

**EVALUATING THE IMPACT OF
LOW-COST HOUSING ON BENEFICIARIES
AT
KWAMATHUKUZA, NEWCASTLE,
KWAZULU-NATAL**

NOMFUNDO SANDRA KAKAZA

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

**Masters of Development Studies,
Faculty of Humanities,
Development and Social Sciences,
University of KwaZulu-Natal**

November 2011

Durban

Abstract

Informed by the sustainable livelihoods (SL) approach, this project investigates whether the impact of the KwaMathukuza housing project has gone beyond meeting the basic human need for shelter to have a broader positive impact on the lives and livelihoods of the occupants. In so doing, the research also considers if the housing project (and the relocation of people to these houses) had any negative effects on the livelihoods of the households.

The main methods of data collection in the study are qualitative structured interviews with a sample of beneficiaries and semi-structured interviews with various key informants. The main findings are consistent with what has been found by studies on low-cost housing in South Africa. The following challenges remain: under-funding; and anti-poor policies such as the Elimination and Prevention of Re-emergence of Slums Act (EPRSA) of 2007; failure to deliver on targets set; poor quality of houses; top-down approaches that do not resolve problems; challenges in acquisition of suitable land; beneficiaries selling their houses without the knowledge of the Deeds Registrar; and delegating housing delivery to the private sector.

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to acknowledge my funder the National Research Foundation (NRF) through its South African Research Chairs Initiative (SARCHI) chair on Economic Development – Professor Dori Posel; the funding made my studies a painless and effortless exercise. Prof. Posel also served as my co-supervisor, providing me with much needed guidance and support in charting the way through unknown academic waters. Second, sincere gratitude and appreciation goes to my supervisor – Dr. Daniela Casale who gave me extraordinary guidance and support; at times I felt I enjoyed more of her time than her family, which made me feel very special. Third, my son – Awethu Kakaza deserves to be honoured for going through the pain and suffering of being alone with no resources in order for me to study full-time. Fourth, I have to mention the people of Newcastle and KwaMathukuza for their warmth and trust in embracing this study and providing me with their time to gather the information I required. Fifth, I cannot forget Prof. Julian May for offering me the opportunity to be part of his project team in evaluating the European Union (EU) Local Economic Development (LED) funded projects in KwaZulu-Natal. The project served as the training ground for my dissertation. Last, I am grateful to my family and friends who have been with me all the way, supplying me with needed emotional and financial support, without you I would not have finished the race. You all remain special and close to me.

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Masters Development Studies, in the Graduate Programme in the School of Development Studies, Faculty of Humanities, Development and Social Science, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa.

I declare that this dissertation is my own unaided work. All citations, references and borrowed ideas have been duly acknowledged. It is being submitted for the degree of Masters Development Studies in the Faculty of Humanities, Development and Social Science, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa. None of the present work has been submitted previously for any degree or examination in any other University.



Student signature

Date

List of Acronyms

ANC	African National Congress
BNG	Breaking New Ground
CBD	Central business district
CBO	Community-based organisation
DFA	Development Facilitation Act
DoH	Department of Housing
EIA	Environmental impact assessment
EPRSA	Elimination and Prevention of Re-Emergence of Slums Act
IA	Implementation agent
IDP	Integrated development plan
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFP	Inkatha Freedom Party
KWADECO	KwaMathukuza Development Committee
MEC	Member of Executive Council
MSA	Municipal Systems Act
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NHBRC	National Home Builders Registration Council
NURCHA	National Urban and Reconstruction Housing Agency
SL	Sustainable livelihoods
TB	Tuberculosis
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY	iii
List of Acronyms	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
Appendices.....	vii
List of Tables	viii
Figure.....	x
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. LOW-COST HOUSING IN SOUTH AFRICA.....	3
2.1. Physical capital	4
2.2. Economic/financial capital.....	4
2.3. Natural/environmental capital.....	5
2.4. Social capital.....	6
2.5. Human capital	6
2.6. The South African housing legislation.....	8
2.7. The South African low-cost housing model.....	9
2.8. Factors contributing to the current state of low-cost housing	10
2.9. Summary	16
3. METHODOLOGY APPLIED TO THE STUDY LOW-COST HOUSING AT KWAMATHUKUZA	18
3.1. Respondents	20
3.2. When were the data collected?.....	22
3.3. How were data collected?	23
3.4. Coding and analysis	25
3.5. The limitations with the study.....	25
4. SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOODS PROVIDED BY LOW-COST HOUSING AT KWAMATHUKUZA	27
4.1. Physical capital	30
4.2. Economic/financial capital.....	44
4.3. Natural/environmental capital.....	51
4.4. Social capital.....	53
4.5. Human capital	58
4.6. Summary	60
5. CONCLUSION.....	62

REFERENCES: 65

Appendices

Appendix A: Sample population 70

Appendix B: Key informants interview guideline..... 72

Appendix C: Beneficiaries fieldwork questionnaire 74

Appendix D: Informed consent form..... 123

List of Tables

Table 1:	Sources for beneficiary identification at KwaMathukuza	27
Table 2:	Type of dwelling prior to staying at KwaMathukuza	29
Table 3:	Poverty levels at KwaMathukuza	30
Table 4:	Planned changes to KwaMathukuza houses in the next 6 months	31
Table 5:	Family sizes at KwaMathukuza.....	32
Table 6:	Year started staying at KwaMathukuza.....	32
Table 7:	Likes and dislikes about KwaMathukuza houses.....	34
Table 8:	Changes in livelihoods at KwaMathukuza and reasons for change	37
Table 9:	Likes about KwaMathukuza neighbourhood.....	38
Table 10:	Individual sewage system at KwaMathukuza (Pilot exercise only).....	38
Table 11:	State of sewage system at KwaMathukuza (Fieldwork only)	39
Table 12:	State of street lighting at KwaMathukuza	39
Table 13:	State of drainage system at KwaMathukuza	40
Table 14:	State of piped water at KwaMathukuza.....	40
Table 15:	Usage of electricity at KwaMathukuza	41
Table 16:	Comments on electricity usage at KwaMathukuza	41
Table 17:	Comments on refuse removal at KwaMathukuza	42
Table 18:	Delivery of mail at KwaMathukuza	43
Table 19:	Municipal services at KwaMathukuza	44
Table 20:	Changes to KwaMathukuza houses (plastering of walls).....	45
Table 21:	Reasons for not making any changes to KwaMathukuza houses.....	45
Table 22:	Houses with lawns at KwaMathukuza houses.....	46
Table 23:	Personal income levels at KwaMathukuza.....	46
Table 24:	Employment levels at KwaMathukuza.....	47
Table 25:	Occupations at KwaMathukuza.....	48
Table 26:	Government grants received at KwaMathukuza	49
Table 27:	Non-commodification of KwaMathukuza houses.....	50
Table 28:	Land usage at KwaMathukuza	51

Table 29:	Dislikes about KwaMathukuza neighbourhood	52
Table 30:	Membership of KwaMathukuza social clubs	53
Table 31:	Reasons people left KwaMathukuza	54
Table 32:	Access to religious services at KwaMathukuza	55
Table 33:	Crime at KwaMathukuza.....	56
Table 34:	Comments on awareness about crime at KwaMathukuza.....	56
Table 35:	Comments about access to the police station at KwaMathukuza.....	57
Table 36:	Comments on the clinic/hospital at KwaMathukuza	59
Table 37:	Education levels at KwaMathukuza	59
Table 38:	Comments on schooling at KwaMathukuza.....	60
Table 39:	Assessment of indicators for sustainable livelihoods	63

Figure

Figure 1: Housing map of KwaMathukuza.....18

1. INTRODUCTION

In South Africa, the provision and sustainability of basic human services such as education, health, shelter, water, sanitation, and food security have been and continue to be problematic, particularly among black communities. Although they are a legacy of the apartheid system (Goodlad 1996; Fitchett 2001; Gilbert 2004; Parnell 2004; Pottie 2004; O’Leary 2006; Ross et al. 2010), these problems have proven challenging to overcome for the democratic government established in 1994.

In the context of the challenges facing housing delivery in post-apartheid South Africa, this research project seeks to evaluate the impact on the lives of the beneficiaries of an almost completed housing project, using the KwaMathukuza housing project at Newcastle, KwaZulu-Natal as a case study. In 2002, KwaMathukuza at Newcastle became a beneficiary of the government’s housing programme when the then Member of Executive Council (MEC) for Housing in KwaZulu-Natal, Minister Dumisa Makhaye, donated R25,76 million for the building of 1 400 houses, each 30 square metres in size with individual water connections and full waterborne sewerage (Makhaye 2002).

Newcastle is an interesting area to study as it is the third largest urban centre in KwaZulu-Natal and the biggest municipality within the Amajuba District – the regional hub of northern KwaZulu-Natal. While it is an important secondary node of industrial development potential, and its surrounding areas are important for agricultural and tourism promotion, it also has one of the highest densities of poverty in KwaZulu-Natal (Newcastle Municipality IDP 2009/10).

The broad question asked in the dissertation is: “What impact did the KwaMathukuza housing project have on the lives of the beneficiaries?” Informed by the sustainable livelihoods (SL) approach, this project investigates whether the impact of the housing project went beyond meeting the basic human need for shelter to have a broader positive impact on the lives and livelihoods of the occupants. In so doing, the research also considered if the housing project (and the relocation of people to these houses) had any negative effects on the livelihoods of the beneficiaries. In particular, the study investigates whether the acquisition of

a house provided, facilitated or hindered access to any of the following assets: physical, economic/financial, natural/environmental, social, or human.

With respect to the methodology applied, three methods were used, namely, qualitative semi-structured interviews; quantitative structured interviews with follow-up qualitative questions; and observation. The participants were drawn from local government officials and politicians, and the developer and beneficiaries of the KwaMathukuza housing project. The total number of beneficiaries interviewed was 30 and the total number of key informants interviewed was five.

The results of this study will hopefully add to the body of knowledge that is being generated to make housing delivery at local government level more effective. In particular, lessons may emerge which the Newcastle municipality may find useful for the improvement of future housing projects which focus not just on the quantity of houses built, but also on the broader impact of housing on the lives and livelihoods of beneficiaries.

This dissertation has five chapters. Chapter 2 discusses the SL theoretical framework in relation to housing delivery as a guide to the study. It also looks broadly at the state of low-cost housing in South Africa with particular focus on the model used for low-cost housing, the challenges experienced, and the potential success areas in housing, including post-1994 South African housing legislation. Chapter 3 describes the methodological approach and gives a step-by-step account of its application in the gathering of data. Chapter 4 presents and interprets the findings of the study. Finally, Chapter 5 wraps up the study by providing concluding remarks.

2. LOW-COST HOUSING IN SOUTH AFRICA

The Sustainable Livelihoods (SL) approach will be the guiding theoretical framework in the investigation conducted at the KwaMathukuza housing project. The SL approach is a bottom-up, open-ended approach that explores how assets and activities are combined so that they can produce a viable livelihood strategy. Although it is targeted for the rural setting, it can be applied to an urban and peri-urban setting (Ellis and Biggs 2001).

The Overseas Development Institute (1999) defines a sustainable livelihood as the ability to recover from stresses and shocks by having access to the assets and capabilities required to live a full life in the present and future. It is important to note that it is not only access to and availability of assets but the security of ownership to such assets – security of tenure in the case of houses and land or stable employment with adequate remuneration – that provide sustainable livelihoods (Chambers and Conway 1991).

According to the International Fund for Agricultural Development (2003), when evaluating the impact of a project on poverty, some of the areas that must be considered are physical assets, financial assets, social assets, human assets and people's empowerment, the environment, and the communal resource base. Similarly, Coupe et al. (2002: 15) state that the SL approach pays special attention to meeting the human needs of the poor, by examining their access to five types of assets, namely, physical, economic/financial, natural, social, and human. This is further supported by Cousins (2007: 223) when he stresses that the poor must have access to productive assets such as infrastructure, financial services and land.

This approach is reflected in the following statement on housing by Govender et al. (2011: 335) and is supported by a number of other authors (Ebsen and Rambøll 2000; Keivani and Werna 2001; Pottie 2004):

Housing is meant to provide shelter and security and is considered a fundamental development process, in which the built environment is created, used and maintained for the physical, economic and social well-being and quality of life of individuals and households.

The following section briefly considers the five types of assets of the SL approach in relation to housing.

2.1. Physical capital

Moser (2007: 23 and 25) explains that a house for any person can be viewed as a physical asset because of the material of the roof, walls, floor, lighting and toilet type. Moreover, the security of a house provides a foundation to accumulate assets and affords the poor a foundation to incrementally add on to the house (Fitchett 2001; DoH 2004; Pottie 2004).

In 2004, the government provided subsidies of up to R25 580 to assist poor people to acquire their own houses (DoH 2004). Providing the poor with an asset like a house with water, sanitation, roads and secure tenure is likely to alleviate poverty. The housing programme offers security of tenure to South Africa's poor in the hopes of building property markets and equity among the poor (Pottie 2004).

2.2. Economic/financial capital

At a macro level, the World Bank promotes the management of housing and urban development as part of the overall economic development strategy of a country (Keivani and Werna 2001). At a micro level this is supported by the Constitution of South Africa of 1996 which declares housing to be a socio-economic right. "Rights in property empower and so impact the social and economic standing of citizenship" (Lalloo 1999: 36).

Furthermore, Narayan et al. (2000: 51) describe a house as a financial asset since it can be sold in the case of financial desperation. Thus it is one of the few safety nets that the poor possess. Moreover, housing may contribute to the redistribution of wealth since it may serve as collateral for credit for home improvements or other purposes such as the development of small businesses (Charlton 2009).

2.3. Natural/environmental capital

Concern with environmental degradation is one of the natural/environmental aspects the SL approach investigates. Environmental degradation is usually a result of poor people meeting their livelihood needs, for example, by cutting trees to use wood for energy for cooking and heating. Therefore a housing project has to be evaluated to determine whether it adds to the rehabilitation or degradation of the environment as that impact directly on the environmental and health issues of the inhabitants (IFAD 2003).

A specific housing project should be adjusted to the local surroundings so that damages to the environment are minimised. Therefore, sustainable sound building materials must be used and their sustainability may be determined through life-cycle analysis. Local traditional materials are mostly sustainable building materials. The design of water supply, sanitation and energy to be consumed must all take environmental sustainability into consideration (Ebsen and Rambøll 2000).

Further, housing is linked to a natural asset because of the land it comes with. The land becomes an asset through its fertility and is enhanced by access to water since it can become productive. For example, it may provide an opportunity for a food garden (Narayan et al. 2000: 49-51).

2.4. Social capital

The creation of a sense of community is an important aspect of social capital because it helps to build relationships between individuals and households. A sense of community is cultivated by the active involvement of a community in the planning, decision-making and ongoing management of a housing project (Ross et al. 2010).

Furthermore, community participation at local government level is a must because it is legislated through the Municipal Systems Act (MSA) of 2000. However, the MSA does not provide guidance on addressing the political struggles that often occur at the local level. In addition, some analysts argue that in the post-apartheid period, social capital within communities has been eroded as many community leaders took positions in government that placed them outside of their communities (Pottie 2004).

2.5. Human capital

The housing strategy in South Africa links health and housing through the development of pro-poor policies. Improved housing materials and indoor air quality, as well as improved water and sanitation in housing contribute to positive health outcomes (Goebel 2007; Statistics South Africa 2007). Criticism has been largely levelled against low-cost housing in South Africa, with respect to these housing projects providing a breeding ground for diseases such as tuberculosis (TB), and creating an internal environment worse than shacks (Gilbert 2004). The types of materials used to build low-cost houses and their location in environmentally dangerous areas affect the human immune system (Govender et al. 2011). A healthy body is very important for poor people because it enhances their human capital for the simple reason that they mostly earn their income by doing physical work.

The above framework enables one to review and evaluate the impact of housing on beneficiaries.

It is argued that worldwide since the 1960's, despite the building industry's claims of housing innovation, the state of housing has been deteriorating (Pithouse 2009). South Africa has not been spared from this trend and it is further compounded by the legacy of apartheid which left very big housing backlogs (Mackay 1999; DoH 2004). Despite the government's initiatives the inequalities of apartheid are still visible: areas mostly populated by the poor black majority remain disadvantaged in terms of government services and infrastructure provision (Mackay 1999; O'Leary 2006; Goebel 2007; Ross et al. 2010).

In addition, informal settlements in the country and the housing backlog are not being reduced (Bond 2000; Ballard 2009; Ross et al. 2010). Increasing demands for housing particularly in urban areas are attributed partly to a rise in urban-bound migration following the abolition of influx control and partly to broader economic issues such as the increasing agricultural debt resulting in the displacement of farm workers (Mackay 1999; Bond 2000). According to the 2001 Population Census, out of a total population of 44 819 776 in South Africa, 3 560 383 people were housed in informal settlements, with KwaZulu-Natal hosting the largest number of people living in these adverse conditions – a total number of 1 016 596 (DoH 2004). In 2007, the total number of households living in informal settlements was estimated at 1 200 000 (Mistro and Hensher 2009). Assuming that each household is comprised of five members, that would mean 6 000 000 people were living in informal settlements.

Both the „progressive“ and the „anti-poor“ post-apartheid housing legislation will be presented and the attention of the reader will be drawn to their conflicting nature. The main focus will be on the factors contributing to the lack of delivery in housing, but a brief discussion on the South African housing model highlighting the criticism levelled against will also be provided. Lastly, the areas of potential success for housing delivery will be acknowledged.

2.6. The South African housing legislation

The ending of apartheid was most significantly marked in the legislative arena when the new democratic government introduced progressive housing legislation, firstly the Housing Bill of 1997 and later the Breaking New Ground (BNG) policy of 2004. Despite this excellent start, some people have argued (Pithouse 2009) that the government has introduced anti-poor laws in the form of the Elimination and Prevention of Re-emergence of Slums Act (EPRSA) of 2007.

The goals of housing intervention are stated in the Housing Bill of 1997 which acknowledges the provision of housing as both a basic human need and as contributing to sustainable livelihoods. The preamble reads as follows:

Housing as adequate shelter fulfils a basic human need, is both a product and a process, is a product of human endeavour and enterprise, is a vital part of integrated development planning, is a key sector of the national economy and is vital to socio-economic well-being of the nation. (Mackay 1999: 387; Miraftab 2003: 231)

It makes a lot of sense to link basic needs to sustainable livelihoods as reflected above because sustainable livelihoods ensure a continuous flow of resources to meet basic needs.

In recognition of the fact that quality should not be compromised in the quest to get rid of the housing back log, the housing policy of 1997 was revised to achieve new objectives through the BNG policy of 2004. The defining concern of the BNG policy is “sustainable communities and settlements” (Pillay 2008: 126). It further makes strong provision for a multi-stakeholder approach to housing delivery (Mafukidze and Hoosen 2009). It acknowledges that there are a number of different approaches to address housing needs, including approaches that promote sustainable livelihoods such as the improvement of existing informal settlements, social housing options, stronger partnerships within government and stakeholders outside of government, and embracing constructive criticism of previous housing delivery methodologies of government (Goebel 2007; Mistro and Hensher 2009).

Moving away from influx control was a giant step. Influx control measures such as the Native (Black) Urban Areas Act of 1923 regulated the movement of the black majority into urban areas to provide labour to the white minority (Bond 2000). Black South Africans had to move out of white urban areas after providing their labour or else they would be jailed for being illegally there. This was to ensure that they did not settle permanently in urban areas (Crocker 1980; Miraftab 2001). However, this has been overshadowed by a retreat to what arguably are „anti-poor“ laws such as the EPRSA of 2007. Some of the objectives of this Act are to eliminate slums and to prevent the re-emergence of slums (EPRSA 2007).

2.7. The South African low-cost housing model

The South African low-cost housing model is built around the provision of one-time subsidies linked to income levels (Goodlad 1996; Oldfield 2000; DoH 2004; Gilbert 2004; Pottie 2004). For example, in 1997/1998, R15 000 was offered for those earning up to R1 500 a month and R17 000 for those earning less than R800 a month (Mackay 1999; Miraftab 2003; Marais and Wessels 2005). In 2004, the government provided subsidies of up to R25 580 to assist poor people to acquire their own houses (DoH 2004). Subsidies can be used for a serviced site; a serviced site with a basic one room top structure; the upgrading of an existing community; or a portion of the cost of a house or a flat (Oldfield 2000; DoH 2004) on land allocated for low-cost housing in urban and rural areas.

Finances are mobilised for the poor through organisations like the National Urban and Reconstruction Housing Agency (NURCHA). NURCHA is a government institution that provides financial guarantees to the housing sector to ensure that development is achieved. There are also attempts to regulate the quality of houses through the National Home Builders Registration Council (NHBRC) which manages a warranty scheme for low-cost housing (Mackay 1999; DoH 2004).

Some analysts point to the negatives of the subsidy scheme such as the reinforcement of spatial separation (Gilbert 2004; Biermann 2006; Zotter and Watson 2006: 10) when it is supposed to reverse the imbalances created by the market. It makes the poor poorer as a result of its individualistic nature which does not facilitate improved access to socio-economic resources because it focuses on the individual housing unit instead of the collective living environment, thus resulting in a lack of sense of belonging, shared interests and community involvement (Laloo 1999). It is argued that the scheme commodifies houses and thereby encourages people to sell the houses rather than to keep them as an asset for future generations (Bond 2000; Huchzermeyer 2004; Rust 2006; Pithouse 2009)

2.8. Factors contributing to the current state of low-cost housing

Quantity vs Quality

In this section, seven factors that have contributed to this failure in housing delivery will be outlined. The first is an emphasis on the quantity of houses delivered rather than on the quality of these houses in the initial post-apartheid period. The new government was under pressure to be seen to be delivering houses and thus committed to itself to deliver 1 000 000 houses within a five year period (Goodlad 1996; Mackay 1999; Ebsen and Rambøll 2000; Oldfield 2000; Fitchett 2001; Keivani and Werna 2001; DoH 2004; Pottie 2004; Biermann 2006; Arkaraprasertkul 2009; Ballard 2009; Charlton 2009; Mistro and Hensher 2009; Ross, et al. 2010). This resulted in compromising quality for quantity. At the end of the five years, not only did the government fail to deliver quality housing, but it also failed to reach the set target number of houses (Goodlad 1996; Keivani and Werna 2001; Gilbert 2004; Pottie 2004).

Theminkosi Qumbela quoted in Pithouse (2009: 7) helps illustrate some of these problems concerning the quality of houses provided:

When these houses are built, there is no proper infrastructural foundation they just put slabs, there is no foundation. The building material is of a low quality. Everything immediately begins to break. The houses are too small to accommodate bigger

families. This becomes a big problem in the situation where parents have grown children who need their own privacy, who at certain situations have their own families. The allocation of these small houses will go to the parents only.

Fitchett (2001), DoH (2004), Gilbert (2004), and Pithouse (2009) suggest that one of the factors contributing to the poor quality of houses is the impact of inflation which decreases the subsidy amount thus reducing the profit margins of private developers. Studies highlight the contradiction of delegating what is supposed to be a people-centred approach with limited financial resources to the private sector which is mainly motivated by profits (Goodlad 1996; Bond 2000; Keivani and Werna 2001; Pottie 2004).

Moreover, the houses that were built were small and in locations that did not promote sustainable livelihoods (Goodlad 1996; Keivani and Werna 2001; DoH 2004; du Toit 2010). There is evidence that some people prefer living in shacks in informal settlements to government housing since shacks are usually built closer to areas with economic opportunities than government low-cost housing which is often far from centres of economic opportunities (Huchzermeyer 2002). Beneficiaries of new low-cost housing are often not satisfied with the costs that come with being relocated to distant settlements because this results in loss of livelihoods as they have to spend a lot in terms of transport to access employment opportunities (Huchzermeyer 2003).

There are other problems with low-cost housing. Studies have pointed out that social capital is undermined when families are “relocated to the outskirts of the city, away from friends, relatives, and the old neighbourhood” (Gilbert 2004: 31). Some people dislike government housing because of the repetitive row configuration and aesthetically unappealing type of houses (Freane 1960; Zotter and Watson 2006: 17; Goebel 2007), and in a shack one can at least build two rooms for privacy and dignity (Charlton 2009; Pithouse 2009).

Although the location of houses in the urban peripheries is always highlighted as a problem, Biermann (2006) and Goebel (2007) caution against placing low-cost housing next to central business districts (CBDs). These authors argue that it does not contribute to the livelihoods of

the poor since much economic activity has shifted to the suburbs. Thus they advocate the building of low-cost houses near elite suburbs where the economic opportunities are.

Neo-liberal policies

The second set of factors which may explain inadequate housing delivery in South Africa concerns the effects of neo-liberal macro-economic policies which make services unaffordable for the poor (Parnell 2004). These policies include the housing and land policies and are dubbed neo-liberal because they promote market oriented economies. For instance the land policy allows the market to set the price of the land to be sold by a willing seller to a willing buyer which makes it difficult to secure suitable and affordable land to build low-cost houses. The housing policy encourages a profit driven private sector delivery where the private sector is allowed to be developers and building contractors for housing projects. These policies put the government in the difficult position of having to juggle its dual commitment to fiscal responsibility and the need to uplift the historically disadvantaged (Goebel 2007). A number of authors stress that neo-liberal policies limit funds available for public development programmes (Goodlad 1996; Oldfield 2000; Fitchett 2001; Miraftab 2001; Gilbert 2004; Pottie 2004; Goebel 2007; Pithouse 2009; du Toit 2010). In 1998, the estimated cost of a house site and a 40 square metre top structure was R40 000 (Mackay 1999); yet most of the time less than 50% of the estimated cost is provided by the provincial and local government, something expected under the upliftment agenda. Consequently, under-funding delays housing delivery and contributes to the poor quality of houses, built on cheap land on urban peripheries (Mackay 1999; Keivani and Werna 2001; Gilbert 2004; Biermann 2006; Goebel 2007; Ross, et al. 2010).

Conflicting legislation

Third, the government has not adopted a consistent approach to housing delivery in the post-apartheid period. The BNG policy of 2004 recognised the importance of the in-situ upgrading of informal settlements, rather than demolishing them. Yet in 2007 the EPRSA was introduced resulting in a conflict between the different laws (Mackay 1999; Fitchett 2001; Goebel 2007; Ballard 2009; Pithouse 2009; Govender et al. 2011). Whereas the BNG policy of 2004 perceives inadequate housing as the fundamental problem, the EPRSA perceives shacks as the fundamental problem. This is problematic as it could be argued that shacks are

the only alternative for the poor at present. Laws such as the EPRSA are diverting attention away from government's failure to deliver, toward making informal settlements the problem that needs be addressed.

Top-down approach

Fourth, researchers suggest that housing delivery in South Africa is characterised by a top-down approach, whereby the government does not involve the communities in the provision of housing but designs solutions on its own and imposes them on the poor. For example the government does not consult communities on the design of the houses and as discussed earlier on some people dislike the boring and aesthetically unappealing look of government houses. The argument is that this approach does not resolve problems (Ross et al. 2010) it moves them from one area to another (Ballard 2009; Pithouse 2009). People may be moved from one unsuitable informal settlement only to be placed in another unsuitable or worse informal environment.

Ghetto development

Fifth, new housing developments and townships continue to be places where poor and low-income blacks live in "ghettos" (Gilbert 2004; Goebel 2007). Pithouse (2009) defines ghettos as places where poor people are placed together according to race and ethnicity.

Imperfect markets

Sixth, the land market is full of market inefficiencies (Keivani and Werna 2001) that produce barriers for the appreciation of value of houses in low income areas; it favours appreciation in high income areas (Gilbert 2004; Huchzermeyer 2004) thus sustaining the residential class differences.

Other factors

Lastly, Mackay (1999) and DoH (2004) include other contributing factors such as: lack of communication and at times tensions between the three tiers (national, provincial and local) of government (Goodlad 1996; Fitchett 2001); lack of capacity at all levels of government

(Goodlad 1996; Oldfield 2000; Pottie 2004); challenges in land acquisition and management; beneficiaries not seeing the house as an asset; and housing beneficiaries selling their properties without the knowledge of the Deeds Registrar.

Although government acknowledges its failure to deliver on housing (Pithouse 2009), there are some potential successes, namely: decentralisation of governing structures; formulating progressive legislation; building partnerships; and promoting environmental sustainability. These four areas of potential government success are discussed in brief below.

Decentralisation of governing structures

The democratic government of 1994 opted for a decentralised power structure by sharing the facilitative role of housing delivery among the three tiers of government, namely, national, provincial and local. It decentralised power as a means to align human settlements with the provision of sustainable livelihoods as outlined on Chapter 7 of Agenda 21 of the United Nations Conference on Environmental Development (UNCED). South Africa's focus was on the implementation of three programmes of Chapter 7, namely, the provision of adequate shelter for all, the improvement of human settlement management, and the provision of sustainable land-use management. The implementation role was given to the private sector due to the lack of expertise within government, especially, local government (Mackay 1999; DoH 2004).

The main challenge is that these new roles and responsibilities were delegated at a time of declining economic growth rates and few new revenue streams, resulting in what are known as "unfunded mandates" (Mackay 1999; Pottie 2004; Goebel 2007). Furthermore, tensions within the tiers of government, and between the public and private sector, may undermine housing delivery.

Progressive legislation

In 2004, the BNG policy promised a shift from conflict to an integrated solution approach that would deal with economic, social and spatial exclusion. Government acknowledges that its usual response to informal settlements is conflict and neglect so it has to move towards the stabilisation and full integration of informal settlements to urban areas. Although very little has been achieved with regards to the implementation of the BNG policy due to lack of political will, there are some small gains such as the agreements signed in 2009 between Abahlali baseMjondolo and the City of eThekweni. They agreed to the in-situ upgrading of three informal settlements and the provision of some basic services to 14 others. However, one cannot guarantee success of that agreement owing to the different power relations between the City of eThekweni and Abahlali baseMjondolo (Mackay 1999; Pithouse 2009).

Additionally, although South Africa did not have specific policies directed at people living in informal settlements, it had programmes and agreements at national and global level that indirectly assisted slum dwellers. These include the Global Campaign and the Human Settlement Redevelopment Programme located in the Department of Housing. The developmental objective of the Global Campaign is to provide secure tenure for slum dwellers and to promote partnerships between slum dwellers and local government in improving the lives of slum dwellers. By achieving this objective, the government would contribute towards reaching target 11 of the Millennium Development Goals, that is a “significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers by the year 2020” (Huchzermeyer 2003: 2; DoH 2004: 10).

Institutional partnerships

Since 1994, South Africa has implemented a number of human settlement interventions including the provision of finances for housing; mobilising institutional, technical and logistical support through the establishment of partnerships with institutions such as NURCHA; and opening up land for development to enhance service delivery in housing (Mackay 1999; DoH 2004). Goebel (2007) emphasises that partnerships within the three tiers of government, domestic and international capital markets, and multilateral and bilateral financial institutions are essential if the government is to deliver, in view of the complex nature of housing delivery.

Environmental sustainability

The post-apartheid government has expressed a commitment to sustainable human settlements and the restoration of human dignity by encouraging the development of quality housing with attention to the environment through NHBRC warranty schemes and Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) (Mackay 1999; DoH 2004). It is also noted by Goebel (2007) that indeed the new government is putting in place policies that give attention to healthy urban environments and sustainable human settlement; however, there is still a long way to go before significant achievements are realised.

2.9. Summary

To sum up, the SL approach clearly focuses on improving the lives of the most vulnerable groups, that is, the poor. Further, it broadens understanding on the impact of housing and positions housing in the centre of poverty alleviation strategies. It also shows how the various elements or strategies to reduce poverty are integrated or interrelated. Above all, it alters the perception of housing providing only a basic human need of shelter, by demonstrating that housing has physical, economic/financial, natural/environmental, social and human aspects. Viewing housing in this perspective could have a significant impact on policy formulation on housing. The various aspects of the SL approach described above will be explored further in the empirical work and will form the basis on which the impact of the housing project at KwaMathukuza is judged.

The chapter also points to the irony of the state of housing in South Africa. On the one hand there is innovation – new technologies in building - and on the other hand there is deterioration – informal settlements increasing and poor quality of houses built. This is the case not only in South Africa, but is a global trend. South Africa is dealing with a complex situation of the legacy of apartheid as well as the new challenges of the post-apartheid period, including increased urban-bound migration. Responses to these challenges are influenced and shaped by global thinking, for example, what is argued to be the “modernist” approach of prioritising quantity over quality and the neo-liberal policies of reducing budgets for social development. The under-funding of housing development projects thus leads to the building of houses that are even smaller than the houses built by the apartheid government (Bond

2000; Pottie 2004); houses that are on peripheral land; houses that do not provide privacy - one roomed houses that are not partitioned and designs that do not instil dignity.

Factors contributing to the current state of housing in South Africa are the contradiction of delegating a supposedly people-centred under-funded housing development project to the private sector which is profit driven. Another factor is the tendency of government not to offer real solutions to problems; instead they postpone them by shifting them around, for example, by removing people from one informal settlement only to place them in a worse human settlement or another informal settlement, for example, in 1999, some people were removed from the streets of Newcastle to be placed in an open piece of land at KwaMathukuza without any resources and infrastructure. A top-down approach of government has also been identified, where laws are introduced without adequate input from the people who will be mostly affected by such laws, for example, the EPRSA of 2007. Also, housing is failing to integrate different classes in communities; the poor are still clustered together, far from the middle and high income classes. This is further reinforced by the housing market in which the value of houses in high income areas appreciates more than in low income areas.

The government is striving to deliver on housing for the poor by providing housing subsidies. However, such subsidies are criticised for their individualistic nature which does not promote social cohesion since the focus is on the individual housing unit rather than the collective environment. They also encourage spatial separation and the commodification of houses, leading people to sell their houses. Nonetheless, some positive initiatives of government in housing delivery include the decentralisation of housing delivery amongst the three tiers of government; progressive legislation introduced such as the BNG policy of 2004 which shifts away from quantity to quality.

3. METHODOLOGY APPLIED TO THE STUDY LOW-COST HOUSING AT KWAMATHUKUZA

This chapter will present the place that was researched and will describe from whom, where, when, and how data were collected, and who was involved in collecting it. Comments on the reliability of the data and any limitations encountered will be made. The main methods of data collection were qualitative and quantitative structured interviews with a sample of beneficiaries, qualitative and quantitative semi-structured interviews with various key informants, and an analysis of the literature together with observation.

Description of study area

KwaMathukuza, the township where the study was conducted, is 10 kilometres from the city centre of Newcastle and five kilometres from eMadadeni Township which is a well-established township and where the Amajuba district municipal offices are located. In 2010, it cost R7 by taxi per single trip to KwaMathukuza from town or from eMadadeni. The roads leading into and out of KwaMathukuza are tarred, but inside KwaMathukuza, there are dust roads. When approaching KwaMathukuza, the first thing visible is a board that markets the selling of goats, sheep and cattle. The goats and sheep are visible; the cattle are not. On the other side of the road is a garage, Cashbuild, Newcor bricks, a big tent church and a large industrial area.

Figure 1: Housing map of KwaMathukuza



Interviews with key informants included Newcastle Municipality Housing Unit and Economic Development Unit officials, a local politician resident at KwaMathukuza, and the administrator/building contractor. Observations were made when interviewing the 30 beneficiaries and households. On-site observation and a review of the literature ensured the verification of interview responses. When KwaMathukuza was visited, easily identifiable sustainability criteria such as materials, settlement layout, land use, energy and water use were determined. Subsequent personal interviews with 30 beneficiaries and households served to verify the less obvious sustainability criteria.

The pilot phase of the project used qualitative and quantitative semi-structured and structured interviews in order to determine the key issues of residents and key informants. This pilot research set out to discover the relevant objective and subjective factors through dialogue with communities and key informants. The questionnaire that was designed in the pilot survey was then modified to ensure that issues important to communities and to local government service providers were accommodated. The main topics explored correspond to the various components of the SL approach described in the previous chapter, viz the role of housing in providing:

- Physical capital;
- Economic/financial capital;
- Natural/environmental capital;
- Social capital; and
- Human capital.

The questionnaire was designed to probe each of these issues on the basis of indicators for each component in order to allow assessment of whether the housing project has had a positive or negative impact on the lives of its inhabitants. The complete table of all responses and their impact can be found in Chapter 5.

The initial observations were that many of the houses had bricks on the roofs to ensure the roofs were not blown off; the houses were painted with water paint but not plastered outside and very few were extended. Some had shacks in the yards, others had rondavels with thatched roofs, DSTV satellite dishes, tuck-shops, and cars parked outside even though some

of the cars did not appear functional. Most of the houses had burglar bars on the windows and doors and did not have fences on all four sides of the house. Very few had well looked after lawns, trees and visible vegetable gardens.

3.1. Respondents

To assess the impact of the housing project at KwaMathukuza, qualitative data from the beneficiaries of the project was gathered. Specifically, those respondents who owned, or who held the rights to rent the house were interviewed. The review of the literature indicated that local governments - in this case the Newcastle municipality - had a significant role to play in the building of the houses. Newcastle municipality has the mandate to build houses which require land, a developer and a builder, so each of these was included. In addition, each geographical space in South Africa falls under a ward with a ward councillor partly responsible for development including housing hence the ward councillor had to be interviewed. A Newcastle municipality official outside the Housing Unit was also interviewed for three reasons: first, he was the initial contact at the municipality who pledged support for the study; second he is in the Economic Development Unit of the municipality so he could provide insight into the economic aspect of the housing project; and lastly, another voice from the municipality outside of the Housing Unit was necessary.

Information gathered was on the commencement and completion of the construction of the houses; funds contributed by the municipality towards the building of the houses; costs incurred by beneficiaries; municipal service provision and payment; infrastructure provision; viability of the KwaMathukuza housing market; size of land and houses; challenges and benefits of housing; profile of people staying at KwaMathukuza in terms of employment, marital status, education levels, and ethnic groups; crime levels; mobility and migration; and the presence of non governmental organisations (NGOs) and community based organisations (CBOs).

Sampling

In sampling, usually reference is made to the universe and the sample. In this study, the universe is the 1 400 houses that were planned to be built. However, there are conflicting reports of the number of houses actually built with one key informant claiming that 1 384 houses were built while three other key informants insist that only 1 380 houses were built¹. From the 1 380 or 1 384 houses built, 30 respondents were interviewed.

Fink (2003: 68) states that representivity and generalisability are not critical with qualitative research, only depth and uniqueness are important. Nonetheless an attempt was made to ensure fair representivity through random sampling. Cluster random sampling was used by taking the map of KwaMathukuza appearing on page 20, dividing it into six areas – North, South, East, West, Centre North and Centre South - then randomly selecting four households in each of the six areas. Caution was taken to ensure that the four beneficiaries in each section are spread out through the whole area. These 24 beneficiaries were combined with the six that was initially piloted since the fieldwork questionnaire did not significantly change from the pilot questionnaire.

On the first day of the fieldwork, it seemed as if it had been raining hard the previous days as some of the houses were still flooded in the yards so such houses were by default all excluded from the sample since it would have been difficult to walk into the house. In these cases, the next available house was used instead. Part of the methodology was that houses with their doors open would be chosen to ensure that someone was home. In two houses that had their doors closed no response was received when knocked at; seemingly there was no one at home so again the next available house was chosen. Overall, most of the houses randomly chosen had their doors open and the inhabitants were able to be interviewed. The population sample is attached in Appendix A.

¹ Another estimate is provided in the housing plan of KwaMathukuza which showed that 1 630 houses were to be built.

There were only a few occasions when interviews could not happen. First, the beneficiary flatly refused, he was visibly drunk and said he had nothing to gain, there had been many people coming through to ask him questions. Second, the beneficiary was busy fixing her house and she did not have time to offer. Third, the woman had just come in from her own house which is at a different township to look after her sister's house whilst the sister was away in town. Fourth, with three houses, only the children were available. Last, the woman had only come to look after her son's house who was admitted to hospital otherwise she did not stay at KwaMathukuza. All these houses were replaced by the next available houses.

Willingness of people to be interviewed

The people of KwaMathukuza seemed to be trusting, warm, welcoming, hopeful and mostly candid in expressing their views. This was quite surprising given that the houses were visibly damaged (which later, information emerged that it was caused by a storm), particularly the roofs (some of the houses appeared not to have roofs at all). Rather, more people were expected to be very angry when any topic related to houses was raised or that they would refuse to be interviewed.

It might have helped that they were told that this was the second round after the pilot study and that some key informants such as the ward councillor, the developer/builder and the Newcastle Housing Unit municipal officials, have already been interviewed. Moreover, that the ward councillor had given the go-ahead for the beneficiaries to be interviewed.

3.2. When were the data collected?

The pilot study was conducted over two days from the 2nd to the 3rd of December 2010. The key informants were identified prior to going to Newcastle to conduct the pilot study. Appointments were scheduled and some of the times were confirmed on arrival at Newcastle to ensure that all five key informants were met over the two days. Qualitative and quantitative semi-structured informal interviews were conducted with key informants to investigate a range of issues. The interview schedule which guided the discussions with key informants is

included in Appendix B. The information gleaned from these five interviews was used to improve the design of the fieldwork questionnaire.

During the qualitative and quantitative semi-structured interviews, indication was received that most of the housing beneficiaries would be available to be interviewed during December; even those who usually go somewhere else during December would not go this time due to financial difficulties. Subsequently, the fieldwork was conducted during the latter half of December 2010. The fieldwork questionnaire gathered biographical information; how beneficiaries gained access to the houses; basic information about the houses; infrastructure and access to services; household well-being and migration. The fieldwork questionnaire is attached as Appendix C.

3.3. How were data collected?

The researcher introduced herself to the ward councillor; in addition, the intention of the research to be conducted at KwaMathukuza; the purpose of the research; clarity on the protocol to be followed to access beneficiaries was discussed with him. The ward councillor was interviewed and he gave the go ahead for the beneficiaries to be interviewed, saying he would not dictate who should be interviewed.

Data was collected through face-to-face interviews during which a structured survey instrument was administered that included fixed-response questions, linked to more open-ended questions. For example, the fixed-response question “Would you like to sell your house?” was followed by several open-ended questions which included “If yes, why would you like to sell your house?” The researcher knocked at the open door of the beneficiary house, introduced herself and explained the research that was being conducted. A request to talk to the owner of the house or the person who held the rights to ownership or rental of the house was then made.

Six respondents were initially piloted in the study; two were individually interviewed whilst four were interviewed as an unplanned focus group since they were found at the same place² and they agreed to be interviewed at the same time. However, when their responses differed, this was noted, and hence their responses are on separate questionnaires and contribute to the sample of 30 respondents. Using the information from the pilot interviews, some minor changes were made to the questionnaire³.

Similar to the pilot study, during the actual fieldwork some of the interviews became unplanned focus groups rather than individual interviews. These were cases where there was more than one owner of a house or people who held rights to own or rent a house were at the same house and they agreed to be interviewed together representing their different households which happened to be spread out, that is, they were not necessarily next door neighbours or from the same street. Where their responses differed, these differences were captured in separate questionnaires. In some houses there were other people present when the interview was taking place. They participated in the interview in the sense that they would at times come into the discussion, contribute and the respondent would agree with their contribution verbally or through body language.

Mostly a mixture of isiXhosa and isiZulu was spoken during interviews as these were the languages spoken by the respondents. English was mainly used to interview key informants. Only the researcher was involved in interviewing the beneficiaries, coding, analysing, transcribing and writing up the results. The interviews took an average of half an hour each.

Once a beneficiary agreed to be interviewed, an informed consent form attached as Appendix D was given and another one read and explained in isiZulu. Thereafter, the beneficiary was requested to sign the form. One copy of the informed consent was offered to the beneficiary for any further contacts they may have needed and most of them declined the copy. One participant expressed the desire to receive the research report and provided his postal address.

² Three of the respondents were visiting the fourth respondent at her home.

³ For example, where a fact had been established, such as that the roads were dust roads, a question asking what type of roads were at KwaMathukuza was then removed. For questions that were about the indirect experience of the beneficiaries, an option of “Don’t know” was added in the responses for such questions. For every question that had follow-up questions on the reasons why something happened, another follow up question on the reason why something did not happen was added.

Permission was also sought to record the interview and where the respondent agreed, a digital recorder was used. Where respondents refused, the responses were roughly captured on paper to be later transferred into individual questionnaires. Out of the 24 interviewed during the fieldwork, 12 agreed to be recorded; whilst the six piloted were all not recorded.

3.4. Coding and analysis

The audio files were listened to and the information was typed into individual questionnaires for coding and analysis. Therefore the instrument yielded both qualitative and quantitative data which was subjected to an integrated statistical and content analysis. As broad themes emerged, they were coded and analysed. The themes were further broken up into sub-themes to provide more specific data. The data were then captured into an Excel spread sheet and combined into one big spread sheet that had data from the key informants, pilot beneficiaries'' interviews and interviews from fieldwork beneficiaries who did not want to be digitally recorded.

3.5. The limitations with the study

There are a number of limitations with this study that need to be acknowledged. First, a number of documents were requested from the municipality to cross check the information gathered from key informants and the beneficiaries. However, these were not made available with the municipality explaining that there is an on-going legal investigation with the KwaMathukuza housing project. This alleged legal investigation was disputed by one of the key informants.

Second, although the majority of the beneficiaries interviewed responded to all the questions posed, there were some problems gathering income data. Of the 30 respondents, eight refused to answer the question on their salaries. Those who refused to provide information happened to be in the presence of other people when they were interviewed, which may explain the reticence.

Third, although the aim was to select beneficiaries through random cluster sampling, there may be limitations and biases. For example, those respondents who were available to be interviewed were mainly unemployed individuals, whereas the houses where interviews could not be secured like the „closed-door“ houses may be houses of employed beneficiaries. In addition, the flooded houses that were excluded may represent good examples of shoddy workmanship or poor siting in relation to environmental conditions.

Fourth, beneficiaries who were potentially dissatisfied with their houses may have already left the area. In order to assess the extent of this possible bias, questions on migration were also asked. These questions sought to establish whether many people had left KwaMathukuza, and whether new people had arrived. About 63% of the respondents said that they were aware of people who had left KwaMathukuza due to the state of the houses, particularly after the second storm in 2009. The percentage dropped to 36.67% when asked if respondents knew of any people who left due to reasons related to the neighbourhood, such as lack of development and crime. However, a large percentage of respondents (73.33%) were aware of people who have moved to KwaMathukuza due to reasons related to improved housing – from a shack to own a house. The percentage of respondents who knew of people who moved into KwaMathukuza due to reasons related to the neighbourhood was 50%⁴.

⁴ People like KwaMathukuza because it's near to town.

4. SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOODS PROVIDED BY LOW-COST HOUSING AT KWAMATHUKUZA

This chapter presents and discusses the findings from the research of KwaMathukuza housing project. The findings will be analysed with reference to the literature outlined and the theoretical framework presented in Chapter 2. First, the context within which the KwaMathukuza houses were built will be provided. Then since the research was informed by the SL theoretical framework, the discussion will follow the pattern of the elements of the SL approach, namely, physical assets, economic/financial assets, natural/environmental assets, social assets and human assets.

The KwaMathukuza housing project was implemented in the early 2000⁵ in a highly politically contested environment between the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP) and the African National Congress (ANC). Some of the key informants state that the political interference and political infightings resulted in nepotism and contradictions between politicians and local government officials in the identification of beneficiaries. In Table 1 below only 14 of the respondents were able to identify how they gained ownership of their houses. The remaining 16 are looking after the houses, renting a house, or they inherited the houses from relatives who passed away. Of the 14 – nine (64%) got the houses through the ward councillor housing list whilst five (36%) got the houses through the municipality housing list.

Table 1: Sources for housing beneficiary identification at KwaMathukuza

Sources for beneficiaries	Number	%
Ward councillor list	9	64
Municipality list	5	36
TOTAL	14	100

⁵ The exact date of implementation of this project could not be determined. Key informants offered different dates for when the project got underway, and official documentation which could corroborate a particular date were not available.

The allocation of houses at KwaMathukuza coincided with a time of changing housing policies where implementation shifted from provincial to local government. For instance, developers are now called implementing agents (IAs). IAs are appointed by municipalities to develop housing projects carrying all the risks associated with the project. One key informant stressed that ever since local government was involved in implementation, the service delivery of houses has gone down. She then went on to say if local government is efficient, there is no problem with it being involved with implementation.

Furthermore, according to one of the key informants, the municipality did not have a procurement policy. It invited an administrator/building contractor based on her track record on low-cost housing when there were other interested parties connected to the local politicians who wanted to be awarded the building contract. This led to the administrator/building contractor leaving the project with 16 of the approximately 1 400 houses not built, claiming fear for her life.

Pithouse (2009) points out that political elites at local level can hijack housing development, resulting in contradictions between the policies of government and their implementation. This can lead to housing policy implementation being anti-poor and pro-political elite. Political elites are driven by greed and corruption and as much as national government has attempted to intervene, it did not stop KwaZulu-Natal from passing the EPRSA of 2007. All the key informants agree that the KwaMathukuza housing project had a specific objective of clearing all the slums at Newcastle which is the main objective of the EPRSA; in addition, it was hijacked by local politicians resulting in fewer people coming from informal settlements benefitting. This is confirmed by the findings, only 33.33% of the respondents interviewed stayed in informal dwellings before they stayed at KwaMathukuza, although the majority of the beneficiaries were supposed to have come from informal dwellings.

Table 2: Type of dwelling prior to staying at KwaMathukuza

Dwelling	Number	%
Municipal house	8	26.67
Informal dwelling	10	33.33
Formal dwelling	2	6.67
At boarding school	1	3.33
Self-built house	6	20
RDP house	2	6.67
Farm house	1	3.33
TOTAL	30	100

It is not clear why so few of the housing beneficiaries at KwaMathukuza come from informal settlements. One explanation provided by some of the key informants was that there was an over-provision of houses and hence they had to look at other waiting lists to fill the rest of the vacant houses. Another explanation was that it was to appease people who were not coming from informal settlements who felt that people from informal settlements were given priority by government.

As discussed in earlier chapters, the South African housing legislation states the goal of any housing project as the provision of shelter and sustainable livelihoods. Sustainable livelihoods primarily focus on the poor. Therefore, it becomes important to start by looking at the poverty levels at KwaMathukuza. According to Table 3, KwaMathukuza households that fall below the dollar a day per capita poverty level amount to 26.67% of the sample. It must be noted that there were a number of missing values for this question, so the calculation was based on 21 out of 30 observations.⁶

On Table 3, the poverty levels of 26.67%, which are substantially below national poverty rates (see, for example, Posel and Rogan 2009), may be viewed as supporting the fact that many of the beneficiaries did not move into the KwaMathukuza houses from informal settlements.

⁶ Eight respondents refused to provide their household income information and one respondent did not know the household income.

Table 3: Poverty levels at KwaMathukuza

Poverty levels	Number	%
People living above a dollar per capita	13	43.33
People living below a dollar per capita	8	26.67
Refused to disclose income information	8	26.67
Do not know amount of household income	1	3.33
Total	30	100

4.1. Physical capital

Prior to the building of the houses, the municipality organised trucks to ferry people from where they were staying to KwaMathukuza. Some of the key informants said that the people had nothing since they had been living in the streets so they erected shacks and some just had plastic to cover their heads. Hence the place is known as KwaMathukuza – “ukuthukuza” means a place where you can hide yourself, or cover your head; it is associated with some form of informal shelter. The relocation of people to KwaMathukuza suggests the tendency of government, highlighted by Pithouse (2009), to shift problems rather than resolve them. In this case, it was moving people from the streets to KwaMathukuza where there was no infrastructure and the people had no resources. They had to erect shacks in a place that was possibly not suitable for human settlement, due to, for instance, the high water table and the sewage system pollution which respondents still confront. When the shack dwellers got access to the houses, the shacks were destroyed.

A number of processes must be in place for the physical structure to be constructed. A developer/building contractor needs to be appointed and supplied with the specifications of the houses to be built. There are differing views regarding the roles played by the different parties in the KwaMathukuza housing project. Some key informants believe that the municipality was not the developer rather that the municipality appointed a developer.

The blurring of roles of the developer and the building contractor might be the result of the changing housing policy at the time, where implementation is said to have shifted from the province to the local government and new terminology was introduced such as IAs. According to the DoH (2004), the municipality appoints a developer and only facilitates the development between the developer and the community. At KwaMathukuza, there was a slight difference according to some key informants because the municipality was the developer and the private sector was the administrator and the builder.

One key informant claimed that the size of the houses was a contradiction between policy formulation and implementation. He claimed that national policy prescribes 40 square metres or more whereas the province and local governments build 30 square metre houses. This was found not to be the case as national policy also refers to 30 square metre houses (Huchzermeyer 2000; Marais and Wessels 2005). One key informant mentioned that the houses are small; they are definitely not the decent houses the people wanted from government. This view is supported by 46.67% of respondents who planned changes in their houses in the next six months if they had the resources, and the majority of whom (10 of 14) gave priority to extending their houses.

Table 4: Planned changes to KwaMathukuza houses in the next six months

Change planned	No. of beneficiaries	%
<i>Extend house</i>	10	33.33
Strengthen house	2	6.67
Put fence & fix toilet/tiles	2	6.67
Sub-total	14	46.67
Waiting for rebuilding of houses	8	26.67
No changes	7	23.33
Don't know	1	3.33
TOTAL	30	100

What is an indictment of the democratic government is that these low-cost houses are even worse than the previous “matchboxes” of the apartheid government in terms of size, that is, less than 40 square metres (Bond 2000). In addition, the houses are not partitioned. These findings echo those pointed out by the DoH (2004), Charlton (2009), and Pithouse (2009) about the size of low-cost houses being small. This means that the houses are too small to accommodate the median family size of four at KwaMathukuza.

Table 5: Family sizes at KwaMathukuza

Households family sizes	Number
Households with family size of 14	2
Household with family size of 13	1
Household with family size of nine	1
Household with family size of eight	2
Households with family size of seven	2
Household with family size of six	1
Households with family size of five	4
Households with family size of four	3
Households with family size of three	2
Households with family size of two	5
Households with family size of one	7
TOTAL	30
Median family size	4

There are again variations in terms of when the construction commenced. Some key informants recollect it as 2001/2002 whereas others think it was late 2003, with almost 100 houses built in the first year and 1 384 finished by 2006. Some respondents started staying at KwaMathukuza before the houses were built, that is, from 1999 and others are new to KwaMathukuza, they started staying there from February 2010.

Table 6: Year started staying at KwaMathukuza

Year	No. of beneficiaries	%
Time of candles with no electricity - 2002	3	10.34
2003 -2006	19	65.52
2007 - 2010	7	24.14
Missing	1	N/A
TOTAL	30	100

Although there were differing views about when the construction began, it seems the last houses to be built were in 2006. All the houses were built with asbestos roofs, and it is surprising that this was allowed in 2006 since asbestos was phased out in South Africa from 2003 (Mail & Guardian 2008). It would seem then that not only was the quality of the houses poor, but further that their construction was with banned building material. Studies have shown that under certain conditions like absent ceilings, leaking roofs, and water damage, all forms of asbestos may cause fatal diseases such as lung cancer (Mathee et al. 2000).

All the houses were constructed of cement blocks and were not plastered, they were water painted and comprised of one large room (sometimes informally subdivided by the owners) with a waterborne toilet, a basin, tap forming an open-plan „kitchen area“ and an outside tap.

The construction of the physical structure was compromised in terms of quality. This was highlighted by most of the key informants. This was also experienced by the researcher when she had to shift around the ward councillor’s house a number of times whilst interviewing him, moving from the rain coming through the leaking roof. She was told that it was damaged by the storm. The ward councillor said he would not be surprised if people came whilst he is being interviewed to complain about their leaking houses. The ward councillor also said that the quality is so poor that the province has taken a decision to rebuild all the houses.⁷ The poor quality came through when 60% of the respondents said there was nothing they liked about the houses and 76.67% said they are not protected from the elements (rain, sun, and wind), which means then that the house is not providing the minimum human basic need - shelter. Another 10% of the respondents said the house is not well built, referring to the houses falling apart.

⁷ One of the key informants challenged this reason, of poor quality, as the primary motivation for the rebuilding of the houses, and argued instead that the decision has been motivated by the municipality’s desire to create employment.

Table 7: Likes and dislikes about KwaMathukuza houses

Likes	Number	%
I have a place to stay	5	16.67
I'm happy I got it for free	1	3.33
I have access to running water; electricity and flushing toilets	4	13.33
I have some independence from my family	1	3.33
I like it because these houses are for young people	1	3.33
Nothing	18	60
TOTAL	30	100*
Dislikes	Number	%
This house is not well built	3	10
I'm not protected from the elements (rain, wind, and sun)	23	76.67
I do not have access to running water; the tap broke	1	3.33
It's not mine, I want my own house	1	3.33
The house is small	1	3.33
It is poorly planned	1	3.33
TOTAL	30	100*

Note: *Percentages may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

There were, however, counter claims about the quality of the houses. The administrator/building contractor insisted that at the end of the day, the project was 90% successful based on the “happy letters” that were signed by beneficiaries as recognition that the new owner was satisfied with the house on completion. Another key informant challenged these “happy letters” as a measure of success for the project because he said the beneficiaries who signed them did not have any technical or structural knowledge about houses (and many problems would have taken time to manifest).

Moreover, the key administrator/building contractor seemed to be contradicting herself when she claimed the success of the project. She said that she never received the engineer’s report on the investigation of the quality of the houses yet she went on to say that the engineer reported that the foundation she built was so strong that when the municipality started rebuilding some of the houses, they could not destroy the foundations; they had to add on to them. Apparently, the plan was first to replace the asbestos roofs with slates and 15 houses have been completed thus far with local government funds only.

A number of factors are identified as contributing to the poor quality of the houses, namely, underfunding, theft, and lack of monitoring and inspection of the houses. In terms of underfunding, two key informants stated that in 2002, the province provided R25.76 million for a slum clearance project to build 1 400 houses (that is, R18 400 per house). The administrator/building contractor went on to say that she was working on a budget of R12 000 for the top structure to put up a 30 square metre house when the total cost of the house was R30 000 - R40 000. This shortfall was further exacerbated by escalating building costs. As a result, it is said, the municipality now always applies for escalation costs in view of the building costs going up all the time.

Theft was also identified as a problem. One key informant stated that the sub-contractor stole cement so less cement was used for the houses. Other theft came in the form of houses being stripped bare overnight. This was further corroborated by one respondent who said he found his house without doors and windows.

The suspension of the contract with the initial developer also resulted in some houses not being completed because the developer/building contractor did not have money, so about 20 beneficiaries had to finish the houses on their own. The houses did not have windows and doors. Part of the explanation for the incomplete houses is also attributed to the unavailability of beneficiaries to sign before they received the houses. Apparently, there were two stages for signing: first before the windows and doors were fitted in, to indicate availability for the fitting of doors and windows, and the second to express satisfaction with the house received. The unavailability of these beneficiaries may be an indication that some of them were coming from Johannesburg as claimed by some key informants. However, this study was not able to verify this claim (none of the respondents interviewed came from Johannesburg).

Besides the incomplete houses, there are allegedly 16 vacant sites where houses must still be built, as a result there is now a court case going on regarding those houses. The developer/building contractor confirmed receiving a letter seven or eight months ago (counting from December 2010), instructing her to complete the outstanding 16 houses and she responded that the municipality has made it impossible for her to complete all the houses. She claimed that her life is in danger if she returns to KwaMathukuza to build the houses.

One of the key informants was surprised that the developer/building contractor was still operating because he was told that the company no longer existed.

Due to the poor quality of the houses, all the houses at KwaMathukuza must be rebuilt. The rebuilding of the houses is faced with insufficient funding due to the slow pace of the provincial government to provide funding. One key informant attributes the province's lack of support to racism, referring to Africans who were fired and some who resigned due to the frustrations they were experiencing and questions being posed to them about being involved in projects which never get finished. The allegation of racism was not substantiated except to note that the current MEC for Housing at KwaZulu-Natal and the manager that was referred to are both Indians whilst the people reported to have resigned out of frustration with the process are all African. One can only assume that the perception of racism arises from the racial differences of those who are seen to be in power and those who are seen to have been vulnerable and ignored.

Some of the key informants reported that in October 2010, the MEC for Housing came to KwaMathukuza, and pledged approximately R25 million for the rebuilding of houses. However, between R40 million and R90 million is required. The community was happy although the funds translate into approximately R17 934 per house, which is not enough to rebuild a 30 square metre house. In December 2010, a copy of the tender document was briefly shown to the researcher and she was told that the province is presently going through procurement.

However, 50% of the respondents said there was a positive improvement in their lives from attaining the houses due to the feeling of ownership, a feeling of emotional relaxation and peace of mind. Peace of mind was also cited by 16.67% respondents as the reason they liked the place. In contrast, 26.66% said that their lives had deteriorated by moving into KwaMathukuza, while 23.33% said there was no change in their lives.

Table 8: Changes in quality of life at KwaMathukuza and reasons for change

Changes	Number	%
Improved greatly	8	26.67
Improved somewhat	7	23.33
Sub-total	15	50
Has got somewhat worse	7	23.33
Has got a lot worse	1	3.33
Sub-total	8	26.66
Stayed the same	7	23.33
TOTAL	30	100*
Reasons for change	Number	%
I became independent	2	6.67
I became responsible	2	6.67
I have access to running water, electricity and flushing toilets	2	6.67
I have a peace of mind	5	16.67
The struggle for a place to stay is gone	1	3.33
Staying at a place for free whilst looking after it	1	3.33
Ownership of property brings change	2	6.67
We are always scared that the houses will be flooded	4	13.33
When the storm starts we know the roof will be leaking	1	3.33
It was better where I stayed before	3	10
We are still waiting for the houses to be rebuilt	1	3.33
Nothing changed	6	20
TOTAL	30	100

Note: * Percentages may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

It is perhaps not surprising that only 50% of the respondents stated that their lives have improved. First, one must remember that 66.67% of the householders at KwaMathukuza do not come from worse conditions like informal settlements. They come from formal houses, farm houses, RDP houses, municipal houses, self-built houses and one was at boarding school. Second, although the houses at KwaMathukuza are formal structures, the poor quality of these structures is a cause for concern for respondents.

Table 9: Likes about KwaMathukuza neighbourhood

Likes	Number	%
I'm used to the place	1	3.33
I feel safer here, I have a peace of mind	4	13.33
I like living in a small place	1	3.33
<i>This place is convenient, it is next to a lot of places</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>26.67</i>
It is developing like other places	1	3.33
I have access to services	1	3.33
This place is ok	2	6.67
You are free to make noise	1	3.33
<i>Nothing</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>36.67</i>
TOTAL	30	100*

Note: * Percentages may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

When questioned about their neighbourhood, a large percentage of respondents (63.33%) had something they liked about KwaMathukuza while 36.67% reported there was nothing they liked. The modal response, accounting for 26.67% of the sample was that KwaMathukuza was convenient in terms of being near to a lot of places, like town.

In terms of people's lives and livelihoods, the physical structure of the house is not adequate without being supported by the physical infrastructure like sewerage, roads, and street lighting. The municipality provided sewerage and water infrastructure, although there are problems with the sewerage and it is being corrected. During the pilot exercise, respondents were asked if their houses had individual sewerage systems and 66.67% claimed that their sewerage systems are connected to their neighbour's with four respondents saying that if their neighbour's toilet is blocked, theirs is blocked too.

Table 10: Individual sewerage system at KwaMathukuza (Pilot exercise only)

Individual sewerage system	No. of beneficiaries	%
Yes, it has	2	33.33
No. The sewage system is connected to my neighbour's, if his/her toilet blocks, mine blocks too	4	66.67
TOTAL	6	100

During fieldwork, a question on the state of the sewerage system was added; 45.83% of the respondents said their toilets were not in working order and they broke easily whilst 50% reported that their toilets were mostly in working order.

Table 11: State of sewerage system at KwaMathukuza (Fieldwork only)

State of sewage system	No. of beneficiaries	%
Mostly in working order	12	50
The toilet is not working, they break easily	11	45.83
We asked them not to install the toilet since we already built it in our back room	1	4.17
TOTAL	24	100

Roads at KwaMathukuza are typical of roads in former disadvantaged areas in that they are bad roads that are not drivable when it is raining. This supports Ross et al. 2010 view that not much has changed for the poor black majority in South Africa post-1994. According to one key informant, the roads cannot be tarred until the houses are fixed because if they get tarred before the houses are fixed the digging will further damage the houses.

The key informants said there is street lighting - flood lights - which was confirmed during the fieldwork. The respondents refer to the flood lights as „Apollo“. Street lighting seems to be in a fair working condition as 56.67% of the respondents said that it is mostly in working condition. This might be a cause of the low crime levels at KwaMathukuza because there is the perception that crime is rare in well-lit areas.

Table 12: State of street lighting at KwaMathukuza

State of street lighting	No. of beneficiaries	%
Mostly working Apollo (flood) lights	17	56.67
There are 2 Apollo (flood) lights, some streets are dark though, it does not reach other areas	5	16.67
There are Apollo (flood) lights. They are often not working and they take time to fix them	3	10
No street lighting	5	16.67
TOTAL	30	100*

Note: *Percentages may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

According to the key informants there is storm water drainage. This is in stark contrast to the 70% of respondents who said there is no drainage system and that they have to build their own drainage. A further 23.33% said the drainage system is often blocked with one respondent saying that “at the corner, the drainage system is often over-flowing and it affects the sewage system”. One is not sure whether those who said there is no drainage system referred to the drainage system in their houses and their yards whilst those who said it was often blocked referred to the drainage system in the streets.

Table 13: State of drainage system at KwaMathukuza

State of drainage system	No. of beneficiaries	%
Mostly in working order	2	6.67
Often blocked	7	23.33
No drainage system	21	70
TOTAL	30	100

It is important to note the dire state of the drainage system at KwaMathukuza, especially after the reports that were given on radio on Kaya FM 95.9 on the 20th of January 2011 that KwaZulu-Natal was the hardest hit in terms of the recent floods and one of the biggest contributing factors to the flooding was the lack of drainage systems in residential areas and drainage systems that are not maintained.

Table 14: State of piped water at KwaMathukuza

State of piped water	No. of beneficiaries	%
The tap is working well	5	16.67
The water pipes are cheap, they are always breaking	9	30
No comment*	16	53.33
TOTAL	30	100

Note: * Respondents did not elaborate on the state of piped water

All the households receive piped water. When asked about the state of their water, 16 respondents did not elaborate. Nine out of 14 respondents who did elaborate reported problems with the water, such as dirty brown water coming out of the taps, water being closed without notification, and water pipes that break easily. Only five out of nine respondents reported that their water pipes worked well. This is no surprise if, as Pithouse

(2009) highlighted, there is a contradiction of delegating a people-centred programme to the profit oriented private sector and on top of that, insufficient funding will definitely lead to cheap, unsustainable materials being used.

Table 15: Usage of electricity at KwaMathukuza

Using for cooking	Using for lighting	Using for heating	Not using for heating	
30 (100%)	30 (100%)	27 (90%)	3 (10%)	1 uses charcoal
				1 uses wood
				1 is not heating the house

During the piloting exercise it was established that all the respondents accessed electricity from the mains, and in the field work it was confirmed that 100% used it for cooking and lighting whereas 90% used it for heating.

Table 16: Comments on electricity usage at KwaMathukuza

Comments	No. of beneficiaries	%
It is reliable and less costly	6	20
If you plug a lot of electrical appliances, the main switch trips	1	3.33
We use charcoal for heating to save electricity	1	3.33
We use wood for heating	1	3.33
Not for heating because it's summer, we will use it in winter	1	3.33
No comment *	20	66.67
TOTAL	30	100*

Note: * Respondents did not elaborate on the nature of their electricity usage and the percentages may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

Electricity is pre-paid and 20% of the respondents are happy with the electricity, they say that it is affordable and reliable. Only one of the 10 respondents who commented stated that the electricity trips when you plug in many electrical items at the same time.

Table 17: Comments on refuse removal at KwaMathukuza

Comments	No. of beneficiaries	%
Removed by local authority at least once a week	24	80
They are good with the refuse removal, they are very active with it	2	6.67
They change the times of the day when they pick it up without telling us	4	13.33
TOTAL	30	100

Some of the key informants said the municipality provides refuse removal services. If a star could be allocated, refuse removal at KwaMathukuza would receive it. The municipality appears to be doing well in this area: all respondents interviewed stated that their refuse is removed at least once a week with 6.67% of the respondents even complimenting the good work the municipality is doing. For example, one respondent said “they are good with the waste removal; they are very active with it”. Only 13.33% of the respondents complained about minor issues like changing the time of the day when the refuse is removed. It would be interesting to know how the waste is managed afterwards, whether the star performance continues in the whole cycle of waste management.

There is no post-office in KwaMathukuza and for post-office services, the respondents all go to eMadadeni and/or to town. However, there was either confusion regarding mail delivery or some sections of KwaMathukuza do receive mail delivered at their dwellings while other areas do not. The confusion appeared to be between receiving only municipal statements and general mail. Municipalities usually use their own resources to deliver their statements to ensure that households do receive them and will then be encouraged to pay. Even though it was made clear that the question referred to general mail including municipal statements, 30% of the respondents still said mail is delivered to their dwellings whilst 56.67% said they only receive municipal statements. It is difficult to understand that KwaMathukuza being such a small place would have certain areas where households receive mail at their dwellings whilst in other areas households do not get the service at all.

Table 18: Delivery of mail at KwaMathukuza

Delivery of mail	No. of beneficiaries	%
Mail is delivered at the dwelling	9	30
Only receive municipal statements	17	56.67
Do not receive mail	4	13.33
TOTAL	30	100

What further complicates the process of development at KwaMathukuza is the apparent co-dependence of its problems, for example, the roads cannot be fixed until the houses are rebuilt as the fixing of the roads will further damage the structure of the houses. The more the rebuilding of houses is delayed, the more development is delayed because 26.67% of the respondents said they are not planning any changes to their houses in the next six months until the promise to rebuild the houses is honoured (refer to Table 4) and 34.48% of the respondents claimed they will not pay for municipal services due to poor quality houses (see Table 19). Goodlad (1996) also reported about a community he researched which felt that payment for services was unjustified until service delivery had shown significant improvement.

Respondents were asked how much their total monthly fixed expenses were, for example, water, electricity, refuse removal, rates etc in rands. Up to 34.48% of the respondents spend less than R100 per month on electricity; 62.07% spend R100-R200; and 3.45% spend between R201 and R300. Ten percent of the respondents said refuse removal and water were free; 51.72% still receive municipal statements reflecting arrears between R3 000 and R85 000. Furthermore, 17.24% indicated that they had applied for relief from the Indigent Fund⁸; and 34.48% stated that they will not pay for services until certain conditions were met, for example, the houses are rebuilt as promised. Although respondents claimed that their applications to the Indigent Fund had been approved, they still receive statements indicating that large amounts of money are owed. Yet, the municipality does not seem to be following up on any non-payments.

⁸ The Indigent Fund is used by local municipalities to support families who are identified as being too poor to access basic services. According to a key informant, the threshold income level to qualify in 2010 was a household income of R1 800 a month

Table 19: Municipal services at KwaMathukuza

Costs of prepaid electricity p/month	Costs of refuse removal p/month	Costs of water usage p/month	Applied for Indigent Fund ⁹	Receive municipal statements	Will not pay for municipal services
<R100 (34.48%)	Free (34.48%)	Free (34.48%)	Yes (17.24%)	Yes (51.72%)	Yes (34.48%)
R100-R200 (62.07%)	Between R15 and R87.50 (10.34%)	Between R15 and R87.50 (10.34%)	No comment * (82.76)	No comment* (48.28%)	No comment* (65.52%)
R201-R300 (3.45%)	Cannot afford to pay (13.79%)	Cannot afford to pay (13.79%)			
	Do not know whether to pay (3.45%)	Do not know whether to pay (3.45%)			
	Do not pay (24.14%)	Do not pay (24.14%)			
	No comment* (13.79%)	No comment * (13.79%)			
Missing = 1	Missing = 1	Missing = 1	Missing = 1	Missing = 1	Missing = 1

Note: * Respondents did not elaborate on the costs incurred on refuse removal and water usage per month; applications for the indigent fund; receipt of municipal statements; and whether they will not pay for municipal services until certain conditions are met, for example, rebuilding of houses. The percentages may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

4.2. Economic/financial capital

Private investment in improving the quality of houses was low. In the sample, 78.95% of the houses are still not plastered outside and have the water paint, and the remaining 21.05% had rough crust plastering on the exterior. The integrity of the walls of the dwelling structures was problematic, showing large visible cracks. Rainwater penetrates through the walls during rainstorms because the walls are not plastered and damp was visible on the inside walls in many dwellings. This is in line with other low-cost housing in South Africa as pointed out by Govender et al. (2011).

Furthermore, many home owners indicated either directly or indirectly that they could not afford repairs to the structural problems of their homes: 78.95% of the respondents have not made any changes to the houses since they acquired them with 10% explicitly citing affordability as the reason. A further 46.67% who said they would plan for changes in the

next six months if they had the resources (see Table 4). The issue of lack of affordability was also demonstrated by the 13.79% respondents who are not paying for municipal services (see Table 19).

Table 20: Changes to KwaMathukuza houses (plastering of walls)

Plastering	No. of beneficiaries	%
Yes	4	21.05
No	15	78.95
Did not see house*	9	N/A
Missing	2	N/A
TOTAL	30	100

Note: * Due to interviewing people in friends' or neighbours' houses, nine houses where participants reside were not seen.

Table 21: Reasons for not making any changes to KwaMathukuza houses

Reasons	No. of beneficiaries	%
Made changes	11	36.67
Still waiting for MEC to rebuild houses	3	10
I cannot afford to make changes	3	10
No reason provided	13	43.33
TOTAL	30	100

However, 14 of the respondents do show pride in their houses by planting lawns in their yards and four (see Table 19) having implemented some form of improvement to their houses, for example, plastering the internal walls. The improvement costs ranged from R400 to R15 000 and the source of funding was mainly household funds – salaries, government grants or pension money.

Table 22: Houses with lawns at KwaMathukuza

Lawns	No. of beneficiaries	%
Yes	14	82.35
No	3	17.65
Did not see house*	9	N/A
Missing	4	N/A
TOTAL	30	100

Note: * Due to interviewing people in friends' or neighbours' houses, nine houses where participants reside were not seen.

The officials from the Newcastle municipality estimated the income levels at KwaMathukuza to be mostly around R800 per month. This estimation was informed by the number of people who qualify for the Indigent Fund. Table 23 describes the personal income levels of the respondents in the sample. Almost a third of the sample did not provide income information because they would not discuss their income. Among those who provided information on income received, none reported an income level of higher than R7 500 a month.

Table 23: Personal income levels per individual at KwaMathukuza

Income levels	Number	%
R1 – R500	4	13.33
R501 – R750	2	6.67
Maximum R750	11	36.67
R1 001 – R1 500	6	20
<i>Sub-total (Earning below R1800)</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>56.67</i>
R1 501 – R2 000	2	6.67
R2 001 – R3 000	1	3.33
R5 001 – R7 500	2	6.67
No income	5	16.67
Refuse to answer	8	26.67
TOTAL	30	100

Table 24: Employment levels at KwaMathukuza

Categories of employment	Employment status prior to staying at KwaMathukuza	%	Current employment status	%
Self-employed full-time	2	6.90	1	3.33
Self-employed part-time	1	3.45	0	0
Employed full-time	16	55.17	8	26.67
Employed part-time	2	6.90	1	3.33
<i>Unemployed looking for work</i>	3	10.34	11	36.67
<i>Unemployed not looking for work</i>	0	0	2	6.67
<i>Unemployed (doing casual work)</i>	1	3.45	3	10
Pensioner retired	0	0	3	10
Early sick pensioner	1	3.45	1	3.33
Student	3	10.34	0	0
Missing	1	N/A	0	0
TOTAL	30	100	30	100

KwaMathukuza is conveniently located near the industrial area, the city centre, and the more established township of eMadadeni. Even with the supposedly advantageous location of KwaMathukuza the key informants all predicted high levels of unemployment at KwaMathukuza, with one key informant giving an estimate of 90% unemployment. The findings as reflected on Table 24 above show a total of 53.34% unemployed. The respondents reported that prior to living in KwaMathukuza 62.07% had waged employment, while since moving only 30% of the respondents did and 3.33% reported being self-employed. It would appear therefore that moving to KwaMathukuza did not improve the working lives of the respondents. However, one cannot conclusively say that it was solely the move to KwaMathukuza that contributed to the fall in employment among the sample. There is also a new road that has been built which cuts the distance between KwaMathukuza and the city, making it within walking distance to town. As a result, 30% of the employed do not incur any travel costs to work, 10% have a choice to incur or not to incur travel costs when going to work, while 60% travel by taxi to work at a cost of R7.00 per single trip.

Table 25: Occupations at KwaMathukuza

Type of occupation prior to staying at KwaMathukuza	Number	%	Current type of occupation	Number	%
Factories	7	25	Factories	4	13.33
Security	1	3.57	Municipality	1	3.33
Domestic work	3	10.71	Steel	1	3.33
Retail	1	3.57	Retail	1	3.33
Building & construction	2	7.14	Building & construction	1	3.33
Gardens and plumbing	1	3.57	Gardens and plumbing	1	3.33
Religion	1	3.57	Religion	1	3.33
Transport	1	3.57			
Business	2	7.14			
Petroleum	1	3.57			
Unemployed	4	14.29	Unemployed	16	53.33
Student	3	10.71	Retired	3	10
Sick pensioner	1	3.57	Sick pensioner	1	3.33
Missing	2	N/A			
TOTAL	30	100*	TOTAL	30	100*

Note: * Percentages may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

Looking at Table 25, it appears that the type of work performed had not altered that much with the move to KwaMathukuza. For example, among the respondents with employment, 25% are presently working at the factories, while 13.33% had worked at the factories prior to staying at KwaMathukuza.

One key informant said the people at KwaMathukuza have a way of surviving, like running tuck shops. Another key informant observed the large number of applications received by the municipality to operate businesses at KwaMathukuza, although, principally they are for operating taverns, hence he said there is a need for small businesses at KwaMathukuza. In a way this is confirmed by all the respondents who said that they go to eMadadeni and/or to town when shopping for food and clothing because there are only spaza and tuck shops at KwaMathukuza.

Respondents were also asked if they use their houses to generate finances, 87% responded “No” and 13% responded “Yes”. They sell airtime and vegetables and some of the vegetables sold are planted in their gardens. Economic activities need to be promoted as they are important. They contribute to transforming townships from being ghettos to vibrant, habitable, stable and sustainable residential places wherein livelihoods are sustained thus meeting government’s housing goals (Mafukidze and Hoosen 2009).

It must however be noted that 11 households have their incomes subsidised by government grants. “It is well established that the pension and the child grant systems provide an essential element of the livelihoods of poor households, ensured that basic needs are met” (Parnell 2004: 14).

Table 26: Government grants received at KwaMathukuza

Household	Pension	Child support grants	Foster care grants	Sick pension grants	Disability grant
Household 1	X				
Household 2		3X			
Household 3		6X			
Household 4		X			
Household 5			2X	X	
Household 6		2X	2X		
Household 7	X	2X	X		
Household 8		6X			
Household 9		X			
Household 10	X	2X			X
Household 11		2X			
TOTAL	3	25	5	1	1

Among the respondents there is no evidence of the influence of commodification of houses, that is, the promotion of selling of houses rather than keeping the houses as an asset for future generations (Huchzermeyer 2004). The majority of the respondents (76.67%) will not sell or rent their houses; 90% of the households have not been away from their houses since they acquired them; 80% see themselves staying at KwaMathukuza for the next five years; and 70% would like to pass the houses on to the next generation.

Table 27: Non-commodification of KwaMathukuza houses

Commodification of houses	Yes	No	No comment	I don't know	Total
Would like to sell/rent houses	3.33%	76.67%	20%*		100%
Would like to pass house to next generations	70%	3.33%	26.67%*		100%
Absence from here since acquiring house	10%	90%			100%
Staying here for next 5 years	80%	3.33%		16.67%	100%

Note: * This category consists mostly of individuals who were either renting or looking after the house for someone else, and who felt they could not speak on the owner's behalf.

Nonetheless, there does appear to be a viable housing market at KwaMathukuza, where people are selling and renting their houses and the value of houses has appreciated. The key informants reported that at first houses were sold for between R5 000 and R7 000 and the sellers went back to live in the shacks, whereas recently a house was sold for R25 000. However this amount is still below the total cost estimate of the house including land and bulk infrastructure. On rentals, the estimates are around R200 per month. Only one respondent was renting the whole house at R100 per month.

Chambers and Conway (1991) stressed that for sustainable poverty reduction, the poor must have legally secure entitlement to physical and financial assets like land, houses, and infrastructure. The beneficiaries of KwaMathukuza were indeed provided with secure tenure, however, it appears that the risky behaviour of selling houses without changing ownership in the title deed is common. Buyers and sellers usually write each other affidavits to seal the sale. While there is also a waiting period of eight years before a person can sell a house, only one respondent seemed to be aware of this waiting period. Problems are expected to crop up regarding these practices with the expected rebuilding of the houses.

There are no financial services available in KwaMathukuza. The one ATM that was there was removed because of crime, and people have to go to eMadadeni or town for financial services. This is the unfortunate reality of South Africa where when facilities or services are provided to low-income communities, they end up being discontinued due to crime.

4.3. Natural/environmental capital

In the case of housing, prior to building houses, land has to be secured and land gives value to the houses. It was no exception for KwaMathukuza: land had to be secured and stand 814 and 815 were acquired by the Newcastle municipality for the KwaMathukuza housing project. The total land area was estimated at seven hectares and each site was allocated between 250 and 300 square metres. Afterwards, the legislative process of establishing a township was followed and completed.

The SL approach promotes multiple livelihoods strategies on the basis that the poor are often allocated very small portions of land thus they cannot live on land alone. This is true at KwaMathukuza where land allocated to each household is quite small for development, and more importantly, it often gets flooded. Despite respondents mentioning flooding as a problem, 56.67% said they have vegetable gardens whilst only 6.67% attributed not having gardens due to damage by rain and flooding. On the contrary, very few vegetable gardens were visible during the research.

Table 28: Land usage at KwaMathukuza

Land	Number	%
Vegetable gardens	17	56.67
We tried to plant a garden but the rain damaged it	2	6.67
Nothing	11	36.67
TOTAL	30	100

Note: *Percentages may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

KwaMathukuza is exposed to high environmental risk; it is often ravaged by thunderstorms, wind storms, and soil erosion. Apparently since being established KwaMathukuza has been hit by two major storms, the last one on 27 November 2009. The storms were so bad that they damaged the asbestos roofs of the houses. The administrator/builder claimed that of the 1 384 houses built; only 16 were damaged by the storm. However, conducting this research at KwaMathukuza, there were far more than 16 houses that had covers and bricks on top of the roofs.

There are also strong winds that come from the mountains. One key informant offered to show the researcher a house which he says has been blown away so many times that it had to be moved to another site. Another key informant pointed out that the effects of the windstorms can be mitigated by planting wind-breaking trees. She claims that in 2001, the Newcastle municipality committed to plant 3 000 of those trees, which would have the additional benefit of complying with the Development Facilitation Act (DFA). However those trees were never planted. It would seem that national environmental initiatives from the Department of Housing of planting trees at low-cost human settlements were not heeded at KwaMathukuza. A relationship with Trees for Africa may have reduced the impact of the windstorms by planting wind-breaking trees.

In addition, the key informants spoke about the environmental unsuitability of KwaMathukuza for residential purposes. For instance, the high water table caused the soil to be saturated too quickly, it created more costs for the builder as they had to lay down bigger drains and it could flood the sewerage system causing an attendant pollution problem. When the respondents were asked if there is anything they do not like about KwaMathukuza, 63.33% of the respondents referred to environmentally related challenges as their biggest dislikes, while only 23.33% of the respondents had nothing they did not like about KwaMathukuza.

Table 29: Dislikes about KwaMathukuza neighbourhood

Dislikes	Number	%
Air pollution	4	13.33
High water table	6	20
Flooding in yards	2	6.67
Drastic weather changes	1	3.33
Tornados	1	3.33
The wind	2	6.67
The roads are bad, muddy	3	10
Sub-total	19	63.33
Crime	2	6.67
Lack of development	1	3.33
Big mice	1	3.33
<i>Nothing</i>	7	23.33
TOTAL	30	100*

Note: * Percentages may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

4.4. Social capital

Building of houses is not only about the construction of the physical structure and the provision of physical infrastructure; it is also about building communities, which means that the social fabric of the community must be nurtured.

This process starts from the very beginning when the community is being planned and developed and can be approached in various ways, namely, consulting with various stakeholders, providing social services, and encouraging social networks. Freane (1960) speaks about the social therapy provided by housing to people in post-war Britain. However he stresses that it is not achievable if access to economic, social and educational opportunities is not facilitated by the acquisition of the house.

Only 10% of the respondents interviewed were members of social clubs, whereas 16.67% belonged to social clubs outside of KwaMathukuza and 73.33% were not part of social clubs. Although KwaMathukuza has a low social capital in terms of membership to social clubs, there are some informal links between the people of KwaMathukuza and people in other parts of Newcastle through the 10% who belong to social clubs outside of KwaMathukuza. Moreover, most of the respondents stated that they were staying at the nearby township – eMadadeni before they moved to KwaMathukuza, so they still have strong links with the area including the shopping and the services they access there.

Table 30: Membership of KwaMathukuza social clubs

Membership	Number	%
Belong to social clubs elsewhere	5	16.67
I belong to stokvels* at KwaMathukuza	3	10
None	22	73.33
TOTAL	30	100

Note: * Stokvels are savings clubs

Another social challenge raised by one key informant was the lack of privacy in the houses when the children are around since the houses are not partitioned. This was supported by 10% of the respondents who said the reason some people left KwaMathukuza was due to the lack of privacy in the houses.

Table 31: Reasons people left KwaMathukuza

Reasons people left KwaMathukuza	Number	%
Disaster caused by storm	9	30
Houses looked after by other people	2	6.67
People coming and going all the time	1	3.33
Lack of privacy	3	10
Haunted by ghosts	1	3.33
Selling of houses	1	3.33
Don't want to talk about it	2	6.67
Don't know	11	36.67
TOTAL	30	100

During piloting, it was established that KwaMathukuza does not have safe open spaces for relaxation and for children to play. This is depriving KwaMathukuza of the social and human capital that can be built through open spaces. This was reflected in Mafukidze and Hoosen (2009) when they interviewed some Diepkloof residents. The interviewees stated that they produced legendary footballers such as Lucas Radebe because they had open spaces for soccer and other games and they managed to transcend ethnic divisions and antagonism partly through close interaction that took place in the open spaces.

All the respondents agreed that KwaMathukuza has the following facilities: a taxi rank, a primary school and a sports field. However, the sports field is not well made; it is just dust with soccer poles. Most of the social services and facilities that are not available at KwaMathukuza can be accessed from eMadadeni or at town which are five kilometres and ten kilometres away respectively. These facilities include the multipurpose centre; community centres; community hall; library; and markets for the informal sector. The social facilities and services are offered by the Amajuba district municipality and Newcastle municipality. It takes 30 minutes to walk or it costs R7 for a single trip by taxi to eMadadeni or to town. Although walking is not ideal, at least there is an option available when one

cannot afford to travel by taxi. This is unique because most low-cost settlements are usually very far from social services and facilities (Keivani and Werna 2001).

Some of the key informants said there are churches at KwaMathukuza. However, only a tent church across a very busy road was visible. Some of the respondents said that people hold church services at their houses or build shacks for church services, and it would seem that the Shembe hold their church services in the open field, judging by the white stones there. According to respondents, the only church building that existed was blown away three times by wind storms. Contrary to this, the key informants had said that there are churches at KwaMathukuza although perhaps they were not referring to physical structures.

Table 32: Access to religious services at KwaMathukuza

Religious services	Number	%
People hold church services at their houses	4	13.33
There are white stones up there on the open field for the Shembe church	8	26.67
The church is at eMadadeni	3	10
It takes five minutes to walk to church	1	3.33
It takes 15 minutes at a cost of R7 per single trip to church	6	20
The church is over the dangerous road	8	26.67
TOTAL	30	100

On the discussion on crime, key informants were asked generally about their awareness of crime at KwaMathukuza, while respondents were asked about both their personal incidences and their general awareness of crime at KwaMathukuza. One key informant warned the researcher about conducting the fieldwork after the 10th of December 2010 because most of the factories would be closed thus many people would be at home drinking their December bonuses. But most of the key informants said that the crime levels at KwaMathukuza were lower than the national crime levels.

They further reported that the types of crimes committed are minor, mainly drinking-related crimes such as making a noise during month ends due to the large number of shebeens at KwaMathukuza. Observations were in line with the majority of the key informants as the

fieldwork was conducted during the latter half of December 2010 without any experience of crime.

With regards to the respondents, 33.33% had been victims of crime with 70% of the 33.33% having experienced crime only once. The most prevalent type of crime was theft and women appeared more vulnerable to this crime than men. Some respondents suggested that women are more vulnerable to crime because it is mostly children and teenagers who commit crime, and they observe the movement patterns of women whom they know to live alone. When asked about their general awareness of criminal activity at KwaMathukuza, 97% were aware of incidences, and when asked about what type of crime they were aware of, some gave more than one type of crime, with housebreaking mentioned the most - 22 of the 29 respondents mentioned it.

Table 33: Crime at KwaMathukuza

Victim of crime		Type of crime experienced		Gender break down		Frequency of crime			Awareness of crime		Type of crime aware of
Yes	No	House breaking	Theft	Female	Male	Several times	Twice	Once	Yes	No	
											Housebreaking 50%
											Drugs 9.09%
33.33%	66.67%	30%	70%	60%	40%	20%	10%	70%	97%	3%	Theft 15.91%
											Rape 11.36%
											Abuse 2.27%

Table 34: Comments on awareness about crime at KwaMathukuza

Comments	Number	%
Too much housebreaking	2	6.67
It is mostly kids who commit crime; they know the houses where women are staying alone and they study their movements	3	10
They stole clothes and furniture	2	6.67
Drugs make them break into houses and steal	2	6.67
The people who break into people's houses are well known	4	13.33
People are abused by their kids	1	3.33
Crime does not happen in our area	5	16.67
Not aware of any crime	1	3.33
No comments*	10	33.33
TOTAL	30	100

Note: * Respondents did not elaborate on crime at KwaMathukuza

There is no police station at KwaMathukuza. Respondents were asked how they access the police station, including the time it takes and the cost involved if any. Most respondents rely on the police station at eMadadeni and in town. The police station in town is said to have a dedicated division that deals with cases from KwaMathukuza. Twenty one percent said they access the police station both by foot and by taxi, whilst the remaining 79% gained access by taxi only, at a cost of R7.00 per trip travelling for 15 minutes. A minority of 38% of the respondents made further comments: 3.33% said the police station is far; 10% said the police vans are very visible and they feel protected; and another 10% said they do not have a police station.

Table 35: Comments about access to the police station at KwaMathukuza

Comments	Number	%
We access it at Newcastle and eMadadeni	1	3.33
We access it at Newcastle	5	16.67
We access it at eMadadeni	1	3.33
The police vans are very visible, we are protected	3	10
The police station is far	1	3.33
I do not use police station services	1	3.33
We don't have a police station	3	10
No comment*	15	50
TOTAL	30	100

Note: * Respondents did not elaborate on access to police station

One key informant and one respondent mentioned a form of community policing that exists at KwaMathukuza, and this may also be contributing to the low crime levels. Those would be the fruits of active community participation as espoused by Zotter and Watson (2006: 10).

There were varying accounts of the existence and the role played by CBOs at KwaMathukuza. Some of the key informants claimed that a KwaMathukuza Development Committee (KWADECO) existed, comprising the Project Development Committee and the Ward Committee, whose responsibility was monitoring of housing developments. However, one key informant was unaware of the existence of such a committee, and another referred to

a committee comprising of municipality officials and community leaders that dictated who must be hired by the administrator/building contractor.¹⁰

Given the poor quality of houses produced, there is not much evidence that housing developments were monitored by KWADECO. It appears also that there was a lack of monitoring by the building inspector. One key informant stated that the building inspector, who is now a councillor, just got into the office and signed that houses had been inspected and they met the required standard (Mpungose, J pers. comm. 03/12/10).

4.5. Human capital

For the economic viability of a community to be further enhanced, human capital must be developed and nurtured. Both health and education are important components of this human capital.

The design and particularly the density of the low-cost houses at KwaMathukuza contribute to an increased risk of communicable diseases. This was raised by one key informant who said he cannot stay with his children at the house for the simple reason that they are often coughing so they have to stay away from him at eMadadeni. Although one could argue that a simple painting of the house would take care of the problem rather than having to live separately with his children. The high water table and the sewerage system pollution are making matters worse though.

It was established from the key informants and the respondents that a mobile clinic visits KwaMathukuza. However, there were differing statements regarding the frequency of the visits, with 88% saying it comes once a month, 6% said twice a month, and 6% said once a week. They also make use of the clinic at eMadadeni and in town. In addition, the availability of ambulance services for the very sick was mentioned by 26.67% of the respondents.

¹⁰ When the administrator/building contractor spoke about the stealing of cement by the sub-contractor, she detached herself from the incident. As the main contractor one would have expected the buck to stop with her. Maybe her behaviour was as a result of being dictated to about whom to hire so she did not feel accountable for a sub-contractor who was imposed on her.

Table 36: Comments on the clinic/hospital at KwaMathukuza

Comments	Number	%
The ambulance service is available	8	26.67
The clinic is at eMadadeni and the hospital is in town	9	30
You have to wait for 1-3hrs at the mobile clinic.	5	16.67
We struggle with the clinic and the hospital, they are far	1	3.33
It's a problem that the mobile clinic only comes twice a month	1	3.33
No comments*	6	20
TOTAL	30	100

Note: * Respondents did not elaborate on the clinic/hospital

With respect to education, the educational levels of the respondents in the sample range from incomplete primary (between grade R/0 and grade 6) to technicon/college, with 66.67% having educational qualifications below matric and 33.34% having matric or above. In South Africa, as in most of the world, the higher the educational qualifications attained, the better the prospects of getting high-paying jobs, thus securing a livelihood. That opportunity seems to be limited at Kwamathukuza judging by the levels of educational attainment.

Table 37: Educational levels at KwaMathukuza

Educational levels	Number	%
Technicon/college	2	7.41
Matric/grade 12	7	25.93
Sub-total	9	33.34
Incomplete secondary (between grade 8 and grade 11)	7	25.93
Complete primary (grade 7)	3	11.11
Incomplete primary (between grade R/0 and grade 6)	8	29.63
Missing	3	N/A
TOTAL	30	100

Note: *Percentages may not add up to 100% because of rounding.

The municipality built a primary school and there is a plan for a high school, although one key informant said the school finishes at grade six and as one grade is added each year in 2011 it will finish at grade seven. The existence of only one school was identified as a problem by only one of the respondents. However, four female respondents highlighted the danger of children at higher grades attending schools at eMadadeni, and in particular, the

danger of rape. It therefore becomes a priority for KwaMathukuza to have its own high school to avert this danger.

Table 38: Comments on schooling at KwaMathukuza

Comments	Number	%
There's a crèche in one of the houses in the neighbourhood	2	6.67
It's a lower primary school and the high schools are at eMadadeni	13	43.33
The school is a problem, there's only one school	4	13.33
Our children get raped on the way to school	4	13.33
There are no school going children in our house	2	6.67
No comment*	5	16.67
TOTAL	30	100

Note: * Respondents did not elaborate on schooling

Early childhood education is provided by people at their houses and the informal nature of early childhood services offered at KwaMathukuza may be a cause for concern if they do not encourage or provide a good foundation for further learning.

“The failure to empower local people will produce neither a sustainable environment nor the conservation of culturally valuable urban localities” (Zotter and Watson 2006: 8). There was definitely no empowerment of the community at KwaMathukuza, either from skills being acquired during the construction of the houses or from the community being involved in the planning and implementation of the project.

4.6. Summary

In summary, the research suggests that the KwaMathukuza housing project failed to provide adequate shelter to housing beneficiaries. Indeed, the buildings are so inadequate that a decision has been taken to rebuild all the houses in the project because of their poor quality, although it is not clear when this decision will be implemented.

More broadly, on the physical aspect of livelihoods, the project did little beyond the provision of shelter. There are a number of reasons for this. First, on the financial aspect of livelihoods, insufficient financial resources were supplied by the provincial government which had a significant negative impact on the quality of houses built, and created a financial burden for the beneficiaries who had to incur the on-going costs of maintaining their houses. Second, with respect to the natural and environmental aspect of livelihoods, the land acquired for the building of the houses was not suitable for residential purposes, particularly because of the high water table which creates problems of damp and flooding. In addition, KwaMathukuza is exposed to natural disasters such as frequent wind storms. Third, regarding the economic aspect of livelihoods, although KwaMathukuza is not remotely located, there appear to be few employment opportunities in the wider area, and there is little economic activity within. Lastly, concerning the human and social aspects of livelihoods, neither human capital nor social capital is being nurtured. The poor quality of houses has health implications; there are few facilities for community interaction; and the only school available is a primary school that currently ends at grade six.

Despite these challenges, there were a number of positive factors identified by respondents: the efficient refuse removal service; availability of mobile clinic once a month; low crime levels; and the appreciating value of the houses.

The integrated nature of housing can be both a strength and a weakness. It becomes a weakness when housing has not been done properly, as appears to be the case at KwaMathukuza. At the same time, it can be a strength when properly executed because a host of other elements of sustainable livelihoods are achieved.

5. CONCLUSION

This study investigated the nature and implications of low-cost housing in South Africa. The study examined a housing project at KwaMathukuza, in the Newcastle municipality in KwaZulu-Natal. Thirty respondents and five key informants at local municipal level were interviewed. Respondents and informants were asked a series of closed and open-ended questions relating to housing and sustainable livelihoods.

To assess the overall impact of low-cost housing on the beneficiaries of KwaMathukuza, Table 39 provides a summary of all the responses in this study. The table has been constructed by assessing indicators associated with sustainable livelihoods. Where the majority perceived a positive impact, a positive sign is recorded, conversely a negative sign is recorded when a negative impact represents the majority view, and a zero is recorded if no majority view could be identified.

Based on the assessment provided in Table 39, it can be concluded that the KwaMathukuza housing project had a 34.04% positive impact and a 61.70% negative impact on the livelihoods of the people of KwaMathukuza, meaning that the South African government still has a long way to go in providing shelter and sustainable livelihoods for the poor majority.

Positive aspects of the KwaMathukuza housing project which were identified by the respondents in this study include the access which residents had to an efficient refuse removal and to a monthly mobile clinic, as well as low crime levels. However, many respondents raised concerns about the poor quality of houses and problems of flooding, which imposed significant financial costs on occupants. Other negative features of the housing project concerned the lack of facilities for community engagement, no high school within the vicinity and few employment opportunities in the surrounding area. These negative aspects, which mirror findings from other studies on low-cost housing in South Africa, undermine the extent to which access to housing can contribute to the sustainable livelihoods of residents.

Table 39: Assessment of indicators for sustainable livelihoods

SL ELEMENT	INDICATOR	ALLOCATION
General	Access to housing	-
	Targeting informal settlement dwellers	-
	Poverty levels	+
Economic/financial	External and internal conditions of houses	-
	House improvements - plastering	-
	House improvements – planting lawns	+
	Reasons for not improving houses	-
	Income levels: personal	-
	Employment	-
	Travel costs to place of work	-
	Occupation	-
	Generating finances with house	-
	Would like to sell/rent house	+
	Left KwaMathukuza for a long period since acquiring house	+
	Living at KwaMathukuza in the next 5 years	+
	Next generations to keep house	+
Natural/environmental	Use of land	+
	Dislikes about KwaMathukuza neighbourhood	-
Physical	Planned changes to houses in the next 6 months	-
	Size of families	-
	Period of stay	+
	Likes about houses	-
	Dislikes about houses	-
	Life changes brought by houses	0
	Reasons for life changes	0
	Likes about KwaMathukuza neighbourhood	+
	Individual sewage system	-
	State of sewage system	+
	State of street lighting	+
	State of drainage system	-
	State of piped water	-
	Source of energy	+
	Comments on electricity usage	+
	Refuse removal services	+
	Access to mail services	-
	Access to municipal services	+
Receiving government grants	-	
Social	Social networks	-
	People leaving KwaMathukuza due to houses	-
	Access to religious services	-

	Personal experience about crime	+
	General perception about crime	-
	Gender bias nature of crime	-
	Access to police station	-
Human	Access to clinic/hospital	-
	Educational levels	-
	Comments on schooling	-
	TOTAL	0 = 2 (4.26%); + = 16 (34.04%); - = 29 (61.70%)

REFERENCES:

Primary sources:

2 x Newcastle Municipality Housing Unit officials (pers. comm. 02/12/10)

1 X Newcastle Municipality Economic Development Unit official (pers. comm. 02/12/10)

1 X Ward councillor (pers. comm. 03/12/10)

1 X Administrator/building contractor (pers. comm. 03/12/10)

30 X KwaMathukuza beneficiaries (pers. comm. 03-14/12/10)

Relevant unpublished research:

Ballard, R. 2009. Give up on 'slum eradication', for now. *The Mercury*. Eye on Civil Society. 29 October, online.

Ebsen, C. and B. Rambøll. 2000. International Review of Sustainable Low-Cost Housing Projects. Strategies for a Sustainable Built Environment: 2nd Southern African Conference on Sustainable Development in the Built Environment. Pretoria.

Fitchett, A. 2001. Contractor Development through the Provision of Low-Cost Mass Housing. WORK2001 Conference. University of Witwatersrand.

Huchzermeyer, M. 2003. Policy Aspects for Informal Settlements in South Africa. South African National Housing Summit. Gallagher Estate.

Huchzermeyer, M. 2004. Housing policy approaches to overcome spatial fragmentation. Research Presentation at the National Housing Research Seminar. Pretoria.

KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Government. 2007. *Elimination & Prevention of Re-emergence of Slums Act No. 6 of 2007*. Pietermaritzburg. Government Printer.

Newcastle Municipality. 2009. Integrated Development Plan 2009/2010. Newcastle.

Mail & Guardian. 2008. It's official: Asbestos to be banned in SA. 27 March, online.

Makhaye, D. 2002. *Unveiling a Slum Clearance Programme in Newcastle as well as Handing Cheques to Flood Victims*.
www.kznhousing.gov.za/LinkClick.aspx?...docs%2FSpeeches%2FNewcastle...2002...
Accessed 26/09/10.

Overseas Development Institute.1999. Key Sheets for Sustainable Livelihoods Approach. DFID.

Parnell, S. 2004. Constructing a developmental nation - the challenge of including the poor in the post apartheid city. Overcoming Underdevelopment in South Africa's Second Economy. University of Cape Town. Jointly hosted by UNDP, HSRC and DBSA. Midrand

Pithouse R. 2009. A Progressive Policy without Progressive Politics: Lessons from the failure to implement „Breaking New Ground“. Rhodes University. Grahamstown.

Republic of South Africa. 1996. *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act No. 108, 1996*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Department of Housing . 2004. South Africa's Progress Report on Human Settlements. United Nations Commission for Sustainable Development 12th Session.

Rust, K. 2006. Analysis of South Africa's Housing Sector Performance. Finmark Trust.

Relevant published research:

Arkaraprasertkul, N. 2009. Towards modern urban housing: redefining Shanghai's *lilong*. *Journal of Urbanism*. 2(1): 11–29.

Biermann, S. 2006. A sustainable livelihood cost-benefit model to enhance the understanding of the dynamics between low income housing and location. *Town and Regional Planning*. 50: 26-37.

Bond, P. 2000. *Cities of Gold Townships of Coal*. Trenton: Africa World Press Inc.

Chambers, R. and G.R. Conway. 1991. Sustainable rural livelihoods: practical concepts for the 21st century. IDS. Discussion Paper 296. Brighton: UK.

- Charlton, S. 2009. Housing for the nation, the city and the household: competing rationalities as a constraint to reform? *Development Southern Africa*. 26(2): 301-315.
- Coupe, S., V. Lewis, Z. Ogutu, and C. Watson. 2002. *Living with Wild Life: Sustainable Livelihoods for Park-Adjacent Communities in Kenya*. London: ITDG Publishing.
- Cousins, B. 2007. "Agrarian Reform and the Two Economies: Transforming South Africa's Countryside" in R. Hall and L. Ntsebeza. (eds) *The Land Question in South Africa: The Challenge of Transformation and Redistribution*. Cape Town: HSRC Press. 220-245.
- Crocker, A.C. 1980. South Africa: Strategy for Change. *Foreign Affairs*. 59 (2): 323-351
- du Toit, J. L. 2010. Local metropolitan government responses to homelessness in South Africa. *Development Southern Africa*. 27(1): 111-128.
- Ellis, F. and S. Biggs. 2001. Evolving themes in rural development 1950s-2000s. *Development Policy Review*. 19(4): 437-448.
- Fink, A. 2003. *The Survey Handbook*. Second Edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications. 1995.
- Freane, R.M. 1960. Low-Cost Housing for South Africa. National Building Research Institute. Bulletin 20. CSIR Research Report, pp. 1-37.
- Gilbert, A. 2004. Helping the poor through housing subsidies: lessons from Chile, Colombia and South Africa. *Habitat International*. 28: 13-40.
- Goebel, A. 2007. Sustainable urban development? Low-cost housing challenges in South Africa. *Habitat International*. 3(1): 291-302.
- Goodlad, R. 1996. The Housing Challenge in South Africa. *Urban Studies*. 33(9): 1629-1645.
- Govender, T., J. M. Barnes, and C. H. Pieper. 2011. Housing conditions, sanitation status and associated health risks in selected subsidised low-cost housing settlements in Cape Town, South Africa. *Habitat International*. 35: 335-342.
- Huchzermeyer, M. 2000. Housing for the poor? Negotiated housing policy in South Africa. *Habitat International*. 25(2001): 303-331.

- Huchzermeyer, M. 2002. Informal Settlements: Production and Intervention in Twentieth-Century Brazil and South Africa. *Latin American Perspectives*. 29(1): 83-105.
- International Fund for Agricultural Development. 2003. A Methodological Framework for Project Evaluation: Main Criteria and Key Questions for Project Evaluation. Evaluation Committee Thirty-Fourth Session. Document 340322. Rome.
- Keivani, R. and E. Werna. 2001. Modes of housing provision in developing countries. *Progress in Planning*. 55: 65-118.
- Laloo, K. 1999. Arenas of Contested Citizenship: Housing Policy in South Africa. *Habitat International*. 23(1): 35-47.
- Mackay, C. J. 1999. Housing Policy in South Africa: The Challenge of Delivery. *Housing Studies*. 14(3): 387-399.
- Mafukidze, J.K. and F. Hoosen. 2009. Housing Shortages in South Africa: A Discussion of the After-Effects of Community Participation in Housing Provision in Diepkloof. *Urban Forum*. 20: 379-396.
- Mathee , A., Y.E.R. Von Schirnding, T. De Wet and K. Mokoetle. 2000. Potential risk factors for asbestos exposure amongst six-month-old infants living in the township of Soweto, South Africa. *International Journal of Environmental Health Research* 10: 135 – 139.
- Marais, L. and J. Wessels. 2005. Housing Standards and Housing Rights: The Case of Welkom in the Free State Province. *Urban Forum*. 16(1): 17-34.
- Miraftab, F. 2001. Governing Post Apartheid Spatiality: Implementing City Improvement Districts in Cape Town. *Antipode: a Radical Journal of Geography*. 39(40): 602-626.
- Miraftab, F. 2003. The Perils of Participatory Discourse: Housing Policy in Post-Apartheid South Africa. *Journal of Planning, Education and Research*. 22: 226-239.
- Mistro, R. D. and D. A. Hensher. 2009. Upgrading Informal Settlements in South Africa: Policy, Rhetoric and what Residents really Value. *Housing Studies*. 24(3): 333-354
- Moser, C.O.N. 2007. *Reducing Global Poverty: The Case for Asset Accumulation*. Washington: Brookings Institution Press.

- Narayan, D., R. Patel, K. Schaft, A. Rademacher and S. Koch-Schulte. 2000. *Voices of the Poor: Can Anyone Hear Us?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oldfield, S. 2000. The Centrality of Community Capacity in State Low-Income Housing Provision in Cape Town, South Africa. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. 24(4): 858-872.
- O'Leary, B. 2006. Changes in the Quality of Life of Durban's People. *Social Indicators Research*. 81: 357-373
- Pillay, U. 2008. Urban Policy in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Context, Evolution and Future Direction. *Urban Forum*. 19: 109-132.
- Posel, D. and M. Rogan. 2009. Women, income and poverty: Gendered access to resources in post-apartheid South Africa. *Agenda*, 81: 25-34.
- Pottie, D. 2004. Local government and housing in South Africa: managing demand and enabling markets. *Development in Practice*. 14(5): 606-620.
- Ross, N., P. A. Bowen, and D. Lincoln. 2010. Sustainable housing for low-income communities: lessons for South Africa in local and other developing world cases. *Construction Management and Economic*. 28: 433-449.
- Statistics South Africa. 2007. *General Household Survey*. Statistical Release P0318.
- van Rensburg, N., E.J. Lucius, J.S. Botes and M. de Wet. 2001. Development Debate and Practice Upgrading and low-income housing initiatives: indicating their value to the people of Freedom Square, Bloemfontein. *Development Southern Africa*. 18(1): 107-116.
- Zotter, R. and G.B. Watson. 2006. "Designing Sustainable Cities" in R. Zotter and G. B. Watson (eds) *Designing Sustainable Cities in the Developing World*. UK: Ashgate, 3-18.

SAMPLE POPULATION FROM COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRES

HOUSE NOS.	AGE	GENDER	MARITAL STATUS	EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	HOUSEHOLD STATUS	OWNERSHIP STATUS	ETHNIC GROUP
1400"s	57	F	Never married	2 = Incomplete primary (between grade r/0 and grade 6)	Head	Owner (the daughter who got the house is getting married)	UmZulu
1300"s	44	F	Never married	3 = Complete primary (grade 7)	Head	Owner	UmZulu
1200"s	32	M	Never married	4 = Incomplete secondary (between grade 8 and grade 11)	Head	Owner	UmZulu
1200"s	36	M	Never married	6 = Technicon/college B. Tech	Head	Owner	UmZulu
1200"s	50	M	Widowed	5 = Matric/Grade 12	Head	Owner	UmZulu
1100"s	65	F	Never married	2 = Incomplete primary (between grade r/0 and grade 6).	Head	Owner	UmZulu
1100"s	32	F	Never married	5 = Matric/Grade 12	Head	Owner	UmZulu
1100"s	41	M	Never married	.	Head	Owner	UmZulu
1000"s	24	M	Never married	5 = Matric/Grade 12	Head	Owner	UmZulu
1000"s	43	F	Never married	5 = Matric/Grade 12	Head	Owner	UmZulu
1000"s	49	M	Divorced	6 = Technicon/college. Diploma Management	Head	Owner	UmZulu
1000"s	38	M	Never married	4 = Incomplete secondary (between grade 8 and grade 11)	Head	Owner	UmSwati
900"s	35	F	Never married	5 = Matric/Grade 12	Head	Owner	UmZulu
900"s	59	F	Never married	2 = Incomplete primary (between grade r/0 and grade 6)	Head	Owner	UmZulu
900"s	39	M	Never married	2 = Incomplete primary (between grade r/0 and grade 6)	Acting Head	Looking after house for the owner	UmZulu

900's	37	M	Never married	4 = Incomplete secondary (between grade 8 and grade 11)	Acting Head	Looking after Phindani's house who works in Johannesburg	UmZulu
900's	25	M	Never married	5 = Matric/Grade 12	Acting Head	Looking after his mother's house	UmZulu
900's	28	M	Never married	.	Head	Owner	UmZulu
900's	31	M	Never married	.	Acting Head	Looking after house for the owner	UmZulu
800's	33	F	Never married	5 = Matric/Grade 12	Head	Owner	UmZulu
800's	53	F	Never married	3 = Complete primary (grade 7)	Head	Owner	UmZulu
700's	40	F	Married	4 = Incomplete secondary (between grade 8 and grade 11)	Acting Head	Looking after house for the owner	UmZulu
700's	27	M	Never married	4 = Incomplete secondary (between grade 8 and grade 11)	Acting Head	Looking after his mother's house	UmZulu
600's	57	M	Married	4 = Incomplete secondary (between grade 8 and grade 11)	Head	Owner	UmZulu
500's	52	F	Married	2 = Incomplete primary (between grade r/0 and grade 6)	Acting Head	Owner	UmZulu
500's	50	F	Never married	2 = Incomplete primary (between grade r/0 and grade 6). Currently studying through ABET	Head	Owner	UmZulu
200's	53	F	Never married	2 = Incomplete primary (between grade r/0 and grade 6)	Head	Tenant	UmZulu
200's	53	F	Never married	1 = Incomplete primary (between grade r/0 and grade 6)	Head	Owner	UmZulu
100's	34	F	Never married	2 = Complete primary (grade 7)	Head	Owner	UmZulu

KEY INFORMANTS INTERVIEW GUIDELINE

A semi-structured informal interview was held with the key informants. The opening question was asking key informants to share what they knew about the KwaMathukuza housing project; their involvement, if any; and any challenges or achievements associated with the project. Afterwards, probing was done to get more information by asking the questions below:

1. Which year did the building of the 1400 KwaMathukuza houses start?
2. Which year did the building of the 1400 KwaMathukuza houses complete?
3. According to the speech delivered by the then MEC for Housing – Dumisane Makhaye on February 2002, the province contributed R25,7 million for the building of the 1400 KwaMathukuza houses; how much did the municipality contribute towards the building of these houses?
4. How much did each house cost to build?
5. How did the beneficiaries access the 1400 KwaMathukuza houses?
6. Did the beneficiaries pay anything for acquiring the 1400 houses? If yes, how much did the pay for each house?
7. What have been the changes at KwaMathukuza since the houses started being built?
8. What services does the Newcastle municipality currently provide at KwaMathukuza?
9. Do the residents of KwaMathukuza pay for services? If yes, how much do they pay for each service?
10. What is the payment rate for services at KwaMathukuza?
11. How do the residents of KwaMathukuza access services that are not currently provided by the Newcastle municipality?
12. What community facilities are presently available at KwaMathukuza?
13. How do residents of KwaMathukuza presently access community facilities that are not available at KwaMathukuza?
14. How long does it take and at what cost do the residents of KwaMathukuza access the services and community facilities that are not available at KwaMathukuza?
15. What infrastructure is now available at KwaMathukuza?
16. Are the people of KwaMathukuza generally available during the December month or do they go to the rural areas or somewhere else?
17. Are people of KwaMathukuza selling/renting/extending/running businesses from their houses?
18. If they do sell, how much do they sell their houses for?
19. If they do rent the houses out, how much do they rent their houses for?

20. What is the size of the houses at KwaMathukuza?
21. What is the size of the site for the houses at KwaMathukuza?
22. What is the total land area of KwaMathukuza?
23. Are there any challenges experienced or being experienced now with the houses at KwaMathukuza?
24. Are there any environmental challenges faced by the people of KwaMathukuza?
25. Are there any achievements attained or being attained now with the houses at KwaMathukuza?
26. What is the age group of the owners/renters at KwaMathukuza?
27. What are the education levels of the people of KwaMathukuza?
28. What are the employment levels at KwaMathukuza?
29. For those who are employed, what are the income levels?
30. What are the crime levels at KwaMathukuza?
31. What ethnic groups live at KwaMathukuza?
32. What is the marital status of the people living at KwaMathukuza
33. Where do most people living at KwaMathukuza come from just before they stayed at KwaMathukuza?
34. How is the mobility of the people staying at KwaMathukuza between KwaMathukuza and other areas?
35. How is the migration into and out of KwaMathukuza?
36. Are the houses at KwaMathukuza being handed over to the next generations?
37. Which NGOs, CBOs and political organisations do you work with on housing?

Please note that the above questions were only asked if the information did not come out when the opening question earlier mentioned was asked. In addition, questions posed were selected according to the role or position of each key informant.

SCHOOL OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

IMPACT OF LOW COST HOUSING ON BENEFICIARIES AT KWAMATHUKUZA, NEWCASTLE, KWAZULU-NATAL

Questionnaire No.	
Date	
Starting time	

CONTENTS	PAGES
SECTION 1: INDIVIDUAL INFORMATION	1- 4
SECTION 2: ACCESS TO HOUSING	5- 11
SECTION 3: BASIC INFORMATION OF THE HOUSE	12-13
SECTION 4: INFRASTRUCTURE & ACCESS TO SERVICES	13-16
SECTION 5: HOUSEHOLD WELL-BEING	17-31
SECTION 6: MIGRATION	31

1. INDIVIDUAL INFORMATION

ULWAZI NGOMUNTU

These questions are to be asked of the home-owner or the individual who holds the rights to own or rent the household.

Le mibuzo izobuzwa kumnini muzi noma onamalungelo okuphatha ikhaya noma umqashi

Address (FILL IT IN BEFORE INTERVIEW)	
Ikheli (LIZOGCWALISWA NGAPHAMBI KOKUBA KUQALWE)	

<p>BEFORE YOU ENTER INTO THE HOUSE OBSERVE THE STATE OF THE YARD OF THE HOUSE AND THE EXTERNAL CONDITION OF THE HOUSE AND NOTE IT DOWN. CONTINUE OBSERVING THE INTERNAL CONDITION OF THE HOUSE WHILST INTERVIEWING AND NOTING EVERYTHING DOWN, WITHOUT THE RESPONDENT NOTICING</p> <p>PHAMBI KOKUBA NGINGENE PHAKATHI KOMUZI KUMELE NGIBUKE INGAPHANDLE, UMA SENGINGAPHAKATHI NGIQHUBEKE NOKUBUKA ISIMO NGAPHAKATHI KOMUZI. ENGIKUBONAYO KUMELE NGIKUBHALE PHANTSI NGAPHANDLE KOKUTHI UMUNTU OZOPHENDULA ABONE</p>		
<p>1.1. First name Igama kuphela</p>		
<p>1.2. Contact no. Inombolo otholakala kuyo</p>		
<p>1.3. How old are you in years? Uneminyaka emingaki?</p>		
<p>1.4. Gender (OBSERVE AND COMPLETE) Ubulili (ZIBHEKELE UBHALE PHANTSI)</p>	<p>Female Owesifazane</p>	<p>Male Owesilisa</p>
<p>1.5. What is your relationship to the head of the household? Uhlobene kanjani nomunini womuzi?</p> <p>1 = The head/acting head Umunini womuzi noma umele umunini womuzi</p> <p>2 = Husband/wife/partner Umyeni/inkosikazi/umasihlalisane</p> <p>3 = Son/daughter/step child/adopted child Indodana/indodakazi</p> <p>4 = Brother/sister/step brother/step sister</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>	

Umfowenu/udadewenu	
5 = Father/mother/step father/step mother	5
Baba/Mama	
6 = Grand-parent/great grand parent	6
Ugogo nomkhulu/ukhulu noma ukhoko	
7 = Grand-child/great grand child	7
Umzukulu/isizukulwane	
8 = Other relative (e.g., in-laws or aunt/uncle)	8
Ezinye izihlobo	
9 = Non-related persons	9
Abantu eningahlobene nabo	
-1 = Not applicable	-1
Okungathintene	
-2 = Don't know	-2
Angazi	
-3 = Refuse to answer	-3
Angithandi ukuphendula	
1.6. What is the highest level of schooling completed?	
Ufunde wagcina kuliphi ibanga?	
1 = No schooling	1
Angiyanga esikoleni	
2 = Incomplete primary (between grade r/0 and grade 6)	2
Angiwaqedanga amabanga aphantsi	

3 = Complete primary (grade 7) Ngiwaqedile amabanga aphantsi	3
4 = Incomplete secondary (between grade 8 and grade 11) Angiwaqedanga amabanga aphezulu	4
5 = Matric/Grade 12 Matikuletshe/ibanga leshumi	5
6 = Technicon/college Ikolishi	6
7 = University Inyuvesi	7
-1 = Not applicable Okungathintene	-1
-2 = Don't know Angazi	-2
-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula	-3
1.7. Ethnic group Uhlanga luphi	
1 = umZulu	1
2 = umXhosa	2
3 = moSotho umSuthu	3
4 = moPedi	4

umPedi	
5 = umSwati	5
UmSwati	
6 = moTswana	6
umTswana	
7 = umNdebele	7
umNdebele	
8 = umTsonga	8
UmShangane	
9 = umVenda	9
UmVenda	
10 = English	10
Umlungu	
11 = Afrikaner	11
Ibhunu	
12 = Coloured	12
Ikhiladi	
13 = Indian	13
Indiya	
14 = Other (specify)	14
Chaza okunye	
-1 = Not applicable	-1
Okungathintene	

-2 = Don't know Angazi	-2
-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula	-3
1.8. Marital Status Isimo ngokwasemshadweni	
1 = Never married Angikaze ngishade	1
2 = Married (living together or separately) Ngishadile (nihlale nobabili noma nihlala kwindawo ezahlukene)	2
3 = Divorced Ngahlukanisile ngokwasemthethweni	3
4 = Separated (temporal or permanent) Ngahlukanisile (okwesikhashane noma ngeze niphinde nihlale nobabili)	4
5 = Widowed Umfelokazi/Umfelwa	5
6 = Living together like husband & wife Umasihlalisane	6
-1 = Not applicable Okungathintene	-1
-2 = Don't know Angazi	-2

-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula	-3
---	----

2. ACCESS TO HOUSING

<p>2.1. Do you..... this house? Ungu.....womuzi</p> <p>1 = Own Munini</p> <p>2 = Rent (IF YOU RENT JUMP TO Q. 2.4) Umqashi (UMA UNGUMQASHI DLULELA KUMBUZO 2.4)</p> <p>3 = Other (specify) Chaza okunye</p> <p>-1 = Not applicable Okungathintene</p> <p>-2 = Don't know Angazi</p> <p>-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>-1</p> <p>-2</p> <p>-3</p>
<p>2.2. How did you gain ownership of this house? Uwuthole kanjani lo muzi?</p> <p>1 = Waiting list Uhla lokulinda</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>2 = Bought from someone Ngayithenga kumuntu</p> <p>3 = Other (specify) Chaza okunye</p> <p>-1 = Not applicable Okungathintene</p> <p>-2 = Don't know Angazi</p> <p>-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula</p>	<p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>-1</p> <p>-2</p> <p>-3</p>
<p>2.3. How much did you pay to own this house in rands? Wakhoka malini ukuthola lo muzi?</p>	
<p>2.4. How did you get to rent this house? Kufike kanjani ukuthi uqashe kulo muzi?</p> <p>1 = Through a family member Ngiyithole ngelunga lomndeni</p> <p>2 = Through a friend Ngiyithole ngomngane</p> <p>3 = Other (specify) Chaza okunye</p> <p>-1 = Not applicable Okungathintene</p> <p>-2 = Don't know</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>-1</p> <p>-2</p>

<p>Angazi</p> <p>-3 = Refuse to answer</p> <p>Angithandi ukuphendula</p>	-3
<p>2.5. How much do you pay per month to rent this house in rands?</p> <p>Ukhoka malini ngenyanga ukuqasha lo muzi?</p>	
<p>2.6. In which year did you start staying at this house? (ASK OF EVERYONE)</p> <p>Uqale ngamuphi unyaka ukuhlala kulo muzi? (BUZA WONKE UMUNTU)</p>	
<p>2.7. Since you started staying in this house, is there a period when you have been away other than for a holiday?</p> <p>Selokhu wahlala kulo muzi, sikhona isikhathi lapho ukhe wangababikho, ngaphandle kwesikhathi lapho ubuthathe khona ikhefu/holide</p>	<p>Yes No (IF NO, JUMP TO Q. 2.11)</p> <p>Yebo Cha (UMA IMPENDULO INGUCHA DLULELA KUMBUZO 2.11)</p>
<p>2.8. If yes, for how long were you away?</p> <p>Uma impendulo inguyebo, uhambe isikhathi esingakanani?</p>	
<p>2.9. Why were you away?</p> <p>Kungani ubuhambile?</p> <p>1= I lost my job</p> <p>Ngiphelelwe ngumsebemzi</p> <p>2 = I found a cheaper place to stay</p> <p>Ngithole indawo yokuhlala engabizi kakhulu</p> <p>3 = I was forced to leave</p> <p>Bengiphoqelekile ukuhamba</p> <p>4 = I got a better job elsewhere</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>

Ngithole umsebenzi ongcono kwenye indawo	
5 = I got married	5
Ngithole umshado	
6 = I got sick	6
Ngiye ngagula	
7 = Other (specify)	7
Chaza okunye	
-1 = Not applicable	-1
Okungathintene	
-2 = Don't know	-2
Angazi	
-3 = Refuse to answer	-3
Angithandi ukuphendula	
2.10. Why did you come back?	
Ubuyele ni?	
1 = I found a job in this area	1
Ngithole umsebenzi kule ndawo	
2 = I feel safer here	2
Ngizizwa ngiphephile lapha	
3 = It's a better place to stay with my family	3
Yindawo engcono yokuhlala nomndeni wam	
4 = Other (specify)	4
Chaza okunye	

<p>-1 = Not applicable Okungathintene</p> <p>-2 = Don't know Angazi</p> <p>-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula</p>	<p>-1</p> <p>-2</p> <p>-3</p>
<p>2.11. The last place you stayed in before you stayed at this house, what type of dwelling was it? (ASK OF EVERYONE)</p> <p>Indawo yokugcina ubuhlala kuyo ngaphambi kokuhlala lana, ibiyindawo enjani? (BUZA WONKE UMUNTU)</p> <p>1 = Informal dwelling Emjondolo</p> <p>2 = Traditional dwelling Iqhugwana</p> <p>3 = RDP house Izindlu zeRDP</p> <p>4 = Municipal house Izindlu zikamasipala</p> <p>5 = Prison Ejele</p> <p>6 = Hostel Ehostela</p> <p>7 = Formal dwelling Izindlu zesubsidy</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>7</p>

8 = Other (specify) Chaza okunye -1 = Not applicable Okungathintene -2 = Don't know Angazi -3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula	8 -1 -2 -3
2.12. What do you <u>like</u> about living in this house? (By house, I mean the actual dwelling place). (ALLOW MULTIPLE RESPONSES) Yini oyithandayo ngokuhlala kulo muzi (UVUMELEKILE UKUKHETHA IMPENDULO ENGAPHEZU KWEYODWA) 1 = I can run a business from here Ngiyakwazi ukuqhuba ibhizinisi lam lapha (uhlobo lunjani lwebhizinisi) 2 = I can grow some food Ngiyakwazi ukutshala ukudla 3 = I feel safer here Ngizizwa ngiphephile lapha 4= I have access to running water Ngikwazi ukuthola amanzi ahlanzekile 5= I have access to electricity Nginogesi 6= I have access to a flush toilet Nginendlu yangasese esheshayo	1 2 3 4 5 6

7= I am more protected from the elements (rain, sun, wind) Ngivikelekile (emvuleni, elangeni nasemoyeni)	7
8= My family can be together Umndeni wam ungaba ndawonye	8
9=This house is well built Lo muzi wakhiwe kahle	9
10 = I have some independence from my family Ngikhululekile emndenini wam	10
11= Other (specify) Chaza okunye	11
-1 = Not applicable Okungathintene	-1
-2 = Don't know Angazi	-2
-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula	-3
2.13. What do you <u>not like</u> about living in this house? (ALLOW MULTIPLE RESPONSES)	
Yini ongayithandi ngokuhlala kulo muzi (UVUMELEKILE UKUKHETHA IMPENDULO ENGAPHEZU KWEYODWA)	
1 = I cannot run a business from here (what type of business?) Angikwazi ukuqhuba ibhizinisi lam lapha (uhlobo lunjani lwebhizinisi)	1
2= I cannot grow some food	2

Angikwazi ukutshala ukudla	
3 = I do not feel safe here	3
Angizizwa ngiphephile lapha	
4 = I do not have access to running water	4
Angikwazi ukuthola amanzi ahlanzekile	
5 = I do not have access to electricity	5
Anginagesi	
6 = I do not have access to a flush toilet	6
Anginandlu yangasese esheshayo	
7 = I am not more protected from the elements (rain, sun, wind)	7
Angivikelekile (emvuleni, elangeni nasemoyeni)	
8 = My family cannot be together	8
Umndeni wam awukwazi ukuba ndawonye	
9 = This house is not well built	9
Lo muzi awakhiwanga kahle	
10 = I do not have some independence from my family	10
Anginakho ukukhululeka emndenini wami	
11= Other (specify)	11
Chaza okunye	
-1 = Not applicable	-1
Okungathintene	
-2 = Don't know	-2
Angazi	

-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula	-3
2.14. In general, how has your life changed since you moved into this house? Kuyishintshe kanjani impilo yakho ukuhlala kulo muzi? 1 = Improved greatly Ishintshe kahle kakhulu 2 = Improved somewhat Ishintshe kahle kancane 3 = stayed the same Akunashintsho 4 = Has got somewhat worse Ibembi 5 = Has got a lot worse Ibembi kakhulu -1 = Not applicable Okungathintene -2 = Don't know Angazi -3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula	1 2 3 4 5 -1 -2 -3
2.15. Could you briefly explain your answer to the above question? Ungayichaza nje kafuphi impendulo yakho kulo mbuzo ongenhla?	
2.16. What do you <u>like</u> about living at KwaMathukuza? (ALLOW MULTIPLE RESPONSES)	

<p>Yini oyithandayo ngokuhlala kwaMathukuza (UVUMELEKILE UKUKHETHA IMPENDULO ENGAPHEZU KWEYODWA)</p> <p>1 = I am close to jobs Ngisondelene nemisebenzi</p> <p>2 = I feel safer here Ngizizwa ngiphephile lapha</p> <p>3 = There are good schools in the area for my children Kunezikole ezisenzigeni eliphezulu okulungele abantwana bam</p> <p>4 = I have access to services (roads, refuse removal and street lighting) Ngithola izidingo (iindlela, ukuthuthwa kukadoti nogesi wasemgaqweni)</p> <p>5 = I have developed new social networks Sengakhe ubudlelwane nabantu abasemazingeni ahlukene</p> <p>6 = Other (specify) Chaza okunye</p> <p>-1 = Not applicable Okungathintene</p> <p>-2 = Don't know Angazi</p> <p>-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>-1</p> <p>-2</p> <p>-3</p>
<p>2.17. What do you <u>not like</u> about living at KwaMathukuza? (ALLOW MULTIPLE RESPONSES)</p> <p>Yini ongayithandi ngokuhlala kwaMathukuza (UVUMELEKILE UKUKHETHA IMPENDULO ENGAPHEZU KWEYODWA)</p>	

1 = I am far from jobs Ngikude nemisebenzi	1
2 = I do not feel safe here Angizizwa ngiphephile lapha	2
3 = There are no good schools in the area for my children Akunazikole ezisenzingeni eliphezulu okulungele abantwana bam	3
4 = I have no access to services (roads, refuse removal and street lighting) Angitholi izidingo (iindlela, ukuthuthwa kukadoti nogesi wasemgaqweni)	4
5 = I have not developed new social networks Angikakhi ubudlelwane nabantu abasemazingeni ahlukene	5
6 = Other (specify) Chaza okunye	6
-1 = Not applicable Okungathintene	-1
-2 = Don't know Angazi	-2
-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula	-3

3. BASIC INFORMATION OF THE HOUSE

ULWAZI OLUQONDENE NOMUZI

<p>3.1. What is the household's main source of water? Uwathola kanjani amanzi kulo muzi?</p> <p>1 = Piped water Amanzi ompompi</p> <p>2 = Other (specify and explain why piped water is not the main source of water for the household) (chaza ukuthi kungani amanzi ompompi ungenawo)</p> <p>-1 = Not applicable Okungathintene</p> <p>-2 = Don't know Angazi</p> <p>-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>-1</p> <p>-2</p> <p>-3</p>												
<p>3.2. What is the main source of energy for this household? Nisebenzisani?</p> <p>1=Electricity from mains Ugesi</p> <p>2=Electricity from generator Ugesi wegenerator</p> <p>3=Gas Igas</p>		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1507 914 1641 962">Cooking Ukupheka</th> <th data-bbox="1641 914 1783 962">Heating Ukufudumeza</th> <th data-bbox="1783 914 1915 962">Lighting Ukukhanyisa</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1507 962 1641 1058">1</td> <td data-bbox="1641 962 1783 1058">1</td> <td data-bbox="1783 962 1915 1058">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1507 1058 1641 1153">2</td> <td data-bbox="1641 1058 1783 1153">2</td> <td data-bbox="1783 1058 1915 1153">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1507 1153 1641 1364">3</td> <td data-bbox="1641 1153 1783 1364">3</td> <td data-bbox="1783 1153 1915 1364">3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Cooking Ukupheka	Heating Ukufudumeza	Lighting Ukukhanyisa	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3
Cooking Ukupheka	Heating Ukufudumeza	Lighting Ukukhanyisa											
1	1	1											
2	2	2											
3	3	3											

4=Paraffin	4	4	4
Upharafini			
5=Wood	5	5	5
Izinkuni			
6=Coal	6	6	6
Amalahle			
7=Candles	7	7	7
Amakhandlela			
8=Animal dung	8	8	8
Amalongwe			
9=Solar energy	9	9	9
Ugesi welanga			
10=Other (specify)	10	10	10
Okunye chaza			
-1=Not applicable	-1	-1	-1
Okungathintene			
-2 = Don't know	-2	-2	-2
Angazi			
-3 = Refuse to answer	-3	-3	-3
Angithandi ukuphendula			

4. INFRASTRUCTURE & ACCESS TO SERVICES

<p>4.1. What is the state of street lighting at KwaMathukuza? Sinjani isimo sikagesi wasemgaqweni?</p> <p>1=No street lighting Awukho ugesi emgaqweni</p> <p>2=Often not working Uvame ukungasebenzi</p> <p>3=Mostly working Uhlale usebenza</p> <p>4=Other (specify) Okunye chaza</p> <p>-1=Not applicable Okungathintene</p> <p>-2 = Don't know Angazi</p> <p>-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>-1</p> <p>-2</p> <p>-3</p>
<p>4.2. What is the state of the sewage system at KwaMathukuza? Sinjani isimo sokuthuthwa kwendle kwaMathukuza?</p> <p>1=Often blocked Ivame ukuvimbeka</p> <p>2=No sewage system Ayikho idreyini</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p>

<p>3=Mostly in working order Ihlale isebenza ngendlela</p> <p>4=Other (specify) Okunye chaza</p> <p>-1=Not applicable Okungathintene</p> <p>-2 = Don't know Angazi</p> <p>-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula</p>	<p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>-1</p> <p>-2</p> <p>-3</p>
<p>4.3. What is the state of the drainage system at KwaMathukuza? Sinjani isimo sedreyini kwaMathukuza?</p> <p>1=Often blocked Ivame ukuvimbeka</p> <p>2=No drainage system Ayikho idreyini</p> <p>3=Mostly in working order Ihlale isebenza ngendlela</p> <p>4=Other (specify) Okunye chaza</p> <p>-1=Not applicable Okungathintene</p> <p>-2 = Don't know</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>-1</p> <p>-2</p>

Angazi	
-3 = Refuse to answer	-3
Angithandi ukuphendula	
4.4. How is the refuse or rubbish of this house taken care of?	
Udoti kumbe imfucuza yalo muzi kunakekelwa kanjani	
1 = Removed by local authority at least once a week	1
Ithathwa umasipala okungenani kanye ngeviki	
2 = Removed by local authority less often than once a week	2
Ithathwa ngumasipala kanye ngeviki kokunye angayithathi iviki lonke	
3 = Removed by community members at least once a week	3
Ithathwa amalunga omphakathi okungenani kanye ngeviki	
4= Removed by community members less often than once a week	4
Ithathwa amalunga omphakathi kanye ngeviki kokunye angayithathi iviki lonke	
5= Communal refuse dump	5
Isichitho somphakathi	
6 = Own refuse dump	6
Isichitho somuzi	
7 = No rubbish removal	7
Ayithathwa imfucuza	
8 = Other (specify)	8
Okunye chaza	
-1=Not applicable	-1
Okungathintene	

-2 = Don't know Angazi	-2
-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula	-3
4.5. How does this household receive most of its mail/post? Lo muzi uzithola kanjani izincwadi/iposi?	
1= Delivered to the dwelling Zilethwa ekhaya	1
2 = Delivered to a post box/private bag Zilandwa eposini	2
3 = Through a friend or neighbour Zilethwa umngane noma umakhelwane	3
4 = Through shop Zilethwa esitolo	4
5 = Through school Zilethwa esikoleni	5
6 = Through work place Zilethwa emsebenzini	6
7 = Through authority Zilethwa kubaphathi	7
8 = Do not receive mail Asizitholo izincwadi/iposi	8
9 = Other (specify)	9

Okunye chaza					
-1 = Not applicable					-1
Okungathintene					-2
-2 = Don't know					-3
Angazi					
-3 = Refuse to answer					
Angithandi ukuphendula					
4.6. From this house, how do you access: Kulo muzi nifika kannjani:	Mode of Transport Indlela yokuhama 1 = By foot Ngezinyawo 2= Taxi Ngetekisi 3 = Car Ngemoto 4 = Bus Ngebhasi 5 = Train Ngesitimela 6 = Motorbike Ngesithuthuthu 7 = Bicycle Ngebhayisekile		Mode of transport Indlela yokuhamba	Time taken for a single trip Isikhathi osithatha yo ukuya kuphela	Cost incurred per single trip Ukhipha malini ukuya kuphela

	8 = Other (specify) Okunye chaza			
1= Clinic/hospital Ikliniki/isibhedlela				
2 = Schools/educational institutions Izikole/izikhungo zezemfundo				
3 = Church Isonto				
4 = Place of work Indawo yokusebenzela				
5 = Bank Ibhange/indlu yokulondoloza imali				
6 = Post-office Eposini				
7 = Police station Emaphoyiseni				
8 = Shopping for food, clothing, etc Izitolo zokudla, zempahla, nezinye				
9 = Other (specify) Okunye chaza				
-1=Not applicable Okungathintene				

-2 = Don't know Angazi			
-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula			

5. HOUSEHOLD WELL-BEING

5.1. What is your current employment status? Sinjani isimo sakho sokusebenza okwamanje	
1 = Unemployed, not looking for work Angisebenzi, angiwufuni umsebenzi	1
2 = Unemployed, looking for work Angisebenzi, ngiyawufuna umsebenzi	2
3 = Pensioner (aged/retired) Impeshini	3
4 = Temporarily sick Ngigula okwesikhashane	4
5 = Permanently disabled Ngikhubazekile	5
6 = Housewife, not working at all, not looking for work Inkosikazi engasebenzi, engafuni msebenzi	6
7 = Housewife, looking for work Inkosikazi engasebenzi ewufunayo umsebenzi	7
8 = Student/learner	8

Umfundi	
9 = Self-employed – full time	9
Ngiyazisebenza ngaso sonke isikhathi	
10 = Self-employed – part time	10
Ngiyazisebenza ngezikhathi ezithile	
11 = Employed part time	11
Ngiqashelwe ukusebenza ngezikhathi ezithile	
12 = Employed full time	12
Ngiqashelwe ukusebenza ngaso sonke isikhathi	
13 = Other (specify)	13
Okunye chaza	
-1 = Not applicable	-1
Okungathintene	
-2 = Don't know	-2
Angazi	
-3 = Refuse to answer	-3
Angithandi ukuphendula	
5.2. If yes to 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 above, then please specify what work you do (your occupation) Uma impendulo yakho inguyebo ku8 noma9 noma10 noma11 noma12 ngenhla, cacisa ukuthi wenza msebenzi muni	
5.3. What were you doing before you stayed at this house? (Ask of every respondent) Yini obuyenza ngaphambi kokuba uhlale kulo muzi?	
1= Unemployed, not looking for work	1

Angisebenzi, angiwufuni umsebenzi	
2= Unemployed, looking for work	2
Angisebenzi, ngiyawufuna umsebenzi	
3 = Pensioner (aged/retired)	3
Impeshini	
4 = Temporarily sick	4
Ngigula okwesikhashane	
5 = Permanently disabled	5
Ngikhubazekile	
6 = Housewife, not working at all, not looking for work	6
Inkosikazi engasebenzi, engafuni msebenzi	
7= Housewife, looking for work	7
Inkosikazi engasebenzi ewufunayo umsebenzi	
8 = Student/learner	8
Umfundi	
9 = Self-employed – full time	9
Ngiyazisebenza ngaso sonke isikhathi	
10 = Self-employed – part time	10
Ngiyazisebenza ngezikhathi ezithile	
11 = Employed part time	11
Ngiqashelwe ukusebenza ngezikhathi ezithile	
12 = Employed full time	12
Ngiqashelwe ukusebenza ngaso sonke isikhathi	

13 = Other (specify) Okunye chaza -1 = Not applicable Okungathintene -2 = Don't know Angazi -3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula	13 -1 -2 -3	
5.4. If yes to 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 above, then please specify what work you were doing. Uma impendulo yakho inguyebo ku8 noma9 noma10 noma11 noma12 ngenhla, cacisa ukuthi wenza msebenzi muni (NOTE IF CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS IS THE SAME AS THE STATUS BEFORE S/HE STAYED AT THIS HOUSE) (QAPHELA UMA ISIMO SOKUSEBENZA KWAKHE SAMANJE NESANGAPHAMBI KOKUBA AHLALE KULO MUZI SIYAFANA)		
5.5. Please give me the letter that best describes the total monthly income after tax. Please include all sources of income, i.e., salaries, pensions, income from investments, etc? (HAND OVER TO RESPONDENT TO SELECT APPLICABLE LETTER) Ngicela ungiphe lokho ekuchaza umrholo wakho uphelele ngenyanga sekuthathwe intela. Ngicela uhlanganise konke, kungabe umrholo womsebenzi, impesheni, imali ezalayo, nokunye (NIKEZA OPHENDULAYO AZIKHETHELE KULOKHO OKUQONDENE NOMHOLO WAKHE)	Household Ezomuzi	Personal Ezakho kuphela
No income Awukho umrholo	1	1
K = R1 – R500	2	2
L = R501 – R750	3	3

M = R751 – R 1000	4	4
N = R1 001 – R1 500	5	5
O = R1 501 – R2 000	6	6
P = R2 001 – R3 000	7	7
Q = R3 001 – R5 000	8	8
R = R5 001 – R7 500	9	9
S = R7 501 – R10 000	10	10
T = R10 001 – R15 000	11	11
U = R15 001 – R20 000	12	12
V = R20 001 – R30 000	13	13
W = R30 000+	14	14
-1 = Not applicable Okungathintene	-1	-1
-2 = Don't know Angazi	-2	-2
-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula	-3	-3
5.6. Do you use this house to generate finances in any of the following ways? (ASK OF EVERYONE AND ALLOW MULTIPLE RESPONSES) Uyawusebenzisa lo muzi ukuze uthole imali ngendlela ezahlukene (BUZA WONKE UMUNTUUVUMELE UKUTHI BAKHETHE IMPENDULO ENGAPHEZU KWEYODWA) 1 = Rent the whole house Uqashise ngomuzi wonke	1	

2 = Rent a room out Uqashise ngegumbi	2		
3 = Offer parking space Uqashise ngendawo yokupaka	3		
4 = Run business from home Uqhuba ibhizinisi ekhaya	4		
5 = Use as security on loan (i.e. accessed credit using your house as collateral) Uyakwazi ukubambisa ngayo komashonisa	5		
6 = Other (specify) Okunye chaza	6		
-1 = Not applicable Okungathintene	-1		
-2 = Don't know Angazi	-2		
-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula	-3		
5.7. Would you like sell your house? (ASK ONLY OF OWNERS. RENTERS JUMP TO Q5.16) Ungathanda ukudayisa umuzi wakho (BUZA ABANINIMUZI KUPHELA, ABAQASHI BADLULELE KUMBUZO 5.16)	Yes Yebo	No Cha	Have not considered it Angikaze ngikucabange
5.8. If yes, why would you like to sell your house? Uma impendulo kunguyebo, kungani ungathanda ukudayisa umuzi wakho			

5.9. If no, why would you not like to sell your house? Uma impendulo kungucha, kungani ungathandi ukudayisa umuzi wakho	
5.10. How much would you sell your house for? Ungawudayisa ngamalini umuzi wakho? 1 = Less than R7500 Ngaphantsi kwaR7 500 2 = R7501-R15000 3 = R15001-R18000 4 = R18001-R20000 5 = R20001-R40000 6 = More than R40000 Ngaphezu kwaR40 000 -1 = Not applicable Okungathintene -2 = Don't know Angazi -3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula	1 2 3 4 5 6 -1 -2 -3
5.11. Is there anything that could stop you from selling your house? Kukhona okungakuvimba ukudayisa umuzi wakho?	Yes No Yebo Cha
5.12. If yes, what is it? Uma impendulo kunguyebo, yini engakuvimba?	
5.13. If you sold your house, would you make the Deeds of Register aware of the change in ownership?	

<p>Uma uwudayisa umuzi wakho ungalenza yini itayitela ukubonisa ushintsho lomunikazi womuzi?</p> <p>1 =Yes Yebo</p> <p>2 = No Cha</p> <p>3 = Not aware of Deeds of Register Angazi lutho ngetayitile</p> <p>-1 = Not applicable Okungathintene</p> <p>-2 = Don't know Angazi</p> <p>-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>-1</p> <p>-2</p> <p>-3</p>
<p>5.14. Would you like to rent out your house? Ungathanda ukuqashisa ngomuzi wakho?</p>	<p>Yes No (IF NO, JUMP TO Q. 5.19)</p> <p>Yebo Cha (UMA IMPENDULO INGUCHA DLULELA KUMBUZO 5.19)</p> <p>Have not considered it Angikaze ngikucabange</p>
<p>5.15. If yes, why would you like to rent out your house? Uma impendulo inguyebo, kungani ungathanda ukuqashisa ngomuzi wakho?</p>	

<p>5.16. How much would you rent out the whole house for per month? Ungawuqashisa ngamalini umuzi wakho wonke ngenyanga?</p> <p>1= Less than R200 Ngaphantsi kwaR200</p> <p>2 = R201-R250</p> <p>3= R251-R300</p> <p>4 = R301- R350</p> <p>5 = R351+</p> <p>NgeR351 ukuya phezulu</p> <p>-1 = Not applicable Okungathintene</p> <p>-2 = Don't know Angazi</p> <p>-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>-1</p> <p>-2</p> <p>-3</p>
<p>5.17. How much would you charge to rent out space in this house/yard? Ungabiza malini ukuqashisa ngesikhala kulo muzi noma kulo mhlaba walo muzi?</p> <p>1 = Less than R50 Ngaphantsi kwaR50</p> <p>2 = R51 – R100</p> <p>3 = R101-R150</p> <p>4 = R151-R200</p> <p>5 = R201+</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p>

NgeR201 ukuya phezulu -1 = Not applicable Okungathintene -2 = Don't know Angazi -3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula	-1 -2 -3
5.18. Is there anything that could stop you from renting out your house? Kukhona okungakuvimba ukuqashisa ngalo muzi?	Yes No Yebo Cha
5.19. If yes, what is it? Uma impendulo kunguyebo, yini engakuvimba?	
5.20. Do you prefer to own a house? Uncamela ukuba ngumunini muzi?	Yes No Yebo Cha
5.21. If yes, why do you prefer to own a house? Uma impendulo kunguyebo, kungani uncamela ukuba ngumuninimuzi?	
5.22. Do you prefer to rent a house? Uncamela ukuwuqashisa umuzi?	Yes No Yebo Cha
5.23. If yes, why do you prefer to rent a house? Uma impendulo kunguyebo, kungani uncamela ukuwuqashisa?	
5.24. Have you made any changes to the house since you acquired it? (ASK OF EVERYONE) Kukhona ushintsho osuke walwenza kusukela waba nalo muzi? (BUZA WONKE UMUNTU)	Yes No (IF NO, JUMP TO Q. 5.28) Yebo Cha (UMA IMPENDULO INGUCHA DLULELA)

	KUMBUZO 5.28)
5.25. If yes, what changes? Uma impendulo kunguyebo, shintsho luni?	
5.26. Why did you make the changes to the house? Kungani wenza ushintsho kulo muzi?	
5.27. How much did these changes to the house cost you? Lakubiza malini ushintsho olwenzile kulo muzi?	
1 = Less than R1000 Ngaphantsi kwaR1000	1
2 = R1001=R2000	2
3 = R2001-R3000	3
4 = R3001-R4000	4
5 = R4001-R5000	5
6 = More than R5001 Ngaphezu kwaR5001	6
-1 = Not applicable Okungathintene	-1
-2 = Don't know Angazi	-2
-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula	-3
5.28. How did you raise funds for the changes made to your house? Uyithole kanjani imali yokwenza ushintsho kulo muzi?	

1= Own funds Imali yakho	1		
2 = Raised loan with a private sector bank Imali-mboleko yasebhange	2		
3 = Raised loan with government finance institution Imali-mboleko yezikhungo zikahulumeni	3		
4 = Money lender Omashonisa	4		
5 = Family Umndeni	5		
6 = Friends Abangane	6		
7= Employer Umqashi	7		
8= Other (specify) Okunye chaza	8		
-1 = Not applicable Okungathintene	-1		
-2 = Don't know Angazi	-2		
-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula	-3		
5.29. Are you planning any further changes to the house in the next 6 months? (ASK OF EVERYONE)	Yes	No	Not sure/Don't

<p>Uhlela ukuqhubekela phambili noshintsho kulo muzi ezinyangeni eziyisithupha ezizayo? (BUZA WONKE UMUNTU)</p>	<p>know Yebo Cha Angiqinisekanga /Angazi</p>
<p>5.30. How much are your total monthly fixed expenses of staying in this house, for example, water, electricity, refuse removal, rates etc in rands?</p> <p>Kubiza malini ngenyanga ukuhlala kulo muzi ngenyanga sekuhlangene amanzi, ugesi, ukuthuthwa kwadoti, namarates nokunye?</p> <p>1 = Less than R100 Ngaphantsi kwaR100</p> <p>2 = R100-R200</p> <p>3 = R201-R300</p> <p>4 = R301- R400</p> <p>5 = R401 - R500</p> <p>6 = More than R500 Ngaphezu kwaR500</p> <p>7 = Other (specify) Okunye chaza</p> <p>-1 = Not applicable Okungathintene</p> <p>-2 = Don't know Angazi</p> <p>-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>7</p> <p>-1</p> <p>-2</p> <p>-3</p>

<p>5.31. What services require this house as proof of residency to access? Yiziphi izidingo ezifuna isiqiniseko sokuthi uhlala kulo muzi ukuze uzithole?</p> <p>1 = Educational Ezemfundo</p> <p>2 = Health Ezempilo</p> <p>3 = Employment Ezomsebenzi</p> <p>4 = Credit Ezikhokelwa kamuva</p> <p>5 = Government grant Usizo lwezimali lukahulumeni</p> <p>6= Other (specify) Okunye chaza</p> <p>-1 = Not applicable Okungathintene</p> <p>-2 = Don't know Angazi</p> <p>-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>-1</p> <p>-2</p> <p>-3</p>
<p>5.32. How do you make use of the land your house occupies? Uwusebenzisa kanjani umhlaba lo muzi owakhiwe kuwo?</p> <p>1=No use is made of the land</p>	<p>1</p>

<p>Akukho esikwenzayo ngalo muhlaba</p> <p>2= Vegetable garden</p> <p>Ingadi yezithelo</p> <p>3 = Parking cars</p> <p>Ukupakwa kwezimoto</p> <p>4 = Extending building</p> <p>Ukukhuliswa komuzi</p> <p>5= Storage place</p> <p>Indawo yokugcina okuthile</p> <p>6 = Landscaping</p> <p>Ukunakekela/ukulungiswa kwegceke</p> <p>7 = Other (specify)</p> <p>Okunye chaza</p> <p>-1 = Not applicable</p> <p>Okungathintene</p> <p>-2 = Don't know</p> <p>Angazi</p> <p>-3 = Refuse to answer</p> <p>Angithandi ukuphendula</p>	<p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>7</p> <p>-1</p> <p>-2</p> <p>-3</p>
<p>5.33. Are there environmental issues that you have to deal with at KwaMathukuza? for example (MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED)</p> <p>Zikhona izinkinga zezindawo okumele nibhekane nazo kwaMathukuza? (UVUMELEKILE UKUKHETHA IMPENDULO ENGAPHEZU KWEYODWA)</p>	

1= Dust Izintuli	1
2 = Water pollution Amanzi angcolile	2
3 = Littering Ukunganakwa kukadoti	3
4 = Noise Umsindo	4
5 = Soil erosion Ukuguguleka komhlabathi	5
6= Potholes Izikhintsi/imigodi emgaqweni	6
7 = Cutting of trees Ukunqunywa kwezihlahla	7
8= Over grazing Ukudla kakhulu kwezilwane endaweni eyodwa	8
9 = Other (specify) Okunye chaza	9
-1 = Not applicable Okungathintene	-1
-2 = Don't know Angazi	-2
-3 = Refuse to answer	-3

Angithandi ukuphendula	
5.34. Do you belong to any of the following..... at KwaMathukuza? Kukhona oyilunga lako kuloku okulandelayo.....kwaMathukuza?	
1= Community organisations Umbutho womphakathi	1
2 = Social clubs Izinhlangano zomphakathi	2
3 = Political organisations Izinhlangano zezepolitiki	3
4 = Church Ezesonto	4
5 = Sport Ezemidlalo	5
6 = Savings Club Inhlangano yokongiwa imali	6
7 = Burial Clubs Umasingcwabisane	7
8 = Stokvels Izistokfela	8
9 = Other (specify) Okunye chaza	9
-1 = Not applicable Okungathintene	-1

-2 = Don't know Angazi	-2
-3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula	-3
5.35. Can you easily reach any of the following community/social facilities..... at KwaMathukuza? Uyakwazi ukufikelela kalula kule zizindawo zomphakathi.....kwaMathukuza?	
1= Multipurpose centre Isikhungu sokunikeza izidingo ezahlukene	1
2 = Community centres Isikhungu somphakathi	2
3= Sports field Inkundla yezemidlalo	3
4= Community hall Iholo lomphakathi	4
5 = Child care Ukunakekelwa kwabantwana	5
6 = Libraries Umtapo wolwazi	6
7 = Taxi ranks/bus shelter Erenke yamatekisi/estopini sebhasi	7
8 = Markets for the informal sector Abadayisi emgaqweni/emakete	8
9 =Other (specify)	9

Okunye chaza -1 = Not applicable Okungathintene -2 = Don't know Angazi -3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula	-1 -2 -3
5.36. Have you ever been a victim of crime since you stayed in this house? Uke wagatshengwa selokhu wahlala kulo muzi?	Yes No (IF NO, JUMP TO Q. 5.40) Yebo Cha (UMA IMPENDULO INGUCHA DLULELA KUMBUZO 5.40)
5.37. If yes, what type of crime? (MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED) Uma impendulo inguyebo, luhlobo luni lobulelesi? (UVUMELEKILE UKUKHETHA IMPENDULO ENGAPHEZU KWEYODWA) 1= Rape Ukudlwengulwa 2 = Theft Ukuntshontsha 3 = Murder Ukubulala 4 = Robbery Ukubamba inkunzi 5 = House breaking	1 2 3 4

<p>Ukugqokeza 5 = Hijacking Ukuduna kwezimoto 6 = Domestic violence Udlame lasekhaya 7 = Other (specify) 8 = Other (specify) Okunye chaza -1 = Not applicable Okungathintene -2 = Don't know Angazi -3 = Refuse to answer Angithandi ukuphendula</p>	<p>5 6 7 8 -1 -2 -3</p>
<p>5.38. How many times have you been a victim of crime since staying in this house? Sewubandakanyeke kangaki kubulelesi selokhu waqala ukuhlala kulo muzi?</p>	
<p>5.39. Are you aware of any crime incidents at KwaMathukuza? Kukhona isiganenko sobulelesi osaziyo la KwaMathukuza?</p>	<p>Yes No (IF NO, JUMP TO Q. 5.42) Yebo Cha (UMA IMPENDULO INGUCHA DLULELA KUMBUZO 5.42)</p>
<p>5.40. If yes, what type of crime? (MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED) Uma impendulo inguyebo, luhlobo luni lobulelesi? (UVUMELEKILE UKUKHETHA IMPENDULO ENGAPHEZU KWEYODWA) 1 = Rape</p>	

Ukudlwengulwa	1
2 = Theft	
Ukuntshontsha	2
3 = Murder	
Ukubulala	3
4 = Robbery	
Ukubamba inkunzi	4
5 = House breaking	
Ukugqekeza	5
6 = Hijacking	
Ukuduna kwezimoto	6
7 = Domestic violence	
Udlame lasekhaya	7
8 = Other (specify)	
Okunye chaza	8
-1 = Not applicable	
Okungathintene	-1
-2 = Don't know	
Angazi	-2
-3 = Refuse to answer	
Angithandi ukuphendula	-3
5.41. Would you like your children or grand-children to stay here and keep this house?	Yes No
Ungathanda abantwana bakho kumbe abazukulu bakho bahlale lapha bawugcine lo muzi?	Yebo Cha

5.42. If yes, why would you like your children or grand-children to stay here at KwaMathukuza and keep this house? Uma impendulo inguyebo, kungani ungathanda ukuba abantwana bakho kumbe abazukulu bakho bahlale lapha bawugcine lo muzi?	
5.43. If no, why would you not like your children or grand-children to stay here at KwaMathukuza and keep this house? Uma impendulo ingucha, kungani ungathandi ukuba abantwana bakho kumbe abazukulu bakho bahlale lapha bawugcine lo muzi?	
5.44. Do you see yourself living in this house in the next 5 years? Uzibona uhlala kulo muzi eminyakeni emihlanu ezayo?	Yes No Yebo Cha
5.45. If yes, why do you see yourself living in this house in the next 5 years? Uma impendulo inguyebo, kungani uzibona uhlala kulo muzi eminyakeni emihlanu ezayo?	
5.46. If no, why not? Uma impendulo ingucha, kungani	
5.47. How many ADULTS stay in this house? (ADULTS = 18 YRS OR OLDER) Bangaki abantu abadala abahla kulo muzi (ABANTU ABADALA BANEMINYAKA EYI18 UKUYA PHEZULU)	
5.48. How many CHILDREN stay in this house? (CHILDREN = 17 YRS OR YOUNGER) Bangaki abantwana abahlala kulo muzi? (ABANTWANA BANEMINYAKA EYI17 UKUYA PHANTSI)	

6. MIGRATION

6.1. Are there any people you know who left KwaMathukuza due to reasons related to the houses? Bakhona abantu obaziyo abahamba KwaMathukuza ngenxa yezizathu eziphathelele nezindlu	Yes No Don't know Yebo Cha Angazi
6.2. If yes, what were the reasons? Uma impendulo inguyebo, yiziphi izizathu	

6.3. If no, what were the reasons? Uma impendulo ingucha, yiziphi izizathu	
6.4. Are there any people you know who left KwaMathukuza due to reasons related to the neighbourhood? Bakhona abantu obaziyo abahamba KwaMathukuza ngenxa yezizathu zokungahlali kahle endaweni?	Yes No Don't know Yebo Cha Angazi
6.5. If yes, what were the reasons? Uma impendulo inguyebo, yiziphi izizathu	
6.6. If no, what were the reasons? Uma impendulo ingucha, yiziphi izizathu	
6.7. Are there any people you know who have moved into KwaMathukuza due to reasons related to the houses? Bakhona abantu obaziyo abaze ukuzohlala KwaMathukuza ngenxa yezizathu eziphatelene nezindlu	Yes No Don't know Yebo Cha Angazi
6.8. If yes, what were the reasons? Uma impendulo inguyebo, yiziphi izizathu	
6.9. If no, what were the reasons? Uma impendulo ingucha, yiziphi izizathu	
6.10. Are there any people you know who have moved into KwaMathukuza due to reasons related to the neighbourhood? Bakhona abantu obaziyo abaze ukuzohlala KwaMathukuza ngenxa yezizathu zokuthanda le ndawo?	Yes No Don't know Yebo Cha Angazi
6.11. If yes, what were the reasons? Uma impendulo inguyebo, yiziphi izizathu	
6.12. If no, what were the reasons? Uma impendulo ingucha, yiziphi izizathu	

Finishing time	
-----------------------	--

ENKOSI!! THANK YOU!! NGIYABONGA

Informed Consent Form

(To be read out by researcher before the beginning of the interview. One copy of the form to be left with the respondent; one copy to be signed by the respondent and kept by the researcher.)

My name is Nomfundo Kakaza (student number 210540768). I am doing research on a project entitled “An Assessment of the Impact of the KwaMathukuza Housing Project at Newcastle Municipality on the Lives of the Beneficiaries”. This project is supervised by Daniela Casale at the School of Development Studies, University of KwaZulu-Natal. I am managing the project and should you have any questions my contact details are:

School of Development Studies, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban OR Unit 5 Granada, Wapadrand, Pretoria. Cell: 0726801447 Tel: 0218077570. Email: warara2003@yahoo.com or 210540768@ukzn.ac.za.

Igama lam nguNomfundo Kakaza, ngingumfundi kwinyuvesi yakwaZulu-Natali, inombolo engibhaliswe ngayo ngu210540768. Ngicosha ulwazi noshintsho oluze nezindlu enizakhelwe la kwMathukuza. Umuntu ungumphathi wam kule zizifundo ndu Dokotela uDaniela Casale wesikole sezentuthukho kwinyuvesi yakwaZulu-Natali. Yimina owenza umsebenzi wokuqoqa lolu lwazi, uma ngabe kukhona okunye ofuna ukwazi ngale projekti, ungaxhumana nabesikole sezentuthukho kwinyuvesi yakwaZulu-Natali noma lapho ngihlala khona ePitoli. Ungathintana ngeselfoni kunombolo 072 680 1477 noma ngekheli leteknoloji kuwarara2003@yahoo.com noma ku210540768@ukzn.ac.za.

Thank you for agreeing to take part in the project. Before we start I would like to emphasize that:

- your participation is entirely voluntary;
- you are free to refuse to answer any question;
- you are free to withdraw at any time.

Ngiyabonga nogkuthi uvume nginkubuze imibuzo. Phambi kokuba siqale, ngingathanda ukuthi ngicacise ukuthi;

- awuphquelekanga ukuthi ukhulume nami
- unelungelo lokuthi ungawuphednuli umbuzo uma ungafuni
- unelungelo lokuthi ungaqhubeki onkukhuluma nami nangesiphina isikhathi

The interview will be kept strictly confidential and will be available only to members of the research team. Excerpts from the interview may be made part of the final research report. Do you give your consent for: *(please tick one of the options below)*

Inkulumo yethu ngekhe yaziswe wonke umuntu, iyakwaziwa kuphela ngabantu negisebenza nabo kule projekti. Ezinye izinto esizikhulumile zingaba yingxenye yeripoti. Uyavuma ukuthi (ngicela ubhale la ngaphansi)

Your name, position and organisation, or Igama lakho, isihlalo nenhlangano yakho noma	
Your position and organisation, or Isihlalo sakho nenhlangano noma	
Your organisation or type of organisation <i>(please specify)</i> , or Inhlangano yakho noma luhlobo luni lwenhlangano (ngicela uchazise) noma	
None of the above Awuvumeli nazo zonke ezingenhla	

to be used in the report?

Ukuthi zisebenziswe kwiripoti?

Please sign this form to show that I have read the contents to you.

Ngicela usayine ukubonis ukuthi ngikufundele konke loku

----- (signed) ----- (date)
(sayina) (umuhla)

----- (print name)
(bhala igama)

Write your address below if you wish to receive a copy of the research report:

Bhala ikheli lakho ngaphansi uma ufuna ukuthola iripoti