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1. CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

1.1 Background or context of the study
Development is an idea, an objective and an activity (Kothari and Minogue, 2002). Development emerged as an idea that nations had to adopt in their journey through post-war history. Development is seen as an ambiguous concept (Allen and Thomas, 1992: 23). In other words, it is defined in many ways to suit different purposes. Furthermore, over the long term development implies increased living standards, improved health and well being for all, and the achievement of whatever is regarded as a general good for society at large (Allen and Thomas, 1992: 23). Therefore, from the above development appears as a “one size fits all” concept, because it is an attempt to address the problems in society. Furthermore, development has been defined as a participatory, people-centred process intended to reduce the incidence of poverty and achieve better livelihoods for all (Kingsbury, McKay, and Hunt, 2004: 43). The definition of development as participatory and people-centred is the most applicable for the purposes of this study.

Participation has been widely used in the development discourse. Within the development sphere, participation has been associated with the community sector (Gaventa and Valderrama, 1999:2). The definition of participation in development has been located in development projects and programmes (i.e. sustainable human settlements for our study purposes), as a means of strengthening their relevance, quality and sustainability (Gaventa and Valderrama, 1999:2). Strengthening of participation in local governance has to do with the strengthening of direct citizen involvement in decision-making by individuals or groups in public activities, oftentimes through newly established institutional channels, such as monitoring committees, planning processes, etc (Gaventa and Valderrama, 1999:8-9). Hence, participation could be seen as involvement in decision-making in all phases of a project (Gaventa and Valderrama, 1999:2). Citizen participation is about power and its exercise by different social actors in the spaces created for the interaction between citizens and local authorities. However, the control of the structure and processes for participation - defining spaces, actors, agendas, procedures - is usually in the hands of governmental institutions and can become a barrier for effective involvement of citizens (Gaventa and Valderrama, 1999:7).

The above discussion has been an attempt to show what participatory development or participation in a development process is all about. This has been done through briefly defining and discussing development and participation and also showing the
relationship between the two concepts. Now the discussion will focus on enlightening the reader about sustainable human settlements – the main issue of this study.

The decision to do research in this area came after the realization that there is still a shortage of houses in the Eastern Cape, and when the government does deliver these houses in a particular area people still have complaints regarding the new houses delivered to them. Then a question that came to mind was whether people are consulted or not before these houses are constructed during the planning stages so that they can give their own views or ideas on houses. Overall the reason for choosing this topic was to look at people’s participation on the development of houses. It is evident in the Provincial Medium Term Sustainable Human Settlement Research Agenda that community participation is lacking in the housing delivery process of the Eastern Cape (Province of the Eastern Cape Human Settlement, 2011:9). The following quotation tries to elaborate on the matter:

“…[People] who demand houses approach their ward councillors who compile lists which are forwarded up the bureaucracy to the Department of Human Settlements which, due to lack of capacity at the local level, takes over the project, deciding on allocation of resources and the extent of delivery. The Department acts as the development agency, while the local municipality is simply left to decide who actually gets the houses. The local people and the municipality are removed from the process and are only visible and participate at the beginning and the end. This has created distance between government and communities and has generated bitterness and conflict around delivery as people fail to understand why some get houses and others not. It also closes spaces for productive engagement and discussion about the nature and form of delivery and the role that communities can play in their own development. Failed housing projects also create community schisms and fuel false expectations, making it difficult for future projects to succeed…” (Province of the Eastern Cape Human Settlement, 2011:9).

It is evident from the above quotation that there is a need for community participation in the development of houses in the Eastern Cape. It has also been shown that lack of participation between the local people and government creates a gap, and it could be argued that some of the challenges facing housing delivery in the Eastern Cape are a consequence of this gap. Furthermore, there is growing concern regarding the social and environmental sustainability of housing programs (Huchzermeyer, 2001). In addition, many problems with the housing
process have become clear as the development of houses was increasing. These problems include:

“(a) New houses and townships continue placing poor and low-income blacks in ghettos on urban peripheries, far from jobs and services. (b) New houses and infrastructure (such as sewerage services) are of poor quality, are rapidly deteriorating and require maintenance. (c) The dominant model of free-hold tenure inadequately deals with the dynamics of poverty, and several categories of the poor, such as temporary workers and many women, would be better served by rental accommodation. (d) People dislike the model of housing used, and would prefer larger houses (main model was changed in 1998 when Department of Housing increased minimum size of new houses to 30 m²)” (Huchzermeyer, 2001).

Because of these problems, it is argued that people often sell or rent out their RDP houses and move back to other informal settlements closer to their economic activities; the issue of transport from the new townships to jobs and income generation activities is seen as the biggest financial problem encouraging this action (Huchzermeyer, 2001). Therefore, the decision to do research in this area came after the consideration of all the factors that have been pointed out above.

1.2 Research problem

- Low-cost houses in Whittlesea are imposed on local people; people are not involved in the decision-making processes.
- Local people are only involved in the construction of these houses (through being given a job opportunity).
- However, the production of the houses is poor in quality, due to poor construction or workmanship.
- It is evident from the previous housing projects that the focus was more on quantity rather than quality.
- The people are not given an opportunity to participate in their own development; rather the government is using a ‘top-down approach’ which excludes the point of view of the people at the grassroots level.
1.3 Research question
How can local people become more involved in the creation of their own sustainable human settlements?

1.4 Research aims and objectives
- The research aims to understand ways in which people can participate in the creation of their sustainable human settlements.
- The research aims to obtain the perspective of the local people on the matter.
- The research aims to determine the extent to which there was participation during the project.
2. CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This discussion is about lack of participation by ordinary people in their housing projects in South Africa. The South African Constitution gives citizens a right to have access to housing as it is one of the basic needs important for human beings. In South Africa, government aims to deliver houses to those in need. However, there is still a shortage of this basic need and there are grievances from those who have already benefited from housing. One of the main grievances raised by the people is their lack of participation in the whole developmental process of housing. This matter has been evident in the whole country. The lack of participation by the ordinary people in their housing projects is what led to the discussion in this document. This discussion is going to focus mainly on participation of local people in their development initiatives (which is housing for the purposes of this study). Because the provision of housing is a development initiative, this discussion will commence by looking at the type of development that is relevant for community participation. The discussion will also focus on defining community and participation separately and define and discuss the concept of community participation. The discussion of community participation will include its components, its advantages and disadvantages. And the discussion will also show how community participation has been applied in other local development projects.

2.2 Development
According to Sachs (1992:1) the idea of development was introduced after the Second World War. Sachs further argues that the United States launched the idea of development to call every nation to follow their path to development (Sachs, 1992:1). It is argued that universal development was high on the agenda when the Marshall Plan was implemented to reconstruct Europe after the devastation caused by the war (Swanepoeland de Beer, 1997: 16).

There are many definitions of what the concept development actually means. According to Allen and Thomas (1992: 23) development is an ambiguous concept and as a result the term is defined in many ways to suit different contexts. In other words, development is contextually defined. Brohman (1995: 124) argues that development should be constantly redefined as our knowledge of the development process deepens and as new problems of development appear.
2.2.1 Participatory and community development

Kingsbury, McKay, and Hunt (2004: 43) define development “as a participatory, people-centred process intended to reduce the incidence of poverty and achieve better livelihoods for all.” The definition of participation in development has been located in development projects and programmes (i.e. sustainable human settlements for our study purposes), as a means of strengthening their relevance, quality and sustainability (Gaventa and Valderrama, 1999:2). This is supported by Nelson and Wright (1995: 1) by arguing that participatory development is to be understood as a means to accomplish the aims of a project more efficiently and effectively. Participatory development and community development are intertwined. This is because participatory development happens within community development. Curtis (1995:115) defines community development “as the process by which the efforts of the people themselves are united with their governmental authorities to improve the economic, social and cultural conditions of communities… and to enable [the people] to contribute fully to national progress.” In this definition Curtis talks about uniting the efforts of the people with their governmental authorities, this shows that participation of both parties has to exist to deal with socio-economic conditions of communities. In other words, it tries to justify the concept that one cannot talk about community development without mentioning participation, because participation is core in community development. In addition, Magwaza (1995: 18) argues that community development assists in keeping the decision-making process at the local level.

2.3 Brief history of housing projects in SA

The democratic government of South Africa inherited an urban housing backlog from the apartheid government at its inception in 1994 (Goebel 2007 cited in Mafukidze, 2009: 2). Accordingly this backlog was unfairly contributed to by apartheid discriminatory administrations and laws (such as the Black (Native) Laws Amendment Act, No 46 of 1937 and the Black Communities Development Act, No 4 of 1984) along with rapid urbanisation during the post-apartheid period (Mafukidze, 2009: 2). Accordingly, in an attempt to improve housing delivery the South African government adopted the legislation that supports community participation from United Nations Habitat Agenda embraced in 1996 (Goebel, 2007 cited in Mafukidze, 2009: 3). However, it is argued that despite these efforts, housing delivery remained slow and impacted negatively upon government’s legitimacy (Mafukidze, 2009: 3). By early 2006, the government had begun the construction and delivery of
approximately 1.9 million housing units but an additional 2 to 3 million were required (Department of Housing). Mafukidze (2009: 3) argues that from a policy formation phase, community participation was seen as a means of assisting in overcoming this huge demand for housing. According to Johnson (2005 cited in Mafukidze, 2009: 3) the need for community participation became more evident when the citizens increasingly became angry and depicted their frustration through protesting.

2.4A Community
In defining community participation, there is a need to first understand the term community. There are many definitions of what a community actually is. However, these definitions are not totally different from each other. In Xali (2005: 7) a community is defined as “a collection of people in a geographical area with a particular identifiable social structure, exhibiting some sense of belonging, and community spirit.” A community is also understood as a group of people that have settled in a geographical area at a given time (Burkey, 1993 cited in Baba, 1998: 23). Lastly, a community could be understood as people who are grouped either according to geography, common interests or identity (Breuer, 2002: 9). From the above definitions, it is clear that a community involves people that are inhabitants of a particular environment and the relations among them.

2.5Participation
Arguably the term participation was first used in the 1950’s by social activists and project managers as a necessary component for development (Olivier, undated: 6). Internationally participation was adopted by the World Bank and the Development Bank of Southern Africa as a precondition for successful project implementation. Prior to the introduction of a democratic system of governance in South Africa, the previous system of governance deprived the racially segregated groups in the country of their right to participate in decision-making and policy making and implementation (Masango, 2002: 52). This is underpinned by (Davids, 2005: 18 cited in Siphuma, 2009: 37-38) when he contends that “public participation is particularly important in the case of South Africa where – prior to democratization- African, Coloured and Indian communities were excluded from the decision-making
processes through statutory mechanisms such as the Group Areas Act (1950) and the Population Registration Act (1950).” Therefore, this is why participation is very significant contemporary.

According to the social scientists in the World Bank “participation is a process through which a community influences and shares control over development initiatives and the decisions and resources that affect them” (World Bank Participation Sourcebook, 2003: 3, cited in Xali, 2005: 8). Roodt (2000: 469, cited in Xali, 2005: 47) argues that participation by a community is one of the ingredients necessary for promoting sustainability. Participation is defined as “a process by which people are enabled to become actively involved in defining issues of concern to them, in making decisions that affect their lives, in formulating and implementing policies, in planning, developing and delivering services and in taking action to achieve change” (Breuer, 2002: 10). Participation is defined by Olivier (undated: 6) “as an active process by which beneficiaries influence the direction and execution of a development project with a view to enhancing their well-being in terms of income, personal growth, self-reliance or other values they cherish.” Kotze and Kellerman (1997 cited in Siphuma, 2009: 41) describe the concept of participation as “a complex and an ongoing process through which people exercise varying influences in developmental activities that affect their lives.”

Davids (2005 cited in Siphuma, 2009: 41) distinguishes between structured and unstructured participation. The former occurs during elections, wards and development forums. The latter refers to the situations whereby local people protest to depict their non-satisfaction with lack of basic services (Davids, 2005 cited in Siphuma, 2009: 41). Both these types of participation exist in housing projects. When structured participation is lacking the unstructured form of participation takes place. Theron (2005c cited in Siphuma, 2009: 42) argues that “current approaches to public participation tend to be unstructured.”

Currently it has become a trend to include some components of participation in the implementation of infrastructure projects within the local government sphere (Olivier, undated: 6-7). The central feature of the participation process in a multi-sectoral, project-based perspective is the relationship between the community and the government. Participation assumes an activity in which a community takes part (Baba, 1998: 34).
2.5.1 Elements of participation

A major requirement of the participation process is that participation has to be accompanied by the ability to implement the projects arising from the development process. It is argued that for participation to be effective the following elements have to be included also:

- Allocation of adequate resources to the community participation programme, and meaningful use of these resources;
- Promotion of legitimacy of and public support for policies and programmes of the local authority; and
- Appropriate mechanisms and training to enable members of communities to contribute meaningfully to the development projects” (Olivier, undated: 19)

It is vital to recognize that when communities are involved in the decision-making process around a project, and they are given some responsibility for the ongoing management of the project, they feel a sense of ownership on the project (Olivier, undated: 19). According to Olivier (undated: 19), this results in the community being willing to contribute more to its projects and increases the possibility of the project being sustainable. The decision-making component of participation should not be seen as an additional aspect and but rather it should be integrated into the entire participation process (Olivier, undated: 19).

Participation is classified by some scholars according to its scale (Mathabela, 1999: 21). This view is based on the fact that it would be difficult to handle participation on a bigger scale than it would be in handling participation on a smaller scale. Hence participation is often restricted into the level of local projects (Mathabela, 1999: 21). Some development theorists distinguish participation according to two approaches – ‘top down’ and ‘bottom up’ approaches. It is argued that with a ‘top down’ approach projects are accomplished quickly and the implementers move on to other projects. However, the community beneficiaries and responsible government officials are always left to deal with the consequences (Skinner, 1983, cited in Mathabela, 1999:22). Moreover, it is argued that on a ‘bottom up’ approach responsibility and implementation of a developmental project is handed over to the local community structures to handle the process (Mathabela, 1999: 22). The development process in this kind of approach is often referred to as development that comes from the grass-roots level. It is further argued that the ‘bottom up’ approach results into community participation being seen as a form of empowerment, because this is the level of engagement where weaker groups in society are strengthened and power is disseminated (Mathabela, 1999: 24).
Furthermore, it is indicated that participation tends to enhance the project’s effectiveness through involving local people at the beginning of a project which will lead to effective designing and implementing of a project. In addition, this is said to lead to the sustainability of a project (Mathabela, 1999: 25).

Furthermore, it is argued that approaches used to initiate local development projects are inadequate without the consideration and participation of the local people, which are the beneficiaries of such projects (Davy, 2006: 10). Empowerment is seen as an important aspect of the public participation process. Empowerment is understood here as the development of skills and abilities of local people to enable them to have a capacity to be involved in decision-making of development projects (Davy, 2006: 11). Empowerment is further regarded as effectively involving local people in the creation of structures and designing of policies and programmes that serve their interests as well as people’s contribution in the development process (AISA, 2002: 298, cited in Davy, 2006: 11). Public participation could be regarded as a form of ‘bottom-up approach’ to development, because it encourages people to play an active role in decision-making processes that affect their lives (Davy, 2006: 13).

The significance of public participation is not only emphasized by social scientists, non-governmental organizations and social activists, but it is also stipulated in the South African Constitution. Chapter 10, section 195 states that “1… (c) Public participation must be development-oriented … (e) People’s needs must be responded to, and the public must be encouraged to participate in policy making…” (The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996).

2.5.2 Defining Community Participation
The importance of community participation was first highlighted by World Health Organization (WHO) at Alma Ata conference in 1978 (Baba, 1998: 34). The term community participation is not easily defined. The meaning of community participation varies according to actors’ interests (Baba, 1998: 34). Community participation has established itself as a fundamental feature for the delivery of low income housing worldwide. Cities such as London, New York, El Salvador and Nairobi have adopted community participation for their
developmental projects (Mathabela, 1999: 28). Therefore, this shows that community participation not only applies to South Africa, but rather internationally also. An example to illustrate community participation internationally is that of a housing project in Dandora, Kenya. In this community it is argued that the Nairobi City Council provided a self-built housing project to provide support for a community development approach. It is argued that the “entire project was geared towards community participation” (Mathabela, 1999: 29).

The central aspect in community participation is participation by the community in decisions that directly affects their living conditions (Baba, 1998: 34). In other words, this refers to the sharing of power between authorities and the community. Community participation is seen as a right, but participation in housing projects is not seen as the important form of participation. It is argued that participation in housing projects should be extended to all spheres of life and must also include the sharing of developmental benefits (Baba, 1998: 38).

Community participation is not an easy concept to define. This concept is often used interchangeable with many terms such as empowerment, community development, community capacity building, and consultation and so forth. Therefore, one can conclude that community participation is an umbrella term for many different practices (Breuer, 2002: 13).

Community participation could be understood as the direct involvement of the people at local level in the overall development programmes (Williams, 2006 cited in Mafukidze, 2009: 7). For Davidson et al. (2006) cited in Mafukidze (2009: 7) community participation involves how and why members of a community are brought into these affairs. In Xali (2005: 7) the concept of community participation is understood as transformation, whereby people who were previous excluded in decision making are now given an opportunity to take part in decisions that affect their lives.

Community participation is a means to achieve better results for a project and better human settlement conditions for the community (Baba, 1998: 38). The objective of community participation is the sustainability of an accomplished project. Therefore, this can be possible if the community is fully involved, because the community knows best about their living conditions (Baba, 1998: 38). The significance of community participation is illustrated by the
following three main factors. Firstly, it is a form of employment creation through the use of local labour and expertise (Davidson, et al. 2006). Secondly, it promotes involvement of local people in collective decision-making which leads to the implementation process being a success (Davidson, et al. 2006). Thirdly, it assists those that are more in need in the community to acquire scarce resources (i.e. houses) through being identified by the larger community to be in need (Davidson, et al. 2006). Hence, community participation is projected as an undertaking that results in the empowerment of the local population (Mafukidze, 2009: 8).

Furthermore, community participation theoretically entails the involvement of local actors in the conceptualisation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of projects; however, practically it tends to be restricted to specific activities (Mafukidze, et al. 2009: 7). As such, community participation could also be understood as local involvement within a range of possibilities where locals may participate only through employment, in decision-making or at all levels (Davidson et al. 2006). The level of local involvement is circumstantial since there are no rules that prescribe levels of involvement (Lizarralde, et al. 2008, cited Mafukidze, et al. 2009: 7). In Diepkloof, for instance, community participation was limited to the discussion of a proposed idea of building high-rise residential flats. Minimal involvement of the local population was undertaken as the participation process was thought to be simply aimed at bringing them together to endorse an idea rather than to achieve empowerment and capacity building (Mafukidze, et al. 2009: 7). In emphasizing the significance of community participation, it is indicated that involvement, “gives people a better understanding of their own interests and the interests of others, and, in some cases, brings them to see what would be best for the entire group” (Mafukidze, et al. 2009: 7). However, this depends on the level at which locals are involved (Moote et al. 1997: 877).

Community participation in housing delivery could be understood as a localised collective learning process where all stakeholders acquire and share information and learn to accept responsibility for decisions while working towards achieving the shared objective of improving delivery (Moote et al. 1997). Therefore, it can be seen that acknowledgement and tolerance of different interests and knowledge, pursuit of cooperation and deliberate minimisation of clashes of interest, reinforce community participation. Even though community participation is understood as above, current debates on participation have
highlighted that participation as formally outlined in policy is not working in practise especially institutional participatory mechanisms currently in place (Bénit-Gbaffou, 2008 cited in Mafukidze, et al. 2009: 7).

2.5.3 Community participation in local government

At the local government level, community participation is understood as the role played by a community and relevant stakeholders in policy making and implementation process at the local level (Mfenguza, 2007: 22). Some examples of community participation activities are that of policy formulation, budgeting, identification, implementation and monitoring of projects and strategy formulation (Mfenguza, 2007: 22). Accordingly, community participation fails when the parties involved are vague about the level of participation they are dealing with (Mfenguza, 2007:22). It is further contended that effective participation occurs when different stakeholders involved in a project are satisfied with the level at which they are operating (Mfenguza, 2007:22).

Lack of community participation has been identified as one of the three main components in the housing problem facing the provincial government of the Eastern Cape (Province of the Eastern Cape Human Settlement, 2011:9). Makumbe (1996:13) contends that top-down structures of local government and community development results in bureaucrats doing most of the planning and decision making in the development process. For that reason, it is argued that active participation in development requires that the community or the beneficiaries (i.e. housing beneficiaries in this study) are fully involved in the whole process (Makumbe, 1996: 13). It is not a recent discovery that top-down approaches do not always work. This is illustrated by Nelson and Wright (1995: 3) when they contend that early post-war models of development were based on the image of capitalism which was supposed to transform the peoples of the Third world through modernization. It is further argued that this use of participation suggested that the people were not economically and politically active before development came along. This meant that people’s participation in projects consisted of contributions in the form of labour, cash or kind (Nelson and Wright, 1995: 3). This is still the situation in the South African housing projects – local people participate in these projects through being given employment in the construction phase of the projects. Nelson and Wright (1995:3) argue that the failure of such public programmes was traced to the alienation of the beneficiaries.
Furthermore, in a study conducted in the Ngqeleni extension 4 housing project, under the Nyandeni local municipality, in the Eastern Cape, the respondents were not satisfied with the housing delivery rendered to them (Madzidzela, 2008:59). The poor quality of the houses delivered was one of the main problems (Madzidzela, 2008: 59). The respondents suggested that community participation should also be taken into consideration (Madzidzela, 2008: 62). They pointed out that it is important for the community to participate in all phases of the project starting from the commencement, so that they can get a sense of ownership (Madzidzela, 2008: 61). In a study conducted in Mbashe Local municipality, communication was seen as one of the main factors preventing community participation in their housing projects (Ngxubaza, 2010; 116). In addition, it was argued that at the local level participation in decision-making was hampered by a tension between those who should represent the interest of the community and those who should inform the community (Ngxubaza, 2010: 116).

Moreover, in a study conducted in the Joe Slovo settlement on community participation in housing delivery, it was evident that the government has used “a top-down approach with limited participation of the beneficiaries and inadequate acknowledgement by officials of the needs and concerns of the residents in the planning process. Such limited community participation during housing projects planning and delivery has seriously hampered project implementation and sustainability” (Mnguni, 2010: 5). Hence, there is a need for local people to be active in the development process, because they understand their community problems better than people from outside (Mnguni, 2010: 64).

When looking at participation at the governmental level, responses of the study showed that officials do not fully involve the community in the decision-making process. In other words, the community is not given a platform to express their views on housing issues (Mnguni, 2010: 65). Dent and Dubouis (2003) cited in Mnguni (2010: 65) states clearly that these top-down approaches to development planning hinder both the implementation and sustainability of projects. This is also evident in a study conducted in Mbashe Local Municipality on the low cost housing process, where the community members that were interviewed felt that the top-down approach used to address issues of housing has led to poor planning and implementation of their project (Ngxubaza, 2010:116). However, in response to the above arguments, it could be argued that if high quality housing that satisfied the needs of the community was delivered without participation the top-down approach would be justified,
because people only complain when there are problems and when the service rendered to them is satisfactory they become satisfied.

2.5.4 Challenges in community participation

Community participation as a concept has its own obstacles. These obstacles are visible in an entire project. The obstacles include the mismanagement of resources, poor communication, 'top-down approach to decision making and so on (Xali, 2005: 56). DEAT (2000: 16-18 cited in Xali, 2005: 58) also agrees that there are obstacles in community participation and adds some of the obstacles as follows:

- “Participation of the community is often included post the making of the planning and strategic decisions.

- Lack of discovering of an appropriate approach to community participation and its objectives

- Lack of fully understanding the purpose and objectives of community participation from the participants (including their own responsibilities) of the community participation process.”

Accordingly, obstacles to participation such as the ones mentioned above can have negative consequences, such as delays in the implementation and delivery in a project (Xali, 2005: 59). Community participation is seen as ideal for resolving problems in the national housing projects. However, Community participation has its disadvantages. For some community participation can be time consuming. Community participation is also disadvantageous since local communities can be tempted by their own self-interest and the government authorities to deal with the consequence of a plan in a particular area (Mathabela, 1999: 27).

Furthermore, it is argued that at times people do not understand the technical work behind projects (Pama, et al. 1977: 1234). Local participants may come up with a list of what they want from the government. Because some of the local government officials want to see basic services being delivered to the people they end up making promises without considering technical, financial and administrative aspect of local governance. This results in government officials losing loyalty of the local people (Pama, et al, 1977: 1234).
Accordingly, poor communication also creates problems for a participatory process in development initiates (Mafukidze, et al. 2009: 15). For instance, in Diepkloof, authorities were accused of reducing a serious issue such as housing delivery to an academic matter that required agreement of the majority to be taken forward because their intention was not clear from the beginning. For instance, in Diepkloof some residents were convinced that the participatory process that was not concluded had political motives instead of asking for citizen contributions towards policy formulation (Mafukidze, et al. 2009: 15).

Therefore, it is stipulated that drivers of community participation should prevent matters such as the above by always considering engaging with local leadership and influential members of a community, as they could assist in managing the post-consultation healing process using their locally accepted leadership and guidance (Mafukidze, et al. 2009: 15). This also emphasises the idea that drivers of the participatory process ought to have prior knowledge of the identity composition of the community in question, its leadership and predominant ideas constituting its socio-cultural background. This knowledge would provide a measure of preparedness in dealing with local knowledge and perceptions (Mafukidze, et al. 2009: 15).

2.5.5 Lesson learnt from community participation obstacles

The above discussion has shown that community participation is a complex process that is difficult to drive forward without adequate knowledge and relevant expertise. Therefore, there is a need for implementers to have proper training on how to deal and conclude community deliberations (Mafukidze, et al. 2009: 15). It is indicated that adequate knowledge could help implementers of community participation in shaping intended outcomes of a process that is inherently characterised by conflict, consensus, contradictions and contestations (Mafukidze, et al. 2009: 15).

According to Mafukidze, et al. (2009: 15) the complexity of the participatory process should be acknowledged. Obstacles to the community participation process are significant, because they are a learning opportunity for local development planners, implementers and other stakeholders such as community leaders and ordinary beneficiaries (Mafukidze, et al. 2009: 15).
15). These obstacles can assist all the above mentioned parties to know what is lacking and to find mechanisms that they can put in place to prevent such matters from happening again.

2.6 Conclusion
The above discussion was about community participation in local development projects. It began by defining development. Participatory and community development have been shown as the relevant aspects of development for community participation. Community participation has been defined and discussed. The discussion also made reference to other local development projects where community participation was identified as a solution and also as a problem. The advantages and disadvantages of community participation have been indicated.
3. CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter deals with the methodology and research methods for the study. This discussion is structured as follows: research paradigm, scope and scale of the research, research design and specific methods. The research design and specific methods entails the research methods, date collection techniques, and data analysis.

3.1 Research Paradigm

There are different types of research paradigms. To mention but a few there are functionalist, radical structuralist, radical humanist and interpretivist (Burrell and Morgan cited in Gerber, 2012). For the purposes of this research an interpretivist research paradigm was adopted. This is because interpretivists are realists. They understand the world as it is. Interpretivists seek to understand the fundamental nature of the social world at the level of subjective experience (Burrell and Morgan cited in Gerber, 2012). They seek explanation in individual consciousness and subjectivity (Burrell and Morgan cited in Gerber, 2012). In addition, their frame of reference is the participant rather than the observer of action (Burrell and Morgan cited in Gerber, 2012). For the purposes of the research, an interpretivist research paradigm was essential because the researcher wanted to get the lived experiences of individual human beings (i.e. their explanations and interpretations) on the problem issue. This is supported by Gomm (2004: 7) by arguing that interpretive researchers are primarily interested in investigating how people experience the world and/or how they make sense of it (Gomm, 2004: 7).

3.2 Scope and Scale of the research

- The subjects of this research were local people who own and those who are staying in the low-cost houses.
- The geographical location of this research was Whittlesea, which is situated in Lukhanji municipality under the Chris Hani district. The research specifically looked at Mabuyase Township in Ekuphumleni. The area is a product of the municipal housing projects in Whittlesea. In other words, it is one of the existing low-cost housing areas in Whittlesea. The researcher spent two weeks in Mabuyase to accommodate the availability of the research subjects. In addition, most of the
research subjects were working people, who were only available after hours. Hence, two weekswere spent in organizing interviews and actually conducting interviews.

3.3 Research Design and specific methods
A research design is a plan and structure of how the research will be undertaken (Maxwell, 2005:7). In addition, it is also a description of the methods that are going to be used or followed based on the context of the research (Maxwell, 2005:7). A qualitative research approach was used. The reason for choosing this approach is that the researcher’s aim was to hear explanations and interpretations of the research participants, since they are the ones affected and who understand the problem issue very well. In other words, the researcher aimed to hear lived experiences of the people. A qualitative research approach is defined as “a type of research which is concerned with discovering people’s life histories and everyday behaviour” (Silverman, 2005:1). Qualitative research is flexible, since it puts people’s feelings first and does not rush to make conclusions about a particular phenomenon (Silverman, 2005:2). In addition, it is also flexible, because it encourages qualitative researchers to be innovative; they are not bound by one way of conducting a research. Silverman (2005: 1) argues that qualitative researchers can conduct research using different methods, for example they can use interviews, focus groups and life stories.

Furthermore, inductive reasoning was applied in this study. Inductive reasoning focuses on context discovery, because it argues that empirical generalizations and theoretical statements should be derived from the data (Brewer, 2011:155). In addition, inductive reasoning has helped in answering the ‘how’ and ‘what’ questions.

3.3.1 Research methods (phenomenology and case study)
Phenomenology and case study research approaches were selected for this study. A phenomenological research approach is a qualitative research method that attempts to understand participants’ perspective and views on social realities (Lester, 1999: 1). This is supported by Patton (1980 cited in Magwaza, 1995:51) by arguing that a phenomenological approach attempts to understand a particular phenomenon in its own terms and context. It is further argued that the purpose of the phenomenological approach is to gather ‘deep’
information and perceptions of the research participants through inductive, qualitative methods such as interviews, discussions and participant observation (Lester, 1999: 1).

There are two main types of the phenomenological approach. The first version is derived from the European tradition of thought and the other ‘new phenomenology’ has a North American origin (Crotty, 1996 cited in Denscombe, 2003: 104). The former version of phenomenology is influenced by philosophy and could regard itself as the original version, because its founding father is from this discipline (Crotty, 1996 cited in Denscombe, 2003: 104). This form of phenomenology can operate at a more ordinary level. For example, it can address issues such as bullying at school. The second phenomenology emanates from social phenomenology. For example, disciplines such as sociology, psychology, education and so forth are applicable here. This kind of phenomenology is more concerned with describing the ways in which humans give meaning to their experiences (Denscombe, 2003: 104). This phenomenology focuses on matters such as experience, an interest in everyday life (Denscombe, 2003: 104). However, it is argued that practically it is not easy to separate these two forms of phenomenology; rather these two forms are often intertwined (Denscombe, 2003: 104-105). For the purposes of this study, the second type of phenomenology was applicable.

Phenomenological research deals with people’s perceptions, attitudes and beliefs, feelings and emotions (Denscombe, 2003: 96). In other words, phenomenology is concerned with human experience. It is indicated that phenomenology prefers to concentrate on getting a clear understanding of things as directly experienced by people (Denscombe, 2003: 98). Phenomenology is also described as particularly interested in how social life is constructed by those who participate in it (Denscombe, 2003: 99).

Phenomenologists when doing research focus on trying to depict the relevant experiences in a genuine manner (Denscombe, 2003: 101). One of the crucial benefits of a phenomenological approach is that it deals with things in depth (Denscombe, 2003: 101). Denscombe argues that good phenomenological research involves a detailed description of the experience that is being investigated (Denscombe, 2003: 101). Another feature of this approach is that phenomenologists concentrate on how experiences are constructed or how people come to see things as they are (Denscombe, 2003: 101).
Moreover, case study research is defined as “a type of qualitative research in which the researcher explores a single entity phenomenon (the case), which is bounded by time and activity (a program, event, process, institution or social group) and collects detailed information by using a variety of data collection procedures during a sustained period of time” (Leedy, 1997:25). Case study research is further explained by Yin (2004: xii) as he argues that it investigates real life events in their natural settings. Yin further argues that this method enables you, as a researcher, to address ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions about the real-life events, using a broad variety of empirical tools (Yin, 2004: xii). According to Gillham (2000: 1) a case can be an individual, a community or an institution. It is argued that a case study investigates the above mentioned cases to answer specific research questions and which seeks a range of different kinds of evidence – evidence which is in a case setting (Gillham, 2000: 1). It is further argued that evidence in case study is not sufficient if generated from one source, therefore, evidence from multiple sources is encouraged (Gillham, 2000: 1-2). In this study the case that has been studied was the individuals who have benefited in the Mabuyase low-cost housing projects in Whittlesea.

3.4 Data collection techniques

The researcher collected data from the literature and people. From the literature, the researcher wanted to find out what is written about the area of focus and the problem issue. In addition, those who have written on the area of focus, and how have they dealt with the problem issue, so that the researcher can determine the problem issue from the literature. From the people, the researcher needed to hear their views, concerns, explanations and interpretations on the problem issue.

In this study data was collected with the use of unstructured and semi-structured interviews. Elements of both these type of interviews were used when collecting data from people. Newing, Eagle, Puri and Watson (2011: 100) define an unstructured interview as “an in-depth conversation usually arranged in advance about a specific issue.” According to Lune, Pumar and Koppel (2010:240) in an unstructured interview, a researcher allows the interviewees to lead the conversation in whatever direction makes the most sense to them. Semi-structured interviews are based on an interview guide that is prepared in advanced (Newing, et al. 2011: 101- 102). Gillham (2000: 61) argues that semi-structured interviews
are the most significant form of interviews for case study research. According to Denscombe (2003) unstructured and semi-structured interviews work well together. Unstructured interviews have helped in obtaining lived experiences of individuals on the problem issue. In the phenomenological approach it is indicated that the process of data collection tends to rely on tape-recorded interviews (Denscombe, 2003: 103). According to Denscombe (2003: 103) the interview process is very important in the phenomenological approach. Denscombe provides some explanation to why he regards interviews as significant.

“First, interviews are said to provide the possibility of exploring a particular issue in detail. Second, interviews allow interviewees to raise important issues in their own perspective. Phenomenologists do this by using unstructured interviews. Unstructured interviews allow plenty of scope for the interviewee to move the discussion to aspects they find significant. Third, interviews give interviewees an opportunity to produce their lived experience, spoken in their own words. Fourthly, interviews help the researcher to verify the correctness of the data s/he acquired from the interviewees” (Denscombe, 2003: 103).

Furthermore, the interview process for this study was recorded with the use of field notes and a digital recorder. Some of the interviews that were recorded were conducted telephonically. The reason for this was that some of the research subjects in this study work long hours and were only available after hours. This is justified in case study research. In Gillham (2000: 61-62) it is contended that when interviewees are far apart from each other and are very busy, telephonic interviews are an alternative. Field notes were taken immediately after the interview to avoid disturbing the interviewee while speaking. Field notes help in capturing information that is not verbal (Denscombe, 2003:175). For example, context of the location, atmosphere under which the interview was conducted, clues about the intent behind the statements being made. Furthermore, digital recording produces a permanent record. However, it captures only what is said not how it is said (Denscombe, 2003: 175). Hence, it was supported by written field notes.

Prior to the commencement of the interview the researcher explained the aims of the research and also indicated what led to wanting to do research in this topic. According to Denscombe (2003: 179) introduction and formalities are an important aspect of the interview process. Furthermore, permission to digitally-record the discussion of the interview was requested from the interviewees. In addition, the interviewees were assured that the information contained in the digital-recorder was confidential.
3.4.1 Interview questions

1. Do you own or are you temporarily occupying an RDP house?
2. How did you get it?
3. Were you consulted during the planning and construction of the houses?
4. If yes, what was the consultation process?
5. How was the state of the house when it was handed over to you?
6. How did you feel when you got the house?
7. Are you satisfied with the condition of the house?
8. Do you think people should be consulted in development projects?
9. Do you think the consultation you got during the housing project was enough?
10. If no, how do you want to be consulted with regards to local development projects?
11. What challenges do you face or did you face because of these houses?
12. Was this house evaluated and approved?
13. Do you have a title deed?

3.5 Data analysis

Content analysis was used for data analysis and interpretation since it was useful when analyzing responses of interviews, which was the chosen data collection tools for this research. Content analysis identifies and summarizes messages that data are sending (IPDET Handbook: p480). Gillham (2000: 81) also argues that content analysis is the relevant type of data analysis technique for case study research. In addition, triangulation can also be used, because it can help to verify an assessment by cross-checking results, for instance, between interviews and focus groups (IPDET Handbook: p473). However, for this study triangulation was not used.

3.6 Conclusion

This chapter addressed the methodology and research methods for the study. The discussion dealt with the following: research paradigm, scope and scale of the research, research design and specific methods. The research design and specific methods entailed the research methods, data collection techniques, and data analysis. This discussion attempted to relate the research aspects to the current research. The researcher also attempted to explain the arguments that were raised to provide clarity.
4. CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

4.1 Qualitative Data Analysis

Qualitative data are information about the social world (Lune, et al. 2010: 322). Qualitative data analysis often focuses on the meaning of information or the relationships among variables. Qualitative researchers when analyzing are trying to find patterns in events and interactions, words, and images or social artifacts (Lune, et al. 2010: 322). Qualitative analysis examines how the particular context shapes social action and experience. Qualitative researchers analyze social action and context by coding the information so that we can understand and explain it (Lune, et al. 2010: 322).

4.1.1 Types of Data Analysis

This study has used a combination of content and text data analysis techniques. The former is the type of analysis that assumes that written and visual communications express the ideas that guide social action. Content analysis is the act of translating text from information, in the general sense, to coded data that can be summarized, compared, and interpreted (Lune, et al. 2010:322). The latter simply involves collecting interview data to analyze them for social research (Lune, et al. 2010:323). Both these types of data analysis were used because they are applicable to a study that uses a phenomenological methodology (which is this study). In addition content analysis is regarded as very useful when analyzing interviews (which was the data collection used for this study) (IPDET Handbook: 480).

The research participants for the study were people who have benefited in the housing project that occurred in Mabuyase Township. Therefore, the sample that was selected for this research was from the beneficiaries of the housing project in Mabuyase Township. According to Trochim (2006) “sampling is the process of selecting units (e.g. people, organizations) from a population of interest so that by studying the sample we may fairly generalize our results back to the population from which they were chosen.” The research participants for the sample were identified using definitions of sampling from sources such as Neuman (2003) and Lune, et al. (2010).
4.2 Sampling Process

Neuman (2003: 210) and Trochim (2006) indicate that sampling is distinguished between non-probability and probability samplings. For the purposes of this research non-probability and aspects of probability sampling were used. In non-probability sampling, purposive sampling was used. Neuman (2003: 213) argues that purposive sampling is appropriate in three situations. First, it is used to select unique cases that are especially informative. Second, it is used to select members of a ‘difficult-to-reach,’ specialized population. Third, it can also be used to identify particular types of cases for in-depth investigation (Neuman, 2003: 213).

For this research purposive sampling was used because the second situation was more applicable to this research, since most of the research participants were working people. It was very difficult to reach them, with most of them working long hours and on weekends they have social commitments to attend. In addition, purposive sampling was chosen since it is said to help when selecting cases with a specific purpose in mind (Neuman, 2003: 213).

In probability sampling, random sampling was used. Trochim (2006) defines a **probability sampling** method as “any method of sampling that uses some form of random selection.” He argues that in order to have a random selection method, a process or procedure must be used that assures that the different units in your population have equal probabilities of being chosen (Trochim, 2006). In this research random sampling has been used through selecting the samples randomly within the beneficiaries of the houses in Mabuyase Township. This random selection was done through selecting research subjects from different vicinities within the township. Random sampling was done in an attempt to produce samples that represent the views of the population of Mabuyase Township, since people were chosen randomly and chances of them being biased are less. However, random sampling does not guarantee that every random sample perfectly represents the perspective a population (Neuman, 2003: 218).

4.2.1 Research Samples

Eight people were used as samples for this study. Although a higher number of participants would have been desirable, many were not willing to be part of the study, even though the purpose of the study was explained. Some people automatically assumed that the researcher was from the government, which they regarded as full of empty promises, which they do not deliver. A typical response was “…the government and other stakeholders only come to them when they are canvassing for elections and make promises for change. However, after
the election period it becomes quiet…” Other potential participants were not willing to participate in a study that is about their socio-economic problems. These were the kind of challenges that the researcher faced during the selection of research samples for the study.

Furthermore, seven of the eight people used as research samples are house owners. One respondent, which is respondent two, is occupying the house but it is written under her mother’s name. The samples’ details were not requested. However, race, ethnicity, age and gender could be determined. The researcher felt the need to mention race, ethnicity, and age and gender because some of these social phenomena did influence the responses received.

4.2.2 Race and ethnicity
The data for this research was collected in a geographical area (Whittlesea) that is occupied by black Africans who speak isiXhosa language.

4.2.3 Age
The age of the participants was not asked but their age range could be determined based on the researcher’s observation. Based on this observation it could be said that the age range of the respondents was between 35 and 50. These participants were heads of households.

4.2.4 Gender
The participants for this research constituted five females and three males. The participants were not selected according to gender, but rather according to their willingness.
### 4.3 FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did they get the houses?</td>
<td>According to the researcher’s findings all eight respondents had gone through the same process in getting the house. They all have said that they had registered for the houses. In the literature community participation is understood as the role played by the community and relevant stakeholders in the policy making and implementation process at local level. In the data collected from the respondents’ one, four, five, six and seven community participation did not exist since there was no consultation of the community by the municipality and the department of housing (which are the relevant stakeholders in this context). <strong>Respondent one</strong> said that the houses were just made for them. Therefore, it could be argued that the housing project was imposed on the community according to <strong>five respondents</strong>. <strong>Respondent two, three and eight</strong> had a different perspective from that of the <strong>five respondents</strong> mentioned above. According to the data collected from them it could be argued that community participation did exist, because they said that they were consulted by the councillor and the officials from the department of housing. They said that they were shown the plan of the houses. <strong>Respondent three</strong> said that they even had committees that were elected from the community by the community to represent them during the period of this project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondent three further says that consultation did occur during the planning and construction stages. Respondent two said that “they [the Councillor and officials from the department of housing] said everyone should be on the site every day, so that s/he can see the process of building the house.” Respondent eight’s statement agrees with the two. According to her “… [meetings] occurred even before the actually construction phase took place, even during the construction phase they did take place, you would even go and check your houses so that any problems that you had you would complain but we complained until we decided to stop because they did not fix the problems until you just fix them yourself.” Therefore, it is clear from respondents two, three and eight that community participation did exist in the form consultation and meetings between the community, the municipality and the department of housing, because they did play a role in this project.

When asked how did they feel about the condition of the house after completion?

None of the eight respondents were satisfied with the condition of the houses because they all had criticisms. For instance, respondents one and three said they were not satisfied with the condition of the houses, but in the name of having a house they accepted them because they did not have houses. Respondent two also said that she was not satisfied but did not mind as she had demolished the house and used that land to build a bigger house. Respondents six and eight highlighted the problems they had experienced and said when they complained they were told that they will have to fix the problems themselves because they were given the houses for free. All the respondents have also indicated that the houses have many challenges, such as the poor quality of
the houses which resulted into cracks in the walls; roofs were unstable on windy days and flooding during rainy seasons. According to respondents four and five the area where the houses were built is not suitable for construction of houses because it is a wet area closer to the river.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When asked whether regular participation through consultation and visiting the site regularly would have made a difference on the condition of the houses or not?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Respondent one, four, five, six, seven stated earlier that the community was not consulted at all; the houses were just given to them. Respondents one, five, six and seven said that consultation would have made a difference as they could have raised the issues that they had had. However, respondent four said it would not have made a difference, because the problem was with the contractors. In her words, “even if there was consultation, may be the plan would have been ok and people would have been happy but the contractors did not do a good job.”

Respondents two, three and eight said earlier that there was consultation. With regards to regular visitations on the site respondent two said that this would not make a difference on the conditions of the houses because “if the contractors were building in a proper way even if you were not there it was not going to make a difference. Therefore, respondent two had the same view as that of respondent four in the above paragraph. Moreover, respondent three and eight’s responses to the entire question were different; they said community participation (through consultation and meetings) did take place during the planning and construction stages of the projects. They said the community was allowed to raise issues that they were concerned about. Problems with the houses were caused by the budget that was given to the Lukhanji
municipality. In her words, “they called us when they started building and then we complained according to the plan we were shown because now they were not following the plan they showed us. Then they told us that the reason they are not following the plan was because of the budget that has been given to the [Lukhanji] municipality here in Whittlesea. Then we agreed because we did not have houses and said the houses are fine.” The responses from the respondents showed different views about the participation process in this project and the causes of the poor quality of the houses. Overall lack of consultation, lack of skills from contractors to produce quality houses and budget constraints were the identified causes of the poor quality of the houses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When asked how do they feel about the level of participation that existed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| In this question only three respondents were able to answer because five respondents indicated that participation did not exist. Therefore, this question became applicable to respondent two, three and eight. For respondent one, four, five, six and seven, the process of participation did not exist at all. For respondent two, three and eight, the participation process existed between the community, municipality and the department of housing. However, respondent two said even though participation did exist, the issues being raised by the community were not responded to by the municipality. Respondent eight would agree with respondent two’s previous statement. She said: “…you would even go and check your houses so that any problems that you had you would complain but we complained until we decided to stop because they didn’t fix the problems until you just fix them yourself. Respondent three would agree with respondent two and eight regarding a committee that was representing the community. After sending the
When they were asked about the kind of participation that should exist in their community projects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent one</strong>'s response was neither clear nor straight forward. <strong>Respondent one</strong> referred to another housing project where the government is now renovating the house since they were not properly built. She said the government has to do that for them also. <strong>Respondent two</strong> emphasized the fact that the government does not respond to their needs. <strong>Respondent three</strong> said she would like a participation process where local committees are elected to represent them, but these people have to be reliable and trustworthy. These people must represent them at meetings with the municipality and must report back to the community. She said they want a committee that works well with the people to represent the community. <strong>Respondent four</strong> said community participation does not guarantee that a project will be a success. For her the people who get the tender in a project have to be hired because they can do the job and be monitored and evaluated. <strong>Respondent five</strong> suggested a participation process where there is a committee elected from the community. He further said that this committee should bring about all the parties involved (i.e. the community, the contractors, and the municipality) in the project, so that aspects of the project that require explanation can be attended to in the presence of all the involved parties. <strong>Respondent six</strong> suggested a participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
process whereby the community is given a platform (in the form of a public meeting where every relevant person is present) to complain and make suggestions on matters of the project. **Respondent six** said “it easy not enough to have an office for complaints and suggestions because you do not even know whether your complaints or suggestions reached the relevant persons. **Respondent seven’s** answer was not clear. He just said as long as the municipality responds when the community has complaints then things would be fine because they (the municipality) ignore the community’s complaints. **Respondent eight** said that the participation process that existed in the form of meetings between the community, the municipality and the department of housing was okay as long as the government can respond to people’s complaints or suggestions when there are community projects. From the above, it is clear that the participation process required has to be between the community, the representatives of the community and the municipality through consultation and the decision making process, so that the voice of the community is not just listened to but it is heard. In the literature, participation is defined as “a process by which people are enabled to become actively involved in defining issues of concern to them, in making decisions that affect their lives, in formulating and implementing policies, in planning, developing and delivering services and in taking action to achieve change” (Breuer, 2002: 10). It is evident from the responses to the above question that the community members have similar views on what should constitute the participation process. The responses of the community members have highlighted some of the aspects of participation that are identified in the definition. It has been indicated also that the participation process alone is not enough in
Community projects, other structures (i.e. monitoring and evaluation process) have to exist to ensure the effectiveness of a project. Lastly, the respondents have also unanimously highlighted the fact that the issues they raise are neglected by the government. This could be a discouraging factor for the community against government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When asked whether the house was inspected and approved?</td>
<td>All the respondents said the houses were not inspected and approved officially. If they were inspected and approved that was done in their absence. <strong>Respondent three</strong> and <strong>six</strong> said that the municipality sent committee members to check if there were any problems and report back to the municipality. However, nothing was done after that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When asked if they had title deeds?</td>
<td><strong>Seven</strong> out of the <strong>eight respondents</strong> said they had not received their title deeds. They said they did not know how long it will take to get them. When they asked they said they were told title deeds take time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.1 Observations

The researcher has observed similarities and differences from the respondents. For instance, respondents two, three, four and five were willing to talk and were open during the interviews. However, respondents seven and eight were reserved and not comfortable with answering questions especially those that required their opinion. They were more comfortable in answering general questions. This did have an influence on the information gathered. For instance, respondent seven when asked questions that required his opinion he would say that there are issues he would like to raise. However, when asked more on those issues he was very reluctant to say how he felt about certain things. As a result he withheld a lot of information that could have helped in the research.

Moreover, the researcher also collected more information from females than males simply because more females were willing to participate in the study. As a result more females were surveyed. Another observation made by the researcher was that women knew more about the project than men. The explanation for this was that the men that were interviewed were working and did not have time to attend community meetings due to the nature of their jobs. However, on this matter some of the women were also working but manage to make themselves available for the meetings. Therefore, the nature of one’s work could have been the determining factor on the availability of someone for a community project meeting.

4.4 Recommendations

These findings have revealed that there was a community participation process that occurred at a local level between the community and the municipality. The kind community participation process recommended was the one where the community elects people to form local committees to represent them, but these people have to be reliable and trustworthy. These people must represent them at meetings with the municipality and must report back to the community. It was said that the elected committee members must be people who work well with the people to represent the community. However, it has also been indicated in the findings that the community participation process does not guarantee the effectiveness of a project. A monitoring and
evaluation process during a community project has also been recommended for the effectiveness of a project. It has been recommended that the service provider who gets a tender on a particular project should be appointed according to his or her competence on the job to help in the effectiveness of a project. Therefore, further research on housing projects should investigate the process of selecting and appointing service providers for tenders in community housing projects to enhance the effectiveness of the community projects.
5. CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

In this study development has been defined as a participatory, people-centred process intended to reduce the incidence of poverty and achieve better livelihoods for all (Kingsbury, McKay, and Hunt, 2004: 43). The definition of development as participatory and people-centred is the most applicable for the purposes of this research or study. The definition of participation in development has been located in development projects and programmes (i.e. sustainable human settlements for our study purposes), as a means of strengthening their relevance, quality and sustainability (Gaventa and Valderrama, 1999:2). The decision to conduct research in this field came after it was identified in the Provincial Medium Term Sustainable Human Settlement Research Agenda that community participation is lacking in the housing delivery process of the Eastern Cape (Province of the Eastern Cape Human Settlement, 2011:9). In a nutshell the research problem was that there was a lack of community participation in the housing development projects in the Eastern Cape. As a result this research’s aims and objectives were to find out ways in which community participation can be improved in the creation of sustainable human settlements. The research question focused on finding out how can local people become more involved in the creation of their own sustainable human settlements. The findings have revealed that there was a community participation process that occurred at a local level between the community and the municipality. The type of the participation process that should exist in community projects was also identified. However, it has also been indicated in the findings that the community participation process does not guarantee the effectiveness of a project.
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7. APPENDIX

ALL INTERVIEWS TRANSCRIBED

NOTE:
Q = Question
R = Response

Interview 1 Response:

Q: Oh ok so tell me how did you get the house? Can you tell me about the process you went through in getting it?
R: I registered my details and I stayed waiting. We got the houses young man.

Q: You registered your details where, at the municipality?
R: Yes we registered at the municipality.

Q: So they never called you for anything like a meeting to discuss the type of houses they were going to built?
R: We were just given the houses, but we are not satisfied but we stayed. Because the house already exists? Yes young man

Q: So when you got the house how was its condition?
R: My house, when I got the house it was unstable since it is still not stable even now and has cracks hee yes young man even the doors were broken and I had to change them.

Q: Did you get them broken or they broke while you are staying in?
R: They got broken while we are already staying. When it is raining the doors get stiff and break.

Q: So that means you were not satisfied?
R: No I was not satisfied with the house when I got it. They used to come especially during the election period and ask what is wrong with the houses and then a week will pass and you won’t see anyone …Oh… when the election period is over you don’t see anyone.

Q: So after the election period you don’t see anyone?
R: Yes it becomes quiet and is still quiet even the taps are licking yes man when it’s raining water penetrates through the leakages.

Q: Is there someone or a place in the municipality where you can report problems that you have in the house?
R: They do come young man and they say we are coming, we are coming then you do not see them again.

Q: Is there another place where you can report them when they are not responding?
R: No we go to them yes… Oh I hear you mama

Q: So these houses were just given to you without anyone consulting you at the beginning?
R: No they did not ask anything to us they just gave us the houses yes.

Q: Do you think if you were consulted from beginning that would have made a difference in the way the houses were built?
R: No even if they did come because at first they wanted to built the houses with cement slabs and we were surprised yes ,
Oh they wanted to build with slabs! Yes they were going to build with cement slabs yes I remember now oh!

Q: So when there are other community projects in the community that exist how do you want you as community members to be consulted or addressed?
What are you saying? To say what?
Q: Do you think when there are other community projects like this one is the way they are doing things right?
R: Yes like there in Extension those houses that are being built. They have demolished the old houses and have built new ones from scratch, so also we would like to see the same thing being done to us because we are also complaining because our houses are not stable yes young man

Q: So do you think the problems you have were caused by being ignored by the municipality from the beginning?
R.: We were ignored from the beginning, but in the name of having a house… yes we even thought of the shacks that we had before since we are here yes …they were even better yes.

Q: So how is your roof ma?
R: You mean the roof…when it is raining there are licks, when there is heavy wind it is not stable even the wall has cracks, so you even say the wall has cracks? Yes there is nothing okay here… even when there is heavy wind parts of the wall are falling even if you do plaster the wall nothing stays, it is falling.

Q: So ma did they make you toilets also?
R: What are you saying? Yes we do have toilets…

Q: In the house did they separate the rooms?
R: The walls were just made but the rooms are divided but the dividing wall did not reach the roof… yes they did not complete the wall.

Q: There is a document that is called a title did, which is papers that prove that the house is yours. Do you have it?

R: Haha I never got them… no we have not got papers all of us … yes… oh so you are just staying without these papers, they only know in the municipality that the house is yours? Eh oh I hear you ma

Q: Was your house assessed and approved for occupation?
R: Yes it was done…no they just said that the house has been approved…
**Interview 2 Responses:**

**Q:** So tell me how did you get your house?
**R:** We had to register our details...I was staying eMadakeni...we were staying eMadakeni we heard that we are required to register our details in the community hall in Sada. People who wanted houses had to go and register especially those from eMadakeni hee. My mom went to register, she had to fill a form, she was asked to provide birth certificates of her children and her identity document...yes that kind of information, yes then she filled the form.

**Q:** After registering before the house was built was there any meeting to find out from you (people who have registered) about the type of houses you wanted or they were just built for you?
**R:** There were meetings, they even took people here and showed them the type of houses that were going to be built. They said the houses would look like the ones in iLinge.

**Q:** In these meetings were you allowed to ask questions about whether you are satisfied about the houses so that some things can be changed?
**R:** Yes there were discussions and they said these were going to be 4 roomed houses, then people were supposed to go with committees to check these house, yes

**Q:** Who use to call the meetings, was it someone from the municipality, or from housing in the municipality?
**R:** Yes from the municipality

**Q:** During the construction phase of the houses, were there any other meetings or the houses were built until they were finished?
**R:** They said everyone should be on the site every day, so that s/he can see the process of building the house.
Q: Was the house approved as ready for occupation?
R: Yes they said the houses were approved

Q: Were you there when the houses were approved?
R: Hee I am not sure and I cannot lie I could not come to the site often because I was staying eMadakeni at the time.

Q: Do you or your mom have a title deed for the house?
What is that?
It is papers that prove that your mom owns the house
R: No she does not yet have it but they said they are doing them but my mom has not got it yet in her position.

Q: How long did they say the title deeds will take before people get them?
R: They did not specify how long

Q: Were you satisfied with the way the house was done?
R: Some people are not satisfactory, because the plastering on the wall is getting off and the zinzcs on the roof are loose, these houses are not right.

Q: Do you think because people did not go to the sites regularly to check that is what led to things going wrong- getting problems with their houses?
R: I don’t think so because if the contractors were building in a proper way even if you were not there it was not going to make a difference

Q: When you got your house which problems did you encounter?
R: We demolished the house immediately and used the land to do the kind of house we wanted on the land

Q: Do you think the way the community was communicating with the municipality was enough?
R: If the houses were build in a proper way things would have been okay, because now there are many problems...The houses are not in good condition you can see for yourself, nothing is okay... people are still struggling in trying to fix the same things that the municipality did, yes

Q: Do you think the meetings you had with the municipality were enough for you?
R: I don’t think so because they seldom come...
Q: Do they still come to check the problems?
Once in a while...yes

Q: Did you see the houses they are renovating in Extension, did they come this side to say that they will also do some renovation also?
R: No I haven’t heard anything like that, but a long time ago they said they will come and fix the houses that are closer to the river, but recently nothing.

Q: Do you have a place in the municipality where you can send your complaints about the houses may be an office in the municipality?
R: Yes they say go and complain in the municipality even though they ignore those complaints, mmh

I would like to thank you very much for your assistance.

**Interview 3 Responses:**

Q: Can you tell me about the process you went through in getting the house?
R: The house, I got it when I was still staying in Madakeni. So people from the municipality came and called people from Sada and Madakeni and requested that people who wanted houses including those from SADA to register for the house especially those from Madakeni and I registered because I was staying there, do you understand?
Yes
Q: After you registered what happened?
R: We stayed after registering and the details of the people who registered came back and were placed on a notice board. They said people should go to the community hall and the municipal office noticeboard and check if their details are correct, so that if there is something wrong with their details they can report. Then I checked and I did not have a problem. They took people’s details again and when they came back the details had house numbers, hee, yes

Ok

Q: How long did you stay before the houses were constructed?
R: Yhu! About four, four to five years

Q: Then during the planning stage of the houses were you called to be shown the plan of the house?
R: Yes we were called and showed the plan of the houses. We were satisfied with the housing plan even, though they did not follow the plan when building the houses.

Q: Who were the meeting participants through your meeting sessions?
R: It was the councillor and the community, but during the registration stage it was the councillor, the community and people from the department of housing, yes young man

Q: During the construction phase of the project was there any other meeting where you were called to check how far they are and are you still satisfied?
R: They called us when they started building and then we complained according to the plan we were showed because now they were not following the plan they showed us. Then they told us that the reason they are not following the plan was because of the budget that has been given to the municipality here in Whittlesea. Then we agreed because we did not have the houses and said the houses are fine.

Q: How were the meetings arranged, I remember during the foundation phase they stayed longer. Were the meetings arranged according to stages of the house?
R: Yes during the phase of the foundation level we were called to a meeting and told that the foundation was going to be a slab then we came and saw the foundation. After that we were not called again until the wall was finished.

Q: What were you promised after the building of the house, for instance, did they say they will put the roof of the house and plaster the wall or what?

R: No they said they will just build only and black wash them. Then black washing was done.

Q: Were you satisfied with the houses?
R: We were not satisfied with the way they were built as a result in most of them we realised that there was less cement and more sand in their mix. As a result when there is wind the houses are not stable.

Q: Were these houses approved even though they were like that?
R: You see Lungile I don’t want to be sure about them being approved because in my house no inspector ever came to check the house only community committee members came to check the problems we had and they wrote and said this information was required in the municipality, but there were no answers after that.

Q: After you got the house did you get your title deed?
R: We haven’t got them even now when we ask the new councillor nothing is being said they just say may be because there were 4 or 5 houses that were not built may be that is what is causing the delay.

Q: Did you elect committees from the community?
R: Yes there were committees that were elected to deal with the process of these houses

Q: When there are meetings who were invited? The committee only or the community also?
R: No the committee used to invite the community especially the people who were to receive the houses?
So the committee invited those who were to receive houses and the community?
Yes
Ok hear you

Q: Were you satisfied with the level of communication between the municipality and the housing the beneficiaries?

R: Not really because the problems we use to report to the committee were written down by it and the committee would go and report and we would stay waiting for the response until we go back to them and remind them that we send them to the municipality and you never came back. Then they will tell us that they have been waiting for the response ever since, yes so that is how it w

Q: If there is another project in your area for the community how would you like your committees to be like?

R: Hey hayi Lungile we would like people who are honest who if there is a project would work with us, people when we have a problem we would sit down with and if we send them to the municipality they would come back to us and give us feedback. Yes people who work well with the community...
but the committee was elected from community members?
Yes it was elected from us the community especially to those who have houses
I would like to thank you a lot for your time and participation. I have learnt a lot from you.

Interview 4 Responses:

Q: Is the house yours or are you renting it?
R: I will say it is mine because it is my husband’s

Q: How did you get the house?
R: We registered during the period of registration in the municipality
Q: When was that?
R: Yho! Wait a minute...1997
Ok

Q: What happened after registration?
R: We stayed and we realised that the house was complete in 2005

Q: So you were never called to any meeting?
R: No we just heard after the houses were complete. There was a list in the municipality and in the community hall where you check your details that is how I knew?

Q: So you new through that list that your houses were complete?
R: Yes

Q: Have you ever heard a meeting during the construction phase of the houses?
R: No

Q: Was the house approved?
R: Hee i don’t know if it was approved because when we moved in, there was already someone staying in the house not knowing how the person moved in, so it happened that the person left because the house was not his/her. So I don’t know whether it was approved or not because when we moved in other people were already staying and we also stayed.

Q: Were you satisfied with the house?
R: No really,

Q: What problems did you encounter?
R: The house is fine, spacious for someone who didn’t have a house but I don’t know whether it is where it was build or how the foundation was made, because when it is raining, water gets in and out of the house freely.

Q: Do you have other problems except this one of the foundation? May be in the structure?
R: No it is well build even if you want to extend you can

Q: Are the yards of the houses all big or is it just certain areas?
R: Those ones are big.
So you are satisfied with the houses except the minor problem of the foundation

Q: Do you think if there was consultation with you and the municipality that would have helped in avoiding the problems you encountered in the houses?
R: I don’t think it was going to make a difference because the problem is the foundation which results in all the houses in the area being vulnerable to water that gets inside the houses and out freely. Even if there was consultation, may be the plan would have been ok and people would have been happy but the constructors didn’t do a good job.

Q: So you are blaming the constructors?
R: Yes the way they constructed and they way they built

Q: Have you heard anything for instance, from your neighbours about whether people did benefit or not from the project, for instance through employment?
R: No I didn’t hear even one person, I didn’t hear anything. No one has talked about people benefiting in the project.

Q: Do you think it was done by a construction company?
R: Yes I think it was done by a construction company

Q: Do you think in other projects that may occur, is it important to be consulted as the community?
R: Yes ke to be told the basic stuff like how is the projects going to be done and where. So they sit down with the community and say ok we are going to build houses for instance in eMadakeni [making an example] we will build real houses, it is a good idea and it is something to compliment. For instance if you look at the houses in extension those houses were build first before Mabuyase but if you check when passing with a taxi there are new ones now but I don’t know where are the people staying temporarily?

They had to be fixed because there was a problem with them. So I blame the contractors, the people who got the tender to build. And the municipality should have a monitoring and evaluation process where officials would go and check the houses on a regular basis. People who have experience in the project who can see whether there is a something wrong in the project or not. Who will advise and tell the contractors, this not how you do a foundation, this not how you this and that…

Oh! I hear you very well

Q: So do you have a title deed in your house?
R: Yes

Q: When did you get it? Did you get it immediately or at a later stage?
R: At a later stage

Q: Did you go to the municipality yourself or they came back to you?
R: We did a follow up in order to get it

Q: Do you think the fact that you made a follow up resulted in you getting the title deed quicker since you had that problem of getting your house while there was already someone in the house?
R: No really because that person ...the person who was there, people from the municipality were not going to have a way of changing the title deed, we did it because it was something that had to be done

I would like to thank you very for your time you have covered all the aspects i was asking for.
Interview 5 Responses:

Q: Is the house yours?
R: Yes

Q: How did you get the house?
R: I registered we had to register, people who were earning less than R2000 rands and those who were unemployment qualified to register for the houses, I was not working at the time so I registered. Then your house number will be available

Q: After your house number was available, did you have meetings where you can discuss with the municipality about the plan of the house?
R: They never took place, we just saw the houses being build with that plan, we never had a meeting where they tell us this is how the house will look like
Oh ok

Q: So you never had a meeting until the house was complete?
R: The house was complete without a meeting, when I got the house there was already someone staying on it, not knowing how that person got the keys of the house

Q: So after you had arrived in the house which problems did you encounter?
R: There are many of them, like wind penetrated easily through the roof and windows, the floor was not properly made, but I fixed them, the roof also is not stable and there is a major problem of water that penetrates in the kitchen and goes out through the dining room when it is raining, we leave the house after a rain

Q: Do you think if you were involved from the beginning, such things could’ve been avoided from happening?
R: Yes obviously, because some of us know about construction stuff of houses for instance, we know where a foundation can be made and the house should have been made a bit higher
especially for that area this is an area where there was a nearby dam and also the environment
where the houses were built was an area that is vulnerable to water, as a result even tap water, we
never run out of water in the area when there is not water we always have water in the area we
use water from pipes.

Q: Oh! I hear you so you are saying that the area is not suitable to build house because of the
conditions?
R: Yes especially because of the water and how the water penetrates the house, I don’t know
how it was approved for building purposes by which company.

Q: If a committee did exist in that project what kind of committee would it be? Would it be a
committee from them for you or the community committee?
R: It should be a committee from the community, a community that will bring together the
contractors and the community, for instance, we never saw a plan we just saw a house already
existing and these houses were built by different people with different skills in construction as a
result some houses are more quality than others.

Q: Oh! They were built by different contractors?
R: Yes for instances, I built 6 houses out of 10 then others subcontractors will be given a chance
to build others parts.

Q: So in your knowledge or from hearing from other people were there people who benefited
from the project may be in the form of employment?
R: Yes they did benefit. These were the subcontracts of the area, so they even recruited locally
for instance labourers and bricklayers.

Q: So do you have a title deed for your house?
R: I think the title deed is ready now we have been waiting for it. They said they are sending
them to Port Elizabeth. There is a man called Tomorrow who was working in the office where
our things were dealt with. I haven’t made a follow up that is one thing I forget to ask whether
when we are getting the title deeds from Tomorrow. Tomorrow was in the office even the
material was collected from his office. This means there was something involving the locals because Tomorrows is staying in Dongwe [A township next to Mabuyase], I don’t know how he was hired though but he was working in that office. We don’t know whether he was hired by the contractor or what.

Q: So did he benefit from the houses?
R: No I don’t want to lie he did not benefit he is still staying at his home.
Oh ok I see

I would to thank you very much for you time, I wanted to hear your views seen you are also owning a house there.

Interview 6 Response:

Q: Do you own a house?
R: Yes

Q: How did you get it, tell me about the process you went through in getting it?
R: I registered for the house when I was staying eMadakeni.

Q: And then what happened?
R: Then people received their house numbers.

Q: And then what happened?
R: They said we must go to the community hall and check for our house numbers and a map that shows where one’s house will be located and I got mine

Q: Then after you received the house number have you ever had a meeting organized by the municipality to tell you about how the plan was going to be like?
R: No we never had a meeting the last thing that was done was when we were told that our house numbers are out we must go and check for our names on the list place on the notice board.
Q: During the construction phase were you ever called to a meeting to be told about the progress and how you feel about it?
R: We were called and told that one must check his or her own house until it is finished

Q: Then after the house was finished was it approved?
R: No these houses were built by people from contractors and after one would occupy his/her own house

Q: What I am talking about is the situation where for instance someone from the municipality would come and inspect the house and say it is ready to be occupied
R: Yes I understand it but it was not done to us

Q: After receiving the house were you satisfied with its condition?
R: Wind was penetrating easily, everything was just not right, the wall that divides the rooms inside also was not complete; it was half way through it didn’t reach the roof

Q: What other problems did you encounter?
R: I didn’t have any others

So you are saying it was the doors and the wall that divides the inside
Yes you had to make a plan yourself.

Q: Was there an official from the municipality who came to check the problems you had?
R: No as I told you after the house was complete they said one must make a plan for him/herself about the problems they had in the house
So ever since you stayed you fixed it yourself

Q: How big are your yards for instance if you want to extend?
R: The yards are big those who want to extend can do so

Q: Do you think the place is suitable for building houses according to your views?
R: Yes it is fine but the network is not good, as a result our TVs are not playing well we have to buy antennas

Q: Do you think if you had meetings to raise your issues that would have made a difference in the condition of the houses?
R: Yes it was going to make a difference because we were going to complain, it was going to help but they never took place.

Q: How do you think the meetings should have been like?
R: Before occupying the houses they should have called us to a meeting to check whether this house really belongs to this person and also check if the person is satisfied with the house before being given your key.

Q: So you never had such things?
R: Yes as a result these houses do not even have titles deeds

Q: How long did they say you will wait before getting title deeds?
R: They said after 5 years

Q: Did they explain to you why you had to wait that long before getting it?
R: They said title deeds take time

Q: Do you have an office where you can send your complaints?
R: No we only complain in street committees we don’t have any office to
I would like to thank you very much for your support and your time

**Interview 7: Response**

Q: Do you have a house?
R: Yes
Q: How did you get it?
R: You had to register from the beginning and they have not started building at the time then when they begin with the foundations you had to be registered and you already have a house number

Q: After registering were you ever called to a meeting, where they sit down with you and tell you that this is the plan what do you think about it?
R: No we never such meetings, they started with the foundations

Q: After the foundation have you ever had a meeting about the progress of the house?
R: No they told us to go and check our houses. I use to go and check when I had time

Q: After the houses were complete were you satisfied with its condition?
R: There were things that were not satisfactory and when you try to complain they say you can fix it yourself because you have been given these houses for free.

Q: What kind of problems were you not satisfied about?
R: The roofs are the problem, even the windows

Q: Was there an office that you could go to when you need advice except for the problems they said you will do yourself?
R: Yes there was an office in the site. That is where you reported your problems
Yes

Q: Do you think if they called you to meetings and sit down with you that would have helped to avoid the problems you had?
R: Yes if it would be like that it would be ok

Q: Do you think it is important to have community committees to raise issues sooner?
R: Yes that would be important.
Q: Were there inspectors to check if things are done properly?
R: Yes

Q: Do you have a title deed?
R: No

Q: Did they say how long they will take?
R: No

Q: Do you have other issues that you would like to raise?
R: Yes there are issues

Q: What kind of issues would you like to raise?
R: There are issues

Thank you very much for time.

**Interview 8 Response:**

Q: How did you get the house?
R: People had to register and then the house number will be available then houses will be built when they are done one would get a house.

Q: After the house numbers had been available have you ever had meetings where may be you elect a committee that will look into the problems that people might experience?
R: There was something like that but I don’t know where it ended, when we experience problems we can go to him/her in the office.
Q: During the construction phase of the house, were there any meetings where they sat down with you and tell you this is how far they have gone, so that you can raise issues you might have?
R: You see there I don’t know much but all I know is that there were meetings that took place

Q: Oh! There were meetings also
R: Yes

Q: Who participated in these meetings, was it the beneficiary of the houses or the committee?
R: You see there I can’t help you that much because my wife was the one who attended, as I was working and I would be at work at that period
Ok I’ll hear that one from her

Q: After the house was complete were you satisfied with the way it was done?
R: There was someone to report when you had a problem, and they would fix the problems but others were not fixed.

Q: So did you have any problems?
R: As I had told you I was always at work but I did have problems here and there but I reported them
Oh! I hear you

Q: Did you get your title deed?
R: No I haven’t got it yet I only got my house number. I don’t think there is someone who has got them.

Q: They don’t even say how long it will take for people to get them?
R: No it is still quiet but it is something that I need to find out.

Now asking the wife the questions that the husband said could be answered by the wife Q:
Q: When did the meetings take place? Was it during the construction period or after the houses have been finished?
R: They occurred even before the actually construction phase took place, even during the construction phase they did take place, you would even go and check your houses so that any problems that you had you would complain but we complained until we decided to stop because they didn’t fix the problems until you just fix them yourself

Q: After the house was complete did you have any other meetings?
R: No I never heard anything until last year when Noxolo Kiviet came and said these houses will need to be renovated including those in Extension but on our side we haven’t heard anything, those that are being renovated are those that are in Extension. May be they will tell us also when they are coming to us.

Q: Do you think it is because of Noxolo Kiviet that there is something happening?
R: I don’t know but those houses were not done properly even these ones are not right themselves

I would like you to thank you and your wife a lot for your time; I wanted to hear your experiences.