Habitat, 2012).

The issue of housing in contemporary South African society is rooted in the years of apartheid. While the post-1994 housing programmes have been significant in many ways, post-apartheid struggles for housing continues unabated (Thomas, 2010). To restore the imbalances caused by apartheid policies, the post-apartheid African National Congress-led government introduced the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) with the focus of the housing programme aimed at addressing the house provisioning challenges (Republic of South Africa, 1994). The RDP was developed around five key programme areas, which included satisfying basic needs; development of human resources; democratization of the state and society; and the expansion of the economy and implementation of the RDP (Republic of South Africa, 1994).

While in theory RDP houses could be built for the vast majority, the reality is that it is virtually impossible to provide all with houses. Mafukidze and Hoosen (2009) acknowledged that there
were gaps in the RDP housing implementation. This became evident as over-crowding was no longer an option and the number of people living in informal settlements increased. Also, housing became too expensive to build and the waiting list has become too long for government to meet the housing demand (Nathan, 2013). For people, fortunate to receive RDP houses, numerous complaints were raised as well. With government’s focus on quantitative housing delivery, there have been qualitative shortcomings and the perceptions are that the constructed houses are of very low quality and do not meet the needs of the residents (Oldfield, 2000).

Furthermore, it is suggested that South African’s government may have also implicitly acknowledged the gaps in the RDP housing implementation and therefore adopted the Breaking New Ground (BNG) in 2004 to improve the efficiency of the RDP programme as a whole (Department of Housing, 2004). Even so, the RDP programme, developed in 1994, is still undergoing implementation or completion and the developments of low-income houses for the poor continue to be a political and an urban reconstruction priority for the post-apartheid government (Oldfield, 2000).

Since the provision of adequate housing, good quality housing remains a major challenge to the population, the study seeks to understand the perceptions of RDP housing beneficiaries regarding the quality of these houses using the neighbourhood of Nollothville in the small town of Port Nolloth in the Northern Cape Province as a case study. By using a mixed-methodological approach (i.e. both quantitative and qualitative methods), the objective of the study will be achieved by conducting one-on-one interviews with the RDP beneficiaries in Nollothville and government officials, administering questionnaires as well as doing physical observations of the RDP houses.

1.1.2. The case study area: Nollothville

Nollothville is a small community in Port Nollothville. Port Nolloth is the largest town in the Municipality. Moreover, it is also renowned for being a typical apartheid frontier town and, like most towns in South Africa, it is spatially divided. Because of the Groups Area Act imposed in Port Nolloth in 1967, the coloured population had to move from the main town to a neighbourhood that is now known as Nollothville (Carstens, 2011). Nollothville lies south of Port Nolloth and is known as the coloured settlement (see Figure 1). It consists of a population of approximately 3443, consisting of 921 households (Frith, 2011). Like other rural municipalities, Richtersveld
Municipality also experiences common challenges such as skewed patterns of wealth distribution, relatively high levels of unemployment and crime. Housing has also become a big issue as many people in the surrounding areas move to Port Nolloth in search of work opportunities, especially those that cannot afford to move to the cities. With the influx of people, the housing backlog has increased and issues regarding the poor quality of RDP built in Nollothville has been brought into question multiple times. The research therefore looks at how beneficiaries perceive the RDP houses and whether these houses meet their needs.

**Figure 1: Map of the Northern Cape**

![Map of the Northern Cape](http://www.rainbownation.com/travel/maps/index.asp?loc=17)

1.2. **Significance and rational of the study**

Research conducted on the perceptions of RDP beneficiaries on the quality of their houses found that there is a general agreement that the RDP houses were poorly constructed and there is much dissatisfaction about it (Aigbavboa and Thwala, 2013; Mafukidze and Hoosen, 2009; Bradlow et al, 2011). Since much of the focus of research is usually on housing in large metro areas, this study...
intends to fill the gap in literature by studying the small town of Port Nolloth, with a specific focus on the neighbourhood of Nollothville. Global research has indicated that small towns are economically important for rural development, since they provide social services, employment and other commercial opportunities for people in the rural areas (Kienast-Duyar, 2010). However, with rapid migration from rural areas, small towns in South Africa have continued to grow as people look for economic opportunities. Due to the influx of people from neighbouring rural areas, small towns have struggled to meet the growing demand for housing as there has been constraints in housing delivery. These constraints include the long waiting lists for RDP housing, whilst the provision of infrastructure also remains a major concern as well as corruption. This is not only influenced by the vast poverty of the households but also by the lack of administrative capacity of local municipalities (Zweig, 2015).

As Port Nolloth is the main town of the Richtersveld Municipality, it is no exception to these challenges. Considered as a sleepy commercial hub today, it continues to attract an influx of people not only from the neighbouring areas but also from other provinces as the town is still rich in marine mineral wealth. As the population continues to grow, so does the unemployment rates and the demand for housing. For those that have received houses, various issues were raised regarding the quality of the houses. This study was therefore motivated by numerous concerns which have been raised across the country about the poor quality of RDP houses, as well as the inadequate provision of infrastructure and amenities in the RDP houses. Also, since little is known or understood about housing in small towns, this study will assess beneficiary perceptions of RDP houses in Nollothville.

1.3. Research problem, questions, aims and objectives
1.3.1. Research problem
With government’s focus on meeting the quantitative housing delivery targets, there have been qualitative shortcomings in the design of the house. The quality of RDP houses has been called into question and much criticism has been aimed at the size of the RDP house and its poor design. Due to this, the study was motivated by the numerous concerns which have been raised about the quality of the RDP house as many have complained that they are sub-standard to the houses built during the apartheid period. Furthermore, since research of housing has mostly been conducted in
the large metro areas, little is known or understood about housing in small towns. This therefore promoted the need to assess how the quality of the RDP houses is perceived in Nollothville.

1.3.2. Research questions
“The purpose of formulating research questions is to focus on the research problem by breaking it down into questions” (Mouton, 2001:53). While research questions specify exactly what the researcher wants to investigate, this research will focus on answering the following questions:

- How are the RDP houses perceived by the community in Nollothville?
- Do the RDP houses meet the needs of community members?
- How has owning a RDP house influenced the lives of people?

1.3.3. Research aims and objectives
The focus of the research will be achieved by the following objectives:

- To understand how RDP beneficiaries perceive their houses.
- To describe the people’s experience before and after receiving a RDP house.
- To establish whether these RDP houses meet the needs of the community.

1.4. Thesis outline
This dissertation will be presented in the following chapters:

Chapter 1: Will introduces the background and significance of the study. Furthermore, it will also include the research problem, questions, aims and objectives of the study.

Chapter 2: Will focus on a review of the available literature relevant to the study. The literature discussion will cover the following sections: global overview of housing, housing in South Africa, housing in small towns, RDP housing programme, shortcomings of the RDP houses and housing challenges in post-apartheid.

Chapter 3: The chapter will present the theoretical framework of the study. This provides a comprehensive causal explanation of the research problem being investigated.
Chapter 4: Presents a detailed description of the case study area, Nollothville. It will also provide a background of the area as well as the socio-economic and demographic overview of the area.

Chapter 5: Provides the research design and methodology used to gather the data. Furthermore, within this chapter the analysis and the interpretation of the data will also be discussed.

Chapter 6: Presents the key findings, limitations, conclusion of the study.

Chapter 7: Will provide recommendations for future consideration to the RDP housing project.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

Whilst the right to housing is enshrined in the South African Constitution, majority of the people do not have access to it. In the past decade, it has been estimated that at least 2 billion people around the world still live in sub-standard houses which do not meet the requirements for basic, decent housing (National Housing Code, 2009). However, an explanation that could be given to this predicament is the growing number of people migrating, especially from rural to urban areas, which in part strains an already strained housing system. Rural-urban migration is increasing rapidly, with projections showing that by 2030 at least 3 billion people (approximately 40% of the world’s population) will need adequate housing and by 2050, this figure is expected to increase to about 66% (UN, 2014).

Similarly, to these countries, South Africa is also experiencing a growth in urban migration which has significantly resulted in the increase of house shortages especially for the poor majority of the population (Black and Coloured). Also, adding to the complex challenges caused by apartheid segregation include the locations of the townships which are far from economic opportunities and social facilities. In South Africa, housing problems persists even in the post-apartheid era. Thus, even though the government has tried to address the issue, housing backlogs and poor-quality houses are still major concerns. Research has indicated that over the years, the provision of quality housing has not been achieved (Mabogunje, 2002; UN–Habitat, 2006; Jiboye, 2010). One of the ways in which South Africa has tried solving the challenges of housing is to build RDP houses, which are also viewed as housing for the poor, but with less quality. However, studies have indicated that most beneficiaries residing in these houses are dissatisfied with the conditions of their houses (Aigbavboa 2010; Charlton 2009; Ogunfiditimi 2007). Housing issues have become a formidable problem as concerns regarding the quality thereof is increasing. Considering the afore-mentioned and since housing conditions has shown to influence an individual’s well-being, there is a need to assess RDP beneficiaries’ perceptions towards their houses, specifically to understand whether their basic housing needs are met. Based on the aims of the study discussed in chapter 1, this chapter reviews the literature on housing quality, factors affecting beneficiaries’
perception on housing quality, housing quality in developing and developed countries, and, lastly, the RDP housing programme implemented by the post-apartheid South African government.

2.2. Conceptualising housing quality

What really constitutes ‘quality housing’ is open to debate as this depends on the context and on the people defining it. In defining the concept, scholars as well as agencies such as the United Nations have used terms such as ‘suitable,’ ‘adequate,’ ‘standard’ or ‘good’ housing (UN, 1977; Charlton, 2009; Mkuzo, 2011). However, the usage and application of such terms is quite controversial as the meaning varies from one context to another and the criteria for what constitutes ‘quality housing’ tends to be very subjective and ethnocentric (Sengupta and Tipple, 2007). As Aliu and Adebayo (2010) contend, the term ‘housing quality’ as it is complex with many socio-cultural and economic meanings attached to it.

However, despite such contestations, the basic understanding is that good housing should at least include adequate size rooms, good materials used to construct the house, and the provision of services such as running water, electricity, and flushing toilets (Aigbavboa and Thwala, 2013). In this regard, the UN Habitat (2009) states that adequate housing is more than just having the four walls which make up a house and emphasised that adequate housing is a place which provides adequate space and privacy. Ideally, this adequacy also had to take people’s perceptions into consideration as to what constitutes an adequate house. As a result, it was argued that when defining housing quality, several factors such as the size, location, neighbourhood, and household composition need to be considered in the determination of the house (Barnes et al, 2013). In line with this, the American Public Housing Association argues that:

*For a shelter to be rated ‘adequate’ or ‘quality’ housing, it must be ‘habitable’, ‘affordable’ and performs a four-fold function of meeting occupants’ physiological and psychological needs as well as protecting them against infections and accidents.*

(Aigbavboa and Thwala, 2013:19; see also Olotuah, 2006; UN- Habitat, 2006).

But the question we may need to pose here is whether such a house does exist in the developing countries?
The idea of housing quality is quite subjective. The term ‘quality’ on the other hand varies on how well a product meets the needs of an occupant in the case of housing (Harris & McCaffer, 2001). This is so because people experience the environment differently and this is informed by their past and present lives (Clacherty, 2011). Good quality housing is essential and basic to planning which should be provided at an affordable price. “Residents perception of the quality of housing has been viewed as a reflection of the extent to which housing attributes; services and surrounding environment are adequate or inadequate in meeting occupants’ needs” (Ibem, 2012:1001). Ideally, it should not only fulfil the basic human physical need for shelter but provide adequate space, privacy basic infrastructure (i.e. water supply, sanitation & waste management), security of tenure, accessibility to work and other services. However, irrespective of the fact that everyone understands what is meant by ‘quality’ as it implies excellence and high standards, people perceive quality differently as it is drawn from their own understanding (Muoghalu, 1991). Consequently, with little attention paid on housing quality by past and current housing programmes, the fulfilment of housing quality has become a complex process. This, therefore suggests that housing quality is a dynamic and multi-dimensional concept that is influenced by engineering, as well as social and political issues (Coley et al, 2012). Given this, the general inference that can be made from the above is that perceptions of housing quality are context specific and differs from one person to the other.

2.3. Overview of housing quality in developed and developing countries

Since 1950, the world’s urban population has rapidly increased from 746 million to 3.9 billion in 2014 (UN-Habitat, 2014), with most of the growth taking place in developing countries. In this regard, the most urbanised regions include Northern America with 82% living in urbanised areas, Latin America and the Caribbean with 80%, and Europe with 73% (UN-Habitat, 2014). This is followed by Africa and Asia which are mostly rural but have between 40%-48% people residing in urban areas. Given the above and the increase of the population, it is perhaps unsurprising that cities are facing challenges such as poverty, pollution, crumbling public transportation infrastructure and shortage of houses. However, the lack of the availability of houses remain a continuous problem as currently 881 million people in developing countries live in the slum areas.
of the cities in contrast to 791 million in 2000. By 2025, it is estimated that at least 1.6 billion people will need adequate, affordable housing (UN-Habitat, 2016).

In relation to the above, the provision of affordable quality housing in a safe environment constitutes an important need and right for everyone. As Barnes et al (2013) note, the issue of providing quality housing has become an important aspect within developed countries such as the USA and Europe. Even though there have been on-going efforts in the USA and Europe to improve housing conditions, there are still challenges such as lack of access to houses and its poor standard. In such scenarios, poor people bear the brunt as they continue to live in dilapidated conditions, structural inadequacy as well as overcrowded places (PAN, 1997). Recent statistics reveal that the European Union (EU) and European Free Trade Association (EFTA) countries suffer from overcrowding (Housing Statistics, 2015). In 2014, it was estimated that 17.1% of EU countries’ population resided in overcrowded houses while 5.1% of the population suffered from severe housing deficiencies. Housing deficiencies reported included leaking roofs, no bath or flushing toilet, damp walls/floors/foundation, or rot in window frames and floors as well as inadequate social facilities (Lelkes and Zólyomi, 2010).

Whilst developed countries suffer from inadequate housing, developing countries are the hardest hit with the expansion of urbanisations happening on an unimaginable scale. Today, cities are home to 54% of the world’s population, which will likely rise to 66% by the middle of this century (UN-Habitat, 2016). Furthermore, it was estimated that 600 million urban residents and one billion rural dwellers within 40 developing countries live in areas which are overcrowded and serviced with poor water quality, lack of sanitation and service delivery (UN-Habitat 2012). Furthermore, people in developing countries live in inadequate forms of shelter (e.g. old buses, shipping containers, cardboard boxes, under staircases and aluminium which has resulted in problems such as depression and other communicable diseases such as tuberculosis) (Groves, 2004). According to Ibimilua (2011:169), the housing problem has emerged because of rapid urbanisation, mismanagement of funds, and politicisation of housing programmes as well as poor implementation. This has caused a major concern as most developing countries have “inadequately developed housing institutions and markets, poor housing workmanship, increasing backlog and insufficient policy responses” (Groves, 2004:26).
Similarly, in Latin America the right to adequate housing is recognised in the constitutions of countries such as Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, and Haiti. The right to housing is considered a state obligation in countries such as Bolivia, Colombia, Paraguay and Costa Rica again (Rapelang, 2013). However, despite these constitutional requirements, Latin America face challenges of house shortages, overcrowding, inadequate services as well as sprawling in informal settlements. Although Asia has more people living in informal areas (42% of the urban population in South Asia, 37% in East Asia, and 24% West Asia) in comparison to North America, Latin America and the Caribbean, it has a lower level compared to 62% of the population in Sub-Saharan Africa (Doling, Vandenberg and Tolentino, 2013). Furthermore, while poor quality housing remains an issue in Asia and elsewhere, the occurrence of slums which is characterised by non-durable construction materials, insecure tenure, overcrowding, and the lack of safe water and sanitation coupled with homelessness remains high (Rapelang, 2013). In countries such as Latin America and the Caribbean, it is estimated that between 42 million and 52 million houses are needed while estimates concerning total housing needs in Africa are set at around 4 million units per year with over 60% of the demand required to accommodate urban residents (UN-Habitat, 2014)

Evidently, regardless of international and national regional instruments recognising the right to adequate housing, billions of people worldwide are either homeless or reside in inadequate houses. With the major influx of people into the cities and towns, rapid urbanisation is placing tremendous strain on housing. It is estimated that by 2030, approximately 3 billion people (about 40% of the world’s population) will need adequate housing by 2050, this figure is expected to increase to about 66% (UN, 2014). Consequently, this causes concern for current housing issues as government is providing houses of poor quality with sub-standard or no infrastructure, which are far from economic facilities. Furthermore, the issue of slow housing delivery and poor administration also prevents the government from realizing the constitutional right to adequate housing.

2.4. Housing in South Africa

South Africa is an anomaly among developing countries (i.e. both a developed country with good infrastructure but it also has major social and economic issues). The legacies of apartheid include housing shortages which are exacerbated by unemployment and persistent chronic poverty
(NDOH, 2004). During the apartheid era, legislation such as 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 were specifically implemented to racially discriminate, oppress and segregate Black South Africans, thus making it difficult for them to enter towns and cities and settle with their families (Lalloo, 1998). In such situations, Black people resettled in squatter camps or shacks which were many times destroyed by bulldozers as these housing structures were regarded as informal settlements and illegal (Thompson, 2000). Furthermore, between 1950 and 1970, the apartheid government embarked on a large-scale public-sector housing programme to control areas of Black settlements. This resulted in less money being invested on housing finance for Black people since it was rolled over to institutions within the homelands. There were limited opportunities for Black people, especially in the cities as the expansion of most townships were banned. Moreover, in the 1970s, more than three million black people were forcibly removed under apartheid policies (Todes et al, 2010).

In the late 1980s, the influx control law was lifted and, in some way, this aggravated the housing problems as the formerly banned Black people had the choice to move from rural areas to settle in cities. This contributed to the development of informal settlements with an increase of shanties and shacks (Steyn, 2010). In 1994, the new democratic government under the African National Congress (ANC) government embarked on the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) and set a target of providing at least one million low-cost houses to low-income families between 1994 and 1999 (Oldfield, 2000). Even though over 2 million houses were built since 1994, South Africa still faces a serious shortage of housing coupled with phenomenal growth of shanties and backyard dwellings on either formal or informal structures. This comes because of rapid rural to urban migration as government has not nearly been quite aggressive to keep up with the housing demands of the people and they have also vested in quantity rather than quality (i.e. houses are inadequate and of poor quality). While the bond between poor housing and environmental conditions reflect poverty, poverty in informal settlements can be regarded as a lack of income or even unemployment. Primarily it can also be characterized by the decline in health and nutritional rates, increase of the population density as well as the stress upon physical and social environments of the poor (Baumann et al., 2004). Additionally, the developments of low-
income houses for the poor continues to be a political and an urban reconstruction priority for government (Oldfield, 2000).

Ideally, since housing is an important component of human settlement, it should play an essential role in all dimensions (i.e. social, economic and environmental) yet there are still many people who do not have access to proper housing. While much concern has been on the quality of housing, other aspects have also been highlighted such as the location and value of subsidised housing. Even though, in theory, these houses can be built, in reality it may be virtually impossible to provide houses to all the people on the waiting list and it is quite expensive (Nathan, 2013). Thus, instead of redressing oppressive and racial apartheid housing spatial patterns, new township growth has perpetuated it (Charlton, 2009). Also, despite the strain on the cities and major towns, smaller towns are now also experiencing the pressure of rapid migration as there are many unable to move directly to the cities and instead move to the nearest town (Todes et al, 2008). As a result, local municipalities are unable to meet the housing demand and discrepancies in perceptions about housing quality was found between provinces. This is also according to a survey conducted in 2010, that complains came mostly from the people residing in the Western Cape, Eastern Cape and the Northern Cape whereas the people in Gauteng and Mpumalanga seemed happy with the quality of their house (News24, 2011).

2.5. Housing in small towns

The concept of small towns is relative since it is determined and defined by several factors. Nel et al. (2011), for example, define a small town as consisting of a population of less than 50 000 people. Small towns provide social services and employment, serve as important urban-rural linkages, and can actively contribute to regional economies (Clacherty, 2011). While some small towns grow, others experience a decline in terms of economic viability. This has been partly due to urbanisation as many young people have moved to the cities in search of better opportunities (Clacherty, 2011). In South Africa, small towns are affected by poor health facilities, weak land and housing markets, poor municipal management and spatial fragmentation based on racial divide (Wessels, 2012:2). For example, while ‘Whites’ reside in the central business districts with efficient services, Blacks, Coloureds and Indians reside in often dilapidated areas. This is also
evident in the extensions of townhouses as well as RDP housing which is mostly occupied by Blacks and Coloureds (Kienast-Duyar, 2010).

While small towns offer basic services, in a rural context, they also attract migrants (i.e. displaced farm workers or unemployed youth) from rural areas who find it difficult to move directly to large cities. Many of the youth migrate to seek employment; hence their motivations also include social networking benefits to secure occupancy (Zweig, 2015). Even though towns have a smaller population in comparison to big cities, they currently face challenges of job losses and they have an unemployment rate of over 60% (Kienast-Duyar, 2010). In addition, the influx of people into small towns creates more demand for housing, services, and job opportunities. While it is the responsibility of the national Department of Housing (DOH) to provide low-income housing, most of the people do not have access to housing subsidies, and there is a lack of institutional and private sector capacity to undertake housing projects in small towns (Wessels, 2012). The challenge has been because of fewer developers, costly materials, and smaller projects within small towns. This has led to a reduced quantity and quality of housing projects. The poor-quality houses are of cheap and poor-quality materials and, as a result, the houses have been vulnerable to extreme weather conditions. Other complaints include: the size of the house which only consist of one or two rooms, thin walls made of line bricks, and insecure roofs that vibrate on windy days (Richards and Bianca, 2007). Such houses are also common in the Northern Cape province.

2.6. Housing delivery and current backlog

Between 1994 and 2004, the government made a tremendous effort to provide houses for the poor as is evident in the R27.6 billion (U$1.9 billion) that was invested in providing housing. Charlton (2009) notes that the South African housing policy is widely praised as providing many houses in a shorter period in comparison to other countries. Between 1994 and 2004, 1.6 million houses were delivered, which rose to approximately 2.2 million houses delivered in 2009, and 2.9 million in 2010 (IRR, 2015). However, regardless of this achievement and the government’s efforts, it has still failed to cut the long housing waiting list, and South Africa’s housing backlog increased from 1.5 million to 2.1 million units, which means that approximately 12 million South Africans are still in need of better housing (IRR, 2015:1).
Table 1 below indicates the housing delivery numbers from 1994 to 2008 (houses completed or in the process of completion) at the national and provincial levels. Only 248 850 houses were completed or are in the process of completion during the 2008/9 financial year indicating that during the period from 1994 to March 2004, there were only 2.6 million houses completed or under construction. Thus, while there was an increase in housing delivery between 2001/02 and 2007/08 in Gauteng, Mpumalanga and Northern Cape, in other provinces it declined between 2006/07.

Table 1: Housing units completed and in the process of completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>1994/95-2002/03</th>
<th>2003/04</th>
<th>2004/05</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
<td>187 237</td>
<td>21 119</td>
<td>37 524</td>
<td>19 825</td>
<td>16 526</td>
<td>12 684</td>
<td>300 915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free State</td>
<td>87 859</td>
<td>16 746</td>
<td>16 447</td>
<td>20 536</td>
<td>19 662</td>
<td>12 482</td>
<td>173 732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>340 331</td>
<td>49 034</td>
<td>66 738</td>
<td>59 310</td>
<td>77 044</td>
<td>90 886</td>
<td>683 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwa-Zulu Natal</td>
<td>245 534</td>
<td>33 668</td>
<td>36 734</td>
<td>35 872</td>
<td>38 290</td>
<td>34 471</td>
<td>424 569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo</td>
<td>114 767</td>
<td>15 810</td>
<td>16 514</td>
<td>46 813</td>
<td>23 609</td>
<td>18 970</td>
<td>236 483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpumalanga</td>
<td>105 093</td>
<td>21 232</td>
<td>18 000</td>
<td>14 986</td>
<td>10 651</td>
<td>16 569</td>
<td>186 531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Cape</td>
<td>29 213</td>
<td>3 787</td>
<td>3 598</td>
<td>8 667</td>
<td>3 880</td>
<td>8 686</td>
<td>57 831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>125 353</td>
<td>10 484</td>
<td>10 037</td>
<td>35 515</td>
<td>46 972</td>
<td>19 945</td>
<td>248 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>185 510</td>
<td>15 735</td>
<td>11 756</td>
<td>11 310</td>
<td>34 585</td>
<td>34 157</td>
<td>293 053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 420 897</td>
<td>193 615</td>
<td>217 348</td>
<td>252 834</td>
<td>271 219</td>
<td>248 850</td>
<td>2 604 763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Human Settlements (Housing delivery in the first 5 years of democracy varied greatly from year to year and from province as different systems of reporting and monitoring had to be untied)
The table below indicates the preliminary units delivered in 2009/10 and estimated delivery up to 2014.

**Table 2: Estimated delivery of housing units from 2008-2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Prelim Units delivered in 2009/10</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
<td>28 633</td>
<td>23 400</td>
<td>23 400</td>
<td>24 463</td>
<td>26 058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free State</td>
<td>18 829</td>
<td>21 462</td>
<td>21 462</td>
<td>22 438</td>
<td>23 901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>39 922</td>
<td>48 553</td>
<td>48 553</td>
<td>50 760</td>
<td>54 071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwa-Zulu Natal</td>
<td>27 376</td>
<td>26 626</td>
<td>26 626</td>
<td>27 837</td>
<td>29 652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo</td>
<td>23 079</td>
<td>22 613</td>
<td>22 613</td>
<td>23 641</td>
<td>25 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpumalanga</td>
<td>8 291</td>
<td>8 181</td>
<td>8 181</td>
<td>8 553</td>
<td>9 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Cape</td>
<td>6 257</td>
<td>6 512</td>
<td>6 512</td>
<td>6 808</td>
<td>7 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>35 141</td>
<td>30 954</td>
<td>30 954</td>
<td>32 361</td>
<td>34 472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>32 371</td>
<td>31 698</td>
<td>31 698</td>
<td>33 139</td>
<td>35 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219 899</td>
<td>220 000</td>
<td>220 000</td>
<td>230 000</td>
<td>245 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Human Settlements

Even though the provision of housing seems to be impressive on paper, there are challenges as compared to the current housing backlog (IRR, 2015). These challenges include the quality of the structures provided and the level of beneficiary satisfaction. Thus, the issue of housing allocation in South Africa and the provision thereof remains a daunting task for government as the backlog continues to increase due to:

*Change in household structures, rapid urbanisation, migration to cities and large towns, lack of opportunities in rural areas, structural unemployment, more households falling into subsidy income band and less access to housing finance (Tissington, 2010:68).*

Whilst the number of informal settlement have increased from 300 to 2 225, an increase of 650%, housing backlogs have increased from 1.5 million to 2.3 million units nationally (IRR, 2015 and
Msindo, n.d). Currently, Gauteng is the province with the highest number of RDP houses built in comparison to the other provinces. This is followed by the Eastern Cape and Kwa-Zulu Natal Provinces, North West and the Western Cape Provinces which have a relative high number of RDP houses, yet their housing backlogs are above 500 000. The Northern Cape again is considered the most sparsely population with a small economy although it also has a housing backlog. Since government is unable to keep up with the increased in housing demands, the housing backlog continues to grow at approximately 178 000 units per year and an estimated R800 billion (US$56 billion) is needed to eradicate the backlog by year 2020 (Msindo, n.d). To address the backlog issue, this has given rise to rows of ‘one-size-fits-all’ houses built on the outskirts of the cities/towns far from employment opportunities and local amenities reinforcing apartheid’s spatial patterns.

2.7. Housing policies in South Africa
South Africa’s current policy of housing was developed during the early 1990s in the context of the RDP and GEAR. Subsequently, changes have been made over the years in the housing policies; for example, from the National Housing Forum (NHF) which preceded the development of a national housing policy, to the two guiding national policies, the White Paper on Housing (1994) and Breaking New Ground (2004), among other important policy and legislative documents (Tissington, 1994).

South Africa’s housing policy arose from various disputes at the NHF, which comprises “members from business, community and development organisations to negotiate a new non-racial housing policy and strategy” (NDOH, 2000:3). The focus of the debates revolved around whether housing provision should be provided by the private or public sector; also, whether the “standard of the house should be a completed four-room house or ‘progressive’ (incremental) housing”, and the cost of addressing the housing backlog (Tissington, 2011:58). Through these debates many institutional arrangements and legal interventions were investigated which gave rise to the development of the first democratic national housing policy in 1994 (NDOH, 2000).

In October 1994, the National Housing Accord formed the basis of the common vision which shaped the fundamental part of the housing policy in South Africa. In December 1994, the White Paper on Housing was developed from the NHF debates and the broad principles of the ANC’s
RDP (Tissington, 1994). In 1997, the Housing Act was promulgated which extended the requirements that were set out in the White Paper on Housing. The Housing Act was important as there was an alignment of the National Housing Policy with South Africa’s Constitution and government’s role and responsibilities within the three spheres (i.e. national, provincial and municipality were clarified). Given these strategies, the housing policy further implied that the provision of housing was not only about the final (material) product but it also played an important role in alleviating poverty and sustainability (NDOH, 2000).

In 2004 the Department of Housing introduced the Breaking New Ground (BNG) policy which became effective from April 2005 (NDOH, 2008). The BNG policy acknowledged the growing housing backlog and sought to promote the development of quality housing, and the development of a subsidy system for different income groups as well as promoting an integrated society (Department of Local Government and Housing, 2009). Initially, the BNG is considered to be more an updated version of the RDP since the BNG policy builds on the 1994 Housing White Paper, although the strategic focus is shifted from delivering affordable housing to making sure that the delivery of houses are sustainable and habitable.

Despite the policies and programmes that underpin the South African housing landscape and more specifically housing for low income households, access to quality housing remains a serious issue (Adebayo, 2009). During the time when South Africa’s housing policy was formulated, local government played a small role in the housing delivery and instead housing delivery was provided by the private sector. With the implementation of the RDP houses, beneficiaries expressed great dissatisfaction regarding the poor quality of the house, the size of the houses and its location (Charlton 2004). The solution was to shift the responsibility housing delivery from the private sector to the municipality. The shift, also reflected in the National Housing Act of 1997, made it clear that the private sector would only act as a contractor to the public sector and that municipalities would take all reasonable steps to ensure that community members in their jurisdiction have access to adequate housing and services (NDOH, 2000). Furthermore, the Act envisaged that local government would play a more active role in housing development. However, despite this shift, national government overlooked local government capacity and finance to provide such services to its people. Municipalities have different capabilities which differ in each area. Where some municipalities have well-staffed housing departments, small rural towns often
have a single housing official, which makes it near to impossible for them to deliver on the housing mandate (IRR, 2015). While the national government is expected to build houses for each person under the Housing Act, the provinces have largely assumed the responsibility for managing housing development. Despite this, local municipalities have been placed in some unpleasant situates by its communities as they view their local municipalities as responsible for the type of houses delivered. Effectively, access to housing is a qualified right within South Africa, but the realisation of this right has been depended on the availability of resources.

2.8. RDP housing programme
As mentioned, the current housing policy in South Africa is based on the fundamental understanding that housing is a basic need. Unfortunately, one of the legacies of apartheid was in housing and it should be noted that, the new ANC government inherited a housing backlog. In response to the housing shortage, the ANC government implemented the RDP housing programme to provide poor South Africans with an average income of R3 500 (US$248) or less for low cost housing of which they qualify for subsidy of R160 573 (US$ 11.3) (Greyling, 2009). The RDP was founded on six basic principles, namely:

An integrated and sustainable programme: It was realised that apartheid cannot be overcome by uncoordinated strategies. The RDP was developed to collate strategies together and harness resources in a sustainable way for the future which will be implemented to all spheres of government, and other stakeholders such as civil society, business and parastatals.

A people-driven process: People’s ambitions and the collective determination are regarded as an important resource. The focus of the RDP is therefore on people’s needs and people’s demand to meet their needs despite the existing race or sex whether they are rich or poor or living in a rural or urban area. Thus, it suggested by actively involving people they can empower themselves and shape their own future.

Peace and security for all: Promoting peace and security is important for all since security forces, police and judicial system were placed at the service of apartheid’s racist ideology. To begin the process of reconstruction and development, each person needs to be treated fair and equal before the law.
Nation-building: South Africa’s unequal economy can be regarded in many ways to be a legacy of apartheid. The principle of the RDP is to promote nation-building to which includes having functioned local and provincial powers, respect for diversity and retaining the cultural identity of groups. Nation-building focuses on unity in diversity.

Link reconstruction and development: Growth, development, reconstruction and redistribution would all be linked in the RDP. Held together by a broad infrastructural programme, it will focus on creating and enhancing existing services (i.e. electricity, water, telecommunications, transport, health, education and training sectors). The RDP therefore, notes that attention will be paid to factors that prevent growth and investment.

Democratisation of South Africa: The above five principles would facilitate democratisation (i.e. all the people most affected by policies should participate in the decision-making process) (RDP, 1994)

The RDP was recognised as being the ANC’s election manifesto for post-apartheid South Africa and acted as a blueprint for improving services and living conditions for poor people. The implementation of the RDP created hope and an expectation that life would improve for those that had been affected by apartheid. Consequently, central to economic growth and development, the RDP suggested that housing will play an important role as it can stimulate growth and development (Steyn, 2010). Additionally, the Macro-Economic Research Group argued that state provision of housing for the poor will contribute to the economy as it broadens employment and income. The RDP’s mandate was to establish housing as a human right, “which was formulated in the 1994 White Paper and was critically recognized in the 1996 final Constitution” (Bond and Khosa, 1999: 10). Since housing played an important role in development, it was concluded that housing be regarded as a lead sector (Hassen, 2003). So, what this meant is that the provision of housing would not only provide access to water, electricity and land but would reinforce economic growth. Thus, the construction of the RDP houses would also create jobs and through this government could move beyond individual poverty alleviation to broad macro-economic sustainability (Knight, 2001).
2.8.1. Shortcomings of the RDP housing programme

The implementation of the RDP created hope and an expectation that life would improve for those affected by apartheid. The RDP was translated into government policy in the form of a White Paper. While the RDP encouraged social sustainability, there were also some issues encountered in the processes of implementation of the sustainable houses (Steyn, 2010). These problems originated from privileging national economic growth over-and-against a critical mass of public spending on housing and other basic infrastructure for the poor. Even under the RDP, economic goals were now being prioritised rather than looking at economic sustainability. Despite the implementation of RDP housing, poor Black people continue to live on the periphery of cities and towns, far from employment opportunities and still experience difficulties in sustaining a proper healthy life (Ogunfiditimi, 2008). Following this, the key characteristics that have impacted on the South African housing market include:

**Severe housing shortage**: Post-apartheid government inherited a critical housing shortage. In 1997 the National Housing Department estimated 2.2 million families were without adequate housing (i.e. living in informal dwellings which were often illegal). Because of rapid urban migration this figure increased by approximately 204 000 families annually.

**Lack of affordability**: With high unemployment rates and relatively low average wage levels, many South Africans are faced with the challenge of providing for their housing needs. This include household with low income below R3 500 (US$248) per month.

**Fragmented housing policy and administrative systems**: In the early 1990s, the Housing Sector was fragmented. This was due to inconsistent funding and lack of defined accountability roles and functions. Initially, there were fifteen departments dealing with the housing issue, namely, one General Affairs Department, three Own Affairs Departments, the Homeland Authorities and more than 60 national and regional state corporate institutions. As a result, many subsidy schemes were implemented, leaving the post-apartheid government with many laws which were either abolished or amended.

**Lack of end user finance**: Many lenders are hesitant to lend money to low-income families for reason such as non-payment of housing loans, service payment boycotts etc. Consequently, many low-income families are unable to access housing loans, even if they could afford to.
Inappropriate standards: Infrastructure, service and housing standards were inappropriate to the needs of the low-income market. This has resulted in difficulties in providing affordable housing products (Housing Delivery, 2014).

It is evident that by promising to deliver one million subsidised houses within five years, the government effectively chose quantity over quality. Not only have complaints over the quality of housing been raised by RDP beneficiaries, but also by different state agencies such as the National Home Builders Registration Council (NHBRC), the Construction Industry Development Board (CIBD), and the Public Protector (Nkambule, 2012). Other problems included improperly built walls, and roofs as well as doors and windows that could not open properly, and the lack of air bricks in the house because they had to leave their windows open for ventilation resulting in dust entering the house (Moolla, Kotze and Block, 2011). According to Moolla, Kotze and Block (2011), the need for a proper kitchen and bathroom was also highlighted and the size of the houses have been criticised as it cannot accommodate a large family nor can they expand the house as the plot is too small.

In a response to the many housing complaints received across the country, the then Public Protector of South Africa, Advocate Thuli Madonsela stated that inspection duties were often neglected by municipal inspectors and therefore many beneficiaries never received occupancy certificates. It was therefore left to the beneficiary to write ‘happy letters’ whereby they confirmed the building specifications of the houses (Regchand, 2011). As a result, there was much dissatisfaction amongst community members since developers do not follow the same specifications for RDP houses. Despite, poorly planned houses there are also procurement irregularities (corruption and fraud), which all contribute to the poor quality of the RDP houses. Furthermore, while the intention was to build houses for the poor, many of the RDP houses built via this subsidy are small, badly constructed, and poorly located, leading the ruling African National Congress (ANC) itself to describe them as ‘incubators of poverty’ that perpetuate poverty (South Africa Government, 2009). Also, whilst government’s line of thinking with regards to housing the poor is that poor should help themselves, maintaining the house has become a burden on the financial resources of the poorer households (Thomas, 2004). For example, the RDP house which was supposed to become an asset for households became a liability as the houses are deteriorating and people lack the financial means to repair and fix the problems (Rust, 2007). Thus, the poor quality of the RDP
houses contradicts government’s intention to provide habitable housing to the poor and the many complaints about the quality of the RDP houses serve as evidence that the government needs to take responsibility for poor service delivery to its people. Ironically, while the aim of the RDP was to ensure quality life for all, it has been clear that the housing project reveals that the government is using it as a dumping site for poor people. In this regard, the poor implementation of RDP houses all over South Africa has raised socio-economic questions as to whether government is still loyal to its people (SABC News, 2011).

2.9. Housing challenges in post-apartheid South Africa
As previously mentioned, government embarked on addressing the issues of housing, through progressive access to tenure. Bond (2003:4) also argues that the neo-liberal approach to low income housing has had many consequences. This includes the disempowerment of the communities by excluding them from the planning of the project and the general needs for capacity which were not met, leading to unwanted housing products.

Despite governments efforts to solve the housing issues, it has proved to be quite unsuccessful given the challenges associated with it (i.e. the quality issues and the fact there are still hundreds of thousands of people on the waiting list). According to Pottie (2004:609), in the post-1994 elections, the then premier of Gauteng Province, Tokyo Sexwale, struck a populist note when he said that,

\[ \text{We shall not be part to any scheme or plan whose eventual outcome ... is to create serviced informal settlement in the name of housing. People deserve to live in proper low-cost houses (The Star, 20 May 1994).} \]

While the Premier had vociferously maintained that poor people in South Africa deserve better housing, the RDP has had many consequences which include the low rate of delivering houses in comparison to what was possible, followed by a growth in the housing backlog (Gelb, 2003). Twenty-one years into democracy, people still lack access to the most basic necessities and government has failed to produce the results which they promised to address the housing issue. In South Africa only 15% of households earn enough to secure a mortgage, while 60% earn less than R3 500 (US$248) a month and can qualify for state housing and the remaining 25% (teachers, nurses, police officers and soldiers) have access to neither since they are too ‘poor’ to secure a
mortgage but too ‘rich’ to qualify for public housing (Findley and Ogbru, 2011). As a result, they are torn in-between. Furthermore, Baumann (2003) also explained that South Africans are not poor only because of market failure, but also because of apartheid policies implemented long before, making people poorer and even more vulnerable.

In addition, while the housing policy has attained some notable achievements, provision of RDP housing has not lifted the lives of those that have received it. Evidently, more criticism than praise expressed has been expressed towards the current implementation of the RDP houses (Mongwe, 2013). The concerns around this is not only that the building of these RDP houses bring down the market value of their houses but often it is also the case whereby public housing and informal settlements are accompanied by crime, lack of security as well as other social problems (Mongwe, 2013). Furthermore, other concerns were that provision of these assets had not truly lifted people out of poverty. Consequently, with respect to government’s role to provide the poor with houses it has been alleged that they have one line of thinking which is that the poor should be helped to help themselves. This means that the poor should maintain their own houses once provided to them which has become a burden on the financial resources for many. Additionally, another concern raised was that high unemployment remains an issue within the areas as RDP houses are located far from economic centres and the implementation of these houses further perpetuate the legacy of spatial apartheid (Nguyen, 2015). Other issues were also aimed towards different aspects of the housing allocation process such as the quality of the houses, slow pace of housing delivery, unreliability of the waiting lists and corruption (either people are put on top of their housing list or own more than one RDP house). Nonetheless, it should be acknowledged that the waiting lists are long because of the legacy of apartheid housing policies despite allegations that people bribe local officials, and accusations that officials manipulate the RDP housing list (Kienast-Duyar, 2010; Mongwe, 2013). For example, in the Northern Cape, RDP houses were initially implemented through a ‘first come, first serve’ approach but many old people died without ever owning a house (The Housing Developing Agency, 2013). It was also found that individuals who had received houses, were renting the houses out for an extra income. A random sample study conducted by Minister of Human Settlements, Lindiwe Sisulu between 1998 and 2008 indicated that only 34% of RDP beneficiaries still occupy their homes allocated to them whilst 11% of the recipients sold their houses illegally and the other left their house vacant to continue living in informal settlements (Nguyen, 2015).
2.10. Chapter summary
This chapter has revealed that the housing crisis is not only a South African issue, but a worldwide one. However, paying attention to the RDP housing programme, there is still a mirage of social, economic and political problems. While scholars and analyst have done much of their research on RDP housing programme, little research has focused on understanding the perceptions that RDP beneficiaries have towards these houses. Given this, it is therefore imperative to question and understand the idealistic objectives of the RDP. Within post-apartheid dispensation there is still a housing crisis and government continues to face the challenge of reducing the housing backlog in South Africa while at the same time trying to improve the quality of houses. Evidently, it can be suggested that despite having achieved some notable successes, the RDP housing programme has failed to achieve most of its goals and objectives.
CHAPTER 3: THEORECTICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1. Introduction
The theoretical framework is regarded as the structure through which the study is examined and it provides an explanation of why the research problem exists (Swanson, 2013). This study employs Maslow’s ‘hierarchy of needs’ to explore how RDP beneficiaries perceive the quality of their houses. Since housing is regarded as a basic need, the central tenets of Maslow’s theory will help us to understand the ways in which housing has been perceived by the beneficiaries.

3.2. Overview of Maslow’s ‘hierarchy of needs’ theory
Over the years, Maslow’s theory has received considerable attention and today this approach has become an important part of theories regarding human motivation as well as social and economic development (Moladi Formwork, 2012). The theory of human motivation states that people’s motivation comes from a desire to satisfy their needs and, to fulfill that need, they will attempt to reach their highest level of their capabilities (Maslow, 1987). Maslow’s classification of needs consists of five levels of cognitive needs, namely, physiological needs, safety needs, belongingness and love needs, esteem needs, and the need for self-actualization. The theory starts with the most basic need or immediate survival need and that each level is reached based on an individual’s satisfaction of the previous level. Maslow referred to the first four levels (i.e. physiological needs, safety needs, love and belonging needs as well as esteem need) as ‘deficiency needs’ as it concerned the ‘basic’ needs of an individual and the top level is known as growth or being needs. Maslow further argues that the motivation force was eliminated once these ‘basic’ needs were fulfilled. The last level, the need for self-actualisation, Maslow regarded as a ‘being need’ as it was an enduring motivator of behaviour (Seelig et al, 2008).

3.3. Understanding the five levels in Maslow’s hierarchy
In the context of housing, Maslow’s theory demonstrates that the desire for a house as a shelter incorporate the needs for a structure that meets basic physical needs such as sleep, rest, food, drink, hygiene, sex, light, air and sun (Israel, 2003). Such basic needs must be fulfilled before the house can accommodate for other social and aesthetic needs and levels of self-actualization. In turn, the physical quality of a living environment become one of the factors that predict an occupants’ level
of satisfaction of their housing (Baqutayan, Raji and Ariffin, 2015). In reference, to Figure 2, an in-depth discussion will be provided on the basic needs as applied to housing, (i.e. physical needs safety and security, love and belonging, self-esteem and self-actualisation needs).

**Figure 2: Applying housing to Maslow's hierarchy of needs**

- **Physiological needs related to housing:** This is said to be the most vital need before an individual can move onto the next stage as indicated in Figure 2. This stage suggests that an individual needs food and shelter (i.e. warmth, rest) to survive. To fulfil this basic need a home should have a kitchen that is stocked with food, a bed, utilities, and the surrounding should be clean.

- **Safety needs related to housing:** Safety needs are on the second level of the hierarchy. This includes a place that provides safety (i.e. physical and psychological) and security to financially maintain a living standard now and in the future. Evidently the house should be well-built and in safe neighbourhood and the house should have functioning locks, fencing, burglar bars and an alarm system would satisfy this level. This level demonstrates the importance of adequate housing for security as well as positive development. Housing in a bad condition would thus create an unsafe environment and have an impact on an individual’s well-being (Baqutayan et al, 2015).
• Belongingness and love needs: This is very important as every individual wants to have a sense of belonging and recognition, either in a social group or in a community. This suggests having a home with enough space so that an individual can invite his/her friends and family over for gatherings. This level is satisfied when a home's total environment includes being able to entertain friends and family.

• Self-Esteem: This relates to the feeling an individual would get when valued and accepted by the people around them. In the context of housing this would include feeling accomplished and proud of the home since a house tells others about you. Consequently, people feel that a clean, satisfying, attractive house can gain the respect and approval of others.

• Self-actualization: This is the last level of the hierarchy and this need occupies the top spot in the pyramid. This includes a home that an individual has always dreamed about or is completely satisfied with the renovations they were able to do. Evidently, the house is the place where one can move towards becoming their capable self (i.e. being able to fully function in the home and do what they want to).

It should be recognised that the hierarchical nature of needs is debatable and not as clear cut in practise as purported by Maslow. For example, within a global context, there is a need for houses as explained in chapter 2. However, much is hidden by the semiotics of the word ‘house’ and formulation that people need houses could therefore infer that once an individual is provided with a house their needs are satisfied. According to Pauw, and Holm (2005);

The formulation a house facilitates the satisfaction of human needs, on the other hand, immediately begs the question what the needs are that are addressed, how effectively they are addressed and what needs are inhibited by the use of a specific house in a particular environment.

Maslow initially stated that individuals should first fulfil the lower deficit needs before progressing to meet the higher-level needs. However, life needs are not linear hence not everyone will follow the same sequence, i.e. aim to fulfil one’s needs before moving on to the next one. Maslow also clarified that fulfilment of needs is not an ‘all or none’ approach. He therefore acknowledged that the ‘hierarchy of needs’ as a pyramid seemed to be misleading as it suggested inflexibility which
was not intended and that the importance of needs decreases as individuals move through the different levels (Maslow, 1987).

Seelig et al (2008) stated that basic needs were subject to change due to external factors such as the surrounding environment which produced a variety of differences in the form of cultural and social beliefs and values. In this regard, Maslow’s theory presents to us that the satisfaction of needs is a never-ending social and economic practice. For example, with the provision of housing it is important to note that careful consideration should be taken in serving the poor in the future. Since houses are provided to the poor people which cannot afford to maintain the houses themselves, government should provide quality houses as well as maintenance of the houses and ensure accessibility to social amenities such as water and electricity (Datta, 2008; Chavarria et al. 2014). The survival of a human being requires basic needs such as shelter, safety, security, shelter, and health, among others, which further extend to physiological and psychological needs (Maslow, 1987). Maslow (1987) further explains that fulfilling these needs has a significant influence on human characteristics as satisfying them would help to reduce the psychological and physiological disorders of an individual, thus resulting in improvements in health (Zavei and Jusan, 2010). This also implied that people will seek to satisfy their upper level cognitive needs once certain needs on the lower level were fulfilled (Maslow, 1987). In line with this, Zavei and Jusan (2010) argued that it was very important to understand the basic need in the context of housing provision. The reason for this is that for many the house is a vital and meaningful aspect of the built environment.

3.4. Applying Maslow’s theory in the housing context
According to Maslow, housing plays an essential role in a person’s life and forms part of basic human need. It was suggested that a house should be designed in a way that promotes beneficiaries’ satisfaction of various needs (Maslow, 1987). This meant that a house is not only about meeting the shelter related need (physical structure of four walls and roof) but also the quality and conditions expanded into other needs such as security needs, love/belonging needs, self-esteem and self-actualization (Israel, 2003). Maslow’s theory demonstrates people’s need for quality housing since housing is central to an individual’s safety and well-being (Baquitayan, Raji and Ariffin, 2015). However, certain aspects can compromise these needs, (i.e. a house without a roof or a leaking roof can affect physiological needs). In addition, areas which are dangerous and overcrowded can affect the security needs while living in a house with cracked walls or damaged
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windows can affect self-esteem (Zavei and Jusan, 2012). Since housing usually has a big impact on an occupant’s safety and well-being, an unsafe environment would therefore adversely impact on the well-being of the family and, housing in poor conditions could also create an unsafe environment.

The link between Maslow’s hierarchy of needs and the built environment has been investigated by many scholars (Baquotayan1 et al, 2015; Israel, 2003). Studies suggest that people’s satisfaction in a house depends on economic or social status. Thus, low-cost housing can only provide for the physiological needs of the residents (McCray and Day, 1977). In this regard, the hierarchical classification of different types of housing based on of Maslow’ hierarchy methods are appropriate for investigating psychological characteristics within the design process, particularly where the individual is in direct contact with the designer. However, this is not applicable in mass housing projects. In another study, McCray and Day (1977) investigated housing related values, aspirations, and satisfactions based on Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. The research was conducted on a group of low-income rural residents living in private houses as well as a group of low income urban residents, who live in public houses. The findings from this study suggested that urban public housing could only meet the physiological needs of the resident and that both groups were aware of the deficiencies in their environments, although perceptions of these deficiencies varied. Additionally, while the rural respondents concern was on the inconvenience of their environments, urban respondents were concerned with social aspects which could adversely affect the satisfaction of a higher level of needs. This suggests that a user’s satisfaction in a house, or social status, is related to the gratification of the user’s higher psychological expectations such as intimacy, love, sense of belonging and freedom (Pauw and Holm, 2005).

At the most fundamental level, it is evident that discussions of basic housing needs are essentially discussions of basic human needs, with subsequent debates concerning how to operationalize the role that housing plays in addressing human needs (Zavei and Jusan, 2012). In any view of human nature, the concepts of quality of life and human needs are of key importance. It is widely held that basic human needs exist in the forms of shelter and protection from the elements, avoidance of physical and psychological harm, and facilitation of personal and social well-being (Seelig and Phibbs, 2006). Housing needs clearly can play a critical role in the achievement of these basic human needs, but it might be argued that housing needs are instrumental in nature, in that they are
the means (facilitator) of achieving human needs, rather than being ends in themselves. Key questions thus arise regarding who undertakes the expression, recognition, measurement and prioritisation of needs, and the basis upon which responses should be framed. Different approaches and models can be identified to conceptualise the basis for the articulation of needs, and the matching of needs with responses. Despite housing’s economic and social policy significance, there has been precious little exposition of needs issues within research. Many studies have exclusively focused on the more methodological and technical aspects of need, rather than the underlying concepts and assumptions (Zavei and Jusan, 2012)

Stone (1970) has made important contributions to recognising how Maslow’s framework can be used in a housing need context. Stone (1970) provides a concise review of classic U.S. literature on human needs satisfaction and housing as a means for analysing and interpreting Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, and the role that housing might play (instrumentally) in basic needs satisfaction. Stone also provides insights into how Maslow ought to be understood, and then how ‘housing needs’ are perhaps conceptually quite different in that while Maslow’s basic needs are ends in themselves, housing needs are invariably ‘intervening needs’ and effectively instruments or processes through which we can seek to address basic needs. In other words, the ‘need for housing’ is about the physiological and safety needs under Maslow. For example, as Stone (1970, p18) states

There may be some minimum physical standards which are necessary, though not sufficient, for the satisfaction of human basic needs for safety and security. Above this minimum the physical characteristics are generally no more than enabling conditions for the satisfaction of higher needs, and whether they are either necessary of relevant for the satisfaction of the higher needs is socially variable.

For most people, housing is central in their daily lives. The quality of housing constitutes the physical condition of housing as well as the perception and actions of the occupants. As discussed above, Maslow’s theory illustrates that if certain needs are not met then it has a direct impact on the family as it affects their emotion, behaviour and psychological well-being.
3.5. Conclusion
The chapter provided a discussion of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs as the theoretical framework. Since housing is such a universal satisfier for humans, people tend to speak to the need for housing. Evidently, meeting the needs of occupant’s is important for housing delivery, as poor-quality housing can contribute to dissatisfaction and affect the well-being of an individual. One of the key programmes of the RDP was to meet the basic needs of the people such as jobs, land, housing, water, electricity, telecommunications, transport, a clean and healthy environment, nutrition, health care and social welfare. However, complaints regarding the RDP housing indicate that these houses do not meet all the needs of the occupants. The researcher considered Maslow’s theory on hierarchy of needs as applicable for the study as the theory indicates that different levels of an individual’s needs imply different levels of housing expectations, hence different housing attributes.
CHAPTER 4: BACKGROUND TO THE CASE STUDY

4.1. Introduction
This chapter provides background on the case study area, namely, Nollothville. It will consist of two sections: an overview of the Northern Cape Province will be provided and the case study area. Since Nollothville, is a suburb or neighbourhood of Port Nolloth, information regarding public service provision and socio-economic structures all pertain to the area as well.

4.2. Overview of the Northern Cape
The Northern Cape is the largest of South Africa’s province taking up almost a third (approximately 30.5%) of South Africa’s land area, but it has the smallest population (Anon, 2016). The Northern Cape is spatially the largest province in the country, but also has the lowest population and some of the least developed areas in terms of its economic and social development. As highlighted in the map below, Richtersveld lies in the northwest region of the Namakwa District, which is the furthest north in terms of the provincial boundaries. The province lies south of the Orange River which forms with the border with Namibia in the north, while the Molopo River is at the border with Botswana to the northeast (see Figure 3). Apart from a narrow strip of winter rainfall along the coast, the province receives very little rainfall during the summer and the landscape is characterised by vast arid plains (Anon, 2016).

Figure 3: Map of the Northern Cape Province

Source: http://www.bdb.co.za/kimberley/general.htm
In 1994, the Northern Cape became a political fact with Kimberley as its capital and it is divided into five administrative districts: Frances Baard District, Taolo Gaetsewe District, Namakwa District, Pixley Ka Seme District, and Siyanda District. With the abolition of apartheid and the Influx Control Act, there has been an increase in population from 991,919 in 2001 to 1,145,861 in 2011 and the number of households has increased from 245,086 in 2001 to 301,405 in 2011 (The Housing Developing Agency, 2013). Most of the people residing in the Northern Cape are Coloured (435,000), followed by Africans (279,000), Whites (112,000), people of Indian descent (2,300), and Chinese and other (12,000) descents. Furthermore, Afrikaans (55.8%) is widely spoken by almost all racial groups, followed by Setswana at 33.1%, isiXhosa at 6.3% and English at 2.4% (Stats SA-2000).

4.3. The case study area
Before the discovery of diamonds in 1926, Port Nolloth was previously known as ‘Aukwatowa’ (a Nama word which means “Where the water took the old man away”). Originally, the town was set up as a port for exporting copper from Okiep in the 1900s, later moving to mining and fishing as its base economy on which the town is now reliant. Port Nolloth is also well-known for being a typical apartheid frontier town and, like most towns in South Africa, is racially divided (Carstens, 2011). The main town consists of the business district as well as associated suburbs. To the south of the town is the neighbourhood of Nollothville, which was classified as a ‘coloured’ settlement during the apartheid era (see Figure 4 and 5). Then there is also a ‘white’ holiday resort called McDougall’s Bay a few kilometres south along the coast, and towards the eastern entrance to Port Nolloth is Sizamile, the ‘black’ township which is also close to the industrial area of the town (Carstens, 2011).
Figure 4: Map indicating where Port Nolloth is situated

Source: https://www.google.co.za/maps/place/Port+Nolloth/

Figure 5: Map indicating where Nollothville is situated (location is within the red outline)

Source: http://census2011.adrianfrith.com/place/363011
Nollothville came into existence because of the Group Areas Act which was imposed in Port Nolloth in 1967 and forced nearly 70% of the coloured population move into the area. Due to the lack of houses in Nollothville, the move was suspended until alternative housing was made available. By 1983 nearly 400 houses had been built in the proclaimed coloured area (West, 1984). The forced removal of people to Nollothville generated issues regarding the quality of housing since all the houses were sub-economic structures with running water, sanitation, but with no electricity and minimal finishing. Furthermore, there were also complaints about inadequate size, poor finishing and the fact that there was no fencing around the house as this was needed for safety purposes as well as protection from the wind and sand. Many Nollothville residents said that they preferred their previous accommodation (West, 1984).

Because of rapid urbanisation, the demand for housing increased. The implementation of the RDP houses gave hope to many. While the previous semi-attached houses regarded as matchboxes, the RDP houses were free-standing and slightly bigger. In support of this, results from a survey conducted within the Namakwa District Municipality revealed that RDP houses provided in Sew de Lewe, Garies, Port Nolloth amongst other places, are of adequate size consisting of an open plan kitchen, lounge, two bedrooms and a bathroom (South Africa’s Human Right Commission, n.d). Notwithstanding the above and despite the RDP house being 36cm², a survey conducted, revealed that the size of the RDP houses in Nollothville are small (see Figure 6). Furthermore, while the size of the house was an issue, residents also complained about improperly built windows and roofs as well as the poor quality of the building material used in the construction. Previous research conducted also revealed that the houses were generally of poor quality and were falling apart probably because of the mostly windy weather conditions as well as the sandy nature of the soil (Carstens, 2011). Despite the many issues residents had with the houses built in the post-apartheid period, perceptions changed as many moved into RDP houses and suggested that houses built in the apartheid-era were of a much better standard compared to the houses built post-apartheid (Carstens, 2011). Consequently, given the lack of research pertaining to the housing issue within Nollothville, information was collected by distributing questionnaires, personal observation and through interviews with key informants as well as RDP beneficiaries. Thus, the empirical research conducted in this study will help to shed more light on how the quality of RDP houses are perceived by the beneficiaries within contemporary society.
4.4. Administrative structure

The Richtersveld Municipality forms part of the broader Namakwa District. Richtersveld Municipality is the north-westernmost local municipality in the Northern Cape. Its coastline is bordered by the Atlantic Ocean. Rainfall is minimal and water is a scarce commodity, yet the vast plains, which are considered a special place by some, are still a very beautiful region with unique characteristics that attract thousands of tourists. The Richtersveld is a conservation area and the main economic sectors include mining, agriculture, fishing, and tourism. With a total population of approximately 11,982, the municipality also faces challenges such as skew pattern of wealth distribution, relatively high levels of unemployment and crime (Richtersveld IDP, 2016/17).

The major areas within the municipality include Port Nolloth, Alexanderbay, Sand-drift Kuboes, Eksteenfontein as well as Lekkersing (see Figure 7). Port Nolloth has the largest population whilst the other towns have very low development potential. Additionally, Port Nolloth is also the main economic centre of the Municipality and it is also the town where the head office of the Richtersveld Municipality is situated. Topographically, the town belongs to the dry and vast Sandveld, and is often shrouded in sea fog.
4.5. Socio-economic structure of population

Nollothville is a sub-place of Port Nolloth and according to census statistics it consists of a population of approximately 3443, consisting of 921 households. Additionally, Afrikaans (97.21%) is widely spoken by almost all racial groups, followed by English (1.42%), Setswana (0.32%) with a few other languages also spoken in the area. Coloured people are the majority at 3329 (96.69%) followed by black people (1.80%). White people (0.46%) and Indian/Asian (0.49%) make up the smallest in numbers (see Table 3). Males outnumber females 2.42 %, being 51.21% and 48.79% respectively (Frith, 2011). The fairly equal ratio of males to females (51.21% - 48.79%) within the population indicates that both males and females have been migrating to this area. As such, it can be assumed that migration into the area consists of families rather individuals.

Because of the Coloured Act implemented, most of the Coloured people now reside in Nollothville and either reside with families in the houses that were built during the apartheid years, waiting for a RDP house or staying in a RDP house. Like other rural municipalities, Richtersveld Municipality also experiences common challenges such as skew patterns of wealth distribution, relatively high levels of unemployment and crime.
Table 3: Population group in Nollothville

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population group</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>3329</td>
<td>96.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian/Asian</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Frith (2011)

4.6. Education & employment
Education remains one of the key avenues through which the government is involved in the economy. Port Nolloth has 3 creches’, 2 primary schools and 1 high school – all of which are situated quite a distance from Nollothville. The matric results are amongst the most important indicators of the performance of the schooling system, although in Port Nolloth it has become a matter of concern as the pass rate was only 46% and there is also a high drop-out rate (Richtersveld, 2016-17). Most of the adult population has some education but did not obtain matric. Because of low literacy rates, high levels of unemployment, there is a high proportion of economically inactive people which in turn has increased poverty levels and social problems (i.e. alcohol and drug abuse, crime and domestic violence). Also, unable to get proper jobs many are depended on government to provide them with houses which is causing a housing backlog in the Richtersveld area.

4.7. Housing
Throughout the Richtersveld area formalisation and upgrading of housing is an urgent need. In Port Nolloth there has been very poor integration of new housing developments, particularly subsidised housing. Within Nollothville the development of low-cost housing remains a challenge for the municipality and inhabitants as the demand for housing grows annually. Another challenge is lack of funding to provide proper shelter to the poor people as enshrined in the Constitution of
South Africa. Furthermore, the low-income housing lacks convenient access to core functions and services in town; it is removed from the sea and it is associated with less desirable land uses (e.g. industrial, railway and sewer works). The first RDP houses were built on unserviced plots of land and were poorly constructed. With the developed of the first houses, many stood empty for quite some time before they were occupied and as a result they were looted. However, desperate to move into house, many beneficiaries still moved into the houses. As many complaints arose regarding the quality of the first phase of the houses, improvements were made to the second phase of the RDP houses.

4.7. Public service provision

4.7.1. Water
Water remains a problem in Port Nolloth as the supply of water is insufficient to support the population. This is especially problematic during the summer period when there is an increase in numbers of holidaymakers. Initially, Port Nolloth was dependant on groundwater that was pumped and stored in the reservoir. A deal was set up with Alexkor (state-owned diamond mining company), who extract water from the Orange River and pump it to a reservoir at Holgat half way between Port Nolloth and Alexander Bay for their mining operations in the south and to provide water for the construction of the tar road from Port Nolloth to Alexander Bay (Richtersveld IDP, 2012). However, with the growing population government realised that the water was not sufficient and that the pipeline from the Orange River did not have the capacity to pump water at a sufficient rate to the reservoir. Another problem was that the pumps run by electricity and with power cuts meant that no water was being pumped. Consequently, the issue of water has become so severe that restrictions were imposed at night to enable the reservoir at Holgat to recharge. To resolve the issue a study was conducted in 2000 for the evaluation of water supply to Port Nolloth; however, costing for the different options were done inaccurately therefore there are still no clear recommendations for the future. Currently, Alexkor RMC JV provides fresh water for Port Nolloth although there is no formal Service Level Agreement. However, there is a process underway to build a 1.5 mega litre desalination plant in conjunction with DWA & Sanitation (Richtersveld IDP, 2016/17).
4.7.2. Electricity
The distribution of electricity to the Port Nolloth/ Nollothville is done by Richtersveld Municipality. The municipality does not generate any electricity and buys it from Eskom. Consequently, while there is accessibility to electricity and street lighting the bulk of the infrastructure is in very poor condition and maintenance is done regularly (Richtersveld IDP, 2013). Currently, all poor households are linked with 50 kilowatt hours of free electricity which was implemented on 01 October 2009 by the Free Basic Electricity Notice, 1963 of 2003. Free Basic Electricity is being provided to all indigent households on the prepaid card system which has had a positive impact on the impoverished communities’ due to the financial relief on their service payments (Richtersveld IDP, 2016/17)

4.7.3. Sewage and sanitation
The town of Port Nolloth has a combination of septic tanks and waterborne sewerage. Consequently, while a section of Nollothville is connected to a waterborne sewerage system that functions efficiently the rest of the town has septic tanks that residents pay to have extracted by the municipality. Consequently, while maintenance is done when necessary, the biggest challenge is the Waste Water Treatment because it is not fully operationally. Since only two of the seven oxidation ponds are functional immense pressure is put on the existing tanker service during the peak holiday season which is a health risk (Richtersveld IDP, 2013). To address these issues, council has set on developing oxidation ponds especially in Port Nolloth. Furthermore, there are plans to increase the extent of the waterborne network as well as the size of the sewerage plan. With the increase of new businesses as well as residential developments, urgency has been placed on sewerage purification works to accommodate the new developments. However, given these issues sewer tanks are not seen as a sewerage backlog and future sewerage plants will only be implemented once funding becomes available (Richtersveld IDP, 2016/17).

4.7.4. Refuse removal
With the upgrading of the Solid Waste Disposal Site, the lifespan of it was boosted. Furthermore, a new guard house with access gates was constructed and rehabilitation of the site was done through machines removing the existing waste into a new trench (Richtersveld IDP, 2013). Previously, free basic refuse services were provided to all households. However, because of the completion of various housing projects, the municipality is facing huge challenges about providing
free basic services and sustainable levels of quality service delivery. The collection of refuse for households is done once a week and twice a week for the businesses. Since the black bag system is still in place, it was highlighted during a public participation meeting that the municipality implement the wheelie bin refuse removal system. Consequently, this can only be considered once an analysis of the cost implications of the wheelie bin systems has been done (Richtersveld IDP, 2016/17).

4.8. Chapter summary

The chapter provided a general overview of the Northern Cape Province. It went further to give a description of the case study area, Nollothville. Subsequently, since Nollothville is a sub-place of Port Nolloth, the information provided had to take the whole area into account regarding the administrative structure and the socio-economic factors.
CHAPTER 5: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

5.1. Introduction
The overall aim of the study was to assess how beneficiaries perceived their RDP houses. To achieve this aim, three research questions were addressed. The nature of the research questions addressed by this study guided the methodology used in the study. This chapter explains the research methodology employed to collect the empirical data that was utilised in this study (i.e. detailed discussion on the research design, the data collection methods and the sampling techniques). Furthermore, it concludes with the ethical considerations that guided the empirical study and challenges encountered during the research.

5.2. Research design
Research design can be defined as a blueprint or a detailed plan for conducting a study as it links the research problems to the relevant and achievable empirical research (Babbie & Mouton, 2001). In corroboration with this, Berg (2001) describes a research design as a road map used for planning to conduct research, which includes the type of data needed, as well as the methods used to collect and analyse the data to answer the research questions. In other words, the research design provides the overall strategy which enables the researcher to obtain relevant data to effectively draw a conclusion. There are design logics that are used for different types of study (i.e. exploration, description, explanation, prediction, evaluation and historical). Nolothville was chosen as a case study because it is a community that was formed when the Coloured Groups Areas Act was implemented, forcing people of colour to move into the area. In relation to the study, mixed-method approach was used (i.e. qualitative and quantitative methods) to obtain information about respondents’ demographic and socio-economic profiles as well as their perspective on the efficacy of the RDP houses. The mixed-method was used as the researcher believed that both methods would prove useful for the collection of relevant information to answer the research questions and to enhance the results reliability and validity of the research findings (Rubin & Babbie, 2008).

This research is an explanatory sequential mix-method study as the researcher used the qualitative results to explain the results of the quantitative research in more detail. According to Creswel (2014), the research is considered explanatory as the qualitative results are used to further explain the quantitative results. It is also sequential since the initial quantitative phase is followed by the
qualitative phase. Even though the issue of ‘inadequate’ RDP housing or people perspective thereof is not a new phenomenon; limited research has been done on these houses in small towns. Nevertheless, a body of knowledge of the existing issue to housing was generated through analysing the captured insights and attitudes of the respondents and used accordingly. This research therefore hopes to add value to this gap.

5.3. Research Methodology
The research method can be defined as the systematic plan for conducting research moving from the “underlying assumptions to research design, and data collection” (Thomas 2010: 301). The methodology basically provides a work plan of the research. The study made use of primary and secondary sources. The secondary information gathered was from literature sources such as housing census reports, housing surveys, government national development plans housing census reports, books, journals and internet sources. The review of the literature showed that certain characteristics are important in evaluating housing quality. These include the type of dwelling, adequate size rooms, availability of resources/amenities, neighbourhood conditions. Information gathered from secondary sources enabled the researcher to situate the study theoretically and provided the conceptual framework with which to work on the primary data.

A researcher’s choice of a qualitative or quantitative approach in each study depends on the kind of research question (Rajasekar et al, 2006). As mentioned in the previous section, the researcher used a mixed method approach. Creswell (2014) describes the mixed methods research approach as using both qualitative and quantitative research methods to collect and analyse data and integrating the two forms to achieve the research objectives. The main assumption of this approach is that the combination of both qualitative and quantitative research methods provided a more complete understanding of the study than using one approach.

According to Weinreich (2006), qualitative methods include observations, interviews and focus groups. These methods allow the researcher to obtain data in a narrative form which helps the researcher to understand an event from the perspective of the participant and to gain in-depth understanding of what is being studied (Babbie and Mouton, 2007). This research paradigm, according to Denzin and Lincoln (2005), allows the researcher to interact with participants in their natural environment to make sense of or interpret phenomena in terms of the meaning that people
bring to them. Furthermore, it also tries to interpret community experiences and produce a better understanding of the social factors that play a role in the specific social environment (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). The qualitative aspect of the study used questionnaires, semi-structured interviews and observation done by the researcher. The open-ended questionnaires were randomly distributed to 40 RDP beneficiaries residing in Nollothville, whilst follow-up interviews were conducted with 11 RDP beneficiaries, two council members and two government officials (RDP housing representative and housing officer). Qualitative research was deemed useful as it enabled the researcher to determine the feelings, attitudes and perceptions of the RDP beneficiaries regarding the houses in their natural settings (Babbie and Mouton, 2001). Research conducted in the natural setting of the respondents, allowed the researcher to delve deeper into the themes discussed and gain a more in-depth understanding of their perceptions of the RDP houses (Terre Blanche et al, 2006).

The study also employed a quantitative research methodology using questionnaire surveys. According to Davis (2007), this method makes it possible for conclusions to be drawn to a specifiable level of probability. Quantitative research has quantifiable results which are presented in a form of some graph or statics. The study used the quantitative research method which was used to produce accurate statically findings. Terre Blanche et al (2006) also states that because the researcher knows in advance what the most important variable is, he/she can devise reasonable ways of controlling and measuring these variables. The quantitative method was therefore deemed useful as it enabled the researcher to obtain quantifiable results about the magnitude of the participant’s perceptions on the quality of the RDP houses in Nollothville (Babbie and Mouton 2007).

5.3.1 Case study
A case study approach was employed in the research to investigate beneficiary perceptions of the quality of their houses and to provide comprehensive information. According to Soy (1997:1), “case studies emphasize detailed contextual analysis of a limited number of events or conditions and their relationship.” Evidently, this definition provides an understanding of how comprehensive the approach is as it also allows for the exploration of all the valid material. Somekh and Lewin (2005) similarly stated that using a case study approach may reveal the uniqueness and commonalities in the experiences of beneficiaries concerning the RDP houses. Similarly, Babbie
(2000) suggested that a case study provides a holistic picture and in-depth understanding of a social phenomenon rather numerical analysis of data. In this way, the researcher gains an overview of the experiences, attitudes and behaviour about certain issues from the target group. Nollothville was chosen as a case study because much like cites, they are also experiencing an influx of people from the surrounding areas in search of employment opportunities. This has also put strain on the delivery and the quality of houses although not much focus has been placed on housing in small towns. The case study approach was therefore regarded as suitable for two reasons: 1) to explore the perception of quality housing based on the methodological aspects in a natural setting, and 2) to provide information about the intensity of the poor livelihoods in the area. Despite the advantages of using a case study in research, there are also limitations. The case study approach has been criticised for lacking rigour and objective in comparison to other social research methods. Another disadvantage is that since we cannot generalise one case study to other cases, it is sometimes difficult to find an appropriate case study that suits all its subjects. Nevertheless, despite these limitations the case study approach is a widely used as in most cases it may provide insights that other approaches might not achieve (Rowley, 2002).

5.3.2. Research Sampling

Sampling refers to a sub-group of people and items from the larger population which the researcher can use to obtain data and analyse to make an inference about the targeted population (Babbie & Mouton, 2007). There are two types of sampling methods, namely, probability sampling and non-probability sampling. Probability sampling is used in quantitative research and it allows every member of the population to have equal chance of being selected. Non-probability sampling, on the other hand is associated with qualitative research and does not give everyone an equal chance of being selected (Kumar, 2011). The study employed a non-probability purposive sampling technique. Welman et al (2005:69) states that “when applying this method, the researchers depend on their past experiences and previous research findings to gather units of analysis in such a way that the sample they obtain represents the relevant population.” Since everyone in Nollothville resides in RDP houses, the researcher selected and distributed 40 questionnaire surveys to the RDP beneficiaries in Nollothville. The beneficiaries were selected based on their availability and their interest to partake in the research study. To understand how the RPD houses were perceived, the researcher purposefully selected the participants, specifically the owner/spouse of the house or the
person renting the house as they could provide more information regarding the ‘adequacy’ of the house.

Furthermore, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 11 RDP beneficiaries as well as 2 council members (one female and the other male) and two government officials both males (RDP housing representatives and housing official). These beneficiaries, council members and government officials were purposefully selected to have follow-up interviews with the 11 RDP beneficiaries as the researcher felt that they were more knowledgeable about the community and RDP houses under investigation. Furthermore, the council members were purposefully selected as they represented the well-being and interests of the community while the government officials contributed valuable information to the focus of the study.

5.4. Data collecting methods
For the study, the researcher utilised primary and secondary data collection. Data collection methods are the ways in which the data are obtained (Babbie & Mouton, 2007). Primary data was collected using a questionnaire survey, semi-structured interviews and personal observations. Additionally, the study utilised an interview guide as a data collection tool using semi-structured questions to collect qualitative data while a Likert scale designed questionnaire with open-ended questions was used to collect beneficiaries’ perceptions of RDP houses (Neuman, 2006). The reason for leaning more towards qualitative research was to gain a deeper understanding of how the RDP houses are perceived by its beneficiaries in Nollothville and personal observations (e.g. photographs) was used in authenticating the information provided by the participants regarding the quality of their houses.

5.4.1. Self-administered questionnaires
A questionnaire is a list of questions which can be used as a tool for gathering and recording information (Trueman, 2016). There are two types of questionnaires, namely, open-ended and closed-ended questions. This study made use of an open-ended questionnaire using Likert-scale designed questions which allowed respondents to answer questions based on their perceptions of the quality of their RDP house. The questionnaire was administered to the head of the household (male or female) or the person renting the house. The questionnaire was divided into three sections namely section A, B, and C. Questions from section A was focused on the participant’s
demographic information (i.e. age, gender, occupation and income). This information is specifically important as it points out the background of the beneficiaries residing in RDP houses in Nollothville. The focus of section B was primarily on the number of people staying in the RDP houses and their employment status. The last was more concerned with the beneficiaries’ perception of the housing quality, areas of concern and whether certain needs were met amongst other.

5.4.2. Semi-structured interviews
Three sets of semi-structured interview schedules were developed: one for the RDP beneficiaries, one for the government officials, and one for the council members. This was done to investigate the perceptions they have on the quality of the RDP houses and to get more detailed information regarding the houses. All the interviews were conducted face-to-face as well as tape recorded for transcriptions after the interviews. During the interview, the researcher also took notes. Both closed ended and open-ended questions were used. With the use of open-ended questions, the researcher could add to the original statements of the participants and ask follow-up questions (Hancock, 2002). To do this, the researcher schedule interviews in advance and drafted a list of topics to be discussed (Hancock, Ockleford and Windridge, 2009). Semi-structured interviews conducted with beneficiaries were done in their natural setting (i.e. residential area). The researcher chose people who resided in RDP houses, specifically those who rented, those who were allocated by government, or those who had the houses passed onto them. Furthermore, semi-structured interviews conducted with government officials as well as council members were conducted at the municipality. Since interviews are useful tools for finding out how participants feel about certain things, this technique enabled the researcher to gain more insight on the research topic. It also gave the researcher the opportunity to probe further for an in-depth understanding.

5.4.3. Personal observation
This type of data collection method is typical done in the qualitative paradigm. Photographs were taken to supplement the data. Data gathered through personal observation served as a check against participant’s subjective report of what they believed (Kawulich, 2005). Furthermore, it considers information that is not verbalised and provides direct ‘first-hand’ information as observed by the researcher. In some cases, it can also assist the researcher to provide meaning and
uncover other factors for a thorough understanding of the research problem that were unknown when the study was designed (Neuman, 2006). The method enabled the researcher to personally observe the condition of the RDP houses to see whether the houses were in a good condition and verify the issues provided by the RDP beneficiaries.

5.5. Data analysis
Research usually starts with a large amount of information which the researcher must sort and categorize. Terreblanche et al (2006) point out that data analysis involves reading through your data repeatedly, and engaging in activities of breaking the data down and building it up again by elaborating and interpreting it. Similarly, Creswell (2009) states that data analysis means that there is a search for patterns recurrent behaviours, objects, or a body of knowledge. This means that more emphasis is placed on the context of the text basically looking at what is said rather than how it is said.

Since the study triangulated both qualitative and quantitative approaches, qualitative and quantitative data analysis processes were utilized. For the research, questionnaire surveys were administered, semi-structured interviews were conducted based on questions such as the quality of the RDP houses and observations made by taking pictures. Data was categorized in accordance to themes, concepts and similar features and the analysis thereof will be completed though four steps which include: transcribing interviews and discussions; and identifying themes to assist in explaining the data. Furthermore, the quantitative data analysis involved the process of translating the raw data into a family of codes and translating the dummy data for analysis using STATA, a statistical software package that is very useful as it assigns and demarcates raw data into variables which can be presented graphically or in table form (Torres-Reyn, 2007). Furthermore, data can also be presented through cross tabulation or through descriptive statistics that also shows relevant answers as to the average and the mean among other things (Neuman, 2006).

5.6. Ethical consideration
The research was undertaken after permission was obtained from the University of the Western Cape, Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences and Senate Higher Degrees Committees. Field research was conducted during the month of July 2016 for two weeks. Since ethical issues play an important role in research the researcher had to use legal authority to embark on the research.
Subsequently, permission to collect the data was sought from the relevant authorities within the community, namely, the local municipality. The study also included people from the community and therefore informed consent was needed from them. Participants were informed about the researcher’s background, the reason for conducting the study and the researcher’s non-affiliation to any political party. The reason for this was due to the political campaigning that was taking place as elections for local government was approaching.

Furthermore, the researcher reiterated that information obtained from participants would not be disclosed. Every aspect of data collection was treated confidentially and anonymously. Respondents were told that their participation is voluntarily and if they decided to partake in the study they had to sign the consent letter. Shahnazarian, Hagemann, Aburto and Rose (n.d), point out that informed consent refers to a voluntary agreement to participate in the study. Therefore, within the letter, the researcher explained the research and its purpose, the right to confidentiality as well anonymity and to withdraw from the research at any given time (Hesse-Biber and Leavy, 2004). By signing the consent letter participants acknowledged that they understood the purpose of the research. Prior to the interviews being conducted, participants were informed that the interviews would be tape recorded and that by signing the consent letter they gave consent in their willingness to participate. Participants were also informed that the recording and transcripts would be safely stored during the research process.

5.7. Limitations of the study

Maree (2007:42) defines “limitations as the challenges that could affect the research, which include time limitations and access to participants.” Since data was collected during the election campaigning most of the participants were a bit hesitant to partake in the study. It was therefore vital to inform the municipality about my research and obtain a permission letter before going into the field. Before going into the field, I had planned to do the data collection within two weeks. Time became a constraining factor as I had to wait two days before receiving the letter and since the letter was received late afternoon I could only go into the field on the third day.

Furthermore, I also avoided doing data collection on a weekend because alcohol consumption in small communities plays a big role. The issue wasn’t the drinking, I was just worried that I wouldn’t get the information I needed and my safety also needed to be considered since I was
alone. I planned to distribute 50 questionnaire surveys and interview 20 people but given time constraint, I was only able to distribute 40 questionnaire surveys and have interviews with 11 RDP beneficiaries, two council members and two government officials (RDP Housing representative and Housing officer).

To overcome the limitations, I had to plan my day very carefully since I couldn’t go to the participant’s houses too early and I also couldn’t go there too late. For those that were working, I had to try my best to get access to the participants by making appointments at convenient times for them. This also included the interviews with the beneficiaries, government officials and the council members.

5.8. Chapter summary
This chapter explained the key elements of the research process and planning. In doing so, key elements were discussed (i.e. research design and methodology, research sample, data collection and data analysis). Thereafter, ethical issues and the limitations of the study were also discussed. Evidently, these processes played an important role in ensuring that the trustworthiness of the research findings is ensured. The following chapter seeks to provide the findings for both qualitative and quantitative data collected in this study and the analysis thereof.
CHAPTER 6: RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

6.1. Introduction
This chapter presents and interprets data obtained from the respondents in the research study. The main aim of the research was to explore the beneficiaries’ perceptions of RDP houses and to establish whether their needs are met. The right to housing is recognised as a human right but most importantly the quality thereof should be adequate. Housing quality evaluation therefore forms the basis of proper housing to improve the quality of life for people. Residence’s perceptions are often excluded therefore resulting in solutions that do not reflect the specific needs of the residents. A mixed-methodology approach was the best approach to gain a better understanding of the analysis. The chapter begins by highlighting the demographic information of the participants. This is followed by a discussion on the beneficiaries’ understanding of adequate housing, how they perceive the quality of their previous house and the significance of owning a RDP house. The last part of the chapter highlights their perceptions of the current RDP house and the general quality of the houses. Pseudonyms were accorded to respondents to protect their identities.

6.2. PRESENTATION OF RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

6.2.1. Demographic information of respondents
This section presents the demographic information obtained from the respondents in the case study area.

6.2.2. Age and gender distribution of respondents
The findings from the data presented in Table 4 below, indicated that only 20% of the respondents owning a RDP house were above the age of 60. Respondents between the ages of 26 and 34 in possession of a RDP house indicated that they had ‘inherited’ the house after the death of their parents or that their names had been on the waiting list. Furthermore, the study revealed that most respondents owning a RDP house are well between the ages of 35 and 59. In a study conducted by Moroke (2009) on “an analysis of the housing needs in South Africa” in the North-West Province, he stated that age distribution of a population is important. The reasons included the fact that a community with a young population would need more educational resources and an elderly population would need more facilities enabling the caring of its members. In Port Nolloth, the
elderly makes up a small percentage of the population. In relation to this, the Integrated Development Plan (IDP) indicated that the Richtersveld Municipality (RVM) has an economically active population (EAP) between the ages of 18-65. The 18 – 65 population group is by far the biggest as it makes up 62% of the total population in this area. 33% of the population is less than 18 years old and only 5% are pensioners. This indicates that people leave the area once they are not economically active anymore. (RVM IDP, 2016-2017). This means that RVM has a fairly young population that is either employed, unemployed or actively looking for employment which ultimately has effect on education and job creation therefore also increasing the need for the provision of housing from government.

Table 4: Age distribution of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s field data, 2016

With regards to gender, further analysis from the data revealed a skewed discrepancy as 67.5% of the respondents were female while 32.5% were males (see Figure 8). This study is consistent with Manomano’s (2013) study at Golf Course Estate in Alice Town, Eastern Cape Province, which revealed that 62% of the respondents were females compared to 38% male. Furthermore, the study reports that gender discrepancy is a common attribute in South Africa. The research findings corroborate South African statistics that females outnumber males in the society (Statistics SA, 2010). With the high percentage of female respondents this could indicate that most households are female-headed which suggests a high poverty rate in Nollothville since it is common that female-headed households are poorer than by males (Manomano, 2013). Studies suggests that in
South Africa a large poverty gap exists between males and females in terms of income as females tend to be up to 30% poorer than men (Morgan, 2016).

**Figure 8: Gender of respondents**

![Pie chart showing gender distribution of respondents with 67.5% male and 32.5% female]

*Source: Author’s field data, 2016*

### 6.2.3. Occupation status of respondents in relation to monthly income

Employment opportunities remain an issue in Port Nolloth and since it is the main town of the Richtersveld, it attracts many people such as displaced farm workers or unemployed youth from surrounding areas who find it difficult to move directly to large cities (Zweig, 2015). Because of the mines downscaling and the lack of economic opportunities within the area, levels of poverty have increased as unemployment figures within the Municipality are high and continue to grow. Unemployment is higher amongst females compared to males (RVM IDP, 2016-2017). The findings of my research revealed that 55% of the respondents were unemployed. The only source of income they received was either from pension funds, government grants (i.e. South African Social Security Agency (SASSA,) specifically child support, disability and old persons grant) or from their children and other family members. The findings further revealed that 40% of the beneficiaries were employed. Whilst some were permanently employed (working either at the local spar, municipality or within construction), the others had casual or seasonal jobs either working as fisherman, drivers or working for the government on their Community Work Programme (CWP). Lastly, only 5% of the respondents were self-employed, running either a house shop or catering...
business (see Figure 9). In relation to the chart, it is clear that the issue of unemployment remains an issue in Port Nolloth as it does with many other towns and cities in South Africa. Literature in South Africa reveals that unemployment is increasing and that many RDP beneficiaries are often unemployed (Manomano, 2013; Africa Check, 2014). Literature also abounds that many RDP dwellers are jobless and complaints have risen regarding the lack of jobs (Manomano, 2013). This has become a serious socio-economic problem as it brings more challenges and complication in South Africa. Along with many policies and strategies tested and tried, high unemployment still remains persistent within the South Africa labour market and it mostly affects young South Africans who are either low-skilled, have little experience of formal employment or have no experience at all (Altman and Woolard, 2006). The Richtersveld Municipality has indicated that they experience common challenges such as skewed patterns of wealth distribution as well as relatively high levels of unemployment and crime (RVM IDP, 2016-2017). Also, with many people in the area not finishing school the skills base of the population is dominated by unskilled labour.

**Figure 9: Occupation status of respondents**

![Figure 9: Occupation status of respondents](http://etd.uwc.ac.za/)

Source: Author’s field data, 2016

The IDP (2016-2017) reports that of the population in the Richtersveld Municipality 9.7% receive no income. Despite this, this research indicates that majority of the respondents 52.5 % (i.e. employed, unemployed and self-employed) receive a monthly income between R1001- 2000 (US$81.31-US$162.46). This money received monthly either came from pension funds, old age grants, money from family members or from casual/seasonal jobs. In relation to this only 10% of
the respondents earned a monthly income greater than R5001 (US$405.9). These respondents indicated their work was full-time and they worked either at the municipality or by the local supermarket called Spar (see table 5 below). With most respondents receiving an income of R2000 and less, the plea has been for government to provide more opportunities as people want to liberate themselves from the vicious poverty cycle. To provide employment, the Richtersveld municipality established a database of unemployed people which assists them in placing people in their different projects. The CWP is one of these initiatives which is an innovative offering from government to provide a job safety net for unemployed people of working age. Supporting the upgrading of the fish processing facility and the jetty is another innovative offer, allowing government to involve the community in tourism (RVM IDP, 2016-2017). Most infrastructure development projects are done in a labour intensive way but still cost-effective adhering to the principles of the Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP). Consequently, despite the municipality’s effort to provide employment in the area, the opportunities are short-lived and once the project is done people are back where they started. As a result, people struggle to create a suitable living environment as they are unable to maintain their houses.

### Table 5: Income status of employed, unemployed and self-employed respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Self-employed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R0-R1000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1001-R2000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3000-R4000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5001+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to disclose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s field data, 2016
6.2.4. Number of dependents living in house

The research findings revealed that the number of dependents living in the RDP house was not really an issue. Majority of the respondents came from a small family, usually between 3 and 4 people in one house (see Figure 10). However, despite this 22.5% of the respondents indicated that they had 5 or more people residing one house. For these relatively big families, the size of the RDP home was a problem as some had children sleeping in the lounge area or parents and grandparents sharing a bedroom with their children. Those who had the money, could build another room whereas others weren’t so lucky. Whilst, the number of dependents residing in the houses were not so high, there was an indication that those residing in overcrowded houses needed more space, especially those who have more than two children. Those who had older children expressed their concern regarding the scarcity of employment for the youth as they were not able to start their lives elsewhere. Furthermore, another contributing factor to overcrowded households was the slow delivery of houses. RDP houses have been criticized for their size and research suggests that having children especially adolescents, share a room with their parents or grandparents is both an embarrassment and culturally inappropriate (Urban Landmark, 2007).

These research findings agree with studies done by Rapelang (2013) on “an evaluation of the right to access to adequate housing in Joe Morolong Local Municipality in the North Cape Province, South Africa.” In this study, an average of 23% of the respondents had 4 members residing in one house in comparison to 7% who had 2 members residing in a house. Rapelang (2013) also indicated that houses are overcrowded and often males and females, including grandchildren, are forced to share a bedroom thus providing little privacy to the family. Similarly, in a study conducted by Aigbavboa et al (2013), on residents’ perception of subsidised low-income housing in Kliptown, Johannesburg, these sentiments were also shared by the respondents. Their expectations of the size and the spacing of the houses weren’t met as they expected it would be bigger. They also indicated it restricted movement. As a result, Baqutayan et al (2015) stated that overcrowded households do not meet the criteria of adequate housing since it could affect the social and physical health of an individual. For example, housing in poor conditions (i.e. damp, no ceiling, unstable foundation and cold) can put an individual at greater risk of poorer general health, low mental wellbeing and respiratory problems including asthma and breathlessness. Furthermore, it can also create an unsafe environment for the whole family (Baqutayan et al 2015).


6.3. **Respondent’s understanding of adequate housing**

According to UN Habitat (2009), adequate housing is regarded as being more than just the four walls of a room and a roof over one’s head. This, therefore implies that adequate housing concerns more than providing shelter; housing is essential for normal healthy living and it plays an important role in ensuring human dignity. Furthermore, it should meet the physiological need for privacy and space, physical needs for security and protection from extreme weather conditions and social needs for basic gathering points where important relationships are forged and nurtured (Moroka, nd). Within this perspective, the qualitative interviews investigated what RDP beneficiaries understood by the term ‘adequate housing.’ Despite not knowing the standard definition of adequate housing, it was interesting to note that respondents had an idea of what it entails. They expected good quality houses with a bathroom (bath and toilet installed) as well as houses built according to the needs of each household (e.g. a spacious house able to accommodate big families with 4 or more members). For many, the house they received did not meet their expectations and although they were grateful for the roof over their heads, many believed that adequate housing should consist of more than an empty shell. For example, Beneficiary 1 is a pensioner and she highlighted what she viewed as an adequate house, stating that:
Well, for a normal human being, you would have a lounge, you have three bedrooms for your kids. You would have a decent kitchen with a sink and maybe one or two kitchen cupboards. At least have a bathroom which has a bath in it that you can at least have a bath [and a shower over the top], a toilet. I would call that adequate and of course you would have ceiling in your home to make it warmer.

In relation to the above, RDP Beneficiary 3 is employed and works for CWP. Despite the little income she receives, she has tried to work on the house every month. In this regard, her children financially assisted her. She expressed that she was unsure of the standard definition of housing but stated that:

*Adequate should mean decent. My parent’s house is still standing after all these years but when I moved into my RDP house I had to fix a lot of things and the foundation is unstable. My house was actually one of the houses that was declared a hazard according to the municipality but it can’t be demolished because I have nowhere to go.*

The extracts above indicate the respondent’s dissatisfaction with their RDP houses. Their views clearly indicate that a house should not only be regarded as having a roof over one’s head but that there are certain factors which should be taken into consideration when determining whether a house constitutes as ‘adequate housing’. As discussed in Chapter Two the idea of housing quality as to whether it is adequate is quite subjective and may vary from place to place. So, for example, while a person in a shack in an informal settlement may find the house that RDP beneficiary 1 and 2 refers to as much better than what he/she lives in, RDP beneficiary 1 and 2 are right to complain about the condition of their houses. Therefore, for the respondents who received the RDP house they believed that the houses were inhabitable to live in based on their experience and interpretation on what should constitutes ‘adequate housing’.

Also, because of making improvements to their houses beneficiaries complained that it compromised the attainment of other basic needs. In Chapter 3, Maslow identified that house should ideally be designed in a way that would promote the fulfilment of the occupant’s different needs (Maslow, 1943). For him, the provision of a house constituted as the basic need for shelter was already fulfilled; however, beneficiaries couldn’t meet their social and aesthetic needs as well as the need for self-actualisation given their financial status. In the study conducted by Rapelang
(2013), he stated that housing should be affordable in the sense that beneficiaries should not be depriving of their other needs by digging into their own pockets to pay for their housing.

Furthermore, according to Rapelang (2013), other elements that contributed to making housing ‘adequate’ was access to basic services and facilities. Although respondents had basic facilities in the house such as electricity, running water and a toilet, they did not have a shower or bath or warm water. Unfortunately, only some of the respondents could either put in a bath or shower as well install a geyser or solar panels whilst the other still use buckets to wash themselves from and boil water for bath time. During the interviews RDP beneficiaries also complained that the area is poorly located and not in proximity to the clinic, shops, schools and other social amenities. This made it especially difficult for the elderly as they must walk a far distance to just get to the shop, clinic or municipality. Similarly, in a study conducted by Moolla and Kotze and Block (2011), RDP house beneficiaries in Braamfischerville in Soweto, Johannesburg in Gauteng also found that respondents were unhappy regarding the travelling distances to access social services.

Considering this and since housing is only regarded as a shelter, a building or a place that should provide protection makes the argument is weak because a house should not only be a physical structure. In identifying that housing is about fulfilling basic needs other aspects should also be taken into consideration to ensure that the fulfilment of these other needs are also met (i.e. affordability, access to basic facilities/credit, economic growth and social development) (Moroke, nd). Based on the definition of adequate housing, it can be concluded that RDP houses fail to meet the requirements of what determines ‘adequate housing. Influenced by various factors, it is therefore evident that all angles should be considered and not only the house as a physical structure when referring to the term ‘adequate’ and that views differ within the context of a certain area.

6.4. Perception of the quality of the previous house
The research findings revealed that 42.5% of the respondents perceived the quality of the house they previously lived in to be good. For those who perceived the previous houses to be in good condition, they indicated that they had previously stayed with family members whilst the others received houses from the mine or factory where they worked. Unfortunately, since the house did not belong to them, once they stopped working for the mine or factory they had to leave the house. Furthermore, 32.5% perceived the quality to be fair. They explained they rented and they often
had to take what they could get. The 25% who considered it to be poor indicated that they previously stayed in zinc houses with no inside toilets, no water or electricity. Others stayed in caravans moving around from one place to another or they resided in backyards dwelling which were not well looked after (see Table 6).

**Table 6: Perceptions of the quality of the previous house**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of previous house</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s field data, 2016

These findings depict that whilst the majority indicated that the previous houses were in a good condition, the need for housing had been a consistent and persistent problem among respondents as most of the respondents did not own the house. The houses they stayed in previously were either houses they received temporarily from the mine if they worked there, some rented whilst other stayed with their parents who resided in subsidy houses built during the apartheid years. Many also stated that those houses were of much better quality than the RDP house they moved into.

**6.5. Significance of owning a RDP house**

The findings of the research suggest that 95% of the beneficiaries agreed to the fact that receiving a RDP house gave them a sense of self-esteem while 5% disagreed (see Figure 11). Maslow relates the concept of self-esteem to the feeling individuals get when they are valued and accepted by the people around them. Consequently, in context to housing individuals feel that a clean, satisfying house can gain the respect from others (Datta, 2008; Chavarria et al, 2014).
As previously discussed research has indicated that housing can affect an individual’s mental and physical health either positively or negatively. Housing therefore performs five major functions, namely, the provision of shelter, space, safety, address and protection of health (Muoghalu, 1991). Since society is concerned with the fulfilment of basic living needs, it is important that the need be sufficiently met to improve the beneficiaries’ living situation. In response to owning their own house, residents were also asked what their expectations were before the house was allocated to them. Many indicated that they had no expectations as they were in desperate need of a house, since they were either renting, staying in an overcrowded house or in a shack. For others, they expected a bigger house, structure with quality finish and a ceiling. They referred to this as to how a normal house should look. The research findings in this study corroborated these sentiments. For example, RDP Beneficiary 4, who is a pensioner living with her daughter and 2 grandchildren, stated that:

*RDP houses are too small. I can live in something like this and have a spare bedroom for my grandchildren but you can’t stuff families in here. You can put a mother, a father and child in this to be humane. To force big families into such a small house is inhumane.*

For many the size of the house remains a concern for bigger families. Nhlapo (2013) stated that overcrowding in the public houses indicated inadequate space. For example, sleeping areas which are too small to accommodate the number of people residing in the house. Furthermore, he also
highlighted that these conditions were further aggravated by other family members visiting and occupants also indicated that too much noise or in some cases too much drinking may make it difficult for children to cope with their learning. Even though people have different ideas about the ideal size for a house as well as the number of bedrooms required for a house, this research found that most of the occupants were unhappy about the size of the house.

While RDP Beneficiary 4 and others were critical of the quality of the RDP houses provided, a government official critiqued this view by arguing that:

*RDP houses are free if you meet the criteria and the government does many things. People are getting a roof over the head, ceiling etc. I understand that that the Constitution talks about shelter, safety, security and all of those things and therefore people think government should provide everything for free and that is why they complain. But the way I see it, government is providing more than enough to the people. Out of my understanding, I feel it meets their needs* (Government official 2).

Findings from the research suggested that the respondents did not quite feel that the provision of the RDP house fulfils all their needs. Despite the size of the house, there were also other factors that hindered their pride of home ownership such as the poor-quality construction which resulted in the need for constant maintenance of the house and envy at the improvements made to the new RDP houses. Nevertheless, despite the houses not fully meeting their needs the respondents were grateful for the house they had received. For them having a house, (despite the size and however flawed), was better than having no house opposed to renting, living with families in overcrowded conditions, or living in a shack. Similarly, Nhlapo (2013) in her study on ‘the experience of moving from an informal settlement to a secure stable home,’ also found that respondents were satisfied with owning a house; however, they experienced some difficulty expressing their opinions when they were asked how owning a house changed their lives.

During the interviews, there was also some respondents who agreed with the government officials. RDP Beneficiary 5, who is unemployed and living with her husband and children, indicated that she was quite satisfied with the house she received:
I was very happy to get a house. My husband and I previously stayed with my sister and although it was a brick house, it only had 1 room, a kitchen with a toilet. It was very small. This house is much bigger than my sister’s house and we have a house to call our own.

These sentiments were also shared by RDP Beneficiary 6 who is seasonal worker and living with his wife. He indicated:

*I had no expectations of the house. I just wanted a house because I was always renting, always depended on other people. This house gave me a sense of ownership as my wife and I could dream about our future plans. Over time we have renovated the house and made it our own.*

Despite the concerns raised regarding the issues of RDP houses, one thing that was clear is that respondents were content with their ownership of the house. For the respondents owning their own house was the most positive aspect of their housing environment. They were also happy to receive a brick house as they previously did not have a house and they felt by owning their own house they could at least renovate it or extend it when they had money. Corroborating these findings, Kellet and Moore (2003) in their study of 'what became of Mandela’s houses’, also indicated that attributes such as a person’s identity, the place they live in as well as their social context all contribute to the importance of owning a house. In another study on ‘housing and family well-being’, Bratt (2002) also suggested owning a house is very important as it provides an individual with satisfactory living space and offers a chance to generate self-esteem and empowerment. In the literature, most people preferred owning a house as opposed to renting or staying with family members because it provides a sense of stability and security for them (Nhlapo, 2013). Many also regard it as an asset for them to pass onto their children. Furthermore, it was also revealed that owning a house is the most important measure of household satisfaction and it stimulates personal investment in housing which would otherwise would not be possible (Mehlomakulu and Marais, 1999). The ownership of a house provides them with the freedom for them and loved ones to do what they want in the yard (i.e. expand or renovate and the basic need shelter). This therefore confirms the argument that owning a house does create a sense of self-esteem according Maslow’s hierarchy of needs.
6.6. Perceptions of the current RDP house

Since the term housing quality is subjective, several authors have stressed the importance of capturing an individual’s experience and perceptions (Coley et al, 2012). Based on this understanding, one can say that a person’s perception to a large extent measures the level of satisfaction towards their house gives indication of the degree of fit between residents’ current housing conditions, housing aspirations as well as housing problems (Opoko et al, 2016). The findings from the research suggests that 35% of the respondents perceived the houses to be good. A further 25% found the quality of the houses to be fair of which the respondents only had a few concerns regarding the houses (see Table 7 below).

Table 7: Perception of the RDP houses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of RDP house</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s field data, 2016

Those who considered the houses to be in good condition said that they were grateful for the house since it was free and they had privacy. Interviews from the beneficiaries further revealed that despite the many negative perceptions they had about the house there were also some positive feelings towards it. For RDP Beneficiary 3, since she was unable to find a stable secure home for her and the children, they just rented. She asserted that “The positive thing about the RDP house is that at least I have a roof over my head.” RDP Beneficiary 7, who previously stayed in a shack with her family, similarly showed her appreciation for her RDP house, stating that “We have our own space and the house is made of brick and not corrugated iron sheets.”

RDP Beneficiary 4, although grateful for the RDP, however, felt that more needed to be done to make people comfortable. This is what she had to say:

_We are grateful, don’t think for a second we are not, but government needs to accommodate people in the correct manner. You cannot accommodate people the same as everyone else because every family differs._

http://etd.uwc.ac.za/
It is interesting to note that the only positive perception beneficiaries had about the houses was that it provided shelter. Similar research conducted by Cewuka (2013), also indicated that participants appreciated their houses despite it being sub-standard. Many overlook these defects in the houses since they are desperate for a house and, as a result, overlook their right to adequate housing. As opposed to the respondents who indicated that the houses were good and fair, 40% perceived the houses to be of poor condition revealing that the houses are not meant for humans. These concerns were also shared by Johannesburg Mayor Herman Mashaba, who expressed that almost all the RDP houses built so far were unsuitable for habitation by human beings (Nhlabathi, 2017). He also stated that many beneficiaries expressed their dissatisfaction of the RDP house.

Given this level of dissatisfaction, the respondents were also asked to indicate their areas of concern (see Table 8 below). These concerns include the size (82.5%), cracking walls (60%), leaking water pipes (52.5%), weak roofs (50%), unstable foundation (42.5%), other (e.g. no doors, windows, bath/shower, tiles, sink or ceiling (32.5%) and mold (15%). In relation to these concerns, some indicated that they noticed these problems occurred immediately when they moved whilst others only noticed them a few months after moving in. Most of the occupants said that these problems occurred within a year of living in the house.
Table 8: Areas of concern regarding the RDP houses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leaking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cracking walls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unstable foundation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weak roofs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mold</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s field data, 2016

Sentiments from the government officials and council members corroborates these findings as no one mentioned any positive aspects about the first RDP house instead constantly referred to the new houses.

Current housing plan is painted inside and outside, ceiling is put in and bathroom. Before they had plastic pipes put in. The houses which were built recently are much better than the previous ones (Government official 1).

Similar thoughts were also shared by Council Member 1 who asserted that:

It’s a fact to say that the houses that have been built now is in a much better condition than the previous ones. If I must make a comparison, I will say that there was definitely an improvement in the second phase of the houses built. With the first houses built we had difficulty with contractors as their agenda was to put the money in their own pockets.
In relation to the above statement, other studies have also revealed that within South Africa most people had negative perceptions of the RDP house and that the contractors/developers contracted to build the houses did a shoddy job (Manomano, 2013). Furthermore, the outcome of the interviews revealed that most of the beneficiaries had a negative perception about the RDP houses especially the first implementation of the houses. These negative outcomes painted grim pictures of the houses in terms of its quality and culminated in recommendations for the demolition of the houses as they were in such a bad state that they were referred to as a health and safety risk. Based on a report on low-cost housing problems presented to Parliament in 2013, Thuli Madonsela, also indicated that houses didn’t have proper foundations and that the houses were built from cheap material therefore some had to demolished and rebuilt. In one year Madonsela’s office received over 5 000 complaints about the quality of RDP housing (Fokazi, 2013). This corroborates the findings of the research suggesting that many houses were built to the extent that made it difficult for people to reside in it.

6.7. General quality and maintenance of the RDP house
Whilst the provision of these houses, can meet the need of a roof over their heads for many respondents and the satisfaction of owning their own house. In response to the quality of the RDP houses, the beneficiaries indicated that they were not properly built and that the contractors used cheap material to build the houses, resulting in the provision of sub-standard houses. For example, where the quality was concerned 37.5% of the respondents indicated that the floors were of poor quality as it was cement and which made the house cold. The quality of the doors was another issue, as some 57.5 % of the respondents indicated they moved into a house which had no bedroom or bathroom doors or they did not have handles whilst 27.5 % complained about their weak roofs that had no ceiling and they had to place rocks on top of the roof to keep it from blowing off (see Table 9 below).
Table 9: Perception regarding the quality of the RDP houses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of floors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State of doors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State of walls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State of toilet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weak roofs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faulty windows</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s field data, 2016

As previously mentioned in Chapter 2, housing characteristics are very important in meeting the physiological, psychological, health and security needs of a resident. Based on the questionnaire and interviews it was quite clear that beneficiaries were dissatisfied with the quality of their houses. These complaints mainly came from those who resided in first RDP houses, although the residents residing in the new houses also had some issues. The following sentiments from RDP Beneficiary 6 corroborates the findings: “Houses are cold; they don’t even put in tiled floors or a wooden floor even would’ve been better than cement. Cement is cold.”
RDP Beneficiary 2 shared these sentiments. She indicated that she didn’t have big expectations and she just wanted a home to call her own. However, she was not impressed with the house she received:

I basically received a frame when I moved in and had to fix everything myself. I received the house without a toilet pot, windows or doors. All this I had to put in myself even the drainage system, plastering of walls and putting in tiles.

In relation to the above, respondents also maintained the second phase of the RDP houses was much better than their houses. The extract below captures RDP beneficiary 8’s feelings towards the new houses and her house: “The new houses that were built after our houses are of better quality. Currently, my walls have cracks in it and are cracking and the foundation is above the ground.”

Findings from the beneficiaries indicated that the quality of the RDP houses were very poor. As previously indicated complaints varied from the quality of the floors, to the state of doors, walls, toilet, weak roofs, faulty windows and unstable foundation. Other issues included dust that would get blown into the house since they had no ceiling and plastering that had to be done to prevent water from seeping through the walls. The poor quality of the RDP houses poses a great health risk to the beneficiaries as some of the houses are not habitable. Many RDP house are built with cheap materials that does not protect the houses from environmental damage and other weather hazards (Manomano, 2013). It is also apparent from the beneficiaries’ viewpoints that the poor quality of houses prompted psychological, emotional and social loss. In relation to Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, studies have found that poor quality housing can cause can cause psychological stress and it can also have a negative impact on an individual’s self-esteem as well as family-sufficiency (Mohamed et al, 2015).

There have been ongoing debates about the development of RDP houses regarding the standard and the quality of these houses as government has yet to set a level of acceptable standards required for contractors and developers. Government and council members also agreed that the quality of the RDP houses are poor. Government Official 2 stated that the:

First RDP houses are built of a very low standard. Contractors did a very poor job. Complaints have been about the walls and floors that have cracks and since there is no
ceiling the weather also plays a role as the south wind can cause health hazards for the people with all the dust going into the houses (Government official 2).

Similar thoughts were also shared by Council member 1 who also stated that: “The Municipality is struggling in terms of the foundation of the houses. The municipality is struggling because the door for example is on the south end and the south wind is blowing all day.”

In response to the above, government officials and council members suggested that they were aware of the issue and they agreed with the fact that the first RDP houses were sub-standard. It was also mentioned that since the municipality did not directly oversee the first implementation of the RDP houses, much corruption occurred as cheap material was used to build the houses, thus resulting in the provision of sub-standard houses. The literature reveals that the state regarding the quality of the RDP houses provided by the post-apartheid government has been questioned many times (Gelb, 2003).

Given the above extracts the quality of the houses is the major issue. Despite respondents expressing that the RDP house is of assistance to them, it has also become a financial burden as many are unemployed but now must pay for necessary repairs. These concerns were also raised by the Council member 1:

How do you provide a house knowing that the person doesn’t really have an income? Now you providing a house knowing the walls aren’t plastered, there is not ceiling etc. At the end of the day, the person receiving the house must dig into his/her own pocket. How do they (government) expect people to come out of the poverty cycle?

Because of the various issues regarding the houses, beneficiaries have approached the municipality to assist them since they were promised decent houses but nothing has been done so far. Beneficiaries have cited that approaching the local municipality has been a waste of time as complaints were laid and a door-to-door campaign was initiated by the local municipality yet nothing transpired from it. Similar studies also concluded that government did nothing to assist beneficiaries 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 built houses (Tissington, 2011). They insisted that everyone should maintain their own houses since it was no longer the property of the municipality. When the researcher asked about those houses that had
been considered a safety and health hazard, government officials as well as council members maintained that a rectification project is in the pipeline. However, because of the backlog of houses they face a challenge of placing the people elsewhere.

The findings agree with the observation done by the researcher who also found the foundation to be unstable since it was built on soft sand. Since Nolothville is close to the ocean, RDP beneficiaries indicated that contractors did not take the weather and geography into account when they built the house since the foundation is being eroded by the wind and water (see Figure 12).

**Figure 12: RDP house with unstable foundation**

![RDP house with unstable foundation](http://etd.uwc.ac.za/)

**Source:** Author’s field data, 2016

Further observations by the researcher also found that the houses had no ceiling and the floor was made of cement (see Figures 13 and 14).

**Figure 13: RDP house with no ceiling**

![RDP house with no ceiling](http://etd.uwc.ac.za/)

**Source:** Author’s field data, 2016
Figure 14: RDP house with no inside doors

Source: Author’s field data, 2016

By having no ceiling, occupants were exposed to dusty conditions and the house was extremely cold threatening their health. Occupants explained that the houses were cold even in summer and in winter it was worse. Another physical aspect is the drainage system never gets cleaned and for some respondents that had to put in their own pipes (see figure 14). Many complained that drainage system is of no use since loose pipes didn’t get replaced or they had to replace the pipes, and that drains often overflows which threatens their health.

Figure 15: RDP house with self-made plastic pipes

Source: Author’s field data, 2016
Given the problems, many beneficiaries indicated in the survey, that improvements were made on the house at their own expense which was often done only when funds were available. The improvements included plastering of the walls, installing new doors (some houses had no doors inside), ceiling, windows, a sink, a shower/bathtub, a geyser, repairing the cracked walls, painting, replacing leaking taps, pipes as well as the toilet and tiling the whole house. While some made improvements to the house, others also extended the house by making each section bigger (i.e. bathroom, kitchen, lounge), others also added extra rooms because the size of the house is too small. Others have also recognized this need for improvement but they have no money for it.

6.6. Chapter summary
This chapter discussed the data obtained from the questionnaires, interviews and observation conducted by the researcher. Although the study was based on a relatively small sample of respondents residing in Nollothville, the findings provide their perception of the quality of the RDP houses and whether their needs were met. Using a mixed-methodology approach, findings from the research analysis and the results could address research objectives formulated in Chapter 1. Findings revealed that the respondent’s expectation of a quality RDP house was not met. Regarding the standard and quality of the RDP houses, reports from the respondents suggest that houses were not properly built. Complaints of households vary from the size of the RDP house, to faulty window, doors and roofs that leaked but this could probably also be because of bad craftsmanship. However, despite their complaints, respondents indicated that they were grateful for the house and for most it had improved their living situations. Besides meeting the basic needs (i.e. shelter), findings reveals that the respondents cannot progress to the higher level as suggested by Maslow’s hierarchy of needs.
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION; SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION

7.1. Introduction
The purpose of the study was to assess how RDP beneficiaries perceive their houses in Nollothville and whether these houses in their current conditions meet their needs. The literature review revealed that access to housing is a right, which seeks to meet the growing need to provide shelter. However, the right to adequate housing has not been met, which has meant that many beneficiaries are unable to improve their living situation. The study was therefore conducted to establish the beneficiaries’ perceptions of the RDP houses, whether the houses meet their needs and the influence these houses have on their lives. To achieve the research aims, a mixed-method approach data was obtained through the distribution of questionnaires, conducting semi-structured interviews and observation by the researcher. This chapter discusses the key findings, recommendations and conclusion of the study.

7.1.1. Research objective 1: To understand how the beneficiaries perceive their houses
Since housing quality is a product of subjective judgment, the findings from the study resulted from the overall perception of the RDP beneficiaries. It was established that that conflicting opinions about the perceived quality of the houses exist. The findings revealed that RDP beneficiaries perceived their houses to be of sub-standard quality. Most respondents complained about the poor quality of the doors (57.5%), walls (42.5%), windows (32.5%) and roofs (30%). Issues concerned regarding quality of the house varied from weak/leaking roofs, cracks in the walls, unstable foundations to un-plastered walls, loose windows, no doors, and generally the ‘unfinished’ nature of their houses. In relation to these issues, the beneficiaries complained about the wind that gets blown into the houses which served as a health risk, especially for the children and the elderly. These issues were especially highlighted by the beneficiaries who moved into the first phase of RDP housing as they indicated that the contractors used cheap materials to build the houses. Beneficiaries also reported that they had to wait some time before moving into their house and since the houses stood empty they were vandalised. However, when they communicated this to the municipality they were told that the houses are their responsibility. This, however, poses an issue as houses are built and they need to be maintained. However, with the high unemployment levels in the area beneficiaries can’t afford the upkeep of the houses. Also, with the rectification project that is still in the pipeline, concerns were raised as there is already a housing backlog in
Port Nolloth and they don’t know where they should place the residents once they project is implemented. Evidently, slow delivery and poor quality of houses is the result of lack of capacity in the municipality to ensure regular monitoring of the projects. Findings from the studies revealed sub-standard houses poses a great issue to the beneficiaries as they must spend money on fixing the defects in the houses and often this can’t be done within one month as building materials are expensive and they must also pay for labour. With many unemployed and unable to tend to the issues themselves they have turned to the municipality. Despite numerous complaints and some also reporting that their house is a safety hazard, nothing has been done as municipality has indicated that there is no money and they also have a housing backlog. This, after Lindiwe Sisulu former Minister of Housing in 2009, promised that she would focus on the quality of houses and would have badly constructed houses demolished and rectified (Tissington, 2011). Consequently, with the second phase of the RDP houses many beneficiaries, even those residing in the new RDP houses indicated that the second phase of the RDP houses was of much better quality than the first houses. Municipality also indicated that they were more involved when the second phase of the houses were built thus overseeing that the houses are properly built.

7.1.2. Research objective 2: To establish whether RDP houses meet the needs of the community
The findings from the study revealed that the RDP beneficiaries were grateful for the free houses but many felt that the house they received did not adequately meet their needs and expectations. As mentioned in Chapter 3, ideally a house should be designed in such a way that promotes the satisfaction of an occupant’s different needs (i.e. from the physiological needs to the higher level of self-actualisation). However, before the house can cater for the social needs and self-actualisation needs it must fulfil the basic physic need (i.e. shelter, hygiene, rest and light). In turn, the physical quality of living environment becomes one of the factors that predict occupants’ satisfaction towards housing. While the perceptions of housing may differ across different contexts, the respondents of Nollothville spoke to their reality. Findings therefore suggest much dissatisfaction regarding the RDP houses and those who expectations were higher referred to the provision of the RDP house as just an empty shell. Being a community with a poor economic background, they expected government to provide them with better quality houses. It was indicated by many respondents that the constant need for repairs created an unnecessary financial strain.
Since many of the respondents are unable to better their lives and maintain their houses, their level of needs is still on the bottom level in terms of Maslow hierarchy of needs. As a result, for many the house only constitutes as a physical shelter.

Respondents also criticised the size of the rooms in the house indicating that it is ‘inhumane’ for government to think that big families can live in such small houses. While most respondents complained about the finishes such as plastering, others also complained about the dust and cold air entering through the roof as no ceilings were put in the houses. Many were also unhappy about the poor quality of the house such as leaking roofs, weak and crumbling walls, cement floors and unstable foundations. Furthermore, respondents perceived that their need for social service weren’t properly met as the distance to the shops and hospital was far. Their safety needs were also not adequately met as they had no burglar proofing or fencing around the house. Gilbert (2007) claimed that provision of houses to the poor can be ineffective if the needs and priorities are ignored as the real need always lies beyond shelter. Consequently, the way the development process was administered effectively disregarded the real needs and the expectations of the beneficiaries and the notion of the government in realising the constitutional right to adequate housing.

7.1.3. Research objective 3: To describe the people’s experience before and after receiving a RDP house
The findings revealed that receiving a RDP houses not only provided a sense of ownership but for many relocating from either an overcrowded house or an informal settlement, this was an improvement on their quality of life. They could dream about the future and renovate the house. However, other respondents felt that as much as some aspects of their lives had changed through relocating and receiving a house, they felt they were not much better off and their lives had not quite change as much as they anticipated. Previously, they weren’t spending so much because they were either living for free or they were just paying rent and the owners would take care of the other issues of the house. On the other hand, many expressed happiness before receiving the houses but after receiving it they were quite disappointed by the size of the house and for many the state that the house was in. Some even mentioned that their parent’s houses which was built during the apartheid years were in much better conditions forty years later, than their RDP houses.
Subsequently, the general observation made from the study was that despite certain issues beneficiaries had with the houses they were grateful for it and they indicated that they could have family over or even renovate the house when they eventually get money.

7.2. Recommendations
The following recommendations should be taken into consideration to mitigate and improve the housing situation in Nollothville:

7.2.1. Involve the private sector
There is an apparent communication gap between the private sector and the government involved in the current approach to housing delivery and solutions. Since owning a house is the most important measure of household satisfaction and government is ultimately responsible for providing houses address this gap can stimulate personal investment in housing which would otherwise would not be possible (Mehlomakulu and Marais, 1999). The municipality should create an initiative to gain financial assistance from private company owners to assist in the housing development process as well housing construction. Furthermore, with their help the municipality should further create a platform where all sectors can offer their expertise and knowledge regarding sustainable human settlements. During an interview, one of the ward councilors stated that the local municipality was working on a plan to seek assistance from local businesses (e.g. Mica Paint and Hardware Retail Store) and other businesses that sell building material. Consequently, more emphasis should be placed on developing and implementing such a long-term plan, especially since there is already a backlog in houses and some occupant’s housing conditions are rapidly deteriorating because of the weather conditions.

7.2.2. Create more focus on housing upgrades
Government should provide more resources and recognition on building capacity within communities. Doing this, will enable community members to make more of their own improvements by cooperating with various parties. This could be a viable approach as more integration between community members would be allowed. Furthermore, it could also provide socially adjusted solutions, while the resources needed for housing improvement would be more immediate and distribution can be done more extensively.
7.2.3. Encourage more community involvement
During the interviews, many complaints arose from the beneficiaries that their voice was taken into consideration. They also stated that previous door-to-door campaigns had been conducted by the government based on the problems regarding their houses; however, nothing has escalated from the surveys. It is important that government encourage more community participation and the feedback from the community members should be central in identifying problems and finding solutions to address the problems. The current top-down, developer-led, master-planned approach that is being created in communities has proved to be an ineffective method of delivery and beneficiaries should be allowed to layout their requirements concerning new houses built.

7.3. Conclusion
This chapter gives a summary by concluding the findings of the study that attempted to answer the research questions provided in chapter one. Regarding the study, several conclusions can be drawn from the discussion and outcomes thereof. Firstly, the term housing quality is a difficult concept to define as it varies one person to the other and across cities/countries. In this research for example there were many complaints about the houses yet the beneficiaries were grateful to when they received a house. Secondly, there are many factors that need to be taken into consideration when providing someone with house and it should fulfill all their needs not just provide shelter. Lastly, since housing policies have become more complicated government should work hard to improve the conditions of the houses and not only focus on the demand thereof but also provide quality houses. Local authorities need to play a more active role if they are to take on the task of housing development in their area. For example, were problems have been reported to the local municipality nothing has been done so far as the municipality also struggles with a backlog of houses. Since the Richtersveld municipality is responsible for other surrounding areas, (not just Port Nolloth) it makes it almost impossible to solve all issues at once. With limited research on this area, the research findings can be used to tackle the impact of inadequate housing condition on beneficiaries and addressing people’s needs. However, there is a need for more comprehensive research. Based on all the available evidence, this research can be considered to support the notion that RDP houses are no different to the other RDP houses built in other areas/provinces as beneficiaries in Nollothville also view their houses to be of low quality and their perceptions thereof is influenced by certain housing attributes as well the organizational capacity of housing providers.
APPENDIX A
Semi-structured interview schedule for government officials

**Project Title:** Assessing beneficiary perceptions of the efficacy of RDP housing: A case study of housing projects in Nollothville, Northern Cape.

1. In which directorate do you work and what are your responsibilities?
2. What role do you play in promoting housing project?
3. What is your office’s satisfaction on the quality of work done by the contractors for the RDP houses?
4. What is your perception on the RDP houses which have been provided to the community?
5. Do you think the provision of these houses meet the needs of the beneficiaries?
6. There seems to be some concern about the quality of the RDP houses, can you speak around this issue?
7. How have these complaints been addressed?
8. Do you think National Government has put enough attention on the plight of housing issues in small towns such as Port Nolloth?
APPENDIX B
Semi-structured interview schedule for council members

**Project Title:** Assessing beneficiary perceptions of the efficacy of RDP housing: A case study of housing projects in Nollothville, Northern Cape.

1. Please tell me about yourself (particular work/role in the community especially as it relates to housing).
2. What is your perception on the services that are provided to the beneficiaries of the RDP houses?
3. What is your perception on the RDP houses which have been provided to the community?
4. Do you think the provision of these houses meet the needs of the beneficiaries?
5. There seems to be some concern about the quality of the RDP houses, can you speak around this issue?
6. How have you addressed complaints issued by the RDP beneficiaries?
7. Do you think National Government has put enough attention on the plight of housing issues in small towns such as Port Nolloth?
8. In your opinion what can the government do to improve the RDP housing situation?
APPENDIX C
Semi-structured interview schedule for RDP beneficiaries

Project Title: Assessing beneficiary perceptions of the efficacy of RDP housing: A case study of housing projects in Nollothville, Northern Cape.

1. Please tell me about yourself (gender, educational level, source of income).
2. Are you originally from Port Nolloth? If not, why did you decide to move here?
3. How did you find out about the RDP housing programme?
4. What was your living situation before receiving a RDP house and has it improved?
5. What do you believe is adequate housing?
6. What are your perceptions (positive and negative aspects) of the RDP houses?
7. What can you say about the RDP houses in terms of quality? Are there any problems so far?
APPENDIX D
Survey questionnaire for RDP beneficiaries

Project Title: Assessing beneficiary perceptions of the efficacy of RDP housing: A case study of housing projects in Nollothville, Northern Cape.

Date of interview……………………………….

Respondent number ……………………………….

Objective of the study

The purpose of the study is to investigate how the RDP houses are perceived. Please respond to the following questions by ticking in the appropriate box of choice. All information collected in this questionnaire is anonymous and confidential. It will take 20-30 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Section A: Demographic information

1. What is your age?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-25 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-34 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-50 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-59 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 years old and above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What is your gender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. What is your current occupation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual labourer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What is your monthly income?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1000 rand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001-2000 rand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-3000 rand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001-4000 rand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4001-5000 rand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001+ rand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to disclose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section B: People who are staying in the RDP houses and their incomes

5. How many people live in the household?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No dependants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. How many people living in the household are employed? Please elaborate


7. If no one is employed in the household what is/are sources of income? Please elaborate


Section C: Perception of housing quality

8. Where did you live before you received a RDP house?


8.1 What was the quality of the house that you lived in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8.2 Please elaborate on the above question


9. Did getting your own house give you a sense of self-esteem?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
9.1 Please elaborate on the above question

……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

10. What is your perception on the space adequacy of the RDP house? Please elaborate

……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

11. How do you perceive the quality of your RDP house?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. What are the areas of concern with regard to the quality of your house? (You can tick more than one).

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cracking walls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstable foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak roofs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mould</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. How would you rate the following defects of the house?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defect</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of doors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of toilet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak roof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faulty windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13.1 Please elaborate on the above-mentioned defects

14. When did you start noticing these defects in the house?

15. Did you approach the local municipality with regards to the above-mentioned concerns? Please elaborate

16. Have you made any improvements on house since occupancy? Please elaborate

17. If so, how many times and what was the nature of improvements? Please elaborate
18. What was your expectation of the housing unit before it was allocated to you?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

19. What is your perception of the expected needs against what you are provided?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

20. To what extent has the RDP house met your needs?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

21. What steps do you think can be taken by government to improve the quality of the RDP houses?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

Thank you for taking your time in completing this questionnaire
APPENDIX E
Letter of consent

I………………………………………………………………………………, have had the opportunity to ask any questions related to this study, and received satisfactory answers to my questions, and any additional details I wanted.

I agree to take part in this research.

I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary. I am free not to participate and have the right to withdraw from the study at any time, without having to explain myself.

I am aware that this interview might result in research which may be published, but my name may be/ not be used (circle appropriate).

I understand that if I don’t want my name to be used that this will be ensured by the researcher.

I may also refuse to answer any questions that I don’t want to answer.

Date: ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Participant Name: ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Participant Signature: ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Interviewer name: ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Interviewer Signature: ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………

If you have any questions concerning this research, feel free to call Charnelle Dunn on 0844078929 or my supervisor, Dr A Karriem on 0219593853.
APPENDIX F
Information sheet

Project Title: Assessing beneficiary perceptions of the efficacy of RDP housing: A case study of housing projects in Nollothville, Northern Cape

What is this study about?

This research project is being conducted by Charnelle Dunn, a student at the University of the Western Cape. You are invited to participate in this study as you are a key stakeholder in the RDP housing project. The purpose of this research is to assess the perceptions you may have towards the efficacy of the RDP housing. We hope that the research will provide possible suggestions and recommendations which government can use to improve the quality of the RDP houses.

What will I be asked to do if I agree to participate?

You will be asked to complete a questionnaire in which you will be asked to share information, suggestions and opinions on the RDP houses in which you reside. The interview will take 30-45 minutes and it will take place within your community. You will have the opportunity to ask for clarification on any of the questions and for it to be translated to Afrikaans.

Would my participation in this study be kept confidential?

All your personal information will be kept confidential and will remain anonymous, if that is your choice. You will be required to sign a consent form to protect your privacy and confidentiality while participating in this study. The identity of the people to be interviewed will be kept confidentially and details of identity will only be provided voluntary or used only with consent. The information collected will be kept safe and used for the purpose for this research project. In the research report, identity of the participants will be protected to the maximum.

What are the risks of this research?

There are no risks involved in participating in this research project. The aim and the objective will be made clear from the start.
What are the benefits of this research?

This research is not designed to help the participant personally. The findings from the research will however provide recommendations for effective and efficient implementation of future programs to government and all stakeholders.

Do I have to be in this research and may I stop participating at any time?

Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. You may choose not to participate and to stop participating at any time you want. If you stop or decide not to participate, you will not lose anything.

Is any assistance available if I am negatively affected by participating in this study?

There are no negative effects that could happen from participating in this study.

What if I have questions?

This research is being conducted by Charnelle Dunn, a student at the University of the Western Cape. Her contact number is +27 844078929.

If you have any questions about the research study itself, please contact Dr Abdulrazack Karriem at The Institute for Social Development (ISD), University of the Western Cape, his telephone number, +27 (021) 959 3853.

Should you have any questions regarding this study and your rights as a research participant or if you wish to report any problems you have experienced related to the study, please contact:

Professor Julian May  
Head of Department: Institute for Social Development  
School of Government  
University of the Western Cape  
Private Bag X17 112  
Bellville 7535

This research has been approved by the University of the Western Cape’s Senate Research Committee and Ethics Committee.
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