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ABSTRACT

The rapid increase in student enrolment in universities has brought about a number of concerns, including off campus student housing as Institutions of Higher Learning are unable to accommodate all students on campus. Due to the extremely small number of students that are currently being accommodated on campus, many students are forced to find accommodation off campus. Property owners nearby Institutions of Higher Learning have begun letting their homes to students for economic gain. Housing of students has become a new business venture for many surrounding houses and large buildings.

This study examined some of the problems associated with non-accredited accommodation in Summerstrand in order to provide recommendations towards a policy for off-campus student accommodation. The study investigated the experiences of both students and landlords in order to establish some of the requirements a property owner needs to meet in order to be legible to house students. Ultimately the study will make recommendations for an effective policy for off-campus student accommodation in the Nelson Mandela Bay. An effective policy for the development of student housing in the Nelson Mandela Bay needs to be formulated as students can be exploited by landlords and landlords can exploited by students. The study identified 4 particular areas of concern namely rent, security, facilities and maintenance; and provided recommendations for the policy for off-campus accommodation.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Development theory focuses on the processes of economic and social change; which lead to progress, the expansion of people’s choices, acquisition of knowledge and obtaining access to resources to ensure adequate standard of living by improving socio-economic and political dimensions of a society (Pieterson, 2001). Power (2003:2) argues that development can be defined as positive change, improvement, or improved condition which lead to “increased living standards, better healthcare and well-being and other forms of common good which are seen to benefit the society at large”.

Haynes (2008) argues that the basic objective of development is to create an enabling environment for people to live long, healthy as well as to live creative lives. Two of the most critical objectives of development, include education and the ability to enjoy a decent standard of living. Housing is one of the most important and essential needs for all humans, and for this reason it has assumed an important place in development (Haynes 2008).

According to Macintyre (2003), the growing market for student housing accommodation is seen to be one that will continue to grow. Each year large number of students are accepted into institutions of higher learning and are in need of accommodation. In addition, Macintyre (2003) argues that research has shown a clear and strong connection between stable accommodation and relative success in studies, which is one of the reasons why housing is important and is an essential need.

This research aims to contribute recommendation towards a policy for off-campus student housing in the Nelson Mandela Bay. According to Gilbert and Varley (1991), a state policy is a critical ingredient in changing any housing situation in any city. The formulation of an off campus student housing policy in Nelson Mandela Bay will assist in preventing and dealing with student housing problems for both the students as well as the landlords.
1.2 RESEARCH PROBLEM

The rapid increase in student enrolment in South Africa Universities has brought about a number of concerns, including rising numbers of students seeking housing, who cannot be accommodated on campus. However, studies have shown that while the demand for student accommodation increases, there is a considerable shortfall in the supply of quality accommodation (Macintyre, 2003). In addition, the DHET (2011) reports that much of the recent provision of off-campus accommodation has been unplanned and reactive, with complicated and even questionable lease agreements and public-private partnerships that see universities carrying risks. These accommodation facilities are often unsuitable, inadequate and often located in the worst and most unsafe areas of the community.

In addition to the shortage of available accommodation, financial restrictions have been identified as a factor that has forced students into substandard accommodation in properties that were frequently insanitary and that failed to meet appropriate safety regulations (Macintyre, 2003). Gilbert and Varley (1991:8) argue that the only “obvious outcome of rising housing costs therefore, is greater overcrowding and deteriorating conditions”.

According to Da Cunha (2014:35), landlords take advantage of student’s inexperience and naivety by charging rent that is way more than what the house or apartment is worth. However, housing students on the other hand does come with disadvantages. Rugg, Rhodes & Jones (2002) mention that landlord’s claim that students can be very demanding, destructive and often fail to pay their rent. The fact that there is no policy to regulate the students as well as the landlords in the Nelson Mandela Bay means that the above mentioned problems go unresolved.

According to DHET (2011) private student housing in South Africa is completely unregulated. There are no clear and coherent regulations governing the provision of student housing in South Africa, at either local/municipal, regional or national levels (DHET 2011). This lack of policy and regulation has been of particular concern, as some international literature has shown, a lack of planning and oversight can lead to serious unintended and negative consequences (Macintyre, 2003). In response the DHET (2011) have stressed the need for policy that mandates minimum standards for
the accommodation and housing of students and made applicable to all providers of student housing, both public and private.

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In response to the problem explained above, the purpose of the research was to discover some of the problems associated with non-accredited accommodation in Summerstrand. Ultimately this research will make recommendations for an effective policy for off campus accommodation in the Nelson Mandela Bay.

The Primary Research Question is as follows:

*What are some of the essential elements that need to be incorporated into an off-campus student housing policy in the Nelson Mandela Bay?*

In order to answer this question, the following secondary questions were posed:

a) What are some of the problems experienced by students residing in non-accredited accommodation?

b) What do students consider to be the most important requirements for off-campus student housing?

c) What are some of the problems experienced by landlord leasing non-accredited houses?

d) What do landlords consider to be the most important requirements for off-campus student housing?

1.4 SCOPE OF STUDY

The Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University is situated in Port Elizabeth, in the Nelson Mandela Bay. The focus of the study was on students residing in non-accredited off-campus residences in the suburb of Summerstrand. The focus of the research was on both students as well as the landlords in Summerstrand. This was to ensure that the policy recommendations are unbiased and cover issues faced by students as well as landlords.
1.5 **RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY**

This research adopted a qualitative approach. Qualitative data can be systematically gathered, organised, interpreted, analysed as well as communicated so as to address real world problems. According to Harwell (2011) qualitative research is a method that focuses on discovering as well as understanding the experiences perspectives and thoughts of the participants. Harwell (2011) further argues that qualitative research methods allow the researcher to formulate explanations from the unrestricted information gathered from the participants. The researcher made use of interviews and focus groups in order to collect data.

This research made use of a non-probability purposive sampling. The intended sample for the study consisted of twenty students from different age groups and who reside in Summerstrand. Interviews were also conducted with seven landlords from Summerstrand.

According to Thorn (1999) many qualitative analytic strategies rely on a general approach called constant comparative analysis. Constant comparative analysis was used to interpret and analyze the responses obtained from the interviews. The other method that was used to analyze the responses is thematic analysis. According to Braun and Clarke (2006), thematic analysis is seen as foundational method for qualitative data. Braun and Clarke (2006) argue that thematic analysis is a method used for identifying, analyzing as well as reporting patterns (themes) within data.

1.6 **LIMITATIONS**

The researcher experienced certain limitations concerning the study. It had to be noted that the knowledge and information the researcher obtained and analysed did not represent all of the students or landlords, and thus the researcher had to be careful of generalisation. However, despite the challenges faced, this research with its findings can provide the much needed insight to prospective researchers and government with regards to off-campus student accommodation.

1.7 **ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

Part of the researcher’s duty was to explain to all the participants the purpose of the study. The participants consent was received by them agreeing to continue in the
The researcher however informed the participants of the purpose of the study and that participation was optional. The identity of the participants was, under no circumstances revealed nor was their identity asked during the interviews.

A consent letter was formulated with the help of the researcher’s supervisor. Once the consent of the participants was obtained, the researcher removed identifying information from the interview material. The participant would, prior to the interview process taking place, notify the researcher when they did not feel comfortable in being interviewed.

The confidentiality of the participants was treated with utmost dignity. The research study respected the participants and their views, regarding their knowledge as meaningful contributions in the process of understanding their social reality. The researcher also made sure that they have been granted permission to interview NMMU students as well as the landlords.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Maasdorp and Haaroff (1983) argue that urban and regional problems have come to assume an important place in development studies, including housing. Housing is one issue that no country whether rich or poor, whether developed or developing can ignore.

The DHET (2011) argues that student housing is a significant variable in a student’s academic life. In September 2011, the Department of Higher Education and Training released a report on student housing within South Africa as a guide as well as a basis of understanding the workings of a residence. Some of the critical issues that were identified by the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET 2011) include, academic learning and success being constrained by overcrowding and the basic health and safety norms and standards that are being violated by poor quality of student accommodation options.

According to the report by DHET (2011), the provision of private student housing is unregulated, this has then allowed a wide spread exploitation of students and exposure of students to various levels of risks. DHET (2011) also argues that the private involvement in student housing projects can make a useful contribution but only if it is regulated as to ensure that all students are provided with quality accommodation that is conducive and sustainable.

2.2 STUDENT HOUSING IN THE INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

There are different student housing trends in many different countries. In the United States for instance, the National Multi Housing Council (NMHC) is reported as saying that many students may actually prefer living off campus because of the space, cost and freedom from university rules (Piotrowicz, 2009). In a survey conducted at a large Canadian university, however, over two-fifths which is 43% of off campus students stated that they would live on campus if they could (Knight and Parr, 2010), with the majority saying that their housing distance from campus meant they are unable
participate adequately in campus life. A Eurostudent report (2011) concluded that, there is no single type of housing which is best for all students. On the other hand, there is no single kind of student for whom any kind of housing would be appropriate, but students with varying socio-economic backgrounds, age, gender, geographic locations, study interests and preferences.

Students’ personal preferences, as in the form of preferences for a certain level of quality of room amenities, can regulate what kind of housing students choose. Youth and students are often seen to be at the forefront of the latest social trends, as well as being directly targeted by advertisers of anything new or up to date, and their expectations, or at least their aspirations, are correspondingly high. In this light, where they have a choice, all students in all locations are increasingly swayed by the quality and availability of housing services and amenities (DHET 2010). In support of the above mentioned statement, Ryan (2003) argues that today’s students also have high expectations for up-to-date service delivery and facilities that provide value. Individuals responsible for student housing programmes have the responsibility of offering students safe and fully functioning facilities with modern facilities and programmes, all at reasonable cost.

During the last few decades there has been an increased emphasis on the university as purely a place for academic exchange, “such that it became the responsibility of the student to source his or her own accommodation” (Han, 2004:21). The growing demand during the 1960s for a university education, coupled with the assertion of the rights of youth and students, exposed the weaknesses in the established approaches to student housing (DHET, 2011). The shortage of accommodation compelled many universities to introduce systems like Cambridge University’s “licensed lodgings”, so as to provide bed and breakfast services to students (Hughes & Davis, 2002).

The demand for student housing especially for specific types of housing is greater than the supply in most of countries, although the extent of the supply varies widely. This is a result of the high influx in the number of students enrolled into universities each year. As a result most universities in Western Europe lack sufficient accommodation to house their students, “with very few accommodating more than 10%” (King Sturge, 2008:2). According to Informa Australia (2011), the second Australian Student Housing Summit focused on the growing demand for, and the shortage of, student housing.
housing in Australia. Using data from Universities Australia, it is estimated that there is only one bed available for every 20 students enrolled in Australian higher education institutions (DHET 2010). In Canada in 2007, “student bed-space across all universities averaged at 16.8%” (Knight and Parr, 2010:25).

The greatest student housing capacity was at the University of British Columbia, one of the largest Canadian universities by fulltime student headcount “it had bed space for 28% of its fulltime students, while the least bed-space was 7.4%, at the University of Calgary” (Knight and Parr, 2010:25). In the United States in 2003, a survey of 118 public and private fourth year colleges and universities, servicing 10% of all US students at the time, found that “they were able to provide housing for an average of 23.5% of their students” (Abramson, 2003:22). At the University of California, Los Angeles, 52% of the student population is currently housed within one mile of campus, though not all this housing is owned by the university (UCLA, 2011).

It is also important to note that the fact that student demand for housing rises and falls at different times of the year has encouraged some universities to develop more flexible models, like the ‘double as a single’ and the ‘expanded housing’ models, to cater for fluctuating demand and thus maximize revenue (Ryan, 2003). Due to this high demand of student housing, some universities even lease hotel rooms or alternate accommodation to meet the temporary demand by students (DHET, 2010).

2.3 STUDENT HOUSING IN SOUTH AFRICA

Hendricks (2012:6) argues that “education within South Africa before apartheid era was limited to white males and females, however, post-apartheid education has become multi-racial and multi-cultural, offering students opportunities that they never had before. The above mentioned is supported by DHET (2011:13) as they state that “the last decade has seen an explosion in student enrolment in our rental university system, with enrolment reaching 535 433 in 2010 and 538 210 in 2011”. The above mentioned growth rate is estimated to grow at a rate of about 2%, (DHET (2011). DHET (2011) further states that the number of beds available at residential universities in 2010 totalled 107 598, which is 20% of the total enrolment.
According to DHET (2011) research suggest that, internationally, about 50% of students reside at their homes or with relatives, however because of the high levels of poverty in South Africa and the unsustainability of the home environment for academic purposes for majority of students, suitable student accommodation needs to be provided for up to 100% of students in some instances. DHET (2010) further states that the ideal bed capacity target that is recommended by the committee ranges from 50% to about 80%, this would then translate into a shortage of 20 800 beds.

Hendricks (2012) argues that there is an accommodation shortage for students as student numbers are growing each and every year. In Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University there are 21 732 students in total and only a shocking 12.83% are housed on campus (Hendricks 2012). Due to the above mentioned shocking estimations of the number of students that are currently being accommodated on campus, large amounts of students are forced to find accommodation off campus. The University of Fort Hare is another example of a university in the Eastern Cape where the constant number of growing students and the lack of adequate student housing is a problem. According to Hendricks (2012), the University of Fort Hare houses approximately 40% of its students however even with this relatively high percentage, would like to accommodate at least 50% of their students.

Apart from those students who reside at home or in their own accommodation, it is estimated that the number of student beds currently made available by both small and large scale private providers in South Africa is close to 10% of the total full-time contact enrolment at universities in 2010 (DHET, 2010). Rugg, Rhodes and Jones’s (2002) argue that many landlords have now become established recently with the aim of capitalising on growing student demand. Property owners around institutions of higher learning have left their homes in order to house students for economic gain. Housing of students has become a new business venture for many surrounding houses and large buildings.

Having mentioned the above it is important to note that the student housing is to be conducive for both living and learning. DHET (2010) states that research evidence suggests that being housed in a safe, well-managed residence is both socially and academically beneficial for students, particularly those from poorer backgrounds. The above mentioned also means that students should not have to spend hours travelling
to and from the university and that they should live in conditions that are conducive to academic study.

Off campus accommodation includes rentals for students outside tertiary institution campuses, accredited or not accredited by tertiary institutions (Hendrick 2012). The above mentioned includes communes, apartments, houses and lastly rooms. It is important to note that there are pros and cons in residing both on and off campus (Hendricks 2012), however each accommodation is chosen to best fit the needs of the students. There are number of different types of student accommodation available today for students, this then boils down to choice, students now have the power to choose the quality of space and location as well as the cost of living (Hendricks 2012).

The element of choice is something many students in the past did not have. Hendricks (2012) argues that, living in the post-apartheid era also means that more students attend universities and the demographics vary from institution to institution. In support of the above mentioned Macintyre (2003) argues that housing requirements of each student will vary. Mature students who are at their master’s level for instance will have different housing requirements from an 18 year old undergraduate.

There are a number of things that influence students when choosing accommodation however most student’s choice of accommodation are heavily influenced by the travel distances, cost of living, student’s success, support system, homeliness of the place, study environment, sleeping space and lastly the eating space (Hendricks 2012). Hendricks (2012) further argues that a residence cannot cater for each and every student, but can however offer choice as well as variety to best fit the needs of the student in order for it to be identifiable and be a timeless solution. Universities consist of multicultural as well as multiracial students therefore student’s wants and needs, differs from student to student.

Finally, due to the high rentals that university students are likely to pay if there is demand for accommodation, they end up taking spaces that could be occupied by neighbourhood families and an artificial inflation of housing prices is created which can have a negative effect on the local housing market (Macintyre, 2003; Han, 2004). It therefore becomes vital for the city and its higher education institutions to work together to address housing concerns. Well planned student housing has the potential
to revitalize neglected city areas (Macintyre, 2003) but, when poorly integrated into existing patterns and demographics, student housing initiatives can have a negative impact on the economic, physical, cultural and social lives of communities (Smith, 2008). Student rental properties can present a problem of low maintenance standards, as the owner is not there to contribute to ongoing maintenance. The above mentioned has the capacity of leading to deteriorating infrastructure, declining property values and potential ghettoization of an area (Macintyre, 2003:116). An example of a cultural impact that may be caused by the accommodation of students is that it may lead to less community involvement and cohesion, after Students are also perceived (Smith, 2008), to have a ‘work hard, play hard’ attitude that affects relations with neighbours because of increased noise levels.

The problems and challenges discussed above, highlighted the need for a policy to regulate off-campus student accommodation. There are also no clear and coherent regulations governing the provision of student housing in South Africa, at either local/municipal, regional or national levels (DHET, 2011). This lack of policy and regulation has been of particular concern, as international literature has shown, a lack of planning and oversight can lead to serious unintended and negative consequences (Macintyre, 2003).

2.4 POLICY

According to Birkland (2002:9), “a policy is a public statement by government, at whatever level, of what it intends to do about a public problem”. Policy development is all about problem solving and developing policies to address those problems (Birkland, 2002).

Policy and regulatory frameworks for student housing exist in most developed countries, due to the fact that student housing has been identified as an area that needs to be regulated as more and more students access institutions of higher learning (Macintyre, 2003). According to DHET (2011:24) the United Kingdom has “the Housing Act of 2004 (United Kingdom, 2004) that exempts higher education institutions from having to license houses of multiple 25 occupants provided they sign up to the Universities United Kingdom (UUK) Code of Practice for University Managed Student Accommodation, which sets standards for health and safety, repair and
maintenance, environmental quality, landlord and tenant relationships, health and wellbeing, anti-social behaviour and disciplinary procedures, and code administration and compliance”. France, on the other hands has the Centre National des Oeuvres Universitaires et Scolaires (CNOUS, 2009) that heads a network that manages student social services, from housing to food to managing student financial aid. United States, in another developed country that has Policy and regulatory frameworks for student housing. The National Association of Housing Co-operatives (NAHC), which works together with Canada through the North American Students Cooperation (NASCO), facilitates the provision of affordable housing through a network of local and regional cooperatives (ICA, 2007). It is important to note that not all developed and developed countries possess a policy and regulatory frameworks for student housing.

On the other hand in South Africa, there is as yet very little national policy and regulation in the field of student housing. “South African legislation and policies on higher education, for instance, the Higher Education Act (Act no. 101 of 1997, as amended by the Higher Education Amendment Acts 55 of 1999, 54 of 2000 and 23 of 2001) and the National Plan for Higher Education in South Africa (DoE, 2001), do not include regulations on student housing” (DHET, 2011).

The first instance when student housing became a significant part of national higher education policy discourse was in April 2010, at the Stakeholder Summit on Higher Education Transformation (DHET, 2011). It was in this summit that the poor physical quality of student accommodation both on- and off-campus was highly criticized. One of the recommendations made in the report on student housing by the department of Higher Education and Training (DHET), is the setting of minimum standards for student housing and accommodation.

2.5 CHAPTER SUMMARY

The increase in the number of students that are accepted into universities has brought about a number of challenges which include the demand for student accommodation. The accommodation that is offered by universities is inadequate thus forces a large number of students to look for accommodation off campus. This chapter has discussed off-campus housing from both an international and national perspective, and highlighted the challenges and problems experienced due to the unregulated nature
of off-campus student housing in South Africa. In response, the need to develop and implement policy regulations was identified.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The following chapter will discuss the research design and methodology used in the research. The use of the qualitative method will be discussed and substantiated. This will be followed by the research scope and sample where the study will describe the target group. In addition the data collection and analysis process followed will be described, including the theoretical background to the methods and instruments of data collection and the data analysis method used.

3.2 RESEARCH PARADIGM

This research has used a qualitative approach. According to Harwell (2011) qualitative research is a method that focuses on discovering as well as understanding the experiences perspectives and thoughts of the participants. Harwell (2011) further argues that qualitative research methods allow the researcher to formulate explanations from the unrestricted information gathered from the participants.

The first advantage of qualitative research is that it focuses on discovering and understanding the experiences, perspectives as well as the thoughts of participants (Harwell, 2011). Another advantage is that qualitative data is rich and holistic, it also provides understanding of a certain process, and focuses on lived experiences, placed in own contexts, interprets participant’s viewpoints and stories (Tracy, 2007)

The research was conducted in Summerstrand, Nelson Mandela Bay. The focus of the research was on both the students residing in non-accredited houses in Summerstrand as well as the landlords. The research made use of focus group interviews on twenty students as well as seven landlords.

3.3 SAMPLE AND SETTING

Nelson Mandela Bay is located on the shores of Algoa Bay, in the Eastern Cape. Nelson Mandela Bay comprises of the city of Port Elizabeth, as well as Uitenhage, Dispatch and the surrounding rural areas. Within the Nelson Mandela Bay, there are
a number of suburbs. This research focused on one small suburb namely Summerstrand where Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University is situated.

This research made use of a non-probability purposive sampling. According to Flom (2013), in a purposive sample, one samples from a population with a particular purpose in mind. Trochim (2006), argues that, when using purposive sampling, the researcher is most likely to get the opinions of their sample. The advantages of purposive sampling according to Flom (2013) are that, it is an easy way to find people who share particular characteristics, especially specific traits which your sample is based on. Purposive sampling uses a wide range of sampling techniques therefore the researcher using this sample can make generalisations. There are also advantages of using purposive sampling. Some of the disadvantages are that, purposive sampling can give misleading views of the entire population through the selected small sample (Flom, 2013). The second disadvantage is that there is a relatively higher chance of the researcher being biased.

The intended sample for the study consists of twenty students from different age groups and who reside in different sections in Summerstrand. Interviews were also conducted with seven landlords of different sections within Summerstrand.

3.4 DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The research made use of two types of data collection methods namely interviews and focus groups. The researcher started the data collection process by setting an appointment with the landlords in order to interview them at a time that will best suit them. An appointment was also set with the twenty ladies and gentlemen who formed part of the two focus groups.

3.4.1 Interviews

The qualitative research used interviews. According to King and Harrock (2010), interviewing is the most commonly used method of data collect in qualitative research. King and Harrock (2010) argue that interviews are generally flexible and open-ended in style, they tend to focus on people’s actual experiences more than general beliefs and assumptions.
Interviews were used in this research in order to get a full range and depth of information and to fully understand the landlord’s impressions as well as their experiences thus far. According to Opdenakker (2006), one of the advantages of face to face interviews includes the researcher being able to take note of social cues which include the voice and body language.

The interview with the landlords took place at their homes after 16h00, which was the time they were less busy and were back from work and some in their offices during office hours. The researcher explained the aim of the interview as well as what is expected of the participants. By doing this, they will be given the choice to participate in the interview or to refuse. No identification or any personal details was asked therefore their identity has remained confidential. The researcher also ensured that they had all the necessary information on how to conduct and make the most of interviews as well as to ensure that the rights and welfare of both the students and the landlord’s remains protected.

3.4.2 Focus groups

Focus group is another method that was used in this research. The focus groups were aimed at stimulating discussion about different experiences with off-campus accommodation. This process allowed the researcher to collect useful information from different perspectives from the respondents. One of the advantages of the use of focus groups is that the researcher doesn’t ask each person to respond to a question in turn but the respondents are encouraged to talk to each other, ask each other questions and also comment on each other’s experiences and points of view (Kitzinger 1995).

The researcher contacted the respondents of each campus. The interviews with the focus groups consisted of five members per group; took place across the four campuses namely South Campus, North Campus, Second Avenue campus and lastly Missionvale campus. The researcher explained the aim of the session as well as what was expected of the participants. By doing this, they were given the choice to participate in the session or to refuse. No identification or any personal details was asked therefore their identity has remained confidential. The researcher also ensure that they have all the necessary information on how to control and make the most of
controlled groups as well as to ensure that the rights and welfare of both the students remained protected.

If the participants requested feedback after the completion of the study, it will be provided to them.

3.5 DATA ANALYSIS

The responses from the interviews and focus groups were recorded and translated into English before analysis. Both constant comparative analysis and thematic analysis were applied in the research process.

According to Thorn (1999) many qualitative analytic strategies rely on a general approach called constant comparative analysis. Constant comparative analysis was used to interpret and analyze the responses obtained from the interviews. Constant comparative analysis is particularly used to analyze interviews as it involves taking one piece of data, being one interview, one statement and one theme, and comparing it with others that may be either similar or different with the aim to develop conceptualizations of the possible relations between various pieces of data (Thorne 1999).

The other method that was used to analyze the responses is thematic analysis. According to Braun and Clarke (2006), thematic analysis is seen as foundational method for qualitative data. Braun and Clarke (2006) argue that thematic analysis is a method used for identifying, analyzing as well as reporting patterns (themes) within data.

According to Gibbs (2007: 38) this analytic method of thematising, coding or categorising involves the identification and recording of passages of data which exemplify the same theoretical or descriptive idea. In a simpler form it can be comprehended as searching for patterns in data that reveal interesting phenomena in relation to the research study. Throughout the research process, a structure in the data develops whereby the research moves a step closer at understand the problem issue, the natural setting of participant as well as the field its working in, which in this research study is poverty alleviation through community development, and applying
meaning to the interpretations the research has received from participants (Flick, 2007).

3.6 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The researcher made sure that they have been granted permission to interview NMMU students as well as the landlords. Before the researcher could continue with data collection, an ethics clearance was sought from the NMMU Ethics Research Committee.

According to Bless, Higson-Smith & Sithole (2013) rights of the research participants must always be protected as there is always a potential of their rights being violated. Part of the researcher’s duty is to explain to all the participants the purpose of the study. However before each interview, a sheet with information about the study as well as a consent form will be handed out to all the participants. Participants of both the interviews as well as the focus groups have signed the consent form which was received by the researcher. According to Bless, Higson-Smith & Sithole, (2013), autonomy is very important and it is whereby an individual has a freedom of action and choices to decide to participate or not as no one needs to be forced to participate. The participants’ consent was received by them agreeing to continue in the study and also signing the consent form. The researcher however informed the participants of the purpose of the study and that participation is optional. Once that was done, the researcher then continued with the interviews and focus group sessions which make up the data collection. The identity of the participants was, under no circumstances revealed nor was their identity asked during the interviews.

3.7 SUMMARY

This chapter has outlined the research method that the researcher chose. Furthermore this chapter also outlined how the research was conducted as well as the different tools that were be used to achieve this. The chapter to follow will therefore discuss the research findings; it will be followed by an analysis of the findings.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides an overview of the results obtained from both the focus group sessions conducted with the students who reside in Summerstrand as well as the interviews conducted with landlords in Summerstrand. The aim and purpose of this research was to discover some of the problems associated with non-accredited houses in Summerstrand in order to provide recommendations towards a policy. This study included an investigation of some of the requirements a house a property owner is to meet in order to be legible to house students. Ultimately this research will then make recommendations for an effective policy for off campus accommodation in the Nelson Mandela Bay. The following four themes were identified from both the interview and focus group data collection processes: rent, security, facilities and maintenance.

4.2 RENT

The focus groups that were held with the students revealed that there are significant variations and difference in the amounts that they pay for rent. The amounts ranged from R1800- R3200. An example of the above mentioned is the following example by one student, “yea they regulate themselves. If they wake up and decide that this year they want to charge R4000 for example there is a house that I went to go view in Erasmus owned by some… couple they wanted to charge me R3500 I said no let me go see it. I went and got see it it’s a shack, its small so”. A number of students agreed to the statement above and one also added that the rent is sometimes the same yet the sizes of the rooms are different, in a sense that one room may be way smaller than the other but they the pay the same amount. The above findings have indicated that the students feel as though it is unfair for them as more rent does not always mean better quality accommodation and facilities. The students also had a sense of confusion as they did not understand what regulations the landlords use to decide on the rent to charge.

The statements by the respondents above are consistent with the literature that states that it has been quite evident that some landlords take advantage of the student's
inexperience and naivety by charging rent that is way more than what their house or apartment is worth (Da Cunha, 2014). This indicates a need for a policy intervention that will assist with the regulation of the rent that students pay for accommodation.

There were a number of issues highlighted by the students. These issues revolved around high prices for not so high quality as well as late or no payment by the students. DHET (2010) argues that private student housing developers offer high quality but also relatively expensive accommodation. Interviews with the students have shown that they sometimes pay more for less quality accommodation.

The findings also suggest that it is necessary for the policy to address this issue by having regulations in the size as well as the quality of rooms. Minimum measurements for each room could be set and met, to ensure that all rooms are of a reasonable and proper size. Further, there could also be a maximum price set that cannot be exceeded by the landlords. This could also depend on the size and facilities offered. The setting of rent according to the size and facilities offered could assist in eliminating students feeling as though they are overpaying as well as assisting landlords in knowing that they are charging the correct amount for the accommodation they offer.

Another key issues highlighted was that the rental amount sometimes excluded electricity costs. The students felt that it was unfair that they should also pay for electricity when they are already paying large amounts of money for rent. There have also been some irregularities with this system as some landlords include electricity in their rent but most of them do not include it.

Another key issue that was revealed was that the students are charged interest for late rent. One student added that “and another problem that I have with rent is interest. Like you can be late for 10 days and you get R200 fine, that is bad R200 it’s too much interest… so every month if you are late for your rent maybe 10 days you pay R200 interest that’s is even more interest that we pay at NMMU for school fees”. The intervention of a policy would also be important for this issue.

The issue of the late payments reflects one of the issues faced by the landlords. The interviews with the landlords revealed that late payments are of a serious concern as all of them have indicated that one of their reasons for leasing their homes is for
financial reasons and late or sometimes no payment from the students jeopardizes that.

The interviews held with the landlords also revealed other problems related to their issues with rent. Another challenge the landlords highlighted is students not paying their rent on time with no arrangement nor communication. One of the landlords also highlighted that they weren’t satisfied with the current rent that they are charging the students because of water bills as well as increased electricity rates. The landlords cannot control the students use of water or electricity and these bills quickly increase to large sums. Another factor highlighted by landlords in the interviews was squatting and landlords feel as though it is one of the factors increasing water and electricity bills each year as the squatters do not pay rent or electricity for those who include electricity in their rent.

The findings above indicate that it is necessary to have standardized and regulated limits and protocols for controlling rent. These regulations could include minimum room size, regulated rental amounts and a specific formula for calculating interest. If students are required to pay interest on late rent then the interest should be standardised and municipality be aware in order to avoid exploitation of students. This will ensure that the landlords are also happy as they will receive interest for late payment and the students will know that the correct interest rates are applied on late payments.

In addition, the findings revealed that the students wanted a guarantee from their landlord’s for all landlords to return student’s deposit at the end of the year and every landlord should have receipt system for them and students to keep as proof of payment. This will assist with students not paying on the last month because they will not be getting their deposits back and this is very disadvantageous for the landlords particularly those whose property has been damaged by students and needs to do major maintenance repairs.

Finally, in terms of maintaining regulations and standards with the rent system, there needs to be a more structured system in terms of when and where contracts are signed to ensure that it is fair and all the necessary things are included. Both the landlords and the students are to sign the contract. Both the landlord and the student should
keep the contract for record keeping. This stems from an analysis made that stated that when it comes to off campus student housing search, it is a fairly stressful process that requires students to rush into signing a lease due to the competitive and fast paced nature of the market (Da Cunha 2014). This then leaves the students at a vulnerable position and some landlords too as some have indicated to get a lease agreement from a friend whilst some indicated that their lawyers drew it up. The reviewing of contracts will ensure that all contracts signed by the students and landlords are in favour of both the students as well the landlords.

4.3 SECURITY

The safety of students and is of paramount importance. The student focus groups highlighted the need for security measures to be put in place by landlords as well as property owners. These security measures include electric gates, security guards, alarm systems, surveillance cameras and each person having their own keys.

Most of the students who participated feel safe with the current measures, however it is important to note that not all the students who participated in the focus group sessions feel safe. One of the reasons for this is highlighted in the statement below made by one of the respondents “because I have big windows and there is no burglar so someone can just throw a stone over there and I stay alone. landlords (landlords) stay far so if I scream no one would hear me”. The focus groups revealed that reasons for students feeling unsafe is also contributed by gates being left unclosed as well as places that have no gates at all, surveillance cameras being non-operational and security guards not patrolling especially in these places where there has been high number of break ins.

Another student commented, “for me which is one that is very important there must be safety, and the reasons why I say safety is that the limitations in the house because these landlords will turn a garage into a room which is not very safe by the way. There must be safety measures don’t try just because you want 10 people in a house and make sure that you compromise on safety. For example the house that I stay in there are 4 rooms upstairs but you can see that these rooms were forced to be here for example I think my room starts here and stops here but then the wall you can hear what’s happening next door and if people got visitors you can hear other effects
as well. So there must be a level of safety material that’s used to build the rooms must be safe”.

The above statement made by one of the students highlights a possible situation of overcrowding and safety issues in off campus accommodations. The above is in line with some of the issues identified by the Department of Higher Learning (DHET 2011), of students spending their academic semester crammed in a room that is designed to accommodate two people.

The interviews with the landlords revealed that the landlords have also had their fair share of problems. The first issues revealed by the landlords was related to security issues. Landlords have noticed that some students are not safety conscious. They sometimes forget to set the alarm, some forget to keep the gate closed which then poses a threat to both the students as well as the landlords who reside on the property. Another factor highlighted by the landlords under security is illegal sleepovers are also considered a security risk by some landlords as they believe that the people who sleep over are the ones who feed information about the place and what is inside the house to the wrong people. This is a problem because leaving the gate unlocked or open and not setting an alarm poses a security risk not only to the person who left it unlocked and open but to everyone who lives in the house. Illegal sleepovers and squatting are also a problem because they are believed to be a security risk by the landlords and also do not know who to hold liable for property damage should there be one from the sleepovers. According to DHET (2011), squatting is prevalent to varying degrees in a number of universities, and this is increased by the lack of available and sometimes affordable accommodation.

The findings suggest that it is important for the policy to tackle safety issues. Therefore it is necessary to have standardised security measures put in place in each and every house that provides accommodation. Landlords are to ensure that they meet these security requirements before housing students at the beginning of the year. Every student has the right to feel safe, this could include panic buttons and gate that is also kept closed at all times and patrolling security guards in the high target areas. Having mentioned the above, the students should also comply with the rules and regulations put by the landlords. The interviews with the landlords also suggest that it is necessary
to initiate fines, for those students who do not comply with the rules and have illegal visitors and squatters.

The findings also suggest it is necessary that all garages changed to rooms must be properly revamped by the property owners and should meet the standard that is to be met by all property owners who house students before students are allowed to move in. This suggestion attempts to ensure a statement made by the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET, 2011) which states that residing in a safe, well managed residence is both socially and academically beneficial for students.

Security and safety have shown to be of paramount importance to both the landlords and students. DHET (2010) argues that safety and security is a major issue for both the students and parents and for this reason universities are increasingly responding to the above mentioned by improving access control as well as installing video cameras that monitor entrances and exists. It is because of this literature and the findings under this theme that is important for off campus student accommodations to follow suit by having standardised security measures that will ensure that all students feel safe and protected.

4.4 FACILITIES

One of the things that students highlighted that they look at when looking for a place to stay at the beginning of the year is facilities. This is consistent with the literature that states that some of the important factors considered by students who reside off campus were proximity, to campus as well as the quality of the facilities (Da Cunha 2014). These range from how big or small a room is to the furnishing too. There are a number of variations in the accommodation offered in Summerstrand. The focus group sessions with the students revealed that some rooms are smaller than the other and some houses do not offer fully furnished homes.

One of the facility related issues that the landlords mentioned was property damage by the students and some rooms that are also left in a filthy state that forces landlords to do deep cleaning as the rooms are infested by pests and rodents. Landlords feel as though students sometimes damage the property and in as much as the money to replace it is deducted from their deposits, the landlords are still required to take time
to find and replace the broken materials. These findings have revealed that landlords spend large amounts of money repairing and fixing property for following tenants, and expenses end up outweighing the amount that they make, and in this way feel exploited by students.

Another factor highlighted by the landlords were reports of high water bills from students wasting water and an example of this is the following quote from one of the interviewed landlords, “they sometimes leave taps running or leaking, they also put two items of clothing in the washing machine that fills up with water”. For the landlords who include electricity in their rent, they have reported a waste of electricity by the students.

In this instance, both the landlords’ rights as well as those of the students need to be protected. The above mentioned issues by both the students as well as the landlords have revealed that it is necessary for the policy to include minimum standards to be set and met by all property owners housing students. Study desks and lamps could be part of those standards. Students are there to learn and study therefore such facilities need to be made available in order to ensure a good living and learning environment. In addition to this recommendation, all facilities advertised should be available, false advertisement should not be allowed, and penalties put in place for false advertising. The above mentioned recommendations will ensure that students are paying for what they are getting and that the accommodation is suitable for living and learning.

The findings from the students have been in line with the literature that states that the people who are responsible for student accommodation should offer students safe and fully functioning facilities all at a reasonable price (Ryan 2003). Facilities have shown to be of importance from both the literature as well as the findings from the students and landlords. The recommendation made under this theme which states that there should be regulation in the size as well as the quality of rooms and that the measurements for each room should be set and met, this is going to ensure that all rooms are of a reasonable and proper size is in line with the literature that states that students need space to study, eat and relax as well as to store their possessions but in some of the smaller rooms it could be very difficult to create an environment that is conducive for studying.
4.5 MAINTENANCE

There are a number of issues that were highlighted by the students regarding maintenance and cleaning services. Students feel as though in some of the places they are required to pay for maintenance issues such as a blocked drain, blocked shower as well as the replacement of bulbs. There are many methods used to pay these and they include fines as well as each member of the house contributing money towards the payment of the fee, one respondent added “for making noise, maybe you have a sleep over without permission, a pet is a fine, oh and even if your drain is blocked you get a fine of R500 for that”. Having mentioned the above the focus group sessions revealed that for some it is stipulated in the contract that they are required to sign upon arrival at the beginning of the year.

The students highlighted that most of the places where they reside have cleaning services that come once or twice a week to clean the common areas of the house which include the kitchen and the lounge area. This is a great initiative by the landlords as this ensures good hygiene, living and learning conditions for the students, however not all the students were satisfied with this. Some reported that their cleaning services do not comply with the stipulated days.

The interviews will the landlords have revealed a number of issues concerned with maintenance of student accommodations. Some of the issues include the constant blocking of showers as well as well as drains from students dumping things and food down the drain. The landlords also highlighted that in as much as they show and tell the students what blocks the showers it has not stopped them from doing it again, therefore the landlords are faced with bills that they have to pay for maintenance.

The above mentioned problems highlighted by the students and landlords are serious because the common areas including bathrooms and toilets are not cleaned thus posing hygiene and living and learning threat to those students. This then is in line with some of the issues identified by the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET 2011) of basic health and safety norms and standards that are being violated by poor quality of student residence which in return affects the academic success of the students residing in those residences. The findings have indicated that it is
necessary for the policy to ensure all landlords continuously regulate and monitor the cleaning services in order to ensure that hygiene and cleanliness are kept at all times.

A policy could also help with this challenge by regulating a fine system that should be implemented by all landlords. Students should be fined for noise and property damage, however these amounts should be standardised. This recommendation is with the aim of protecting and assisting landlords with some of the issues they have been faced with. If the process of allocating fines was more regulated, it would allow for the landlord’s to ensure that students pay the consequences for their own actions, while protecting students from potential exploitation. This could lead to a more fair system which protects both students and landlords.

4.6 OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS

According to Department of Higher education and Training (DHET, 2011) minimum standards for the accommodation of students must be developed and made applicable to all providers of student accommodation both public and private. This is particularly important considering that the issues that the students have highlighted are of paramount importance as they all play a role in the academic success or failure of the students.

The challenge will be developing a policy which protects both the students and the landlords, and which will provide regulations which are fair to both parties. For example, while the students focused more on the rent and security related issues, the landlords focused more on the maintenance and security aspects relating to the rental accommodation. The introduction and implementation of a policy in the Nelson Mandela bay should focus on the challenges discussed in the previous sections by both the landlords as well as the students. However further research is required in order to broaden the requirements that should be met by landlords and property owners.

This issue of off-campus accommodation is a highly charged issue, with both students and landlords feeling high levels of frustration. The policy would need to take into account both parties grievances and experiences in order to provide fair regulations to satisfy the needs of both parties.
This study has revealed the need for a policy and regulatory framework in Summerstrand. Literature has highlighted the very little national policy and regulation in the field of student housing, further stating that some Higher Education Acts do not include regulations on student housing in South Africa. The introduction and implementation of a policy in the Nelson Mandela Bay will assist in the intervention and prevention of exploitation of both the students as well as the landlords as the findings have clearly shown both parties to be currently exploited. The policy will also assist with the management of some of the problems that have been expressed by the respondents of this study.

4.7 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has presented and discussed the findings with relevance to the research questions that were highlighted in the first chapter. The final chapter will cover the conclusion of the study as well as the recommendations towards the development of an off campus student housing policy in the Nelson Mandela Bay.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The study investigated key problems and challenges associated with non-accredited accommodation in Summerstrand in order to provide recommendations towards a policy. From the research it has become clear that there are a number of variations in the rent, facilities, security measures and maintenance currently in place in off-campus accommodation in Summerstrand. The findings obtained from the focus group sessions with the students as well as the interviews have been in line with the Department of Higher Education and Training’s call for the development and application of minimum standards for the accommodation and housing of students.

This chapter presents a summary and conclusion of the study, based on the literature review and findings of the study. This chapter also provides recommendations towards the development and implementation of a student housing policy in the Nelson Mandela Bay.

5.2 RE-VISITING THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The purpose of this research was to discover some of the problems associated with off-campus accommodation in Summerstrand in order to provide recommendations towards a policy. The aims and objectives of the research are all aimed at investigating problems and challenges experienced by the landlords as well as the students as well as their perspectives of the requirements that should be met by landlords in order to house students. All these seek to provide recommendations towards the development of a policy. The literature provided in the study reinforces the importance of an off-campus student housing policy as a way to ensure good quality accommodation for students. While the students prioritised issues of rent and security, the landlord prioritised challenges of facilities and maintenance. The policy would need to consider both parties’ experiences and challenges and provide regulations that would protect both students and landlords.
A qualitative approach was adopted in this research and data was collected through the use of focus group sessions with students as well as interviews with the Landlords all people who reside in Summerstrand. The key themes that stemmed from the focus group sessions as well as the interviews held with the landlords included rent, security, maintenance and facilities. These themes highlighted issues and problems faced by both landlords as well as students who participated in the study.

Problems faced by the students under the above mentioned themes highlighted variations on the off-campus student accommodation in Summerstrand. Further, details of some requirements to be met by all landlords and property owners were identified by the students and landlords who participated in the study. The data obtained has been in line with Department of Higher Education and Training’s call for the development and application of minimum standards for the accommodation and housing of students.

5.3 LIMITATIONS

Due to the time available to do the research, the study was done with 20 students and 7 landlords around Summerstrand. Due to the above mentioned it is therefore difficult to generalize the findings to the entire Summerstrand area.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the findings from both the students as well as the landlords the following recommendations can be made:

a) Further research should be undertaken with a considerably larger sample of students and landlords in order to gain further insight into the relevant issues and challenges which are currently faced. This research should also branch outside of the Summerstrand community, and include all off-campus accommodation throughout the Nelson Mandela Bay.

b) Should the policy be implemented, there would need to be a facilitator from the municipality appointed in order to ensure these requirements and regulations are met to ensure the welfare of both the students and landlords.

c) It would also be beneficial to have a central office at the University where complaints, concerns and questions can be lodged and dealt with. Currently
students and landlords have nowhere to turn when experiencing problems and require a service which can deal with issues and challenges
d) Should the policy be implemented, it would be helpful to have a generic contract written up in consultation with students and landlords which would become the official contract for off-campus accommodation. This could help to ensure consistency and protection for both students and landlords.
e) Finally, there should be a stricter and more regulated process of application for landlords before being able to rent out accommodation to students. Landlords should need to apply and gain accreditation before renting to students.

5.5 CONCLUSION

The research has strongly highlighted that there is a dire need for the development and implementation of a student housing policy in the Nelson Mandela Bay. It has also discussed the need for the development and application of minimum standards for the accommodation and housing of students.

Recommendations for elements which need to be incorporated into the policy were discussed and presented within the themes of rent, security, facilities and maintenance. Finally, further research is recommended required to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of the issues and challenges which the policy would need to consider.
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APPENDIX A: FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

1. Quick round of introductions. Can each of you tell the group your name, course, year of study and which off campus accommodation you reside in?
2. What are your reasons for staying off campus?
   a) Probe: what do love and enjoy about staying off campus
3. What do you look for when choosing a place to stay at the beginning of the year?
   a) Probe: Would you say you found what you were looking for where you currently reside?
4. How much do you pay for your accommodation?
   a) Probe: Would you say you can afford this amount?
   b) Is it worth it?
5. What security measures are in place?
   a) Probe: Do you feel safe?
6. What are some of the problems you have experienced?
   a) Probe: Have those problems been resolved? if yes
   b) Probe: Who fixed them and how long did it take for the problems to be resolved?
7. What are some of the requirements do you think a property owner is to meet in order to house student?
   a) Probe: In your opinion, in what way does your current property owner meet these requirements?
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (LANDLORDS)

1. Which age group do you fall under?
2. How long have you been a landlord?
3. What are your reasons for letting your home/house?
4. Do you reside on the property? If not is there a manager that resides on the property full time?
5. How many students do you house?
6. Is your property accredited by NMMU?
7. What is your target market, kind of students you accommodate?
   a) What is your reason for choosing that particular target market?
8. How much do you make a month?
   a) Are you satisfied with this amount?
   b) What is the total amount you would like to make?
9. What security measures does your property have?
10. How do you deal with noise, alcohol, and property damage?
11. What are some of the problems you have experienced as a landlord?
12. What are some of the requirements you think a property owner is to meet in order to house students?
13. Do your students sign a contact? If yes 

Who drew up the contract?
**APPENDIX C: INFORMATION AND INFORMED CONSENT FORM**

NELSON MANDELA METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY

**INFORMATION AND INFORMED CONSENT FORM**
(Please delete any information not applicable to your project and complete/expand as deemed appropriate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of the research project</th>
<th>The development of student housing in Nelson Mandela Bay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal investigator</td>
<td>Miss Asisipo Mhlonyane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>South Campus, Veritas Residence, Room A6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact telephone number</td>
<td>0786483951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(private numbers not advisable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A. DECLARATION BY OR ON BEHALF OF PARTICIPANT**
(Person legally competent to give consent on behalf of the participant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I, the participant (full names)</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.D./passport number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address (of participant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A.1 I HEREBY CONFIRM AS FOLLOWS:

1. **I, the participant, was invited to participate in the above-mentioned research project that is being undertaken by**
   
   Miss Asisipo Mhlonyane

   of the Research Centre

   Development Studies

   Business and Economics

   in the Faculty of

   the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University.

2. **The following aspects have been explained to me, the participant:**

   2. The purpose of this research is to discover some of the problems associated with non-accredited houses in Summerstrand in order to provide recommendations towards a policy. This study will also investigate what some of the requirements a house a property owner is to meet in order to be legible to house students. Ultimately this research will make recommendations for an effective policy for off campus accommodation in the Nelson Mandela Bay.

   2.2 **Procedures:** I understand that I have been offered the opportunity to participate in an interview or focus group.

   2.3 **Risks:** none

   2.4 **Possible benefits:** n/a

   2.5 **Confidentiality:** My identity will not be revealed in any discussion, description or scientific publications by the investigators.

   2.6 **Access to findings:** Any new information/or benefit that develops during the course of the study will be shared as follows: A final report will be provided to all participants and sponsors. This report will not indicate any specific development or personnel. The findings of the research will also be presented in progress reports and manuals.
2.7 Voluntary participation/refusal/discontinuation:

| My participation is voluntary | YES | NO |
| My decision whether or not to participate will in no way affect my present or future care/employment/lifestyle | TRUE | FALSE |

3. The information above was explained to me/the participant by

Miss Asisipo Mhlonyane

in

| Afrikaans | English | Xhosa | Other |

and I am in command of this language.

I was given the opportunity to ask questions and all these questions were answered satisfactorily.

4. No pressure was exerted on me to consent to participation and I understand that I may withdraw at any stage without penalisation.

5. Participation in this study will not result in any additional cost to myself.

A.2 I HEREBY VOLUNTARILY CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THE ABOVE-MENTIONED PROJECT

Signed/confirmed at

| on | 20 |

Signature or right thumb print of participant

Signature of witness

Full name of witness
### B. STATEMENT BY OR ON BEHALF OF INVESTIGATOR(S)

I, ........................................................................................................... declare that

- I have explained the information given in this document to

- he/she was encouraged and given ample time to ask me any questions;

- this conversation was conducted in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Xhosa</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and no translator was used / this conversation was translated into

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(language)</th>
<th>by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I have detached Section D and handed it to the participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed/confirmed at

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>on</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of witness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of interviewer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full name of witness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. IMPORTANT MESSAGE TO PATIENT/REPRESENTATIVE OF PARTICIPANT

Dear participant/representative of the participant

Thank you for your/the participant’s participation in this study. Should, at any time during the study:

- an emergency arises as a result of the research, or
- you require any further information with regard to the study, or
- the following occur

- You should not be able to continue with the research for any reason
- You are unhappy with the nature or progress of the research

(indicate any circumstances which should be reported to the investigator)

Kindly contact

Asisipo Mhlonane

at

S211078751@nmmu.ac.za
APPENDIX D: ETHICS CLEARANCE

Ethics clearance reference no:

Dear

You are being asked to participate in a research study. The necessary information to assist you to understand the study and explain what would be expected of you as the participant will be provided to you. The guidelines will include the risks, benefits, and your rights as a study subject. Please feel free to ask the researcher to clarify anything that is not clear to you.

It will be required of you to provide a written consent that will include your signature, date and initials to verify that you understand and agree to the conditions in order to participate.

You have the right to query concerns regarding the study at any time. Immediately report any new problems during the study, to the researcher. Cell phone numbers as well as the email address of the researcher are provided. Please feel free to contact the researcher.

It is also of importance that you are aware of the fact that the study has been approved by the Research Ethics Committee (Human) of the university. The RECH consist of a group of independent experts that has the responsibility to ensure that the rights and welfare of participants, in research are protected and that studies are conducted in an ethical manner. Studies cannot be conducted without RECH’s approval. Queries with regard to your rights as a research subject can be directed to the Research Ethics Committee (Human) you can call the Director: Research Management at (041) 504-4536. Alternatively, you may contact the Education Faculty secretary, Mrs Jackie Elliot-Gentry, at 041 504 4568 or by email: jackie.elliott-gentry@nmmu.ac.za.
If no one could assist you, you may feel free to write to: The Chairperson of the Research, Technology and Innovation Committee, PO Box 77000, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Port Elizabeth, 6031.

Participation in research is completely voluntary. You are not obliged to take part in any research. Should you decide to partake, you have the right to withdraw at any given time, during the study without penalty or loss of benefits. However, if you do withdraw from the study, you should return for a final discussion or examination in order to terminate the research in an orderly manner.

It is important to note that if you fail to follow instructions, or if your medical condition changes in such a way that the researcher believes that you should not continue in this study, or for administrative reasons, your participation maybe discontinued. The study may be terminated at any time by either the researcher, the sponsor or the Research Ethics Committee (Human) that initially approved the study.

Although your identity will, at all times remain confidential, it is important to note that the results of the research study may be presented at scientific conferences or in specialist publications.

This informed consent statement has been prepared in compliance with current statutory guidelines.

Yours sincerely

**Miss Asisipo Mhlonyane**

s211078751@nmmu.ac.za

0786483951
APPENDIX E: ETHICS APPROVAL

Ref: H-15-BES-DTS-030 [Approved]

14 October 2015

Dr S Leonard
Development Studies
South Campus
NMMU

Dear Dr Leonard

PROJECT PROPOSAL: POLICY CONSIDERATIONS TOWARDS THE DEVELOPMENT OF EQUITABLE STUDENT HOUSING IN THE NELSON MANDELA BAY (MASTERS)

PRP: Dr S Leonard
PI: Ms A Mhlonyane

Your above-entitled application for ethics approval served at Fac RTI.

We take pleasure in informing you that the application was approved by the Committee. However, please note that the approval is on condition that permission to conduct the study is also obtained from the other relevant individuals, parties, organisations and/or role players to which the study pertains. The ethics clearance reference number is H-15-BES-BMa-030, and is valid for three years. Please inform the Faculty RTI Committee, via the faculty representative, if any changes (particularly in the methodology) occur during this time.

Please inform your co-investigators of the outcome.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Prof C Rootman
Faculty of Business and Economic Sciences