

**EVALUATING THE IMPACT OF LIMA RURAL DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION  
ON THE LAND REFORM POLICY IN LIGHT OF CHANGING THE  
LIVELIHOODS OF PREVIOUSLY DISADVANTAGED PEOPLE IN  
HAMMARSDALE, KWAZULU-NATAL, SOUTH AFRICA.**

**Bulelani Simangaliso Madonsela**

**Student number 211509068**

**SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FUFILMENT FOR THE DEGREE: MASTER OF  
SOCIAL SCIENCE (PUBLIC POLICY) IN THE COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES  
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU NATAL  
HOWARD COLLEGE CAMPUS, DURBAN**

**Supervisors:**

**Dr Joseph Rudigi Rukema**

**and**

**Mr Ndwakhulu Tshishonga**

**May 2021**

## DECLARATION

I, Bulelani Simangaliso Madonsela (211509068), declare that this dissertation, titled *Evaluating the impact of LIMA Rural Development Foundation on the Land Reform Policy in light of changing the livelihoods of previously disadvantaged people in Hammarsdale*, is entirely and originally my own work. The work contained in this dissertation has not been used or submitted to any other university for a degree or examination. I further submit that all work, information, and sources derived from other works have been properly acknowledged, cited, and referenced.

.....

SIGNED

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my Supervisors, Dr Joseph Rudigi Rukema and Mr Ndwakhulu Tshishonga, for agreeing to supervise me and for your knowledge, wisdom, insight and encouragement that have guided the completion of this dissertation. I thank you both for your open-door policy and for always availing yourselves whenever I needed your guidance.

I would also like to acknowledge and thank LIMA Rural Development Foundation for allowing me to pursue this research. A big thank you goes to Ms Thembeke Khanyile and Ms Xolile Sibisi for your support and assistance. Most importantly, I thank you both for sharing your knowledge and expertise with me during this project.

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents, Rev. W.N. Madonsela and Mrs. N.D. Madonsela. Thank you for your continued support and the love that you have shown me along every journey that I have embarked on and decision that I have made. Most importantly, thank you for your prayers throughout my Masters' journey. I love you both dearly.

To my sister, Nomthandazo Zamaswazi Madonsela, and my aunt, Khethiwe Mthembu, thank for you both for always being there whenever I needed you and for always believing in me. I love you both very much.

Lastly, a word of special thanks goes to my close friends and classmates who supported me, encouraged me, and inspired me throughout this journey.

## **ABSTRACT**

The focus of this study was on land reform programs executed by LIMA Rural Development Foundation that specifically targeted agricultural activities and smallholder farmers in Hammarsdale, KwaZulu-Natal. The overarching aim of the study was to evaluate the extent to which LIMA used the land reform programme as a strategy to alleviate poverty, reduce unemployment, and upskill smallholder farmers in Hammarsdale for sustainable farming endeavours. The study adopted a qualitative research approach using in-depth interviews as the main data collection instrument. Eleven participants were interviewed. Nine participants were drawn from smallholder farmers as land recipients and two staff members were drawn from LIMA as representatives of the organisation responsible for the land reform program in the Hammarsdale area. The findings of this study revealed that LIMA, as a non-governmental organisation, had the skills and expertise to support land recipients and thus render them successful farmers. However, LIMA lacked vital resources and support from government to sustain their land reform programs in Hammarsdale. For these reasons, land recipients could not be given the necessary support and equipment to ensure their success and sustain their livelihoods. The inability of LIMA to sustain land reform programs in Hammarsdale due to a lack of infrastructure and financial support meant that some cooperatives and smallholder farmers failed to sustain the agricultural production initiatives that they had embarked on. The study argues that due to the small sizes of land redistributed and owned by current landowners, smallholder farmers are unable to grow sustainably or compete in larger agricultural markets. The study recommends that government and NGOs devise a more detailed and specific framework that will operationalise skills development, training, and financial support for new farmers, improve farming infrastructure, and procure machinery to enhance the existing skills of smallholder farmers so that they are enabled to farm sustainably. The study also proposes that government should facilitate the accessibility of smallholder and emerging farmers to larger commercial markets through the development of a detailed framework that will compel larger market agents and role-players to support these farmers. This study further recommends that relevant government officials should demonstrate the political will to sustain NGOs who have the expertise and skills to support emerging farmers and to assist them so that they may continue their support for a skilled and thriving smallholder farmer community in Hammarsdale.

## ACRONYMS

ANC	African National Congress
BLF	Black (First) Land First
CBD	Central Business District
CSI	Corporate Social Investment
DA	Democratic Alliance
DLA	Department of Land Affairs
EFF	Economic Freedom Fighters
KZN	KwaZulu-Natal
LIMA	LIMA Rural Development Foundation
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
SADC	Southern African Development Community
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## CHAPTER ONE GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Background	1
1.3	Problem statement	4
1.4	Aims and objectives of the study	5
1.5	Research questions	5
1.6	Rationale and significance of the study	6
1.7	Structure of the dissertation	6

## CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1	Introduction	9
2.2	Understanding the importance of ownership and land reform	9
2.3	Issues of land ownership in Africa	12
2.4	History of land ownership in South Africa	15
2.4.1	The Glen Grey Act of 1894	16
2.4.2	The Natives Land Act of 1913	17
2.4.3	The Group Areas Act of 1950	17
2.5	Implementation of land reform initiatives	18
2.5.1	Historical legislative framework of land policies in South Africa	19
2.5.2	The land reform programme in South Africa	20
2.5.3	The land reform policy	22
2.5.3.1	Land restitution program	22
2.5.3.2	Land tenure reform program	23
2.5.3.3	Land redistribution program	24
2.6	Role players in land reform in South Africa	26
2.6.1	Non-governmental organisations (NGOs)	27
2.6.2	Farmer's organisations	28
2.6.3	The Land Bank	28
2.6.4	The Land Reform Credit Facility (LRCF)	29
2.6.5	Role of the government in land reform	30
2.7	Land reform and poverty alleviation in South Africa	31
2.8	Land reform and sustainable livelihoods in South Africa	32
2.9	Smallholder farming and land reform in South Africa	34

2.10	Cooperatives and land reform in South Africa	39
2.11	Current debates on land reform in South Africa	42
2.12	Conclusion	44

### **CHAPTER THREE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

3.1	Introduction	45
3.2	The sustainable livelihoods approach	45
3.3	The capability approach	48
3.4	The human development approach	50
3.5	The policy implementation model	52
3.6	Concluding remarks	54

### **CHAPTER FOUR RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND METHODS**

4.1	Introduction	55
4.2	Qualitative research approach	55
4.3	Research design	56
4.4	Research techniques	58
4.4.1	Identification of study site and population	59
4.4.2	Study sample	59
4.4.2.1	LÌMA Rural Development Foundation	60
4.4.2.2	Land recipient participation	60
4.4.2.3	Sampling techniques	61
4.4.3	Data collection	62
4.4.3.1	Semi-structured interviews: Land recipients	62
4.4.3.2	Semi-structured interviews: LÌMA representatives	63
4.4.3.3	Observations	64
4.4.4	Data analysis	65
4.5	Limitations of the study	66
4.6	Ethical considerations	66
4.7	Concluding remarks	67

### **CHAPTER FIVE FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS**

5.1	Introduction	68
5.2	Demographic information of the participants	68
5.3	LÌMA Rural Development Foundation Profile	72
5.3.1	The role of LÌMA in land redistribution and reform programs in Hammarsdale	73

5.3.2	Successes achieved by LÌMA in Hammarsdale	75
5.3.2.1	Adherence to land reform policy objectives	75
5.3.2.2	Development of skills and capabilities and knowledge acquisition to engage in organic farming	77
5.3.2.3	Accessibility of resources	82
5.3.2.4	Improvement and sustainability of livelihoods	83
5.3.3	Transition from subsistence farming to commercial farming	86
5.3.4	Market linkages	90
5.3.5	The formation of cooperatives and a farmer's association in Hammarsdale	93
5.4	LÌMA's achievements of the objectives for land reform in Hammarsdale	96
5.4.1	Growth in income	99
5.4.2	Food security and poverty alleviation	101
5.4.3	Employment opportunities	103
5.4.4	Improvement in quality and quantity of produce	105
5.4.5	Participation of women in need and the youth	107
5.5	Challenges and constraints associated with the land reform program in Hammarsdale	109
5.5.1	The relationship between LÌMA and other stakeholders	109
5.5.2	The dependency syndrome evident among land recipients	113
5.5.3	Lack of resources	114
5.5.4	The inability of land recipients to apply the skills they were taught	119
5.5.5	Conflict amongst land recipients and failure to work collaboratively	121
5.5.6	Policy implementation	125
5.5.7	A lack of safety and security measures	128
5.5.8	Lack of youth participation in the sector	130
5.5.9	Lack of access to suitable markets	132
5.5.10	Limited access to land	134
5.5.11	Lack of opportunities to grow	136
5.5.12	Lack of communication between LÌMA and land recipients	138
5.6	Conclusion	139
<b>CHAPTER SIX</b>		
<b>CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>		
6.1	Introduction	141
6.2	LÌMA's progress in achieving effective land redistribution in Hammarsdale	141
6.2.1	Land redistribution objectives and the enhancement of land recipients' livelihoods	143
6.2.2	Achievements and challenges faced by land recipients in efforts to improve their livelihoods	145

6.2.2.1	Achievements	145
6.2.2.2	Challenges	146
6.3	Recommendations for interventions to improve land redistribution programs in Hammarsdale	147
6.4	Recommendations	148
6.5	Conclusion	149

## **REFERENCES**

## LIST OF TABLES

5.1	Age	69
5.2	Gender	69
5.3	Race	70
5.4	Marital status	71
5.5	Socio-economic status	71
5.6	Level of education	72

# **CHAPTER ONE**

## **GENERAL INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Introduction**

This chapter provides the background to the study and presents the problem statement. The aim, objectives, and the research questions that gave impetus to the study are presented while the major argument underpinning this research is also discussed. The problem statement is defined, and the purpose of the study is discussed in relation to the problem statement. Holistically, this chapter provides a brief understanding of what this research sought to explore and presents the research questions and objectives.

### **1.2 Background**

South Africa's political transition in the 1990s from an apartheid system of governance to a democratic system called for a radical change in public policies (Habib & Padayachee, 2000). Post-1994, the African National Congress (ANC) regime has put numerous legislations and policies in place that seek to redress the injustices and inequalities of the past that occurred in the political, social, and economic spheres (Hall, 2004). One of the redistributive socioeconomic policies that was implemented post-1994, with the intention of alleviating poverty and inequality, is the Land Reform Policy (Habib & Padayachee, 2000). The Land Reform Policy is a socioeconomic policy that was implemented under the auspices of Section 25 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (South Africa, 1996). The policy imposes the responsibility on the state to utilise its available resources and facilitate processes relating to land reform initiatives that redress inequalities for the victims of past discriminatory laws (South Africa, 1996; Lahiff, 2007). The South African Land Reform Policy of 1997 makes provisions for three categories of reform namely land restitution, land redistribution, and land tenure (Department of Land Affairs, 1997).

Land restitution intends to provide relief for victims who were forcefully disposed of their land, while land redistribution was initiated to allow the operationalisation of programmes that will redress racial imbalances in landholding. The land tenure category provides for the securing and extension of tenure rights to victims of past discriminatory practices (Department of Land Affairs, 1997). For the purposes of this study, the land redistribution category was the area of focus as it was the most applicable to the objectives that had been formulated. The land redistribution category aims to facilitate programmes that will ensure access to land for

previously disadvantaged communities. Land will thus be accessible for both residential and production purposes with the intent of improving the income and quality of life of disadvantaged communities. At the heart of this programme is the intention to alleviate poverty among those who were previously disadvantaged through an effective and sustainable land redistribution programme (Lahiff, 2007). This category was assessed by considering LIMA's activities and efforts to change the livelihoods of previously disadvantaged communities in the Hammarsdale area.

Since taking power in 1994, the ANC government has experienced a slow-down in the economy, high unemployment rates, and widespread poverty (Bradstock, 2005). Against this background, the land reform policy became a driving tool for the provision of land to the poorest sections of the country for both residential and agricultural production purposes (Bradstock, 2005). Hammarsdale was identified as one such area and it was thus a case study for this research as it was envisaged that the region would benefit hugely from the objectives of the land reform policy and its programmes.

Poverty is generally rife amongst the black population in South Africa due to reasons such as a lack of opportunities and the inability to accumulate capital due to a poor infrastructure in the rural areas where the vast majority reside (Aliber, 2003). In KwaZulu-Natal (KZN) in particular, 86.9% of households live in remote areas that have limited access to economic growth opportunities and to land per capita, and the province thus ranks as one of the poorest in South Africa with a very high unemployment rate (Aliber, 2003). Hammarsdale comprises an area that is located in the outer west entity of the eThekweni Municipality in KwaZulu-Natal (National Treasury, 2006). The area is located 30 km from Durban and has a population of about 62 000 people. Most of the population fall between the ages of 15 and 34, which means that the area harbours a predominantly young population but an economically inactive one (National Treasury, 2006). It has been argued that this is the reason that there has been a decline in the number of people in this area who either reach or enter Grade 12 (Matric) (National Treasury, 2006). It is thus a noteworthy fact that Hammarsdale is an area within the eThekweni region that performs poorly economically and faces high levels of poverty and unemployment (National Treasury, 2006), and survival challenges and lack of opportunities are rife in this area. During the 1980s, a large number of the population was employed by textile and clothing industries that the erstwhile government had located in this area to create job opportunities for economic upliftment. However, post-1994 more than 60 factories were forced to close which

led to huge job losses (National Treasury, 2006). This contributed to rising poverty and unemployment levels that exist to this day (National Treasury, 2006). The reason for the stagnant high levels of unemployment and poverty in Hammarsdale today is, unfortunately, that most of the population still depends on declining textile and clothing industries for employment (National Treasury, 2006). However, the South African textile industry came under heavy pressure due to cheap imports from countries such as China that took over most of South Africa's textile industry. Other problems that have impacted this industry negatively, are that retailers have affiliated themselves with the National Textile Bargaining Council, which has cut business for many factory owners, textile businesses moving their operations to countries such as Eswatini (Swaziland), the increase in the minimum wage for factory workers, and load shedding (Is the textile industry on the decline..., 2020). This led to the demise of many textile industries in South Africa and resulted in many job losses as South Africa could no longer produce its own local brands but had to rely on cheap textile imports from China. Nowadays, employment opportunities in textile and clothing industries are minimal to non-existent. This poses a major threat to the livelihoods of the people of Hammarsdale, and disadvantaged people in this area can benefit from other sectors of the economy such as agriculture and animal husbandry. However, this will only be possible through land reform initiatives and programmes to improve their livelihoods.

The main purposes of the Land Reform Policy are to redress the injustices of apartheid, to foster national reconciliation and stability, to underpin economic growth, and to improve household welfare and alleviate poverty (Department of Land Affairs, 1997; Sibanda, 2001). The implementation of this policy and the fulfilment of the abovementioned objectives are vested in the involvement of national departments, various levels of government, and partnerships among various private and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) (Department of Land Affairs, 1997). It is evident that the implementation of the Land Reform Policy relies on the participation of various stakeholders such as NGOs, of which LIMA Rural Development Foundation is one. NGOs are often stakeholders that are at the forefront of land reform, although they vary in size, strength, opinions, and strategies (Sibanda, 2001). They are said to be major contributors to the development processes of any government and, when partnered with government on specific projects, they can play a monitoring role by acting as a watchdog that ensures that government fulfils its constitutional obligations, also in terms of addressing land reform policies (Clark, 1993; Sibanda, 2001). It can therefore be said that NGOs play, and should continue to play, a very important function in the implementation of the Land Reform

Policy. Conversely, the failure of policies intended to change the livelihoods of previously disadvantaged communities may also be attributed to the inaction or unsustainable operations of some NGOs.

LÍMA Rural Development Foundation (hereafter referred to as LÍMA) is an NGO that this study investigated with particular emphasis on its role and impact in implementing the land redistribution program in Hammarsdale. It is a rural development NGO that was established in 1989 to implement various projects in agriculture, address land reform, support social development, and engage in public health and community-based training programmes (LÍMA, 2017). LÍMA has branches in various provinces including KZN and has done work pertaining to land reform and development as well as agriculture in various areas, including Hammarsdale. This NGO has been at the forefront of land reform and it has been tasked to share its expertise and resources for training and support to ensure the implementation and sustainability of the land redistribution program and its projects.

### **1.3 Problem Statement**

The land redistribution program is deemed one of the solutions for reducing poverty and curbing unemployment among previously disadvantaged people, particularly black South Africans. However, the implementation of the program has been rather slow, and evidence suggests that the land redistribution program has performed poorly in terms of the sizes and quality of land that have been transferred to previously disadvantaged communities/farmers (Hall, 2009). Many reasons have been offered to explain the poor performance of the policy, one of which is a lack of political will from government to execute this mandate effectively. This means that the majority of previously disadvantaged poverty-stricken communities remain underdeveloped, even with the land redistribution program in place. This is also the case for many previously disadvantaged individuals in Hammarsdale where the lack of support and budgetary provisions by government to support stakeholders and the program have impeded the successful execution of the land redistribution program (Sibanda, 2001). This lack of support and political will has led to a lack of co-ordination between government and NGOs and has also contributed to the failure of development programs because NGOs had to pull out due to a lack of funds (Dlamini, 2016).

This study was thus conceptualised against the backdrop of inevitable poor policy outcomes unless support and cooperation for land ownerships could be resuscitated in the Hammarsdale

area. I therefore had to determine whether LÌMA Rural Development Foundation was prone to various challenges or whether it had the power, capacity, and resources to sustain land redistribution programs in Hammarsdale and thus change the livelihoods of land recipients in this area. I was cognisant of the fact that NGOs vary in capacity, ability, and strength in their efforts to ensure sustained and improved livelihoods for their target populations (Sibanda, 2001), and I envisaged that this scholarly investigation would shed light on the capacity and sustainability of land reform initiatives driven by LÌMA in the Hammarsdale area.

#### **1.4 Aims and Objectives of the Study**

The overarching aim of the study was to evaluate the role played by LÌMA in land reform and land redistribution programs in order to determine whether land recipients were reaping maximum benefits from the program and whether unemployment and poverty alleviation would be sustainable in the Hammarsdale area.

To achieve this aim, the objectives of the study were to:

- evaluate progress made by LÌMA Rural Development Foundation in terms of land redistribution in Hammarsdale;
- assess whether the objective of land redistribution to enhance the livelihoods of land recipients had been fulfilled;
- assess the achievements and challenges faced by land recipients in enhancing their livelihoods through the land redistribution programme; and
- explore possible further interventions from which recommendations could flow that would improve the land redistribution programme in Hammarsdale.

#### **1.5 Research Questions**

The questions that gave impetus to the study were the following:

- Do the implementation strategies of LÌMA Rural Development Foundation give effective priority to previously disadvantaged people, particularly the poor, the youth, and women in terms of the land redistribution programme in Hammarsdale?
- Is the land redistribution programme of the LÌMA Rural Development Foundation able to secure employment, offer support, and ensure sustainable development opportunities for land recipients in Hammarsdale?
- Is LÌMA Rural Development Foundation able to address and eradicate the challenges that threaten the success and livelihoods of land recipients in Hammarsdale?

- What are the achievements and challenges that LÌMA Rural Development Foundation experiences in terms of land redistribution in the Hammarsdale area?
- Are the intervention strategies employed by LÌMA Rural Development Foundation to improve land redistribution in Hammarsdale sustainable?

## **1.6 Rationale for and Significance of the Study**

The Land Reform Policy was established to contribute to the economic development of the poor and to ensure that such households would engage in productive land use or access employment opportunities (Hall, 2009). This study intended to investigate LÌMA's efforts to facilitate employment opportunities for people through assisting them to access productive land usage. It is important that the Land Reform Policy achieves its objectives because creating sustainable livelihoods for black South Africans, and particularly black South African women as envisioned by rural development policies (Hall, 2009), is a priority. This study intended to discover whether LÌMA effectively executed its mandate as an NGO to facilitate land redistribution in Hammarsdale and, most importantly, to assess whether the program would be sustainable. This study acknowledged at the outset that the implementation of the land redistribution program had previously posed challenges to both land recipients and LÌMA as the executor of the plan and, as such, it was thus necessary to determine whether this NGO was successful in addressing the various challenges it had faced in the past. The study intended to determine if there were any loopholes and sustained challenges that threatened the successful execution of land redistribution and the sustainability of farming endeavours in Hammarsdale. Based on this intensive and comprehensive investigation, recommendations and solutions are offered in the hope of improving the livelihoods of land recipients as well as LÌMA's efforts to execute land redistribution sustainably in Hammarsdale.

## **1.7 Structure of the Dissertation**

This dissertation is presented in the following six chapters:

### **Chapter One: General Introduction**

This chapter provides a brief introduction as background to the study and expounds the founding principles that influenced the major arguments. This chapter also includes a clearly defined problem statement followed by an outline of the research questions and objectives that were explored in the study.

## **Chapter Two: Literature Review**

The discourse in this chapter centres on a review of related literature that informed the study. The literature provided foundational information pertaining to the topic under investigation and my discussion highlights various progressions and shortfalls regarding land reform and restitution in South Africa.

## **Chapter Three: Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework that was utilised included a model and four approaches, namely the policy implementation model, the human development approach, the sustainable livelihoods approach, and the capability approach. These approaches are unpacked in this chapter to provide a foundation on which the arguments pertaining to the research questions and the objectives of the study were built.

## **Chapter Four: Research Methodology and Methods**

This chapter provides a clear exposition of the research methodology used in this study. Different methods were employed to address the objectives and the key questions that the study posed. A qualitative research approach was adopted to generate data and evaluate the results of the study.

## **Chapter Five: Data Analysis and Assessment**

The data that were elicited and the evaluation thereof are presented in this chapter. I thus unpack my exploration of the functions of NGOs – and particularly those of LIMA – in terms of land reform programmes in Hammarsdale. The discourse outlines the implementation and outcomes of land reform initiatives in Hammarsdale and measures these against the policy objectives of land reform in South Africa. The chapter also details the successes, challenges, and shortfalls of LIMA in its efforts to implement the land redistribution program. The challenges faced by land recipients in Hammarsdale that hindered their livelihoods and progress as farmers are also assessed. An important focus is the successes achieved by land recipients in Hammarsdale and existing and possible opportunities for enhancing their livelihoods are highlighted.

## **Chapter Six: Conclusions and Recommendations**

This chapter entails a comprehensive summary and concludes the discourse on the topic under investigation. Recommendations for policy change and a framework that proposes solutions to the challenges of land reform programs are offered.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

This chapter presents a review of the related literature that informed the topic under study. This chapter resumes with discussing issues of land and its historical value. Thereafter the chapter moved onto issues of land and land reform for the African people and African continent. Lastly this chapter delved into the case study of South Africa. Here, issues of land ownership and the dispossession of land during the apartheid era in South Africa were discussed. Followed by the democratic government's efforts for land restitution and redistribution that currently exist and apply in the case study of LIMA and the Hammersdale community.

#### **2.2 Understanding the Importance of Land Ownerships and Land Reform**

Land is defined as the part of the earth's surface that is not covered by water and that are a natural resource (Oxford English Dictionary, 2018). Land is undeniably an important resource and asset, and all humans are tied to and have connections to it (Cooke, 2012). Humans cannot survive without land as it is an essential asset for sustaining livelihoods (Hall, 2008). Land ownership is a determining factor of political and social power in any country and affects the livelihoods and food security of all citizens (Camay & Gordan, 2000). It is evident that land is vital for the existence of all human beings and that, in conjunction with water, it is the source of life and survival. People are born on the land of a country in which they live and, when they die, they return to the same land. It is for this reason that land ownership is an emotive issue because people are connected to it and it is a means that provides residential and survival opportunities for those who live on it. Land provides housing and food for those who occupy it and those with rights and ownership to land pass it on to the generations that follow. It is for this reason that some declare land as 'the land of our ancestors' or 'land of our fathers'. Land is the resource that addresses vital human needs, and it is imperative that people not only have access to land, but that they should also own pieces of it. This becomes particularly important for the poor and disadvantaged who, due to their marginalised position in political and social power relations, are deprived of the right to access and own land. This deprivation has caused upheaval and strife throughout history because land sustains the livelihoods of the poor and the disadvantaged. Land is thus deemed key to eliminating poverty and creating sustainable livelihoods for the poor.

It is for this reason that land reform policies and initiatives have been driven by the South African government and NGOs after the advent of democracy in 1994. Land reform is the process of changing land laws and policies and transferring land to the poor. Land reform policies thus make land accessible to those who were previously denied the right to it and have the potential to eradicate poverty and improve the livelihoods of millions (Lipton, 2009).

In addressing land reform, it is important to note that the definition of land reform, its aims, and its approaches are continent, location, and context dependent. Therefore, the goals of land reform can differ from country to country and region to region. Lipton (2009) suggests that land reform and its aims can be summarised as “the redistribution of property and land rights for the benefit of the landless, farm labourers, and tenants” (Pienaar, 2014:11). Land reform/s thus differ according to jurisdiction, context, and issues at stake and these, in turn, guide the mechanisms and approaches that are used for land reform (Pienaar, 2014). This means that approaches to and definitions of land reform are adaptable and flexible, but in most cases the process of land reform entails “any improvement to land tenure or agricultural organisation” (Pienaar, 2014:13) that improve the quality of life of the those who were previously disadvantaged. This suggests that land reform is linked to agriculture. Moreover, this traditional approach is one that is driven by the acquisition of land for agricultural purposes and for the creation of sustainable livelihoods for the disadvantaged (Hall, 2008; Pienaar, 2014). This explains why the terms ‘land reform’ and ‘agrarian reform’ have often been used interchangeably by many states and scholars.

In most developing countries land reform occurs under the auspices of a set of laws that aims to reduce poverty and increase opportunities for the poor through the acquisition of farmland. This process is driven by the belief that it will increase their income status and economic and social power (Lipton, 2009). Land reform also intends to reduce land inequalities as private land rights are redistributed from large landowners and given to small and previously landless agriculturalists (Lipton, 2009). In this process, it is hoped that land will become an important and productive asset for the poor as, without it, their income, farming entrepreneurship skills and employment opportunities are limited (Hall, 2008; Lipton, 2009). It thus seems clear that land reform is in fact executed with the sole purpose of enhancing the livelihoods and employment opportunities for the poor. In South Africa, this process has meant transferring land ownership and land rights from white ownership to poor black farmers who have been without land and land rights over a long period of time (Lipton, 2009). This is a very difficult,

delicate, and uneasy process and previous efforts have resulted in many debates and even ineffective or incomplete land reforms (Lipton, 2009). This issue is not exclusive to South Africa as land reform has either been ineffective, stopped, slowed down, or left incomplete in countries such as Brazil, China, the Philippines, and Bolivia (Lipton, 2009). Land reform has been shown to be difficult to achieve in many countries due to the fact that it is an intricate process. It becomes even more difficult when a balance needs to be struck between unequal and fair distribution of land (Pienaar, 2014). Land reform has often coincided with peaceful transitions due to a new political dispensation and has needed careful handling without infringing the rights of either new or former property owners – i.e., the disadvantaged and the previously advantaged need to be treated fairly (Pienaar, 2014).

Apart from the abovementioned difficulties in the implementation of land reform, some challenges are also experienced in the administration and implementation of land reform programs. A lack of effective administration is usually due to a lack of training by the program and policy implementers (Lipton, 2009). In most developing countries such as South Africa and Zimbabwe, this is coupled with corruption and the lack of political will from governments to implement land reform policies and programs effectively and successfully (Hall, 2008; Lipton, 2009).

Land reform has been implemented for different purposes by governments such as the decolonisation of most Asian and African countries where different political and social forces pursued land reform either through peaceful or more radical means (Pienaar, 2014). A classic example of pursuing land reform through radical means is Zimbabwe, where some land was indiscriminately and relentlessly seized from landowners. This was a process of land grabbing (Moyo, 2011) that was not fair and just. Less radical means of land reform entail a fair process that recognises the rights of all individuals involved. It is usually a process that involves negotiation and reconciliation, as it needs to be in South Africa (Pienaar, 2014).

There are generally three broad categories of land reform programmes, namely first generation land reform, second generation land reform, and third generation land reform. First generation land reform aims to correct and change patterns of land holding that are unfair and unjust due to previous historical events and political arrangements and doctrines. Second generation land reform programmes are a continuation of initial first generation land reforms and seek to redress or reverse patterns of land ownership. However, this form of land reform is now

executed with the intent of eradicating poverty and improving food security within states. Third generation land reform focuses on the landless who were deprived of land and are once again given land to strengthen their economic and productive livelihoods and to assure sustainable food production (Pienaar, 2014).

This study focused on elements of both second and third generation land reform by looking at the recipients of land and investigating the prospects of land holding to improve the livelihoods of smallholder farmers through sustainable land reform programmes. Moreover, the study explored the possibility of ensuring that land holding would eradicate poverty and improve food security through sustained economic and productive prospects as supported by the LÍMA Rural Development Foundation.

### **2.3 Issues of Land Ownership in Africa**

Boyce et al. (2005:1) argue that, in agricultural economies such as in Africa, land becomes the single most important asset and rural people thus require access to land so that they can feed themselves and their families (Boyce et al., 2005). Given the historical effects of colonisation such as political instability and the continued dire issue of hunger and high levels of poverty on the African continent, the land issue remains pertinent as answers to the abovementioned problems are moot. Various African states have tackled the issue of land differently and have implemented various approaches depending on the challenges they needed to address. However, there is commonality in the challenges in most African states, such as the need to redress injustices of the past in terms of land holding and land ownership, and addressing the issue of poverty through sustained livelihood development.

Peters (2004) argues that, unlike areas in Asia, African states have land in abundance. However, millions of poor Africans have either only small plots of land or are landless, and these issues have in turn led to former and current conflicts and competition over land resources. The issue of land ownership on this continent has been deepening to the point that it has caused conflict amongst ethnic groups and local and non-local elites over the expropriation of land. Some conflicts have taken the form of civil wars between ethnic groups, for instance in Burundi and Rwanda (Peters, 2004). The land issue on the African continent is not only fraught with emotion, but it has also excluded most black African people from the debate. This has resulted in deep social divisions and class formations that, in some instances,

exist to this day (Peters, 2004). It is for this reason that much of the land is in the hands of a privileged elite who is in a position of power economically and/or politically, whereas the disadvantaged are left landless. The elite thus stands to benefit and thrive due to land ownership.

There is evidence that farm sizes are becoming smaller in various countries on the African continent. For instance, in Zambia, Rwanda, Mozambique, Kenya, and Ethiopia (Jayne et al., 2003) many households are landless and own less than 0.10 hectares of land per capita. This shrinking land ownership has led to the prevailing issue of poverty, regardless of land redistribution programs (Jayne et al., 2003). Moreover, it is apparent that trends in land ownership throughout the continent have not changed and remain unjust. Rural poverty remains a persistent issue that land redistribution has not been able to solve. This is evidenced by the fact that more than 41% of the sub-Saharan African population is still living in poverty, even with poverty alleviation strategies such as land redistribution programs in place (World Bank, 2017). Moreover, various poverty reduction strategies have been in place and have been implemented in more than fifteen countries on the African continent since 1998 (Jayne et al., 2003). These countries have received various forms of support from international organisations such as the World Bank in an attempt to alleviate poverty among rural communities. However, in the fight against poverty and the quest to create prosperity and sustainable livelihoods in their jurisdictions, most African governments have failed to recognise the role of their most important asset, which is land (Jayne et al., 2003).

It is estimated that at least 70-80% of the rural population in countries such as Kenya, Ethiopia, Zambia, and Mozambique generate their income from agriculture. This means that poverty reduction is dependent on agricultural productivity and growth (Jayne et al., 2003). However, productivity and growth alone do not reduce poverty but require the redistribution of land, which is the most fundamental natural asset. (Hall, 2018). It has been established that growth in land redistribution patterns in most countries in Africa has made the most remarkable difference in reducing poverty and has contributed to rising rates of economic growth (Hall, 2018; & Jayne et al., 2003). The only problem that now lies ahead is the issue of patterns of land ownership on the continent, as more than 50% of land still needs to be transferred and some of the land still rests in the hands of foreigners (De Villiers, 2017). It is therefore important to address this challenge through a legal framework that is very specific procedurally and that guarantees justice, fairness, and equality for all. Land redistribution will continue to

be a challenge unless successful land redistribution programmes and policy frameworks, that redress unemployment and poverty, are implemented. All that is required, as De Villiers (2017) suggests, is that there is a land redistribution program that is not only clear but also inclusive of all beneficiaries when land is taken and redistributed in a just and fair manner.

Land has been deemed the tool that Africa needs to unlock economic potential on the continent. Debates about the issue of land still rage as land is seen as the solution to poverty. This is only possible if productivity is boosted and hunger alleviated through enhanced economic and sustainable opportunities for the poor (De Villiers, 2017). However, the lack of opportunities for land ownership and access has caused a hindrance in agricultural growth on the African continent (De Villiers, 2017). Some challenges that the continent has faced regarding land reform and redistribution are land investments for traditional authorities, evictions, and the inability of land recipients to use it for productive purposes as envisioned by the land redistribution framework (De Villiers, 2017; Hall, 2018). In some cases, the land redistribution process has been improperly and unjustly implemented and victims had to face eviction without any form of compensation. A challenge in South Africa has been the failure of government and traditional authorities to reach consensus regarding land redistribution. It has been estimated that 60% of Africa's land is in the hands of traditional authorities and that individual land ownership is minimal (De Villiers, 2017; Hall, 2018). This has called for communal ownership of land, but even this has proven difficult due to a lack of co-ordination between governments and traditional authorities.

Another issue is that African women traditionally and currently have no or limited access to land rights, whereas it is they who contribute largely to agriculture and food security on the continent (De Villiers, 2017). Land reform frameworks in many countries on the continent envision broader access to land rights for women as they are the 'foot soldiers' of agriculture and food security and head many households. Women are thus breadwinners and it is therefore reasonable and justifiable that sustainable land reform opportunities should in fact be extended to women. However, the minimal land reform opportunities extended to women in Africa suggests that the continent is still facing challenges in terms of redress, inequality, and gender injustice where the issue of land and land reform is concerned.

## **2.4 History of Land Ownership in South Africa**

The history of land ownership in South Africa dates as far back as colonialism and the apartheid era. During the 20<sup>th</sup> century, about 90% of South Africa's land was in the hands of white settlers and this was legalised by the Natives Land Act of 1913. This Act forced indigenous people from their land onto remaining marginal proportions of land. This forced many of black South Africans out of their homes and later compelled many to migrate from rural areas to urban areas in search of jobs. Providing cheap labour was particularly enforced upon black South Africans as migrant workers on farms and in the mines (Ntsebeza & Hall, 2007). The forceful and sometimes violent removals and dispossession of land by colonial rule as well as by the apartheid government after 1948 (when the Nationalist Party came into power) created twisted patterns of landholding that have persisted over the years. The process of land dispossession by colonial settlers and apartheid laws in South Africa also led to inequalities with regard to access to land (Hall, 2009). It is for these reasons that the ANC government has sought to redress the injustices and inequalities of the colonial and apartheid regimes after the democratic elections in 1994.

Post 1994, about 82 million hectares of commercial farmland were solely in the hands of about 60 000 white farmers (Lahiff, 2007). This situation prompted redistributive policies by the ANC government, such as the land reform policy that seeks to remedy past injustices that left most of South Africa's commercial farmland in the hands of the minority whilst the majority of more than 13 million poverty-stricken black South Africans own no land (Lahiff, 2007). The ANC government of 1994 inherited a very slow economy due to a world-wide boycott of the apartheid regime's economy, a high unemployment rate, and widespread poverty. The land reform policy thus became one of the driving tools to provide land to the poorest sections of the country for both residential and productive purposes (Bradstock, 2005). The land reform policy, and particularly the land redistribution program, became tools that aimed to alleviate poverty, give the previously disadvantaged access to land, and empower black South Africans – particularly black women in need (Department of Land Affairs, 1997). Since 1994, South Africa's democratic government has taken huge strides to provide basic services such as water and electricity to previously disadvantaged individuals and communities. However, as far as the land reform policy and the redistribution of land are concerned, its efforts have had poor policy outcomes (Weiner & Harris, 1999; Hall, 2009). The land reform policy has not only performed poorly in terms of the sizes of land transferred to the poor, but it has also performed

poorly in terms of the quality of the transferred land (Hall, 2009). These poor policy outcomes have been a result of many factors, but an understanding of the history of the land issue also explains the difficulties in the execution of the Land Reform Policy in South Africa.

The dispossession of land in South Africa and across the African continent occurred because of colonialism and apartheid policies. Many scholars have argued that it is due to the historical white regime that the land question exists today. Upon the arrival of the European settlers on the African continent, they occupied the land of the African people (Letsoalo & Thupana, 2013). Land dispossession by colonial Dutch settlers resulted in wars between them and ethnic groups such as the Zulu, Sotho, Xhosa and Khoikhoi people (Letsoalo & Thupana, 2013). The land and livestock of Africans were often taken forcefully from them by Dutch settlers in retaliation for livestock stolen from them. This forceful dispossession of land by the Europeans rendered Africans landless and transformed them from being landowners to becoming cheap labourers and tenants (Letsoalo & Thupana, 2013).

Events of land dispossession that commenced in the 17<sup>th</sup> century later became legalised through various Acts. Both British and Afrikaner land and industrial Acts continued to exclude black people through legislation from participating in the economy while consolidating their own future and wealth. The formalisation and legalisation of land dispossession in South Africa then occurred in various forms of legislations such as the Glen Grey Act of 1894, the Natives Land Act No. 27 of 1913, the Urban Areas Act of 1923, and the Group Areas Act of 1950 (Weideman, 2004).

#### **2.4.1 The Glen Grey Act of 1894**

The Glen Grey Act was introduced by the Cape Colony Parliament in 1894 and was the first Bill to introduce the segregation of black (also referred to as natives at the time) and white South Africans (Thompson & Nicholls, 2011). This Bill was the first attempt to regulate the lives of black South Africans by excluding them from political decisions, the economy, and stripping them of their land and allowing white farmers to inherit more land for farming activities (Thompson & Nicholls, 2011). The Glen Grey Act of 1894 is considered the law that laid the foundation for segregation and the discriminatory policies of the apartheid government. After the passing of the Glen Grey Act of 1894, the issue of land and segregation in South Africa continued to escalate and more and more land was claimed by colonisers and taken away

from black South Africans, culminating a new piece of legislation in 1913 known as the Natives Land Act (Thompson & Nicholls, 2011).

#### **2.4.2 The Natives Land Act of 1913**

The Natives Land Act that was passed in 1913 made it lawful for black South Africans to be stripped of their land and prevented many from accessing and owning land. They were moved to demarcated land referred to as ‘native reserves’ (Hall, 2010; South African History Online [hereafter referred to as SAHO], 2012; Walker, 2008). Walker (2008) contends that only 10% of the land was reserved for black people, and that this piece of legislation led to large unequitable divisions of the country’s available land. This Act thus contributed to extensive, unequal, and racially based landholding patterns in South Africa (Dlamini, 2016). Feinberg (1993) contends that the Native Land Act was the first major piece of legislation in South Africa that formed the basis for the legalisation of the apartheid structure. Feinberg (1993) further contends that this legislation was passed to prevent Africans from occupying what was referred to as ‘white owned land’, further promoted agriculture and labour segregation, and prevented Africans from purchasing land. Amendments later included Coloured and Indian people in its segregation intent and addressed the ‘native question’ by advantaging white minority claims to land (Walker, 2008). The legislation effectively dealt with race relations and ensured that Afrikaners and other erstwhile European landowners did not lose their land to African purchasers. The Natives Land Act had profound ramifications as it prohibited Africans from hiring, buying, or owning 93% of South Africa’s land. Only the remaining 7% of the land was reserved for Africans (SAHO, 2017).

#### **2.4.3 The Group Areas Act of 1950**

After 1948, when the Nationalist Party came into power, the political principle of separate development, or apartheid, was legalised which led to the passing of many discriminatory laws such as the Group Areas Act of 1950. Various Acts enforced the separation of racial groups into residential areas in what was considered urban locations. This Act further made it legal to continue moving black people off their land and onto smaller areas of land (Walker, 2008). The Group Areas Act introduced a concept that was referred to as ‘betterment planning’, which was a policy that reserved urban residential land for racially designated groups. It was not only directed at black South Africans, but at coloured and Indian South Africans as well. This policy further made provisions that guarded against illegal squatting, and also made it illegal for black Africans to squat on farms. Rather, they were employed as labourer tenants. Some scholars

such as Baldwin (1975) have argued that the Group Areas Act was yet another policy by the apartheid government to maintain white supremacy and ensure the existence of mixed-race neighbourhoods by instilling limitations on property rights for people considered non-white. The Group Areas Act of 1950 was responsible for the displacement of thousands of people and many were separated from their families, relatives, and original communities (SAHO, 2017).

The most devastating effect that the Group Areas Act had was the fact that black South Africans were not only deprived of property rights and dispossessed of their land, but they were also evicted to pieces of land that were small and had no agricultural, infrastructural, or economic prospects. In turn, this prevented black South Africans and other non-whites from having any prospects of growth and prospering more than whites, and thus white supremacy by a white minority was maintained. The effects of the Group Areas Act of 1950 and the Native Land Act of 1913 exist in South Africa today, as most rural African people still reside in ‘native’ areas allocated by the Native Land Act and the Group Areas Act. These areas are far from urban areas and lack infrastructure and development. It is for these reasons that the land question in South Africa is a prominent and on-going issue.

Post 1994, after the newly introduced democratic era, the Land Reform Policy and the land redistribution program were enacted in an attempt to redress the effects and injustices of the Natives Land Act and the Group Areas Act and their subsequent regulations. The land reform policy attempts to eradicate poverty by empowering victims of past discriminatory laws and by giving them their most important and precious asset – land – for productive and residential purposes and for economic prosperity.

## **2.5 Implementation of Land Reform Initiatives**

Sikor and Muller (2009) argue that land reform is either state- or community-initiated. Land reform either poses various challenges or promises success, and in both instances, whether land reform is state- or community-led, the political will of the government plays a major role in ensuring the success of either of the implementation initiatives. Sikor and Muller (2009) contend that land reform programs steered by national governments from a top-down approach by their administrative branches usually encounter significant challenges. This is often occurs because initiatives have a lack of support from relevant local actors at grass roots level while the government also fails to address the various meanings of land and property that exist among the people they intend to assist (Sikor & Muller, 2009). However, when land reform programs

are initiated by a community, they tend to perform better because community-led strategies connect state action better from a bottom-up approach (Sikor & Muller, 2009). This is because, in the latter approach, government is better equipped to offer support and is usually more accommodating of the actual needs of the people at grass roots level. The bottom-up approach calls for a government to be “more reactive to political demands originating ‘from below’ and more responsive to variations in local institutions and practices” (Sikor & Muller, 2009:1307). At times, land reform programs failed because of the way they were approached or implemented, and the nature of the role government played in each case. It has therefore been suggested that land reform programs will be more likely to succeed if they are addressed from a bottom-up approach rather than from a top-down approach. Thus, the state needs to acknowledge the community as an important stakeholder in land reform programs at grass roots level. If this occurs, a government will be in a better position to respond directly to the needs and aspirations of land recipients, which are in most cases the rural poor who are most likely to benefit from land reform programs. In turn, resistance from the rural poor and land recipients who are civilians that are non-state actors is unlikely.

### **2.5.1 Historical legislative framework of land policies in South Africa**

As was previously mentioned in the section on the history of land in South Africa, various discriminatory policies on land ownership and transfer were implemented in South Africa prior to the new democratic constitutional dispensation. Such laws were the Glen Grey Act of 1894, the Natives Land Act of 1913, the Urban Areas Act of 1923, and the Group Areas Act of 1950. All these Acts had serious consequences for the land issue in South Africa as they created unjust and unequal patterns of landownership which have remained prevalent in the country to this day. These Acts and resultant discriminatory and unjust land policies dispossessed black South Africans of their land and deprived them of access to land ownership and rights. Moreover, they also led to inequalities and disparities between whites and blacks in South Africa and created an unjust political system and economy (Hall, 2004). Post 1994, the African National Congress (ANC) government thus began to redress the injustices and inequalities of the past (Hall, 2009). One such policy that was implemented after 1994 with the intention of alleviating poverty, inequality, and injustice is the Land Reform Policy (Habib & Padayachee, 2000).

The Land Reform Policy still exists to date and addresses land and land ownership rights. This policy includes various provisions that focus on the accessibility of land, especially for

previously disadvantaged groups who were deprived of land rights or whose land was dispossessed. The Land Reform Policy of South Africa is a socioeconomic policy that is like many similar policies that aim to eradicate racial discrimination. This policy was passed in light of section 25 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa that mandates the state to use its available resources to facilitate processes relating to land and land reform and to redress discrimination in this regard (South Africa, 1996; Lahiff, 2007). Apart from correcting and redressing past discriminatory laws pertaining to land and access to land and the disparities they created between whites and blacks, various other objectives and reasons contributed to the creation of the Land Reform Policy. Some of these include tackling the issues of poverty, unemployment, sustainability, and economic development in a new democratic era.

When the ANC government assumed power in 1994, the Land Reform Policy became a driving tool that intended to provide land to the poorest sections of the country for both residential and productive purposes (Bradstock, 2005). The reason for this is that poverty is particularly rife amongst the black population of South Africa for many reasons, such as a lack of opportunities, the inability to accumulate capital due to the deprivation of infrastructure and being located in remote areas with no economic prospects (Aliber, 2003). Slow economic growth, high unemployment rates, and widespread poverty amongst black communities were outcomes of the apartheid regime and its laws that, to a large extent, prevented the black population from accessing economic opportunities, land, and education. During the apartheid era, non-whites were excluded from any form of discussions on matters involving economic prosperity; instead, they were paid low wages and given minimal opportunities to grow. The Land Reform Policy was then devised in an attempt to create a more inclusive society with more inclusive economic opportunities and freedoms for all citizens, irrespective of their race. The first step of achieving such freedoms and prosperities for all was to correct the unjust laws and policies and to work towards eliminating inequalities that existed between whites and non-whites. One issue was the pattern of landownership. The Land Reform Policy thus became one of the driving tools to redress the injustices of apartheid, foster national reconciliation and stability, underpin economic growth, improve household welfare, and alleviate poverty (Department of Land Affairs, 1997; Sibanda, 2001).

### **2.5.2 The land reform program in South Africa**

The democratic government of South Africa has, since its inception, sought to redistribute land rights, to remedy past racial injustices, and to lay the foundation for a more improved and

equitable development of its citizenry (Hall, 2009). Land is seen as the most basic need for people living in rural areas. In attempting to achieve social justice, the Land Reform Policy is pro-poor, and it also aims to eliminate gender inequality. In order to fulfil this mandate, new investment and production patterns and the transformation of agriculture in both commercial and communal areas across the country became imperatives (Hall, 2009). These intentions were iterated by the election manifesto of the African National Congress (ANC, 1994:19–20), which reads:

“The land reform programme is the central and driving force of rural development and this programme must be demand-driven and must aim to supply residential and productive land to the poorest section of the rural population and aspirant farmers.”

It is therefore apparent that land is deemed a basic human need and right of even disadvantaged black South Africans. It also stands to reason that, once all black South Africans have been granted the right to land for residential and agricultural purposes, then poverty will be alleviated (Bradstock, 2005). Thus, steps have been taken to allow previously disadvantaged black South Africans the opportunity to participate in the economy through accessing agricultural and productive land.

The democratic government of South Africa therefore developed the Land Reform Policy to deal with the discriminatory and inappropriate distribution of land in South Africa. According to Hall (2009) and the Department of Land Affairs (1996), in response to inappropriate patterns of landholding the Land Reform Policy aims to address the following:

- inequalities embedded in the distribution of land ownership;
- the immediate need for secured tenure for all persons;
- the need for sustainable and productive use of land;
- the need to rapidly access land to allow development to commence;
- the need to record and register all property rights; and
- the need to establish an effective administration of public land.

The above are the core objectives of the Land Reform Policy which intends to change the livelihoods of all previously disadvantaged South Africans (Department of Land Affairs, 1997; Bradstock, 2005). This policy also aims to guide the country towards stability and reconciliation, ensure economic growth and stability, and improve the welfare of households by addressing and eradicating poverty (Department of Land Affairs, 1997; Dlamini, 2016).

Dlamini (2016) argues that the success of the Land Reform Policy and the eradication of poverty should not be measured by the number of people who have access to land rights, but should be measured by the productivity of the land which is what will ensure poverty reduction and the sustainable livelihoods of the poor. The land reform policy and its various provisions seek to achieve these objectives through the implementation and facilitation of its various categories of land reform, which will be explained below.

### **2.5.3 The Land Reform Policy**

The Land Reform Policy of South Africa addresses three categories of land reform, namely the land restitution programme, the land redistribution programme, and the land tenure reform programme. According to Sibanda (2001), all these programs of land reform work towards:

- redressing the injustices of apartheid;
- fostering reconciliation and stability;
- underpinning economic growth; and
- ensuring improved household welfare and the alleviation of poverty.

#### *2.5.3.1 Land restitution program*

According to Sibanda (2001), the land restitution program deals with claims that are lodged against the Restitution of Land Rights Act No. 22 of 1994. Under this Act, persons or a community that were dispossessed of property through the Native Land Act of 1913 are entitled to lodge claims for restitution of their lost property as a form of redress. Sibanda (2001) contends that this provision of the Land Reform Policy addresses the injustices of the apartheid regime most directly. The Native Land Act of 1913 allowed the forceful removal of Africans and non-whites from their land with the intention of facilitating racial segregation and separate development. This ultimately resulted in many people living in overcrowded areas referred to as Bantustans.

According to Boudreaux (2010) and Sibanda (2001), all restitution claims had to be filed by the end of December 1998. It was expected that these claims would have been resolved by 2008, but there are still claims that remain pending and unresolved. In March 2009, it was found that 4 296 cases, most of which were about rural land, had still not been resolved (Boudreaux, 2010:15). It then became apparent that the process of land restitution progressed at a very slow pace. Finalising claims proved difficult and tedious due to the influx of claims

that had to be heard. Moreover, this process is very costly (Boudreaux, 2010), while other notable challenges have also slowed down the process (ANC, 2012), for instance:

- exorbitant land prices;
- protracted negotiations to settle claims;
- the complexities of settling rural land claims in the absence of documented evidence;
- fraudulent claims;
- non-disclosure by claimants; and
- competing claims for the same piece of property.

The abovementioned challenges still exist and, as a result, the government is faced with numerous cases that remain unsolved and call for better administration of land claims forwarded to the government. According to Sibanda (2001), most of the claims lodged under the land restitution program resulted from the Group Areas Act, particularly in the area in the Western Cape known as District Six. About 1 698 claims were received from tenants, and a total of R27.9 million has already been paid as compensation. It was established that claims involving financial compensation alone were far quicker to resolve than land claims (Sibanda, 2001). What is worrisome, is that most of these claims did not involve the transfer of land to black people, which avoided the underlying issue of land reform in South Africa. It is clear, regardless of the land restitution program, that the issue of racial dispossession of land and skewed patterns of land ownership have still not been adequately addressed (Sibanda, 2001).

#### *2.5.3.2 Land tenure reform program*

The Land Tenure Reform Program aims to provide people with access to secure tenure where they reside. This prevents instances of arbitrary evictions and fulfils the constitutional right of all South Africans to tenure on land they occupy (Sibanda, 2001). The Department of Land Affairs (1997) states that the Land Tenure Reform Program extends security of tenure to all South Africans under diverse forms of tenure. The government does this to clarify and strengthen the rights of individuals, families, and groups to the land they occupy, and this grants real land rights to the poor in both rural and urban areas (Department of Land Affairs, 1996). This process involves the transfer of private property rights.

The Land Tenure Reform Program changes the way that terms and conditions on land were held, used, and transacted in the past (Adams et al., 1999). Ultimately, the goal of the Land Tenure Reform Program is to strengthen the rights of people to the land that they occupy and

to eliminate the ill practices of the past whereby people would be deemed labour tenants who had no right to the land on which they worked and lived. The implementation of the Land Tenure Reform Program has also been painfully slow. However, there have been some successes as people have been granted statutory rights to land in various categories of landownership (Boudreaux, 2010). According to Hall (2009), most settlements of claims were in the form of cash, which resulted in the fast conclusion of most urban claims during the period 2000 to 2006. Commercial property and urban residential claims were settled easily during this period in the form of financial compensation. Conversely, Hall (2009) contends that rural land claims were a lot more complicated procedurally and they often involved far greater land and more people than urban claims.

Sibanda (2001) also states that the Land Tenure Program is slow and difficult to implement and notes that the Department of Land Affairs strongly believes that there are more cases of illegal evictions than legal ones because the Department lacks resources and personnel to ensure effective communication and the enforcement of legal claims. Sibanda (2001) also believes that the performance of the justice and policing systems in terms of these claims is poor due to a lack of financial muscle. Moreover, constraints in state-led financial aid have also led to the poor performance of the land tenure reform program. These challenges have given rise to NGOs' firm belief that a more radical implementation of legislation should occur that will ensure that farm dwellers are given ownership rights in a fair and equitable manner (Sibanda, 2001).

### *2.5.3.3 Land redistribution program*

During 1994 to 1999, the purpose of the land redistribution program was to provide the disadvantaged and the poor with land for productive and residential purposes. The land redistribution program also aimed to reallocate land to the landless and to those who had been previously dispossessed of their land. This aim was supported by section 25 of the Constitution (South Africa, 1996), which to this day provides that the state has the responsibility to utilise all available resources to facilitate processes relating to land and land reform to victims of earlier discrimination. This section of the Constitution confers the power onto the state to assist in creating conditions that will enable the landless to have access to land through the state's available resources (Dlamini, 2016). In light of Section 25 of the Constitution – which underpins the Land Reform Policy and land redistribution provisions – government is expected to put measures in place and take reasonable steps to ensure that there are means by which

citizens can gain access to land. However, as much as the right to access to land is embodied in the South African Bill of Rights, there is no provision that definitively states that everyone should have the right to own land (Jacobs et al., 2003). However, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights provides that people have the right to own property and have access to food and water, which are rights that are also included in Chapter 2 of the South African Bill of Rights. With these basic rights entrenched in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, these rights pertain to the ownership of land as well. This means that everyone should be granted access, or at least the possibility of having access to land, for the purposes of having a house and cultivating the land for food to ensure a better and sustainable livelihood.

According to Hall (2009:5), the land redistribution program is a provision in the Land Reform Policy that aims to foster improved livelihoods and quality of life among previously disadvantaged people through the securement of commercial farmland. Farmland was to be acquired through negotiations between existing property owners and landowners and land was to be subsidised for beneficiaries through government grants. The government would then, through the redistribution program, initiate community-based projects that would help claimants to obtain farms in groups as a collective with the sole purpose of using the land for productive purposes and to ensure sustainable livelihoods (Hall, 2009). The concept of willing-buyer-willing-seller was introduced, and this formula was a proactive intervention by the state to market and buy land that was on offer and then identify land that would be appropriate for potential beneficiaries (Hall, 2009). This often involved land tax implications that created ceilings on the sizes of land that people could hold (Hall, 2009). Hall (2009) also contends that, at times, the state had the right to refuse to sell land and, in certain circumstances, it expropriated land. A new policy framework was introduced in 2008 that mandated the Department of Agriculture to provide support to recipients of land to ensure that land was used for commercial and agricultural purposes as the livelihoods of land recipients needed to be uplifted (Hall, 2009).

It is undeniable that the land redistribution program endeavours to deliver land to claimants; however, when compared to the demand in claims and people's expectations, the land redistribution program falls short by a long margin (Sibanda, 2001). Sibanda (2001) also concedes that the program faced various challenges in the early years of its implementation, but since 2000 it has picked up pace and has made significant improvement in the lives of

many. Sibanda (2001) further concedes that the Land Reform Program in South Africa has, apart from other constraints, faced serious resource constraints such as a lack of political will and supportive legislation. For instance, there was less capital expenditure for land acquisition in the period 2000/2001 with compensation amounting to R1.1 billion compared to R18 billion spent on the housing program that allowed the building of 1 billion houses (Sibanda, 2001). In that period, the Department of Land Affairs underspent on its allocated budget due to inadequate administrative capacity and its inability to administer land reform programs effectively. This ineptness contributed to the slow execution of land reform programs (Sibanda, 2001). However, another factor that has also contributed to the slow execution of land reform programs is the fact that the government allocated a very limited portion of the national budget to the Department of Land Affairs compared to other programs and departments. Sibanda (2001) supports this notion by arguing that the Department of Land Affairs is allocated less than 1% of the national budget for its programs whereas the tasks, resources, and skills needed for the execution of land reform programs exceed the allocated budget annually.

In a nutshell, the key constraints to the delivery of land reform programs include: the scarcity of resources at government level, a lack of coordination and integration with other spheres of government and departments, and a lack of effective organisational and technical support for new farmers and land reform beneficiaries. These constraints have not only slowed down land reform programs, but also made them ineffective and rendered them unsustainable.

## **2.6 Role-players in Land Reform in South Africa**

The implementation of the Land Reform Policy is dependent on the participation of various stakeholders, namely the ANC government, NGOs, farmers' organisations, the Land Bank, and the Land Reform Credit Facility. All these stakeholders have a role to play when it comes to the execution and bringing to fruition of the Land Reform Policy. Moreover, the success of the Land Reform Policy is dependent on co-ordination and execution as well as the interrelated relationships among these stakeholders. The implementation and fulfilment of the objectives of the Land Reform Policy thus require the involvement of national departments, various levels of government, and their partnerships with various private organisations and NGOs. The role of each stakeholder will be discussed below:

### **2.6.1 Non-governmental organisations (NGOs)**

Sibanda (2001) contends that NGOs are the foot soldiers of land reform due to their watchdog role since and before the execution of the Land Reform Policy. They often perform a watchdog role in land reform activities such as land redistribution, landholding, and production. NGOs have historically played a significant role in fighting for equality and assisting communities to fight against apartheid, particularly at the beginning when they fought against forced removals and Bantustan consolidation (Sibanda, 2001). Hall (2009) contends that NGOs played a significant role in terms of working with communities that were forcefully removed from their land and/or residences during the apartheid era. Many thus built close relations with people and communities at grass roots level.

According to Hall (2009), from 1993 onwards there has been a shift in policies that addressed restitution and land redistribution processes in South Africa. The early 1990s is regarded as the beginning of ‘the legal liberation struggle’, as legal negotiations on the patterns of landownership began in this era. NGOs were at the forefront of these negotiations and represented various communities (Dolny, 1994). These negotiations then ignited the process of wider land redistribution to previously disadvantaged individuals and intensified efforts to enhance their ability to produce and be involved in the wider market. Previously disadvantaged individuals thus took advantage of the markets and the economy by forming cooperatives. They began to earn an income as they became active in various markets (Hall, 2009). In this process, they were actively supported by NGOs that are skilled in land negotiations and in providing skills and resources to recipients of land. Previously disadvantaged individuals were then capacitated to create sustainable livelihoods with the support and expertise of NGOs. Sibanda (2001) states that NGOs that were involved in the land, development, and agricultural spheres in South Africa varied in size, strength, expertise, opinions, and strategies. To this day NGOs have a clear and prominent function as they play a development role in alliance with the government on specific projects while they also fulfil a watchdog/lobbying function (Sibanda, 2001).

Nauta (2001) notes that NGOs often engage directly with the government and many have been contracted to implement the land redistribution program since 1995 in an attempt to deliver tangible benefits to rural and previously disadvantaged communities. However, in executing subcontracted work for the government, NGOs are often faced with numerous challenges that

create tensions and hinder the smooth execution of land reform and land redistribution programmes (Pearce, 1995). These challenges have left NGOs with the dilemma to weigh the needs of the state against those of civil society, and this has also necessitated policy changes.

Debates on policy change have become increasingly useful to NGOs and donors whose mandate (and that of the Land Reform Policy) is to be 'pro-poor' and offer their products, services, and support to previously disadvantaged people and communities (Adams et al., 1999). NGOs have also relentlessly adhered to their mandate to "reject market-based ideologies that hinder land redistribution and reject and abandon the poor" (Adams et al., 1999:306). These organisations have thus continued to work alongside government and the Department of Land Affairs in their combined efforts to ensure the smooth execution and fulfilment of the land redistribution program and its objectives.

### **2.6.2 Farmers' organisations**

Farmers' organisations play a significant role in igniting a pressure for land reform initiatives. Such organisations can thus be defined as pressure groups that play a watchdog function, just like NGOs do (Sibanda, 2001). In 1995, after the democratic elections of 1994, the Minister of Agriculture, Land and Environment introduced a policy framework that allowed farmers to become involved in decision making in matters involving their interests. This framework ensures that upcoming and developing farmers are equipped with indigenous knowledge and advanced technologies that will enable them to successful farmers. This policy framework requires that researchers and departmental staff be accountable to farmers' organisations and provide them with the necessary training, skills, resources, and knowledge that will enhance upcoming farmers' capacity and capabilities. The intention is to accord small and upcoming farmers access to support that will enhance their ability to engage in subsistence and commercial farming. For this policy framework to be feasible and for farmers to become more prosperous through the support of government, farmers' organisations need to put pressure on government for support. Government should also be accountable to these farmers in terms of its legal mandate to support smallholding and development initiatives in the agricultural sphere.

### **2.6.3 The Land Bank**

The Land Bank was established in 1912 for the purpose of assisting the government's agricultural policies and to promote white commercial farming. However, over the years, radical changes and transformation occurred within the Land Bank which then opened ways

for the new South African agricultural economy to flourish. The Land Bank thus became accessible to a new set of clients and it offered support to enhance agricultural development among South Africa's upcoming farmers (Sibanda, 2001). The Land Bank provided support to South African beneficiaries in the form of funding and loans at low interest rates, and these facilities were accessed by the government to purchase farms for productive and agricultural purposes. Loans were also granted to clients and beneficiaries that did not have any security or a record of financial strength and accomplishment (Sibanda, 2001). The lenient terms offered by the Land Bank assisted thousands of clients that would previously have been deemed commercially unviable in the agricultural sector, and this bank thus also used its expertise to assist in the attainment of land reform objectives that were inclusive of black commercial farmers.

The mandate of the Land Bank was to start a lending program utilised by the new ruling ANC and to ensure and maintain sustainable commercial farming in South Africa (Williams, 1996). There were numerous discussions and agreements between the Land Bank and ANC political leaders as the bank attempted to ensure that commercial farming became more efficient and that it would improve South Africa's land issue and the agricultural sector through its lending program, regardless of its policy of little or no interest rates. However, as a commercial enterprise in a profit-driven economy, this policy seems to be disastrous as the Land Bank is now in dire straits and at the brink of collapse. According to Henderson (2021, 5 January), the Auditor General of the Land Bank stated that it needed a "R7bn bailout to ease [its] financial woes".

#### **2.6.4 The Land Reform Credit Facility (LRCF)**

The Land Reform Credit Facility (LRCF) is a repayment loan fund that was established in the 1990s with the aim of providing finance of a high value to partnerships between commercial landowners and historically marginalised South Africans (Sibanda, 2001). This facility has access to millions of Rand for finance and uses funding from the Department of Land Affairs (DLA) as well as the European Union under the administration of Khula Enterprise Finance. What is noteworthy about the LRCF is that it offers funding at a low interest rate of 2 to 3%, which is below the normal bankers' rate. The LRCF targets previously disadvantaged people and households who seek to become commercial landowners. This assistance diverts landless individuals to owning productive assets. In addition, bankers and investors then become attracted to them and assist them financially (Sibanda, 2001).

In 2000, the LRCF was described as a well-conceived initiative by a review committee that also argued that it would fit well with the land redistribution program. The reason why this initiative was regarded as well-conceived was that it was admired for its narrow approach that sought to only address specific aspects of the land reform program (Sibanda, 2001). However, it was also suggested that the facility should extend its role and empower its beneficiaries more. The facility has contributed significantly to the land redistribution program and has accommodated numerous previously disadvantaged individuals in the new democratic era.

### **2.6.5 Role of the government in land reform**

The Land Reform Policy and its programmes have been implemented under Section 25 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (South Africa, 1996). The Land Reform Policy itself was created considering Section 25 of the Constitution, which mandates the state to utilise its available resources in order to facilitate processes related to land acquisition and land reform involving victims of past discrimination (Lahiff, 2007). According to Section 25, the state is mandated to operationalise this section in accordance with plans that involve all spheres of government at national, provincial, and local levels. The Department of Land Affairs and the Department of Agriculture are at the forefront of all processes relating to land and land reform (Sibanda, 2001). The government, along with its various stakeholders as per the constitutional mandate of Section 25, thus needs to facilitate land and land reform processes to change the existing skewed patterns of land ownership in South Africa. Furthermore, it needs to ensure that previously disadvantaged individuals are given an opportunity to own land and participate meaningfully in the farming sector. This mandate is supported by the land redistribution program as mandated by the Land Reform Policy, which is a programme that aims to create opportunities that will improve the livelihoods of previously disadvantaged individuals and groups and allow them to create sustainable livelihoods through the processes of allocation and reallocation of land that is driven by the land redistribution program. These processes should not only improve the livelihoods of land recipients, but should also secure their land and ownership rights, thus remedying past injustices that rendered them landless.

Not only are these objectives envisioned by the Land Reform Policy and the Constitution, but they are also included in the Freedom Charter and the African National Congress (ANC) Manifesto of 1992. The Freedom Charter stipulates that “the people shall share in the country’s wealth” and that “the land shall be shared among those who work it” (ANC, 1992:2). These statements reiterate that remedying past injustices and redressing racial imbalances in land

ownership and economic prosperity are vital (SAHO, 2017). The ANC Manifesto of 1992 calls, amongst others, for the redistribution of land based on affirmative action. This requires that government plays a proactive and pivotal role in acquiring, allocating, and redistributing land to ensure that it reaches the hands of previously disadvantaged people, particularly women and the very poor, in order to improve their livelihoods (ANC, 1992). All the above-mentioned objectives expounded by the Land Reform Policy and relevant sections of the Constitution are paramount to South Africa's democratic intentions, and their execution is vested in the hands of all relevant departments and stakeholders. Government is thus obliged to facilitate processes that will ensure the smooth execution of land reform and it needs to make the necessary budgetary provisions that will make this smooth transition possible.

## **2.7 Land Reform and Poverty Alleviation in South Africa**

Sibanda (2001) argues that, for about the first five years after the introduction of the land redistribution program, emphasis was placed on the poor. Therefore, to qualify for a settlement and land acquisition grants, the applicant had to be earning less than R1 500 a month (Sibanda, 2001). This requirement underscored the intent to focus on the challenges faced by rural poor and to put productive assets in the hands of these people. This process allowed beneficiaries to take possession of prized land for both agricultural and non-agricultural purposes. Moreover, beneficiaries and land recipients also had better access to services than before. However, despite the improvements generated by the Land Reform Policy and its programs, poverty remains rife in most rural areas.

Regardless of this fact, Sibanda (2001) argues that despite the challenges faced by land reform programs in South Africa, land reform has achieved notable achievements that have contributed to equity, efficiency, and sustainable growth. Sibanda (2001) also suggests that land reform programs have been some of the few programs in South Africa that have addressed the needs and rights of the rural poor, more so than any other national initiative. It is also suggested that the land reform program has made significant strides towards redressing past imbalances, especially at the earliest stages between 1998 to 2001. However, the ANC government contends that, although the land reform program has made significant headway, only a small number of beneficiaries have fully benefited from it (Sibanda, 2001). As a result, the ANC shifted its focus to extend assistance to black commercial farmers, and this was a step towards alleviating poverty and ensuring sustained economic growth among previously disadvantaged people in South Africa.

Internationally, Aliber (2005) contends that land reform initiatives in developing countries have contributed to the alleviation of poverty in rural communities. Aliber (2005) highlights that agriculture is the most appropriate method of poverty reduction in developing countries and that it is also a sector that contributes heavily to the economies of developing nations. As such, it becomes imperative that land reform initiatives are executed in rural communities where poverty is rife to ensure that the agricultural production of smallholder farmers contributes to the relevant country's GDP. Manona (1998) also argues that land reform is one of the many ways in which development is secured in rural communities in terms of skills, resources, and infrastructure, while Aliber (2005) suggests that, in rural communities where the majority of the poor reside, agriculture is the most common character of every household as agricultural endeavour is a tool that is most effective in the reduction of poverty in these communities. In South Africa, most population groups that still live in poverty, reside in rural communities, and agricultural production thus becomes a very important activity here as its outcomes will ensure both food security and poverty alleviation (Aliber, 2005; Kirsten et al., 1999). Achieving the abovementioned objectives can only occur if all stakeholders who invest in land reform goals and initiatives in rural communities are committed to this goal. Moreover, this will open a way for the fulfilment of other objectives of land reform such as providing skills, training, creating jobs, and focusing on women empowerment.

It is important that agricultural and land reform initiatives are supported by large budgetary provisions by the government. Although Aliber (2005) argues that there has been a huge decline in the agricultural sector in terms of its overall contribution to South Africa's economy, agriculture remains vital in contributing to and creating livelihoods for many poor people in South Africa. Some scholars have argued that there has been a decline in household income derived from farming activities (Sibanda, 2001; Aliber, 2005; Hall, 2009), but agriculture, livestock, natural resources and cropping have made a significant contribution to the livelihoods of people residing in communal areas in South Africa (Cousins, 1999; Kepper, 1997).

## **2.8 Land Reform and Sustainable Livelihoods in South Africa**

The South African Land Reform Policy and its programmes, and particularly the land redistribution program, have been viewed as strategies that intend to alleviate poverty by creating sustainable livelihoods and growth among the poor. This is one of the aims of the land

redistribution program in South Africa, which is a process that demands that the poor are offered opportunities and strategies that will enable them to survive and improve their standard of living (Ellis, 2000). Sustainability becomes a very important aspect when it comes to the livelihoods of the poor who have become land recipients through the land redistribution program. This essentially means that land recipients are enabled to cope, recover, and maintain levels of functionality that are sustainable (Chambers & Conway, 1992). However, the inability of the vulnerable and previously disadvantaged to access or create enough assets or capabilities renders them unable to create sustainable livelihoods that will allow them to meet their basic needs and take care of their households (Niehof, 2004). The land redistribution program aims to guard against this by attempting to provide the vulnerable with land, assets, and skills that are sustainable and that will allow them to live lives that are free from poverty. The Land Reform Policy and its agents are thus mandated to ensure that their beneficiaries are offered the necessary support to develop their skills, multiply their assets, and enhance their capabilities to allow them to live prosperously and survive economically for generations to come.

However, fulfilling this objective has not been easy due to various challenges. One challenge is that many rural households have no access to assets that will render them less impoverished and allow them to live better and improved lives. This situation is exacerbated by factors such as a lack of support by government and a lack of education. Those recipients who have skills, knowledge, and education are in a good position to live more sustainable lives as they are less vulnerable, can cope better, and can better survive any shocks that arise over time than their less educated counterparts (Dlamini, 2016). Moreover, rural inhabitants that are vulnerable but are well educated and possess the right skills and knowledge are equipped to access financial capital that will ensure the sustainability of the projects they initiate. It is for these reasons that Cousins and Scoones (2010) argue that it is imperative that government and the private sector invest heavily in rural infrastructure and rural development to ensure that there is better securing of land as a resource that will guarantee sustainable livelihoods among the poor. As such, government is tasked with the responsibility to secure donors that will support the rural poor and reduce the epidemic of poverty in rural areas.

If more productive assets are available to households, they are better equipped to survive and to recover from financial stresses. However, the basic needs of rural households can only be met if they embrace opportunities that will enable them to survive and live sustainably. The old adage in this regard is true: give a man a fish and he has food for a day but teach a man to

fish and he will have food for the rest of his life. *Handups*, and not *handouts*, should thus be the driving tenet to support the poor. But to do so, the government should invest heavily in rural infrastructure development in order to assist the beneficiaries of land reform programs to reduce their poverty status and to live prosperous lives. Wiedeman (2004) suggests that, for land reform initiatives to be effective, they need to be extended to poor individuals and communities that land reform policies are intended to benefit. This is because land reform policies can only reach their desired outcomes if they target the right people and communities in need of support.

## **2.9 Smallholder Farming and Land Reform in South Africa**

The mandate of the Department of Rural Development and the Land Reform Policy is not only to implement land reform in a fair and just manner, but also to do so strategically by offering support to all land reform activities (Department of Rural Development and Land Reform, 2019). These support initiatives extend to the development of farmers and cooperatives and specifically target smallholder farmers in rural communities in an attempt to ensure rural development and to curb poverty and unemployment rates. Stepping closer to the fulfilment of the Land Reform Policy means operationalising land reform initiatives and land redistribution programs. The re/vitalisation of smallholder farmers in South Africa is one strategy of many and intends to correct the vast unequal patterns of land ownership and redistribution that exist today (Lahiff & Cousins, 2005). Lahiff and Cousins (2005) further iterate that uplifting smallholder farming is a land reform initiative that aims to eradicate rural poverty and increase access to land for black South Africans.

At the end of the apartheid era, most of the land was in the hands of the white minority whilst the majority of black South Africans lived in overcrowded or deep rural areas with no agricultural prospects. The agricultural activities that prevailed in black communities were on a small scale and generally only contributed to household livelihoods and not to employment and community development (Lahiff & Cousins, 2005). This state of affairs contributed significantly to very high unemployment and poverty rates in rural areas where about 45 000 white landowners were in possession of the majority of agricultural land. These unequal and unjust patterns of landowning led to the implementation of land reforms that aimed to promote the entrance of black farmers into the commercial farming sector as smallholders (Lahiff & Cousins, 2005). The advent of smallholder farming envisions economic development and the curbing of poverty in rural areas. Lahiff and Cousins (2005:127) argue that this system rests

on three pillars, which are: “large scale of redistribution of land, enhanced state support for existing black smallholders, and reform of agricultural markets”.

Smallholder farming is not only restricted to rural areas, but extends to a wide range of locations such as townships, certain areas in cities, former homelands, and commercial farms (Lahiff & Cousins, 2005). Smallholder farmers largely produce staple foods for household consumption, with the exception of a few food products that make their way onto local and other markets (Lahiff & Cousins, 2005). However, it is noteworthy that although not a large portion of smallholder products make their way to open markets, key objectives of land reform are met by this strategy, namely the reduction of poverty and unemployment rates. Moreover, smallholder farming is supported by the government’s New Growth Plan which extends support to the agricultural sector and thus impacts positively on household food security (Thamaga-Chitja & Morojele, 2014). This is because most smallholders consume much of what they produce, but they become entrepreneurs when they sell their excess produce at small markets for a profit.

Land that is redistributed to smallholders varies from small gardens to large plots of land, which means that land size determines the prospects of smallholders for producing either for consumption or commercial gain, or both. The allocation of plot sizes is usually determined by many factors such as economic status, race, gender, and class (Lahiff & Cousins, 2005). Post 1994, preference has often been given to poor black women who normally produce products on a small scale for household consumption, followed by more ‘elite’ individuals who are mainly men who produce at a larger scale for commercial gains (Lahiff & Cousins, 2005).

Research has shown that although land reform programs that target smallholder farming have at times been unsuccessful and unsustainable (Lahiff & Cousins, 2005), smallholder farming has improved the livelihoods of many, albeit for a limited time. However, it has also been revealed that many smallholders failed and thus ceased to exist due to their inability to sustain their activities (Lahiff & Cousins, 2005). Government thus decided to extend more support to smallholders at provincial and local levels, but the challenge persists that support only reaches a minority of existing smallholder farmers (Lahiff & Cousins, 2005). Government’s inability to reach all land beneficiaries has led to its decision to strengthen its partnerships with other stakeholders, such as NGOs, that provide support to land reform initiatives and programs such as smallholder farming (Department of Rural Development and Land Reform, 2019).

Generally, smallholder farming has been unsustainable for the most part due to a lack of resources such as land, working equipment, capital, a lack of support services (private and state), and a lack of markets that support smallholder farming and their produce (Lahiff & Cousins, 2005). Thamaga-Chitja and Morojele (2014) argue that the South African government has recently directed large financial resources towards smallholder farming, but the impact of this support is unclear. This calls for land reform initiatives and programs to be more responsive towards the call to enhance the capabilities and assets of local people in various jurisdictions (Thamaga-Chitja & Morojele, 2014).

Access to markets in South Africa continues to be a major challenge as far as smallholder farmers and land beneficiaries are concerned. Thamaga-Chitja and Morojele (2014) state that accessibility to markets will enhance sustainability, eradicate household food insecurity, and address the issue of inequality and poverty in South Africa. However, this cannot occur if smallholders lack market readiness due to a lack of capabilities. Most smallholders are poor, lack skills, are not highly educated, and reside in rural communities that are underdeveloped and lack infrastructure (Lahiff & Cousins, 2005). Another challenge as far as smallholders in rural communities are concerned is that most of them are women who do not consider themselves farmers as they merely produce extra food and do not focus on growth, access to markets, and commercial farming (Lahiff & Cousins, 2005). Thamaga-Chitja and Morojele (2014) argue that this attitude is influenced by their cultural beliefs and a lack of information. Culturally, African rural women farm because it is expected of them as part of their domestic chores. This persistent belief makes them vulnerable and limits their empowerment as envisioned by the Land Reform Policy because of their inability to produce far beyond their household needs. This traditional custom also has a serious impact on women as they have limited assets to enhance their livelihoods, ensure food security, and extend their participation in available markets (Thamaga-Chitja & Morojele, 2014). Moreover, women smallholder farmers who sell their products to markets are seen as neglectful of their expected homebound domestic chores because they are deemed to have left (or even abandon) their households to access markets and sell their produce (Thamaga-Chitja & Morojele, 2014). In addition, the way in which formal markets are set up hinders smallholder activities because the costs of market transactions limit their income generation capabilities (Thamaga-Chitja & Morojele, 2014:153). These challenges “impede on the meaningful participation of women in taking their farming activities beyond mere subsistence” (Thamaga-Chitja & Morojele, 2014:149).

Lahiff and Cousins (2005) further argue that the land redistribution program in South Africa tends to shift favour and support towards emerging farmers who have their own resources and that it aims to enhance these farmers' access to credit rather than that of the landless and the poor for subsistence purposes. As a result, new land reform programs require a whole range of support services to smallholders that will allow them access to markets that are not in competition with those used by large commercial farmers (Lahiff & Cousins, 2005). These support services include "agricultural extension and veterinary services, research, mechanical services, credit facilities, transport services, development of irrigation and other infrastructure, [and] training and market information [that are] all specifically targeted to [address] the needs of smallholders" (Lahiff & Cousins, 2005: 130). These support services are essential for the growth of smallholder farmers if the intent is to allow them access to markets and to render them sustainable, financially secure, and free from poverty and unemployment.

However, government funding alone cannot support all the services that smallholder farmers require to grow, and it is for this reason that government is encouraged to strengthen its partnerships with all stakeholders that provide support to land reform programs and initiatives, and particularly to smallholder farmers. Moreover, proper implementation of programs and a high level of service delivery co-ordination to benefit all stakeholders are essential for successful land reform programs and for their objectives to be realised. Lahiff and Cousins (2005) also urge that sustained and strong institutional support is required to encourage the creation of more dynamic farmers' unions and cooperatives and engender institutional support that will create more opportunities for farmers' education and opportunities to access community-based markets.

The sustainability of land reform programs and land redistribution requires a shift in policy by both the government and the private sector to ensure that they provide a substantial number of resources over lengthier periods (Lahiff & Cousins, 2005). This shift in policy will also require the redistribution of some land from large-scale landowners towards smallholders. Smallholders as beneficiaries of such land must be varied in terms of social groups as they may be located on commercial farms and in urban areas where land is utilised as small gardens that are developed as commercial units (Lahiff & Cousins, 2005). Lahiff and Cousins (2005) also argue that a reform in agricultural markets is essential to do away with markets that are monopolised by large-scale enterprises. Therefore, new and suitable markets should be created

to specifically assist smallholder farmers to gain access to markets that function on a smaller scale.

Support by government and the private sector needs to be extended to both existing and emerging smallholder farmers and the markets available to them as part of the land reform initiative for a more just and equitable system that will help smallholders to reap some benefits (Lahiff & Cousins, 2005). Thus, policy changes and systems for their implementation need to be in place in order to render land redistribution programs and smallholder farming projects successful. This will require a shift in the current agricultural system that is characterised by inequalities in terms of support services, economic assets, market access, infrastructure, and income (Pienaar & Traub, 2015). Pienaar and Traub (2015:4) also argue that the smallholder sector has for a long period suffered from labour intensive practices that still use traditional production techniques and that lack institutional capacity and support. Thamaga-Chitja and Morojele (2014) argue that smallholder farming and land redistribution should be understood as rural community initiatives and, for these to be successful, policy makers ought to understand the 'rural way of life' in South Africa. Thamaga-Chitja and Morojele (2014) further assert that tailored policies and interventions are required to meet the contexts and challenges of the areas where they will be applied for improved and successful land redistribution programs that target smallholder farmers.

This intensive review of smallholder farming in South Africa revealed that the concept and its various applications come with numerous challenges but also possibilities. It is clear that smallholder farmers' growth in the agricultural sector has been minimal and even, in some instances, unsustainable. Moreover, it is also evident that more assets, resources, and capabilities need to be invested in this farming sector for it to run successfully and sustainably. It is unfortunate that development initiatives from government and the private sector have been inactive in many local communities and this fact has rendered various projects unsustainable. Furthermore, a lack of political will and unwarranted irresponsibility have resulted in the loss of large sums of money in the sector due to government's failure to appreciate the importance of "the capacitation of the human, cultural and social assets that are essential in the improvement of sustainable livelihoods and food security" (Thamaga-Chitja & Morojele, 2014:152). Poor policy co-ordination by government is another factor that has impeded the success of land redistribution and smallholder farming development, particularly as these

farmers are ousted from market participation which has negatively impacted their sustainable livelihood outcomes and productivity potential.

## **2.10 Cooperatives and Land Reform in South Africa**

Ortman and King (2007:19) define cooperatives as “an autonomous association of persons united voluntarily to meet their common economic, social, and cultural needs and aspirations through a jointly-owned and democratically-controlled enterprise”. This means that the formation of cooperatives is often initiated by people of the same interest group who work together with the sole purpose of improving their economic or social status. To do so, they combine their skills, labour and resources in a project or sector to make profits or improve their livelihoods. Cooperatives are democratically controlled and, as such, the benefits they reap are distributed fairly and equally to all members based on their stake or patronage in the cooperative (Ortman & King, 2007). Therefore, a farmer who participates in a cooperative and who has invested 10% to the volume of agricultural products sold by the cooperative will receive 10% of the net earnings. Ortman and King (2007:19) argue that such dividends “...help boost the income of farmers directly [and reduce] the effective cost of the goods and services provided”.

Various government departments and institutions in various sectors encourage the development of cooperatives in South Africa, such as the Department of Arts and Culture, the Department of Social Development, the Department of Small Business Development, and most importantly the Department of Land Reform and Rural Development that functions alongside the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (Dube, 2016). Initially, the Department of Trade and Industry was tasked to administer cooperatives and their formation in South Africa (Department of Trade and Industry, 2004). However, the function of cooperatives then shifted to other departments such as the Department of Agriculture. The formation of cooperatives was introduced in South Africa to encourage and enhance development across all the sectors in which they exist. Their establishment in the agricultural sphere under the auspices of the Department of Land Reform and Rural Development and the Department of Agriculture aims to promote development, strengthen competitiveness, ensure growth, create employment opportunities, and address food security in South Africa (Dube, 2016). Both the Department of Land Reform and Rural Development and the Department of Agriculture are thus mandated to support and develop cooperatives, especially those that function in previously disadvantaged

areas, with the aim of enhancing growth and development and creating opportunities for the previously disadvantaged to earn a sustainable income (Dube, 2016).

The literature suggests that cooperatives formally originated in Europe as “a self-help method to counter extreme conditions of poverty” (Ortman & King, 2007:21). Ortman and King (2007) also argue that the formation of cooperatives has the potential to provide opportunities for all communities to participate positively in the economic growth of a country. This suggests that if more citizens participate in economic activities, the results will be positive and support a country’s development (Dube, 2016). Moreover, if small-scale farmers work together in the form of cooperatives, they can increase their bargaining power by buying agricultural resources in bulk at lower prices. Such resources are for instance fertilizer and seeds (Dube, 2016). By forming cooperatives, smallholder farmers can potentially maximise their profits and secure their markets, which in turn will enable them to achieve greater bargaining power. It is for these reasons that cooperatives in South Africa and in the SADAC region can play a major role in alleviating the social ills that face farmers and communities due to poverty.

Research has also shown that the formation of cooperatives in the agricultural sector has in fact received a lot of support in developed and less developed nations across the world (Okem & Lawrence, 2013). The reason for this is that it is strongly believed that agricultural cooperatives could reduce poverty, strengthen food security, create employment opportunities, improve the lives of the poor, and contribute to economic growth (Okem & Lawrence, 2013). Ortman and King (2007) also argue that the formation of cooperatives in the agricultural sector has promoted competitiveness and the exploitation of new market opportunities. It has also encouraged competitive prices and maximised income through reduced costs and profit maximisation. With different cooperatives located all over South Africa, the distribution of food at lower prices and enhanced food security have occurred, more especially in poverty-stricken rural communities (Dube, 2016). Thus, cooperatives in the agricultural sector that are involved in land redistribution projects have contributed to reducing poverty and improving the livelihoods of smallholder farmers by means of their active involvement in the agricultural sector. Moreover, farmers that have been able to reap the benefits of improved livelihoods through land redistribution projects are members of various successful cooperatives across South Africa.

Many cooperatives in the agricultural sector within the SADAC region have been successful and have been considered as the engineers of poverty reduction within this region (Dube, 2016). However, some cooperatives were not successful as they could not achieve sustainability, and they thus collapsed. Okem and Lawrence (2013) assert that most cooperatives in South Africa collapse because of a lack of support from government, especially in terms of skills development and financial resources. With the proper support, cooperatives in South Africa will play a crucial role in poverty reduction, improved livelihoods, employment opportunities, and participation in relevant markets in the agricultural sector. They will also achieve the objectives of the land redistribution program and the Department of Land Reform, Rural Development and Agriculture. With the right support given to cooperatives, they will possess the potential to address the socio-economic challenges of their members, more especially those of the previously disadvantaged, the socially excluded, and the vulnerable (Dube, 2016). However, cooperatives in the agricultural sector in South Africa have been prone to many challenges that have rendered most unsuccessful or unable to reap the maximum benefits of their programs. Ortman and King (2007) assert that cooperatives often fail because of managerial and leadership problems that characterise a management style that is not accountable to the members. This in turn leads to political activities that are inappropriate and unjust and that result in many financial irregularities and corruption (Ortman & King, 2007). Ortman and King (2007:23) further state that cooperatives are prone to “a lack of management experience and knowledge, a lack of capital resources, and the disloyalty of members due to ignorance”.

Some other challenges that have hindered the progress and success of cooperatives in the land redistribution program include a shortage of skills and limited training of cooperative members (Dube, 2016). Many members of cooperatives are uneducated, lack technical and managerial skills, or have no business skills, which are reasons why they dissolve. Poor infrastructure and a lack of financial resources also hinder some cooperatives, and many receive no financial support to help them grow. Government, as well as other stakeholders and organisations that support developmental and agricultural cooperatives, have limited financial muscle – or no financial muscle at all – to support the financial needs of cooperatives (Dube, 2016). Cooperatives in rural areas are hindered by limited infrastructure and suffer from a lack of water, technology, irrigation facilities, and transport. These challenges impact their productivity and access to formal markets and thus their sustainability. Poor cooperative governance is another factor that contributes to the failure of agricultural cooperatives in South

Africa, because incentives are not distributed fairly amongst all cooperatives, thus resulting in some cooperatives receiving little or no support from government (Dube, 2016). Other cooperatives lack knowledge and awareness of the various benefits, assistance, and incentives that government and other development agencies can offer them, and they thus fail because they do not access these services. Dube (2016:35) also points out that a lack of coordination among the government, stakeholders, NGOs, and other developmental agencies is another factor that contributes to the failure of some cooperatives in the agricultural sector. This is because each agency has its own objectives and agenda, and these are often inconsistent with the objectives of other stakeholders. Each agency thus pushes its own agenda, and this lack of cooperation is the final straw that breaks the backs of many cooperatives in the agriculture sector (Dube, 2016).

The challenges mentioned above impact many cooperatives in South Africa and have resulted in the failure of some. Many cooperatives that are incentivised by land redistribution motivations in agriculture are thus rendered ineffective and none of their members reap any benefits because of these challenges

### **2.11 Current Debates on Land Reform in South Africa**

Among the many pressing issues in South Africa currently, the debate on land reform remains the most prominent. A writer for *Times Live* (Shelly, 2018) argues that the debate on land reform is based on misunderstandings of what can be achieved. This report highlights discussions that emanated from a University of Stellenbosch Business School panel. Several experts on the subject revealed that restitution for land dispossession is not feasible, arguing that the obstacles to land reform are political and not legal and that policymakers need to determine what their goal for land reform is before moving forward. As one of the key advocates of land expropriation without compensation, the Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF) argue that, first and foremost, land should not be expropriated until Section 25 of the Constitution has been amended (Merten, 2018).

According to Jankielsohn and Duvenhage (2017), a great deal of political rhetoric uttered in South Africa relates to radical economic transformation – that is transformation in general and transformation in terms of land ownership. They point out that the transformation of land ownership should occur as redistribution of ownership from white to black. The African National Congress (ANC) is the ruling party with more than a two-thirds majority in

Parliament, and their stance on this issue goes way back and is deeply rooted in its ideology. Jankielsohn and Duvenhage (2017) point out that one of the ANC's founding documents that outlines the ideological struggle against apartheid and for post-apartheid transformation is the 1955 Freedom Charter. It pronounces: "Restrictions of land ownership on a racial basis shall be ended, and all the land [should be] re-divided amongst those who work it to banish famine and hunger" (ANC, 2015, in Jankielsohn and Duvenhage, 2017). This was stated a couple of decades ago and numerous developments have taken place with great emphasis on the issue by the EFF to speed up the process.

EFF policy documents indicate that the party will support expropriation without compensation when all land is distributed into the custodianship of the state (Economic Freedom Fighters, 2016). Moreover, as one of the emerging movements with the mandate to advocate for the needs of black people who are oppressed and marginalised, the Black [First] Land First (BLF) movement has also shown its unwavering support for the redistribution of land along strong racial lines, with comments such as the following (BLF, 2017 in Jankielsohn & Duvenhage, 2017):

"Without land there can be no freedom or dignity. We want land first because it is the basis of our freedom, our identity, our spiritual well-being, our economic development and culture. The land of Africans was stolen, and this theft has rendered us landless in our own land. We want all the land with all its endowments on its surface together with all the fortunes underground as well as the sky. All of it belongs to us, we are a people crying for our stolen land, we have decided to get it back by all means possible."

In sharp contrast to the views of the EFF and the BLF movements on the redistribution of land, the Democratic Alliance (DA) has firmly opposed efforts to expropriate land without compensation. The DA argues that land expropriation without compensation is a bid to sow racial divisions and that it endangers property rights in South Africa. The standing argument on this issue by the DA is their affirmation that property right is the bedrock of development and economic growth (Merten, 2018).

In conclusion, the issue of land reform in South Africa continues to be a contentious issue that always begs the question of balance versus of radical transformation if landowners are stripped of their right to land through redistribution along racial divides. Alternatively, a cautious and

slow execution of the policy to achieve land reform and redistribution in a manner that is fair, equal, and consistent with the human rights of all seems to be the way to go.

## **2.12 Conclusion**

This chapter engaged in a review of relevant literature pertaining to issues of land reform from both an international and a South African perspective. The literature review explored various issues pertaining to land and it became evident that this is a complex but pertinent issue that dates back centuries. The discourse focused on land redistribution and the progress made in this regard in South Africa and abroad. It is evident that land redistribution programs have been slow and complex and are still ongoing, especially in South Africa. Land reform and land redistribution programs vary according to the context in which they are executed; however, land restitution intent and benefits remain the same. What is notable is that land reform in South Africa is driven by the history of this country that is rooted in injustice. For South Africa, land redistribution is therefore a corrective measure that aims not only to redress past discriminatory laws and their impacts, but also to eradicate current economic challenges that affect many of its people. It is for this reason that land redistribution is seen as a socio-economic policy that intends to eradicate poverty, unemployment, and unequal patterns of landowning. Moreover, it aims to create sustainable livelihoods for previously disadvantaged individuals, especially women.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

This research study was guided by the sustainable livelihood theory, the policy implementation model, and the human development and capability approaches. A perusal of these models provided key information that underpinned the investigations and explorations conducted during this study. Ultimately, I wanted to assess the sustainability of land redistribution programs in Hammarsdale. To achieve this aim, it was necessary to determine whether land recipients had been adequately supported to render them capable of creating sustainable livelihoods. In this process, the role of the NGO, LIMA Rural Development Foundation, was assessed. The abovementioned models as a theoretical framework for land redistribution and development were appropriate as they underpinned the premise upon which this research study was based. Although the capability and human development approaches were applied interchangeably in this study, each approach is discussed separately below.

#### **3.2 The Sustainable Livelihoods Approach**

Sustainability is a term that refers to longevity and livelihoods refers to the assets, capabilities, and activities required to make a living or livelihood (Morse & McNamara, 2013; Morse et al., 2009). A person's or family's livelihood can only be sustained if they can recover from certain stresses or shocks well into the next generation and even for a longer period (Morse et al., 2009). Therefore sustainability, or a sustained livelihood, requires resilience in the face of the unpredictability of the ever-changing world of politics, the economy, and the environment, all of which can affect the sustainability of livelihoods (Morse & McNamara, 2013). It is therefore important that a particular livelihood environment maintains and enhances its capabilities and assets (i.e., material and social resources) in the long term (Morse et al., 2009).

The livelihood approach has greatly influenced many developmental and donor policies such as the land reform policy and its advocacy and it thus informed the Land Reform Policy and the land redistribution program under investigation in this study. The sustainable livelihoods theory was used to investigate the sustainability of livelihoods of previously disadvantaged people in Hammarsdale. The land redistribution policy intends to ensure the sustainability of agricultural activities among previously disadvantaged people by ensuring that the poor have access to land for agricultural purposes. It also encourages their collaboration with retailers that

will buy their produce which will, in turn, ensure a better life for them. The Land Reform Policy thus aims to provide the poor with land, assist them in using this land for productive purposes, and thus convert them into self-employed farmers. This process is supported by various NGOs, such as LIMA Rural Development Foundation, that aim to provide support, resources, and training to land recipients in areas such as Hammarsdale to ensure the sustainability of their livelihood operations. The livelihood approach stresses the importance of investing in vulnerable people – particularly the rural poor – and of reducing their vulnerability by putting productive assets and resources in their hands, as envisioned by the land redistribution program (Serrat, 2008).

Morse and McNamara (2013) argue that a livelihood is not just about surviving or the means thereof, but it is also about giving people access to resources that will enable them to enhance their lives and improve their well-being. The sustainable livelihoods approach addresses poverty among the poor by finding ways of eradicating it through effective and sustainable means. Proponents of this approach acknowledge that poverty is a complex issue and that its eradication requires the active involvement of both people at grass roots level and institutions, and in this process, each participating sector needs to understand what needs to be done and by whom (Morse & McNamara, 2013). This approach not only recognises that success in eradicating poverty requires the involvement of various stakeholders, but also urges that improving matters for the poor need to be impactful, long-term, and should not have short-term benefits that will disappear after a while. This has been the intention of the Land Reform Policy since its inception as it intends to eliminate poverty by giving land to the poor. The aim is that they should utilise this land productively, as this will yield long-term benefits that will sustain future generations.

The sustainable livelihoods framework highlights various factors that influence, enhance, or constrain the chances of livelihood improvement and these factors can influence one another in more ways than one. The sustainable livelihoods approach recognises the fact that households have different ways of accessing assets to enhance their livelihoods (Dlamini, 2016). However, relevant institutions, policy frameworks, and stakeholders are mandated by law to intensify, expand, and diversify these assets to ensure households' sustainability. This framework offers various options to ensure sustainable livelihoods and these options should be made available to the poor to eradicate poverty as intended by the land redistribution program.

These options include assets in the form of human capital, social capital, natural capital, and physical capital. Each of these assets is briefly explained below:

- Natural capital: This is anything that pertains to the environment such as environmental services, biodiversity, trees, forests, wildlife, and land (Serrat, 2008). The latter was the focus of this study.
- Human capital: This is defined as anything that involves the capacity to work and adapt, for instance humans who use their skills, education, knowledge, nutrition, and health to perform work (Serrat, 2008).
- Physical capital: This refers to the assets (infrastructure) that are created by humans such as roads, buildings, railways, houses, transport systems, energy, and communications (Serrat, 2008).
- Social capital: This involves the relations between various stakeholders or groups who share the same sentiments, interests, values, and goals. These relations often involve trust, mutual understanding, and support both from a formal and informal perspective. Social capital is developed through mechanisms that allow public participation and decision-making processes to occur and thrive (Serrat, 2008).
- Financial capital: This asset includes money that varies as forms of debt, loans, credit, savings, payments, allowances, and wages (Serrat, 2008).

The list above contains options and assets that are varyingly considered as important and necessary to ensure the sustainable livelihood of an individual, family, or group. In the case of poor or disadvantaged people, the government and its stakeholders will invest in one or more of these assets to assist the poor and replenish their livelihoods. This study in particular investigated land reform and land redistribution in light of these assets and focused on land as a natural asset and one of the most important assets that government seeks to endow upon the disadvantaged so that they will live more prosperously. In terms of human capital, the government makes budgetary provisions to capacitate the disadvantaged with skills, training, and knowledge.

Various expectations underpin the sustainable livelihoods framework. According to Serrat (2008), the three most important expectations of this framework are:

- reduced vulnerability and increased food security;
- increase in household income and improved well-being; and

- growth in the sustainable use of natural resources.

These expectations of the sustainable livelihood approach are vital when it comes to the rural poor and rural development. This is because if poverty is to be reduced or even replenished, then the poor should be given access to land that they can cultivate so that they can secure food for their households and generate an income. When this is achieved, the rural poor will enhance their livelihoods and access improved opportunities for growth. This process needs to be supported by the DLA, the Department of Agriculture, and various NGOs such as LIMA Rural Development Foundation.

Shackleton et al. (2000) and Cousins and Scoones (2009) contend that the sustainable livelihood framework recognises the fact that the livelihoods of the poor are complex and dynamic and require sustainable economic activities. The approach does not only look at aspects such as production, household income or employment, but it addresses varying aspects of land utilisation. Quan (2000:32) for instance describes land as a basic livelihood asset, arguing that it is the principal form of capital from which people produce food and earn a living. This can include the utilisation of cropland, grazing, and common land from which people can access a range of natural resources. Land is one of the most important natural assets and, according to Quan (2000:32), is a heritable asset that forms the basis from which wealth and livelihood security can be generated for future rural generations. It is for this reason that land reform is such an important policy in South Africa as it addresses issues of poverty and corrective equality. The sustainable livelihoods theory was thus foundational in the investigation that was launched by this study.

### **3.3 The Capability Approach**

The capability approach is a framework concerned with evaluations and assessments of individual well-being and social arrangements and is applicable to various settings (Robeyns, 2007). Sen (1998) argues that the capability approach is a moral framework and that social arrangements should be evaluated primarily in terms of the extent to which people have the freedom to promote and achieve the things they value. The capability approach is often referred to as an evaluative approach as it can be used to evaluate various aspects of people's well-being such as poverty, inequality, or even the average well-being of members in a group or society (Robeyns, 2007). Deneulin and Shahani (2009) argue that the capability approach involves the notion that people are able to do what they value for what they value. This notion involves

looking at the capabilities and freedoms that people enjoy and the ability to pursue them in order to contribute to their well-being (Sen, 1982; Deneulin & Shahani, 2009). It can therefore be said that the capability approach can in fact be broken down into two aspects: freedom, and valuable beings and their doings (or ‘functionings’). Sen’s (1982) key contribution has been to unite the two concepts. Functionings can be described as the various things a person may value and have reason to value doing or being. There are many indicators of functionings such as income, assets, and access to education and health care (Sen, 1999). Freedom on the other hand is defined as “the real opportunity that we have to accomplish what we value” – freedom must thus be real or a real possibility (Sen, 1998).

The capability approach also looks at agency which is defined as people’s ability to act on what they value and have reason to value (Sen, 1982). This approach puts people in the centre of attention and thus emphasises human agency rather than that of organisations or the government. It is thus important that opportunities and freedoms are stretched towards the realm of human agency. In this way people can then be rendered capable based on the freedoms and opportunities given to them or accessible to them to function, create, and have a prosperous livelihood. It is by means of capability that human development is achieved, as without capabilities or access to them people cannot develop, or their development is limited. It is for this reason that Sen (1999) asserts that an objective of development is to expand peoples’ capabilities and choices.

Amartya Sen is regarded as the founder of the capability theory (Sen, 1985; 1990; 1997) as he iterates that individuals can only function with the resources at their disposal that render them capable. This theory is based on the premise that, by participating in development, individuals, communities, and societies gain self-confidence, knowledge, and power and are thus better able to influence their own lives and futures (De Beer & Swanepoel, 2013). Sen (1999) further states that governmental programs and provisions are the main instruments that contribute to human development and render humans capable. In the case of this research study, the land redistribution program was deemed the main instrument that was used to promote and enhance the capabilities and development of land recipients in Hammarsdale.

This research study explored the well-being of land recipients in Hammarsdale and their capability to enhance their livelihoods through sustainable agricultural means. Robeyns (2007) argues that the capability approach is a framework that is also used as a tool to design and

evaluate policies – particularly welfare and development policies by government and NGOs in third world countries. The approach is not used to explain phenomena such as well-being, poverty, or equality, but is rather used to evaluate them (Robeyns, 2007). For the purposes of this research study, the capability approach was used to evaluate whether the livelihoods of land recipients were improved through their involvement with LIMA Rural Development Foundation. This was achieved by investigating whether land recipients had the capabilities and agency to create sustainable livelihoods.

The human development and capability approaches are multi-faceted and can thus not be reduced to one aspect alone (Deneulin & Shahani, 2009). Sen (1985; 1992; 1999) also suggests that the approach is diverse and that its applicability is dependent on the context and environment in which it is applied. For example, well-being cannot be reduced to happiness or income alone as there are various other aspects that can contribute to the well-being of an individual. It is for this reason that the human development and capability approach focuses on outcomes and the processes that contributed to those outcomes, depending on context and environment. The key principles that are imperative to this approach are equity, efficiency, participation, and sustainability (Sen, 1999). The land redistribution program in Hammarsdale was thus evaluated in accordance with, among others, the human development and capability approach. The approach was used to assess if and how land recipients had created improved livelihoods through their participation in the land redistribution program that was supported and managed by LIMA Rural Development Foundation.

### **3.4 The Human Development Approach**

Human development is defined as a process of enlarging people's choices and enhancing their levels of well-being (United Nations Development Program [UNDP], 2000). It is a process that is holistic and integrated and in which political and economic forces continuously interact with one another in diverse environments to improve the lives of and opportunities for the poor (UNDP, 2000). In South Africa, sustainable human development implies a process that facilitates and redresses social reconciliation, nation building, and economic growth in conjunction with the sustainable use of natural resources (UNDP, 2000) as is expounded by the Land Reform Policy of South Africa. The land reform and redistribution program in South Africa aims to improve the lives of and opportunities for previously disadvantaged people in the poorest sections of the country. Therefore, the human development theory assists scholars to measure and assess progress and improvements with regards to the capabilities of targeted

communities (Deneulin & Shahani, 2009). In the context of this study, the investigation was executed with specific reference to the land redistribution framework as contained in the Land Reform Policy. Human development as an approach is concerned with that which makes life more worthwhile, and therefore focuses on those aspects that contribute to a life that is full of choices and has room for growth and the improvement of capabilities (Deneulin & Shahani, 2009). The human development approach is also summarised in a definition by Alkire (2009:30) as follows:

“[It is the] expansion of people’s freedoms to live long, healthy and creative lives; to advance other goals they have reason to value; and to engage actively in shaping development equitably and sustainably on a shared planet. People are both the beneficiaries and the drivers of human development as individuals and in groups.”

Robeyns (2007) states that the human development approach is concerned with both building human capabilities by investing in people and using those human capabilities fully for growth and employment. The vision of the land redistribution program is thus to allow land recipients to invest in the land given to them, which will in turn empower them by making them skilled farmers who are self-employed with opportunities to grow in the market and in the agricultural sector. By taking cognisance of this approach, this research study was able to assess whether LIMA Rural Development Foundation had achieved this goal among land recipients in Hammarsdale.

Deneulin and Shahani (2009) assert that the human development approach rests on four pillars, namely equality, sustainability, productivity, and empowerment. These pillars were used in evaluating the results of this research study to determine whether the land recipients had been empowered by means of the land redistribution program to ensure their sustainable development in the present as well as in the future. The human development approach was effective in this regard as it allowed the evaluation of human capabilities in the present as well as predictions for the future regarding all spheres of life, namely the economic, social, political, and cultural (Deneulin & Shahani, 2009). The approach also allowed an investigation of people as agents in their own lives and in their communities and it was effective in determining whether people had attained the set goals by embracing the opportunities given to them and enhancing their ability to access available opportunities.

### **3.5 The Policy Implementation Model**

The policy implementation model of the public policy analysis framework that this study employed is explicitly concerned with a top-down perspective. This approach suggests that policy making and policy implementation are processes that are framed as a hierarchical steering by superior institutions (Frank, Fischer, Gerald, Miller, Mara & Sidney, 2006). When policy implementation fails due to street-level bureaucracy, then policy changes need to be made at national level where government institutions, together with other stakeholders, have the power to make policy changes to improve existing policies. Proponents of a bottom-up approach to policy review, such as Lipsky (1980) and Ingram (1977), emphasise that implementation needs to address everyday problems overlooked by “street-level bureaucrats” (Lipsky, 1980:85). In this context, the land redistribution program of the Land Reform Policy is a program that is implemented with the intent of fulfilling the objective, among others, to improve the livelihoods of the previously disadvantaged (Land Act, 2013).

The implementation of the Land Reform Policy and its programs is thus vested in the state and its various stakeholders such as NGOs. Hammarsdale was the study area and LIMA Rural Development Foundation was the NGO that was the stakeholder that this study looked at. As a stakeholder, this NGO was deemed the responsible agent for ensuring the smooth implementation of the land redistribution program and rural development in Hammarsdale. The study looked at the role of LIMA in the implementation of the land redistribution program in Hammarsdale and considered whether the lives of previously disadvantaged people had in fact been improved. According to Frank et al. (2006), scholars understand the importance of the policy implementation stage in the policy cycle, and they also realise that policies themselves are not self-executing but rather rely on the dedication of active stakeholders to be successful. For the purposes of this study, LIMA was deemed responsible for the successful execution of the Land Reform Policy – thus land redistribution and rural development – in Hammarsdale in order to change the livelihoods of the many previously disadvantaged people living in this area. Therefore, LIMA was responsible for the achievement of the policy goals and its success could only be measured by the program outcomes of land redistribution in Hammarsdale. The program outcomes were compared to the intended goals of the program in order to ascertain the efficiency of LIMA in implementing the program in Hammarsdale.

Scholars such as Barkenbus (1998) realise that threats that face those having to implement a policy/program are substantial and therefore implementation becomes very difficult to achieve. This suggests that policy implementation is a process that is undeniably difficult, and an assumption of this study was that LIMA indeed faced challenges in the implementation of the Land Reform Policy and its objectives. It was also assumed that these challenges would explain the failure of policy implementation by LIMA, if any, and that proposals for policy amendment and improvements would assist in its successful execution, namely, to ensure the improved livelihoods of previously disadvantaged people. This part of the investigation addressed the objective to investigate the means that were utilised to enhance land redistribution in Hammarsdale.

Pressman (1987) and McCool (1995) argue that the implementation of policy objectives and effective compliance with them sometimes rest on the political attractiveness or feasibility of the policy objectives. This suggests that the success or failure of policy implementation sometimes relies on how realistic policy objectives are. Alternatively, policy objectives are at times based on their political attractiveness or appeal rather than on the likelihood of them being achieved, and this can be a hindrance in the implementation of the policy. Regarding the land redistribution program and its implementation in Hammarsdale, an investigation of the program outcomes was initiated to determine whether the policy objectives were socially feasible rather than politically attractive. The findings in this regard would explain policy success or failure.

Grindle (1980) acknowledges that an understanding of policy contexts can affect the policy implementation process and the degree to which policy implementation has been effective. In considering the Land Reform Policy, an understanding of the various institutional contexts was essential to determine compliance and responsiveness to the policy objectives. The objectives of land reform include eradicating poverty through investment in rural development activities that seek to bring about change to the poor through the implementation of strategic and sustainable programmes. It was assumed that an understanding of these institutional contexts and objectives would result in an effective assessment of whether the policy had been implemented successfully or not.

Parsons (1995) and Grindle (1980) state that an analysis of the extent and the types of resources allocated for policy implementation is critical in determining the causes of policy success or

failure. In terms of the Land Reform Policy and its implementation, the allocation of resources by LIMA was investigated to determine the success or failure of the Land Reform Policy in Hammarsdale. The policy implementation model was thus very useful to this study as it enabled an assessment of LIMA's implementation of the Land Reform Policy in Hammarsdale and explained whether this NGO had achieved success or failure in this regard.

### **3.6 Concluding Remarks**

The literature revealed that the execution of land reform and land redistribution in South Africa is vested in an interrelated relationship of various stakeholders. The execution of the land redistribution program is thus not only the responsibility of government and its various departments, but also relies of the assistance of NGOs. It is for this reason that this study evaluated the role of LIMA Rural Development Foundation as on organisation tasked to utilise expertise, skills, and resources to effectively implement land redistribution programs. LIMA's role was to assist previously disadvantaged individuals (land recipients) in Hammarsdale to achieve sustainable livelihoods. This was evaluated against the backdrop of an extensive theoretical framework that included theories that were of significance and relevance to this study. The theories outlined in this chapter are important for understanding, outlining, and analysing the important issues of this research study. These theories, namely the sustainable livelihood theory, the policy implementation model, and the human development and capability approaches were discussed, and it was explained how they were interlinked and allowed this study to answer the research questions and achieve its objectives.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND METHODS**

#### **4.1 Introduction**

This chapter presents details of the research methodology that was applied in this study. The discourse will examine all the methods used to select the sample and collect and analyse the data. The various research methods, procedures and options that were utilised and the findings and solution/s to the research problem are outlined. The ethical considerations and limitations of the study are also discussed. The research options and methods used by the researcher depend on the research approach that was chosen, and for the purposes of this study the qualitative research approach was the most appropriate. Thus, selectively applied methods associated with the qualitative methodology were based on an evaluative research design. All the relevant qualitative research methods that were employed are thus clarified and discussed in this chapter.

#### **4.2 Qualitative Research Approach**

Three major research approaches are the quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods approaches (Daniel & Sam, 2011). However, this study opted to use the qualitative approach as the qualitative researcher engages with participants that are under investigation. In this process the researcher uses appropriate language and probes to arrive at the deepest possible meaning and understanding of their views. Daniel and Sam (2011) state that the qualitative researcher employs inductive reasoning from a bottom-up approach. Data is thus collected during fieldwork operations from knowledgeable human participants in natural settings/environments where the behaviour that is explored generally occurs (Bryman, 2012; Daniel & Sam, 2011). More particularly, this research study utilised the qualitative methodology in order to elicit rich data in order to determine how the land redistribution program affected the livelihoods of land recipients in the Hammarsdale area. The data were collected from a bottom-up approach, which means land recipients associated with LIMA (an NGO) were recruited to engage in the study. The fieldwork phase of the study explored the participants' attitudes, opinions, and experiences regarding land redistribution in the area under study. During the evaluation process of the data, the use of the qualitative approach assisted me in understanding the successes as well as the shortfalls and impediments of the land redistribution program in Hammarsdale. Daniel and Sam (2011) suggest that knowledgeable

peoples' insights and impressions can be gathered by means of the qualitative approach, and thus the study sought the insights and impressions of both land recipients and LIMA representatives to illuminate the role this organisation played in effecting land redistribution in Hammarsdale. Furthermore, both the challenges and successes faced by the land recipients and LIMA were evaluated subjectively and explained qualitatively in order to offer recommendations for future applications to improve the land redistribution process in the study area.

According to Babbie and Mouton (2001), the qualitative approach is when a researcher studies human behaviour with the aim of characterising and understanding a phenomenon instead of just explaining it. This approach was therefore appropriate as it illuminated both the successes and challenges LIMA experienced in considering how Lima Rural Development Foundation has executing the Land Reform Policy to change the livelihoods of previously disadvantaged residents in Hammarsdale. The study was thus able to characterise, understand, and explain the sustainability of the land redistribution program and how human capabilities and the development of land recipients enhanced or impeded sustainability in terms of the quest for improved livelihoods and the successful implementation of the land redistribution program in Hammarsdale.

Unlike quantitative research that seeks to answer the 'how many' and 'how much' questions, the qualitative research method aims to answer the 'what', 'how', and 'why' questions, which is what this study was able to do (Babbie & Mouton, 2001). Therefore, the qualitative research approach was best suited for this study because it was able to assist me in explaining and answering the research questions and objectives as stipulated in Chapter One.

### **4.3 Research Design**

The process of selecting an appropriate research method is important as it ultimately defines the research design of the study (Vogt et al., 2012) as the design determines how the data are analysed and interpreted to enhance the trustworthiness of the study (Vogt et al., 2012). It is therefore important to establish a justifiable research design with appropriate data collection methods, sampling choices, and ethical considerations (Vogt et al., 2012). According to Vogt et al. (2012:2), a research design is "a research plan that includes basic methods of collecting evidence by means of experiments, observations, surveys and interviews". The latter authors

further point out that everything essentially flows from the design choice, which is usually influenced by the research questions and theories that underpin the study.

The design choice prepares the researcher for data collection and analysis. Six steps are usually followed, which are: selection of the study design, sampling, ethical considerations, coding of the data, and final analysis (Vogt et al., 2012). All these steps that form the research design are influenced by the data generating method, which is either quantitative or qualitative, or both. As this study used qualitative methods of data collection, it generated qualitative data. To do this, in-depth interviews were conducted with participants using open-ended questions that elicited rich and detailed data that addressed the research questions.

The sample that was recruited comprised nine (9) land recipients from different cooperatives who had received land due to the land redistribution program. They were categorised as emerging smallholder farmers who had been receiving assistance and support from LIMA in the form of assistive skills, resources, and support. Data were also generated from interviews with two (2) key informants who worked for LIMA as project managers responsible for the land redistribution program and rural development in Hammarsdale. The questions posed to these two project managers were also open-ended and elicited in-depth responses. Thus, the eleven (11) interviews that were conducted allowed an in-depth analysis of the successes and challenges of the land redistribution program. Babbie and Mouton (2001) suggest that qualitative interviews should address the how, what, and why of a phenomenon under study to enhance the quality and richness of the results, and this is what this study aimed to accomplish.

As an effective strategy, the study made use of the case study option. Creswell (2003) states that a case study is appropriate when a researcher engages in an in-depth exploration of a program, event, or activity by involving one or more individuals over a sustained period of time. This study thus focused on the case of LIMA as the driver and executer of the land redistribution program in Hammarsdale as well as selected land recipients that were assisted by this organisation.

By focusing on land recipients, the study was able to determine whether they had reaped the maximum benefits of the land redistribution program with the assistance of LIMA. This enquiry called for an evaluative research design in order to investigate the outcome of the land redistribution program. The evaluative strategy or design is understood as research that

“assesses outcomes of treatments applied to social problems or outcomes of prevailing outcomes”, and thus aims to provide an accurate account of a treatment program applied to a social problem (Salkind & Miller, 2002:3). The study thus evaluated the outcomes of the land reform program by considering to what extent it addressed the social ills of poverty among land recipients in Hammarsdale. The evaluative research strategy also seeks to assess the merits of programs or policies and attempts to provide reasoning behind the successes and failures of a policy or program to determine whether it has achieved its proposed or anticipated goals, and why (Babbie & Mouton, 2001).

The evaluative research strategy was useful in this study because it assisted me in assessing LIMA’s implementation of the land redistribution program in Hammarsdale. This design also assisted me in evaluating whether the Land Reform Policy and its redistribution program fulfilled their objectives and improved the livelihoods of land recipients. Moreover, the use of the evaluative design made it possible to explain the challenges and successes experienced by LIMA in its efforts to implement the land redistribution program. It also assisted this study in determining whether the program had in fact benefited the poor, those who had been previously disadvantaged, and women in need. In essence, this research design adequately assisted me in addressing the main research questions and objectives and the study thus achieved validity and trustworthiness (Creswell, 2003).

#### **4.4 Research Techniques**

Various data collection options and research techniques are available to qualitative researchers. Silverman (2005) and Creswell (2003) mention that some of these techniques include observations, document review, interviews, and the perusal of visual materials. They also mention that the researcher needs to establish whether these techniques will be used in a structured, unstructured, or semi-structured manner (Silverman, 2005; Creswell, 2003). Therefore, before data collection techniques or options can be applied, the researcher first needs to identify who the data will be collected from for the proposed a study (Creswell, 2003). The selected or identified participants, informants, or subjects are then selected using the most appropriate sampling procedure or procedures based on the characteristics of the subjects and the objectives of the study (Marshall & Rossman, 2011).

I therefore carefully selected the study site and participants using the purposive sampling technique, which is a technique that is common to the qualitative research approach. The

population was thus identified, and the sample participants selected based on the qualities they were deemed to possess and their perceived ability to address the objectives of this study (Creswell, 2003).

#### **4.4.1 Identification of study site and population**

According to Polit and Hungler (1999:37) a research population is defined as follows:

“[It is] ...an aggregate or totality of all the objects, subjects, or members that conform to a set of specifications. It can also be referred to as a set of elements consisting of persons or subjects that possess common qualities that are defined by the sampling criteria established by the researcher.”

This study was conducted in Hammarsdale which is situated 45 km from the Durban CBD. At the time of the study, the area was populated by about 62 406 people, of which 66.4% fell within the working age group of 15-64 years (Statistics South Africa, 2011). Moreover, 99.5% of the population in Hammarsdale comprised black South Africans of which 52.5% was female and 47.5% was male (Statistics South Africa, 2011). According to a 2011 Statistics South Africa (2011) report, 18.9% of households in Hammarsdale had no income, which was an indication what this population could benefit hugely from the land redistribution program in its quest to reduce poverty and unemployment. The inclusion criteria of the population and sample in this study were that they had to be land recipients categorised as smallholder farmers in the Hammarsdale area who had supposedly benefited from the land redistribution program with the assistance of LIMA. Hammarsdale was selected as the study site because land reform programs and the support of smallholder farmers had been initiated in this area some time before the study was conceptualised. It was thus assumed that land recipients in this area would be beneficiaries of the Land Reform Policy and its land reform initiatives.

Because the participants were purposefully selected according to a non-probability sampling method, not every member of the smallholder farming population of Hammarsdale had the opportunity of being selected.

#### **4.4.2 Study sample**

Polit and Hungler (1999) refer to a sample as the people or objects selected to participate in a study. For the purposes of qualitative research, it becomes imperative that the appropriate sample size is selected as the sample participants need to adequately answer the research questions (Marshall, 1996). Ultimately, the total sample size of this study was eleven (11)

comprising of two (2) LIMA representatives and nine (9) smallholder farmers associated with LIMA. This sample size was appropriate for qualitative data collection as the participants were able to answer all the research questions and their responses addressed the objectives of the study.

#### *4.4.2.1 LIMA Rural Development Foundation*

LIMA is a rural development NGO that was established in 1989. This organisation has been involved in various urban and rural development initiatives throughout South Africa, including Hammarsdale (LIMA, 2017). Two participants, who were project managers, were purposively selected from the LIMA branch that operated in Hammarsdale. It was envisaged that these representatives would, as Creswell (2003) suggests, be able to share their experiences, perceptions, beliefs, and opinions on the land redistribution program as executed by this organisation as they were actively involved in the execution and facilitation of the program.

LIMA was specifically selected because it is a large and well-known organisation involved in various rural development activities in KZN and in Hammarsdale in particular. As an NGO, LIMA has vast knowledge on land reform and, prior to the study, actively assisted and supported small and emerging farmers in Hammarsdale. Its executive officer was approached with the request to allow me to interview representatives to gain insight into their assistance of farmers and the implementation of the land redistribution program in Hammarsdale. This request was approved and ultimately two representatives were identified, recruited, and interviewed.

#### *4.4.2.2 Land recipient participants*

The land recipient participants were not randomly selected as the purposive sampling method was also adopted in this case. The land recipients were purposively selected based on their membership of the co-operative they had joined and the length of time these cooperatives had been functioning. The land recipient farmers were selected from large cooperatives that had been assisted by LIMA and that had been running for a period of more than three years. Ultimately nine (9) smallholder farmers associated with LIMA, who had been purposively recruited with the assistance of co-operative managers, were interviewed in the field at a time that was convenient to them. The sample size of nine (9) land recipients was appropriate given the fact that the land redistribution programme had been relatively slow and the fact that only a few farmers had been able to obtain land through the program for the purposes of sustaining

and improving their livelihoods. Also, because of time constraints and high transport costs, the size of the sample had to be kept to a realistic number. The nine land recipients were selected based on their first-hand experiences in the program, the fact that they had supposedly benefited from the land redistribution programme, and the support and assistance they had received from LIMA.

#### *4.4.2.3 Sampling techniques*

Sampling refers to the processes or procedures used to select a group of people in order to evaluate their behaviours, experiences, and insights that will contribute to the objectives of a study (Polit & Hungler, 1999). There are various ways of selecting (or sampling) participants such as random, quota, convenience, snowball, and purposive sampling (Polit & Hungler, 1999). As this study adopted a qualitative research approach, a non-probability sampling method known as purposive sampling was used.

Purposive sampling is a method that is also known as judgmental sampling as it is a choice of sampling used by an expert who has a clear idea of the nature of the data that need to be collected. According to Polit and Hungler (1999), purposive sampling occurs when the researcher uses personal judgement to select knowledgeable participants that are representative of the population. Polit and Hungler (1999) further assert that purposive sampling can also refer to the ‘handpicking’ of subjects or the selection of subjects who have experience in the phenomenon under study. In other words, purposive sampling allows a researcher to choose a case that illustrates some feature or process of scholarly interest (Silverman, 2005:129). Silverman (2005:129) contends that qualitative researchers generally employ the purposive sampling technique as it allows the researcher “to seek out groups, settings and individuals where...the processes being studied are most likely to occur”. Hence this study employed the purposive sampling technique by purposely selecting land recipients in Hammarsdale who were smallholder farmers that were associated with, benefited from, and had been assisted by LIMA Rural Development Foundation. Two key project managers from LIMA in Hammarsdale, who had facilitated the land redistribution program and provided skills and support to the smallholder farmers in Hammarsdale, were also selected in an attempt to compare, triangulate, and thus validate the data.

More specifically, nine land recipients were purposively selected by identifying three large cooperatives and then selecting three land recipient smallholder farmers from each. These

cooperatives had all been running for a period of more than three years which means that data were generated from land recipients who had been benefiting from the assistance of LIMA and the land redistribution program for some time. The participants were thus selected because of “some defining characteristics that [made] them the holders of the data needed for the study” (Nieuwenhuis, 2007:79). In brief, the selected participant met the research objectives and questions because they were close to the phenomenon under investigation and had expert knowledge on the execution of the land redistribution program as they had experienced it first-hand through the assistance of LIMA.

#### **4.4.3 Data collection**

Miles and Huberman (1994) state that data collection procedures involve the consideration of four aspects: the setting, the actors, the events, and the process. They further state that the procedures require one to consider “where the research is taking place, who will be observed or interviewed, what the actors who are going to be observed are doing, and ... the evolving nature of events undertaken by the actors within the setting” (p. 185). Creswell (2003) proclaims that four main basic types of data collection procedures exist in qualitative research, namely observations, interviews, document analysis, and the perusal of audio and/or visual materials. I employed both semi-structured interviews and observations in the field as the data collection instruments of this study.

It is important to iterate that, before collecting data from any of the participants in the form of in-depth interviews or observations, their consent was obtained. All the participants signed a voluntary consent form, and, with the permission of each participant, a voice recorder was used to record each interview while notes of important points were also taken. Also, prior to making observations in the field while the land recipients were farming, their permission was requested and granted.

##### *4.4.3.1 Semi-structured interviews: Land recipients*

After the recruitment of the participants and permission by the gatekeeper (LIMA) and themselves to be involved in the study, I visited the Hammarsdale area and collected data by means of semi-structured interviews and observations. Semi-structured interviews are interviews that consist of open-ended questions that allow in-depth discussion and explanations. I was also able to probe for more in-depth insights up to saturation point

(Creswell, 2003), which enriched the data. In this manner a historical overview of the phenomenon under study as well as thick data could be obtained (Creswell, 2003). The participants from both categories (i.e., LIMA representatives and smallholder farmers) provided rich and detailed knowledge that exceeded my original expectations. All the participants were interviewed individually by myself using semi-structured interviews and an interview schedule consisting of open-ended questions.

I collected data in the form of nine in-depth interviews that I conducted with selected land recipients who had been assisted by LIMA. These interviews were conducted face-to-face in IsiZulu on the fields while the participants were engaged in their various farming activities. This means that the interviews were conducted in the participants' natural setting at a time and place that were convenient to them and in a relaxed and non-threatening manner. The participants felt comfortable and provided detailed information about their experiences as land recipients who were also smallholder farmers assisted by LIMA. They detailed how they had benefited from the land redistribution program, were honest about the challenges they had experienced, and revealed to what extent the support that LIMA offered had already assisted them. According to Creswell (2003:186), the advantage of an in-depth interview that is conducted face-to-face is that it allows the researcher to be in control of the line of questioning. As I followed this advice, I allowed the participants to provide rich and detailed information based on the questions I asked, particularly when they were asked to clarify or elaborate a point when there was some confusion or uncertainty.

#### *4.4.3.2 Semi-structured interviews: LIMA representatives*

Two additional in-depth interviews were conducted with project managers from LIMA Rural Development Foundation. These participants were regarded as key informants as they had overseen the implementation of the land redistribution program in Hammarsdale. They were at the forefront of representing LIMA as an NGO and had developed projects that intended to upskill, assist, and support land recipients to address the sustainability of their livelihoods. These two interviews were conducted in IsiZulu and English individually at the informants' workplace in a venue that was secluded and private. The interviews were engaging and informative as these two participants demonstrated vast knowledge about the subject matter of this study. They freely expressed their opinions about the successes and challenges of the project in Hammarsdale and detailed how land recipients had been assisted. Gliem and Gliem (2003) argue that an advantage of in-depth interviews is that participants can provide historical

information as well as current details about their experiences. This study thus benefited from the involvement of these two informants as they were able to analyse the conditions under which the land recipients had lived before LIMA intervened as well as the changes and growth that had occurred after they had been assisted by the project.

The interviews were primarily conducted in isiZulu, as this is the indigenous language of the population in Hammarsdale. The recordings and notes were then translated verbatim into English for the purpose of this dissertation and the future dissemination of the findings.

#### *4.4.3.3 Observations*

According to Creswell (2003:185), making observations occurs when a researcher goes into the field and takes field notes regarding the physical surroundings as well as the behaviour and activities of individuals at or near the research site. I thus observed and took field notes of how land recipients in the area generally executed the skills they had been taught by LIMA. I particularly observed the behaviour of the participating smallholder farmers in the field and noted how they interacted with other land recipients. These observations, coupled with the data elicited from the interviews, enhanced my rich understanding of the impact of the land redistribution program on smallholder farmers in Hammarsdale. I became intensely familiar with the experiences and behaviours of the selected actors, which in turn allowed this study to attain its objectives.

This approach to data collection was useful as it allowed field notes to be taken while I observed the active behaviour of the land recipients. It specifically allowed insight into the interaction of the land recipients with one another and I could witness their work ethic, the manner in which they operated, and how long they worked and how often they took breaks. Creswell (2003) defines observation as a method of data collection that involves the researcher either as a participant or a non-participant in the field because he or she takes notes while observing the behaviour and activities of individuals or groups at the research site. Creswell (2003:186) argues that this method of data collection is advantageous to the researcher because “the researcher has first-hand experience [of] the participants and can record information as it is revealed”. As I followed this advice meticulously, the data were enriched, and the validity of the findings was enhanced.

#### **4.4.4 Data analysis**

According to Cresswell (2003), data analysis is a process that involves making sense of text or image data. As this was a qualitative study, I adopted the thematic procedure of data analysis to make sense of the collected information. Braun and Clarke (2006) define the thematic procedure of data analysis as a process of identifying patterns or themes within qualitative data, while Ibrahim (2012:40) describes thematic analysis as follows:

“[It is] the most appropriate [method] for any study that seeks to discover [and] look for meaning and interpretations. As it provides a systematic element to data analysis [thus making thematic analysis the most suitable method for analysing data that is based on the interpretivist paradigm], it allows the researcher to associate an analysis of the frequency of a theme with one of the whole contents.”

As the data obtained for this study were collected in the form of individual interviews and observations (field notes), the data were transcribed verbatim from the voice recordings and field notes. Based on this exercise, I became familiar with the data and identified patterns and similarities as they emerged from the transcriptions of the comments made by the various participants. Terre Blanche and Kelly (2002) state that the process of reviewing the data over and over is vital in that it allows the researcher to become immersed in the data for clarity and familiarity. The transcribed interviews elicited identifiable patterns that allowed themes to be induced without deviating from the main objectives of the study or the subject matter.

Upon the identification of the different patterns that emerged, the coding process could then commence. According to Mason (2018), coding is a pivotal link between data collection and explaining the meaning of the data. The data that were obtained by means of the interviews and field notes were then coded together under different themes. These themes were colour-coded in the transcriptions and each pattern was then grouped together based on the different colour codes and themes. In this manner meaning was extracted from the data and the findings could be explained in light of the different themes. Mason (2018) argues that it is vital to experiment with data by structuring the parts until a good account can be given of the content. I therefore conducted a careful review and noted that new themes emerged in the form of sub-themes. In this way I was able to explain and evaluate the findings in more depth. Mason (2018) explains that the last step of data analysis involves interpreting and checking the data. I adhered to this advice in order to verify that all the data had been lodged under their appropriate themes. I

could also check whether the data had been interpreted correctly and that the findings addressed the objectives of the study.

The secondary sources of data that I analysed for the purposes of this study were:

- Government documents such as the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, the Land Reform Policy, and various relevant documents on the website of the Department of Land Reform and Rural Development that address the aims of land redistribution, cooperatives, rural development, and smallholder farming in South Africa.

The primary data sources that were analysed were:

- The interview transcripts;
- My field notes.

#### **4.5 Limitations of the Study**

All studies experience limitations and this study was no exception. One limitation was the unavailability of originally identified respondents and thus the number of land recipients who could be interviewed declined from twelve (12) to nine (9). Another limitation was the relatively limited scope as only one NGO and no government departments were included. It is thus acknowledged that the findings could have been enhanced had more NGO representatives and departmental/government officials been interviewed. However, as the participants were very knowledgeable and keen to share their insights, the data were saturated in terms of the purposes of this study. Future studies could expand the scope by identifying additional participants.

#### **4.6 Ethical Considerations**

According to Marshall and Rossman (2011), various ethical issues need to be considered in studies of this nature, and particularly in settings that are sensitive or in areas that are taboo. Marshall and Rossman (2011:121) advise that ethical issues not only involve obtaining informed consent, but suggest that they are also concerned with protecting participants' anonymity. For these reasons all the participants involved in this study completed an informed consent form in IsiZulu. They were advised that their participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw from the interview at any time. Furthermore, in line with the research policy of the University of KwaZulu-Natal, the identities of the participants are withheld in this dissertation and will not be revealed when the findings are disseminated on various platforms.

Instead, the views of the respondents are coded as ‘Interview’ followed by the date on which the interview was conducted. Moreover, as suggested by Marshall and Rossman (2011), the participants were presented with my ethical clearance certificate and student card identification as proof that I was in fact a student of the University of KwaZulu-Natal and had been granted permission to pursue this study in fulfilment of my Master’s degree program.

Before the participants signed the consent form and agreed to participate in this study, they were reminded that their participation was voluntary and did not come with any benefits. They were also informed that their participation was not compulsory and that they could withdraw at any point during the interview without penalty or coercion. They were also informed that the study intended to elicit their views and insights on the topic under investigation and that I intended to offer recommendations that would enhance the productivity of LIMA Rural Development Foundation and the land redistribution program in Hammarsdale and that these recommendations would hopefully improve conditions to the benefit of all concerned.

#### **4.7 Concluding Remarks**

This was a qualitative research study, and this chapter outlined the methodology that was employed to address the objectives and key research questions. Various key concepts pertaining to qualitative research were explained and it was discussed how these different concepts had been applied and how they had been useful to the study. This chapter thus illuminated the research design and methodology with special attention to the selection of the study sample, the data collection instruments, and the data analysis procedures that were followed. The limitations of the study and the ethical considerations that had been adhered to were also outlined.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS**

#### **5.1 Introduction**

In this chapter I present the data and discuss the findings. The aim of this study was to evaluate the impact of LIMA Rural Development Foundation on the livelihoods of previously disadvantaged smallholder farmers in Hammarsdale. Key to this investigation was the question whether the implementation of the Land Reform Policy and its complementary programs had been successfully achieved in the Hammarsdale area. Eleven participants, of which nine were smallholder farmers and two were LIMA project managers, were identified, recruited, and interviewed. The interviews were conducted between October and November in 2019. Thematic analysis was done to identify and analyse the empirical data. Themes relating to the study's objectives were identified. These objectives were to:

- evaluate the progress made by LIMA Rural Development Foundation in terms of land redistribution in Hammarsdale;
- assess whether the objective of land redistribution, namely to enhance the livelihoods of land recipients, had been fulfilled;
- assess the achievements and challenges faced by land recipients in enhancing their livelihoods through the land redistribution programme; and
- explore possible further interventions and make recommendations that would improve the land redistribution programme in Hammarsdale.

Direct quotations are used to present and validate the authenticity of the findings. Relevant literature and references to the theoretical framework are used to refute or support the empirical findings.

#### **5.2 Demographic Information of the Participants**

This section presents the biographical information of the participants who were interviewed. The total of 11 participants (9 participants consisting of land recipients and 2 participants consisting of key informants from LIMA) are categorised in terms of their age, gender, marital status, socio-economic status, and education level.

Table 5.1: Age

<b>Age Category</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage %</b>
18-25	1	9.1
26-35	2	18.2
36-45	2	18.2
46-55	1	9.1
56 and above	5	45.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 5.1 reflects the age range of all the participants who participated in the research study. The data show that, of the 11 participants, the majority (45.4%) fell in the category above the age of 56, whilst the fewest participants (only 1 each) were in the 46-55 year and 18–25-year categories. Only two participants fell in each of the age categories 26-35 [2 key informants from LIMA] and 36-45 [2 land recipients]. It is thus evident that most of the participants were relatively elderly people, which suggests that most people involved in smallholder farming in the Hammarsdale area might be elderly and that younger people might take little interest in farming. This may be because there are various opportunities for the youth to grow and be employed in other industries, whereas the elderly have few options other than securing food security for their households by means of farming. However, the prospect for sustainable livelihoods looks dire in light of the comment made in Chapter One that the majority of the people in the Hammarsdale area is young and that the textile industry that traditionally employed the youth in this area is on the verge of collapse.

Table 5.2: Gender

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage %</b>
Male	3	27.3
Female	8	72.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 5.2 indicates that most of the participants who participated in the study were female (72.7%) while only three (27.3%) males were involved, which suggests that it is mostly females that participate in smallholder farming in Hammarsdale. Whilst the 2 other females were not smallholder farmers but are key informants from LIMA. Lahiff and Cousins (2005) also suggest that it is usually poor black women who participate in small-scale farming for household consumption, whereas men usually produce on a larger scale and tend to participate in commercial farming. As the land redistribution policy of South Africa gives preference to black women who are in need (Hall, 2009), the table above suggests that this policy objective is being addressed in the land redistribution program in Hammarsdale. However, in light of the small number of participants in this study, this is not a definitive finding and this aspect should be investigated in future studies.

Table 5.3: Race

<b>Race</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b> %
White	0	0
African/Black	11	100
Indian	0	0
Coloured	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 5.3 indicates that only black African participants were involved in this study, which is a reflection of the population distribution in the Hammarsdale area where the study was conducted. Moreover, the data presented in the above table also reflect the reality of the land reform and redistribution policy objectives that place priority on previously disadvantaged groups (Sibanda, 2001). The study investigated the implementation of the land redistribution program in Hammarsdale and its impact on the livelihoods of previously disadvantaged people, with specific focus on women and black people. It is thus apparent that only black people would benefit from this programme in Hammarsdale. Furthermore, the two key informants from LIMA were also black and were residents of Hammarsdale and thus formed part of the black African population of Hammarsdale where the program under study was executed.

Table 5.4: Marital status

<b>Marital status</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage %</b>
Married	3	27.3
Single	7	63.6
Divorced	0	0
Widowed	1	9.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>

The above table depicts the marital status of the participants and reflects that most of them (63.6%) were single or not married [including the 2 key informants from LIMA], while only 27.3% was married. None of the participants were divorced and only one participant was widowed. These data also seem to confirm that most smallholder farmers in Hammarsdale are single, which suggests that most households are headed by women. This also paints the picture that there is only one source of income and one income stream in most of the households of land recipients in Hammarsdale. Again, in light of the small scope of the study, it is proposed that future studies should utilise a large sample size to confirm this finding.

Table 5.5: Socio-economic status

<b>Number of dependants</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage %</b>
Employed	3	27.3
Unemployed	8	72.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>

The data depicted in the above table indicate the socio-economic status of the participants. Most of them (72.7%) were unemployed while only a few (27.3%) had employment other than smallholder farming. This seems to suggest that most of the smallholder farmers in Hammarsdale tend to rely on their farming enterprise to earn an income and ensure food security. It also suggests that their involvement in farming is an escape from both poverty and unemployment, which is the intention of the land redistribution program as implemented by LIMA in Hammarsdale. However, if the total sample is considered, it means that of the three employed participants, two were LIMA employees, and thus only one the nine farmers was

also otherwise employed. Aliber (2005) contends that land reform in agriculture is the most appropriate method of poverty reduction in developing nations such as South Africa

Table 5.6: Level of education

<b>Level of education</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage %</b>
No Matric	5	45.4
Matric	2	18.2
Higher certificate	2	18.2
Diploma or post diploma	0	0
Degree or post degree	2	18.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>

The above table indicates that most of the participants were poorly qualified as 45% had no Matric (Grade 12 level of schooling). The two LIMA employees each held a degree or post-graduation qualification, thus only four of the nine smallholder farmers had an education level (Matric or Higher Certificate) that might allow them access to a more formal job market. Thamaga-Chitja and Morojele (2014) state that most smallholder farmers have limited education but that they do stand to benefit from land reform programs that intend to enhance their skills and capabilities. However, the four participants with a Matric qualification and a higher certificate were in a better position to find employment in a sector other than agriculture, but the reality is that due to the high levels of unemployment in the Hammarsdale area, jobs are very scarce here. The low education levels of the land recipient participants and their relatively high age are indications that Hammarsdale, like many poor areas in South Africa, still suffers from a lack of educational opportunities for adults.

### **5.3 LIMA Rural Development Foundation Profile**

LIMA Rural Development Foundation (LIMA) is a non-governmental organisation (NGO) that is based in South Africa with branches in all nine provinces. It was first established in 1989 and it prides itself in the fact that it is as an executor of various rural and urban developmental projects in South Africa (LIMA, 2017). It encourages development, transformation, and the advancement of disadvantaged communities across South Africa to ensure the betterment and sustainability of the livelihoods of these persons (LIMA, 2017). Focusing on rural communities, their programs vary from agriculture, land reform, education, and food security to social development (LIMA, 2017). LIMA aims to eradicate, or at least lessen, the socio-

economic issues that plague South Africa and hinder the prosperity and freedom of the South African nation. LIMA's head office in KZN is situated in the province capital of Pietermaritzburg and it executes various programs across KZN, and also in Hammarsdale. This study examined the impact that LIMA had on the livelihoods of previously disadvantaged people in this area through the land redistribution program.

### **5.3.1 The role of LIMA in land redistribution and reform programs in Hammarsdale**

The key informant officials from LIMA stated that the organisation began the land reform program in Hammarsdale in 2016. LIMA was approached by RCL Foods, also known as Rainbow Chickens, to advise their CSI division on ways to give back to the disadvantaged community of Hammarsdale. Upon conducting a survey in 2016 to assess the needs of the people of Hammarsdale, LIMA found that Hammarsdale had some small-scale farmers who could assist other farmers where there were shortages of services. They found that small-scale farmers had already been allocated land for production and consumption purposes and were also receiving some support from the Department of Agriculture. However, the two officials stated that LIMA found that there was a shortage of services in the day-to-day running and support of small-scale farmers in Hammarsdale. Thus, LIMA's role was to intervene as an agency to fill the gaps and implement the land redistribution program in this area. The organisation was tasked with the role to provide support, enhance skills, and offer training that would include knowledge acquisition of marketing and sales and how to package produce. One official stated that land recipients and small-scale farmers had to be trained in all the stages of cultivating, harvesting, and marketing their produce in order to generate profits and earn a sustainable income. This information is also supported by the literature which states that NGOs such as LIMA that are involved in land reform programs play a crucial role in providing resources and imparting skills to previously disadvantaged land recipients to build their capacity and skills (Sibanda, 2001 & Hall, 2009). This is further supported by the sustainable livelihood approach that stresses the importance of reducing the vulnerability of the poor by giving them the necessary skills, assets and resources (Serrat, 2008) to foster a more sustained livelihood, as envisioned by both LIMA and the land reform program. A LIMA official also explained the role of this organisation in the land redistribution program in Hammarsdale as follows:

It ensures the creation of smallholder farmers that are sustainable and to increase opportunities for job creation and employment. And by so doing, it also increases

household incomes and reduces poverty, hunger and unemployment in Hammarsdale. (LIMA official 2; Female, Aged 29)

The above statement is also supported by the literature in terms of land reform policy objectives, as it states that the objectives include “ensuring improved household welfare and alleviating poverty” (Sibanda, 2001). Improved household welfare occurs when farmers are skilled and can sell their produce to generate an income that will in turn improve their financial status and render them employed and not hungry or impoverished. One LIMA official saw the role of LIMA as follows:

[We are] an implementing agency that is tasked with the responsibility of successfully executing the land redistribution program in Hammarsdale. As such, LIMA is also tasked with playing a watchdog role which entails monitoring that smallholder farmers execute the skills and knowledge provided by us successfully. Moreover, our role also entails developing smallholder farmers by providing them with the necessary skills, resources, and assets that will make them capable farmers that are free from poverty, food insecurity, and unemployment. (LIMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

The second official added the following comment:

Since the focus is on uplifting and empowering the community of Hammarsdale as envisioned by RCL Foods, LIMA let go of handing out food parcels and focused on a more sustainable option. LIMA then opted to implement the land redistribution program in Wards 4, 5, 6, 7 and 91 where there were existing small-scale farmers working communal gardens and we began to empower them with skills and knowledge that will make them aspirant and sustainable small-scale farmers. (LIMA official 2; Female, Aged 29)

This comment means that LIMA targeted existing farmers from different municipal wards in Hammarsdale and incorporated them in their land redistribution program by developing and upskilling them to become aspirant and eventually successful small-scale farmers.

### **5.3.2 Successes achieved by LIMA in Hammarsdale**

#### *5.3.2.1 Adherence to land reform policy objectives*

As was previously mentioned in Chapter Two, in its intention to address and remedy discriminatory laws in terms of land, the Land Reform Policy's objectives and its land redistribution program include the following (Sibanda, 2001; Department of Land Affairs, 1997):

- Sustainable and productive use of land;
  - Rapid redistribution of land to allow development to commence;
  - Improved welfare of households by addressing and eradicating poverty among Africans;
  - Providing the disadvantaged and the poor with land for productive and residential purposes; and
- Fostering improved livelihoods and a better quality of life for previously disadvantaged individuals and households.

LIMA was thus tasked with the mandate to fulfil the above-mentioned objectives in Hammarsdale as it was imperative to make these objectives applicable to land recipients and small-holder farmers who operated under different cooperatives in various wards in Hammarsdale and who were assisted by LIMA. The officials argued that, despite the challenges that threatened the execution of the program, LIMA was very successful in addressing most of the objectives of the land reform policy and its program. One official stated:

LIMA ensured that land recipients are skilled in planting so that they can make good use of the land that they have been given and it has ensured that the farmers use the land productively so that they can sustain their lives. LIMA also ensured that we transform the small-scale farmers from being just subsistence farmers to being commercial farmers that can earn a sustainable income. (LIMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

This suggests that LIMA successfully achieved the objective of ensuring that land recipients became sustainable farmers by productively using land and utilising the right skills and resources to produce products that could be sold to generate an income. The LIMA participants also emphasised that having the right skills and resources was fundamental in enhancing the ability of land recipients to continue their productive use of land and to ensure agricultural

sustainability. According to the officials, the organisation managed to ensure sustainability and productivity in all the wards where small-scale farmers operated in Hammarsdale. LIMA achieved this by means of extensive training and skills development workshops on organic farming and by providing all the land recipients with farming tools, equipment, seedlings, compost, and other materials to get them started. One of the officials stated:

Phase one of the project was to provide land recipients with start-up packages such as tools, seedlings and compost. From there we provided land recipients with different types of skills and training that would make them better farmers that can grow their businesses. The community of Hammarsdale has been able to get fresh produce on their doorstep because of these small-scale farmers. (LIMA official 2; Female, Aged 29)

The other official added the following:

From the foundation phase of the program, we started afresh and trained land recipients from the start in the basics of organic farming and provided them with tools and resources to start farming organically. After the different sites had completed their first phase of trainings, we moved on to test the soil of each site and sections of the gardens. This was to find out which crops, or vegetables could be grown on which sections of land on the different sites. We did this to avoid the mistake of land recipients growing crops that would be ruined because the soil was not conducive for a crop or vegetable to grow. We thus avoiding the possibility of land recipients making a loss. (LIMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

Soil testing was thus an important focus of LIMA to ensure sustainability and the continued use of productive land. This involved testing the soil for the cultivation of appropriate crops and vegetables so that the smallholder farmers would generate sales based on demand and their understanding of soil appropriateness. This process is supported by the sustainability approach which stresses the importance of maintaining livelihoods through enhanced capabilities and the provision of assets (e.g., materials as well as natural and social resources) in the long term (Morse et al., 2009). In this way land can be reserved and preserved sustainably for generations.

Two officials from LIMA revealed that this NGO had come a long way in meeting the Land Reform Policy objectives, namely ensuring sustainability and productive utilisation of land by land recipients. This was achieved by equipping land recipients with relevant skills and providing them with the resources and training that would make them successful as farmers.

These farmers were then enabled to secure sustainable livelihoods and generate a living income for themselves and their families. The findings of the study also revealed that poverty and unemployment could be addressed by making resources available and imparting skills and knowledge to land recipients. This notion is supported by Niehof (2004), who asserts that when beneficiaries receive the necessary support, training and assets, they acquire appropriate skills to develop their capabilities. This allows them to live sustainably and prosperously and enables them to impart their skills and knowledge to future generations.

#### *5.3.2.2 Development of skills and capabilities and knowledge acquisition to engage in organic farming*

As an agency of land reform programs in Hammarsdale, LIMA had to fulfil the objectives of the Land Reform Policy by developing, teaching, and imparting skills and knowledge to land recipients. The intention was that these skills would capacitate them and improve their livelihoods. LIMA provided various land recipients with skills, training, and support at various stages of the land reform programme. The foundation phase of the programme entailed providing them with basic skills in organic farming and teaching them about the correct use of tools and equipment for this purpose. This phase of the programme also involved basic training on different types of weeds, seeds, crops, and vegetables as well as basic training on how to garden, plant, and plough their crops correctly. During these training sessions, LIMA provided the land recipients with start-up packages that consisted of various tools, equipment, seedlings, and seeds to get them started. One of the project managers stated:

Organic farming involves teaching farmers the concept of trench farming which rejects the idea of traditional farming of planting directly into the soil but encourages filling a deep trench the size of a spade with organic matter in the form of layers until it fills up before you plant your seedlings at the top. (LIMA official 2, Female, Aged 29)

The project managers also confirmed that this phase, being the foundation phase, was the longest phase of the programme and involved continuous monitoring of all the different sites in the various wards in Hammarsdale. The officials also stated that this phase of the programme had to be done well before other phases could commence, as it involved all the basics of farming and was aimed at enabling land recipients to produce good quality vegetables.

The purpose of the trainings sessions was to ensure that LIMA offered sound knowledge and upskilling that would entrench long-term benefits for all the participating land recipients. These

support efforts, skills training and workshops allowed these smallholder farmers to stand on their own feet and create sustainable and improved livelihoods for themselves. In support of this statement, a land recipient said:

When LÌMA arrived in Hammarsdale with their program they found us farming and saw that we were passionate in what we did; but they realised that we were struggling, and they were not happy with the quality of our produce and the way we planted our crops. So, the first thing they did was that they gave us seedlings and taught us how to plant using trenches. That's the first thing they taught us and immediately we began to see a change in the quality of our produce. LÌMA was impressed with the results and the quality of our produce and they started seeing potential in us. That then was the beginning of the skills that they taught us. LÌMA felt we were ready to learn more skills and from there they started coming to our sites to teach us more skills. (Land recipient 4; Female, Aged 50)

The information provided by this participant confirmed that smallholder farmers in Hammarsdale were already farming when LÌMA started its interventions, and LÌMA officials realised that they possessed the right skills and resources to invest in the growth and development of these smallholder farmers in Hammarsdale.

The study further revealed that training involved information about land preservation and the soil and knowledge about which plants would be most suited for which type of soil. A land recipient expressed her gratitude for this intervention and stated:

When LÌMA was happy with the quality of our produce, they motivated us to plant more vegetables and use more of our land to plant a variety of vegetables. They taught us which vegetables to plant in which sections of our land or gardens and in which seasons to plant them. We started working harder and spent more hours in the fields and, because we produced a lot of vegetables, LÌMA connected us to buyers. That was when LÌMA taught us how to package our vegetables and they provided us with transport to for our produce to big shops like SPAR in Hammarsdale and the cafeteria at another place. (Land recipient 4; Female, Aged 50)

This is a revelation that LÌMA imparted skills and shared resources to assist these smallholder farmers in the development of skills for effective farming in the Hammarsdale area. This is in agreement with Sen's (1998) notion that it is important to invest in people's capabilities because, if you expand their capabilities, they become more adept and developed. As land

recipients develop in terms of skills, growth becomes inevitable and gives them access to larger markets and other consumers who, in turn, contribute to their growing wealth.

After LIMA had provided the land recipients with basic skills, training, and knowledge about organic farming, the second phase of the program involved transforming them from land recipients and small-scale farmers who produced crops for their own consumption into commercial farmers who could compete in more formal markets. One of the officials attested to this by stating the following:

We proceeded to provide more training and this time provided training in bookkeeping because now the farmers were selling their produce and not just cultivating crops for their own consumption. So, this was a different ball game as they now needed to keep record of their sales and understand why they were making a profit or suffering a loss. Therefore, training was important because it also involved training in sales and marketing so that they would become efficient business men and women. (LIMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

This phase of the program was the inception stage of preparing the land recipients for the formal market and ensuring that they were adequately equipped to compete with larger commercial farmers. The study indicated that the second phase gave the targeted land recipients an opportunity to generate a real and sustainable income and make profits that would improve their livelihoods. According to the officials, this was important because all the recipients involved in this programme headed households and had formerly been unemployed. Lahiff and Cousins (2005) support this goal by stating that reform in agricultural markets is essential. This in turn challenges market monopolies by big companies and allows smallholder farmers to participate in the economy. Moreover, allowing existing and emerging smallholder farmers to reap the benefits of their endeavours and make profits will enhance these programmes and encourage more rural people to actively utilise such programs (Lahiff & Cousins, 2005).

The LIMA officials confirmed that, after a series of training on selling, marketing, bookkeeping and packaging, smallholder farmers were in a better position to enter formal markets. However, participating in such markets and yielding better profits require much effort, as was suggested by one of the project managers:

Monitoring and managing land recipients and then securing market linkages for them to sell to companies such as SPAR, and RCL Foods is tough. This also requires that

farmers no longer work in isolation but as members of a co-operative and they should then start producing in bulk in order to participate in larger markets as commercial farmers. (LIMA official 1, Female, Aged 28)

A land recipient also addressed the need for smallholder farmers to become involved in cooperatives:

Our co-operative grew more and more after LIMA had trained us because, after we had started producing more vegetables, we began making more money. After that, LIMA taught us during workshops and training sessions how to package our vegetables and do proper bookkeeping and save on costs. We learnt how to manage our finances and control our expenses because before LIMA we didn't have proper bookkeeping or a joint account to keep track of our money. But LIMA taught us and motivated us to become proper, responsible business owners. (Land recipient 8; Male, Aged 56)

The literature argues that when people with the same goal come together in a co-operative and contribute their skills, labour, resources and produce, they grow in social status and experience improved livelihoods due to larger profits (Ortman & King, 2007). Thus, the second phase of the programme was important as land recipients were encouraged and enabled to work harder as a professional team in order to yield better produce and higher profits. This implies that the participating land recipients produced agricultural products on a larger scale and of a better quality, packaged these products well, and marketed them effectively in order to secure deals with large supermarkets. This phase of the project required LIMA to continuously monitor the land recipients to ensure that they were effectively executing the skills and knowledge they had acquired during their training. They had to be monitored to ensure that their bookkeeping was of a high standard, that they produced enough products of a good standard, that the packaging of these products was of an acceptable standard, and that they were producing good quality products.

The LIMA officials also iterated that it was essential during this phase of the program that the land recipients were registered as cooperatives under one farmer's organisation in Hammarsdale. One of the officials offered the following information in this regard:

We are done with all training and imparting skills to the land recipients, and we are now monitoring whether they are executing what they have learnt well. We are now in a very exiting phase of the programme and our exit strategy involves ensuring that the

land recipients can stand alone without our assistance. We need to make sure that they are registered and continue to be sustainable after we as LIMA have exited the program. (LIMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

The information that was shared by the LIMA officials confirmed that this organisation played a major role in empowering smallholder farmers in Hammarsdale and that it made huge strides forward in teaching these farmers and improving their skills, expertise, and livelihoods. Vast capital and assets were invested in the land recipients and one of the officials endorsed this expense by praising the developmental role that LIMA played in the lives of successful farmers in Hammarsdale as an implementing agency:

Teaching the farmers how to farm for consumption purposes was a rewarding experience. We realised this only after the completion of the programme, but we had groomed them to become commercial farmers who cultivated crops and sold them, and we got them to register as cooperatives. Through our training programmes we taught them how to measure the success of their sales and profits because previously they would just sell their produce without recording anything. We also taught them proper packaging, branding, and marketing skills which they didn't know before. (LIMA official 2; Female, Aged 29)

The land recipients also affirmed that LIMA had assisted them in becoming more effective farmers and real entrepreneurs. They learnt new skills during a series of training sessions on good farming and marketing practices, learnt business skills, adopted sound customer service habits, learnt how to write a business plan, and they generally embraced entrepreneurship. These accolades were an affirmation that LIMA had invested a lot of expertise and time in the development of these land recipients in Hammarsdale. Moreover, LIMA had proven itself as an organisation with the skills and resources to upskill land recipients so that they could become independent farmers who could create a sustainable living through agricultural activities. The successes that were achieved demonstrated that LIMA played a significant role in the development of land recipients in Hammarsdale. As a development agency, this organisation seems to understand that the capabilities of people need to be developed, which is a notion that is supported by Sen (1999). However, this organisation's effectiveness became limited when the resources available to it were depleted (which will be referred to again later), which means that the government's and sponsors' support remained essential to its continued expansion and support of struggling smallholder farmers. LIMA thus needs to expand its operations by

scaffolding its training and workshop sessions and allowing development and growth among increasing numbers of land recipients in Hammarsdale.

### *5.3.2.3 Accessibility of resources*

The availability of and access to resources are fundamental for land reform projects and their programmes to continue running successfully. The scarcity of resources available to all stakeholders involved in land reform programmes and land redistribution projects is often a stumbling block that causes the demise of these programmes. Therefore, agencies that implement and drive these programmes need resources to ensure effective and sustainable land reform programs, while the beneficiaries of these programme also need resources in order to ensure continued functionality and sustainability. LIMA as an agent of land reform and the land redistribution programme in Hammarsdale was fortunate in this regard as it had access to ample resources to run the programme that was launched in 2016. The organisation thus made significant progress and achieved various successes in terms of land reform and the land redistribution programme. One of the LIMA officials iterated this success as follows:

LIMA has had the skills, resources and expertise to fully execute the land reform program in Hammarsdale until the final stage where we exit the programme. LIMA ensured that, by the time we have to exit the program, our land recipients are fully equipped with all the resources and skills to become successful farmers that can work independently without assistance from government or another NGO. (LIMA official 2; Female, Aged 29)

The other official endorsed this statement and added the following comment:

We managed to keep to our targets and deadlines with the land reform program in Hammarsdale. We also managed to spend and spread our funding over the years to ensure that all the required skills, support and training were imparted to the land recipients. The land recipients were provided with sufficient equipment, tools, transport, seedlings, and compost and they were given sufficient training for them to continue functioning as improved small-scale farmers. The Department of Agriculture and the Municipality also assisted by providing support and resources to these land recipients where there were shortages, such as fencing, Jojo (water) tanks, and farming equipment. (LIMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

Access to and the availability of resources and funding from LIMA were key to the land recipients' successes, sustainability, and the development of their farming acumen in Hammarsdale. The literature warns that smallholder farming often fails and becomes unsustainable if there is a lack of resources such as land, working equipment, capital, support services (from the private sector and the state), and available markets that support smallholder farmers by providing facilities to sell their produce (Lahiff & Cousins, 2005).

#### 5.3.2.4 *Improvement and sustainability of livelihoods*

As is the case with all development programmes, the success of the smallholder farmers could only be measured by the results, impacts, or goals that they were able to achieve. Regarding the land redistribution programme and the development of land recipients that were driven by LIMA in Hammarsdale, it was vital that the programme's objectives had to be achieved. One of the objectives that had to be fulfilled by LIMA was to ensure that sustainable strategies were in place to improve the livelihoods of both current and future land recipients, as poverty in the area will be difficult to eradicate entirely in the space of a few years. Ellis (2000) argues that successful programs thus require sustainable opportunities for land recipients that will enable them to survive, improve their standard of living, and eradicate poverty. However, one of the LIMA officials mentioned that there had been *some* improvement in the lives of *some* land recipients who had listened to them and fully executed the skills that they had been taught by LIMA. Ideally, those skills were intended to result in the improvement of many livelihoods and the establishment of a host of sustainable farmers. In this regard, the official stated:

Their livelihoods have changed, and our farmers have grown, but it's still early days for them because land is scarce and therefore their gardens are not big enough for us to say that they can fully compete with large farms and large commercial farmers. Some of our farmers have seen a drop in their profits since September 2019 when LIMA pulled back on certain support such as transport, membership fees and packaging. (LIMA official 2; Female, Aged 29)

The above comment revealed that there was some improvement in the livelihoods of land recipients, but that it seemed to be only sustainable as long as the agency provided both physical and financial support. When such support was withdrawn, collapse was imminent. This implies that the improvement in the livelihoods of the affected land recipients was minimal as they were likely to fail in executing the skills they had been taught. This suggests that smallholder farmers who are supported through upliftment programmes may suffer from an inability to

fully compete with larger commercial markets and commercial farmers once external support is withdrawn. This is evident in the fact that some land recipients saw a decline in their profits and standard of living because their day-to-day expenses became untenable as soon as LIMA pulled out and stopped supporting transport costs, membership fees, packaging expenses, and the purchasing of seedlings. When this happened, some land recipients soon made a loss as their expenses became larger than the profits they had been making, which of course diminished their chances of gaining a sustained livelihood. Niehof (2004) reported a similar finding and commented on the inability of the poor to access or create enough assets or capabilities to render them able to create sustained livelihoods. Restrictions of resources and scarcity of land to produce crops thus impede improvement and limit the success of land recipients in Hammarsdale because they cannot produce foods at the demand of larger and formal commercial markets where real profits are made due to larger orders and purchases. Land recipients thus seem unable to fully immerse themselves in the commercial farming industry when support is withdrawn. Walker (2003) and Dlamini (2016) also confirm that access to land becomes crucial when it comes to the enhancement and sustainability of livelihoods. One lesson that might be learnt from this finding is that when the poor are supported materially and financially and start making a profit, they should be taught how to transform that profit into wealth instead of using it for the consumption and purchasing of luxury goods.

However, there were a few success stories involving some land recipients who managed to improve and sustain their wealth even after the withdrawal of LIMA from the project. One official commented that there was encouraging improvement in the skills of some land recipients who had learnt to manage their finances and businesses well through effective bookkeeping and banking practices. This is an indication that training was beneficial for some land recipients in Hammarsdale. This argument was supported by the other official who stated the following:

Last year alone, the Hammarsdale Farmers Association managed to make about a million rand in profits. So, they have managed to move from making a mere hundred rand a month or five hundred rand a year to a million rand a year as an association in Hammarsdale. (LIMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

This comment demonstrates that there was some improvement in the livelihoods of a group of land recipients in Hammarsdale and that LIMA's intervention resulted in significant profits

following their support, training, and skills development project. As a result, some of the land recipients learnt to run sustainable businesses to support their families. They managed to enhance their livelihoods, ensure food security, and were able to escape from poverty and unemployment by engaging in sustainable small-holder farming activities.

Some land recipients agreed that their livelihoods had improved since their involvement in cooperatives and the assistance rendered by LIMA. They particularly mentioned the resources they had received and the skills they had acquired through training sessions and workshops. The resources they received included seedlings and farming equipment while the training focused on how to plant different vegetables and package them for the consumer market. The land recipients admitted that, after receiving these resources and acquiring these skills, they started to see improvement and a change in their livelihoods. A similar finding is mentioned by Ellis (2000), who comments that when beneficiaries are offered the right opportunities and strategies, they can improve their standard of living and that is when improved and sustainable livelihoods become visible. Some land recipients also stated that, after receiving assistance and support from LIMA, their income and productivity became sustainable. For instance, one of the land recipients stated the following:

During training and workshop sessions offered by LIMA, we learnt which vegetables to plant where and when and which vegetables would sell and make it to the markets faster. So, we end up making more money because we don't plant vegetables that won't sell. Also, the quality of our vegetables has improved because we know the right seasons and where to plant them in the garden. (Land recipient 8; Male, Aged 56)

This response demonstrates that this land recipient learnt to generate and maintain a sustainable income by ensuring that quality produce is planted in the right season as it will then sell and ensure a good profit margin.

The land recipients understood that, in order to survive and improve their livelihoods, they needed to ensure that their assets were productive and sustainable, and their capabilities enhanced so that they would be equipped to create a sustainable income and live free of poverty. A land recipient divulged the following:

We understand that land needs constant nurturing and preservation and LIMA has taught us that the same produce cannot be planted in the same patches or sections of land but must be planted alternatively in different sections in our gardens. In some

seasons some patches need to rest to replenish the soil. (Land recipient 4; Female, Aged 50)

This land recipient understood that preserving the land so that it becomes sustainable for continued productivity is important. Morse and McNamara (2013) also endorse this point and argue that land that is allocated to the previously disadvantaged needs to be cultivated appropriately to ensure long-term benefits that will sustain future generations. From the responses it was clear that the land recipients firmly believed that they were sufficiently skilled to earn an income and sustain their livelihoods. Moreover, they were adamant that they knew how to maintain the land that had been allocated to them and they were ready to develop their skills, while most hoped to be allocated more land one day so that they may live an even more prosperous life.

It is therefore evident that LIMA, as an implementing agency, guided some land recipients to procure improved and sustained livelihoods. Conversely, some land recipients achieved minimal improvement resulting in restricted sustainability. Moreover, both officials from LIMA concurred that land recipients in Hammarsdale would only achieve improved and sustainable livelihoods if they properly execute and utilise the knowledge, skills, training, resources, and financial management that provided. For the most part, LIMA extended its resources and capabilities to land recipients to ensure that they were capacitated to gain sustainable livelihoods. However, it is also evident that the implementation of the land redistribution program in Hammarsdale failed to some degree in its goal to reduce poverty through “enabling assets and capabilities that have allowed land recipients to cope, recover and maintain a sustainable livelihood” (Chambers & Conway, 1992:125). It became clear that, for the successful achievement of sustainable livelihoods, land recipients who are initially dependent on external support for the acquisition of proper farming skills and access to land and resources (i.e., human and financial capital) need to harness the will to function independently as such support cannot sustain them indefinitely. If these people do not embrace independence and utilise their profits as growing capital for future self-sustainability, minimal growth will occur, and such farmers will fall back to their previous condition of poverty and dependence.

### **5.3.3 Transition from subsistence farming to commercial farming**

Historically the commercial farming sector was predominately sustained by white farmers. A vast majority of agricultural land was in the hands of white farmers while the black population

had limited access to arable land. As a result, the black population and rural communities in South Africa could only farm on a small scale and strictly for household consumption purposes, food security, and household welfare. Based on the objectives of land reform policies, LIMA intervened to redress the wrongs and unjust policies of the apartheid regime which deprived mainly black people from owning land and having access to the commercial farming sector (Hall, 2009). Before LIMA's execution of land reform programs in Hammarsdale, the land recipients in this area farmed only for consumption purposes. Many merely planted staple foods in their gardens and rarely sold any produce for profit. Instead, farming was a means of ensuring food security and eliminating the prospect of imminent hunger (Thamaga-Chitja & Morojele, 2014).

The data revealed that land had already been allocated to smallholder farmers in Hammarsdale prior to LIMA's involvement in driving the land redistribution program in this area. However, these land recipients were farming to escape poverty and food insecurity while only a small portion of their produce made its way to small local markets. Against this backdrop, the Land Reform Policy and rural development initiatives envisioned the development of smallholder farmers who would participate profitably in and have gainful access to the commercial farming sector.

LIMA as an NGO and a land reform implementing agency changed the mindset of some land recipients in Hammarsdale. They helped them change from being producers for home and household consumption to becoming self-contained farmers who generated a sustainable income and experienced improved livelihoods. In this context, LIMA became an agent that worked tirelessly towards transforming land recipients from subsistence farmers into profitable commercial farmers. One of the officials from LIMA mentioned the following:

One big intent LIMA has is that we want to grow these land recipients from being subsistence farmers to becoming commercial farmers that can earn a sustainable income. We envision that the land recipients in the Hammarsdale area will be independent and able to or capable of competing with large commercial markets. (LIMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

Training sessions and workshops on organic farming skills were trained were offered by LIMA. These sessions prepared the land recipients for the challenges of commercial farming. In this process, they learnt to adapt their farming skills and turn their farms into viable and sustainable

businesses. The land recipients themselves revealed that these training sessions and workshops helped them to improve the quality of their produce and increase their productivity to meet the demands of larger markets. The land recipients further submitted that LIMA also upskilled them on how to package fresh produce before transporting it to markets. They were also provided with transport for the delivery of these products to viable markets. Once land recipients had proven their readiness as producers for larger markets, LIMA linked them with such markets which they then served from the basis of various cooperatives. This marked the beginning of the land recipients' transition from being subsistence farmers to becoming commercial farmers who were able to ensure food security and earn a sustainable income. Some land recipients soon realised that they could make profits and earn an income as commercial farmers instead of farming only to feed their households. Lahiff and Cousins (2005) argue that many smallholder farmers are slowly realising that they can farm staple foods for household consumption while some food products can be produced for local and other markets. One of the officials from LIMA echoed this notion as follows:

We don't want land recipients to farm only to eat, but we want them to farm to make money which will achieve our vision of creating job opportunities. (LIMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

The transformation of land recipients from subsistence farmers into commercial farmers meant that they could generate an income and function as business entrepreneurs who earned money and made profits. As mere land recipients, many remained unemployed and earned no income other than what they could use to ensure household food security. The other LIMA project manager commented on this as follows:

Before we intervened as LIMA, land recipients were not producing a lot and were not producing well. So, when LIMA came in with their training and support for farming and planting, it changed the way our farmers now produce. They now produce large quantities, and they produce food of good quality. We have been able to guide them to work together by forming an association of farmers in Hammarsdale. The farmers can now produce in bulk and can make huge profits by selling their produce to larger markets. Some of these farmers are no longer working in isolation and are able to expand their gardens. (LIMA official 2; Female, Aged 29)

The transformation from subsistence farming to commercial farming in the Hammarsdale area required that LIMA train land recipients properly and prepare them for the commercial farming

sector, which demands good quality produce, large quantities of produce, and reputable businesses underpinning crop sales. The findings confirm that LIMA was able to achieve this by encouraging farmers to form cooperatives, produce in bulk, produce organically, and produce foods of good quality. LIMA also upskilled the land recipients to ensure proper marketing and packaging practices. To shift from subsistence to commercial farming entailed that the land recipients had to work harder and longer hours in the fields. One land recipient described their success as follows:

We have grown as farmers and make big profits from farming. We are motivated to grow even more and have more farmland so that we can sell our produce provincially and even nationally because we have seen that there is a lot of money that you can make from agriculture. (Land recipient 10; Female, Aged 56)

This comment concurs with Lahiff and Cousins's (2005) view that the agricultural sector can generate great financial rewards and can be an effective tool in eradicating poverty and unemployment. Moreover, effective farming practices contribute to economic growth and sustainable livelihoods. Land recipients in Hammarsdale admitted that they shifted from farming for the purpose of food security to farming for meeting the demands of large local markets for economic growth and a sustainable income. One of the land recipients stated the following:

We have to use all our farmland to plant vegetables so that we can sell them in bulk to large markets because they order in bulk. (Land recipient 4; Female, Aged 50)

This iterates the point that land recipients were tasked to increase their productivity in order to gain entry to new markets and to provide produce that could be sold at larger markets that served the commercial farming sector. Previously, however, land recipients had used only a small portion of their land and gardens, but soon some learnt how to maximise the use of their land and cultivate it to full capacity in order to meet the demands of their target markets.

LIMA's role in imparting farming skills and knowledge to land recipients in Hammarsdale allowed many to become more competent and attracted to commercial farming. As a result, many land recipients learnt how to make large profits from their hard labour and participation in the commercial farming sector with the help and support of LIMA. Some land recipients from Hammarsdale admitted during the interviews that they had grown as farmers and had become smallholder farmers who provided quality produce to larger markets. They attested to the fact that they had moved from being mere subsistence farmers to farmers who increased

their productivity and the quality of their produce to access the commercial farming sector. This growth also led to growth in financial independence and sustainable development, which in turn resulted in sustainable livelihoods. Some of these farmers gained the potential for further and independent growth and development. This outcome of the redistribution of land policy is also testament to what Thamaga-Chitja and Morojele (2014) suggest, which is that when smallholder farmers have enhanced accessibility to markets, it potentially enhances their sustainability, eradicates household food insecurity, and addresses the issues of inequality and poverty in South Africa.

#### **5.3.4 Market linkages**

The commercial farming sector is very competitive, and it therefore demands quality produce speedily and in bulk at very competitive prices. This study discovered that entrance into the commercial farming sector is often very difficult for smallholder farmers such as the land recipients in Hammarsdale. This is because smallholder farmers often cannot meet the demands of the commercial farming sector and the high standards that its markets demand. However, as required by the objectives of land reform and land redistribution policies, government and its stakeholders – such as NGOs – are expected to enhance smallholders' capabilities and accessibility to markets and the commercial farming sector.

The study found that LIMA, as a supporting and implementing agency in Hammarsdale, managed to strengthen and build some land recipients' capabilities and skills to enable them to gain access to the commercial farming sector. Officials employed by LIMA attested to the fact that they had managed to transform land recipients into subsistence farmers that focused on their farming practices for both consumption and commercial gain. Furthermore, upskilling through training and monitoring was executed by LIMA to ensure various land recipients' readiness to access the commercial farming sector. In this regard, an official from LIMA stated the following:

In 2016, LIMA began a series of training initiatives to prepare land recipients for enhanced farming practices and, when they were ready, we began managing land recipients and then secured market linkages for them to large enterprises such as SPAR, RCL Foods, and other formal local markets. Managing land recipients involved monitoring how they did their bookkeeping and executed their sales. We also recorded and assessed how they did their packaging because now they were no longer selling to community members alone, but they were also selling to bigger markets. This is the

phase in which we are now at as LÍMA. So, we are done with all the training because now they have all the skills that they need to become successful commercial farmers. (LÍMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

The LÍMA employees confirmed that land recipients from Hammarsdale had received training that rendered them capable of selling to larger local enterprises such as the SPAR franchise. It is evident that LÍMA adhered to its mandate as they transformed some land recipients from being subsistence farmers to becoming commercial farmers that yielded large profits and ran sustainable businesses. LÍMA made a deep impact on the lives of many smallholder farmers by contributing to their well-being and sustainability and enriching their livelihoods by linking them with local and larger markets where they could sell their produce profitably. Moreover, LÍMA not only secured markets for some successful land recipients, but it also ensured that the packaging of produce was appropriate and attractive. Skills in financial literacy and bookkeeping methods were also provided by LÍMA during training sessions to ensure that the trainee land recipients made real profits, understood budgetary practices, and made decisions that would keep their businesses functional and sustainable. The findings suggest that a high level of financial literacy and education is an important tool in ensuring that smallholder farmers remain sustainable and survive in the commercial farming sector. This notion is also supported by Lahiff and Cousins (2005), who state that smallholder farmers usually fail when they lack market readiness due to a lack of capabilities, limited skills, low levels of education, and poor infrastructure.

LÍMA thus ensured that land recipients would be ready for local markets and the commercial farming sector. One of the officials supported this statement as follows:

As LÍMA, we are at the phase of monitoring if they are implementing the skills that we have taught them and we assess whether their produce is suitable for the markets. We are also securing orders for these markets and handle that aspect for them since LÍMA has access to email and internet facilities – so we do the technical stuff for them. (LÍMA official 2; Female, Aged 29)

This is an indication that land recipients from Hammarsdale were prepared to be ready, equipped, and skilled for the commercial farming sector as they could then sell their produce to large local markets such as SPAR. However, the land recipients needed to learn to stand on their own feet in terms of securing orders and transporting produce to local markets with which

LÌMA had linked them. Some land recipient thus acquired the skills to maintain and extend their market linkages without the support and assistance of LÌMA. Such land recipients need to be technologically literate and run their businesses independently in a technologically advanced manner in order to immerse themselves effectively into the commercial farming sector.

The data revealed that LÌMA will not sustain land recipient farming operations indefinitely and that they will withdraw their support at some stage, as happened in Hammarsdale. To explain LÌMA's exit strategy, an official stated the following:

We are now training the land recipients to be independent and do these things by themselves instead of us doing it for them. We are now teaching them how to make and take orders, how to draft and respond to emails, and how to ensure that their sales records are recorded correctly. (LÌMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

This comment confirms that LÌMA was successful in preparing land recipients for the commercial farming sector as they assisted and supported them by securing and linking them with larger local markets where they could market, package, and sell in bulk to generate larger profits. LÌMA thus successfully achieved the vision of land reform by investing in smallholder farmers' capabilities, improving their economic growth, and allowing them to access formal commercial farming markets. LÌMA initiated linkages between land recipients and various neighbouring markets for which some soon produced fresh quality food and subsequently generated a sustainable income. However, sustainability will only be assured if upcoming farmers can improve their operations and meet supply and demand in the long term. At the time of the study, some of the farmers had become very successful, and one of the officials from LÌMA made the following comment to support this:

Local markets are now able to get fresh produce at their doorstep because of these small-scale farmers. (LÌMA official 2; Female, Aged 29)

The LÌMA participants were confident that some of the land recipients in Hammarsdale were able to provide produce regularly and to the satisfaction of local markets despite the challenges that they faced from time to time in terms of transport and sustained productivity.

### **5.3.5 The formation of cooperatives and a farmers' association in Hammarsdale**

A cooperative is defined as an association that consists of persons who come together and work together to achieve the same goals and have the same interests that will enhance their socio-economic status (Ortman & King, 2007). The formation of cooperatives becomes very important as far as smallholder farmers and their participation in the commercial farming sector are concerned. Smallholder farmers have reaped many successes and achieved fair financial gains by forming and being part of cooperatives. This is because smallholder farmers produce food on a small scale, but when they function alongside others as members of cooperatives, they often increase their productivity and this enables them to access and compete in the commercial farming sector. An official from LIMA stated the following in this regard:

We had to ensure that all the land recipients in Hammarsdale were registered under recognised registered cooperatives. This is because land in Hammarsdale is scarce and farmers need to farm and work together in order to increase productivity and produce foods in bulk. (LIMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

It was also noted by the other official that membership of cooperatives was important for the success of the project:

We had to get some cooperatives formally registered again because some had expired certificates and cooperatives weren't existing or reflected in the system because some had changed the name of their cooperative and some had failed to pay or update their membership. (LIMA official 2; Female, Aged 29)

An official from LIMA also stated the following:

Our land recipients can now produce large quantities and they produce foods of good quality. We have been able to get them to work together by forming cooperatives and a farmers' association in Hammarsdale. (LIMA official 2; Female, Aged 29)

According to the study findings, membership of some kind of farmers' association is instrumental in easing access to commercial markets for smallholder farmers. Dube (2016) stresses that such organisations encourage competitiveness, strengthen productivity, ensure food security, and enhance employment opportunities for famers. Membership of such an association means that a land recipient can produce in larger quantities to meet the demands of larger markets that buy in bulk. Some land recipients endorsed this notion and agreed that the

formation of cooperatives for farmers helped to strengthen their competitiveness and encouraged productivity, as farmers began to produce quality products which, in turn, enhanced sales and profits for the members of the various cooperatives. Ortman and King (2007) agree that the formation of cooperatives is a useful strategy when members work together and share their skills, labour, and resources in order to improve their economic status and profits and enhance their livelihoods. It thus follows that LIMA successfully encouraged farmers to be registered as members of cooperatives, which increased their productivity and profits.

One of the officials from LIMA also confirmed that production and profits increased as he made the following statement:

Farmers now can produce in bulk and can make huge profits by selling to larger markets. The farmers are no longer working in isolation and are able to now expand their gardens. (LIMA official 2; Female, Aged 29)

Land recipients in Hammarsdale undeniably benefited from cooperative membership as this enabled them to develop as farmers and to provide adequate food supplies to local markets in Hammarsdale. Land recipients were also encouraged to meet the demands of market linkages. The land recipients who were interviewed agreed that their membership of cooperatives strengthened their household food security and income. One of the land recipients stated the following point, which was also raised by all the others:

Being a member of this co-op [cooperative], I have found myself a family and it has changed my life because I have learnt so much from these members. Also, being a member of this co-op has enabled me to provide food and vegetables to my family without going to the shops and still make an income from our sales, and this allows me to buy other necessities like school uniforms and stationery for the kids. (Land recipient 8; Female, Aged 71)

From this response, it is evident that the land recipients' participation in a cooperative helped to reduce poverty, increase food security, and enhance employment opportunities, which are all aspects of land redistribution policies and the vision of the Department of Rural Development and Agriculture. Indeed, it is for this reason that the formation of cooperatives is described as "a self-help method to counter extreme conditions of poverty" (Ortman & King, 2007:21) that are caused by unemployment, hunger, limited incomes, skills, and capabilities.

What is noteworthy is that LIMA also encouraged all cooperatives in Hammarsdale to form a farmers' association that would incorporate and represent all cooperatives in Hammarsdale. One of the officials from LIMA revealed the following:

All farmers in Hammarsdale now belong to one association so that no one misses out, and this will now ensure that if there are new people coming in, it is now up to the existing farmers to train and upskill them. We have done this so that they can survive and be sustainable even after we have left Hammarsdale. (LIMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

This notion of a collaborative association for various cooperatives is supported by Sibanda (2001), who agrees that when cooperatives form an association, all farmers become involved in decision making and this then ensures that all farmers become equipped with indigenous knowledge and advanced technological skills, all of which enable them to become better and more equitable farmers. Therefore, LIMA's efforts to encourage all land recipients in Hammarsdale to belong to one farmers' association enabled them to work together and ensured that all their interests and goals were represented and protected by the association. Currently, all the cooperatives in the different wards in Hammarsdale collaborate under one association that governs and represents all the smallholders in this area.

In a discussion on the importance of membership of a farmers' association during one of the interviews, a land recipient stated the following:

Having a farmers' association has helped us a lot because we can all meet as farmers of Hammarsdale under this association and share our problems, knowledge, and skills with other farmers. Even when we face challenges as a co-operative, the Hammarsdale Farmers' Association is always willing to help and support us in what we need. (Land recipient 7; Male, Aged 56)

This comment demonstrates that the Hammarsdale Farmers' Association attended to the needs of all smallholder farmers and looked after them. Another land recipient from one of the cooperatives also reiterated this point by stating the following:

The Hammarsdale Farmers' Association has allowed us to meet as farmers of Hammarsdale and decide which cooperative should produce which type of vegetable and when. (Land recipient 4; Female, Aged 50)

This type of diversification in an agricultural setting where competition is rife is an effective strategy that allows all cooperatives to thrive and generate profits, as their members produce crops that are in demand in a manner that is fairly and equitably distributed. In this way all cooperatives make a profit, and their members earn a fair income. This avoids the threat of planting less than the demand or planting vegetables that will not sell on the open market. It also alleviates the possibility of the over production of one crop that will force prices to drop and profit margins to shrink. The impact of a farmers' association can thus be positive, and it engenders effectiveness and enables inclusivity and unity amongst its members. Boyce et al. (2005) agree with this notion by stating that farmers' associations are often effective in establishing a basis for a more inclusive economy that ensures growth and allows its members equal opportunities to make profits and gain access to commercial markets. Moreover, the establishment of a farmers' association also strengthens land recipients' skills, resources and knowledge, which are skills that in turn enhance their capabilities as farmers. This point was demonstrated by the success and achievements of some smallholder farmers in Hammarsdale. In conclusion, it is noted that the legal establishment of cooperatives and a farmers' association in Hammarsdale, which was strongly encouraged by LIMA, proved to be beneficial to some smallholder farmers. These cooperatives and the farmers' association encouraged a culture of inclusion, representation, unity, and cooperation among the smallholder farmers in this area. Under the protection of these structures, profits were yielded, and skills were strengthened. Moreover, resources were made available to and shared among various farmers while collaboration enhanced their knowledge and fuelled their confidence to improve their farming practices. Ultimately, membership of these entities led to improved economic viability, access to commercial markets, improved bulk production, and improved quality of produce. To achieve these outcomes, these farmers had to learn to harness the right skills, use their newly acquired knowledge, and utilise their resources effectively and wisely.

#### **5.4 LIMA's Achievement of the Objectives for Land Reform in Hammarsdale**

LIMA, as an agent for land reform and land redistribution in Hammarsdale, established its own vision and goals for the community that it was mandated to upskill in Hammarsdale. One of the officials from LIMA stated:

As an implementing agency, LIMA prides itself in the fact that it is an agricultural specialist and a competent and reputable agency with years of experience in the field. (LIMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

From 2016 to as recent as 2019, LÌMA essentially existed to execute the land reform program in Hammarsdale and to fill in any gaps that might occur in the execution of this policy. Its vision for this project was in line with the objectives of the Land Reform Policy of South Africa. As mentioned by one of the key officials from LÌMA, its vision at the commencement of the program for land recipients in Hammarsdale was the following:

Our first goal was to create smallholder farms that farm sustainably, and thus increase opportunities for job creation and employment. Those were our main goals as LÌMA. We also wanted to increase the income of the different households and reduce poverty, hunger, and unemployment in Hammarsdale. (LÌMA official 2; Female, Aged 29)

This vision mirrored the objectives of land reform which are to eradicate poverty, increase household income, ensure food security in disadvantaged households, and reduce unemployment through agricultural activities that are driven by land reform initiatives. The above response suggests that the LÌMA representatives felt very confident that their vision would be achieved and that their initiatives would be executed in the program that was launched in 2016. The LÌMA officials firmly believed that this NGO's expertise base was instrumental in its ability to properly manage and execute the land reform program in Hammarsdale. By training and upskilling land recipients and improving their practices, various smallholder farmers became competent in running sustainable businesses. Moreover, land recipients in the Hammarsdale area managed to increase their household incomes and some even managed to attain sustainable livelihoods as they freed themselves from poverty and hunger. LÌMA thus achieved the goals of land reform and rural development such as improving household welfare, alleviating poverty, improving livelihoods, curbing unemployment, and increasing food security (Hall, 2009). One of the officials mentioned the following:

Our big intent as LÌMA is that we want to grow these land recipients from being subsistence farmers to becoming commercial farmers that can generate a sustainable income. We envision the land recipients in Hammarsdale to be independent and able to or capable of competing with other markets. That is why one phase of our project was to assist them with access to markets so that they could compete with other commercial farmers. Therefore, we don't want them to only farm to eat, but they also need to farm to help others to eat – so in turn our vision of creating job opportunities will also be achieved. (LÌMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

The above comment suggests that LIMA strove to empower the land recipients in the Hammarsdale area. LIMA also embraced the vision of land recipients entering the commercial farming sector, improved food security, and reduced unemployment statistics in Hammarsdale. Serrat (2008), a proponent of the sustainable livelihoods approach, argues that when implementing agencies enhance the skills, knowledge, resources, and competencies of their beneficiaries, their vulnerability will be limited, and food security will be increased. In turn, beneficiaries will generate increased household incomes, and this will lead to a better life and the personal well-being of all (Serrat, 2008). Furthermore, the two key officials from LIMA were confident in that they had managed to make an impact on the livelihoods of the land recipients in Hammarsdale, because they had started off on the right foot by teaching them the basics of farming. They then gradually groomed these smallholder farmers to abolish their subsistence farming practices and to embrace the challenges of entering commercial farmers' markets. In this process, the support of cooperatives was vital. One official from LIMA attested to the value of training as follows:

Through our training programs, we taught the land recipients how to measure their sales and profits because previously they would just sell without recording the results. We also taught them proper packaging, branding, and marketing skills which they had not been aware of before. With the support and skills development programs we offered over the years, we saw our farmers becoming respectable. Some can now even employ young people that are unemployed to assist them in their gardens. We have watched our farmers grow to become good businesswomen and -men because of our assistance. They now sell to big markets, have skills and business ethics, and contribute to the farming sector [in Hammarsdale]. (LIMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

The above comments demonstrate that LIMA fulfilled its responsibilities and achieved its objectives as an agent of land reform in Hammarsdale – at least to some extent, as will be explained later when the challenges this organisation experience will be discussed. After commencing its operations in 2016 in Hammarsdale, LIMA soon invested in human capital by equipping smallholder farmers with various skills, offering training programs, providing various resources, and supporting the land recipients in the area. As a consequence, LIMA enhanced the capabilities of these farmers and assisted them in ensuring longevity and maintaining and sustaining their livelihoods. Productivity increased in Hammarsdale and various crops were soon sold profitably in open markets.

The sustainable livelihoods approach that this study utilised confirms that livelihoods can only be sustained if capabilities and assets (material, human, natural, financial, and social) are enhanced for long term applicability (Morse & McNamara, 2013). This notion is supported by the capability approach, which articulates that if beneficiaries' capabilities are strengthened, they can ultimately contribute to enhancing their well-being by being able to do what they value for what they value (Sen, 1998). The human development approach that underpinned this study also underscores LIMA's role and the impact that it made on people's lives, as the interventions that this NGO initiated in the 2016 programme enhanced people's capabilities and helped them to grow and develop (Robeyns, 2007).

#### **5.4.1 Growth in income**

When referring to the various activities that the land recipients embarked on, they mentioned that they were grateful that they had managed to grow their income. One of the contributory factors they mentioned was the fact that they had shifted from farming solely for consumption purposes to commercial farming. The outcomes of this transition improved their financial status, ensured food security, and generated profits. Simmons et al. (2009) and Boyce et al. (2005) argue that land reform and land redistribution programmes are powerful strategies for rural development involving the poor, particularly if they are taught to use land productively in order to eradicate hunger and sustain food security. In more recent times, land reform and land redistribution programmes in South Africa have graduated from merely ensuring food security to securing a sustainable income and economic growth for the poor. The land recipients in Hammarsdale, with the assistance of LIMA and the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development, by their own admission managed to transform from being subsistence farmers to commercial farmers with access to formal markets where they sold their produce in order to make a profit and ensure an income.

The land recipients who participated in LIMA's 2016 project in Hammarsdale were mostly elderly women who had previously farmed for household consumption only. They had scraped together a living in this manner and had managed to procure only a little money to feed their families with produce that came directly from their gardens. One of the land recipients described her experiences of this kind of survival and the transition to more profitable farming practices as follows:

We have been farming because we grew up farming and it is a skill we acquired from our elders who taught us that farming your own produce was a skill that would ensure

that you never go hungry. We only farmed to put food on the table and if there was a lot of produce, we would often give some to the needy or sell it to our neighbours at a small price. However, LÌMA taught us that if we are dedicated, we can do serious business and earn serious money for our efforts. (Land recipient 5; Female, Aged 74)

This comment endorses the point that LÌMA was responsible for transforming subsistence farmers into commercial farmers who were well equipped to partake in the commercial agricultural sector and earn a sustainable income. Another land recipient contributed the following insight:

Since we became involved with LÌMA, we have grown as farmers and so has our income and that is because we now farm more appropriately and cultivate quality produce on a larger scale [than before]. We sell this produce in bulk to fairly large markets. We have become real businesswomen and entrepreneurs now, thanks to LÌMA. I was even able to renovate and extend my family home. (Land recipient 4; Female, Aged 50)

This testimony confirms that LÌMA equipped land recipients with adequate skills, knowledge, and resources which enabled them to produce quality crops in larger quantities in order to generate larger incomes and profits. The literature also confirms that when human beings enjoy and make real use of the freedoms and opportunities given to them, they are rendered capable of creating a more prosperous life for themselves (Sen, 1998). In the same vein, some land recipients in Hammarsdale experienced financial growth with the assistance of LÌMA's training and skills enhancement programmes that improved their capabilities and rendered them effective, prosperous farmers.

To conclude, all the land recipients from the various cooperatives who participated in the study asserted that they had experienced improvement and growth in their income and lifestyles, although some did so for a limited period of time, as will be discussed later. With the support programmes and skills training initiated by LÌMA, the land recipients became increasingly confident to participate in more advanced agricultural activities and many managed to generate adequate profits from their endeavours. The latter is one of the objectives of the land reform program. The improvement of the economic feasibility and enhanced livelihoods of land recipients was a dream that was made real by investing in skills training and the provision of resources that enabled smallholder farmers to gain access to new markets. In this process their

sense of worth was enhanced as they became worthy participants in the commercial farming sector where personal and professional growth and the generation of a sustainable income are possible.

#### **5.4.2 Food security and poverty alleviation**

Historically, global land reform initiatives were largely initiated with the intent of assisting poor communities in rural areas that were subjected to harsh socio-economic conditions and a lack of opportunities. At the top of these adverse socio-economic conditions were poverty and food insecurity that were challenges that land reform programmes aimed to alleviate. Through land reform and land redistribution programs, land was transferred or made accessible for use by disadvantaged and displaced rural communities. They were tasked to use these patches of land productively for staple food production in the attempt to alleviate hunger and to strengthen their families' food security (Hall, 2004). An objective of the Land Reform Policy in South Africa, amongst many others, is to initiate land reform programs and initiatives in identified areas and to improve the welfare of land recipients in the quest to alleviate their poverty. LIMA embraced this policy and initiated a land reform program in Hammarsdale and sought to actively achieve the alleviation of poverty and improve the welfare of land recipients in this area in a sustainable manner. With the initiation of various developmental activities and training programmes that land recipients were exposed to thanks to LIMA, various land recipients in Hammarsdale were emancipated from poverty and are now able to feed their families and live a more advanced lifestyle. One of the land recipients offered the following comment:

Since I got into farming and joined this co-operative, my family and I have never gone hungry because we no longer have to buy staple foods. Whenever I need staple foods, I just pick fresh vegetables from one of our gardens and go home and cook a meal.  
(Land recipient 9; Female, Aged 71)

This comment is testament to the fact that the land redistribution program in Hammarsdale has ensured that land recipients have food security and that their families do not go without a meal at any time. Thus, the successful execution of the land redistribution program by LIMA has assisted in combatting – or at least alleviating – the scourge of poverty faced by many families in Hammarsdale. Another land recipient in the study endorsed this point:

As members of our co-operative, farming has enabled us to put food on the table for our families without having to go to the shops and buy food. This has also allowed us

to save money on groceries because we only spend money buying meat and cooking oil. (Land recipient 4; Female, Aged 50)

Another land recipient added the following:

We even share recipes of creative ways to cook the fresh produce from our gardens without spending money. This has allowed us to save and spend less from our earnings. (Land recipient 7; Female, Aged 71)

One participant referred to how much they had learnt thanks to LIMA:

Farming has been something we have been doing from a young age and we grew up at a time when our parents told us that you will never go hungry as long as you know how to work the garden. (Land recipient 5; Female, Aged 74)

This participant obviously implied that they had now learnt to utilise better farming practices. The above responses endorse what the literature relays of food security when farmers employ appropriate practices. Aliber (2005) for instance states that agriculture is one of the most effective methods to use when adversity needs to be addressed among disadvantaged communities where poverty is rife. This notion is shown to be true when the successes experienced by the land recipients in Hammarsdale are considered. Moreover, Jayne et al. (2003) concur with the above finding by arguing that real poverty reduction is dependent on agricultural productivity and development.

All in all, the land recipients agreed that participating in more appropriate agricultural activities had made many significant changes in and brought many improvements to their lives. They specifically referred to improvement in household food security and household income and the fact that they had been released from debilitating poverty. Land recipients who use appropriate farming methods are never short of food as long as they work hard and keep their gardens fully functional and productive. Moreover, they are knowledgeable enough to produce the best quality types of produce and then harvest and package these to be sold to neighbouring commercial markets. In this manner they make reasonable profits and earn an income that uplifts their financial status. Participation in more advanced farming activities thus elevated many land recipients in Hammarsdale to a position where they no longer experience poverty as they have become dedicated, passionate, and resilient farmers. Most importantly, their improvement as farmers is testament to the fact that the land redistribution program was

effective and that it fulfilled the objectives of various policies to alleviate poverty and increase household food security in Hammarsdale.

### **5.4.3 Employment opportunities**

The land reform and the land redistribution programs in South Africa not only aim to address the issue of poverty, but also to improve economic growth and the livelihoods and quality of life of previously disadvantaged individuals in this country. Some of many objectives of the Land Reform Policy in South Africa are to alleviate poverty and enhance employment opportunities through agricultural activities. The land redistribution program also seeks to do the same by ensuring that poverty and unemployment are reduced when land recipients use land productively to secure both wealth and food security for themselves. Land recipients in Hammarsdale agreed that agriculture, and particularly agriculture in the manner that was imparted to them through the support and assistance of LIMA, was an effective strategy that facilitated the generation of income and also made them successful entrepreneurs. One of the land recipients highlighted this point as follows:

Through agriculture, I now see myself as a real entrepreneur, with my own working hours and with an income that is more than what I made as a security guard. (Land recipient 2; Male, Aged 43)

Another land recipient agreed, and offered a comment in the same vein:

As a farmer, I never have the problem of seeking for employment or losing employment because farming is my job and it has sustained me and my family. I have my own gardens under this co-operative that I farm in my own time and that generate an income and food for me and my family. (Land recipient 1; Female, Aged 61)

These submissions underscore Bradstock's (2005) argument that land reform and land redistribution programs, when applied correctly, can be a tool that, if effectively utilised, can tackle poverty and unemployment and ensure sustainability and economic development in a democratic South Africa. Land recipients in Hammarsdale were enabled to create successful livelihoods for themselves when they applied the farming techniques they had learnt successfully. Some thus became successful entrepreneurs who participated (and some are still participating) in gainful agricultural activities. This participation in the agricultural farming sector exempted them from the scourge of unemployment and released them from the many financial challenges that are still faced by most disadvantaged groups in South Africa.

To underscore this finding, another land recipient offered the following comment:

I left my old job to become a farmer. In the factory where I worked, we worked long shifts for a very small pay. I started suffering from severe backache and foot pains, so I quit my old job to become a farmer. Here, I have my own working hours and can take as many breaks as I want. The money that I make from farming is dependent on my hard work and productivity. I can always calculate how much profits I can make based on my productivity and that's what often motivates me to work harder and be on the land more frequently. (Land recipient 3; Female, Aged 44)

Other land recipients in Hammarsdale also admitted that they had found solace in farming and that it was an escape from poverty and unemployment – or unsatisfactory employment – for them. Some were also able to secure a sustainable income based on their efforts that enhanced productivity and bore the fruits of their hard labour and dedication. The literature that was reviewed supports this theory as various authors agree that successful land redistribution programs can reduce poverty by boosting productivity and that it can also alleviate hunger through enhanced economic and sustainable opportunities extended to previously disadvantaged beneficiaries (De Villiers, 2017). This notion is also supported by Dlamini (2016), who states that it is productivity that will ensure poverty reduction and sustainable livelihoods, which is of course coupled with hard and dedicated land tilling. A land recipient from one of the biggest cooperatives in Hammarsdale revealed the following:

Since our cooperative consists of elderly women, we often become tired and worn out from the daily activities in our gardens. So, as there are times when we can't be working in the gardens, we have trained and employed young males to help us complete our daily activities. (Land recipient 5; Female, Aged 74)

Another land recipient from the same cooperative agreed, and added her insight:

My son, we are old and not as active as we used to be, so we now suffer from muscle aches and arthritis. That's why we need help from these young gentlemen who help us to carry water, water our vegetables, and plough the field. (Land recipient 8; Female, Aged 71)

It is noteworthy that these land recipients in Hammarsdale did not only reap the benefits of smallholder farming for themselves, but they extended the same opportunities and benefits to the youth (by implication unemployed young men) to improve their livelihoods and those of

others in the community, as they paid them a weekly wage. This suggests that the land redistribution program in Hammarsdale was effective in achieving its objectives of diminishing poverty and enhancing the livelihoods people as these elderly ladies contributed to the income of community members by creating jobs for them and extending employment opportunities in their community.

To conclude this section, it is reiterated that land redistribution can be an effective tool for curbing poverty and improving the livelihoods of previously disadvantaged communities as it may facilitate employment opportunities in the agricultural sector, which was aptly demonstrated in the case of the 2016 program that was launched in Hammarsdale, Kwa-Zulu-Natal.

#### **5.4.4 Improvement in quality and quantity of produce**

One of the outcomes of the 2016 project was LIMA's achievement to successfully impart agricultural skills and knowledge to former poorly equipped land recipients, to the extent that they were enabled to produce quality produce and market and sell these gainfully. It was previously mentioned in this chapter that land reform initiatives and the land redistribution program developed over time with a lot of hiccups and challenges. The development of and improvements due to these programmes entailed a close look and consistent review of the objectives which required various activities and actions from both beneficiaries and implementers to achieve their goals. Serrat (2008) states that if sustainable livelihoods are to be achieved, people's vulnerabilities need to be reduced by for instance increasing their food security which, in turn, relies on improved household income and improved well-being. There are many strategies to address these requirements and bring them to fruition, such as improving the quality of produce that farmers produce and increasing the quantity and types of produce that are taken to the market. LIMA embraced its mandate to develop smallholder farmers in Hammarsdale in a manner that equipped them to produce good quality harvests in large quantities by investing in and enhancing their skills and resources to do so. A land recipient in the study stated:

Before LIMA arrived in Hammarsdale we were farming so that we didn't have to go to the shops to buy vegetables, and we would sell these extra vegetables at a small price to our neighbours. But LIMA made us realise that we could sell to big shops and supermarkets if we worked hard and produced more vegetables. (Land recipient 11; Female, Aged 58)

This response suggests that LIMA encouraged land recipients to increase their productivity so that their produce could reach larger markets and eventually give them entry into the commercial farming sector. This process is also described in the literature by Lahiff and Cousins (2005), who state that large-scale productivity is essential if small-scale farmers want their food to make its way to larger markets. If they cultivate crops that are only sufficient for household consumption, poverty alleviation is only a dream and becomes a vicious cycle. However, the land recipients in Hammarsdale revealed that, after being involved with LIMA, they saw themselves as capable and efficient entrepreneurs that could make a living from agriculture. They also knew that they could generate higher profits by selling their freshly produced and quality products to larger markets. A land recipient explained this as follows:

LIMA taught us that we need to make sure we produce a lot of vegetables that are fresh and look good for the big stores that we sell our products to. We saw that if we did that, then these big markets begin to trust us to become their providers of fresh, quality products. (Land recipient 9; Female, Aged 47)

Adding to this comment, another land recipient stated:

LIMA also taught us how important it is to package our produce properly and to deliver them on time so that large markets trust us because we are professional. (Land recipient 11; Female, Aged 58)

The above comments clearly imply that LIMA managed to impart knowledge and teach skills to land recipients and that these imparted proficiencies allowed them to eventually enter the larger commercial farming sector. Moreover, these skills and knowledge gave these land recipients the ability to compete with larger farms that sold their crops to large commercial markets. It can also be concluded that LIMA guided the land recipients in Hammarsdale to realise the importance of marketing quality produce and producing harvests on a large scale to meet the demands of larger markets. Moreover, they soon understood the importance of creating a loyal client base in these larger markets by being reliable and professional, such as delivering quality produce that was appropriately packaged on time.

It thus follows that LIMA's intervention facilitated improvement in the quantity and quality of produce produced by the land recipients in Hammarsdale. In turn, their increased productivity had a positive impact on poverty and unemployment alleviation as well as household food

security in the homes of many Hammarsdale families associated with these developing smallholder farmers.

#### **5.4.5 Participation of women in need and the youth**

The land reform and the land redistribution programs in South Africa seek to redress the past injustices of the apartheid regime that discriminated against the most vulnerable groups in our society. These vulnerable groups include black South Africans and people of colour who were considered non-whites, as well as women of colour who are in need. These groups of people are included in the list of objectives of the Land Reform Policy and its land redistribution program as they aim to empower previously disadvantaged groups by giving them access to land that they were deprived of for residential, production, and consumption purposes. The Land Reform Policy of South Africa is a corrective policy that intends to change the patterns of land ownership in this country by taking ownership away from the hands of previously advantaged people and allowing access to that land to the previously disadvantaged in an attempt to curb poverty, food insecurity, and unemployment.

In the previous chapters it was stated that the Land Reform Policy envisions that most land recipients will be women and that fewer men will benefit. In light of the fact that women's enhancement is stated as a priority in the objectives of the Land Reform Policy, it is noteworthy that most of the women in this study singularly headed their households and were thus sole breadwinners who were responsible for their children's and even their grandchildren's upbringing. Most of the land recipients in this study were women and they revealed that they had either never been married or that they were widows who had a family and grandchildren that they needed to take care of and provide for. In this context, one of the land recipients revealed the following:

I lost my husband a long time ago and he was the one that provided for this family. Because I was already old and not educated when he died, I turned to farming to feed my family and used the money I received for the extra produce I sold to the locals.  
(Land recipient 5; Female, Aged 74)

This response is testament to the fact that land recipients are often women that are in need and who singularly head their households. Moreover, they turn to agriculture or farming to produce staple foods in order to feed their families. This phenomenon is also supported in the literature as various studies have found that it is embedded in the South African culture that women

engage in farming activities as part of their domestic chores in order to make their families and dependents less vulnerable to poverty (Thamaga-Chitja & Morojele, 2014). It is for this reason that the Land Reform Policy makes women a priority as the beneficiaries of land reform initiatives because they often singularly head households and are therefore most vulnerable and susceptible to poverty and food insecurity. LIMA as an agency that implements land redistribution programmes has clearly fulfilled the objective of focusing on and empowering rural women – who are primarily considered as vulnerable members of society – in the Hammarsdale area. This is in agreement with the views of Thamaga-Chitja and Morojele (2014), who state that the Land Reform Policy demands the transfer of land rights to women as it is, they who are the ‘foot soldiers’ of agriculture and food security in Africa.

In terms of these women’s ability to roll out their newly acquired land rights to other members of the Hammarsdale society and thus benefit their community members as well, one of the land recipients offered the following comment in the interview that I conducted with her:

The youngsters of today are lazy and do not realize that there’s money in farming. That is why we have taken some unfortunate and unemployed youngsters under our wing to train them, keep them busy and give them an income. This is so that they will realise that there are great financial rewards in farming and that a good living can be made off the land. We also employ them because we are old and cannot work such long hours in the fields like we used to, so these young boys help us in our daily activities, and we monitor and pay them. (Land recipient 5; Female, Aged 74)

This is an indication that the youth are also starting to become involved in farming and agriculture, which is an encouraging sign as high unemployment rates in South Africa negatively impact the youth. Moreover, young people are also starting to realise that the farming and agricultural sector can ensure food and job security and that they thus can earn a sustainable livelihood if they engage in farming activities.

A 20-year-old land recipient stated the following:

I got introduced to farming by these old ladies who needed help such as fetching water and watering the crops because they can no longer do heavy work or spend long hours in the fields. So, I offered to help, and they paid me for it. As time went on, they taught me all the skills of farming and gave me my own garden, and that’s when I started making more money because I could sell my produce and could feed my family by cooking meals with my own fresh produce. (Land recipient 6; Male, Aged 20)

If one assumes that the above participant discussed her situation and growing success with her peers and other community members, it may be an indication that many other unemployed youths will slowly enter the farming sector as they may be realising that there are financial rewards to be reaped in this sector.

In conclusion, it is clear that there is a growing tendency among rural women – both elderly and younger ones – to participate in the agricultural sector, and to particularly operate as smallholder farmers whose goal it is to improve the lives of their families and those of other members of their community as well. The findings thus suggest that the land redistribution program that was initiated by LIMA in the Hammarsdale area has benefited some of the most vulnerable groups in this society, as is envisioned by the Land Reform Policy and the land redistribution program. In turn, there has been visible improvement in the lives of some previously disadvantaged residents in Hammarsdale, as most participants admitted that they had earned and saved sufficient funds to upgrade their homes and live a life devoid of poverty. These land recipients' efforts have also contributed to improvement in food security in various households as well as a decline in poverty and unemployment rates.

## **5.5 Challenges and Constraints Associated with the Land Reform Program in Hammarsdale**

### **5.5.1 The relationship between LIMA and other stakeholders**

The execution of land reform initiatives in South Africa often requires the involvement of various stakeholders to fulfil of the Land Reform Policy's objectives. Achieving success with this policy also demands extensive coordination and interrelated relationships among various stakeholders who variously contribute their skills, resources, and knowledge to this cause. However, difficulties and challenges arise when some stakeholders lack competence, focus on their exclusive mandates, misunderstand the goals of the policy, and wish to achieve their own agendas and visions without considering the primary aim of land redistribution and restitution. These conflicting agendas often cause conflict and cause some stakeholders to work in isolation instead of in alliance with others. LIMA is an NGO that strives to execute land reform initiatives in Hammarsdale in alliance with other stakeholders such as government departments, the community of Hammarsdale, local markets, wider markets such as SPAR and RCL Foods, and land recipients. This stakeholder base is quite broad, and it seems inevitable

that conflict should either erupt or simmer under the surface if collaboration is fragmented. One of the key informants employed by LÌMA responded as follows when asked what the organisation's relationship was like with other stakeholders:

Well, in terms of government, we don't get enough support from them. For instance, the Department of Agriculture believe that we are already doing enough for the community of Hammarsdale. They feel that we don't need their help and they also feel that our standards, goals, and objectives are too high for them to attain. (LÌMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

This response is an indication that government lacks the will and even the insight to assist LÌMA as a stakeholder and it also indicates that LÌMA and the Department of Agriculture have different goals and a dissimilar vision for land recipients in Hammarsdale. This friction seems to result in conflict and, most particularly, in a lack of support from government for LÌMA's initiatives to implement the Land Reform Policy as required by the government itself. The literature iterates that governmental officials and representatives of relevant departments who have the political will and courage to drive the land redistribution programs should play a major role in ensuring that reform programmes attain success and address the needs of all the targeted stakeholders and, more specifically, the identified beneficiaries (Sikor & Muller, 2009).

The study also discovered that a lack of coordination among stakeholders such as government, NGOs, and other developmental agencies is a debilitating factor that instigates to the failure of some cooperatives in the agricultural sector (Dube, 2016). More particularly, government departments' inability to work closely with LÌMA was detrimental to the targeted land recipients and the community in the Hammarsdale area at crucial times. The findings thus suggest that it is vital that both LÌMA and government departments work collaboratively to improve and sustain the livelihoods of land recipients in the study area. Information that was elicited during the interviews revealed that officials from LÌMA still managed to execute much of the land reform program on a limited budget and under the guidance of their funders despite the lack of support from government. One official lamented the fact that the relevant department folded their hands and failed to step in when urgent resources were required to propel the programme. This person stated:

Our resources could only go so far, and the Department of Agriculture could have stepped in by providing water, irrigation systems, fencing, and the installation of Jojo

tanks. Because they have a budget as a government department they could have assisted and supported us when our resources were limited. (LÌMA official 2; Female, Aged 29)

The literature supports this comment by the LÌMA official, as Thamaga-Chitja and Morojele (2014) state that the South African government directs large financial resources towards smallholder farming, but that its impacts have, for the most part, been unclear. These authors reason that government does indeed have resources and should invest a lot of resources in land reform activities, especially in smallholder farming, but that the resources they provide never seem to make an impact or alternatively, never reach the proposed beneficiaries. Moreover, government's failure to support and work collaboratively with NGOs is testament to the fact that there is a lack of co-ordination and a lack of coalition between government and LÌMA and that any such breach in addressing the aims of the land reform program in any area is likely to impede success. However, the LÌMA representatives mentioned that they had a good relationship with other stakeholders such as the local counsellor of Hammarsdale. The official who provided this insight commented as follows:

When we need to host events, training sessions or meetings, the counsellor always assists us, and we don't have to pay for the venues. Also, whenever we have big events or tours of Hammarsdale for our stakeholders, he is always there to show support. So, whenever we also want to meet with the community, he is always there to support and arrange these meetings for us. (LÌMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

This statement illustrates that the only support that LÌMA received during the 2016 programme, and even after this program had concluded, was from the local counsellor of Hammarsdale. Therefore, as far as receiving support to execute the land redistribution program that would enhance the capabilities and productivity of land recipients was concerned, government did not support LÌMA and literally left it to its own devices. The officials also revealed that they often clashed with government departments regarding their goals. This more particularly occurred when government ignited a sense of entitlement among the land recipients by giving them handouts, whereas LÌMA wanted these land recipients to become independent through 'handup' initiatives. The officials admitted that this was problematic at times as government officials tended to make promises to land recipients that they never honoured, and LÌMA then had to take responsibility for government's inactions. One can only surmise that a political agenda was at the heart of these empty promises at times that it would be beneficial to these government officials to gain the support of local communities or, conversely, that the culture

of empty promises had become so entrenched in a society that had been devastated by an unjust socio-political arena that the agents that should serve the people had been desensitised to the real needs of communities at grassroots level.

As far as the relationship between LÌMA and other stakeholders is concerned, the officials concurred they had a relatively healthy relationship with the land recipients. Apart from a few land recipients who failed to utilise the skills they had been taught and disputes between cooperatives that arose from time to time, LÌMA representatives and training personnel were well able to forge strong bonds with the land recipients they supported.

However, during the interviews the two LÌMA officials mentioned that their relationship with one of the stakeholders was problematic and caused challenges for them. This conflict occurred between LÌMA and market representatives that they had to link up with land recipients. In this regard, a LÌMA official commented as follows:

Markets sometimes place orders and then cancel at the last minute because they found a different provider. At times, markets order in small quantities and then some cooperatives end up not making any profits. And at times, we have to deliver goods to far distant locations that ordered small quantities and the farmers end up making a loss because they have to pay the driver and petrol from their minimum profits. (LÌMA official 2; Female, Aged 29)

This suggests that the unreliability of markets can cause serious ramifications for LÌMA, particularly when orders are cancelled. This naturally results in losses for the land recipients as their produce gets spoilt, which results in unnecessary waste. In fact, this may also cause conflict between LÌMA and the land recipients when the latter demand that they be recompensed for their losses.

There was thus sufficient evidence that was offered frankly by the key officials that LÌMA faced various challenges when they had to work with other stakeholders to address the objectives of the Land Reform Policy. These challenges often arose when the stakeholders had different goals and a divergent vision for land reform in Hammarsdale.

Moreover, incompetency, unreliability, and a lack of professionalism and the will to succeed were also evident among other stakeholders involved in the upliftment project in Hammarsdale.

Proponents of the Land Reform Policy and scholars who have explored its efficacy and its implementation model have argued that the policy itself is not self-executing but rather relies on the dedication of affected stakeholders to achieve success (Frank et al., 2006). Therefore, ensuring the success of the policy and bringing it to fruition rely on an effective and collaborative relationship among all stakeholders. Only when this is achieved will all land recipients experience improved and sustainable livelihoods.

### **5.5.2 The dependency syndrome evident among land recipients**

The dependency syndrome is an attitude issue which can be described as the belief that a group of people adheres to that their current circumstances are inescapable and that they cannot solve their own problems without the help, support, or assistance from outside agents or other actors. Both the LIMA officials believed that a large group of land recipients in Hammarsdale suffered from this dependency syndrome as they held the firm belief that they could not stand on their own feet and that they were entitled to receive support and assistance from LIMA and government departments to address their issues and solve their poverty condition. The officials argued that this attitude was enhanced by the relevant government department's inability to honour the promises the officials made to the land recipients. As a result, LIMA experienced frustrating challenges in their efforts to counter the gaps that occurred due to the government department's unfulfilled promises. Moreover, the land recipients then became and remained reliant on government and LIMA to solve all their problems and address the shortfalls they experienced instead of becoming self-reliant or self-sufficient as skilled and knowledgeable entrepreneurs. An official from LIMA commented on this frustrating and debilitating issue as follows:

Government has the power and resources to give the farmers something without the farmers working for it, and the land recipients then become lazy and demanding. Whereas LIMA, on the other hand, tries to train our farmers to become independent and sustainable farmers. (LIMA official 2; Female, Aged 29)

It was this evident that there was a clash between government and LIMA because they did not work collaboratively towards the same goal. LIMA embraced their mandate to create independent and self-sufficient land recipients who could stand on their own feet, whereas officials from the government department behaved as if they were incapable of improvement and continued to supply them with all kinds of material support at no cost. This caused serious problems as neither government nor LIMA could ultimately meet all the demands of the land

recipients, whereas the land recipients remained comfortably under-developed as they believed that they were entitled to receive support and assistance from either LIMA or the government, or both. Moreover, when either the government or LIMA was unable to meet a demand or promises made to the land recipients, it made them seem unreliable and incompetent.

This appeared to be a catch 22 situation, because when the land recipients became dependent on either government or LIMA (or both) for their livelihood, then they ran the risk of allowing their businesses to fail. These land recipients were thus under severe threat of losing everything they had gained during the programme as they were running crumbling, collapsing, and unsustainable businesses soon after LIMA exited the program. This was directly against everything that LIMA had intended to achieve and their efforts to ensure that the land recipients were fully equipped to run their businesses effectively without any outside help, were counteracted by short-sighted government officials.

The question may be posed whether these land recipients who failed to stand on their own feet during the program had learnt enough to survive despite the collapse of governmental and NGO support. However, the scope of the study did not extend to the period after LIMA had exited the program, and future studies should thus continue this investigation to highlight the impact of government's inability to support land recipients in the absence of a supportive NGO or NGOs.

The dependency syndrome, as was witnessed among certain land recipients, is a weakness that will result in the demise of their businesses. Land recipients need to realise that not all their demands can be satisfied by LIMA or the government because resources eventually run out. It is also evident that government now needs to support LIMA's objective to gradually withdraw support from the land recipients in order to first encourage and then compel them to become self-reliant and utilise their profits and skills to sustain their businesses. Only when this happens will this worthy intervention program prove that it has contributed to improved and sustainable livelihoods.

### **5.5.3 Lack of resources**

Because policies that drive intervention programs are not self-executing but rely on the skills, resources, and expertise of various actors to be successful, it is important that intervention agencies such as NGOs and the government clearly understand the role they have to play in

such upliftment projects. For this reason, LIMA, which is an outside agency that had to implement a land reform initiative in Hammarsdale, could not completely or fully execute its mandate to assist land recipients without the necessary and appropriate skills, resources, and expertise. In terms of skills and expertise, LIMA is very confident in its capabilities, as an official from this organisation proclaimed as follows:

LIMA is an NGO that has been existing for over ten years and it has branches in all nine the provinces of South Africa. So, we have the experience, knowledge, and expertise to assist rural communities. Also, before LIMA executes any program in any community, we first ensure that we shall respond directly to the needs of that community. We assess what the community needs first, then we bring in the right experts to respond to those needs. (LIMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

This excerpt confirms that LIMA is an NGO with years of experience and that it may therefore be deemed competent and capable of implementing land reform initiatives in any area, as it attempted to do in Hammarsdale. In addition, LIMA ensured that it understood the needs of the Hammarsdale community, and it was therefore confident at first that it could respond effectively and directly to the needs of the community and, more particularly, to those of land recipients in this area. However, challenges were experienced as was attested by one of the officials from LIMA:

As LIMA, we have a limited budget and our resources can only go so far. But some of our land recipients face infrastructural challenges such as fencing and water irrigation needs, but we cannot assist them because of a limited budget. We also are planning our exit strategy and will be exiting the project next year because we are confident that the land recipients we served were adequately skilled and are now competent enough to run sustainable businesses. But also, the project has to end because we no longer have an adequate budget for it, and we are now investing the possibility to moving onto other projects elsewhere. (LIMA official 2; Female, Aged 29)

This submission demonstrates that LIMA, like most external agencies, is also exposed to financial constraints due to a limited budget which, in turn, limits the level and period of support it can provide to land recipients in a specific area. The support that is required is usually in the form of water provisions and irrigation systems as well as proper fencing. Moreover, the official admitted that the execution of a particular program cannot run indefinitely and that it ends when there is no longer financial muscle to maintain a project and keep it running. The

literature that was reviewed also agrees that government, as well as other stakeholders and organisations that support developmental and agricultural cooperatives, often have limited financial muscle – or no financial muscle at all – to support or address all the financial needs of smallholder farming cooperatives (Dube, 2016). In the same breath, it needs to be stated that LIMA relies on funding and/or financial aid from their own funders and thus, when LIMA no longer has access to funding or loses financial muscle, then support for the needs of land recipients will either be limited, or it will end. One of the officials from LIMA explained this as follows:

Our biggest problem is financial muscle and a restricted budget. Infrastructure is still a problem and is still needed on many of the farms, especially water. We have been able to assist some farmers but there are still plenty more farmers that need assistance, but because our resources are limited, we can't assist all of them. Fencing and security are other problems that exist for some farmers, but we cannot help them all. (LIMA official 2; Female, Aged 29)

It is undeniable that the success of land reform and land redistribution programs is dependent on numerous factors, one of which is the availability of resources. Organisations that intervene and assist such farmers are tasked with the responsibility of placing resources in the hands of land reform beneficiaries that will render them capable of reaping the maximum benefits of such a program. Moreover, they need to enable land reform beneficiaries to live prosperous and sustainable lives that are free from poverty and that promote economic growth. It is thus imperative that government and NGOs such as LIMA lend support to and invest various resources in land redistribution projects to ensure long-term impacts that are sustainable. However, as the LIMA officials revealed, due to a lack of budgetary provisions and financial muscle, LIMA's support base and resources have become depleted and its inability to sustain its support may constrain the growth and success of those land recipients in Hammarsdale who failed to ensure their independence during or directly after the 2016 project. During the interview a land recipient stated the following:

LIMA and the Department of Agriculture have provided us with seedlings and basic gardening tools such as spades, rakes, watering cans, forks, and wheelbarrows to get us started, but we are challenged because we have no or limited access to water to water our produce. We must carry water from our homes in 25 litre bottles and buckets to our gardens, which is a lot of work and a long distance. We tried connecting water

hosepipes but couldn't because the distance is too far. (Land recipient 5; Female, Aged 74)

Lack of sufficient water was a challenge that was commonly faced by all the land recipients and they all felt that they could use additional support, such as the installation of Jojo tanks on their respective sites for the storage of and easy access to rainwater. The land recipients understood that a water irrigation system and Jojo tanks were important tools, but they complained that a lack of these facilities contributed to their slow productivity at times. Another land recipient also addressed the effort that water access demanded:

We are forced to wake up early in the morning so we can begin by collecting water and taking it and filling the storage drums in our gardens before we can start our farming and gardening activities. We sometimes have to do this again later in the day because the water we collect is not enough to last us the whole day. (Land recipient 4; Female, Aged 50)

This is proof that, during the 2016 project, LIMA did not have the capacity to provide or install proper water access and irrigation systems to support the land recipients in Hammarsdale. This resulted in access to water being one of the constraints that contributed to slow productivity by some farmers and it was an impediment that prevented some smallholders from fully competing with large commercial farmers who had proper water irrigation systems in place. This finding is also supported by the reviewed literature, as Dube (2016:28) states that "some cooperatives are hindered by the lack of infrastructure, especially cooperatives that function in rural communities that suffer from a lack of water, technology, irrigation and transport which, in turn, affects their productivity, sustainability, and access to formal markets".

Land recipients in Hammarsdale also submitted during the interviews that another resource that they lacked was financial support and funding from supporting agencies such as the government and LIMA. In addressing this challenge, one of the land recipients stated:

LIMA and the Department of Agriculture have supported us by giving us tools, seedlings and teaching us skills during workshops that helped us to grow as farmers. But we also need a financial boost to help us solve some of our challenges such as buying tractors, installing water irrigation systems and sprinklers because it will take long before we start making profits that will buy us this equipment which will improve our farming. (Land recipient 8; Female, Aged 56)

This excerpt reveals that although government and supporting agencies such as LIMA may provide start-up gardening packages and skills training that are enabling, it can take months or even years before land recipients see great financial rewards that will allow them to buy or install some of the equipment and resources that they lack. It is for this reason that Dube (2016) argues that poor infrastructure and a lack of financial resources are contributing factors that stand in the way of growth and the sustainability of land recipients and land redistribution programs.

The land recipients also mentioned transport as another resource that they lacked. Adequate transport is needed to transport water and farming equipment and to deliver produce to markets where they sell their produce. A land recipient stated the following:

We face the big challenge of transport now because LIMA stopped providing transport to deliver or move produce or farming equipment. We now spend a lot of money on hiring vehicles that will do deliveries for us. Sometimes this slows us down and our deliveries end up being late because drivers will not be on time to collect produce or will sometimes not come and we end up losing orders because of unreliable drivers and transport. (Land recipient 1; Female, Aged 61)

A lack of transport vehicles contributed to the slow running of the daily activities of the land recipients, and this of necessity impacted their businesses because they were not able to deliver their produce to demanding markets on time. This unfortunately made them look unreliable as suppliers. Dube (2016) also mentions that a lack of transport can be a hindrance to cooperatives and argues that this will affect their productivity, sustainability, and access to formal markets. In agreement with the land recipients, LIMA admitted that the organisation suffered from a lack of resources and that it could not extend assistance and support to all land recipients. While some land recipients received assistance, others unfortunately continued to face challenges such as water shortages, no fencing, and no security, which affected the productivity of their farming endeavours. In addition to this comment, the other official from LIMA stated:

LIMA, like most NGOs, relies heavily on funding to execute and ensure the running of programs. Therefore, once our funders [for a particular project] stop bringing in funds and feel that we have met our targets, then as an NGO we move on and invest in other projects or programs. (LIMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

This comment reiterates that LIMA generally relies on funding to execute its program and that these programs and projects can only be sustained while there are resources and financial muscle to implement and support them. An official from LIMA also discussed the consequences of a lack of resources:

We are unable to assist some of our cooperatives with proper fencing to keep livestock away from their gardens as the livestock end up eating their vegetables. Another challenge that some of our cooperatives face is proper water and irrigation systems and this means that some farmers are not able to water their vegetables. So, most of the farmers require Jojo tanks which we are unable to provide. (LIMA official 2; Female, Aged 29)

The above responses make it evident that LIMA experienced a lack of resources to successfully support the land redistribution program that had been launched in 2016. It is also evident that land recipients in Hammarsdale consequently faced the challenge of access to limited resources to meet the demands of their daily activities as farmers. In turn, the lack of resources also had serious consequences for these land recipients as it slowed their productivity, negatively affected their sales, and thus hindered their sustainability. The literature also attests to this fact as Lahiff and Cousins (2005:38) state: “Because of a lack of resources, support only reaches a minority of smallholder farmers and that results in some smallholder farmers failing or ceasing to exist due to their inability to sustain their activities.” Sibanda (2001) agrees that the scarcity of resources can result in the poor delivery of land reform programs which can, in turn, result in poor service delivery by the land recipients. Chambers and Conway (1992) also state that if land reform beneficiaries have enough assets and resources, they find themselves in a better position to cope, recover, and then maintain sustainable livelihoods. However, Sen (1999) argues that if beneficiaries’ capabilities and opportunities are not expanded, it limits their growth and development. Therefore, the scarcity of resources can pose a challenge to both NGOs such as LIMA and land recipients as it limits the ability of NGOs to sustain their support of targeted beneficiaries. In turn, this can hinder beneficiaries’ ability to develop and remain sustainable.

#### **5.5.4 The inability of land recipients to apply the skills they were taught**

The most vital role of NGOs is to execute their developmental role in alliance with government departments when specific projects are launched. They are thus required to possess the necessary skills, have adequate capacity, and have access to relevant assets and resources to

ensure that beneficiaries receive the most appropriate support. When engaged in land reform projects, NGOs such as LIMA invest in a lot of skills to support land recipients' access to land and to ensure that their capabilities are enhanced so that they can develop and improve their livelihoods. However, the two officials from LIMA explained that one of the challenges that they encountered was that some land recipients failed to effectively utilise the skills that they had been taught during special training sessions. This became a challenge for LIMA because some land recipients' businesses failed or underperformed, and the organisation ran the risk of trying to flog businesses that were unsustainable back to life. When discussing land recipients' failure to employ the skills that LIMA had tried to teach them, an official from LIMA mentioned the following:

As LIMA, we faced the big challenge of people's mindsets. For instance, most of our farmers are elderly people that have been doing the same thing for a long time. So, it was difficult to come in with a new way of doing things as an implementing agency. It was only after they saw results that they tried to continue to do things the way that we had taught them. (LIMA official 2; Female, Aged 29)

This response indicates that LIMA undoubtedly faced a severe challenge, as some of the land recipients failed to utilise the skills they had been taught. In all fairness, this result could have been expected as it is common particularly among elderly land recipients not to persevere when required to do things differently. This is because they grew up farming in a particular manner and tend to be set in their ways. Therefore, if a new way of doing things is introduced, it is problematic for them and they battle to adapt and execute their tasks differently. Perseverance then becomes a primary challenge. It was thus particularly difficult to change the mindset of the land recipients in Hammarsdale because they had initially been subsistence farmers who had farmed for consumption purposes only. The transition required by LIMA in the quest to transform them into commercial farmers who would earn an income from their produce was a new school of thought that required training and the acquisition of new skills that were quite foreign to them. This posed a challenge for LIMA as most of the land recipients they targeted were elderly women who were relatively uneducated and had to survive without any financial literacy, marketing, or business skills while they were required to run successful farming businesses. The literature supports this notion as Lahiff and Cousins (2005) state that most rural farmers are women who do not consider themselves farmers but who see themselves as matriarchs who have to produce staple food to feed their families. Many of the land recipients had never even considered their smallholder farming or gardening operations as anything other

than household food management, let alone producing food with the potential to access larger markets to make a profit. The literature also states that women till the land because it is a deeply rooted African tradition and expected of them as part of their domestic chores. However, in a modern democratic dispensation this expectation makes them vulnerable and limits their growth as envisioned by the Land Reform Policy, because many are incapable of producing food beyond their household requirements (Lahiff & Cousins, 2005).

The officials from LIMA also mentioned that some land recipients neglected to execute bookkeeping and banking skills effectively, regardless of the training they had received. This became problematic because some land recipients ended up running losses because they did not keep correct records of their sales and profits. This at times caused conflict amongst the members of the cooperatives because of the lack of accountability and transparency that plagued these operations. As such, the land recipients ended up spending a lot of money without saving any and they were subsequently unable to cover their day-to-day expenses. As a result, some of the small farming businesses failed because these farmers were unable to run them without financial muscle and continued financial support.

The failure by the land recipients to execute various business skills thus limited their success and improvement as well as the sustainability of their businesses and livelihoods. Furthermore, this collapse by some defeated the purpose of the programme because it was meant to strengthen the capabilities of the targeted land recipients in order to reduce poverty and unemployment and ensure food security as well as improved livelihoods. Moreover, in cases where the land recipients failed to utilise the skills they had been taught and thus enhance their capabilities, LIMA's extensive and costly investments in them became redundant, useless, and a waste of resources.

#### **5.5.5 Conflict amongst land recipients and failure to work collaboratively**

The formation of cooperatives in the farming sector is usually a strategy to ally small-scale farmers under one cooperative in the quest to achieve one common goal. According to the literature, small-scale farmers usually form such an alliance in order to maximise their profits, secure existing and new markets, and to enable them to enhance their bargaining power (Dube, 2016). LIMA thus encouraged the formation of cooperatives in Hammarsdale so that the land recipients would generate and maximise their profits, increase productivity and supply of their produce, and gain entrance to the commercial farming sector. However, the officials from

LIMA revealed that the formation of cooperatives was fraught with unexpected challenges and difficulties. One of the officials stated the following:

We often face the challenge of having to intervene in or solve internal disputes because they are always fighting amongst themselves. Some disputes result in the dissolving of partnerships and cause a change of membership or directors and this then requires changing the signatures and issuing a new certificate for the registration of the cooperative. These issues we face often, and the processes involved take up a lot of our time. (LIMA official 2; Female, Aged 29)

This participant asserted that various conflicts often occurred amongst members of cooperatives and argued that it was due to differences in their goals and vision. However, the purpose of cooperatives is to achieve a common goal that is in the interest of all its members. When such disputes cannot be resolved, they result in the dissolution of the affected cooperative and it can take time to change membership, the name of the cooperative, and members of the executive. These changes in turn can slow down the productivity of both the cooperative and supportive agents such as LIMA. When such disputes occur, they are disruptive, waste time, and take the attention away from the objectives of the land reform program and the activities required to achieve its goals.

Information that was shared during the interviews by the land recipients revealed that, just like any partnership or business experiences relationship disagreements, differences and conflict often erupted among the land recipients which impacted the sustainability of the cooperatives. It was found that cooperatives often collapsed as they lost members or gained new members due to differences and disagreements. It was also discovered that a common cause of these differences was that members had different goals and work ethics. A land recipient attested to this by stating the following:

We sometimes don't get along as members in a cooperative because some members are lazy and don't want to work hard and put in the hours as some of us do, but they still want to share in the profits in the same proportion as everyone else in the cooperative. (Land recipient 3; Female, Aged 44)

This comment suggests that some members of a cooperative may contest the purpose of that co-operative, which is usually to work together towards the same goal. This requires that members contribute the same time and effort if they wish to share equally in the profits.

Increasing outputs and productivity result in profits that improve the livelihoods of all members, but this can only occur if everyone works equally hard. However, due to the lack of work ethics of some members, conflicts may arise and, when no resolution is found, some members exit the cooperative which results in its instability and even collapse. In this regard, one land recipient stated the following:

Some land recipients want to see quick results or make fast money and will work hard at the beginning and later give up because farming sometimes takes time and big orders from markets are not always guaranteed. Because of this you then find some members leaving the cooperative. (Land recipient 1; Female, Aged 61)

This comment indicates that members of cooperatives in Hammarsdale often disagreed and left because they lacked resilience and did not persevere if the desired results and profits were not achieved immediately. Successful smallholder farming requires continued hard work to achieve productivity and positive results. These may only come over time with bulk sales that are of a high standard. Moreover, it was mentioned that gainful income from large orders was not always secure or a given as markets were unpredictable and highly competitive in the commercial and agricultural farming sector. On the subject of conflict amongst members in a cooperative, a land recipient added the following:

We usually have people asking to join the cooperative and, as time goes by, they will leave the cooperative when they find a new job. This causes us to fight because the member didn't tell us at the beginning that they were looking for another job and that they would not be there for a long time. Sometimes, because most of our members are elderly women, we lose them to death. So, you find that because we lose members so often it slows our productivity, and we end up being overworked. It is also frustrating when we lose members because our membership fees increase, and we have to go and register and change our membership certificate and its signatures. (Land recipient 8; Female, Aged 56)

This response suggests that cooperative membership may be fluid as members leave readily to access a new job. This can cause conflict and ultimately result in a slowdown in productivity. Moreover, because most cooperative members are elderly land recipients, they are prone to ill health. The death of such a member requires that changes be made to the membership of the cooperative in terms of names and signatures and the issuing of a new certificate. These changes cause setbacks and conflict and the need for a new management structure, and it is

normal that members clash over management positions. The participants agreed that conflict arose when some members were indifferent and too lazy to put in more hours in the field in an attempt to improve the general productivity of the cooperative after losing a member. Furthermore, when the cooperatives lost members, it became costly to sustain and maintain the cooperative because the remaining members had to pay higher membership fees towards the acquisition of resources. Conversely, Dube (2016) argues that if small-scale farmers work together in the form of cooperatives, they generally increase their bargaining power and generate the funds for their agricultural necessities to buy what they need in bulk (such as fertilizer, seeds, and packaging) which is cheaper. However, due to conflict among some land recipients in Hammarsdale, they incurred extra costs instead of saving on costs. A land recipient offered the following comment in this regard:

At times cooperatives fight with other cooperatives because of jealousy when they see another cooperative doing better than theirs. This usually happens when another cooperative sees us selling more vegetables than they do or when our vegetables look better and fresher than theirs. So, when we arrive in the fields, we sometimes find that they ruined our vegetables by walking all over them. (Land recipient 2; Female, Aged 43)

According to this participant, members of a cooperative not only clashed amongst themselves, but they also clashed with members of other cooperatives because of petty jealousy and unkind competitiveness. Thus, conflict erupted between cooperatives because of spite and envy which resulted in unhealthy relations. Such conflicts counteracted the purpose and effectiveness of these cooperatives. Dube (2016) states that cooperatives are meant to promote development and strengthen healthy competitiveness. They are also supposed to promote growth in agricultural activities, provide employment opportunities, and ensure food security in their communities.

A noteworthy revelation was that female land recipients were exposed and vulnerable to the issues of sexism and patriarchy, as male farmers tended to deny them their rights and did not acknowledge their worth. The female farmers agreed that male farmers did not like taking advice from female farmers and undermined their authority and opinions during meetings. This came as no surprise given the fact that the farming and agricultural sector is largely dominated by male farmers and has only recently involved and prioritised female participants. Moreover, the agricultural and farming sector is still dominated by the older generation that adheres to

patriarchal behaviours and attitudes. This is also iterated in the literature by Thamaga-Chitja and Morojele (2014), who state that the farming sector is influenced by cultural customs and values that entrench the belief that women should till the land as part of their domestic chores whilst the larger commercial farming sector is run by ‘elite’ male farmers. Therefore, women are not considered ‘real’ farmers or entrepreneurs who can compete in the commercial farming sector, and this belief system makes female farmers vulnerable and limits their empowerment as envisioned by the Land Reform Policy that deems them worthy of producing far beyond their household farming capacity.

Conflict amongst land recipients is just as inevitable as it is in any other partnerships and relationships. Thus, conflict may erupt due to various factors such as different and conflicting goals, the dissolution of a cooperative, unfair farming and marketing practices, and differences in work ethics. All these can result in setbacks that impact cooperatives and their existing members, such as the need to pay increased membership fees to sustain the cooperative and a slower productivity rate that can result in the loss of profits. When such conflicts occurred and members could not resolve them, LIMA tended to intervene and gave guidance to find a solution so that members could resume doing what they loved for what they valued, which was creating sustainable and improved livelihoods by means of their farming activities.

#### **5.5.6 Policy implementation**

The implementation of land reform and land redistribution programs in Hammarsdale was vested in LIMA as the executing agency that was tasked to ensure the availability of resources and expertise to address the objectives of these programs. However, a perusal of the implementation model made it apparent that the successful execution of any policy or program is dependent on the dedication of all actors involved (Frank et al., 2006). Therefore LIMA, that it is an NGO that has access to many resources, expertise and skills, cannot ensure the successful implementation of the land redistribution programme in Hammarsdale on its own. In fact, the findings highlight the fact that the support and dedication of land recipients and the government are also essential for the successful execution of these programs. Also, the environment and the context in which LIMA executed the land redistribution programme were equally important for the programme to yield results and achieve success, because the environment and context in which the programme was executed needed to be conducive for LIMA to successfully execute its plan without any hindrances from other actors or stakeholders involved. LIMA, as the implementing agency, was tasked to ensure that the land reform

initiatives were successfully executed and achieved in Hammarsdale. Its role was to upskill and equip previously disadvantaged farmers in order to help them achieve sustained livelihoods through farming. They also needed to be guided to improve their income, eradicate poverty and unemployment, and strengthen household food security. The two participants from LIMA confirmed that they had managed to successfully implement land reform initiatives in Hammarsdale, although there were challenges along the way. One of the officials supported her statement by stating the following:

LIMA does have capacity because we have been able to provide farmers with all the necessary skills to equip them so that they could run sustainable farms. As officials of LIMA, we have achieved our goals and those of the land redistribution program. Now we feel the farmers are ready and capable, hence now we are at the exiting phase of our project. (LIMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

This statement shows that, by focusing on the utilisation of expertise, experience, skills, and support, LIMA was able to help the land recipients to develop. Some became successful farmers who were able to run sustainable businesses which, in turn, enhanced their livelihoods and food security and eradicated the threat of poverty, unemployment, and hunger. Moreover, LIMA managed to achieve the objectives of Land Reform Policy as its officials ensured that the land recipients used the land, they had been allocated for productive purposes so that the outcomes would ensure better and sustainable livelihoods for them (Dlamini, 2016).

However, there were many other objectives of the land reform initiative that LIMA was tasked to fulfil, which included fostering opportunities for previously disadvantaged individuals and women by capacitating them by means of training programmes, skills development opportunities, and active support. One task was to see that women thrived and were enabled to create sustained livelihoods for themselves and their families in the agricultural and commercial farming sector. An official from LIMA confidently stated the following:

We have fulfilled the objectives of land reform. First, we are assisting previously disadvantaged people – black people. Our farmers largely comprise of women who are in need and are single parents, women who are breadwinners, and women who are heading households although they are either widows or unmarried. We also have managed to get the youth involved in our program in the farming sector. We have young members sitting in committees of their cooperatives and the larger Hammarsdale Farmers' Association. Therefore, as LIMA we have made sure that the objectives of

the policy were met and that there aren't any existing inequalities or disparities. (LÌMA official 1; Female, Aged 28)

Evidently, LÌMA managed to provide opportunities, skills and support to a black community that was considered as previously disadvantaged. As per the objectives of land reform initiatives, LÌMA also managed to extend support to women in need by focusing on their upliftment and getting them skilled and involved in the agricultural sector that had previously allowed minimal or no access to black farmers, the youth, and women in need. This finding concurs with a finding by Aliber (2005), who argues that agriculture is the most effective tool and activity to reduce poverty and enhance food security among the previously disadvantaged. It is also a tool to create jobs and empower the youth and women in the farming sector.

It was also observed that LÌMA had actively encouraged the establishment of cooperatives and a farmers' association to support land recipients in Hammarsdale. LÌMA thus achieved one of the objectives of land reform which is the establishment of cooperatives in order to develop and strengthen competitiveness, enhanced and improved agricultural activities, food security, and employment opportunities for smallholder farmers and communities in South Africa (Dube, 2016).

The two LÌMA officials were assertive and confident that LÌMA had achieved the goals and objectives of land reform initiatives and programmes in Hammarsdale. They firmly believed that most land recipients had been adequately developed and upskilled in a manner that would allow them to be capable farmers who could create sustainable and improved livelihoods for themselves and generations to come. The LÌMA officials further affirmed that land recipients in this area were in a better position than when they had first encountered them as they had improved their productivity, skills and knowledge and had secured markets to ensure growth in income, improvement of well-being, alleviation of poverty, and the reduction of vulnerabilities. Validated by the human development approach that underpinned this research, it may be argued that "...investing [in] and building on human capabilities [can] in turn lead to a recipient's enhancement in growth, employment, empowerment, sustainability and productivity" (Deneulin & Shahani, 2009). Thus, the processes of investing in human capabilities and developing land recipients made them less vulnerable and less susceptible to poverty and unemployment.

Although there were impressive results by LIMA in terms of the goals envisioned through policy implementation of land reform in Hammarsdale, there were also many barriers that hindered the comprehensive implementation of this program. For instance, it was revealed that, due to LIMA's lack of resources, poor infrastructure in the target area, and a lack of financial muscle, LIMA was unable to successfully support all land recipients in Hammarsdale. Some issues were the inability to provide fencing, water, and irrigation systems that would enhance these smallholder farmers' productivity and sustainability. Other issues were poor safety and transport provisioning. The findings of the study thus revealed that LIMA was unable to fully respond to the needs and aspirations of the land recipients in Hammarsdale.

### **5.5.7 A lack of safety and security measures**

The various social ills that South Africa faces such as unemployment, poverty, and the lack of opportunities for the youth and previously disadvantaged groups are some of the issues that contribute to high crime rates. Hammarsdale is not exempt from these social ills and, as a result, is prone to high crime rates and, more particularly, the scourge of theft. Bradstock (2005) states that, after the demise of the apartheid regime and even far into the democratic era, South Africa has had to contend with a slow economy, high unemployment rates, and widespread poverty. Land recipients in Hammarsdale also fall victim to high crime rates and the data revealed that most of them had to contend with numerous incidences of theft that affected their farming and gardening sites negatively. One of the land recipients commented on this issue as follows:

As farmers we also face the big challenge of theft by some community members. When we arrive on site, we usually find that some of our vegetables have been stolen and are missing and you even find the footprints that these thieves left behind. Sometimes they even walk over our vegetables and we find them ruined, and this holds us back as farmers because we end up having a shortage of vegetables to provide to our customers.  
(Land recipient 8; Male, Aged 56)

Theft was cited as one of the direst challenges the land recipients in Hammarsdale experienced and it was a challenge that was mentioned by all the participants. They submitted that their produce got stolen from their gardens by delinquent community members living close to these spaces. They suspected that these culprits were generally those who were unemployed and faced dire poverty, of which there were many in their area. They also lamented that incidences of theft affected their productivity and slowed production down considerably because they then ran out of fresh produce to deliver to their suppliers. A shortage in the bulk of the produce they

promised to deliver thus became a serious problem and affected their trustworthiness in the eyes of their suppliers. The scourge of theft thus rendered them incapable of meeting supply demands and this limited their profits. It is for this reason that the land recipients felt that criminality in the society negatively impacted their farming activities and reduced their income and they agreed that theft was a barrier to their success and potential progress.

Another land recipient also addressed this issue by stating the following:

We face the challenge of community members stealing from our gardens at night, then during the day and even at night they steal the livestock such as goats and cows that invade our gardens. Livestock also eat our crops and walk over and crush our vegetables and we end up losing fresh vegetables because we don't have proper and secure fencing to protect our gardens. (Land recipient 3; Male, Aged 44)

The issue of livestock entering land recipients' gardens was a common phenomenon that most of them referred to. These animals reportedly ate and ruined their crops and this potentially limited productivity and resulted in some land recipients running losses. This problem was exacerbated by the issue of poor fencing structures which they argued allowed easy access for livestock and perpetrators who stole and ruined their crops. Poor fencing is thus associated with poor safety and security, which indicates that there were no effective measures in place to protect the crops in their gardens.

As was discussed in the previous sections, the LIMA participants admitted that, due to a limited budget, their resources did not stretch to the point where they could provide fencing and security measures to protect their own gardens in the Hammarsdale area. One of the land recipients offered the following insight in this regard:

Safety and security is one of our big issues that we face, and our vegetables are always stolen or ruined by livestock. But we cannot at this point afford to put up new and higher fencing with a big and security gate to protect our gardens. We once thought of hiring a security guard to guard the gardens at night, but our budget does not allow us because we have other things to pay for such as hiring drivers and vehicles to transport and deliver orders to our clients. (Land recipient 8; Male, Aged 56)

The above comment revealed that the land recipients not only faced theft and livestock invasion into their gardens as severe challenges, but they also lacked security facilities to prevent or

diminish the threats that impacted their crops. The lack of safety and security exposed these land recipients and their gardens to destructive incidences of theft and animal invasion. It is apparent that the land recipients needed support such as secure fencing and entry points through gates to prevent – or at least make it difficult – for trespassers to enter their properties. The literature stresses the importance of reducing the vulnerability of land reform beneficiaries by providing them with appropriate assets and resources (Serrat, 2008). The lack of proper fencing and secure gates thus rendered the land recipients in Hammarsdale vulnerable to theft and livestock invasion. Sadly, they acknowledged that they lacked the financial capacity to install safety and security systems and this impeded their capacity for service delivery.

### **5.5.8 Lack of youth participation in the sector**

Considering the growing rate of unemployment among the youth, the limited participation by young people in the agricultural sector is a worrying fact in South Africa in general, but in Hammarsdale in particular. It is argued that the youth's engagement in agriculture will open opportunities for young people to escape the dire social economic impact of poverty and unemployment and to achieve improved livelihoods (Hall, 2009). The land redistribution program places emphasis on women in need because many women are the heads of their households and have many mouths to feed. The policy to ensure the participation of women in land redistribution programs and agricultural activities thus intends to address gender inequality in the agricultural sector which is known to be largely dominated by men. In the Hammarsdale area, land recipients are mostly elderly women who are often the only breadwinners in their households. Most of these women dream of escaping poverty and achieving food security by participating in agricultural activities (Habib & Padayachee, 2000). This means that the implementation of land redistribution programs not only needs to address inequalities in race and gender, but this process also needs to focus on the diverse needs of role players at grassroots level such as promoting the participation of the youth in these programs.

The land recipients in Hammarsdale were proud of the fact that they intended to teach various youths in Hammarsdale the importance of the agricultural sector by showing them the benefits they could reap through active participation in farming endeavours. One of the land recipients offered the following comment:

The youth looks down on farming and the work that we do, but they forget that when you are a farmer and know how to farm you will not go hungry and you will eat fresh and healthy vegetables from your own garden. Youths do not understand that the food

we buy in the shops is sometimes not as healthy as it looks and has lost nutrients, unlike fresh food from your own garden. They also look down on farming and prefer working in offices because they don't know that there is money and growth in farming. (Land recipient 5; Female, Aged 74).

The participant suggested that the agricultural sector lacked youth participation due to a lack of information on and insight into the health benefits and the financial rewards it can generate. As a result, young people choose to enter other careers where they will work in more attractive workspaces such as offices. They seem to ignore the value of working in the fields or on a farm. The government and NGOs thus need to do more to involve the youth and promote their participation in the farming sector. Involving the youth in the farming sector is particularly important because high unemployment rates are swelled by unemployed youths and their participation in farming will contribute to the reduction of poverty and unemployment. Dlamini (2016) states that when land redistribution programs are implemented successfully, they can contribute to the eradication of poverty and unemployment as well as to the sustainable livelihood of people, particularly in rural areas.

One of the land recipients admitted that the participation of youths in farming activities was important as she stated the following:

We are old now and we cannot work as hard as we used to, and we can't do certain things like carrying water and heavy goods because our bones are not as strong as they used to be. So, we need the youth to help us with certain activities and we need to teach them the skills of farming so that they can continue the legacy even after we are gone. (Land recipient 1; Female, Aged 61)

This response reflected the shared notion among the land recipients in Hammarsdale that they desired the participation of the youth in the farming sector, particularly as young people could benefit from this in many ways. One advantage that was mentioned is that young people could make the life of elderly farmers easier while working gainfully in the fields and in gardens. In a jocular manner, it was also argued that the involvement of the youth in agricultural activities would of course also improve and speed up productivity if everyone worked longer and faster than their elderly employers. The land recipients also stressed that the involvement of the youth in the farming sector would ensure that skills would be passed on from one generation to the other, which in turn would ensure the sustainability of farming and improve livelihoods. The

related literature also argues that it is important that land reform initiatives cultivate long-term benefits that will sustain beneficiaries and thus assist them to transfer their skills and knowledge to future generations (Morse & McNamara, 2013).

Another reason that the land recipients mentioned for their willingness to welcome the youth into the farming sector is that the elderly often lack education and schooling. There are aspects of farming that require a certain level of education, learning and knowledge, and these could then be provided by better educated youths who could not only assist the elderly in the form of hard manual labour, but who could also extend their assistance to more academic activities such as bookkeeping, marketing, designing advertisements, creating and receiving emails, and the application of other technological skills that the elderly lack. This is extremely important because the farming sector and related businesses continue to evolve and advance and these processes often involve advanced technology. These are the skills and insights the youth could provide to help their more elderly partners or employers to keep up with modern ways of doing things. The land recipients were thus excited to involve and teach the youth what they had learnt about farming because it would also ultimately benefit the wider Hammarsdale community. They further expressed that teaching and involving the youth in farming activities would get potentially delinquent youths off the streets and reduce drug abuse and crimes such as theft and robberies while also addressing unemployment. Therefore, they argued that creating opportunities for farming or gardening and involving the youth in these activities would contribute to eliminating, or at least reducing, societal issues that caused the youth to embrace delinquency and criminality. Hammarsdale is a community that is plagued by poverty, unemployment, crime, and alcohol and drug abuse, and these vices are rife particularly amongst the youth. This community could thus work together to curb these social ills by involving the youth in agricultural activities as it would offer employment opportunities and eradicate the need to engage in criminal activities for personal gain and survival.

#### **5.5.9 Lack of access to suitable markets**

Land reform and land redistribution programs aim to alleviate poverty and to encourage economic prosperity by providing opportunities to the rural poor and the previously disadvantaged to become involved in agricultural activities. In this process, land redistribution programs invest numerous resources in the development of smallholder farmers to enable them to generate sustainable livelihoods and to live lives that are free from poverty and food insecurity. As its purpose is to ensure sustainable livelihoods for land reform beneficiaries, the

objectives of the land reform programme is to grow smallholders so that they can compete with large commercial farmers. To compete effectively with large commercial farmers will require smallholder farmers to gain entrance into the commercial farming sector and its commercial markets where significant financial profits may be generated. However, entrance into commercial markets is dependent on the strength and size of smallholder farmers' businesses and their capacity to meet the demands of such commercial markets.

When the field work phase of the study was conducted, it was clear that some land recipients in Hammarsdale had already secured a select few neighbouring markets where they could sell their products. However, a land recipient commented on the difficulty of achieving this by stating the following:

Competition is tough amongst cooperatives and these cooperatives all sell to the same markets and, because of that, sometimes we cannot secure or execute our orders. (Land recipient 3; Male, Aged 44)

This comment revealed that the land recipients needed ready access to more and larger markets because the markets that they had linked themselves with were either very small or few and did not allow them many opportunities to effect sales and earn sufficient profits to thrive. Some land recipients ended up dropping out of the project and were thus unable to make sufficient sales. It was for this reason that land recipients need ready access to larger markets. It was further revealed that land recipients often struggled to sell their produce because their markets required orders that were much larger than what they could produce, or they requested vegetables that were not in season. When this happened, it caused strain on the land recipients because they ended up not making any sales, often for long periods, as they could not meet the demands of their consumers/markets. This suggests that they sometimes produced either too little or too much and then ended up making a loss. When they produced too much and the market would not purchase their produce, it was obviously a huge waste of good food.

The land recipients in Hammarsdale also needed access to markets that were outside the Hammarsdale area. For instance, if they could access markets in Durban, Pietermaritzburg and surrounding areas, it would make a difference to their sales and increase their profits as their customer and profit base would be extended. Furthermore, access to more markets would enhance their sustainability, eradicate household food insecurity, and address the issues of inequality and poverty in the Hammarsdale area (Thamaga-Chitja & Morojele, 2014).

However, access to more markets would not be possible if these land recipients lacked market readiness and were thus unable to provide services and produce to markets outside Hammarsdale. It is evident that, for this reason, land recipients in Hammarsdale still needed support from LIMA and the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development to enhance their capabilities even further in order to render them ready for and capable of further access to markets. Lahiff and Cousins (2005:127) also expound this notion as they state that the ability of smallholders to access larger markets requires “large scale redistribution of land, enhanced state support for existing black smallholders, and reform of agricultural markets.” The latter argument suggests that priority needs to be extended to and support needs to be offered to smallholder and emerging farmers in terms of land reform and land redistribution programs. Such support was offered to land recipients in Hammarsdale with some measure of success. Agricultural market agents also need to place priority on smallholder and emerging farmers by allowing them ready access to these markets.

#### **5.5.10 Limited access to land**

Access to land as a natural asset is the first and most important focus of land redistribution programs. With access to more land, land recipients can develop their acumen and skills, but only if they either possess land or have access to the right resources. However, land recipients in Hammarsdale lacked access to sufficient spaces of land which impeded their growth and limited their productivity. More land would undoubtedly have allowed them to thrive in the commercial farming sector. During the fieldwork phase of the study, one of the land recipients revealed the necessity for more land once smallholder farmers have become successful:

We are passionate about farming and the work we have been able to do based on what we have learnt from LIMA. This knowledge has motivated us to do even more and acquire more gardens so we can grow larger crop. (Land recipient 4; Female, Aged 50)

Another land recipient agreed, and stated:

We have the skills now and we know how to preserve and look after the land. All we wish for now is to grow, have our own farms, and own more land that is in our names. (Land recipient 1; Female, Aged 61)

Clearly, the land recipients who were interviewed were elated with their development and wished for more land to enhance their growth and expand their farming enterprises. Farmers who have access to large tracts of land produce more crops and this contributes to their

sustainability and enhance their livelihoods. During the interviews it became apparent that some of the participants had acquired the discipline, dedication, and skills that made them good and passionate farmers that embraced the challenges and demands of the commercial farming sector. However, their growth and potential to expand were limited due to a lack of support from government and its refusal to allow them access to larger acres of land. The farmers were also deprived of sufficient resources and had to contend with poor infrastructure, and these factors impeded their activities and limited their participation in the commercial farming sector. Thamaga-Chitja and Morojele (2014) state that land that is allocated to previously disadvantaged smallholders often varies in size and may range from small gardens to large plots of land. The size of their land thus determines the prospects of smallholders and impacts their potential to produce food either for their own consumption or for commercial gain, or both. The information received clearly revealed that the land recipients in Hammarsdale required larger plots of land than the ones they had received if the objectives of development and agricultural production for commercial purposes and financial gain were to be realised.

The land recipients were satisfied that they had acquired and mastered adequate farming as well as entrepreneurial skills to become successful farmers and to run their own agricultural businesses. They expressed their readiness to develop into even more successful farmers if they were allowed to extend their own farms or received larger farms and could sell their products to both local and external markets. They also expressed their willingness to teach community members, particularly the youth, the skills of farming and how to preserve the land for prosperity. One land recipient offered the following insight:

We see ourselves wish to grow and participate in other sectors of farming such as cattle farming and raising goats, pigs and chickens. We could then also sell animal products to both local and external markets. (Land recipient 3; Female, Aged 50)

Clearly, the land recipients were ready and eager to develop and expand their businesses. However, their growth was still limited by their lack of access to more land and due to a lack of resources and infrastructure. Access to sufficient land means that land recipients can boost their productivity and expand the bulk and types of products that they produce. By producing in bulk, they are assured of access to ever-hungry markets in the commercial farming sector. In this context, Lahiff and Cousins (2005) affirm that it is the objective of land reform policies and programmes to equip smallholders with the skills and expertise to enter the commercial farming sector as a means of reducing poverty and unemployment. They also argue that

smallholder farmers “generally fail for the most part due to a lack of resources such as land, working equipment and capital, lack of support services (private and state) and a lack of markets that support smallholder farming and their produce” (p. 3). Moreover, if government acknowledges and acts upon the clear need for extended support to smallholder farmers in the agricultural sector, it will impact positively these people’s household food security and will ensure the sustainability of their commercial efforts (Thamaga-Chitja & Morojele, 2014).

The capability approach urges that governments need to place the right assets and capabilities in the hands of land beneficiaries so that they can grow and thrive through capacity building (Sen, 1999). In the case of smallholder farmers in Hammarsdale, government’s support is most definitely required to enhance their capabilities and to capacitate them to participate gainfully in the commercial farming sector. When this happens government, in collaboration with NGOs, will ensure that the growth, income, and livelihoods of these members of rural communities are sustainable.

#### **5.5.11 Lack of opportunities to grow**

The participating land recipients lamented that there was a lack of opportunities for them to grow in the farming and agricultural sector. This view was largely informed by factors such as the scarcity of resources, the relatively old age of the land recipients, and their limited capabilities that were prevalent regardless of concerted efforts to train and capacitate them. The participants felt that their development was predominantly impeded by a lack of resources such as transport, secure fencing, potable water, and irrigation systems. The fact that water supplies, and irrigation systems were inadequate slowed their productivity. Limited water supplies in particular impacted productivity as some crops were ruined during times of drought or limited rainfall. Pienaar and Traub (2015) state that smallholder farmers still use traditional production techniques that are labour intensive, and this slows productivity. In the current study, it was found that few smallholder farmers had embraced infrastructural improvement such as those used by commercial farmers, obviously because of the high costs of these facilities. The lack of proper fencing also impacted productivity negatively, as was discussed in an earlier section. A lack of efficient transport was a big challenge as the land recipients lamented that they struggled to procure appropriate and available transport to take their produce to consumers and markets. As a result, some orders were cancelled because timeous delivery was of paramount importance to the market agents that supported them.

All the factors that were mentioned above impeded the ability of the smallholder land recipients to develop and participate fully in the commercial farming sector. As these land recipients continued to face challenges associated with resources, their ability to grow was impacted and this limited opportunities for the recipients to fully engage in the commercial farming sector. Thamaga-Chitja and Morojele (2014:152) state that government needs to take notice of the need for “the capacitation of the human, cultural, and social assets that are essential in the improvement of sustainable livelihoods and food security”. This suggests that government should invest in and extend its capacity to provide resources to beneficiaries, as this will boost the enhancement and sustainability of their livelihoods, ensure food security, and encourage participation in the commercial farming sector.

One of the biggest threats that faced the land recipients in Hammarsdale was the lack of access to more land. From the observations during the fieldwork, it was observed that smallholder farmers fully utilised the land that they had been allocated and that they maximised the opportunities and financial profits available to them to develop the land. However, many patches of land were small, and it came as no surprise that the land recipients stated that they no longer had sufficient land to expand their operations. It was apparent that the productivity of some was diminished because the land they occupied did not encourage further expansion opportunities. It thus follows that these farmers could not compete with larger farming enterprises that could produce in bulk and provide produce to local, national, and international markets. It is for this reason that Thamaga-Chitja and Morojele (2014) state that it is the result of poor policy coordination by government that the success of land redistribution is impeded.

According to the participants, they have not fully benefited from the land redistribution program. As far as food security, poverty reduction and sustainability were concerned, the land redistribution programme appeared relatively successful. However, it became evident that, due to a lack of assets, resources, and opportunities, the land recipients’ growth remained limited, and may continue to remain so. The problem is that land recipients lack the resources to develop and grow to become as successful as large commercial white farmers as upcoming black farmers. These previously disadvantaged smallholder farmers still lacked the resources, support and opportunities to enhance their ability to compete with large commercial white farmers who are still viewed as the elite in the agricultural sector. Pienaar and Traub (2015:4) suggest that, in order for land redistribution programs to be successful, there needs to be “shifts

in the current agricultural system which is characterised by inequalities in terms of support services, economic assets, market access, infrastructure, and income.”

#### **5.5.12 Lack of communication between LIMA and land recipients**

Despite the support provided by LIMA to the land recipients in the study area, some aspects such as coordination, communication, and a relationship of trust between this NGO, the land recipients, and the Hammarsdale community at large remained a grey area. Some land recipients were dissatisfied with the fact that LIMA did not effectively communicate with them. They felt that LIMA did not relay certain information to them and often made decisions that affected land recipients without consulting them. This suggests that the execution of land redistribution in Hammarsdale occurred in a top-down approach with LIMA and government agencies at the top and land recipients at the bottom. It is thus evident that the land redistribution program in Hammarsdale, particularly the 2016 project, was not community-led and that the recipients who stood to benefit from the program were largely marginalised. Sikor and Muller (2009) comment that, regardless of the manner in which land redistribution programs are executed (i.e., either from a top-down approach or a community led bottom-up approach), the process is fraught with challenges despite various successes. In the Hammarsdale area, some noteworthy successes were achieved, but many challenges impeded greater success. For instance, a land recipient divulged the following:

LIMA does not tell us or consult with us when there are markets or businesses that need our vegetables or when there are businesses that we can sell our produce to. They just tell us that they are coming to collect vegetables to sell to markets, and sometimes they don't even come to collect those vegetables. (Land recipient 1; Female, Aged 61)

This response is testament to the fact that LIMA tended to direct the land recipients' operations to the point where they informed them how much produce to sell and to which markets, without the land recipients having a say in the matter. This comment is evidence of the top-down approach that LIMA employed and exposes a shortcoming in that the needs and the voices of the land recipients were often not considered, especially in terms of how land recipients preferred to run their businesses. A land recipient expanded on this challenge:

LIMA sometimes decides for us without consulting us how much our vegetables will sell for at markets. Sometimes we end up not making a profit because they didn't ask us how much our vegetables should sell for. (Land recipient 7; Female, Aged 74)

This revelation means that LÌMA's intervention sometimes went beyond their mandate and posed a threat to the businesses of the land recipients because they suffered losses at times when LÌMA failed to consult with them before making a sale. The danger existed so much that losses would be suffered and this in turn potentially impacted the sustainability of the land recipients' farming enterprises and endangered their livelihoods. Moreover, the inability of land recipients to meet their expenses was also imminent in such situations. This argument is corroborated by Sikor and Muller (2009), who contend that land reform programs that are steered in a top-down manner/approach usually encounter significant challenges.

It was also clear that poor communication channels existed between LÌMA and the land recipients and/or their cooperatives, which had serious consequences for the land recipients' businesses. In any programme of this nature, it is important that good communication is maintained between the agent of change and the targeted recipients to ensure that the latter's needs are effectively addressed and that such a program is concluded successfully. A proper relationship and good communication between the agent (e.g., LÌMA) and the beneficiaries (the land recipients) are essential if good policy outcomes are to be yielded.

Against this background, it is suggested that the land redistribution program would have yielded better results if better communication channels had been utilised and if the project had not been conducted from a top-down approach. Sikor and Muller (2009) support the idea of a bottom-up approach as they argue that the implementing agency that utilises such an approach is well equipped to offer support as it is deeply conscious of and accommodating to the actual needs of the people at grassroots levels. However, this study clearly demonstrated that LÌMA failed to a certain degree in its objectives as the implementing agent of the land redistribution program in Hammarsdale, as it failed to acknowledge the land recipients as important stakeholders in the program and thus exempted them from important decision-making strategies.

## **5.6 Conclusion**

In conclusion, Chapter Five presented the relevant demographic information of the participants. This was followed by a brief description of LÌMA and its role as the NGO agency that was mandated to implement the land redistribution programme in Hammarsdale. I then proceeded to discuss and analyse the data by first focusing on the successes achieved by LÌMA and by then referring to the positive impact it had on land recipients by means of the land redistribution program that it steered in the Hammarsdale area. This analysis was followed by an analysis of

the challenges and constraints that LIMA and the land recipients experienced in the process of land reform in Hammarsdale. The views that were presented and the data that were presented had been obtained from interviews with two informants from LIMA who worked with land recipients and who steered the land redistribution programme in this area, as well as nine land recipients who were beneficiaries of this programme. The data were analysed, and the findings were presented under different themes (sub-paragraph headings) that emerged from the views of the informants. The data were further justified, analysed, and validated by references to findings in related literature and the theoretical framework, which was discussed in Chapter Two of this dissertation. The next chapter will conclude this study report with a brief overview of the study while the most important findings will also be highlighted and evaluated.

## **CHAPTER SIX**

### **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **6.1 Introduction**

Chapter Six is the final chapter of this dissertation in which I shall present the overall conclusions and recommendations based on the findings. The final conclusions were derived from the data that had been collected from eleven participants as well as from the literature that had been reviewed to support the study. The findings are discussed in conjunction with the views of earlier scholars that were derived from the literature. The findings are assessed in line with the objectives of this study as outlined in Chapter One in order to arrive at the overall conclusion.

The overarching aim of this study was to evaluate the impact that LIMA, a land reform NGO, had on land reform in the Hammarsdale area. The focus of the investigation was to determine if the role that LIMA played succeeded in improving the livelihoods of previously disadvantaged smallholder farmers in the Hammarsdale area. The investigation entailed evaluating the extent to which LIMA utilised the land reform programme as a strategy to alleviate poverty and reduce unemployment. In essence, the study endeavoured to determine if LIMA's intervention strategy was successful in upskilling smallholder land recipients and if it succeeded in enhancing the sustainability of these previously disadvantaged farmers in Hammarsdale.

#### **6.2 Summary of Key Findings**

It is imperative to revisit the objectives that this study endeavoured to achieve. The study was driven by four objectives that were as follows: (1) Evaluate the progress made by LIMA in terms of land redistribution in Hammarsdale; (2) Assess whether the objectives of the Land Reform Policy and the redistribution of land were achieved and whether the vision that land redistribution should enhance the livelihoods of land recipients was realised; (3) Assess the achievements and challenges that both the land recipients and LIMA faced in their efforts to enhance the livelihoods of smallholder farmers by means of the land redistribution programme; (4) Make recommendations for the improvement of land redistribution and the conditions of land recipients in Hammarsdale.

Below is a summary of the key findings in relation to the objectives of the study.

## **6.2 LIMA's progress in achieving effective land redistribution in Hammarsdale**

According to the findings, LIMA executed the land redistribution programme in three phases. At the time of the field work phase of the study, LIMA was in the third and final stage of the programme that had started in 2016, which was the exiting phase.

LIMA managed to make considerable progress in terms of the land redistribution programme in Hammarsdale. It was clear that various successes had been achieved although some challenges had impeded the program. In terms of successes, this NGO extended appropriate support to land redistribution beneficiaries by teaching them new methods of farming, equipping them with crop cultivation and entrepreneurial skills, offering relevant training sessions in farming methodologies, and capacitating them by making donations of gardening tools, farming equipment, and seed and seedlings to them. It was apparent that the land recipients had become skilled farmers and entrepreneurs who were able to improve their livelihoods, albeit for a limited period in the case of some. Moreover, the land recipients were able to create sustainable livelihoods for themselves that were free from unemployment, poverty, and food insecurity.

The above points are indicative of the successes that LIMA achieved and reflect the progress it made in its quest to redistribute land more equitably to previously disadvantaged smallholder farmers. It thus achieved various policy outcomes that yielded positive results in improving the livelihoods of land recipients. In fact, LIMA achieved most policy objectives in its execution of the land redistribution program. It prioritised women in need, particularly those who headed households and ensured the development of these predominantly female smallholder farmers as they were capacitated with the necessary skills, knowledge, and capabilities to execute their newly acquired farming skills effectively. It was also revealed that LIMA encouraged the establishment and registration of cooperatives for land recipients and smallholder farmers in Hammarsdale. This process was also encouraged by the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development to enhance the growth, skills, and resources of smallholder farmers so that they would better achieve market accessibility in the farming sector. These cooperatives in Hammarsdale strengthened the growth, skills, resources, and productivity of land recipients in the area.

LÌMA also made considerable progress in enabling land recipients to use land productively by utilising the right skills which, in turn, improved the quality of the produce that they cultivated and sold to neighbouring markets. Moreover, the land recipients were enabled with the aid of LÌMA to use land sustainably and productively, which boosted productivity and created sustainable and improved incomes. Lastly, LÌMA made considerable progress in terms of the land redistribution program by encouraging and assisting land recipients to form a farmers' association referred to as the Hammarsdale Farmers' Association. This association now represents the needs and interests of all farmers in the Hammarsdale area. It was also revealed that it had resolved some differences among the various cooperatives which enhanced their unity and solidarity. Farmers are now able to share their skills and resources and this strengthens their development and ability to function independently. Finally, LÌMA also approached and secured local markets that now buy produce from the land recipients.

LÌMA's efforts and successes in the execution of the land redistribution program created employment opportunities, improved household incomes, strengthened food security, and alleviated poverty to some extent in Hammarsdale.

### **6.2.1 Land redistribution objectives and the enhancement of land recipients' livelihoods**

The objective of land redistribution to improve the livelihoods of land recipients was achieved as LÌMA's intervention strategies positively changed the livelihoods of many previously disadvantaged people in the Hammarsdale area. Most of the farmers that they upskilled, supported, and trained were women who singularly headed their households. It is envisioned by the Land Reform Policy that women in need should be prioritised in upliftment programmes that target agricultural endeavours. LÌMA also trained farmers in the basic skills of farming as well as entrepreneurial and marketing skills to run successful farming businesses. These various skills development and training sessions allowed the land recipients to improve the quality of their produce, increase productivity, and improve their sales and profits. All these in turn resulted in the enhancement of the land recipients' livelihoods.

It was evident that the land redistribution program as driven and executed by LÌMA was successful to some extent in improving the livelihoods of land recipients in Hammarsdale. Many land recipients were capacitated to create a regular income from their farming activities

by utilising the skills, support and knowledge that had been imparted to them by LIMA's dedicated officials. LIMA trainers upskilled land recipients by for instance teaching them to use trenches when planting their crops which improved the quality and yields of their produce. In turn, the land recipients began to see an improvement in sales because their products were now very attractive for market agents and consumers, and thus their livelihoods also improved. Soil testing done by LIMA's experts guided the land recipients to plant crops that were best suited to the type of soil in their gardens. This improved the sales of the produce which also resulted in the improved livelihoods of the land recipients. The land recipients were also upskilled in packaging practices and branding of produce and they were taught how to nurture their gardens and harvests. This resulted in improved sales and higher profits that sustained the livelihoods of many land recipients.

LIMA also enhanced the livelihoods of the land recipients by transforming them from subsistence farmers into farmers that made a sustainable income, thus achieving one of the objectives of the land redistribution programme which is to create employment and sustained incomes for land recipients in the agricultural sector. The land recipients managed to create sustainable incomes for their households by increasing their productivity and selling their produce in bulk with the assistance of LIMA to larger neighbouring markets. This achieved the objectives of creating employment opportunities in the farming sector, alleviating poverty, creating sustainable incomes for households, and improving household food security.

The advanced skills development and training opportunities that LIMA provided contributed significantly to enhancing the livelihoods of the land recipients in Hammarsdale. The entrepreneurial and financial literacy skills training sessions enabled the land recipients to run successful farming businesses that made profits. They sold quality produce that was packaged well to satisfied market agents. LIMA continuously trained the land recipients during the course of the project in marketing and branding skills that enhanced the attractiveness of the cooperatives in Hammarsdale among neighbouring markets and consumers. The training in skills and knowledge development sessions that LIMA initiated contributed to the development of land recipients as budding farmers in their own right and also to the ability of some to live sustainable and improved lives thanks to the agricultural and farming practices as envisioned by land redistribution policies. With the assistance of LIMA, the land recipients increased their household income and curbed poverty, unemployment, and food insecurity. This means that

the objectives of land redistribution for disadvantaged people and communities were achieved to a large extent by LIMA's 2016 intervention program.

## **6.2.2 Achievements and challenges faced by land recipients in efforts to improve their livelihoods**

### *6.2.2.1 Achievements*

With the active support of LIMA, the land recipients achieved some successes that improved their livelihoods. First and foremost, LIMA encouraged the establishment of cooperatives that consolidated land recipients into formal agricultural groupings. Their collaborative efforts and interactions enhanced their knowledge, skills, and ultimately their productivity and thus helped them to eventually improve their profits. The land recipients were able to combine their skills and invest in collaborative labour and suitable resources in their cooperatives, which strengthened their capacity and enabled their ability to produce in bulk to access larger neighbouring markets where they sold their produce profitably. Secondly, the shift from subsistence farming to commercial farming was an achievement that resulted in improved livelihoods. LIMA's interventions to drive the land redistribution program were instrumental in bringing about this development. The land recipients began to generate larger and more sustainable incomes which improved their lives. Some land recipients attested to this fact by stating that they had been able to renovate their homes and send their children to good fee-paying schools.

The upskilling of land recipients through various training sessions and skills development programmes created employment opportunities for members of the community – particularly young men – and this contributed to the alleviation of poverty and improved food security in more homes. It is thus undeniable that LIMA assisted various land recipients to generate sustainable incomes to improve their livelihoods. This NGO further made it possible for land recipients to realise that growth in income and sustainability is possible with the right skills, knowledge, and capabilities when these attributes are combined with hard work and dedication. Therefore, it may be concluded that LIMA contributed successfully to improve the livelihoods of land recipients by transforming them into skilled farmers who generated good returns on their hard labour. However, the study also confirmed that various challenges negatively impacted the successful outcomes of the 2016 land redistribution programme in Hammarsdale.

### 6.2.2.2 *Challenges*

Some debilitating challenges were the lack of safe and secure gardens, poor infrastructure, limited transport availability, limited water supplies, a lack of irrigation systems, difficulty in accessing larger markets, and limited or no access to more arable land. These challenges limited the extended growth of the smallholder farmers, slowed their productivity, and threatened their livelihoods, sustainability, and longevity. It was established that LIMA had been unable to assist the land recipients with the abovementioned challenges due to a lack of resources due to budgetary restrictions. Moreover, due to limited access to extensive resources available to LIMA, the land recipients who had managed to improve their agricultural activities and outcomes initially, were later no longer able to sustain their efforts as emerging farmers as they collapsed under the lack of further support provided by LIMA. The findings demonstrated that LIMA, under the threat of limited resources and financial muscle, could not sustain its response to the aspirations of land recipients indefinitely. The growth of the land recipients thus declined as their need for proper farming and environmental infrastructure, the donation of resources, access to water and irrigation systems, machinery, transportation, capital, and safety measures could no longer be addressed. An important finding is that the land recipients' yearning for access to more land to allow greater productivity, profits, and the creation of new jobs for the unemployed could not be fulfilled. LIMA could only drive the program as far as providing start-up packages and training in basic farming skills to equip the land recipients with the knowledge to use their land productively. However, when it came to the point that the land recipients were required to function independently in order to continue their growth, their potential longevity and sustainability collapsed, more specifically because LIMA lacked the financial muscle to sustain the support it had initially rendered these smallholder farmers.

Although the manner in which the land recipients spent their additional profits was beyond the scope of this study, it may be surmised that a considerable proportion was spent on purchasing items that they could never afford before. It is a natural human trait to utilise extra funds to purchase luxuries and parents often indulge their children in this regard. The implication of this notion is that land redistribution programs need to focus on training that equips land recipients to utilise their growing wealth wisely at first, until they have accumulated sufficient resources for additional luxuries.

### **6.3 Recommendations for Interventions to Improve Land Redistribution Programs in Hammarsdale**

Based on the findings of this study, various recommendations were formulated and are offered here.

The first recommendation concerns governmental interventions in the quest to uplift smallholder farmers and recipients of land based on land restitution and redistribution policies. First, government agencies need to acquire the strong political will and financial resources to support NGOs such as LIMA as well as land recipients to reap the maximum benefits of the land redistribution program. Only if government departments work collaboratively and in close consultation with organisations that drive their land redistribution policies, will the longevity and sustainability of these programs be assured.

The findings clearly indicate that LIMA, and therefore by extension numerous other NGOs, did not have the resources to drive land redistribution programmes indefinitely. For this reason, alternative measures, incentives and even sanctions should be devised to ensure that land recipients cast off the cloak of dependency from government and external organisations as soon and as effectively as possible, which is the only way to ensure their sustainability.

The findings also indicate that land recipients need financial support, proper infrastructure, and technological know-how to grow their businesses and boost productivity. The findings indicate that such growth will, in turn, create more employment opportunities for unemployed community members, particularly in rural development areas. The results further indicate that land recipients were dependent on proper security gates and fencing for their gardens as well as Jojo tanks for water storage, but that none were able (or willing) to procure these facilities themselves, regardless of growing profits. This finding suggests that their profit margins were either very limited, or that they spent this extra money on facilities other than those that would support their sustained survival.

When LIMA's resources became depleted, neither the government nor the land recipients stepped in to find ways to sustain their growing success in the smallholder farming industry. For this reason, revised interventions are required for the coordination and establishment of interrelations between government and NGOs (for instance LIMA) to combine and extend their

resources in order to invest in the needs of existing farmers who are skilled but need continued support to maintain and grow their productivity and their businesses until they can successfully stand on their own as farmers.

#### **6.4 Recommendations**

1. The lack of resources and budgetary provisions is a major problem that limits the growth, sustainability, and longevity not only of smallholder farmers, but of land redistribution programs as well. This study recommends that relevant government departments should be mandated to focus on working collaboratively with NGOs such as LIMA in a coordinated and interrelated manner to extend and combine their resources and budgets in order to invest in smallholder farmers and cooperatives that have the skills and potential to grow in the agricultural sector. If this becomes a reality, smallholder farmers will be allowed access to transport, machinery and proper water and irrigation systems that will enhance their productivity and promote their legitimacy as competitors in commercial markets. This will in turn secure the sustainability and longevity of smallholder farmers and cooperatives as envisioned by land reform and rural development policies. In this process, both government and support agencies should strive unstintingly to render land recipients competent enough to secure their independence to the point where they no longer require continued support, in the same manner that commercial farmers with whom they compete have to secure their independence.
2. It is often the case that government and NGOs place focus on emerging and unskilled farmers but neglect to assist, support and monitor existing skilled smallholder farmers who require financial support, access to larger markets, and larger pieces of arable land to grow their businesses. As a result, existing farmers eventually fail and some collapse entirely due to unmanageable losses and the unsustainability of their farming operations. It is therefore recommended that government should allocate more land to existing, skilled and deserving farmers in Hammarsdale so that they can boost production and the size of their crops in order to expand their profit margin. In turn, such larger farms and gardens will offer more employment opportunities to the unemployed, particularly the youth. This will curb unemployment and poverty and food insecurity not only among farmers, but among the Hammarsdale community as a whole.

3. This study also recommends that government should create a policy framework that mandates larger agricultural markets to support smallholder farmers through their cooperatives and associations by granting them unrestricted accessibility to market opportunities.
4. Government and NGOs have to train and support smallholder farmers and upcoming land recipients to effectively utilise databases that will enhance their administrative control of their businesses. This in turn will engender better income rates, improve livelihoods, and ensure the development of smallholder farmers in Hammarsdale in a sustainable manner.
5. Finally, this study recommends that relevant governmental departments and NGOs such as LIMA prioritise youth participation and involvement in land reforms and agricultural activities. This is because a large number of youths residing in Hammarsdale are unemployed and revert to criminality and the abuse of drugs and alcohol. Most of the land recipients in Hammarsdale are elderly women who are sickly and uneducated, and they could benefit from the participation of young adults who support and aid them on their farms or in their gardens. Youth participation will also assist in technological advancements and the execution of heavy tasks that elderly smallholder farmers in Hammarsdale find difficult to execute. The contribution of the youth to the smallholder farming sector will undoubtedly enhance productivity and generate larger profit margins for land recipients, while it will ensure a living income and sustain their livelihoods as well.

## **6.5 Conclusion**

The investigation that explored the research questions and addressed the objectives of this study focused on the operations of LIMA, an NGO, that had been mandated to implement a land redistribution program in Hammarsdale by utilising its capacity to access skills, expertise, and resources for the benefit of smallholder farmers in this rural setting. This organisation thus committed itself to assist various land recipients by upskilling and uplifting these previously disadvantaged members of the Hammarsdale agricultural sector. The study found that, for the most part, LIMA made a positive impact due to its land reform initiatives as its interventions facilitated the enhancement and livelihoods of various previously disadvantaged smallholder farmers in the study area. In fulfilment of its mandate, LIMA achieved various milestones and

achieved some of the objectives of the South African Land Reform Policy. However, it also encountered various challenges that impeded the full and comprehensive achievement of some of the objectives of land redistribution for the previously disadvantaged. These challenges threatened the sustainability of the land reform program that was launched in 2016. Positive results were slow and tended to collapse when external support for the land recipients was withdrawn, and the intended purpose of LIMA's land reform initiatives was ultimately not met. However, this study proposes insightful recommendations that, when properly executed, may be useful in enhancing land reform programs. They may also assist support agencies and relevant government departments in achieving the intended objectives of the worthy quest to improve the livelihoods of previously disadvantaged people through sustainable land redistribution efforts for the benefit of future generations.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, M., Sibanda, S. & Turner, S. (1999). *Land tenure reform and rural livelihoods in Southern Africa. Natural Resource Perspectives*, 39. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- African National Congress (ANC). (1992). Land manifesto for ANC policy conference. Endorsed Final Draft. Johannesburg: ANC.
- African National Congress (ANC). (2012). Land reform policy discussion document. Johannesburg: ANC.
- Aliber, M. (2003). Chronic poverty in South Africa: Incidences, causes and policies. Human Sciences Research Council, Pretoria, South Africa. *World Development*, 31(3), 473–490.
- Aliber, M. (2005). *Overcoming underdevelopment in South Africa's second economy*. UNDP, South Africa.
- Alkire, S. (2009). *The capability approach and human development*. Oxford University: Poverty and Human Development Initiative, pp. 1-60.
- Babbie, E. & Mouton, J. (2001). *The practice of social research. South African edition*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa.
- Baldwin, A. (1975). Mass removals and separate development. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 1(2), 215-227.
- Boudreaux, K. (2010). *Land reform as social justice: The case of South Africa*. Oxford: Institute of Economic Affairs, Blackwell Publishing.
- Boyce, J.K., Rosset, P. & Stanton, E. (2005). Land reform and sustainable development. *Research Working Paper No. 28*. City: Political Economy Research Institute.
- Bradstock, A. (2005), Changing the livelihoods and land reform: Evidence from the Northern Cape Province of South Africa. *Journal of World Development*, 33(11), 1979–1992.
- Braun, V. & Clark, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). United States: Oxford University Press.
- Chambers, R. & Conway, G. (1992). *Sustainable rural livelihoods: Practical concepts for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. UK: Institute of Development Studies.
- Cooke, E. (2012). *Land law*. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Cousins, B. (1997). *How do rights become real? Formal and informal institutions of South Africa's Land Reform*. Johannesburg: Institute for Development Studies.

- Cousins, B. & Scoones, I. (2009). Contested paradigms of ‘viability’ in redistributive land reform: Perspectives from Southern Africa. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37, 31–66.
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: SAGE.
- Daniel, P.S. & Sam, A.G. (2011). *Research methodology*. Delhi: Kalpaz Publications.
- De Villiers, J. (2017). *Solving Africa’s land issues to boost productivity, alleviate poverty and eradicate hunger*. Gauteng, South Africa: Africa Business News [Online]. Available at: <https://www.cnbc africa.com/news/2017/03/24/land-redistribution/> [Accessed: 23/08/2018].
- Deneulin, S. & Shahani, L. (2009). *An introduction to the human development and capability approach: Freedom and agency*. UK and USA: Earthscan.
- Department of Land Affairs. (1997). *White Paper on South African land policy*. Pretoria: Department of Land Affairs, p. 38.
- Department of Rural Development and Land Reform. (2019). Land redistribution and development. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.ruraldevelopment.gov.za/services/land-redistribution-and-development#.XNwYj8gzaUk> [Accessed 15/05/2019].
- Ding, C. (2003). Land policy reform in China: Assessment and prospects. *Journal of Land Use Policy*, 20(2), 109–120.
- Dlamini, S.I. (2016). *Transforming local economies through land reform: Political dilemmas and rural development realities in South Africa*. Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Political Science, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban. Available at: [https://researchspace.ukzn.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10413/14379/Dlamini\\_Siyabonga\\_Innocent\\_2016.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://researchspace.ukzn.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10413/14379/Dlamini_Siyabonga_Innocent_2016.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) [Accessed 21/05/2019].
- Dolny, H. (Ed.). (1994). The use of segmented land markets as a redistributive mechanisms. In LAPC. *Land redistribution options conference proceedings 12–15 October 1993*. Johannesburg: LAPC, 43–50.
- Dore, R.P. (1959). *Land reform in Japan*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Dube, H.N. (2016). *Vulnerabilities of rural agricultural cooperatives in KwaZulu-Natal: A case study of Amajuba District, South Africa*. Dissertation for the degree of Master of Commerce, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban. Available at: [https://researchspace.ukzn.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10413/14243/Dube\\_Hlengiwe\\_Ntongolozzi\\_2016.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://researchspace.ukzn.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10413/14243/Dube_Hlengiwe_Ntongolozzi_2016.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) [Accessed 21/05/2019].

- Ellis, F. (2000a). Determinants of rural livelihood diversification in developing countries. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 51(2), 289–302.
- Ellis, F. (2000b). *Rural livelihoods and diversity in developing countries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Feinberg, F.M. (1993). The 1913 Natives Land Act in South Africa: Politics, race, and segregation in the early 20<sup>th</sup> Century. *Journal of African Historical Studies*, 26(1), 65–109.
- Fischer, F. & Miller, G.J. (2006). *Handbook of public policy analysis: Theory, politics, and methods*. New York: CRC Press.
- Fischer, F., Miller, G.J. & Sidney, M.S. (2006). *Handbook of public policy analysis theory, politics, and methods*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gliem, J.A. & Gliem, R.R. (2003). Calculating, interpreting, and reporting Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient for Likert-type scales. Midwest research to practice conference in adult, continuing, and community education. [Online] <https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/344/Gliem%20%26%20Gliem.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y> [Accessed: 04/04/2021].
- Grindle, M. (1980). *Politics and policy implementation in the Third World*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Habib, A. & Padayachee, V. (2000). Economic policy and power relations in South Africa's transition to democracy. *Journal of World Development*, 28(2), 245–263.
- Hall, R. (2009). *Another countryside? Policy options for land and agrarian reform in South Africa*. Cape Town: Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies, School of Government, University of the Western Cape.
- Hall, R. (2018). *Global land grabbing and political reactions 'from below'*. New York, USA: Routledge.
- Harvard Library. (2018). *Library research guide for the history of science: Introduction*. Cambridge, USA: Harvard Library Research Guide. [Online]. <https://guides.library.harvard.edu/HistSciInfo/secondary>> [updated November 8 2018, accessed 16/11/2018].
- Henderson, R. (2021, 5 January). Land Bank needs R7bn bailout to ease financial woes. *Bloomberg News*. [Online]. Retrieved from: <https://www.news24.com/fin24/companies/banks/audit-woes-at-land-bank-has-bondholders-worried-20210105> [Accessed: 21/01/2021].

- Holsti, O.R. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. London: Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- Howlett, M. & Ramesh, M. (2003). *Studying public policy: Policy cycles and policy subsystems* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Is the textile industry on the decline...? (2020). *Newcastillian*, March 2020. Available at: <https://newcastillian.co.za> [Accessed on 02/02/2021].
- Jacobs, T., Lahiff, E. & Hall, R. (2003). Evaluating land and agrarian reform: Land redistribution. *Occasional Paper Series No. 1*. Cape Town: Institute of Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape.
- Jang, S-H. (2004). Land reform and capitalist development in Korea. Paper presented at the Economic History & Development Workshop, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, May.
- Jayne, T.S., Yamano, T.B., Weber, M.T., Tschirley, D., Benfica, R., Chapoto, A. & Zulu, B. (2003). Smallholder income and land distribution in Africa: Implications for poverty reduction strategies. *Journal of Food Policy*, 28, 253–275.
- Kepe, T. (1997). *Environmental entitlements in Mkambati: Livelihoods, social institutions and environmental change on the Wild Coast of the Eastern Cape* (No. 1). University of the Western Cape: Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, School of Government.
- Kirsten, J.F. & van Zyl, J. (1999). Approaches and progress with land reform in South Africa. *Agrekon*, 38 (special issue).
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). California: SAGE.
- Ladejinsky, W. (1977). Land Reform. In L.J. Walinsky (Ed.). *Land reform as unfinished business: The selected papers of Wolf Ladejinsky* (pp. 354–366). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lahiff, E. (2007). ‘Willing Buyer, Willing Seller’: South Africa’s failed experiment in marketed agrarian reform. *Journal of Third World Quarterly*, 28(8), 1577–1597.
- Lahiff, E. & Cousins, B. (2005). Smallholder agriculture and land reform in South Africa. *Journal of Development Studies*, 36(2), 127–131.
- Laswell, H.D. (1949). The structure and function of communication in society. In Schramm, W. (Ed.), *Mass communication* (pp. 102–115). New York University of Illinois Press.

- Letsoalo, E.M. & Thupana, M.J.J. (2013). Repeal of the Land Act: The challenge of land reform policies in South Africa: Social dynamics. *Journal of African Studies*, 39(2), 298–307.
- LIMA Rural Development Foundation. (2017). Organisational profile [Online]. Available at: <https://lima.org.za/about-us/organisational-profile/>. [Accessed: 03/5/2019].
- Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Lipton, M. (2009). *Land reform in developing countries: Property rights and property wrongs*. New York: Routledge.
- Long, H. (2014). Land use policy in China: Introduction. *Journal of Land Use Policy*, 40, 1–5.
- Maeresera, S. (2012). *Military interventions in African conflicts: The Southern African Development Community Coalition of the willing's military intervention in the Democratic Republic of Congo, 1998-2002*. Thesis for the degree Doctor of Philosophy, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg.
- Manona, C. (1998). Land tenure and use: Perspectives from a village in the Eastern Cape, South Africa. *African Sociological Review*, 2(2), 77–89.
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G.B. (2011). *Designing qualitative research* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). London: SAGE.
- Mason, J. (2018). *Qualitative researching*. London: SAGE.
- McCaston, M.K. (1998). *Tips for collecting, reviewing, and analyzing secondary data*. London: Partnership & Household Livelihood Security Unit (PHLS).
- Merten, M. (2018). *Parliament: Historic land expropriation agreement reached amid South Africa's changing politics*. Johannesburg: *Daily Maverick*. [Online] Accessed from: <https://www.inceconnect.co.za/article/parliament-historic-land-expropriation-agreement-reached-amid-south-africa-s-changing-politics>. [Accessed on 11/02/2021].
- Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Morse, S. & McNamara, N. (2013). *Sustainable livelihood approach: A critique of theory and practice*. New York, London: Springer Science+Business Media.
- Morse, S., McNamara, N. & Acholo, M. (2009). *Sustainable livelihood approach: A critical analysis of theory and practice*. [Online] Accessed from:

<https://www.reading.ac.uk/web/files/geographyandenvironmentalscience/GP189.pdf>

[Accessed on 15/05/2018].

- Moyo, S. (2011). Three decades of agrarian reform in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 38(3), 493–531.
- Nauta, W. (2001). *The implications of freedom: The changing role of land sector NGOs in transforming South Africa*. PhD dissertation, Vrije Universiteit, Netherlands.
- Niehof, A. (2004). The significance of diversification for rural livelihood systems. *Food Policy*, 29(4), 321–338.
- Nieuwenhuis, J. (2007). Qualitative research design and data gathering techniques. In K. Maree (Ed.), *First step in research* (pp. 69–97). Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Ntsebeza, L. & Hall, R. (2007). *The land question in South Africa*. Cape Town, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) Press.
- Okem, A.E. & Lawrence, R. (2013). Exploring the opportunities and challenges of network formation for cooperatives in South Africa. *KJMB*, 5(1), 16–33.
- Ortmann, G.F. & King, R.P. (2007). Agricultural cooperatives I: History, theory and problems. *Agrekon*, 46(1), 18–46.
- Oxford English Dictionary. (2018). Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa.
- Palys, T. (2008). *Purposive sampling*. In L.M. Given (Ed.). *The SAGE encyclopaedia of qualitative research methods Vol. 2* (pp. 697–698). Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Parsons, W. (1995). *Public policy: An introduction to the theory and practice of policy analysis*. United Kingdom: Edward Elgar Publishers.
- Pearce, B. (1995). Redistribution policies. NLC Director. Input for Property Law and Land Rights Conference, 6–7 February.
- Peters, P.E. (2004). Inequality and social conflict over land in Africa. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 4(3), 269–314.
- Pienaar, J.M. (2014). *Land reform*. Cape Town: Juta and Company.
- Pienaar, L. & Traub, L.N. (2015). Understanding the smallholder farmer in South Africa: Towards a sustainable livelihoods classification. [Online]. Available at: <https://tind-customer-agecon.s3.amazonaws.com/bd63c4d3-40e0-4567-8dec-33e9fbad9fb6?response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3D%22PienaarUnderstanding%20the%20smallholder%20farmer%20in%20South%20Africa-1233.pdf%22&response-content-type=application%2Fpdf&AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAXL7W7Q3XHXDQYS&E>

[xpries=1558365285&Signature=We%2BqFmFV23H9iMD%2BQgFKXhCdFuk%3D](#) [Accessed on 20/05/2019].

- Polit, D.F. & Hungler, B.P. (1999). *Nursing research: Principles and methods*. Philadelphia: JB Lippincott Company.
- Quan, J. (2000). Land tenure, economic growth and poverty reduction in sub-Saharan Africa. In C. Toumlin & J. Quan (Eds.), *Evolving land rights, policy and tenure in Africa*. London: Department of International Development.
- Rajasekar, S., Philominathan, P. & Chinnathambi, V. (2013). Research methodology. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 5(3), 288–296.
- Republic of South Africa. (1996). *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act No. 108 of 1996*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Robeyns, I. (2007). The capability approach: A theoretical survey. *Journal of Human Development*, 6(1), 93–117. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/146498805200034266?needAccess=true> [Accessed on 14/06/2018].
- Rosset, P., Patel, R. & Courville, M. (2006). *Promised land: Competing visions of agrarian reform*. Oakland, California: Institute of Food and Development Policy.
- Salkind, N.J. & Miller, D.C. (2002). *Handbook of research design & social measurement*, (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). United Kingdom, London: SAGE.
- Sen, A. (1982). *Poverty and famine: An essay on entitlements and deprivation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sen, A. (1985). *Commodities and capabilities*. New York: Elsevier Science.
- Sen, A. (1990). Development as capability expansion. In K. Griffin & J. Knight. *Human development and the international development strategy for the 1990s* (pp. 41-58). London: McMillan.
- Sen, A. (1992). *Inequality re-examined*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sen, A. (1997). *On economic inequality*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Sen, A. (2000). A decade of human development. *Journal of Human Development*, 1(1), 17–23.
- Serrat, O. (2008). *The sustainable livelihoods approach*. Washington, DC: Asian Development Bank.

- Shackleton, S., Shackleton, C. & Cousins, B. (2000). *Re-evaluating the communal lands of Southern Africa: New understandings of rural livelihoods*. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Shelly, N. (2018). Land reform debate needs to shift, says experts. Johannesburg: *Times Live*. [Online] Accessed at: <https://www.google.co.za/amp/s/www.timeslive.co.za/amp/news/south-africa/.2018-05-18-land-reform-debate-needs-to-shift-say-experts/>. [Accessed on 11/02/2021].
- Shin, G-W. (1998). Agrarian conflict and the origins of Korean capitalism. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(5), 1309–1351.
- Sibanda, S. (2001). Land reform and poverty alleviation in South Africa. Paper presented at the Southern African Regional Poverty Network workshop on Land Reform and Poverty Alleviation in Southern Africa, 4–5 June, Pretoria.
- Sikor, T. & Muller, D. (2009). The limits of state-led land reform: An introduction. *Journal of World Development*, 37(8), 1307–1316.
- Silverman, D. (2005). *Doing qualitative research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: SAGE.
- Simmons, C., Walker, R., Perz, S., Aldrich, S., Caldas, M., Pereira, R..... & Arima, E. (2010). Doing it for themselves: Direct action land reform in the Brazilian Amazon. *World Development*, 38(3), 429–444.
- South African History Online (SAHO). (2012). Land reform policy discussion document. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.sahistory.org.za/sites/default/files/Land%20Act%202013.pdf>. [Accessed on 14/04/2019].
- South African History Online (SAHO). (2017a). *The Natives Land Act of 1913*. Cape Town, South Africa: South African History. [Online]. Available at: [\[https://www.sahistory.org.za/topic/natives-land-act-1913\]](https://www.sahistory.org.za/topic/natives-land-act-1913) [Updated June 2017, accessed 04/11/2018].
- South African History Online (SAHO). (2017b). *The Freedom Charter: Land redistribution and social conflict by Franco Frescura*. Cape Town, South Africa. Available at: <https://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/freedom-charter-land-redistribution-and-social-conflict-franco-frescura> [Accessed on 30/10/2018].
- Statistics South Africa. (2011). The South Africa I know, the home I understand. [Online]. Available at: [http://www.statssa.gov.za/?page\\_id=4286&id=10419](http://www.statssa.gov.za/?page_id=4286&id=10419). [Accessed on 03/04/2019].

- Thamaga-Chitja, J.M. & Morojele, P. (2014). The context of smallholder farming in South Africa: Towards a livelihood asset building framework. *Journal of Human Ecology*, 45(2), 147–155.
- Thompson, R.J. & Nicholls, B.M. (2011). The Glen Grey Act: Forgotten dimensions in an old theme. *South African Journal of Economic History*, 8(2), 58–70.
- Tilley, S. (2007). International comparative study of strategies for settlement support provision to land reform beneficiaries. *Research Report No. 26: Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies*. University of Western Cape.
- Vogt, W.P., Gardner, D.C. & Haeffele, L.M. (2012). *When to use what research design*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Walker, C. (2003). ‘Piety in the sky?’ Gender policy and land reform in South Africa. *Agrarian change, gender and land rights*. 3(1-3), 113–148.
- Walker, C. (2008). *Landmarked: Land claims and land restitution in South Africa*. South and North America: Ohio University Press.
- Weideman, M. (2004). *Land reform, equity and growth in South Africa: A comparative analysis*. Thesis for the degree Doctor of Philosophy, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
- Williams, G. (1996). Setting the agenda: A critique of the World Bank’s rural restructuring programme for South Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 22(1), 139–166.
- World Bank. (1993). *The East Asian miracle: A World Bank policy research report*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank. (2017). *The 2017 global poverty update from the World Bank*. Washington, DC: World Bank.