THE AGRARIAN RURAL HOUSEHOLD ECONOMY

Status report on livelihoods, rights, and land use in selected sites in the Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal, Limpopo, and Western Cape
THE AGRARIAN RURAL HOUSEHOLD ECONOMY

Status report on livelihoods, rights, and land use in selected sites in the Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal, Limpopo, and Western Cape

Published by Tshintsha Amakhaya,
c/o Surplus People Project [SPP]
2nd Floor, 266 Lower Main Road, Salt River 7925,
PO Box 468, Athlone 7760, Cape Town, South Africa

Tel +27 (0)21 448 5605
Fax +27 (0)21 448 0105
E-mail moniqueta@spp.org.za

Website https://sites.google.com/site/tshintshaintranet/


July 2012

All rights reserved.
No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means without prior permission from the publisher or the authors.

Editor: Sharon Dell
Design & Layout: Duo Designs
Photography:
Mike Carelse, M Salomon, FSG, AFRA, S Greenberg

With thanks to our funding partners

TSHINTSHA AMAKHAYA
Working together for rural change
## Table of Contents

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** 1  
**FOREWORD** 6  
1. **INTRODUCTION** 9  
2. **METHODOLOGY** 13  
   2.1 Preparation 15  
   2.2 Field-work 15  
   2.3 Data capture and cleaning 15  
   2.4 Data analysis and reporting 16  
3. **DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE** 17  
4. **DEMOGRAPHICS** 23  
   4.1 Household size, gender and age 24  
   4.2 Education 25  
   4.3 Employment 27  
5. **LAND ACCESS** 31  
6. **INCOME** 37  
   6.1 Sources of income 38  
   6.2 Mean household incomes 44  
7. **ACCESS TO FOOD** 46  
   7.1 Extent of hunger 47  
   7.2 Sources of food for household consumption 51  
   7.3 Frequency of food consumption 54  
8. **LIVESTOCK OWNERSHIP, SALES AND MARKETING** 56  
   8.1 Livestock ownership 57  
   8.2 Livestock use and marketing 64  
   8.3 Livestock value chains and agro-ecological production 67  
9. **CROP PRODUCTION, SALES AND MARKETING** 69  
   9.1 Crop production 70  
   9.2 Crop use and markets 74  
   9.3 Crop value chains and food sovereignty 77  
10. **WATER ACCESS AND AGRICULTURAL SUPPORT** 79  
   10.1 Access to water for productive use 80  
   10.2 Agricultural support 82  
11. **FARM WORKER CONDITIONS** 86  
12. **EVICTIONS** 89  
13. **ORGANISATION** 94  
14. **KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS** 97  

**ANNEXURE 1:** Relationship between TA objectives, indicators and baseline survey 100  
**ANNEXURE 2:** Consolidated situation analysis report 101  
1. Introduction 102  
2. Geographic overview 102  
3. Demographic overview 103  
4. Social issues and dynamics 105  
5. Main economic activities 107  
6. Land reform and agriculture 109  
   6.1 Overview of agriculture 109  
   6.2 Land reform and tenure 113  
   6.3 Black farmers 115  
7. Institutional analysis 116  
8. Conclusion 117  

**ACRONYMS & REFERENCES** 118
list of figures

Figure 1: Research sites and districts
Figure 2: Sample size by organisation (N=1,743)
Figure 3: Provincial breakdown of sample (%) (N=1,743)
Figure 4: Compilation of the provinces
Figure 5: Type of land tenure (N=1,699)
Figure 6: Type of tenure by province (N=1,699)
Figure 7: Age distribution by gender (N=1,705)
Figure 8: Highest level of education attained (N=943)
Figure 9: Level of education by tenure type (N=943)
Figure 10: Type of employment (N=1,542)
Figure 11: Crop land size (%) (N=1,260)
Figure 12: Crop land size by tenure type (% with food gardens or <1ha) (N=1,094)
Figure 13: Primary source of income, grouped (N=1,726)
Figure 14: Primary source of income (N=1,726)
Figure 15: Secondary source of income (N=1,510)
Figure 16: Agricultural production by monthly household income (N=1,113)
Figure 17: Household income by province (N=1,113)
Figure 18: Did you or a member of your household go hungry in the past 12 months? (N=1,712)
Figure 19: Hunger by province (N=1,712)
Figure 20: Hunger by tenure type (N=1,667)
Figure 21: Hunger by crop production and land access
Figure 22: Who goes without food if there is not enough? (N=700)
Figure 23: Main sources of different food types for household consumption
Figure 24: Main source of food by production of selected products
Figure 25: Frequency of consumption of different types of food (%)
Figure 26: Livestock ownership (N=1,743)
Figure 27: Livestock ownership and sales (N=1,743)
Figure 28: Livestock ownership by province (N=1,743)
Figure 29: Livestock ownership by tenure (N=1,698)
Figure 30: Herd/flock sizes
Figure 31: Percentage of households with >10 head of different livestock types by province
Figure 32: Aggregate changes* in herd/flock sizes
Figure 33: Aggregate changes in herd sizes by province
Figure 34: Main reasons for decrease in herd/flock sizes
Figure 35: Main uses of livestock
Figure 36: Livestock sales
Figure 37: Mean value of livestock sales
Figure 38: Primary livestock markets for those who sell livestock (%)
Figure 39: Percentage producing different types of crops (N=1,743)
Figure 40: Crop production by province (N=1,743*)
Figure 41: Crop production by tenure (N=1,698*)
Figure 42: Disaggregated farm dweller crop production
Figure 43: Crop amounts produced by crop type
Figure 44: Use of crops
Figure 45: Crop sales by crop type
Figure 46: Mean crop sales
Figure 47: Main markets for crops
Figure 48: % of respondents in different hunger categories producing crops (N=1,717*)
Figure 49: Primary water source for crops and livestock
Figure 50: Water source for crops by province
list of figures

Figure 51: Water source for livestock by province 81
Figure 52: Payment for water (N=1,007) 82
Figure 53: Agricultural support by province and average 82
Figure 54: Agricultural support by tenure type 83
Figure 55: % of producers of selected products above a threshold* by access to extension 84
Figure 56: Compliance with basic conditions of employment 88
Figure 57: Evictions and threat of evictions 91
Figure 58: Evictions and threats of eviction by tenure type 92
Figure 59: First stop when faced with eviction (N=127) 93
Figure 60: Membership of types of organisations (%) 95
Figure 61: Membership of organisation by tenure type 96

list of tables

Table 1: Sample sizes of participating organisations 18
Table 2: Research site details 20
Table 3: Total residents in sampled households 23
Table 4: Household sizes 23
Table 5: Gender of household members (N=1,722) 25
Table 6: Employment by gender (N=1,542) 28
Table 7: Access to land (N=1,616) 32
Table 8: Forms of tenure and key tenure issues in the research sites 33
Table 9: Crop land size (N=1,260) 35
Table 10: Mean and median household income (N=1,113) 44
Table 11: Hunger by crop land size (N=1,237) 50
Table 12: A typical food basket for each province 55
Table 13: Percentage of households with >10 head of different types of livestock by tenure type 61
Table 14: Mean herd/flock sizes and range 62
Table 15: Crop production 70
Table 16: Basic conditions of employment: compliance requirements 87
Table 17: Does anyone in your household belong to any organisation? 95
Stephen Greenberg (PhD) led the research process from survey design to writing up the research findings. His dedication, expertise, and eye for detail have been crucial in compiling this report. He also provided guidance and hands-on support to the partner organizations and their research teams.

AFRA: Erna Kruger, Ndabezinhle Ziqubu, Nonhlanzeko Mthembu, Sanjaya Pillay, Nokuthula Mthimunye (staff), Nkonzo Zondi, Mqelele Mpamza, Londiwelwe Khathi, Nkokhela Luthuli (interns), Sipho Khumalo, Ntombikayise Mthembu, Ntombi Khulu (Dannhauser), Jabhi Mlangeni, Mike Dladla, Ambros Sithebe (Bothas Pass), Thabile Mavuso, Goodness Mtshali (Utrecht), Alfred Nkosi, Jacob Kubheka (Ingogo), Thabile Ntuli, and Mzondeki Mkumane (Nomandien)

BRC: Yandisa Gebe, Zanele Semane, Fanelwe Mhaga, Nomonde Feltiti (staff) Thandeka Msi, and Judith Pule (data capturers), Nomava Tshatshu, Sikelelwa Rode, Sandiswa Mgunu, Funeka Mbolekwa, Mzonyana Tontsi, Musa Fihla, Sinoxolo Daweti, Ayabulela Msethu, Weziwe Tete (community members)

FSG: Maxwell Mudhara (PhD), Avrashka Sahadeva, Michael Malinga, and Zanele Shezi (staff), Stembile Ndandwe, Ntandokazi Ninela, Nondumiso Dumakude, Samukeliswe Zondi, Fidzit Fidzani (students), PS Mbele (Potshini), SE Mduba (Potshini), Nkosithandile Ndlovu (Okhombi), Sphiwe Dubazana (Okhombi), Ellias Ngubane (Nokopela), NE Hlatshwayo (Nokopela), BJ Kumalo (Mlomleni), Ngenisile Khaba (Mmlomleni), Busi Mlangeni (Obonjaneni), Margaret Kumalo (Obonjaneni), Hlongwane Zama (Busingatha), Celiwe Kumalo (Busingatha), Beauty Nkabini (Newstand), MA Malinga (Newstand), Daniel Ngwenya (New Reserve B), and Nomaonlo Mazibuko (New Reserve B)

Nkuzi: Phumudzo Nemadzivhanani, Pricilla Rambau, and Shadrack Tshifar (contract staff)

SCLC: Rosa-Linda Kock, Yule Philiso, Patrick Sambo, Bussiwa Silo-Ntolosi, and Ntombomzi Sixolo (staff), Luzaan Kock, Siya Zonke, Dumisa Ratana (data capturers), Anna Philander (Vermaaklikheid), Clive Pretorius (Heidelberg), and Koos Saayman (Riversdale)

SPP: Harry May, Ronald Wesso, Pedro Kotze, Ricardo Jacobs (staff), Peter John Danster, Cecelia Shandu, Ayanda Mbehe, Mpho Mkanya (interns), Petrus Brink (Citrusdal), Hendrik Janse (Citrusdal), Charmaine September (Citrusdal), Davine Wilbooi (Citrusdal), Ryno Zimiri (Elies River), Jaydine Grootboom (Delft), Andries Titus

TCOE: Boyce Tom, Paula Cardoso (staff), Christoline Ntwayi, Estel Tala, Heather Swart, Mandisa Myeki, Marquart Snyman, Monica Babuma, Nomasoni Gaba (community members)

TRALSO: Cebisa Pelem (staff), Peleka Mankumba, Zipho Xego, Wandisile Mncomoe, Nndodzuhayi Dumalisile, Anle Gxotelwa (students), Leonard Toto (Eastern Cape Community Land Reform Organization), Nosiso Jo (Dwesa-Cwebe), Nomzamo Ntukwini (Ntiweni)

WFP: Colette Solomon, Jesmaine Bruintjies, Alison September, Carmen Hendricks, Elia Lindoor, Glynis Rhodes, Ida Jacobs, Jenny Nkala, Sharon Bailey, Sharon Messina, Rose Horn (staff); Emily Ratchford (intem)

Monique Solomon (PhD), TA coordinator, ensured that staff capacity was enhanced. A core team of researchers held several meetings to compile one TA database for comparative analysis and used statistical software packages PSPP and SPSS to analyze the research findings.

TA Data analysis core team: Avrashka Sahadeva (FSG), Harry May (SPP), Rosa-Linda Kock (SCLC), Stephina Ngoasheng (Nkuzi), Yandisa Gebe (BRC), Zipho Xego (TRALSO).

Our sincere thanks go to staff, students, and community members who have contributed to this important research endeavour.
executive summary
executive summary

INTRODUCTION
Tshintsha Amakhaya (TA) is an action learning platform of civil society organisations that support local community struggles in land and agrarian reform. Through action research, campaigns, and building active participation, the TA alliance seeks to enhance rural people’s capacity to secure and realise their livelihoods and rights, and to promote alternative models of land tenure and agricultural production for food sovereignty.

The partner organisations in TA are the Association for Rural Advancement (AFRA), Border Rural Committee (BRC), Farmer Support Group (FSG), Legal Resources Centre (LRC), Nkuzi Development Association (Nkuzi), Southern Cape Land Committee (SCLC), Surplus People Project (SPP), Transkei Land Services Organisation (TRALSO), Trust for Community Outreach and Education (TCOE), and Women on Farms Project (WFP).

In this report key findings are presented of a baseline survey conducted at the end of 2010 and the start of 2011. The aim of the survey was to identify key priorities for joint action on land access and agricultural production amongst constituent communities. For this purpose, the survey focused on income, food, livestock and crop production, and land, with a focus on farm dwellers by some partners. There were 1,743 respondents in 12 local municipalities, across four provinces – KwaZulu-Natal, Eastern Cape, Western Cape and Limpopo.

DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE
An average of 194 respondents was surveyed by each organisation. Three organisations were over the average (SPP, TRALSO, and SCLC), and the remainder were under. The survey was skewed towards the Western Cape, reflecting the composition of TA.

Six tenure types were captured in the survey. From largest to smallest they were communal land (36%), farm dwellers on commercial farms (34%), land reform (redistribution and restitution) (13%), commonage (10%), informal settlements/towns (4%) and church land (2%).

DEMOGRAPHICS
The average household size was four, with 6,987 household members covered. Women and girls constituted 51% of surveyed household members. Eighty-two percent of respondents had primary or secondary education as their highest level of education.

Twenty-eight percent of household members had farming as their primary economic activity, as identified by respondents. Thirty-one percent of men and twenty-five percent of women were identified in this category.

Twenty-six percent of household members were farm workers, 17% were employed off farms, and fewer than 6% had their own business or were self-employed. Twenty-four percent of household members were unemployed. Unemployment was higher for women (28%) than men (19%).

LAND ACCESS
Eighty-four percent of respondent households had access to land, 78% had access to land for cropping, and 28% had access to land for grazing, with some overlap between the two.

Seventy-one percent of those who specified crop land size had access to crop land of less than one hectare (ha). Seven percent had more than 5ha of land for cropping. Land sizes were small and constituted a fundamental constraint to increasing production.
INCOME
Along with food security, household income was used as a proxy measure for livelihoods.

Wages were the main source of income, earned by 58% of members in responding households (excluding children). Off-farm wages were more significant than farm wages across responding households.

Social grants (mainly pensions and child support grants) were the second biggest source of income at 33%. If we disaggregate wages into off-farm/on-farm and full-time/casual, then grants are the largest primary income category.

Own business was the primary source of income for 4% of members in responding households. Agricultural production was the primary income source for only 2% of members of responding households, with another 6% having agriculture as a secondary source of income. This is despite farming being considered the primary employment for 28% of adult household members.

Wealthier households tended to have higher levels of livestock ownership, while lower income households tended towards lower crop production, with a rise in crop production amongst the highest income category (more than R10,000 per month). This aligns with previous studies that show that the poorest and the richest households are most likely to engage in agricultural production (both crops and livestock). Nevertheless, the study did find ‘middle income’ households also producing.

The average household income was R2,606 per month, and the median (below which half of all cases fall) was R1,860. The average was around the level of poverty lines proposed in the literature, indicating that more than half of the households surveyed live in poverty (measured by income).

ACCESS TO FOOD
Thirty-one percent of households went hungry sometimes, often or always, in the previous year. Five percent went hungry often or always, signifying severe food insecurity. The situation is worst in KwaZulu-Natal (KZN) and then E Cape, and is particularly severe on communal lands and in informal settlements.

Ironically, more people who produced crops went hungry than those who do not produce crops. Rather than indicating that crop production means greater hunger levels, we can assert that food insecure households tend to engage in crop production to alleviate the impact of hunger.

More people without land went hungry compared to people who had land.

Women tended to go without food first if there was not enough food for all household members.

Supermarkets were the main source of food for household consumption across all food types, but highest for dairy and meat and lowest for fruit and vegetables.

Local markets were the main source of different food products for 10-20% of respondent households, except maize for which local markets appeared to be limited.

Own production was the primary source of maize and fruit production for around a quarter of responding households. Bread and vegetables were the most frequently consumed types of food, and meat and chicken were the least often consumed. There were provincial variations with bread being a staple in W Cape and to an extent E Cape, and maize being a staple in KZN, Limpopo and to a lesser extent E Cape.

LIVESTOCK OWNERSHIP, SALES AND MARKETING
Fifty-seven percent of respondents kept some kind of livestock. Forty-three percent had some kind of livestock apart from poultry, and 38% had poultry, with some overlap between the two.

The most commonly held livestock were chickens (35%) and cattle (30%). Less than 20% of respondents kept goats, pigs or sheep.

KZN and E Cape had higher levels of livestock ownership, with Limpopo the lowest (apart from chickens) and W Cape also on the low side.

Eighty-six percent of respondents had chickens and two-thirds had cattle in KZN.

Respondents with commonage and communal tenure had the highest proportion of livestock by and large, with informal settlements and farm dwellers the lowest. The latter finding masked significant differences between labour tenants in KZN, with high levels of livestock ownership, and W Cape farm dwellers with very low levels of livestock ownership.

Twenty-eight percent of cattle herds comprised 10 head or more, and 60% of chicken flocks were made up of over 10 chickens.
Limpopo and KZN tended towards bigger cattle herds, while W Cape had bigger goat and pig herds and E Cape had the larger sheep flocks. Poultry flock sizes were more similar across provinces.

All livestock types except pigs (in all provinces, except in Limpopo) experienced declining herd sizes over the past year, with goats and cattle faring the worst. E Cape and KZN (where herd sizes tended to be larger and ownership was higher) experienced negative growth in herd sizes, while W Cape experienced positive growth across all livestock types, and Limpopo was mixed (increases in cattle and goat herd sizes, decreases in pigs and chickens).

The main reason for the decline of herds was unplanned deaths, except for pigs where forced sales and voluntary sales were equally important. Lack of medication and technical support for livestock health, and lack of fodder were the main reasons cited by researchers.

Livestock was mainly kept for household use, although 50-60% of respondents indicated they sold pigs, cattle and sheep at times.

Twenty percent or less of livestock sales generated more than R12,000 per year (an average of R1,000 per month).

Local buyers and auctions were the main outlets for livestock sales.

Cattle were important across all four provinces.

The research shows that livestock management is a key point of intervention, especially secure access to grazing land, grazing management (camps, herding techniques), technical support (vets and dipping) and infrastructure (fencing, dipping and water).

Integrated livestock and crop production systems is likely to orient production along an agro-ecological path in KZN and Limpopo in particular, but also in E Cape. Nearly 80% of respondent households produced maize in KZN, and 70% produced vegetables. In Limpopo, 69% of households produced maize and 60% produced vegetables.

W Cape exhibited low levels of crop production apart from vegetables, but even in this case less than 30% of households produced any crops. This skewed the entire sample, since W Cape constituted 56% of the sample households.

The level of production was fairly low by commercial standards: 70% of maize producers produced at or below subsistence level (400kg/year). The vast majority of households produced less than 100 kg of other types of crops.

More than 80% of households produced crops mainly for own use (except vegetables, where 70% produced mainly for own use). This reinforces the idea of poor households seeking to alleviate their own food insecurity.

Most sales generated less than R1,200 a year, although 19% of maize sales generated more than R2,400 a year.

Income earned from crop sales was between R308 (vegetables) and R1,280 (maize) per year. Although these numbers were low, they made a contribution to households whose average income was around R2,600 a month.

Markets for crops were overwhelmingly local and informal.

The study found that a higher proportion of households which experienced hunger - often or always - were crop producers, especially of maize and vegetables. This provided further evidence that crop-producing households in the survey were also poorer households. An emphasis on intermediate storage and processing technologies and the facilitation of local food exchange is recommended.

WATER ACCESS AND AGRICULTURAL SUPPORT

The primary water sources for both crops (68%) and livestock (76%) were rivers, streams or dams. The research did not examine how the water was brought to fields.

For crop production, taps/standpipes were important in Limpopo, W Cape, and to a slightly lesser extent, in KZN. Boreholes and rainwater harvesting were important in KZN. Taps were the main source of water for livestock in W Cape. Respondents generally did not pay for water (85%).
Forty-five percent of respondents had received some kind of agricultural training, with Limpopo and E Cape having the highest proportions. Training was most common in respect of land reform, communal land and commonage tenure categories, and low amongst farm dwellers.

Only 16% of households had been visited by a government extension officer in the past year. Extension support was more common in KZN and least common in Limpopo. Seven percent of households had access to production credit, with almost a quarter in E Cape but less than 10% elsewhere.

There was a positive correlation between access to extension services and levels of production, especially of maize and chickens. There was a negative relationship between access to agricultural training and production levels. The relationship between production credit and production levels was mixed. This may suggest training and credit are inappropriate or not properly targeted.

**FARM WORKER CONDITIONS**

Fifty-four percent of farm workers in the respondent households were women. The majority of farm workers (78%) interviewed were permanently employed and 5% of workers were employed by labour brokers (all in the Cape Winelands).

Compliance with basic conditions of employment was between 65% (maternity leave) and 92% (annual leave). Seventy-one percent of workers received the minimum wage, and 79% were registered for Unemployment Insurance Fund (UIF). Compliance was generally lower for women workers than men.

**EVICTIONS**

Four organisations asked questions about evictions, covering farm dwellers but also other respondents.

Eleven percent of households experienced eviction in the past 10 years, while 13% indicated a current threat of eviction.

The situation was much worse in KZN (only amongst labour tenants in Amajuba), with 32% saying they had experienced evictions in the past 10 years and 48% indicating a current threat of evictions. This is a flashpoint that should attract TA’s attention.

Seventeen percent of those in informal settlements (in Rawsonville in the Cape Winelands) indicated a current threat of evictions.

The majority of those who faced evictions (73%) looked first to civil society organisations for support, mainly at advice offices. Of the quarter that turned to government, the majority went to the municipality, despite the existence of a Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR) national support programme.

**ORGANISATION**

In 63% of respondent households someone was a member of an organisation. Religious organisations were the most common (87% of households), followed by burial associations (55%), political parties (54%) and farmer associations (52%). In 30% of households there were members in savings groups, and 20% had members in movements or campaigns. Only 9.4% of households belonged to a water forum.

Membership of religious organisations may be passive, for example, members might merely attend church once a week and otherwise not be involved. Thus, membership does not necessarily indicate active participation. Over 80% of households in land reform, informal settlements/towns and commonage-type categories had members in some kind of organisation.

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

While government and private sector resources are being invested into building a black commercial smallholder sector to feed into formal agri-food value chains, this is likely to benefit only a small minority of producers. The survey showed that the marginalised majority of producers are TA’s core constituency.

**KEY RECOMMENDATIONS**

- Focus on improving agricultural production for household use and sales to local markets;
- Learn from and strengthen local distribution systems;
- Facilitate immediate welfare interventions for households that are often or always hungry;
- Extend secure access to grazing land, including management systems;
- Improve livestock management, especially grazing systems, fodder production and health;
- Extend secure access to crop land;
- Integrate livestock and crop production systems;
- Introduce intermediate processing and storage technologies for both livestock and crops;
- Develop farmer-to-farmer participatory systems of sharing and learning;
- Improve adherence to basic conditions of employment and focus on access to land for production for farm dwellers.
foreword
A MESSAGE FROM PROF. DR. MICHAEL BOLLIG

Reports and academic publications on various aspects of social, economic and cultural change in South Africa are plentiful and they draw on admirable sets of data. In the light of this abundance of information, the dearth of quantitative and comparative data on the highly politicised areas of tenure change and land use is noteworthy.

While politicians, activists and journalists often speak of the challenges and possibilities of comprehensive land reform, their knowledge about rural dwellers is astoundingly shallow and limited. While there were some excellent case studies on rural livelihoods conducted after 1994 and some regionally-focused quantitative studies (notably by the Programme on Land and Agrarian Studies at the University of the Western Cape), there is limited detailed and quantified data comparing the challenges facing rural dwellers across South Africa.

Do people living on rural commons (the former homelands) fare better than people living on land reform farms, or as tenants on farms? Is food insecurity still an issue in South Africa’s rural areas? To what extent is smallholder agriculture still a feasible option for land use in a highly industrialised setting? What kind of agricultural investments do rural dwellers prefer to make (if they make any) and to what extent do rural extension services assist them? There is also very little information available about how rural livelihoods compare across South Africa’s provinces. Do rural dwellers in KwaZulu-Natal pursue different livelihood strategies to villagers in the Eastern Cape? How do land-based livelihood strategies develop in the Western Cape where communal lands are minimal and where land redistribution and restitution has had little impact?

This book provides answers to many of these questions, and it does so on the basis of detailed data, produced in a methodologically sound way. As such, it is a highly laudable contribution to the field and gives us a stable and objective foundation on which to base future inputs and policies and a vehicle through which to de-politicise ideological discussion on the challenges of land reform and agrarian change.

The book is the joint product of a number of civil society organisations which support local communities engaged in land and agrarian reform. These organisations established the learning platform Tshintsha Amakhaya in 2009. A key activity of this platform is to provide sound information for further planning.

This report presents the data of a baseline survey conducted at the end of 2010 and in early 2011. In total, 1,743 respondents in 12 municipalities across four provinces (Western Cape, Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal and Limpopo) answered questions on livelihood strategies, household income, factors contributing to vulnerability, and access to public services. While six different rural tenure types were captured, the majority of the respondents resided on communal lands, on commercial farms (as farm dwellers), on land reform farms and on urban commons.

The survey convincingly shows that agricultural activities still feature significantly in South Africa’s rural areas: 55% of those over 18 in the households were identified as farmers or farm workers. Smallholder agriculture is still (and will be) an important option for many rural dwellers. There is little evidence of the rapid de-agrarianisation postulated by some commentators. Astonishingly, access to land does not seem to be a major issue for many: 84% of the respondents claimed to have access to land and that agricultural activities were a feasible option for them. This, however, does not preclude the fact that many of them have access to only tiny pieces of land which are not economically viable to farm, or lack the correct agricultural techniques to intensively farm small parcels of land.

The rather positive outlook on land access, however, is contradicted by findings on food security. These were devastating: 31% of all households went hungry sometimes, often or always, during the past year, and 5% specified that hunger was a recurrent problem in their homes. These figures have serious implications for South Africa but also for global politics: more than 30% of the population in one of the world’s rapidly evolving markets experiences grave problems of food security. Thus, a growing industrial economy which thrives on the export of food does not readily produce a situation of domestic food security.

Food insecurity was most severe in KwaZulu-Natal and the Eastern Cape and people living on communal lands and in informal settlements faced hunger more often than others. These are also regions of South Africa where conflict and violence are concentrated and it takes little imagination to draw a causal link between food insecurity and social unrest.

The report impressively shows that rural dwellers in no way passively accept this situation.
A first strategy to buffer periodic shortfalls among poor rural dwellers was crop production, even if only small pieces of arable land were accessible and levels of production were fairly low. While about half of all respondents received some kind of agricultural training, this apparently had little effect on productivity. This casts a fairly negative light on the efficiency of such services, which may possibly have to be reconsidered on the basis of the data presented here.

There is grim irony in the fact that despite agricultural activities being of importance, the research indicates that the main source of food for household consumption was supermarkets. Food sovereignty is thus at low levels throughout most communal areas. Local food markets were not of major importance in the sample. This underlines the disarticulation of rural agricultural livelihoods. The report shows that many rural dwellers are keenly interested in extending their agricultural portfolios. Many identify as farmers, claim access to some land, and more than a third of all households had some kind of livestock. It is here that non-governmental organisations as well as the extension services of the administration find an entry point.

This publication serves as an important instrument for decision-makers and commentators. It will equip them with better data on which to base their policies and services to rural communities. It is also a tool for communities themselves which can use the information as a starting point for internal discussion.

The book is also intended to serve as a benchmarking tool to measure progress. The intention is to repeat the survey in the future to reflect upon the efficiency of inputs by governmental bodies and non-governmental organisations. Thus, it serves as a valuable contribution to pertinent discussions in South African society and as an important point of reference for people working in the land sector.

**Prof. Dr. Michael Bollig**
Institute for Social and Cultural Anthropology & Vice-Rector for International Relations, Diversity and Academic Career, University of Koeln

---

**A MESSAGE FROM ANGELA CONWAY**

Agrarian transformation is an illusion for the majority of rural South Africans. Skewed land ownership patterns remain entrenched. The dominant commercial agriculture context, increasingly monopolised by large agri-business, excludes small-scale, resource-poor farmers. Farm workers and dwellers’ continue to live without secure tenure. Furthermore, the minimal social protection offered by labour legislation is often not adhered to on farms.

The effect of these conditions on poor, rural people is stark, with the findings of this research showing that 31% of the households interviewed reported experiencing periodic hunger and other estimates pointing to figures as high as one in four. This is compounded, especially in rural areas, by the commodification of food from seed to table and the steep rise in food and transportation prices. The fact that supermarkets are the primary source of food despite more than a quarter of people interviewed listing agriculture as their primary employment confirms the need to strengthen small-scale agriculture.

World-wide there is growing recognition of the potential of small-scale agriculture and agro-ecological methods of production to combat poverty and environmental degradation. In the rural areas of South Africa large numbers of people are practising some form of agriculture yet remain excluded from the formal agri-food value chains, with only 2% of participants in the research noting agriculture as their primary source of income.

Detailed research into the agrarian rural household economy was necessary to deepen an analysis of rural livelihoods and of the potential and obstacles of small-scale agriculture and to thus identify the priorities and strategies of the Tshintsha Amakhaya platform. The findings and recommendations of the research will be used to inform mobilisation and advocacy strategies and underpin campaigns relating to small-scale farmers and farm workers and dwellers. At the same time the research forms a baseline against which impact can be measured. The research is a basis for the work of the Tshintsha Amakhaya partners in enhancing rural people’s capacity to secure livelihoods and rights for food sovereignty.

Forward to food sovereignty!

**Angela Conway**
Chair, Programme Sub-committee of Tshintsha Amakhaya
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Tshintsha Amakhaya (TA) is an action learning platform of civil society organisations that supports local community struggles in land and agrarian reform. Through action research, campaigns, and building active participation, TA seeks to enhance rural people’s capacity to secure and realise their livelihoods and rights, and to promote alternative models of land tenure and agricultural production for food sovereignty.

TA’s 10 partner organisations are primarily concerned with supporting dispossessed and landless communities to gain access to land in South Africa. Some of the organisations have also worked closely with smallholder and resource-poor black farmers to build sustainable smallholder agriculture and rural livelihoods. The partner organisations are the Association for Rural Advancement (AFRA), Border Rural Committee (BRC), Farmer Support Group (FSG), Legal Resources Centre (LRC), Nkuzi Development Association (Nkuzi), Southern Cape Land Committee (SCLC), Surplus People Project (SPP), Transkei Land Services Organisation (TRALSO), Trust for Community Outreach and Education (TCOE), and Women on Farms Project (WFP).

This report highlights key findings of a baseline survey conducted at the end of 2010 and the start of 2011 amongst constituent communities in TA. There were 1743 respondents in 12 local municipalities in four provinces: Eastern Cape (E Cape), KwaZulu-Natal (KZN), Limpopo and Western Cape (W Cape) (Figure 1). Six land tenure types were analysed: communal; commercial farmland; land reform; commonage; church land; and informal settlements/rural town.
The survey focused on income, food, livestock and crop production and, to some extent, land across all organisations, with some additions for farm dwellers as a key constituency amongst some partners. The quantitative baseline survey focused less on participation in organisations, which is not as easily measurable using a survey tool. However, we found very high membership of organisations, related closely to respondents’ involvement with the non-government organisations (NGOs) forming the TA partnership. This is more of a qualitative issue and process and different tools are needed in order to analyse and learn from it. It is related to the objectives of TA, which call on partner organisations to build organisation and a rural voice. TA has as an explicit goal: the formation of a representative platform of food producers. The discussions about who leads this voice, how different voices might be heard at different times or even simultaneously, and how different partners contribute are part of the on-going processes of interaction with producers and their organisations on the ground.

Smallholder agriculture is now being placed in the mainstream (comparatively speaking) with government and private sector resources going into building a black smallholder sector. This is a positive shift from the days of a complete focus on large-scale commercial agriculture, although it has a limited reach. There is not a lot going for the remaining 95% of the land-based population who do not and cannot interact with formal value chains as sellers. The survey makes it clear that this marginalised 95% is TA’s core constituency. Individual organisations may exist which also seek to assist that small top layer to enter formal value chains to a greater or lesser extent. The question is how resources are distributed, and what the benefits are of distributing them to some rather than other sections of the population. Perhaps there is no distinction. The survey shows high levels of class compression, in that the wealthy are not very much wealthier than the poor in these food producing communities, as measured by the standards of income and assets.

Integrated farming systems – mixing livestock and cropping agro-ecologically – is a key point for development. The alternative is to pursue the route of concentration and expansion, the capitalist-industrial logic. Is this alternative feasible? TA sets out to engage with that question in practice and learn from the experience.
The assumption is that access to land and agro-ecological food production enhances the lives not only of those directly involved, but of those around them. The survey indicates a solid base to work with.

TA’s focus is mainly on those with some kind of access to land, but who are nevertheless severely land constrained, mostly with access to under 2ha of land for production. They are small-scale producers with potential to produce surpluses for those around them and, in so doing, improve their lives. The underlying assumption of TA is that agricultural production will improve livelihoods. The aim is to test this belief in practice, through a collaborative partnership of organisations.

The survey reflects this constrained access to land as well as low levels of production, coupled with high levels of hunger and food scarcity. What role can agriculture play in improving these conditions? The most obvious is the production of food for households and neighbours, and then beyond, if possible. The goal is to expand food production, but the form this takes needs to be discussed in interaction with producers or potential producers and their broader communities, with an emphasis on ecologically and socially sustainable surplus production. There is a ‘hidden economy’ in rural areas that must be recognised and stimulated. The focus of TA is therefore not the farmers who are poised to enter into supply contracts with Walmart or Woolworths or any of the other big food retailers; it is on those who are not yet producing enough even to meet their own household needs.

MARKETS, VALUE CHAINS AND FOOD SOVEREIGNTY

TA has an explicit focus on both markets and food sovereignty. Further consideration is required of the relationship between the two. Food sovereignty emphasises local production for local consumption, whereas markets and value chains tend to emphasise the sale of surpluses to others. They are not necessarily incompatible. The key is the expectation of what food production can achieve in the context of the broader agri-food system in South Africa and globally. Concentrated inputs and output markets and entrenched large-scale agricultural production, coupled with landlessness or constrained access to land and insecure tenure, have contributed to marginalising the contribution of smallholder agriculture in South Africa.

The National Planning Commission (NPC, 2011) plan for agriculture focuses on commodity chains and integration of smallholders into the formal agri-food system, controlled by the state and capital. This translates into a focus on employment and entrepreneurship, both regenerating the capitalist economy. Value chain analysis is useful in understanding the links between inputs, production, storage, processing and distribution of food, and even consumption. However, the tendency is to look only at formal systems. The challenge for TA is to consider these elements of the agri-food production cycle in alternative forms. Input supply, processing, storage and distribution have received little investigation from NGOs to date. Most of the TA’s partner organisations had a primary focus on access to land. As access to land (even if small amounts) has expanded, there has been an additional focus on productive use of the land. This improved productivity has proven difficult to realise in the absence of resources or appropriate technical support. In the context of low and inconsistent levels of production, the issues of storage, processing and distribution have not been systematically tackled.

The linear model of development of value chains fails to take into account the holistic character of agri-food systems, where storage, processing and distribution do take place but in ways that are not considered to have much economic or financial value. Food sovereignty poses a challenge to the ‘nodal’ approach to value chains, with the latter’s emphasis first on production and later on processing and distribution. Production of agricultural products, their processing into foodstuffs, methods of storage and distribution of the products take place simultaneously and are socially and culturally embedded activities. Food sovereignty calls on food producers and their immediate communities to consider methods of value addition and distribution of food as part and parcel of the production process.
CHAPTER 02
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methodology

This baseline survey forms part of an action learning process that will inform TA’s interventions. It provides a basis for monitoring those interventions to track changes over time. Agrarian change is a value-neutral concept. We encounter agrarian change as part of a dynamic capitalist system, including dispossession and marginalisation. We may find, when the survey is conducted a second time, that conditions have got worse, not better. The measurement, therefore, cannot only be a measure of the success of TA’s interventions. There are many much larger factors outside the control of TA, including global economic crises, trade regimes, political conflict, state regulation, service provision, demographic changes and new technologies, etc., which will have a far greater impact on the lives of the rural population than the interventions of a few small NGOs. Therefore, the baseline is not designed specifically to monitor TA’s impact. However, it may give an indication of the kinds of changes being experienced in rural areas. Part of TA’s task is to understand why these changes take place, and to define appropriate responses that might have a positive impact on the lives of the people we are working with and their broader communities (in whatever way we may choose to define ‘community’).

The survey can be used to identify the current state of affairs on some key variables, and to launch a discussion about appropriate interventions. This is the action learning process. Producers and their organisations are to be drawn into the process from the outset as key partners, with NGOs facilitating intersections between producers in different locations and between producers and appropriate technical and organisational support as required.

There are limits to quantitative methodologies such as surveys of this nature. A survey often freezes dynamic relations, fails to capture social nuances, ignores important questions and issues, and loses the relationships between processes and ‘facts’ (the frozen presentation of variables in reality). Nevertheless a survey can offer a basis for comparison. For example, it may provide some insight into the extent of food production and consumption, or access to land and agricultural support, and establish some basic relationships between these.

A key part of the survey was to capture gendered dynamics of land access and production. We ran into some insoluble problems in this regard. The primary issue was that, apart from demographic information, most questions were asked at a household rather than an individual level. This meant we could not look at the individual gender differences in production and land access. But even if we had posed questions to individuals in the household, the results would have been inadequate, because the household is the primary unit of economic activity; it is a pooling of the individual contributions of its members, albeit unevenly distributed. These are dynamics which we seek to dissect and engage with, but cannot do so easily in a survey, because of the nature of the household as a shared pool of resources.

Even if we had consistently established the designated head of the household, this would still have ignored the reality of ‘situational leadership’, whereby men and women take leadership responsibility for different aspects of their joint relationship, even if this often is skewed in favour of men making decisions. Women almost always take primary responsibility for children and family health, and often take decisions about the use and allocation of household resources. Further, assigning household characteristics on the basis of gender to the head of the household would have revealed little more about gendered intra-household dynamics.
Further qualitative work is needed to understand some of the dynamics at play within the household. TA is focused on agricultural production, thus a gendered analysis would examine the decisions women make about what to produce, and why, and the gendered division of agricultural and household labour. A survey could eventually capture these finer details, but a process for unearthing the information is first required. We are therefore developing a gendered methodology.

These issues posed a big challenge to our ability to grasp the essence of gendered ownership and production patterns. We can see from the data that women are only slightly less likely to be farmers than men, that there are slightly more women of economically active age than men in the sample, and that women are slightly better educated than men in the sample. However, we have not been able to establish a baseline differentiating men’s and women’s access to land and agricultural production. This constitutes a limitation of the research.

Another limitation was our inability to satisfactorily capture group production data. By focusing on the household as the unit of analysis, group production was omitted, thus underplaying the possible role of group projects, not least organisationally. We consequently do not know what contribution to income, food and assets is made by group production. Some organisations asked questions about group production, but they were too few to be applied across the study. For others, group production did not feature in the questionnaire.

The institutional aspects of group production will need to be further explored by organisations working on this issue. There are likely to be points of intersection with the ideas around building platforms and organisations. What can we learn from the institutional issues in group production schemes? The same goes for land governance, a key issue that emerged across the six tenure types which were: communal; commercial farmland; land reform; commonage; church land; and informal settlements/rural towns.

2.1 PREPARATION

The survey and analysis were conducted between October 2010 and May 2012. In the first period, until early 2011, questionnaires were developed with the TA indicators in mind. Appendix 1 shows the basic relationships between the TA objectives, indicators and the baseline survey. All partner organisations were involved in developing the questions, with each organisation’s research team meeting to design its questionnaire. The process was iterative, starting at one organisation, moving to another and building individual organisational questionnaires while also seeking commonalities across all. The work of previous organisations was brought into the discussions as the process unfolded. The result was some basic standardisation of questionnaires, but organisations shaped them in accordance with their needs: some used pre-existing surveys with some additions in order to develop a comparative study with other work they had done in different areas.

This level of variation later presented challenges for the construction of a TA database because not all organisations had the same variables. Some organisations did not ask particular questions, and other organisations did not ask others, or asked them in different forms that could not be made quantitatively compatible. A lesson we drew from this experience was to develop and agree on a common base of questions for all organisations, and then allow organisations to add to that if they so wished. We now have that base of questions for the future survey.

2.2 FIELD-WORK

In the second period, partner organisations selected their sample, piloted and conducted the surveys. Samples were generally stratified samples with selection for gender, age and type of production (livestock, crop, back yard). In some cases only those already doing food production and/or already involved in selected community organisations were chosen for participation in the survey. Some organisations which planned the TA intervention with more than one tenure category also stratified on the basis of tenure type. This was particularly the case for those organisations working with farm dwellers as well as other people off the farms (SCLC, SPP, TCOE and WFP). Respondents were also geographically stratified, i.e., a number of respondents from each farm, settlement or site were selected to ensure a geographical spread. Organisations worked with existing community structures and committees to identify respondents and, in a number of cases, these community structures also conducted some of the surveys together with NGO staff. There were variations across the organisations. Some focused on smallholder farmers with access to land, others on farm dwellers, others on agricultural producers.

2.3 DATA CAPTURE AND CLEANING

Research team members from each of the partner organisations met to learn how to use a database. Two organisations (SPP and FSG) already had Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and knew how to use it.
Initially we used Excel, because SPSS licenses are prohibitively expensive and all organisations had access to Excel. Individual organisations entered their data into Excel, with four using other databases according to their preference (AFRA, SPP, FSG and TRALSO). Individual databases were checked internally and externally (by the TA research co-ordinator) and the organisational data was cleaned by research team members in the individual organisations.

Representatives from the partner organisations met to carry the process forward and decided to use PSPP, an open source version of SPSS with less flexibility but enough to sufficiently support the data. All databases were then converted to PSPP.

A smaller team consisting of research team members from SPP, FSG, TRALSO, BRC and SCLC with two steering committee members and research co-ordination and facilitation cleaned the data in a series of workshops, and selected the variables for inclusion in a ‘mother’ database, linked to the indicators (Appendix 1) and which cut across all or many organisations.

This process went through a number of iterations, with team members being tasked to clean sections of the database, which was then checked by selected members of the research team. Members moved between SPSS and PSPP as they came across limitations in the open source package. The process took longer than planned, since the time it took to enter, clean and check the data was under-estimated. Nevertheless, research team members benefited and learnt from in-depth engagement with the database.

### 2.4 DATA ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

Individual organisations conducted their own data analysis with some feedback both from TA co-ordinators and their constituencies. There were some methodological errors, especially around gender, which we were nevertheless able to correct in the meta-analysis phase as a result of the work by individual organisations. The core research team met in another series of workshops to analyse the data as it emerged.

This included identifying additional variables and cross tabulations required to mine the data and their inter-relationships in more depth. An initial presentation of the data was made to the steering committee in February 2012 with Prof Michael Bollig, the external advisor, present. Inputs at this meeting shaped the further direction of analysis.

Members of the research team met with each other in small geographical groups to develop sections of the analysis further. The research co-ordinator pulled the separate analyses together and conducted an on-going cleaning up of the database. An initial draft was presented to an expanded research team with representation from all nine organisations involved in the research in April 2012, and further comments and analyses were made, variables added and the draft revised.

The draft report was then presented to partner constituencies and the steering committee for checking and further comment in May 2012. Draft proposals for discussion on the way forward for TA based on the research are included in this report.

Each organisation produced its own baseline reports to guide its specific activities. This meta-analysis looks across all the organisations to obtain an overall picture and to highlight some key points of overlap that might form the basis for TA’s interventions as a network. Individual organisations have very different approaches to providing support. Part of TA is to understand these, to share across organisations and learn from one another.
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A total of 1,743 households participated in the survey. An average of 194 respondents was surveyed by each organisation. Three organisations were over the average survey size (SPP, TRALSO and SCLC) and the remainder were under.

The size of the surveys varied from 59 (AFRA) to 441 (SPP) (Figure 2). These differences reflect variances in the nature of organisational interventions and target groups.

The survey is skewed towards W Cape, reflecting the composition of TA. Four of the nine organisations (SPP, SCLC, WFP and TCOE) which participated in the baseline survey have their research sites in W Cape (Figure 3). This skews some of the results, with a notable one being maize production and consumption. The Legal Resources Centre (LRC) is also a member of TA, but did not participate in the baseline survey. The LRC will provide legal and associated support to partner organisations across the sites.

Throughout the report ‘N’ is used to indicate the number of cases in which that question was answered. In the demographic section this is accompanied by another number indicating the number of individuals in the responding households. N fluctuates widely. In some cases, not all organisations asked the question. In other cases, such as those relating to sales, questions were only applicable to a few.
The survey does not claim to be nationally representative: Mpumalanga, Gauteng, North West, Free State and Northern Cape have no representation. TA aims to expand beyond its boundaries to include other organisations, if not as direct members, then in developing relations and sharing with these organisations. The organisations and their provinces involved in the survey are:

W Cape: SCLC, SPP, TCOE, WFP
E Cape: BRC, TRALSO
KZN: AFRA, FSG
Limpopo: Nkuzi
The highest percentage of respondents in the sample live on communal land (36.4%), followed by farm dwellers (including labour tenants) at 33.6% (Figure 5). E Cape accounts for most communal dwellers in the sample, and farm dwellers are mainly in W Cape.

**FIGURE 5: TYPE OF LAND TENURE (N=1,699)**
Nationally an estimated 40% of the population still lived in former homelands/communal areas in the mid-2000s (Hemson et al., 2004:5). An estimated 3-4 million non-owners live on South African commercial farms (Human Rights Watch, 2010:30), thus constituting approximately 13-17% of the rural population. Therefore residents of communal areas are slightly under-represented in relation to the national distribution of tenure types, and farm dwellers are over-represented.

Land reform respondents (13% of our sample) are also slightly over-represented in our survey. However, to some extent the proportions in the survey reflect the locations and focus of the work of the partner organisations.

The land reform category incorporates restitution but excludes commonage, which is treated as a separate category because of the specific issues facing those accessing commonage, especially around livestock.

There is also the obvious issue of land ownership, with land redistribution and restitution respondents owning the land, even if this is at times only in a collective form that is not well translated into practice. In contrast, those with access to commonage lease the land from the state, currently on relatively short-term leases (e.g., under 10 years) and where lease contracts and terms of leasing are not always clearly specified.

Divisions into tenure types were also made on the basis of the dominant land governance institution. In Limpopo, Nkuzi’s respondents all came from three contiguous restitution farms surrounding a rural township (Meifontein).

Some of these are under the de facto authority of traditional authorities, although the land is formally owned by the Communal Property Association (CPA), a statutory land-holding body acting on behalf of successful restitution claimants. In E Cape, BRC’s sites in Keiskammahoek are also restitution claimants, but at the time of the survey the land remained under traditional authority.

The favoured resolution is a financial pay-out rather than an outright transfer of land out of the hands of traditional authorities, although the money has not yet been paid. The respondents in this case were therefore categorised under communal tenure. The same is true of some of the respondents in TRALSO’s sites in Mbhashe in E Cape.

In each of these sites, where CPAs, the state and traditional authorities vie for authority over land management and allocation, the lack of clarity on governance institutions has caused on-going conflict which has at times turned violent. At times, therefore, there are overlaps across tenure types in terms of the dominant land governance institutions and the types of land access of individual households.

Within the category of farm dwellers there are also variations, with labour tenants in Amajuba in KZN (AFRA), few of whom work for the land owner, and farm dwellers in W Cape sites (SCLC in the southern Cape, SPP on the West Coast and WFP in the Cape Winelands) with a high proportion of farm workers amongst them. On some issues conditions are quite varied amongst labour tenants and what were, historically, farm worker households, and the category is disaggregated particularly in relation to livestock and crop production where the biggest differences between the KZN labour tenants and W Cape farm dwellers are apparent.

Informal settlements/rural towns are under-represented in the survey, which indicates the general orientation of the partner organisations in the deeper rural areas. A selection of respondents in informal settlements was chosen for inclusion in the survey in Rawsonville in the Cape Winelands (WFP) because of historically high levels of eviction and increasing use of labour living off the farms mainly for casual and seasonal work.

In TCOE’s case in Swellendam, the tenure status of a number of respondents was unclear but they had access to some land for production and lived in and around the main rural towns in the district. They were therefore included in this category. Both of these are commercial farming areas and the links between small town, peri-urban and rural residents are fairly strong.

Again there will be some overlap in practice between those living in towns and those who are classified as falling under commonage. The latter do not live on the commonage but in the towns, but it was clear in the survey that they had access to commonage land.

For those who were categorised as living in town, there was no clear evidence that the land they had access to was commonage or some other land. Finally, church land is accessed by a small percentage of the population with a very specific tenure on land owned by churches, and references work being done by SPP with these constituencies.
Farm dwellers constitute the biggest proportion of the Western Cape sample (55%), followed by commonage (18%) and land reform (14%) (Figure 6). The whole E Cape sample (BRC and TRALSO) is on communal land, as indicated above. The KZN sample is mainly communal (71% -- FSG) with the remainder farm dwellers (AFRA). As mentioned above, the entire Limpopo sample was drawn from land reform farms. Communal residents are thus split between E Cape (76%) and KZN (24%). Farm dwellers are mainly from W Cape (90%) and then KZN (10%). Land reform is split between W Cape (59%) and Limpopo (41%), and all respondents on commonage, informal settlements/towns and church land were from W Cape. A greater diversity of tenure types is therefore evident in W Cape.
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This section provides an overview of the demographic characteristics of the respondent households in the survey. It looks at household size, gender and age, and then has some focus on education and employment.

The municipal areas where the research was conducted range from fairly sparsely populated areas (Cederberg, Swellendam, Emadlangeni, Hessequa) to the very densely populated (Makhado, Newcastle, Mbizana, Mbhashe). Although there is growing urbanisation in most of the municipalities, just three have an urban population of over 50% (Newcastle, Swellendam and Breede Valley, with 49% of Cederberg’s population urbanised). At the other end of the spectrum, just 5% of the populations of Mbizana, Mbhashe and Makhado live in urban areas (see situation analysis report, attached as Annexure 2).

4.1 HOUSEHOLD SIZE, GENDER AND AGE

TABLE 3: TOTAL RESIDENTS IN SAMPLED HOUSEHOLDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>1,735</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>6,987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average household size in the survey is 4.03. The sample covers households with a total of 6,987 members, and household sizes vary from one to 22 members. Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) for the municipalities and districts where the research sites are located show household sizes of between 3.3 (Swellendam in W Cape) and six (Upper Gxulu in E Cape), with most towards the lower end (see situation analysis report, Annexure 2). In this context 4.03 appears reasonable. Sixty-three percent of households surveyed had four or fewer people in the household. The majority of the remainder had five to 10 regular household members (35%). A greater proportion of households in communal areas are small compared with other tenure types, with 71% having four or fewer members. The findings contradict the pattern established during apartheid which saw the homelands or communal areas serving as locations for the surplus population, which would swell in numbers when times were hard. However, they do accord with the urbanisation trends indicated below and in the situation analysis report (Annexure 2). Church land (50%), informal settlements/towns (54.3%) and farm dweller households (55.3%) tend to have fewer small households. Commonage and land reform households are in the middle.

TABLE 4: HOUSEHOLD SIZES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>1,090</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total HH</td>
<td>1,735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relatively small household sizes compared with historically large rural households may have a number of causes, including one-way migration to urban areas, declining fertility rates, higher numbers of deaths, and greater subdivision of households. Urban migration has been noted as an issue in a number of the research sites.
Across the municipalities there is undoubtedly a trend towards urbanisation, either within the same municipality or into other municipalities with bigger towns. Typically there are both ‘push’ and ‘pull’ factors driving urbanisation. ‘Push’ factors are those that compel people to move out of rural areas. These include mine closures in some areas (notably around Amajuba in KZN) or the decline of commercial agriculture (Cederberg); mechanisation of commercial agriculture resulting in fewer jobs being available and evictions as commercial farmers rationalise their workforces (Breede Valley, Amajuba); shifting rural economies, for example from cultivation to less labour-intensive livestock, game farming or eco-tourism; and the negative social impacts of HIV/AIDS where households find it difficult to survive following illness or death of household members. ‘Pull’ factors are those that make urban areas more attractive than marginal rural areas. These include greater opportunities for employment, and potentially better access to housing and services like water and electricity. National statistics show strong outmigration from E Cape and Limpopo between 2006-2011, with a relatively stable overall population in KZN and in-migration to W Cape (Stats SA, 2011:13).

Urbanisation is a trend, but not one that will result in a complete depopulation of the more remote rural areas: however limited it may be, people in the villages and settlements of the more marginal rural areas often have access to some land, housing and livestock, and are connected into social and support networks. The rural population is projected to continue growing in absolute terms, even if it is declining as a proportion of the overall population. This means rural areas will remain important even while the urban population grows as a proportion of the overall population.

**TABLE 5: GENDER OF HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS (N=1,722)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2,771</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,398</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just over half (51.3%) of household members are females (N=1,722), compared with the national average of 51.5% (Stats SA, 2011:9). There are slightly more males in the younger age categories and slightly more females in the older age categories (Figure 7). This suggests greater movement of males out of the rural areas once they reach working age, although it is not a very big difference.

The situation analysis (Annexure 2) shows the proportion of women in the district population of between 50% and 56%, with an outlier of 44% in Emadlangeni in Amajuba in KZN. So the survey sample is within the range. District statistical data (Annexure 2) show 40-50% of the population in most of the municipalities is under 19, with a few outliers (some higher, some lower).

Our survey shows that children aged 18 and under constitute 35% of the household members (N=1,705, with responses for 4,850 individuals). This category constitutes those who are counted for child support grants. Proportionally there are slightly more boys than girls in this category in our survey. Sixty percent of the sample population are of working age (19-59), which runs counter to the historical trend of working age people leaving the rural areas.

There are slightly more women (61.5%) of working age in the rural sites than men (58%). It may be that people still leave to find work, but movement is easier than under apartheid and they return more often than tightly-controlled migration previously permitted. Five percent of the sample population is 60 or older.

SPP, which has the largest single dataset in the survey (25% of cases), did not ask ages of children, and, although children were included in the total household numbers, they were left out of the main database on age. This may well account for the lower percentage of children in the sample.

### 4.2 EDUCATION

Eighty-two percent of respondents had primary or secondary education, and 6.5% had no education (N=943, covering 3,121 individuals\(^1\)) (Figure 8).

Female household members had slightly higher average levels of education than their male counterparts. 51% of females had secondary education or higher, whereas only 45% of males did.

The situation analysis (Annexure 2) shows the district proportion of inhabitants with less than a Grade 7 level of formal education to be 35-54% with two outliers (Newcastle more higher education and Okhahlamba less higher education than the main range). Our survey shows 50.6%, so once again it is within the range shown in district statistics.

---

\(^1\) It is possible that some organisations left a blank where education was ‘none’. This would need to be checked.
FIGURE 7: AGE DISTRIBUTION BY GENDER (N=1,705)

FIGURE 8: HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION ATTAINED (N=943)
The order in Figure 9 is more or less the reverse order of level of education by tenure type. Residents of informal settlements have lower levels of education, followed by farm dwellers, commonage, communal and land reform with the highest average levels of education across all household members. Respondents in informal settlements in the Cape Winelands are mainly former farm workers, thus reinforcing the lower levels of formal education amongst farm dwellers.

4.3 EMPLOYMENT

Most of the research sites fall into areas that are low in the economic and spatial hierarchy. They are marginal to the broader economy. The closest towns to the research sites are mostly so-called ‘third order’ towns (drawing on National Spatial Development Perspective typologies), which are no more than service centres for the rural population, with a limited economic base of their own (see Annexure 2).
### TABLE 6: EMPLOYMENT BY GENDER (N=1,542)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th></th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th></th>
<th>COMBINED</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time farmer</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time farmer</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land reform farmer</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non land reform farmer</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm worker</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal trade</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other own business</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own business/self-employed</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed by government</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed elsewhere</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed off-farm</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/unemployed</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,518</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A methodological note before we consider employment: SPP, which has the biggest dataset in the survey (N=441 or a quarter of the sample), only asked the head of household (the respondent in their case) for demographic information. They therefore did not capture demographic data for anyone else in the household. This severely limits our knowledge of those households, because the data does not indicate gender, age, education or employment of anyone other than the head. It should be assumed that this will skew the data away from the unemployed and probably also women (assuming that more men are heads of households than women in these sites). We aimed to exclude children (18 and younger) from the employment data, but with only some success. This is a question for further follow-up, if necessary. A total of 1,542 respondents answered questions about type of employment, covering 3,518 individuals.

Farmers, as identified by respondents, are the largest employment group at 28% of the sample (Figure 10). A large portion of these (19% of the total sample and 59% of those identified as farmers) were identified as coming from land reform farms (Table 6). This is very significant, as it shows that those on land reform farms consider themselves to be first and foremost farmers, a willingness which could stand TA and the countryside in good stead. Their households generally have access to some land, and a fair number are producing. All of this is shown below. Although more men (31%) were identified as farmers, 25% of women were also thus identified. This suggests a gender balance amongst farmers that is only slightly in favour of men.

Farm workers are the second largest employment category in the survey, at just over a quarter. This more or less accords with tenure data that shows around a third of respondent households were on commercial farms. This is the largest single employment category (apart from unemployed) for female household members surveyed (27%).

Workers may be slightly over-represented as a proportion of farm dwellers. The difference between the two figures (25% employment and 34% tenure type) consists of other farm dwellers who are not workers (i.e., around three-quarters of a non-working dweller per worker). The lack of data beyond the household head is important here again, since SPP had a large proportion of farm dwellers in its study.
The head of the household will almost always be a farm worker in these conditions (though it differs for labour tenancy in KZN), meaning that workers are over-represented since no data on other dwellers was gathered.

Unemployment is the third largest overall category, at nearly a quarter (23.7%) of all household members. Again, concern is noted about the possibility of SPP data skewing the sample away from the unemployed. National unemployment was reported at 23.9% in the fourth quarter of 2011. Annexure 2 shows widely diverging district statistics, ranging from 7% to 79%. There are certainly differences in the way unemployment is understood and applied. For males, unemployment is only the fourth largest category after off-farm employment. Women experience much higher unemployment (28%) than men (19%). Women also constitute the highest percentage of those unemployed (62%). The question did not attempt to capture the narrow definition of unemployment (i.e., anyone actively looking for work currently without employment). We simply asked the respondent to indicate which members of the household are unemployed.

When we look at unemployment by age we come across some anomalies that show we did not entirely remove children from the unemployed/none category, while we did not exclude pensioners (over 60). If these groups are considered, this will increase the unemployment rate, since they will not have employment, unless we consider child labour as openly admitted. The unemployment rate for the youth category (19-35) and the older income-generating age (36-59) show that youth unemployment is slightly higher (22.5%) than unemployment for older income earners (19.7%). Both figures are lower than the overall average (23.7%), so we will need to separate out these two categories for exclusive attention on unemployment.

Off-farm employment is the fourth biggest category for women (13.7%), and the third biggest category for men (20%), with a combined 17%. Twenty percent of this work comes from government for both men and women (suggesting gender equity in government programmes), and the rest from the private sector. The combined total in wage employment (off-farm employment plus farm workers) is 42%. In the question on main source of income below, the data indicates that a much higher proportion (60%) rely on wages as their primary source of income. It may be that farmers, for example, identify themselves as farmers even though they currently rely on wages as their main source of income. This is consistent with the history of agriculture in South Africa, where the majority of producers rely on externally-generated cash to do farming. Input costs are generally higher than any sales, and most households produce primarily for their own use.

Own business/self-employed is fairly low at 5.5%, and is discussed in more detail below, under income. It is evenly balanced across gender.

Farmers (52%) and the unemployed (48%) constitute the highest percentage of respondents with levels of education below matric (N=935, with 2,205 individuals). Off-farm employment and own business/self-employed (both 40%) had the lowest number of respondents with less than a matric. According to Bhorat (2009:9), unemployment rates rose between 1995 and 2005 across all levels of education.

KEY POINTS

- The standard picture of rural migration is contradicted. There is a high proportion of people of prime income-generating age present in the rural areas

- Average households are made up of four people

- Nearly a quarter of the population (24%) is unemployed, with women experiencing much higher unemployment (28%) than men (19%)

- Fifty-five percent of those over 18 in the households were identified by respondents as farmers or farm workers

---

CHAPTER 05

land use
A majority (83.5%) of respondents indicated they have access to land (N=1,616). Seventy-eight percent had access to land for cropping, and 28% (N=1,466) had access to land for grazing. There is an overlap as some respondents had access to both. Access to grazing land is low. Church land (55% of respondents, but based on a small sample with N=20), communal land (42%) and commonage (33%) having the highest access to grazing land. Only 23% of farm dwellers, 14% of land reform respondents and no respondents from informal settlements/towns had access to grazing land. For farm dwellers, there is a significant difference between labour tenants in KZN (AFRA) and farm dwellers in W Cape. Eighty-three percent of labour tenants had access to grazing land, compared with less than 20% of farm dwellers in W Cape.

In all the research municipalities except for Mbizana and Maphasar, both in the former Transkei, private land is the dominant form of land ownership (Annexure 2). Cederberg, Breede Valley, Swellendam and Hessequa -- all in W Cape -- are overwhelmingly dominated by private land ownership, with small portions set aside as Act 9 land (coloured reserves under apartheid). Okhahlamba (KZN), Amahlathi (E Cape), Makhado (Limpopo) and to a lesser extent Amajuba (KZN) have some ‘communal’ areas but private property is still dominant. In the first three, the location of the Tshintsha Amakhaya research sites is on communal land. In the case of Makhado, the research site is on restitution farms governed by Communal Property Associations. In Amajuba, the focus is on tenants and farm dwellers on commercial farms.

Given the Constitutional challenge to the Communal Land Rights Act (CLRA), land ownership in the former homelands remains in the hands of the state by default. Different levels and branches of the state also own other land. Some national departments own land, and municipalities own commonage around the towns. The information on the percentage of land owned by the state is not readily available for every municipality, but ranged from 4% in Amajuba district to 13% in Overberg district (under which Swellendam falls).

Table 8 shows the key tenure issues at the different research sites. Insecure tenure and lack of access to land are primary issues in commercial farming areas, and land governance arrangements are of key importance in areas under traditional authority (Annexure 2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>MAIN TENURE TYPE</th>
<th>KEY TENURE ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle, Dannhauser, Emadlangeni, KZN</td>
<td>Tenancy on private commercial farms</td>
<td>Evictions, tenure insecurity, squeezing of conditions of tenancy, lack of services, fencing of communal cropping fields, agri-villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amahlathi, EC</td>
<td>Restitution in former Ciskei homeland (betterment scheme)</td>
<td>Governance arrangements, land allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okhahlamba</td>
<td>‘Communal’ land</td>
<td>Governance arrangements, land allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makhado, Limpopo</td>
<td>Restitution farms on commercial farms that were expropriated by the state for inclusion into Venda homeland under apartheid</td>
<td>Governance arrangements, exclusion of non-claimants from land access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa, WC</td>
<td>Commonage, tenancy on commercial farms</td>
<td>Lack of rental or land use agreements, flat rate rentals, confusion about who owns land, no rules governing land allocation and access, agri-villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg, WC</td>
<td>Commonage, church land</td>
<td>Access to commonage and farm land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam, WC</td>
<td>Tenancy on private commercial farms, Act 9 land, commonage</td>
<td>Access to commonage and farm land, agri-villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mtizana and Mbhashe, EC</td>
<td>Communal land, restitution on communal land expropriated under apartheid for conservation</td>
<td>Governance arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
<td>Tenancy on private commercial farms, informal settlement</td>
<td>Evictions, security of tenure, permanency of settlement, land access, agri-villages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Access to grazing land

Five organisations (AFRA, BRC, Nkuzi, SCLC and WFP) posed questions specifically about the nature of access to grazing land. Amongst respondents who had access to grazing land (N=257), just over a quarter (26.5%) indicated grazing land was open access. Most organisations did not ask about amount of land accessed for grazing.

In Amajuba in KZN labour tenants live on privately owned commercial farms. They have a right of access to grazing for cattle, although the size of land and number of cattle is stipulated by the landowner. To some extent this depends on historical arrangements, as landowners are legally obliged to maintain historical arrangements unless there is mutual agreement to change such arrangements. However, new and incoming landowners often do not respect this obligation and try to reduce or remove this right. Also, there is a tendency among farm dwellers to try to keep as many cattle as they can, regardless of the arrangement made with the landowner. Cattle are the primary livestock component of the labour tenants’ farming system. Eighty-three percent of the households have access to some grazing land. This is the case for both male- and female-headed households.

Slightly more than a fifth of the labour tenants in the Amajuba sample graze their cattle on open access land. Open access refers to cattle grazing wherever they can, with no specific allocation of camps or fields. While there may be informal rules and procedures for accessing such land, by definition open access implies lack of formal and transparent rules and regulations, whether formulated within a community or by the state. Open access tends to favour those with larger herds and is prone to overuse. On the other hand, they may perform the so-called ecosystem services of feeding the land as they graze. However, the grazing methodology and management is important. This is referred to in more detail below.

In the communal areas of Okhahlamba in KZN all grazing land is situated in mountainous areas. There are no formal restrictions on how much cattle each household can graze, or even where to graze. Thus, grazing is open access. A similar situation pertains in Keiskammahoek in E Cape, where there is open access to communal grazing land with no defined grazing rights for local users. In the Limpopo sites, some restitution communities have organized camps for grazing but in other cases livestock owners still resort to open access since institutional systems and physical infrastructure are not in place.

In Swellendam in W Cape, a significant number of livestock owners graze their livestock on commonage land. However, due to the limited supply of commonage land in some areas, such as Buffelsjags, small-scale farmers keep their livestock in their backyards and graze them wherever possible. In this case, reference to municipal land does not suggest commonage, but refers to any open public spaces that are not necessarily meant for agricultural use. This is an important indicator of the need for land in the area.
The majority of those with crop land (62% of the total, or 71% of those who specified the size, N=1,101) had plots or homestead gardens of less than one (Figure 11). Around 7% of those who specified land size had more than 5ha of land for cropping (Table 8).

In all cases, the land refers to that which is accessed directly by the household rather than shared land or communally held land. This was established by asking individual households what their land access is, and excludes collective ownership, as in restitution. But it is also at least partly an issue of inadequate land governance and institutional systems, which mean people do not have any clearly defined access to collectively owned land, and individual or household tenure remains insecure or even unknown in these collective systems.
Of those who specified crop land sizes (N=1,094), farm dwellers and residents of informal settlements/towns have access to the smallest amounts of land (97% and 92% respectively have access to less than 1ha for cropping) (Figure 12). This was followed by those in the land reform category (79%). There is no significant difference between labour tenants in KZN and farm dwellers in W Cape with regard to size of crop land to which they have access. In all cases, 96% or more of those who specified size of crop land have less than 1ha. Those with access to commonage have the smallest proportion of respondents with under 1ha of land for crops.

From the results, it does not appear that land reform is producing secure access to more land for beneficiary households. Seventy-nine percent had access to less than 1ha for cropping, and only 14% had access to land for grazing. This raises the question of who is benefiting from land reform. It is clear that access to land remains a problem on land reform and restitution farms, indicating unresolved institutional issues that prevent transparent allocation of land to beneficiaries or residents. The result is that transferred land remains unused and beneficiaries continue to be land constrained.

The National Planning Commission (2011:197) proposes a target for improvement in the livelihoods of 10% of those with land less than 0.5ha and of half those with land between 0.5ha and 5ha. For smallholder farmers over 5ha, the aim is to get the farmers to employ themselves and another two people.

**KEY POINTS**

- The survey captures mainly people with some access to land (83.5% of the sample)
- Eighty-five percent have access to 2ha or less of cropping land
- Twenty-eight percent have access to grazing land
CHAPTER 06 income
This section uses individual and household income as one proxy measure for livelihoods, in conjunction with food access, dealt with in the next section. The proposal is that improved individual and household incomes and increased and more balanced consumption of various foods are indicators of improved livelihoods.

### 6.1 SOURCES OF INCOME

**FIGURE 13: PRIMARY SOURCE OF INCOME, GROUPED (N=1,726)**

The primary income source of individuals with an income in respondent households is wages at 58% of the sample (Figure 13). The most obvious reason for this comparatively high figure is that a large portion of the sample was farm workers, thus skewing the sample towards wage earners. There were 1,726 responding households covering 3,693 individuals in the households. Children (16 and under) were excluded from the calculations, as were the 24% of the sample who indicated no employment. Social grants are the next primary source of income, with a third of respondents having this as their main source of income. Social grants essentially include child support grants and old age grants (pensions). Self-employment (4.1%) and agricultural production (2.2%) are both very low as primary sources of income.
**Wages** cover a wide spectrum of employment types, with the primary segments being on-farm and off-farm work, and permanent/full-time or casual/part-time/seasonal work. If we break down the category of wages (Figure 14), the data shows that permanent off-farm work constitutes the largest portion (36.6%) of this category, followed by off-farm casual wages (24%). That means that off-farm wages are earned by 60% of those for whom wages are a primary income source. The other 40% is from on-farm work. Off-farm employment includes private (80% of our sample) and government (20% of our sample). In Amajuba, off-farm jobs include those at mining and steel companies and transport sector, and government officials. In Okhahlamba, off-farm casual employment mainly comprises domestic work, cooking at bed and breakfast establishments and jobs at supermarkets. In Makhado in Limpopo, off-farm employment includes professional work carried out by teachers, nurses, lawyers and medical doctors. These are restitution claimants. Generally speaking, the reliance on wages in the context of low household incomes reinforces the common perception of poorly-paying rural economies.

![Figure 14: Primary Source of Income (N=1,726)](image)

The 2010 General Household Survey (GHS) (Stats SA, 2011a:37) does not make a distinction between urban and rural households. However, it indicates that salaries constituted the main income for 57% of households, with remittances another 10%. The figures are therefore somewhat higher than those of our survey, but do include urban households where we can expect higher reliance on wages. Alemu (2011:15), who does a statistical analysis of GHS 2009 to derive data for rural households, indicates that 34% of households rely on wages as their main source of income and another 15% rely on remittances, making a total of 49%. Remittances are likely to be absorbed into wages in our survey, since the contribution of employed household members is made mainly through wages. Even where the person is only a part-time member of the household and remains away most of the time, their income will be considered a wage contribution rather than a ‘remittance’, and the latter was not an answer frequently offered by respondents. Therefore wages and remittances are likely to be conflated into one category in our survey.
Public works as a key source of off-farm income

Public works are considered by researchers as a key form of off-farm employment in their sites. The Community Work Programme (CWP) provides an employment safety net by giving participants a minimum number of regular days of work, typically two days a week or eight days a month, thus providing a predictable income stream. The CWP is designed as an employment safety net, not an employment solution for par ticipants. The purpose is to supplement people’s existing livelihood strategies by offering a basic level of income security through work. It is an on-going programme that complements the social grants. CWP sites are established in marginalised economic areas, both rural and urban, where unemployment is high. Unemployed and underemployed men and women qualify to apply for work. Communities are actively involved in identifying ‘useful work’ needed in the area. The Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP) is a national programme aiming to provide additional work opportunities coupled with training.

In Amajuba in KZN, many of the farm dwellers, especially women, are employed through the public works programme known as Zibambele – a local road maintenance programme which employs people for 8-10 days per month. In Okhahlamba in KZN, there are public works, such as a pavement project around Okhomba in AmaZizi, and repairing of pot-holes. However, none of the individuals in the FSG research sites were employed through this project. In Upper Gxulu in Amahlathi municipality in E Cape, participants in public works programmes are involved in agriculture, including maintaining an agricultural project, repairing access roads, and renovating agricultural infrastructure such as barns and fencing. In Rawsonville in the Cape Winelands in W Cape, a public works road construction programme employs people from Rawsonville. The municipality is responsible for managing the database of applicants. In Hessequa municipality in W Cape, 17 projects were operating at the time of the research. Ten were based on infrastructure, with 228 job opportunities created. Seven were based on environmental projects with 186 job opportunities. In Limpopo, there were no known public works programmes in which individuals in the research sites were involved.

On-farm Employment

Farm work is the third main income category, if wages are disaggregated, following grants and off-farm wages. Farm dwellers are the second largest tenure type in our survey, after communal areas. There are slightly more farm dweller respondents (26%) than those who identified their main source of employment as farm work (23%). This is to be expected since not all farm dwellers are also workers, although there was a high proportion of farm workers in the sample. The national context is one of a declining overall number of farm workers since the 1970s, although with fluctuations from year to year. This is linked to ‘modernisation’, including mechanisation and other technologies, and changes in the labour regulatory framework. In the latter there is a shift to a labour relations model and away from a paternalist model (Du Toit, 1993), although shades persist, especially on smaller, less wealthy farms. These smaller farms constitute more than 50% of all commercial farms, if we use R300,000 annual gross farm income as a cut-off (Coetzee, 2012). Gross farm income is a measure of income before production expenses. The amount of R300,000 is not very high if expenses, including labour, are considered. This group constitutes a relatively poor class of white commercial producers whose land may be targets for land reform. Voices in the commercial sector have suggested that if a way could be found to give these producers an outlet – almost a reverse agri-village – where they could have a small settlement near a town and be drawn on as paid mentors, this could free up land that has productive potential but whose current owners are ‘trapped’, unable to sell or move.3

Historically, permanent workers were men who lived on the farms. Additional labour was drawn from their families, and for this reason, amongst others, seasonal work tended to be done by women – the spouses and other family members of permanent workers. Labour restructuring in the 1990s in response to global and national changes placed greater emphasis on outsourcing of labour, with rising casualisation and other forms of precarious work. Women, who were already concentrated in seasonal work, expanded as a proportion of the labour force, and hence there was a continuation of their role under apartheid as ‘stop-gap’ workers in agriculture. There was also a movement of labour off the farms as farm owners tried to circumvent tenure security laws passed in the mid 1990s. Nevertheless, on-farm labour still plays an important role in the farm business for many of the less wealthy farmers mentioned above.

3 Comments made by Jack Armour, Agri Free State at DST/NRF workshop on land and agrarian reform, Cape Town, 28 Feb 2012
In KZN our sample was derived from labour tenants, who seldom also work on the farms they live on. Theoretically, labour tenants have their own rights to land and are not required to work for the farm owner. However, these rights are largely insecure in practice. In our survey, farm workers do exhibit some production albeit at low levels, although labour tenants’ production levels are higher. Production focuses on chickens and then cattle, vegetables, beans and, to a lesser extent, maize (though this is probably the result of the provincial bias towards W Cape in the sample of farm workers).

It should be noted that farm labour constitutes a primary form of income but much less often a secondary form of income: less than 1% had on-farm employment as a secondary form of income. This suggests that farm workers rely almost entirely on their wages, and that very few respondents, even if in casual or seasonal farm work, have other more important sources of income than farm work.

When talking about multiple livelihoods, this may suggest that improving conditions on commercial farms is a priority for livelihood improvements in farm worker households. A key question is what emphasis should be put on working conditions and what emphasis on access to land for production for farm dwellers and labour tenants.

Around 40% of those relying on wages as their primary source of income (both on- and off-farm) had only casual or seasonal work. This indicates that casualisation of work cuts across the farm divide. That the primary source of income is wages from precarious work for a quarter of respondents indicates the levels of financial insecurity for the households in the sample.

A higher proportion of wages as a secondary source of income is off-farm (42%) compared to primary source of income (36%) (Figure 15).

Social grants

Social grants constitute the main income source for the second largest group of respondents at 33%. If wages are broken down into off-farm, on-farm, permanent, casual, then social grants are the main source of income for the largest group of respondents. The grants are overwhelmingly state child support grants and pensions (‘older person’s grant’), although we included the few private pensions that came up. As of April 2012 the older person’s grant is worth R1,200/month for qualifying individuals over 60 years old. Figure 15 shows that social grants constitute the largest group for the second most important form of income (45%), so all in all 78% of individuals for whom there was a response indicated social grants as the first or second most important form of income.

Child grants in South Africa

Child grants are paid out to the primary care giver, who must be 16 years or older, to provide for the child’s basic needs. All grants do not cover permanent care in a state institution. The grant is worth R280 per month per child for qualifying individuals. Children between the ages of 14 to 18 were excluded from the child support grant until 2009/10, when a child had to be under the age of 15 to qualify. This was raised in 2010/11 to include children between the ages of 15 and 16 and raised again to 17-18 in 2011/12. A person cannot apply for grants to cover more than six non-biological children.

The 2010 GHS (Stats SA, 2011a:37) shows 22% of households (urban and rural) with grants as their main source of income. The survey (Stats SA, 2011a:20) further indicates that 45% of households nationally (rural and urban) were receiving grants, even if not the main source of income. Alemu (2011:15) draws on Stats SA data to show that 41% of rural households derive their main income from grants and pensions. Our data is primarily rural, and also looks at individual main income rather than household main income, and the higher figure may be reflective of these differences. Our data shows 78% of individuals relying on grants as a primary or secondary form of income, but a number of these will be in the same household, thereby reducing the total number of households with grants. Further work can also be done in this regard on our data, if necessary, to get main sources of household income. The GHS reveals that Limpopo and E Cape had the highest uptake of grants nationally.

A detailed survey by Strategy & Tactics (S&T) (2008) is not directly comparable, since there the question was about any, rather than main, income source. However, the survey did find that 41% of respondents – who were in the Integrated Sustainable Rural Development Programme (ISRDP) nodes, the poorest 13 rural municipalities – relied entirely on social grants for household income (Strategy & Tactics, 2008:13). Our 33% finding appears reasonable in this light, considering that we inquired about primary form of income by adult individual. In the S&T survey, there were very high levels of unemployment, with only 18% of respondents having
any kind of waged employment. Our sample finds a much higher percentage of waged employment: indeed, it is the primary source of income for almost 60% of individuals in the survey. This does not automatically mean it is the highest source of income for the household, especially where the average household income (below) is around R2,600/month. This points to very low wages that can be outstripped by the value of social grants, low as they are, as the primary source of income for households. This line of enquiry may be followed up in future, to obtain more specific indications of household sources of income.

Own business or self-employed was given as the main source of income for 4.1% of the sample, compared with 5.5% who indicated that their main form of employment was own business or self-employment (Table 6). The category ‘own business’ includes taxi owners, spaza shops and funeral parlour owners and informal trader. In comparison, the 2010 GHS (Stats SA, 2011a:37) indicates 13% of households derived their main source of income from own business, but that includes urban households. In the S&T survey (2008:14), 12% of respondents in ISRDP nodes had some kind of income from own business. This could indicate a slightly wider group which does not get its main income from this source, but does get some. In our survey another 5% of respondents indicated own business as a secondary source of income (Figure 15), making 9% in total.

**FIGURE 15: SECONDARY SOURCE OF INCOME (N=1,510)**

![Bar chart showing secondary sources of income](chart.png)

**Agricultural production:** Earlier we saw that 28% of respondents were classified by household members as farmers. Yet agricultural production is the main source of income in only 2.2% of cases, with another 6% relying on agriculture as a secondary source of income. This suggests either that those who consider themselves farmers are not producing food for one reason or another or are producing but are not selling. There is a long history of low income from agriculture in South African rural households outside of commercial agriculture. The 1993 SALDRU survey4 showed that agricultural production (both sold and consumed) constituted just 3.4% of total household income nationally and 6.8% in KZN (May, 1996:17). The 1997 Rural Survey (Stats SA, 1999) showed that farming was the main source of income for only 2.7% of rural households. The picture has therefore not changed much since the 1990s in this regard.

This is not to say that everyone doing agriculture should rely on it as their primary source of income. Historical data show that the poorest households rely on agricultural production most heavily for own consumption, even if it is small amounts, while richer households tend to use agriculture as an income generator (May, 1996:23).

---

4 Project for Statistics on Living Standards and Development, based on a survey of 9000 urban and rural households, and 40000 people.
The small percentage who indicated agriculture as their main source of income represented those who were wealthier. Our survey achieved a less categorical finding. The wealthier households have slightly higher rates of livestock ownership than the poorer households (Figure 16). But poorer households tend to engage more in crop production than (relatively) wealthier ones, although there is also an increase amongst the households in the top category (>R10,000/month) (Figure 16). Although the contrast is not as sharp as the SALDRU findings, for example, where middle households relied very little on agriculture, we can nevertheless conclude that agricultural production is slightly concentrated in the poorest and the wealthiest households. Part of the issue is class compression (a narrow gap between rich and poor), which lessens the distinction between households.

**FIGURE 16: AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION BY MONTHLY HOUSEHOLD INCOME (N=1,113)**

Part of the challenge for TA is to learn how agricultural production also benefits people in other ways, especially in household consumption and sharing with neighbours, even if these cannot accurately be quantified in amount or value. The low percentage deriving income from agriculture must also be related to land size because 85% of responding households have access to 2ha of cropping land or less, which reduces their ability to make an income from agricultural production.
6.2 MEAN HOUSEHOLD INCOMES

TABLE 10: MEAN AND MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME (N=1,113)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total annual HH income</th>
<th>Monthly average HH income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>R31,279.39</td>
<td>R2,606.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>R22,320</td>
<td>R1,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>R528,000</td>
<td>R44,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey reports low household incomes, with a monthly average of R2,606.28. The median income is R1,860/month. This is the amount below which half the households fall. The most recent comprehensive national survey of income was last conducted in 2005/06, which indicated average rural household incomes of R30,859/year (Stats SA, 2008:156), or R2,571.58/month. Our figures are therefore very close to national averages, taking into account three considerations.

Firstly, household incomes will tend to rise over the years as a result of inflation (e.g., social grants), which has been running at around 6%/year.

Secondly, black rural households are poorer than other rural households, and will therefore be lower than the average in the Stats SA survey.

Thirdly, our own survey is taken from amongst the poorer rural population, measured by income, whether black or coloured. We can therefore expect a lower than average household income in our sample.

District statistics on income show widely divergent figures for households earning incomes below R1,600 per month.

These range from 24% to 98% (Annexure 2), and some of the statistics are old.

The monthly average per household member in our baseline is R646.72. This is R21.56 per day. Many poverty lines have been proposed that we might compare this with.

The UN Millennium Development Goal (MDG) line is US$1/day/person (R780 April 2012). This translates into R234/month and a household poverty line of R936/month. However, the US$1/day is a very old figure and is used more for the purposes of measurement of progress than an accurate reflection of what is needed to avoid poverty. South Africa’s food security policy (DAFF, 2012:5) sets ‘a food poverty line of R260 per individual expenditure for food every month to serve as a proxy indicator for food security, this amount covers 70% of the basic nutritious basket.’

So if we multiply R260 by our average household size of four, we get a monthly household requirement of R1,040 for our sample as a food poverty baseline. Below that means no money for anything else if people are to get 70% of their minimum nutritional requirements. Beyond food, South African poverty lines of between R515 and R949/capita (2008 values) have been used (Leibbrandt, et al., 2010:17). For a household of four, that means anything between R2,060 and R3,796 (2008).

After taking inflation into account, we therefore find that the average household income in our survey places these households around the poverty line.
Sixty-six percent of households earn R2,500 or less per month on average (Figure 17). Although Limpopo has the most households in the lowest category (R1,000/month or less) it also has the highest percentage of households in the top category (>R10,000/month). This may signify some slightly greater nascent class differentiation in that province compared with others. E Cape followed by Limpopo has the highest proportion of households in the lower income categories (83% of responding households in E Cape and 79% in Limpopo have average monthly incomes of R2,500 or less). W Cape is above average in the higher categories. Nationally, the Stats SA income survey (2008) shows coloured households with significantly higher average incomes than black households, although the data is not disaggregated for rural areas.

Households on communal land have the lowest average incomes, with 85% of households having incomes of R2,500 or less a month. These are followed by land reform households (58% with R2,500 or less a month) and those in informal settlements (53%). Forty-nine percent of households with access to commonage and 44% of farm dweller households had incomes of R2,500 or less. The number of respondents on church land is too small to make any meaningful comment.

**KEY POINTS**

- Wages and then grants are the primary sources of income

- Agricultural production is a low source of income (2.2% primary, 5% secondary), even though 28% of respondents identify primarily as farmers

- Average monthly household incomes are R2,606, with up to two-thirds of households with incomes of R2,500/month or less
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access to food

The survey looked at two main pieces of information with regard to food consumption. The first is closely related to food security and looks at the extent to which households consume various types of food. The second sets the ground for a consideration of one aspect of food sovereignty, and looks at the main source of different types of food consumed in the household. A successful intervention is one in which the amount and diversity of food consumed by households increased. In line with the concept of food sovereignty, there is also emphasis on food from own production or local trading rather than supermarkets, especially in the South African context of concentrated ownership in the agri-food system.

Food is generally available in South Africa, with the country able to produce or buy the food required to meet ‘effective demand’. However, effective demand binds the amount of food required according to those who are able to pay for it. The needs of those who are unable to pay for food do not register as demand in the formal market. So while food availability is not a primary issue in South Africa, food access is. The food may be on the shelves, but some people cannot afford to buy it, and therefore do not have access. Government welfare schemes such as school feeding programmes and social grants are critical responses to improving the access of poor households to food. Current government proposals also aim to increase household production of food for own consumption as another strand of food security policy (DAFF, 2012). TA aligns with this objective of increasing food production amongst households that can benefit directly from immediate access to food for their own use.

7.1 EXTENT OF HUNGER

Almost a third (31%) of the respondent households in our survey went hungry ‘sometimes’ and ‘often or always’ in the past year (Figure 18). Five percent indicated they were often or always hungry, constituting severe food insecurity.

FIGURE 18: DID YOU OR A MEMBER OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD GO HUNGRY IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS? (N=1,712)
These figures are reinforced by other studies. A recent Action Aid report found that 32% of children currently suffer from hunger in South Africa. A quarter of children under the age of five suffer from moderate to severe stunting, the result of chronic undernourishment (Action Aid, 2011:67). The International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI, 2010:17) shows no change in South Africa on their Global Hunger Index (GHI) between 1990 and 2010. Using official statistics, the GHI measures the proportion of undernourished people in the population, the prevalence of underweight children, and the mortality rate of children. Peter Jacobs (2012:1) of the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) indicates that the number of households reporting they had periodically gone without food during the year because they had no money rose from 12% in 2007 to 24% in 2010. The 2010 GHS (Stats SA, 2011a:38) indicates 13.8% of households with inadequate access to food, and another 8.1% with severely inadequate access nationally for both urban and rural populations. We can reasonably anticipate higher levels of inadequate access in rural areas. There is thus general statistical agreement on the broad extent of food insecurity.

Of the four provinces covered by our survey, the situation is worst in KZN, with 27% of households in the GHS reporting inadequate or severely inadequate access to food. KZN is also the most food insecure province from our data (Figure 19). It reflects an even higher percentage than in the GHS, with 56% of respondents indicating that they sometimes or often or always went without enough food in their household. More than one fifth of respondents in KZN indicated their households went hungry often or always. These higher figures can be accounted for by the fact that our survey was conducted in rural areas only and, specifically, in marginalised communal and labour tenant communities.

In E Cape, 44% of respondents indicate they went hungry sometimes, often or always. Even in W Cape, where the situation is slightly better, almost a quarter of respondents (22.5%) indicate that their household members went hungry sometimes, often or always. In Limpopo, where the situation was best amongst the case studies, 14% of respondents indicate household members sometimes went hungry – this tallies with education but not income, where Limpopo had the highest proportion of poor households. Income cannot be the only measure. There are other indicators of poverty.
Communal land and informal settlements are the tenure types hardest hit by hunger (Figure 20). For respondents on communal land, 46% of households experience hunger sometimes, often or always, and for informal settlements it is 40%. Those going hungry often or always are more evenly distributed across tenure types than across provinces. Communal land is the highest (8.6%) followed by farm dwellers (3.6%). Land reform and commonage are the least affected by hunger, although over 15% of those with access to commonage still experience hunger sometimes, often or always. Church land, with a fifth of respondents indicating an experience of hunger, and farm dwellers with 28%, are in the middle, but these are high levels of hunger with one out of every four or five households experiencing hunger in these two tenure types.

**FIGURE 21: HUNGER BY CROP PRODUCTION AND LAND ACCESS**

Crop production N=1,711; land access N=1,593
If we cross tabulate households going hungry by crop production and by land access, we find that households which produce crops go hungry more often than those which do not (Figure 21). This reflects the earlier discussion in the income section which indicated that households relying on agricultural production tend to be poorer households. This does not suggest that people are poorer because they produce crops, but rather that they produce crops because they are poor (except for the small top layer producing primarily for income). There is a positive relationship between food security and land access, i.e., a higher percentage of households with access to land indicate they never or seldom go hungry compared with those without access to land. However, more respondents with land are severely food insecure (often or always) than those without land (amongst 88 households which said they went hungry often or always). The data is therefore mixed in regard to crop production and land access in relation to hunger. Respondent households are poor, as the section on income shows, and one of TA’s objectives is to support increases in production and land access to enable these households to improve their food security.

When we look at crop land size in relation to hunger (Table 10), the results are uneven. Those with homestead gardens and those with 1-2ha tend to be more food insecure than others. Those with more than 5ha and those with small plots (<1ha) for cropping tend to be more food secure. This suggests that other variables rather than land size are more important determinants of hunger (e.g., tenure or provincial location). As we see in Figure 21, those with no land access in our survey are more food secure than those with only a homestead garden and those with 1-2ha of land.

### TABLE 11: HUNGER BY CROP LAND SIZE (N=1,237)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Homestead garden</th>
<th>&lt;1ha plot</th>
<th>1-2ha</th>
<th>3-5ha</th>
<th>&gt;5ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never or seldom</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often or always</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIGURE 22: WHO GOES WITHOUT FOOD IF THERE IS NOT ENOUGH? (N=700)
In nearly half the cases (49%), a combination of household members goes hungry if there is not enough food, compared with 39% of cases where women are the first to go hungry and 9% where men go hungry first (Figure 22). This reinforces other analyses which suggest that female-headed households are more likely than male-headed households to experience hunger (Jacobs, 2012:3). In Jacobs’s study, female-headed households in communal areas in E Cape and KZN experienced the sharpest rise in hunger.

Forty-three percent of respondents (N=985) indicate that they do sometimes buy food on credit. This means the income they are getting is not enough to buy enough food to last them for the month. Three quarters (74.6%) of respondents (N=686) indicate that their children receive food at school.

### 7.2 SOURCES OF FOOD FOR HOUSEHOLD CONSUMPTION

**FIGURE 23: MAIN SOURCES OF DIFFERENT FOOD TYPES FOR HOUSEHOLD CONSUMPTION**

Supermarkets are the predominant source of all household food types, with over 60% of respondents indicating they purchased dairy products and meat from supermarkets as their primary source (Figure 23). More than half the respondents indicate supermarkets as their primary source of bread, maize products and chicken, while over 40% indicate sourcing fresh fruit and vegetables from supermarkets. Local shops and informal markets are also an important source of food. Mostly around 15-20% of respondents indicate this is their primary source for different types of food, with the notable exception of maize (just 6.6% of respondents) and to some extent fruit (13.7%). The figure for maize is surprising, and indicates very weak local markets for maize. Most households either buy from the supermarkets or produce their own maize, but there doesn’t appear to be much local trading.

Around a quarter of households for maize (26%) and fruit (24%) indicate that their own production is a primary source of household supplies (Figure 23). For other food types, this is mainly around 15%, with the exception of dairy (a low 6.6% producing their own as the main source) and vegetables (11%). Dairy producers may get some of their household needs from own production but still buy most of their dairy requirements from the store. The data for vegetables is more surprising, although the same may hold: some household production, but the primary source is still supermarkets or local sellers.
Figure 24 indicates the results of a cross tabulation between main source of various types of food for household consumption and whether the household indicated they produce that food (the ‘no’ or ‘yes’ columns in the figure). It shows a number of cases where respondents said they did not have livestock or produce various crops but indicated their main source for that product was own production. This number is below 10% for most except maize (13%). Putting that slight mismatch aside for now, the figure clearly shows that those who produce various foodstuffs are less likely to rely on supermarkets or the formal sector for these foods. The contrast is sharpest for maize and chicken. This means households producing maize or owning poultry are much less likely to need to buy from supermarkets. For vegetables own production tends to displace informal markets first, before supermarkets, as the main source of household consumption. For livestock, those with their own animals are only slightly more self-reliant in meat than those without. This reinforces the argument in the livestock section below that livestock ownership is for multiple purposes of which food production is a relatively minor component.

For individual households, poverty is the driver of food insecurity. Lack of money precludes the purchase of food, however available it is. The correlation between poverty and hunger is however more complex than it seems. For example, a damaging feedback loop may come into play where the degree of hunger reduces the physical capacity of families to work or to learn to their full potential. The propensity for this to happen is a result of the fact that many people in the study are unemployed and those that are employed do not have well-paying jobs to ensure food security for themselves and their families.

Poorer households in South Africa spend a larger share of their total income on food (around 36-38% in 2005), although they spend less in real terms than their wealthier counterparts (down to around 7% for the wealthiest 10% of households) (Altman, et al., 2009:14). The National Agricultural Marketing Council (NAMC, 2012:7) shows that a basic food basket took 39% of the average household income of the poorest 30% of households in January 2012, while it only constituted 3% of the average household income of the richest 30% of households. Poorer households spent less than R1,000 per adult equivalent in 2005, while the richest households spent almost R8,000 per adult equivalent in the same year.
Only one in 10 rural households can afford a nutritionally adequate food basket compared to one in four urban households (Altman, et al., 2009:14).

The NAMC has shown over a long period that rural food prices are higher than urban food prices. Prices have risen rapidly in the past years, with the domestic price of white maize rising 90% between January 2011 and January 2012, and retail prices of maize meal rising between 41% and 64% in the same period (NAMC, 2012:1). Poorer households have no mechanism to cope with rising prices other than to reduce the volume or nutritional quality of their consumption. Sharp rises in food prices therefore hit poorer households and rural households hardest, underlining Amartya Sen’s argument that in conditions of rising food prices and scarce financial resources, households that produce their own food may have greater food security than those who buy food (Sen, 1982).

Supermarkets are the dominant source of food across the board for the households in the survey, and constitute the main source of food for more than 50% of households in all food categories except vegetables and fruit. Supermarkets offer convenience, sometimes lower prices and better quality than the available alternatives and, perhaps, status for rural households. However, the expansion of supermarkets into rural areas may come at the cost of strengthening the connection between local production and consumption, and the active involvement of rural households in the agri-food system.

The Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP) identifies ‘rural shopping malls’ as part of its vision for rural development (DRDLR, 2009:23). The NPC (2011:205) places emphasis on access to formal markets for smallholders, and Walmart’s entry into South Africa will accelerate private sector programmes to integrate commercial smallholders into supermarket value chains. These efforts at inclusion are likely to benefit only a small top layer of producers because of requirements for infrastructure (e.g., cold chains), management expertise, and an ability to carry financial risk. There may be some room opening up for local procurement by supermarkets, notably Spar in rural areas, where franchise managers are given leeway to purchase some fresh produce on spot markets without long-term contracts (Bienabe & Vermeulen, 2007). However, there are still quality, consistency of supply and volume requirements that most smallholders, especially resource-poor smallholders like those who participated in our survey, will battle to meet as basic conditions of entry. This leaves us with a question about the role supermarkets can play amongst poorer constituencies, apart from imposing unequal competition on producers who might otherwise distribute their surplus produce locally.

The survey shows that there is some use of local/informal channels for food distribution. Overall, own production or local distribution outside the supermarkets is the main source of food for between 31% and 38% of households, except for dairy and meat where this is lower (22-25%). The source of produce for these local or informal markets is often the corporate food sector but this does not have to be the case. The new AgriBEE policy and the Zero Hunger Programme both propose sourcing a greater share of produce from black smallholders, and this is an opportunity for the development of bulk infrastructure that can support the local marketing and distribution of locally produced food. There are ecological benefits to a shorter supply chain through the reduction of transport costs and the stripping away of inefficient movement of produce to centralised processing and storage facilities, and their movement back to rural areas at higher prices.
7.3 FREQUENCY OF FOOD CONSUMPTION

Across the whole sample, bread and vegetables are consumed most regularly, and meat and chicken are consumed least regularly (Figure 25). Almost three quarters of respondents (74%) eat bread more than three times a week and 54% eat bread every day (not shown in the figure). Our sample is skewed towards W Cape, where bread is a staple. In W Cape, 71% of respondents indicate they eat bread every day, compared with 12% in KZN, 34% in E Cape and 44% in Limpopo. Fourteen percent of respondents in KZN never eat bread. Conversely, maize is the staple in the other provinces in the survey.

One fifth of W Cape respondents eat meat every day, compared with 2% or less in the other provinces. In E Cape 12% never eat meat. Between a fifth and a quarter of respondents indicate they eat fruit every day except in E Cape. In E Cape, 27% of respondents never eat fruit. Forty percent of respondents in W Cape consume dairy every day, compared with less than 20% in the other provinces. In Limpopo more than a quarter (25.6%) of respondents and in E Cape more than a fifth (21.1%) never consume dairy. Chicken is consumed fairly regularly (a few times a week) in all provinces. Vegetables (data only for W Cape and E Cape) are consumed by nearly half of respondents (48%) every day in E Cape and in W Cape 32% eat vegetables every day.

The overall picture is of more regular household food consumption in W Cape, and less regular consumption across most food types in E Cape, with KZN and Limpopo in between. This generally accords with greater poverty and lower incomes in E Cape and relatively higher incomes and lower poverty levels in W Cape. We can construct a ‘typical’ food basket for each province based on more than 40% of respondents consuming a type of food three or more times a week. Table 11 gives the results. Carbohydrates are very important in current diets, which is not surprising as they are relatively cheap and filling. Diversification will improve food security by introducing a wider range of nutrients. The W Cape currently has the most diverse typical food basket, followed by E Cape. In KZN and Limpopo, meat consumption is low, although dairy does feature in KZN. Questions about vegetable consumption were not asked in a way that could be standardised in KZN and Limpopo, and it is possible that vegetables would also feature in a typical food basket in these provinces.
TABLE 12: A TYPICAL FOOD BASKET FOR EACH PROVINCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Contents of typical food basket (in order of importance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E Cape</td>
<td>Vegetables, bread, maize, fruit, chicken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZN*</td>
<td>Maize, fruit, dairy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo*</td>
<td>Maize, bread, fruit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Cape</td>
<td>Bread, dairy, vegetables, chicken, fruit, meat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No response for frequency of vegetable consumption

**Dietary diversity amongst farm dwellers in Amajuba in KZN**

Dietary diversity was explored as a further component of food security for farm dwellers living in the Amajuba area of KZN. This method assesses the range of foods eaten and frequency of consumption to give an indication of dietary adequacy at a household level. Here the different food items consumed on a daily, weekly and monthly basis are quantified. A very low household dietary diversity score means households consume food between three to five different food groups in a day.

Dietary diversity among farm dwellers is poor, reflecting low incomes and limited livelihood options. Most households are unable to eat the kinds of foods they prefer and have to limit the variety of foods they eat due to lack of resources. The situation is more extreme for female-headed households with a larger percentage of female-headed than male-headed households having to often limit their variety of foods. Most respondents have to eat smaller or fewer meals than they would prefer in a day, due to limited food availability. Again, the situation is more severe for female-headed households.

Farm dwellers produce a surprising proportion of their own foods, including vegetables, fruit, meat, eggs and milk. Own production of food contributes significantly to farm dwellers’ ability to provide adequate nutrient intake for themselves. Coping strategies for food shortages rely heavily on land-based livelihood activities such as cropping, livestock and livestock products such as milk, maas and eggs.

**KEY POINTS**

- Almost one-third of respondent households are food insecure — 26% food insecure, 5% severely food insecure
- Women tend to go hungry first when there is not enough food
- A high proportion of food is sourced primarily from supermarkets
- Hunger is related to tenure — people in communal, informal settlements/towns go hungry more often
CHAPTER 08

livestock ownership, sales and marketing
Fifty-seven percent of respondents keep some kind of livestock (Figure 26), 43% have some kind of livestock apart from poultry, and 38% have poultry, with some overlap between the two.
The most commonly held livestock are chickens (35%) and cattle (30%). Less than 20% of respondents keep goats, pigs or sheep (Figure 27). This signifies relatively low ownership of livestock and is likely to be related to limited access to land. Those who sell livestock as a percentage of those who own (red line on graph) is highest for pigs (59%), then cattle (49%) and lowest for chickens (16%). In the food access section above, we saw that ownership of cattle did not translate into significant own consumption, whereas ownership of chickens resulted in more respondents producing for themselves rather than buying chickens for household consumption. This finding is underlined here; chickens are not often sold, suggesting home use.

FIGURE 27: LIVESTOCK OWNERSHIP AND SALES (N=1,743)

FIGURE 28: LIVESTOCK OWNERSHIP BY PROVINCE (N=1,743)
Executives summary

Respondents with commonage and communal tenure have the highest proportion of livestock by and large, with those on church land also indicating relatively higher ownership of livestock (Figure 29). More than 40% of respondents on both commonage and communal land owned some cattle. Residents of informal settlements/towns and farm dwellers are the lowest (apart from chickens amongst farm dwellers).

However, the low overall figures for farm dwellers disguises significant differences between labour tenants in KZN (AFRA) and other farm dwellers in the sample. The majority of labour tenants in KZN (92%) owned cattle, compared with just 30% in the southern Cape (SCLC), 1.5% on the West Coast of W Cape (SPP) and zero amongst farm dwellers in Rawsonville in the Cape Winelands (WFP). In Amajuba, where the labour tenants are, around eight to 11 livestock per household are allowed on commercial farms. Farm dwellers would like to keep much larger herds of around 70-100 livestock. The average number of livestock presently kept by the Amajuba labour tenants surveyed is 22 per household. There are therefore restrictions on livestock ownership tied to land ownership.

There are similar patterns of ownership of chickens and goats, with a high percentage of the labour tenants in AFRA’s sample having chickens (95%) and goats (66%). However, farm dwellers in W Cape own far less livestock (less than 4% for goats and 20% or less for chickens). Farm dwellers working with SPP and WFP have very low ownership of livestock across the board (highest ownership of just 16% for chickens amongst SPP farm dweller respondents and 11%, also for chickens amongst WFP respondents). Farm dwellers in the SCLC sample have slightly higher levels of livestock ownership than other farm dwellers in the province: 30% with cattle, as indicated above; 25% with sheep; 20% with chickens; and 19% with pigs.

Chickens are the most widely owned livestock in KZN, E Cape and Limpopo (Figure 28). This is followed by cattle in all provinces. Goats are fairly important livestock in KZN and E Cape, while pigs are more important in W Cape and are the second most widely owned type of livestock in that province. It is clear from Figure 28 that a higher percentage of respondents own livestock in KZN and E Cape, and that W Cape and Limpopo have relatively low ownership of livestock. Eighty-six percent of respondents in KZN own chickens, 66% own cattle and 47% own goats. In contrast, less than 10% of respondents in the Limpopo sample own any kind of livestock except chickens (29%).

**Figure 29: Livestock Ownership by Tenure (N=1,698)**
We thus need to acknowledge the site and tenure specificity of livestock ownership in relation to farm dwellers, with labour tenants in KZN having far higher levels of ownership than farm dwellers in W Cape.

Almost two-thirds of respondents on communal land keep chickens, and over 40% of those with access to commonage have pigs. Goats are kept by over 30% of respondents in communal areas.

**FIGURE 30: HERD/FLOCK SIZES**

Around 28% of cattle herds are over 10 head, and almost a third of goat herds are over 10 head (Figure 30). For sheep and pigs this drops to a quarter and a fifth respectively. Very few herds/flocks in the sample are over 100 head. Although a higher number of chicken flocks are over 10 head (60%), no respondents were producing chickens anywhere near commercial scale. This reflects the trend towards household consumption, as described below.

**Poultry and integrated agro-ecological farming systems**

Traditionally, poultry is kept in a free range system. Chickens are expected to forage for themselves and may be provided with some supplementary feeding in the form of food scraps and ground yellow maize. Housing is generally not provided unless deaths due to predation are particularly high, and cages for roosting and sleeping may then be provided. Traditionally, nesting boxes are constructed off the ground for brooding hens and for egg laying. However, this practice has become less common and people tend to leave the chickens to nest wherever they can.

Generally, traditional chickens do not lay eggs regularly, but have specific and reasonably short breeding seasons. The hens are generally broody and will brood their eggs as soon as they start laying, which limits the collection of eggs for human consumption. Death rates of chicks are high unless separate housing and feeding for the chicks is provided, which a minority of owners do provide. The meat of traditional chickens is dark and quite tough. They are, however, preferred for ceremonies and cultural practices. Households irregularly slaughter chicken for the pot.

More recently multi-purpose breeds of chickens are being introduced. These chickens are both good meat producers and reasonably good layers and lend themselves towards the more traditional husbandry practices as they are also more hardy than the commercial breeds of broilers and layers.
Figure 31 shows the percentage of households with herds larger than 10 head. Limpopo and then KZN have a higher proportion of larger cattle herds, and also a slightly higher proportion of larger chicken flocks. The Limpopo sample is fairly small (nine respondents for cattle and 26 for chickens) so these results for that province should be treated with caution. E Cape has a higher proportion of larger sheep flocks, and W Cape has a higher proportion of bigger goat and pig herds. The larger chicken flocks are the most evenly distributed across the provinces of all the livestock types. These results may suggest a differentiated response in different provinces.

The results of a similar exercise are shown in Table 12, with the top tenure types shown per livestock type. Farm dwellers, commonage and land reform appear on the list for three livestock types each, and informal settlements/towns appears on the list for two livestock types. As with the provincial data, those with larger chicken flocks are fairly evenly distributed across tenure types.

**TABLE 13: PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH >10 HEAD OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF LIVESTOCK BY TENURE TYPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livestock type</th>
<th>Top tenure types and % with &gt;10 head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>Farm dwellers (40.2%), land reform (37.7%), commonage (32.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>Communal (36%), land reform (35.7%), informal settlements/towns (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>Commonage (63.6%), farm dwellers (46.8%), church land (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>Commonage (36.5%), land reform (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickens</td>
<td>Farm dwellers (64.7%), informal settlements/towns (63.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average herd size for cattle (N=524) is 10.5 head and for sheep (N=209) it is 14.8 (Table 13). The average number of chickens (N=605) is 18.8.
### TABLE 14: MEAN HERD/FLOCK SIZES AND RANGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickens</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>18.76</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 32 AGGREGATE CHANGES * IN HERD/FLOCK SIZES**

*% of respondents indicating an increase in herd size minus % of respondents indicating a decrease in herd size over the past year

More respondent households experienced a decline in herd numbers than a growth over the previous year for all livestock types except pigs (Figure 32). The situation was worst for goats (an aggregate of 31% of households indicated herds had declined) cattle (22%) and chickens (19%). It must be borne in mind that herd sizes will fluctuate regularly on the basis of climatic and market conditions, and the figures indicate a short-term trend only.
There is a fairly clear trend provincially of declining herds in E Cape and KZN, and increasing herds in W Cape (Figure 33). Limpopo is uneven, with aggregate growth in cattle and goat herds but a decline in pig and chicken numbers. In W Cape we see an expansion of herd sizes across the board, whereas in E Cape and KZN aggregate herd sizes of every type of livestock are declining.

FIGURE 34: MAIN REASONS FOR DECREASE IN HERD/FLOCK SIZES
When asked for reasons for declines in herd numbers, the majority of respondents indicated unplanned deaths as the main cause, except for pigs where there was no clearly dominant reason for declining numbers (Figure 34). Sales (forced or voluntary) were the second most important as a reason except for chickens (since very few chickens in the sample were sold). Forced sales included sales made because of lack of water, grazing or food for the animals. Pigs go against the trend of death as the main cause of declining stock numbers. This may be associated with the fact that pigs are more regularly kept for eventual sale. Unlike cattle, sheep and goats, pigs do not need grazing land and this eliminates a lack of grazing as a cause of death. They could, of course, still die of hunger.

Theft was cited as the third most important reason for declining stock numbers, especially of small stock (goats, pigs and sheep).

Researchers in partner organisations also identified a lack of veterinary or dipping services, medication and knowledge about how to treat diseases as key reasons for livestock deaths. Drought and lack of fodder are also important reasons.

8.2 LIVESTOCK USE AND MARKETING

FIGURE 35: MAIN USES OF LIVESTOCK

More than half of respondents indicated they kept livestock mainly for household use (overwhelmingly consumption, with very few reporting some use for draught power or reproductive purposes), apart from pigs (Figure 35). A quarter to a third of respondents with pigs, sheep and cattle indicated they kept the livestock primarily for sale. Goats and especially chickens were more for household use.
A relatively small proportion of those who sell livestock earned more than R12,000 from sales of individual types of livestock in the past year (Figure 36). Unsurprisingly, more households which sold cattle earned higher amounts, since cattle are more valuable than other livestock. The majority of respondents for all kinds of livestock earned less than an average of R500 a month from livestock sales in the past year — more than 90% for goats, and 80% or more for other livestock types except cattle (55%). Across all livestock types, 13% of households earned more than R12,000 in the past year from the sale of individual types of livestock.

**South African ‘cattle culture’ as a limiting factor for commercial livestock production**

In Amajuba in KZN, farm dwellers keep cattle primarily for their own use, for traditional ceremonies and for lobola (bridewealth). As a rule they do not sell cattle unless they need money for a specific reason such as a family emergency, school fees or a funeral. As a rule they also do not slaughter cattle unless it is for a specific social ceremony. Cattle are considered a central part of the identity of a Zulu household. Keeping as many cattle as possible is important in terms of ‘wealth’ and status in the community. Farm dwellers strongly resist having to spend money to sustain livestock and generally do not feed cattle in winter. They also resent having to pay for grazing.

The average amount earned from sales of any single type of livestock was just under R6,500 in the past year (Figure 37). Some households sold more than one type of livestock, and in these cases overall income from livestock would be higher. Average sales of cattle was R9,300; for sheep the figure is around R5,200; and average sales of pigs, goats and chickens were less than R5,000 in the past year.
Local and informal markets are the main outlets for livestock sales (Figure 38). For goats and chickens, more than three-quarters of sales go through these channels, and for pigs, sheep and cattle local channels account for more than half of sales. Auctions are important for cattle and pigs (27-28% of sales), and other formal markets or more generically ‘town’ have some importance for all livestock types, ranging from 14% for pigs to 24% for sheep sales. However we should take note of the low overall numbers – this only applies to those respondents who do sell and who answered this question, and the numbers vary between 17 (chickens) and 165 (cattle).
8.3 LIVESTOCK VALUE CHAINS AND AGRO-ECOLOGICAL PRODUCTION

While individual organisations will pursue their own strategies in relation to the marketing or distribution of livestock and livestock products, for TA as a whole the question arises of what the focus should be. There may be some racial bias in formal markets, for example SCLC and SPP in W Cape report that ‘VAT free’ is used as a code at auctions to signal to buyers that the livestock comes from a black farmer, resulting in black farmers receiving unfairly lower prices. However, in Swellendam, respondent farmers indicate they receive better prices at auctions than through other channels. Generally speaking, there is no inherent obstacle to black smallholders selling into the formal market. The barriers to entry are fairly high for resource-poor livestock owners, but not insurmountable. Meeting required volumes, consistency of supply and product quality standards necessitates infrastructural and other investments. According to livestock farmers in KZN, livestock quality, accurate timing of sales and sale of younger animals will result in higher prices. Getting the right bull is the crucial first step. Farmers should also not go to the auctions ignorant of how they work. They should first visit the auction and speak to officials to understand clearly how it works before bringing their animals. These factors are within the farmers’ control. However, even before issues of marketing logistics and infrastructure, there are the basic questions of herd maintenance (water, veterinary support, access to medicines, fencing and the associated institutional management of grazing land) to ensure a product that can be sold.

Road access, transport costs, cold chain infrastructure and storage all require investments in bulk infrastructure that most individual farmers cannot undertake on their own. There are also issues around contracts and the fairness of agreements. There are long distances to formal markets and contracts are seldom signed unless farmers operate at a large scale and can offer a consistency of supply. Rising energy costs will have a significant impact on the livestock industry, leading to increasing costs of livestock production and transport.

**The Okhahlamba Livestock Association**

Farmer organisation is of value in responding to these challenges. The Okhahlamba Livestock Association, for example, covers the transport costs for members’ livestock to auctions. They also facilitate meetings between their members and the local commercial farmers’ association to receive information about auctions and to get other market advice. They have forged links with the local extension officer for animal health in order for the officer to check and medicate livestock before sale. This allows farmers to realise higher prices. Community organisation also allows livestock owners to monitor the cattle of the collective and assist and inform one another of problems and solutions.

Auctions play an important role as local livestock markets, although buyers and sellers are subjected to various service charges by the local authority and other bodies. Markets are dispersed with remote markets lacking price information. Better information combined with excess supply place the trader in a better position during price negotiations. Prices are usually fixed by individual bargaining. Prices depend mainly on supply and demand, which is heavily influenced by the season of the year, climatic conditions such as drought and the occurrence of religious and cultural festivals.

Development of value chain coordination strategies and systems is a costly, time-consuming endeavour, requiring considerable cooperation among partners and buyers. More information is needed regarding effective coordination strategies, anticipated customer demands and the implications of various forms of coordination strategies for economic efficiency, competitiveness, market access, and risk shifting. The scope for niche or highly differentiated markets for meat products is unclear. Understanding consumers’ willingness to pay for extrinsic attributes is critical to assess the implications of differentiated product markets on the competitive position and growth opportunities for producers and processors. The significant impact that regulatory costs have on cost competitiveness is relative to the size of firm and location.

Apart from the technical requirements for entry into formal livestock value chains, there are also the socio-cultural issues mentioned above that act against an orientation towards the commodification of livestock. Production methodologies also need close attention, because consistency of supply and standardisation of the product channel farmers into livestock production processes that generally run counter to socially or ecologically sustainable farming systems that integrate livestock into a whole-farm approach. The dominant commercial model is feedlot production, where cattle are concentrated in holding facilities for bulking up before sale.
The industrial production of chickens through battery farming is also a dominant commercial method. In these instances both animal and human health are placed under increasing threat, as the recent large-scale global outbreaks of bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE or ‘mad cow disease’, caused by carcasses of dead animals being incorporated into cow feed), H5N1 (avian flu) and H1N1 (swine flu) attest to. Free-range production of livestock (apart from chickens) requires adequate land for grazing.

In light of this, from an agro-ecological point of view, the emphasis might be placed on more local distribution of livestock and livestock products, where auctions can also play a role. The emphasis should not only be on markets but also on production for household consumption for food security. TA partner organisations currently place varying emphasis on supporting strategies to access formal markets, with most directing some effort and resources into supporting formal market access where opportunities arise. However, across TA as a whole, the emphasis might well be placed on bolstering the conditions for successful distribution and trade in livestock in local markets, including auctions. Participating livestock owners need to be involved in these strategic decisions.

The data indicates some opportunities for the local marketing of livestock and livestock products. Fifteen percent to 18% of households indicated local markets as their primary source of meat, dairy and chicken. Government investment in supporting, formalising or upgrading local market infrastructure can play a role (e.g., access to water and electricity in market facilities), although ways of functioning even in the absence of government support will also be useful. Farmers identified occasional problems with receiving payment for local sales, which makes these markets less attractive. Identifying the necessary and desired types of storage and processing should be part of TA’s ongoing interventions.

Cattle are of central importance across the four provinces in the survey, culturally and economically. Improvements to livestock are reliant on food, water and health care. Food for animals is as much a component of the agri-food system as food for humans and can be kept for varying lengths of time, bartered or traded and exchanged for money. This in turn raises the question of herd size and production methodology. Integrated farming systems are at the heart of agro-ecology. Grazing land can benefit from more, rather than less, livestock, although this must be well managed. According to Allan Savory, a holistic natural resource management practitioner from Zimbabwe, the restoration of healthy soil requires ‘substantial numbers of large herbivores on the land, tightly herded together, grazing, trampling, dunging and urinating on a piece of land and then moving on after a brief period, just as the great wildlife herds once did’ (quoted in Dugmore, 2012). Simply, Savory argues for more camps of smaller size, with higher stocking densities for shorter periods of time (Dugmore, 2012). Open rangelands of extensive grazing are the most logical option in most of South Africa’s agro-ecological zones. However, this needs secure access to land and control over its management. Infrastructure is also required, whether it comes from the state or not. This includes fencing to separate grazing camps, water and other production; access to water; and road access for vehicles. Livestock management is a key intervention point, whether the production system is traditional, agro-ecological or commercial. This may include improvement of depleted grazing lands, cattle breeding methods to determine which cattle or other livestock are most suited to the area, and developing links with local extension officers on the issue of animal health.

**KEY POINTS**

- Fifty-seven percent of respondents own livestock
- Very few respondents are selling livestock
- There is a very high mortality rate among livestock
- Local markets are the main outlet for livestock sales
CHAPTER 09

crop production, sales and marketing
This section focuses on how many households produce crops, what crops they produce, how much produce is sold and where. Attention is paid to differences and similarities across the four provinces, and across land tenure types found in the research sites.

9.1 CROP PRODUCTION

TABLE 15: CROP PRODUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty-five percent of respondent households produce some kind of crops (Table 14). Five percent of those who said they did not have access to land (N=266) indicate they produce crops, suggesting they must have some access to land. Sixty-four percent of those who said they had some access to land (N=1,349) also indicated they produced some kind of food crop.

More than 50 crops were recorded in the survey. To allow comparison across the sites, crops were selected that occurred in at least four sites. These crops are grouped into five categories: maize; dry beans; ‘traditional crop’ staples (butternut, pumpkin, and sweet potato); vegetables (i.e., beetroot, cabbage, carrot, onion, green pepper, potato, spinach, and tomato); and fruit and nuts.
* For ‘vegetables’, the individual crops were added together even though there are overlaps in production (i.e., the same household may produce more than one crop). New variables will need to be created in the database to capture households producing one or more crops in this category. The percentage of producers will then come down.

Forty-one percent of respondents produced vegetables, and 31% produced maize (though this is skewed because the sample leans to W Cape where maize is not widely grown), 19% produced dry beans, 16% produced traditional crops and less than 7% produced fruit and nuts (Figure 39).

**FIGURE 40: CROP PRODUCTION BY PROVINCE (N=1,743*)**

* N for vegetables = 1,741
There are high levels of maize and vegetable production in KZN and Limpopo in particular, but also in E Cape (Figure 40). Nearly 80% of respondent households produce maize in KZN, and 70% produce vegetables. In Limpopo, 69% of households produce maize and 60% produce vegetables. In E Cape, more than half of responding households produce maize and vegetables. In contrast, in W Cape only 7% produce maize and a quarter produce vegetables. Maize is not a staple in W Cape (underlined in the food consumption section above, where bread is a more important staple), and W Cape is not an ideal climate for maize production. However, generally speaking, crop production in W Cape is low compared with the other provinces, and the overall crop production data is therefore skewed to the lower side (because W Cape respondents constitute 56% of the overall sample). More than 40% of respondents in KZN produce dry beans, but otherwise crop production in the other categories is generally below 20% for all provinces. For vegetables, potatoes, cabbage, onions and spinach were the most widely produced crops. Fruit and nuts are produced by 10% or fewer of responding households in all provinces.

Vegetables is the most common type of crop production across tenure types (Figure 41). Maize is important in communal and land reform areas. In communal areas and on church land, beans and traditional crops (butternut, pumpkin and sweet potato) are relatively important. There are low levels of production on commonage and in informal settlements/towns, and only slightly greater crop production amongst farm dwellers.

**FIGURE 41: CROP PRODUCTION BY TENURE (N=1,698*)**

![Table showing crop production by tenure](image_url)
However, as with livestock, the category of farm dweller disguises significant differences between labour tenants in KZN and farm dwellers in W Cape. Figure 42 shows that when this category is disaggregated, labour tenants show high levels of maize and vegetable production in particular, and farm dwellers in W Cape have far lower levels of production, apart from traditional vegetables. A difference between the disaggregated data here and for livestock is that for crop production a higher proportion of farm dwellers in SPP’s sample (West Coast) produce crops and a very low percentage of farm dwellers in SCLC’s sample produce crops, whereas for livestock, SCLC farm dweller respondents had higher levels of ownership in W Cape.

FIGURE 43: CROP AMOUNTS PRODUCED BY CROP TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop Type</th>
<th>Maize (N=243)</th>
<th>Beans (N=203)</th>
<th>Traditional (N=236)</th>
<th>Vegetables (N=803)</th>
<th>Fruit &amp; nuts (N=41)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1 ton</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 kg-1 ton</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-100 kg</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most crop production over the previous year was below 100 kilograms per household by type of crop, with the exception of maize which is a bulky product. It should be noted here that the data represents an approximation (Figure 43). Respondents were not necessarily able to quantify amounts in kilogrammes. Often, amounts were reported in other units, such as bags, bunches, crates, packets, heads or others. The research team and fieldworkers used their experience to make a rough conversion into kilogrammes. In addition to this, not all producers will remember precisely how many bunches of carrots or beetroots they produced at the start of last year, and were therefore also only be able to give a rough estimate of their production. Most producers – especially if producing small amounts in their back yards or on small pieces of land – do not keep detailed production records. Therefore all crop figures should be taken as estimates.

For maize, 10% of producers generated more than a ton of maize in the past year. Byerlee & Heisey (1997:16) indicate that average per capita consumption of maize in southern Africa (excluding South Africa) is around 100kg per person per year. Our sample is based on an average of four people per household. We can therefore reasonably use 400kg/year of maize production as the cut-off point for subsistence production. Based on this, of those producing maize (N=243), 69.5% produced at or below household subsistence level. In E Cape and W Cape, virtually all maize production is under the subsistence level. Ninety nine percent of maize production over subsistence level is in KZN, and 46% of those producing maize in KZN produce over the household subsistence level.

Unfortunately no data was collected on amounts of maize produced in Limpopo. For other crops, a very small percentage (none for fruit and nuts) produced more than a ton. Less than 10% of those producing vegetables produced more than 100kg a year of any kind of vegetable.

9.2 CROP USE AND MARKETS

**FIGURE 44: USE OF CROPS**

To a far greater extent than for livestock, crops are used for household consumption, although (apart from fruit and nuts, which are seldom sold in our sample) between 12% and 24% of responding households produce crops with some sales in mind (Figure 44). Of all crops, vegetables are most often sold, with 29% of households selling some or all their crop. Of those producing more than one tonne of maize, 60% produce entirely for own consumption and another 36% produce for a combination of own consumption and sale.
Sales from crops were mainly less than R1,200 in the previous year, except for maize and beans where a higher proportion of those who sold earned above R1,200 (Figure 45). For maize, 19% of those who sold earned above R2,400 from sales in the past year. We can relate this to the discussion in the section on food access, where we saw that poorer households tend to engage to a greater degree in agricultural production and this provides some relief from food insecurity. A fairly high number of respondents (N=439) indicated some sales of vegetables. In the other crop types, numbers are low. Maize, beans and traditional crops have the advantage of being able to be stored for some length of time and one can expect that sales are mainly of surpluses. For vegetables, shelf life is short and therefore short-term surpluses cannot be stored and will thus be more likely to be sold. The alternative is for them to be wasted or turned into compost, which is a reduction in their value. Potatoes, spinach, tomatoes and cabbage earned the most income amongst vegetable types.
The value of sales is low. Maize has the highest mean sale value at R1,280, followed by beans (R882.87), traditional crops and then vegetables (mean sales of R307.53) (Figure 46). These amounts constitute between 1.5% and 6% of average household incomes in our sample, although this percentage will be higher for households below the average. Either way, it is clear that the main benefit of crop production is direct access to food for household consumption.

FIGURE 47: MAIN MARKETS FOR CROPS

Local markets and informal trading overwhelmingly dominate as outlets for the sale of crops (Figure 47). In a small number of cases, respondents sold to supermarkets (6% for vegetables and 4% for beans).
There is an inverse relationship between hunger and crop production. Those households that indicated they engage in some kind of crop production tend to experience hunger more than those households that do not engage in crop production. Figure 48 shows the percentage of each hunger category of respondents who do produce specific types of crops. Overall, 73% of those households which experience hunger ‘often or always’ (highly food insecure, N=88) do produce crops, 64% of households which said they were ‘sometimes hungry’ produce crops, and 50% of those who said they ‘never or seldom go hungry’ produce crops. Over 50% of those who said they were often or always hungry produce maize and vegetables. This provides further evidence that the sample incorporates those poorer households which attempt some agricultural production in order to stave off hunger rather than to become commercial producers.

9.3 CROP VALUE CHAINS AND FOOD SOVEREIGNTY

The data points to the benefits of supporting crop production primarily for household use and distribution of any surpluses locally. Local distribution has positive effects for the producing household in the form of income from sales (if the produce is sold) and also for the consuming household in the form of more food consumption. Sales outside the locality will benefit only the producing household in the locality. Some partner organisations, such as SPP, are interested in further exploring the ‘solidarity economy’ or the exchange of food in the form of gifts.

In our survey, maize is widely produced outside W Cape. There is a gap in the local market, with very little local trading. People either buy from supermarkets or produce for themselves as their primary source of maize for household use. For those who grow their own maize, storage and processing is required before consumption. Storage helps to stabilise food supply by smoothing seasonal production variations. Although traditional storage methods are widely used in South Africa and are relatively inexpensive to construct and maintain, they often also lead to substantial post-harvest losses, particularly in humid areas such as KZN (Thamaga-Chitja, et al., 2004).
Pests, fungi and oxidation damage are all major causes of post-harvest crop losses. Post-harvest grain losses in sub-Saharan Africa are estimated to be in the region of 10-20% of production, and 13.5% of the value of the crop (World Bank, 2011). Vegetables decay rapidly after harvesting and an estimated 20-50% of the crop may be lost in the absence of cold chains or preservation techniques (Masarirambi, et al., 2010). Improved methods of storage, not just for maize but for vegetable types too, can boost household food security substantially.

In many rural areas, maize is sent to formal sector mills for grinding and storage until the producer calls on it. The producing household does not relinquish ownership of the maize and is also the consumer, but pays for storage and processing. In such cases, we can look at how to integrate storage and processing functions under the same producer-consumer’s control (whether individual or household, or even collective). Although there is some current discussion in government on decentralised agro-processing hubs, the emphasis is on processing for distribution into supply chains beyond the locality rather than at the household level. Individual households or farmer associations may benefit from intermediate processing technologies (e.g., small-scale hammer mills and preservation techniques) that can add value to the product locally and enhance storage life.

**KEY POINTS**

- One in two households produce crops
- There are high levels of maize and vegetable production in KZN and Limpopo and to a slightly lesser extent in E Cape, and low levels of crop production in W Cape
- Production is mainly for household consumption
- Where crops are sold, this is locally rather than to supermarkets
CHAPTER 10

water access & agricultural support
water access and agricultural support

This section looks at access to water for productive use and three types of agricultural support: training, production credit and extension services. Some consideration is given to the relationship between agricultural support and levels of production.

10.1 ACCESS TO WATER FOR PRODUCTIVE USE

FIGURE 49: PRIMARY WATER SOURCE FOR CROPS AND LIVESTOCK

The primary water source for both crops and livestock is rivers, streams or dams (Figure 49). More than three quarters of respondents used this as their main source of water for livestock and more than two-thirds for crops. The questionnaires did not include more detailed questions about whether water is pumped or how it reaches the site of use. Taps were the main source of water for crops for 21% of respondent households and 17% for livestock. Taps provide municipal water, which is potentially costly (although as shown below, few respondents currently pay for water). There is very limited use of boreholes or harvested rainwater for agricultural production. Although in some areas rainwater tanks are part of provincial Department of Agriculture (DoA) starter packs, these are apparently not reaching all agricultural producers.
There is some provincial variation in primary water sources for crops (Figure 50). Rivers, streams or dams are predominant for crops in E Cape (92% of respondents in that province). In other provinces, there is a mixture between rivers/streams/dams and taps, with taps the majority in Limpopo (54%) and a more even split between these two in KZN and W Cape. There is significant borehole use in KZN (23.4%) and slightly less so in Limpopo (but we should note that N is fairly low). Harvested rainwater was identified as the primary source of water for production in 15% of cases in KZN, but was almost non-existent in sites in other provinces.

FIGURE 51: WATER SOURCE FOR LIVESTOCK BY PROVINCE
For livestock, the vast majority of water is from rivers/streams/dams across all provinces, except W Cape where taps are the primary source of water for livestock for the greatest percentage of households (48% compared with 43% for rivers/streams/dams) (Figure 51).

The majority of respondents (85%) did not pay for the water they used (Figure 52). Of those who did pay, 84% pay to the municipality, and most of the remainder to the land owner.

FIGURE 52: PAYMENT FOR WATER (N=1,007)

Respondents with communal tenure generally do not pay for water (just 4%), whereas for farm dwellers (22%), commonage (23%) and land reform (28%), a fifth to a quarter of respondents pay for water. Church land is somewhere in-between (17%) and the question was not asked of respondents in informal settlements/towns.

10.2 AGRICULTURAL SUPPORT

FIGURE 53: AGRICULTURAL SUPPORT BY PROVINCE AND AVERAGE
There are generally low levels of external support for agriculture, although this is higher for agricultural training. Forty-five percent of respondents have received some kind of agricultural training (N=1737), especially in Limpopo (89% of respondents) and E Cape (74%) (Figure 53). However, those having received agricultural training in KZN were few (17%). There was not enough standardised information about the type of agricultural training received, with some organisations asking a general question about training and others asking specific questions about type of training. Training might include one-off short courses, mentoring, and on-the-job learning. The key is to integrate practical and theoretical knowledge. TA partners will investigate further the types of training received and which farmers believe they still need, with the aim of facilitating this.

Only 16% of the overall sample were visited by a government extension officer in the past year (N=1,683). Extension support is more common in KZN (41% of respondents said they were visited by an extension officer in the past year) and least common in Limpopo (just 7% of respondents had interacted with extension services in the past year). Just 7% had access to production credit (N=1,276), with almost a quarter in E Cape (23%) but less than 10% elsewhere.

National statistics show that 12.6% of households involved in agriculture received some kind of agricultural-related support from government in the previous year, and only 2% reported receiving training (Stats SA, 2011a:38). Our figures for training are therefore higher than the average.

**FIGURE 54: AGRICULTURAL SUPPORT BY TENURE TYPE**

Respondents on church land and farm dwellers receive the least agricultural support of all tenure types (Figure 54). Communal, land reform and commonage respondents receive relatively better agricultural support services. These three tenure types showed a higher proportion of respondents who receive agricultural training (51-71% of respondents), whereas less than 15% of those accessing church land have received agricultural training, and just over a fifth (22%) of farm dwellers. Extension support is provided most in communal areas followed by informal settlements/town. But even in communal areas, just 25% of respondents were visited by an extension officer in the previous year. Church land, farm dwellers and land reform have the least access to extension services. This goes down to 3% on church land and 8% for farm dwellers. Access to production credit is low across all tenure types, but slightly higher in communal areas and land reform, at just under 15% of respondents in each. Very few of those in other forms of tenure have received production credit.

If we cross tabulate the three types of agricultural support by those with livestock and those producing crops, we find that provision of agricultural training differs for those who are doing agricultural production and those who are not. For both livestock and crop production, 20% more of those who are producing have received agricultural training in comparison with those who are not producing.
For extension there is a similar pattern, except the gap is smaller between those who produce and those who do not. Those with livestock are twice as likely to have received extension support as those without livestock. For crop production the gap is still narrower, but 25% more respondents who are producing crops received some kind of extension assistance compared with those not producing crops.

Livestock owners are almost three times as likely to get production credit as those without livestock, although the overall percentage is low (just 10.6% of those with livestock have received production credit). For crop producers, there is no statistical significance between those who are producing and those not producing in relation to production credit. That is, they are equally likely to receive production credit (which is seldom).

We cannot infer causation from correlation. That is, we cannot automatically conclude from these results that access to training and extension is likely to result in more production. It could very well be that extension and training services target precisely those who have already started producing. We do not know, from our data, which came first.

To dig more deeply into this, we selected four key agricultural products based on production shown earlier in the report. These products are cattle, chickens, maize and potatoes (a proxy for vegetables as the largest individual vegetable category). We compared production amounts for those with access to the different kinds of agricultural support and those without.

The figures below show the percentage of producers with more than 10 head of livestock, and who produced more than 400kg of maize (the subsistence level) and more than 100kg of potatoes. We compare those who did and did not receive the three different kinds of agricultural support.

There is a positive correlation between access to extension services and levels of production (Figure 55). A greater percentage of those with access to extension services produced above the threshold for all the selected products. The positive relationship was the greatest for maize. For potatoes and to some extent cattle, there is little or no significant difference whether extension support was received or not. For chickens, there was a positive correlation, but smaller than that for maize. This suggests that maize and chicken producers benefit most from access to extension support.
We carried out a similar exercise for agricultural training and production credit. We found a negative correlation between agricultural training and individuals producing above the threshold, and a mixed result for production credit. N for chickens and cattle was reasonable, at over 500 respondents (but below 400 for production credit by amount of production). For maize and potatoes N was lower, at under 300 for maize and under 200 for potatoes. Although we might query whether training and credit are properly targeted or that the content of training is appropriate, we would not want to infer that access to training or credit results in lower production.

KEY POINTS

- Most water for production comes from natural sources
- One in five producers in W Cape use taps for crop production
- There are low levels of extension support or access to production finance, but higher levels for agricultural training
- There is a positive correlation between access to extension services and increased amounts of production
- There is a negative correlation between agricultural training and, to a lesser extent, production credit with production, suggesting a possible disconnection between the support provided and production needs
CHAPTER 11

farm worker conditions
farm worker conditions

Although four organisations are working directly with farm worker constituencies within TA – AFRA, SCLC, SPP and WFP – detailed questions on worker conditions were only asked by SCLC and WFP, with AFRA answering a few cases for two variables. Therefore the responses in this section are very site specific and cannot be generalised too widely. However, they do give a picture of the conditions of farm workers in Rawsonville (WFP) and in Hessequa municipality (SCLC) in particular.

Fifty-four percent of farm workers in the respondent households were women, and 46% were men (N=881). The majority of farm workers (78%) interviewed are permanently employed. The remainder are casual/seasonal, 95% are employed directly by the land owner and the remaining 5% are employed by labour brokers. Those employed by labour brokers are in the Cape Winelands Municipality.

Questions on basic conditions of employment were asked of respondents as individuals, even where there was more than one farm worker in the household. Using the gender of the main respondent we acquired some measure of the gendered differences in conditions of employment. Across the board we can see that farm owners are slightly more compliant with the law for men farm workers than for women, although the number of women respondents is fairly low, which may skew the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms of Basic Conditions of Employment Act (BCEA) and sectoral determination</th>
<th>% compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual leave</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay slip</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work contract</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered for UIF</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick leave</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum wage</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family responsibility leave</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity leave</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compliance is above 90% only for annual leave. This question was only asked by SCLC. The lowest compliance related to maternity leave (with 65% compliance) and family responsibility leave (66% compliance). These issues obviously affect women more acutely since women tend to take more responsibility for family health and well-being. Registration for UIF (which also affects women because they can use UIF during maternity break), contracts and pay slips are at around 80% compliance. The existence of work contracts was raised only by SCLC.

Generally, there is greater compliance on farms on which SCLC conducted their research in the southern Cape, less compliance on farms on which WFP conducted research in the Cape Winelands, and poorest compliance on KZN farms on which AFRA is working, although there is limited data for the latter. Again, it is important to keep in mind that the results are very site specific.

The question of whether farm dwellers have a housing contract followed a similar pattern, with the majority of respondents (75%) for SCLC saying ‘yes’, with this proportion declining amongst WFP respondents (43%) and dropping drastically for AFRA respondents (12%). However, this was the total extent of quantitative inquiry about housing, and doesn’t give us much. Since housing is a key issue for farm dwellers, this will need to be developed in the qualitative process.

Twenty-six percent of farm worker households reported sometimes going hungry, and 3.6% reported often or always going hungry.

**KEY POINTS**

- Twenty-nine percent of farm workers are not paid minimum wages
- Twenty percent of farm workers are not registered for UIF

---

*Methodological note on gender breakdown of basic conditions of employment (BCE): Questions on BCE not asked by all organisations or consistently within organisations. Only respondent’s gender used, not those of other household members who are farm workers. Higher number of men indicates a higher number of male farm worker respondents who were asked questions on BCE.

*N for women respondents: minimum wage = 86; salary slip and UIF = 51; sick leave = 45; family responsibility leave = 42; maternity leave = 34; annual leave and contracts = 5. *N for men respondents: salary slip = 225; minimum wage = 219; UIF = 216; sick leave = 208; family responsibility leave = 194; annual leave = 105; contracts = 104
CHAPTER 12

evictions
The restructuring of farm labour (see situation analysis, Annexure 2) has resulted in farm dwellers being moved off farms and being drawn on as required for seasonal and part-time work. In some cases this has taken the form of outright evictions. This is particularly notable in Amajuba, Hessequa and Breede Valley. In other cases, farm dwellers are encouraged to move off the farms with an incentive of some kind of housing support. This movement off farms has resulted in growing informal settlement near rural towns, and has increased the tenure insecurity of these populations. The alternative proposed by commercial farmer unions, some municipalities and even the National Farmworker Summit (DAFF, 2010:5) is an orderly transition in the form of agri-villages. These are envisaged as rural settlements where former farm dwellers can be moved off commercial farms and settled in areas provided with basic services. The inhabitants will then be drawn on as needed by commercial farmers. Whether or not this model will be in the interests of former farm dwellers is yet to be fully considered, as is the extent to which such a model can lead to transformation of the inherited spatial economy in favour of the marginalised.

All four organisations working with farm dwellers in TA (AFRA, SCLC, SPP and WFP) asked respondents questions about evictions. These included both farm dwellers and other respondents who do not live or work on commercial farms.
In KZN the data shows a greater threat of evictions amongst farm dwellers in KZN than in W Cape. This reflects the importance of this issue amongst labour tenants. More respondent households currently face threats of eviction than have experienced evictions in the past decade, indicating that evictions remain a current concern. For the sample as a whole, 13% of responding households said they currently face some threat of eviction.

Around 11% of the total sample (N=647) experienced forced evictions in the past 10 years. However, not everyone recognises so-called ‘constructive eviction’ as a forced eviction. Because of problems, farm dwellers may decide to leave the farm and therefore do not consider it eviction. This should be investigated further in the qualitative process. In KZN farm dwellers tend to move from farm to farm if evicted, but in W Cape they tend to move to informal settlements.

Nkuzi’s study on farm dweller evictions nationally between 1994 and 2004 shows that KZN faced the highest number of evictions in that period, at 21% of the total number of evictions, and W Cape evictions constituted 11% of the total (Wegerif et al., 2005:59).
Residents of informal settlements and farm dwellers are the most susceptible to eviction. A third of respondents in informal settlements (N=30) indicated they had experienced evictions in the past. This is a single site (Rawsonville) in a commercial farming area in W Cape. Seventeen percent felt they were currently facing a threat of eviction, and 14% of farm dwellers felt the same. For other tenure types, 6-7% felt a current threat of eviction (no data for communal).

Evictions are rising for farm dwellers and land reform in comparison with the past 10 years, and are lower for informal settlements compared with the past, but still very high. For land reform, we must ask the question again as to why people who previously had not experienced evictions begin to face the threat of eviction once they move onto land reform farms. This suggests that the current structure of land reform is not watertight in its securing of tenure.

There is no clear relationship between household income and experience of evictions or threat of evictions. With a fairly small sample, we find that half of those households that experienced evictions in the past earn R2,500/month, and half have incomes of more than R2,500/month. For those households currently facing a threat of evictions, 60% have incomes over R2,500 a month, and the rest below. In more than three quarters of the cases (76%) reasons given for past evictions centred on labour dispute or breakdown in the relationship with the farm owner. Reasons given for current threat of evictions are more varied. Labour disputes or other breakdowns in the relationship with the farm owner were given as reasons in 43% of cases (N=44). However 41% also responded that they know their rights or tried joining a union, which signifies a different kind of breakdown in the relationship with the farm owner.

Questions about reasons for eviction or threat of eviction were only asked in W Cape. This percentage is significantly higher than that given in the 2004 Nkuzi eviction study where around half the respondents nationally indicated some kind of dispute that resulted in eviction (Wegerif, et al., 2005:66-67).

Only a small number of respondents (N=11) indicated the site from which they were evicted in the past. Almost three quarters of these (73%) indicated they were evicted from a farm in the same district. The others were evicted from a farm outside the district in which the respondent now lives.

Of those who responded (N=32), half indicated they moved to an informal settlement or township in the same area after eviction, and 37.5% indicated they moved onto another farm in the area. Others are still fighting the case and remain on the farm, or had moved into a settlement in a different area. The sample is too small to conduct a meaningful analysis by province or tenure type.
Informal settlements are a relatively recent phenomenon in rural areas in W Cape. Evictions have increased as South African commercial agriculture has ‘modernised’, moving towards more capital-intensive production techniques accompanied by new labour and tenure laws (BCEA, Labour Relations Act, Extension of Security of Tenure Act, Labour Tenants Act, etc.) that sought to protect farm workers.

The result was a reduction of farm labour since the mid 1980s especially, increasing casualisation and ‘feminisation’ of the workforce and a shift to off-farm housing. On many (though by no means all) farms, paternalist relations between farm owners and workers were weakened or severed and replaced by market relations.

The majority of those who face evictions (73%) first look to civil society organisations for assistance. This is mainly advice offices (44% of respondents), and to a lesser extent trade unions (13%). Of the quarter that first look to government, the majority look to the municipality. Almost no respondents indicated that they first go to the DRDLR, despite the appointment of Cheadle, Thompson and Haysom Attorneys to support farm dwellers with eviction cases. The project was instituted in 2008 and dealt with 1,050 cases affecting 20,500 occupiers over three years (DRDLR, 2011). Just under a fifth (19%) of those who have been evicted expect that they will be supported by the municipality, including access to housing. Where there is a high incident of evictions, there is no support from government and if there is an office available, people are not aware that the office can assist them. In the Nkuzi survey, 75% of those evicted said they did not know where to go for assistance upon eviction (Wegerif, et al., 2005:63).

**KEY POINTS**

- Thirteen percent of respondents are currently facing the threat of eviction
- Almost one in two respondents in KZN in our sample are currently facing the threat of eviction
- Civil society is the main form of support sought by those facing evictions, despite a national government programme to support those facing evictions
CHAPTER 13 organisation

50/50 LAND 4 WOMEN
In 63% of respondent households (N=1,676) at least someone was a member of an organisation. The data about the kind of organisation is uneven owing to differences in questionnaires. In addition, some interviewers left blanks where the household did not have someone who was a member of a specific organisation, while others answered with a specific ‘no’. Therefore the data on specific organisations is not a particularly accurate picture of membership of organisations.

Nevertheless, the data does indicate where there is some concentration in organisation type. Membership of religious organisations is the highest (86.8%). While such membership could offer the opportunity of involving these organisations in raising awareness, such an overture could also highlight contradictions in instances, for example, where churches might continue to protect their land interests.

**TABLE 17: DOES ANYONE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD BELONG TO ANY ORGANISATION?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 60: MEMBERSHIP OF TYPES OF ORGANISATIONS (%)**
Political party membership is very high at 54% of respondents. ‘Self-help’ organisations – 55% of respondents in burial associations and 30% in savings groups – indicated some collective savings initiatives. Membership of some kind of producers’ structure (farmers’ associations, commodity producers’ associations or commercial farmers’ unions) was at 52% (with some possible overlap in responses).

Just less than 20% of respondents also indicated they were members of some form of movement, campaign or land rights group. This indicates a fairly high level of organisation – partly deliberately selected as the partner organisations are working with these structures – but provides a basis for organisation of farmers.

Ten percent of the sample indicated membership of trade unions. This was both off-farm and on-farm. Out of 60 farm dweller respondents to this question, a third said someone in the household was a member of a trade union. This is high compared to national averages, again indicating that partner organisations are working with relatively better organised constituencies than the average, and a significant part of their work is to assist in building organisation. The strength of the NGOs is shown here, although the quantitative data does not give any indication of the strength of the various organisations households are part of, to what extent they are active, and what the gender and leadership dynamics are, etc. This needs further exploration through the on-going qualitative process.

FIGURE 61: MEMBERSHIP OF ORGANISATION BY TENURE TYPE

The most organised constituencies amongst the research sites are in land reform, informal settlement and commonage. The least organised are on church land, followed by farm dwellers. The majority of households answered the question.

KEY POINTS

- Membership of religious associations is dominant, but the data does not indicate the depth of household involvement
- Membership of organisations is fairly low for farm dwellers
- Belonging to an organisation is obviously important for respondent households
- There is a fairly high level of farmer organisation, connected to NGO organisation
key findings and recommendations
## KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### OBJECTIVES AND SURVEY FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives and Survey Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Living conditions of rural people, especially women, have improved and benefits of self-organisation are visible | • Focus on improving agricultural production for household use and sales to local markets
| • Average HH income R2,606/month                                                                | • Learn from and strengthen local distribution systems                            |
| • Wages (58%) and grants (33%) most important sources of income                                | • Immediate welfare intervention for HH that are often or always hungry, linked to local smallholder production |
| • 24% unemployment (28% women)                                                                  | •                                                                                   |
| • 63% HH participation in organisation                                                          | •                                                                                   |
| • 52% HH participation in some kind of producer’s structure                                    | •                                                                                   |
| • 2% of HH with agriculture as primary form of income, and 6% as secondary source of income     | •                                                                                   |
| • 5% of HH hungry often or always, 27% sometimes                                                | •                                                                                   |
| • 54% of food from supermarkets, 15% from own production                                        | •                                                                                   |
| • Bread and vegetables most often consumed, meat and chicken least often                         | •                                                                                   |
| • 24% unemployment (28% women)                                                                  | •                                                                                   |
| • 63% HH participation in organisation                                                          | •                                                                                   |
| • 52% HH participation in some kind of producer’s structure                                    | •                                                                                   |
| • 2% of HH with agriculture as primary form of income, and 6% as secondary source of income     | •                                                                                   |
| • 5% of HH hungry often or always, 27% sometimes                                                | •                                                                                   |
| • 54% of food from supermarkets, 15% from own production                                        | •                                                                                   |
| • Bread and vegetables most often consumed, meat and chicken least often                         | •                                                                                   |
| • 28% of HH with access to land (78% cropping, 28% grazing)                                     | •                                                                                   |
| • 84% of HH with access to land (78% cropping, 28% grazing)                                     | •                                                                                   |
| • 85% of HH with land have less than 2ha for cropping                                            | •                                                                                   |
| • Rivers/streams/dams the primary water source for 76% of livestock and 68% of crops           | •                                                                                   |
| • 45% of HH have received some agricultural training                                            | •                                                                                   |
| • 16% of HH have received some agricultural extension                                            | •                                                                                   |
| • 7% of HH have received production credit                                                      | •                                                                                   |
| • Agricultural markets for crops (78-86%) and livestock (52-84%) mainly local                  | •                                                                                   |
## OBJECTIVES AND SURVEY FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 29% of farm workers are not paid minimum wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 20% of farm workers are not registered for UIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lowest compliance of basic conditions of employment is for maternity leave (65%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- More HH currently facing eviction (13%) than have experienced eviction in the past (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 48% of HH under threat of eviction amongst labour tenants in Amajuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Highest threat of evictions amongst informal settlements (17%) and farm dwellers as a whole (14%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- Look both at basic conditions of employment and at access to land for production for farm dwellers

- Formulate land rights demands
### Annexure One

## Relationship Between TA Objectives, Indicators and Baseline Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Living conditions of rural people, especially women, have improved and benefits of self-organisation are visible | - Household incomes have improved  
- Increased level of involvement in local activities  
- Household diets have improved | - Average income  
- Proportion of income from agriculture  
- Household participation in organisation  
- Variety of food consumed  
- Regularity of foods consumed |
| 2. Rural people are willing and able to use the land productively and improve their livelihoods if given the necessary support | - Agricultural production has increased  
- Perception in people’s relation to land and its values has changed  
- Increased expertise in farming | - Ownership of livestock  
- Crop production  
- Amount of livestock owned  
- Amount of crops produced  
- Income earned from agriculture  
- Receipt of agricultural training and extension |
| 3. People are able to develop policy proposals and interventions that define the support required | - Policy papers are produced  
- Engagement around policy issues has increased at all levels  
- Collective actions are organized around shared perspectives and policy alternatives | |
| 4. Local associations of farmers get access to services and support for improved livelihoods | - Increased access and users’ rights to land, water and agricultural inputs  
- Increased access to appropriate extension services and technical inputs  
- Increased access to markets and financial services | - Access to land  
- Access to water for productive use  
- Access to land and agricultural production  
- Receipt of agricultural training, extension and production credit  
- Agricultural markets |
| 5. The partner organisations have greater clarity about their tasks and roles in the context of agrarian transformation | - Increased level of collaboration and networking  
- Government engages around joint policy proposals  
- Partners have increased capacity and expertise to address livelihood issues | |
| 6. A platform is established to articulate the interests of the rural poor | - The platform is recognised and has legitimacy with relevant stakeholders  
- The platform influences political decision-making in favour of the rural poor  
- A representative leadership structure exists comprising women and men | |
annexure 2
CONSOLIDATED SITUATION ANALYSIS REPORT
1. **INTRODUCTION**

Tshintsha Amakhaya is an action learning platform of civil society organisations that supports local community struggles in land and agrarian reform. Through action research, campaigns, and building active citizenry, Tshintsha Amakhaya seeks to enhance rural people’s capacity to secure and realise their livelihoods and rights, and to promote alternative models of land tenure and agricultural production for household food security and national food sovereignty.

The 10 partner organisations of Tshintsha Amakhaya are primarily concerned with supporting dispossessed and landless communities to gain access to land in South Africa. Some of the organisations have also worked closely with smallholder and resource-poor black farmers to build sustainable smallholder agriculture and rural livelihoods. The partner organisations are the Association for Rural Advancement (AFRA), Border Rural Committee (BRC), Farmer Support Group (FSG), Legal Resources Centre (LRC), Nkuzi Development Association, Southern Cape Land Committee (SCLC), Surplus People Project (SPP), Transkei Land Services Organisation (TRALSO), Trust for Community Outreach and Education (TCOE), and Women on Farms Project (WFP).

As part of the first phase of Tshintsha Amakhaya, partner organisations carried out detailed research, both qualitative and quantitative (in the form of a baseline survey) to identify the key priorities for action on land access and agricultural production in the constituencies in which they are working. Part of the research process included the drafting of situation analysis reports to highlight key contemporary issues, dynamics and trends in their geographical areas of work. The majority of research sites selected for participation in Tshintsha Amakhaya are very localised, in some cases encompassing only a few farms or villages. However, an appreciation of the economic, social, institutional and political context is necessary for effective action. This context is not merely a passive backdrop to the work, but dynamically and continuously interacts with and shapes practical action.

This synthesis situation analysis report provides an overview of each of the research areas, highlighting some of the key demographic, social and economic issues. It also considers the agricultural economy at the municipal and district level, looking at what trends are evident, and then provides an overview of land reform activities in the different research areas. Key commonalities and differences across the research sites are highlighted and, where applicable, links are made to broader national debates about the role of agriculture and land reform in improving livelihoods in South Africa.

2. **GEOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW**

Table 1 and Figure 1 show the geographical spread of the research sites. Four sites are in the Western Cape province, two sites in the Eastern Cape, two sites in KwaZulu-Natal (KZN) and one site in Limpopo. The Western Cape sites are all in commercial farming areas, with some incorporating Act 9 land. The Eastern Cape sites are in former bantustans, still governed by traditional authorities. The KZN sites are divided between land under traditional authority and commercial farm land. The Limpopo site is land that was a buffer between white commercial farm land and the former homelands of Venda and Gazankulu. The research sites incorporate land transferred through restitution, labour tenant claims and commonage programmes. They also include landless rural dwellers, farm workers living as tenants on privately owned land and those living under ‘communal’ regimes. The tenure arrangements and issues are discussed in greater detail below.

---

annexure two
TABLE 1: GEOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW OF RESEARCH SITES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>PROVINCE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>MUNICIPALITY</th>
<th>MAIN TOWNS</th>
<th>RESEARCH TOWNS &amp; VILLAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRA</td>
<td>KZN</td>
<td>Amajuba</td>
<td>Emadlangeni</td>
<td>Ulreich, Groenvlei</td>
<td>Farms across the districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dannhauser</td>
<td>Newcastle, Madadeni, Oszwenei</td>
<td>Newcastle: Ingogo, Botha’s Pass &amp; Normandien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRC</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Amatole</td>
<td>Amahlathi</td>
<td>Stutterheim, Cathcart, Keiskammahoek</td>
<td>Upper Gxulu, Upper Mnyameni, Lower Mnyameni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSG</td>
<td>KZN</td>
<td>uThukela</td>
<td>Okhahlamba</td>
<td>Bergville, Winterton, Zunckels</td>
<td>Amazi Ti: Okhombi, Busingatha, New Stand &amp; Obonjaneni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AmaNgwane Ti: Potshini, Mlimeleni, New Reserve B &amp; Nkopela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nkuzi</td>
<td>Limpopo</td>
<td>Vhembe</td>
<td>Makhado</td>
<td>Louis Trichardt, Elim/Shirley, Vleifontein</td>
<td>Restitution farms surrounding Vleifontein township – Mvuhungeni, Munzhedzi, Shimange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSG</td>
<td>KZN</td>
<td>Okhahlamba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCLC</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Eden</td>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td>Riversdale, Albertina, Heidelberg</td>
<td>Farmer groups across the municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>West Coast</td>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td>Clanwilliam, Wupperthol, Citrusdal</td>
<td>Clanwilliam, Wupperthol, Citrusdal, Lambertsbaai, Eldorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCOE</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Overberg</td>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td>Swellendam, Suurbraak, Barrydale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRALSO</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>OR Tambo</td>
<td>Mbizana</td>
<td>Bizana Dutywa, Willowvale</td>
<td>Ntlenzi (11 villages) Dwessa-Cwebe (Hobeni, Mendwane, Cwebe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Cape Winelands</td>
<td>Brede Valley</td>
<td>Worcester, Rawsonville, De Doorns</td>
<td>Farms and informal settlement around Rawsonville</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW

TABLE 2: KEY DEMOGRAPHIC STATISTICS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>MUNICIPALITY</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL POPULATION</th>
<th>NO OF HH</th>
<th>URBANISATION</th>
<th>% WOMEN</th>
<th>UNEMPLOYMENT AS % OF LABOUR</th>
<th>% INCOME &lt; R1,600PM</th>
<th>% EDUCATION GR. 7 OR LESS</th>
<th>% 19 YRS OR LESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRA</td>
<td>Emadlangeni</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dannhauser</td>
<td>98,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>364,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRC</td>
<td>Amahlathi</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>38%**</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSG</td>
<td>Okhahlamba</td>
<td>151,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nkuzi</td>
<td>Makhado</td>
<td>516,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCLC</td>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP</td>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCOE</td>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRALSO</td>
<td>Mbizana</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mbhase</td>
<td>262,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>Brede Valley</td>
<td>184,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Drawn from IDPs and SDFs. **Gr. 6 or less, #under 15 yrs old, @R0-R800pm, @R0-R1,000pm.
The demographic data in Table 2 is drawn from municipal and district Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) and Spatial Development Frameworks (SDFs). These statutory documents are drafted every five years as guides for the priorities and activities of municipalities, and are reviewed and adapted every year. In many instances, the quality of the information is questionable. Many IDPs still rely on 2001 census data, and some even go back to 1996 data. Much of the information is a decade old and there are therefore questions about the accuracy of those statistics. In a single report (the Overberg socio-economic profile from 2006), for example, there are three vastly differing figures provided for the number of people with education to Grade 7 or less. A number of municipalities have used the 2007 Community Survey conducted by Statistics South Africa, which is at least updated and it appears that the data is more sound. However, the situation makes it difficult to identify trends, since the data is not always comparable. Therefore, while the table above gives a basic outline of the different municipalities in which the research sites are located, they should be taken as rough guides rather than the gospel truth.

The municipal areas range from fairly sparsely populated areas (Cederberg, Swellendam, Emadlangeni and Hessequa) to the very densely populated (Makhado, Newcastle, Mbizana and Mbhashe). Although there is growing urbanisation in most of the municipalities, just three have an urban population of over 50% (Newcastle, Swellendam and Breede Valley, with 49% of Cederberg’s population urbanised). At the other end of the spectrum, just 5% of the populations of Mbizana, Mbhashe and Makhado live in urban areas.

Population trends vary across the municipalities. In Amajuba (KZN) there is an increase in the population especially around Newcastle, Madadeni and Osizweni, and in the rural areas immediately to the east of these townships (Buffalo Flats, kwaMdalane and others). In Emadlangeni municipality, a mainly rural area, there is an increase in the actual population, but a declining growth rate. Dannhauser has a stagnant population, with growing peri-urban settlement east of Osizweni (which is in Newcastle LM). Official statistics for Hessequa show a decline in population, but the municipality believes the population is growing, especially with retirees along the coast. Cederberg shows a declining overall population. Many of the trends cannot be accurately measured, given questions about the quality of data from the 2001 population census, from which many demographic statistics are still drawn.

Across the municipalities there is undoubtedly a trend towards urbanisation, either within the same municipality or into other municipalities with bigger towns. Typically there are both ‘push’ and ‘pull’ factors driving urbanisation. ‘Push’ factors are those that compel people to move out of rural areas. These include mine closures in some areas (notably around Amajuba in KZN) or the decline of commercial agriculture (Cederberg); mechanisation of commercial agriculture resulting in fewer jobs being available, and evictions, as commercial farmers rationalise their workforce (Breede Valley, Amajuba); shifting rural economies, for example from cultivation to less labour-intensive livestock or game farming or eco-tourism; and the negative social impacts of HIV/AIDS where households find it difficult to survive following illness or death of household members. ‘Pull’ factors are those that make urban areas more attractive than marginal rural areas.

These include greater opportunities for employment, and potentially better access to housing and services like water and electricity. In some areas along the coast, notably around Hessequa and Swellendam, wealthy retirees have moved into coastal towns and even into inland towns as property prices rose too high on the coast. Given the small populations of these municipalities, this has had a notable demographic effect. As discussed later, the trend towards people from outside the area buying formerly agricultural land for leisure or non-agricultural purposes is having an effect both on land prices and on the rural economy.

Despite these factors, urbanisation is not a trend that will result in a complete depopulation of the more remote rural areas: however limited, people in the villages and settlements of the more marginal rural areas often have access to some land, housing and livestock, and are connected into social and support networks. The rural population is projected to continue growing in absolute terms, even if it is declining as a proportion of the overall population. This means rural areas will remain important even while the urban population grows as a proportion of the overall population.

Children constitute a high and growing proportion of the populations in the municipalities where the research sites are located. This proportion is generally highest in the areas in the former homelands, and lower in the Western Cape, though still high. The female population is slightly over 50% of the overall population. Both of these demographic features are a continuing legacy of apartheid, when men migrated to look for work while women’s movement into urban areas was severely proscribed and their movement was tied to the movement of their spouses, families or male partners on commercial farms.
Even today, 25 or more years since the abolition of apartheid ‘influx controls’, the spatial economy of migrant labour persists, with women looking after the rural home and the children while men move around looking for work and a foothold in spaces closer to economic opportunities and services.

Growing urbanisation requires a consideration of land on the urban edge and in peri-urban areas as a key component of land reform and planning processes. The National Spatial Development Perspective (NSDP) creates a framework for spatial planning at provincial and municipal level. It is based on a methodology that seeks to identify nodes and corridors of economic importance, and nodes where many people are living in extreme poverty. Unsurprisingly, nodes of economic priority are based on towns with an established industrial base, while nodes of extreme poverty are concentrated in rural areas remote from any economic activity. The NSDP proceeds to present a strategy for altering this apartheid-inherited space economy. This is achieved in two ways: i) by focusing economic investments in nodes and corridors of economic potential; and ii) by strengthening the ‘social capital’ in areas of extreme poverty, in particular welfare and education, with the aim of building the capability of people living in these areas to move to the economic concentration points with a better package of skills and resources than they currently have. The idea is to have a centralised economy, but one in which all can benefit.

In line with this, the provinces and districts and local municipalities drafted Spatial Development Frameworks (SDFs) to identify the priority nodes and corridors of economic activity, and the nodes of extreme poverty where ‘social investment’ would be prioritised. Most of the research sites fall into areas that are low on the spatial hierarchy. That is, they are marginal to the broader economic economy. The closest towns to the research sites are mostly so-called ‘third order’ towns, which are no more than service centres for the rural population, with a limited economic base of their own. The focus of the SDFs is not on longer term economic infrastructure for these towns, but on developing them as service centres to support the movement from remote rural to urban.

From a migration point of view, these towns are often stepping stones to larger towns. Whether people stay or move is very much dependent on the resources people have. Newcastle and Worcester may offer some employment opportunities, but in most of the research sites, the larger towns are outside the local municipal area. The current spatial planning framework embedded in the SDFs encourages this logic.

4. SOCIAL ISSUES AND DYNAMICS

There are many similarities in social conditions and key social issues across the municipalities in which the research sites are located. There is nothing new about what is revealed here. The issues pre-date the end of apartheid, and political democratisation in 1994 has made few inroads into these conditions at a structural level. Government’s main efforts have been welfarist in nature — social grants, poverty alleviation projects, extension of certain types of basic infrastructure (mainly electricity and water) and some sporadic efforts at providing housing. But the structural features of the apartheid-capitalist economy remain in place. This has resulted, first and foremost, in the continuation of spatial segregation along racial lines. Whites continue to dominate the economy, while blacks are situated on the margins, in the service of that economy.

One of the major changes in the economy since the days of apartheid has been the liberalisation and restructuring of the economy so that the state plays a less directly interventionist role and private, largely white-owned corporations dominate the economic landscape. This is very evident in the agricultural economy, where the former agricultural co-operatives have been converted into private companies, and where the state has removed itself from direct management of marketing and pricing of agricultural products. The result has been a ‘modernisation’ of the agricultural economy based on efficiency driven by international competitiveness. Liberalisation and deregulation, coupled with an opening up to the global economy, meant a shift in the broader economy from primary production to trade and services as a core component of the domestic economy.

This has had a direct impact on the lives of the black rural population. Firstly, a different package of skills was required as agriculture – and other types of production like mining – became more concentrated and integrated into a knowledge-intensive economy. Literacy and numeracy became more important even for jobs at lower grades. Yet, as Table 2 shows, levels of education remained very low in rural areas in particular. Between 29% (Newcastle) and 65% (Okhahlamba) of the population in the municipalities in this study had no more than a primary school education. The quality of this education remains very poor, so that completing Grade 7 cannot automatically be taken to mean having the capacity to read and write or do basic mathematics. As long as employment in the formal sector is seen as the answer to the social challenges confronting South Africa, these measures of skill and education will remain important.
The education system has been unable to adapt to the needs of formal sector employment.

Secondly, the availability of employment has declined in the formal economy as concentration in the economy increases and as capital-intensity and mechanisation proceeds in accordance with the dictates of competitiveness. Commercial farms have shed almost half of all jobs since the mid-1990s. Outsourcing, casualisation and greater precariousness in the remainder of farm jobs have had profound social effects on farm dwellers. The fragmentation of farm work has meant an imposed diversification of livelihood strategies for households that formerly relied on farm employment as their main source of income. Farm labour has become just one of a range of efforts to secure survival in conditions of economic concentration and vast pools of surplus labour.

But given the lack of skills suitable for the formal economy, the result has been a saturation of hawkers, taxi drivers, and illegal activities where competition denudes any possibility of an incremental improvement in overall conditions.

The restructuring of farm labour has resulted in farm dwellers being moved off farms and being drawn on as required for seasonal and part-time work. In some cases this has taken the form of outright evictions. This is particularly notable in Amajuba, Hessequa and Breede Valley. In other cases, farm dwellers are encouraged to move off the farms with the carrot of some kind of housing support. This movement off farms has resulted in growing informal settlements near rural towns, and has increased the tenure insecurity of these populations. The alternative proposed by commercial farmer unions and some municipalities is an orderly transition in the form of agri-villages. These are envisaged as rural settlements with basic services to which former farm dwellers can be moved from commercial farms. The inhabitants will then be drawn on as needed by commercial farmers. Whether or not this model will be in the interests of former farm dwellers has not yet been fully considered, nor the extent to which such a model can lead to transformation of the inherited spatial economy in favour of the marginalised.

The unemployment data provided in Table 2 is very weak. Not only is some of it based on 2001 information, but there are big differences between census, community survey and ward level studies. In addition, some municipalities include the non-economically active population (e.g., school children) in their figures for those not formally employed, and some exclude them. Some use the narrow definition of unemployment (those who have no work and actively sought work in the past two weeks) and some use the broad definition (including those who are discouraged from seeking work). The definitions are seldom specified in the IDPs or SDFs. As a result, the data is not comparable across the municipalities. Within municipalities, some that report relatively low levels of unemployment (e.g., Cederberg with 7% or Okhahlamba with 18%) show a very high level of the population earning less than R1,600/month suggesting large numbers of ‘working poor’. But whichever way we look at it, it is safe to say that in most cases there are very high levels of unemployment or underemployment, and that income from employment is very low for many people. It should be noted that women have higher rates of unemployment than men across the board. Given the seasonality of employment in agriculture and tourism, the two mainstays of the rural economy in most of the municipalities, there is also a seasonality in respect of hunger. Food security interventions have to take this into account, and having employment does not automatically translate into eradication of hunger.

There is a need to consider what other economic activities in which people are engaged, since employment statistics generally refer to formal employment. What else do people do to make ends meet? There is a severe lack of detailed research of informal or marginal economic activities, which could also act as points of support and intervention and provide a challenge to the single-channel approach of trying to secure formal jobs in conditions where the structural character of the economy works against a rapid growth in jobs.

The majority of municipalities report improvements in basic services, but still not enough to clear backlogs. There is spatial inequality in the provision of services. Dense former homelands and communal areas have very low levels of services and infrastructure, and former white areas have high levels. But in the latter there is still unevenness, between townships and towns, and between commercial farmers and tenants. In the rural areas, there is still poor access to clean household water supplies, electricity, clinics and health facilities, sanitation and refuse removal, public transport, electricity, housing and access roads. In the commercial farming areas, municipalities claim they have no mandate to provide services to tenants or dwellers on private land.

This also goes for restitution farms, where the land is seen as being privately-owned by the successful claimants. In the former homeland areas, the dispersed nature of settlements and their remoteness make provision of services technically more difficult and costly. TB and HIV/AIDS, and teenage pregnancy are of serious concern in a number of municipalities.
Agriculture is the dominant economic activity in four of the municipalities in which the research sites are located (Table 3). Not surprisingly, these are all commercial farming areas, mainly in the Western Cape (except for Okhahlamba in KZN). In Makhado and Hessequa, agriculture is one of the main economic sectors, but not the largest. Hessequa has experienced a decline in its fishing economy. In all the Western Cape municipalities in the study (Hessequa, Cederberg, Breede Valley, Swellendam), tourism has grown rapidly on the back of the commercial agricultural economy. We should consider the effects of tourism on the black population in these municipalities. Given the current ownership of the economic infrastructure, land owners with resources to adapt their production activities to accommodate tourism are the primary beneficiaries of the growth in tourism. While it may create some seasonal, low-paid work for black inhabitants, the transformations in the rural economy brought about by tourism do not produce a structural change in relations of power or control over resources in these areas. In Hessequa and Swellendam in particular, the influx of wealthy white retirees to coastal towns and even into some inland towns produced a short-term expansion in construction and in temporary employment. But it also forced up land and property prices, and similarly produced no structural change in relations of racial or class power in the municipalities.

In all municipalities, community and social services or government services are amongst the dominant economic sectors. This essentially involves the provision of services by government and puts government in the role of a major employer. There is a strong reliance on remittances and social grants, especially child care grants. In Amahlathi, Makhado, Mbizana and Mbhashe this is the dominant form of income, and there is an obvious overlap with the former homeland areas in this regard, i.e., a limited economic base and government as the primary source of economic support. Once again, historical patterns in the spatial economy persist. Mbhashe has a small amount of tourism and agriculture but there is hardly any economic base at present.

Wholesale and retail trade features as a main economic activity in six of the municipalities. For the more marginal areas, this is closely aligned with government grants, with inhabitants spending their grants buying food and other necessities from the formal sector. In light of the expansion of supermarkets into rural areas, wholesale and retail trade can be considered to be an extractive sector. While it may bring greater convenience, it comes at the expense of constructing alternative local economies where inhabitants produce for and buy from one another.

In Amajuba, alone amongst the study sites, manufacturing and mining are dominant. Historically this is a coal-mining area, although this is declining as an economic sector. Newcastle is the dominant town here, with Utrecht and Dannhauser as secondary towns. In Newcastle there has been industrial development and diversification of the economic base. Industrialisation was a product of decentralised industrial strategies under apartheid, where industrial zones were created close to pools of labour in the homelands, and investments were subsidised by the state. At Newcastle that base was built on after 1994 when the decentralisation policy was abandoned. In Makhado, a similar node was created but was unable to sustain itself after the policy was relinquished. In Okhahlamba industry is mainly located in Ladysmith, outside the municipality (but still within uThukhela district). Cederberg, Swellendam and Breede Valley have some light industry, mainly associated with agro-processing.

As mentioned above, the towns closest to the research sites are mainly third order towns or lower. The economic structure of these areas is thus oriented outwards towards bigger towns often in a different municipality altogether. Local economies barely exist in many of these places, with income leaking out of the local area either to bigger towns or through retail conduits. Very little research has been done on the ‘informal’ or ‘marginal’ sectors. The dominant approach to the informal sector is to seek ways to integrate it into formal economy, instead of considering it as a potential base for the development of local economies. This raises one of the core questions facing Tshintsha Amakhaya: what possibilities are there for small-scale value-adding activities and distribution of agricultural produce at a local level.
TABLE 3: MAIN ECONOMIC SECTORS AND ECONOMIC ROLE OF AGRICULTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>DISTRICT / MUNICIPALITY</th>
<th>MAIN ECONOMIC SECTORS</th>
<th>AGRICULTURE AS % OF OVERALL ECONOMY</th>
<th>AGRICULTURE EMPLOYMENT AS % OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRA</td>
<td>Emadlangeni Dannhauser</td>
<td>Manufacturing (33%), mining (16%), government services (13%)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Manufacturing (26%), mining (26%), trade (9%), transport and communication (9%)</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRC</td>
<td>Amahlathi</td>
<td>Social and community services (27%), agriculture, forestry and fishing (22%), wholesale and retail trade (15%)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSG</td>
<td>Okhahlamba</td>
<td>Agriculture, forestry and fishing (22%), community and social services (19%), wholesale and retail trade (15%)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nkuzi</td>
<td>Makhado</td>
<td>Finance (26%), services (25%), wholesale (16%), transport (15%)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCLC</td>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td>Government sector (35%), agriculture (22%), manufacturing, tourism</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP</td>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td>Agriculture, forestry and fishing (32%), wholesale and retail trade (20%), community &amp; social services (15%)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCOE</td>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td>Primary agriculture (24%), wholesale and retail trade (20%), manufacturing (13%)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRALSO</td>
<td>Mbizana Mbhatha</td>
<td>Government services, retail Social and community services (57%), wholesale and retail (19%)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
<td>Agriculture (29%), community services (22%), finance (20%)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. LAND REFORM AND AGRICULTURE

6.1 Overview of agriculture

The municipalities in which the research sites are found can be split into two groups from the point of view of the importance of agriculture to their economies. One group consists of those municipalities where agriculture constitutes between a fifth and a third of the municipal economy. These are invariably areas of high-value commercial farming. The second group consists of those municipalities where the value of agriculture is less than 10% of the overall economy. In almost all cases commercial agriculture is negligible in these areas, as they are primarily former homeland areas. Only in the case of Amajuba could the argument be made that agriculture is important but is overshadowed by other larger sectors, like manufacturing and mining.

Agriculture’s share of total formal employment ranges from 1% (Mbizana, where commercial agriculture is virtually non-existent) to 57% in Cederberg, where agriculture is the largest portion of the economy of any of the municipalities. Some of the statistics provided in the IDPs and SDFs are questionable. For example, although agriculture is less than 1% of GDP in Newcastle, the statistics show that it provides 19% of formal employment. This cannot be correct. In most cases, agriculture’s share of employment is greater than its economic contribution measured by GDP. This suggests that commercial agriculture is still more labour-intensive than other sectors of the economy, even if there is growing mechanisation. It should be noted, however, that much of this employment takes the form of seasonal and part-time work.

In Amajuba district as a whole there is a decline in the agricultural economy. One percent of land is under irrigated cultivation, nearly 10% of land under dry land cultivation (about a third of this subsistence production), plantations cover 3% of the land area and indigenous forests cover another 1%. The main crops are maize, soya beans, peanuts, wheat, dry beans, potatoes, cabbage and there is intensive livestock farming (poultry, piggeries, dairy and feedlots). Soya is being emphasised as feedstock for biodiesel, with a production plant at Newcastle in the works. Emadlangeni local municipality has an extensive reliance on agriculture, though different statistics show different degrees. Land availability in the municipality is not a problem and mainly extensive farming is carried out. Government aims to refocus production in the municipality on high value-added activities. Dannhauser has extensive grazing (mainly cattle, some sheep and game), dairy forestry in pockets, and some mixed farming (livestock and crops – maize, soya, dry bean, and vegetables). There is a fair amount of land with good agricultural potential: 19% high potential agricultural land (mainly in the west); and another 16% is good agricultural land. Dannhauser town has a number of agro-processing facilities: Waterfall Poultry (egg production), Dannhauser Malt (malt factory), Roadside Abattoir (abattoir Class B), and Leicester Mill. Nevertheless, the municipality has experienced a decline in food, beverages and tobacco manufacturing. While there has been a growth in agricultural employment, there has been a decrease in average wages.

Twenty-five percent of the land in Amahlathi is arable, including land around Keiskammahoek near the research site. Maize, potatoes, sweet potatoes, pumpkins, cabbage and beans are grown around Keiskammahoek. The municipality also has some livestock production. About 9% of the municipal area, and 27% of the land around Keiskammahoek, is forested. For Keiskammahoek, 7% of this is planted forest (with an additional potential of 5–10,000ha). There is some agro-processing around Stutterheim and Keiskammahoek, including a sawmill. Keiskammahoek has an irrigation scheme, mainly for pasture linked to a dairy. This has not functioned since 1997, although some efforts are being made to revive portions of it and develop supply links with big supermarket chains in Port Elizabeth (Nelson Mandela Metro) and East London (Buffalo City). There is currently a dairy project on the scheme supported by the Department of Agriculture in joint partnership with commercial farmers, supplying locally and to Clover in East London, but production is low. There are also commercial partnerships around Keiskammahoek to produce and sell paprika, potatoes and blueberries.

In Okhahlamba, the central and western portions have the highest agricultural potential, but there is poor to very poor land potential in the tribal areas where the Tshintsha Amakhaya sites are. A total of 35% of the land in the municipality is ‘tribal land’, characterised by dense rural settlements on steep mountainous areas, making agriculture difficult. The result is low yields in subsistence farming, exacerbated by lack of inputs (including labour). Estcourt is earmarked to be developed as a primary agro-processing hub for the district. Efforts by South African Breweries (SAB) to engage with local farmers in the research site to produce maize under contract have failed.

Production in Makhado focuses on livestock, sub-tropical fruit, citrus, vegetables and forestry. There is some agro-processing but most produce leaves the municipality in a raw form. Less than 5% of land in Vhembe district is considered arable, and is thus mostly used for extensive livestock production, with gradual shift from cattle to game
farming. There are some high-value pockets of nuts and subtropical fruit and vegetables, with some irrigation, notably at Levubu.

In Hessequa, agriculture is a dominant part of the economy. Livestock is dominant in the municipality measured by value of output. Sheep, dairy and ostriches are the main types of livestock production. Main crops are fruit, winter grains and vegetables. In 2002, there were 25,000ha under winter grains and fodder and the municipality had 2,300ha of irrigated production, 78% of which was grains and fodder and 18% was vegetables. Tea, olives, biomass and wine are identified as potential growth sectors. There is high rainfall near the coast, but inland the municipality incorporates portions of the much drier Karoo. Most agro-processing happens outside the municipality.

In Cederberg, dry land agriculture occupies 17% of the area, mainly in the north-west. Mostly winter grains are produced. The municipality has two sections of irrigated land constituting 8% of the land area: the Olifants River (citrus and deciduous fruit) and Sandveld-Wadrif (potatoes). In the latter area especially, depletion of groundwater resources is becoming an issue. Other products include fodder crops, vegetables and livestock. There is export citrus around Citrusdal, and export rooibos at Clanwilliam. There is some fishing activity and potato production around Elandsbaai. Lambert’s Bay has a processing factory for fishmeal, lobster packaging and potato chips. Wupperthal does tobacco drying, dried beans, rooibos tea and dried fruit and has a tea production facility. Government has identified the Olifants River development corridor (incorporating Clanwilliam and Citrusdal) and a tourism corridor (incorporating Elands Bay and Lambert’s Bay) for development.

The Overberg district, in which Swellendam is located has 300-500,000ha of arable land. Within this, 116,000ha is under dry land production and 38,000ha is irrigated. The main dry land crops are wheat, barley and lucerne. The main irrigated crops are fodder and deciduous fruit. Youngberries, grapes and wine are produced for export, especially around Barrydale. Livestock production includes sheep, poultry, some dairy and beef cattle and ostriches. Agriculture is the primary activity, but has been in decline in the past decade. There has been a growth in niche products, or new products such as korog (wheat-rye cross). 90% of water in the district is used for irrigation. Eighty-two percent of manufacturing in the municipality is agro-processing (although this is put at 40% elsewhere), but this is very limited in Swellendam town. Agro-processing includes milk, canning, and distilling of wine, beer and spirits. There has been a decline in agricultural employment, caused by mechanisation and capital intensification in agriculture, and a rise in seasonal work in agriculture and tourism. There are trends towards both diversification out of farming and consolidation of large farms. Pioneer, Tiger and SAB purchase grains from farmers in the municipal area, and Parmalat and Nestlé are major buyers in the dairy sector.

Mbhashe has good agricultural potential: the area is well-watered, has reasonable soils, and untapped local markets. Thirty-three percent of the land is arable. Production includes subtropical and citrus fruit and maize. There is no large-scale agro-processing in the municipality, and production is mainly ‘subsistence’ agriculture. There is potential for dry land maize and beans, and forestry. There are local markets for poultry, maize, beans, and vegetables (grown hydroponically).

At Mbizana there is potential for cabbage, maize, beans, sorghum, potatoes, sub-tropical fruit, nuts, coffee, but only in conditions where adequate support is provided. The area has 20,000ha of moderate to good forestry potential. Arable land is spread throughout the area. There are existing biofuels and cane/sweet sorghum projects (three projects). An abattoir is planned for Bizana town.

In Breede Valley, cultivated and commercially irrigated land covers just 0.18% of the municipal area. Nevertheless, there has been growth in agriculture from 2001 to 2009 and one third of the population is dependent on seasonal agricultural employment. Commercial agriculture is undergoing increasing mechanisation. There is intensive agriculture around Rawsonville town, especially Slanghoek Valley and Goudini-Breede River. Production includes table grapes, wine, vegetables, grains and fruit (canned peaches and apricots). The area has abundant groundwater, and irrigation from the Breë River. But there is over-consumption of water and water is of poor quality. There is some poultry production around Worcester. Agro-processing includes 22 wine cellars, dried fruit production, poultry processing (Rainbow) and a Coca-Cola bottling plant at Worcester.

Agriculture’s contribution to the economy lies more in its linkages with upstream and downstream economic activities than in its primary production. In those municipalities with some manufacturing base, this was primarily agro-processing (except for Newcastle). The commercial farming areas tend to have more developed agro-processing infrastructure than the ‘communal’ areas. Again this is unsurprising, given the historical development of the agro-food system in South Africa. As indicated, however, these are often not found in the same area or municipality.
Concentration of agro-processing facilities has increased since deregulation and liberalisation, and these facilities closed down in many rural towns. Agro-processing has consolidated around fewer, larger entities both in ownership and in physical structure and location.

A problem with many of the plans and proposals that examine the potential of agriculture is that they are based purely on a technical examination of the agricultural possibilities, but do not deal with the socio-historical context of lack of support or infrastructure. Plans paint very rosy pictures about the expansion of agriculture and the development of agro-processing facilities as if the only considerations are market potential or the environmental conditions. One area that is getting a lot of attention is agro-fuels, especially in the Eastern and Southern Cape and KZN. The plans are generally based on smallholder production of soya or other agro-fuel crops for supply to privately-owned processing facilities that have yet to be built. This contract scheme model – where the buyer is also the supplier of inputs, and deducts the cost of inputs from the price of the raw materials – is popular in government at the moment as a way of integrating smallholders into established or new commercial value chains. In some places such as Makhado, such schemes are up and running for poultry in particular. While a small number of producers may benefit from these arrangements, they may also have limited wider benefit for local economies and may prevent smallholder farmers from producing food crops.

In the majority of cases, markets for agricultural produce are a combination of formal and informal markets. The formal include supermarkets, independent grocery stores, butcheries and agricultural co-ops, with livestock auctions held in some places (e.g., near the research sites in Okhahlamba, Makhado and Hessequa). In some places, efforts are being made to link local producers into export markets, but this is highly resource intensive and requires high levels of outside intervention and resources. Informal markets include spaza shops, street traders/hawkers and informal fresh produce markets. In Okhahlamba, local market days are held at Potshini near the research sites. In Hessequa there are no formal markets around Slangrivier.

Both formal and informal retail outlets tend to source from suppliers in the formal system. For example, the grocery store and butchery at Keiskammahoek in Amahlathi purchase most of their products from outside rather than trying to establish local suppliers. Hawkers often source produce from the supermarkets for resale (specifically mentioned in Hessequa and Makhado, but undoubtedly relevant elsewhere too). Poor roads and lack of transport and cold storage facilities; lack of market intelligence; problems with quantity, consistency and quality of supply; selling into a ‘buyer’s market’ (where buyers are few and sellers are many which allows the buyer to set the price) all constitute obstacles to smallholders selling into formal markets or markets that are distant from the point of production.

This suggests the need to consider alternative channels for the sale of surplus production, especially local markets. As mentioned above, however, little work has been done on the informal sector in relation to the supply and distribution of food in rural and urban areas alike. Despite the expansion of supermarkets, local produce still constitutes a significant portion of the food market and warrants deeper investigation.

Another area that is not very well covered in the existing documentation is the availability of water for production. In very broad terms, the eastern coastal belt; incorporating Swellendam, Hessequa, Amahlathi, Mbizana and Mhlashe is water-rich. But this does not tell us about the infrastructure that distributes this water and to whom it is distributed. Catchment Management Authorities (CMAs) and, under their jurisdiction, Water User Associations (WUAs) are in various phases of establishment around the country. But these are oriented to the needs of industry, mining, commercial agriculture and municipalities. Coupled with the licensing of water to major users based on historical use, it is difficult for smallholders to access adequate water supplies for production. Agriculture is a joint national and provincial competency, and hence plans are drawn up at this level. In some places, there is decentralisation of agricultural interventions to district and even municipal level, but the authority resides at the provincial level. We thus need to look at provincial plans. But there is a problem with how these plans intersect with local development plans; mostly there is a poor connection.

Agriculture is a national and provincial competency while the municipalities are responsible for basic services. As such, the municipal IDPs and SDFs focus on the provision of services, including water to households. The provision of water for agricultural production is dealt with in provincial agricultural plans. The emphasis in these plans is on large-scale irrigation refurbishment or construction, but there is little on the provision of water to farms that are not producing at large scale. This is a reinforcement of the tendency to focus on commercial production at the expense of other kinds of food production.

At provincial level, there is a strong focus on agriculture and agro-processing in all areas, but this is very unevenly implemented, especially in the poorer areas.
Table 4 shows some of the district and municipal plans for supporting agriculture, keeping in mind that most resources for agriculture will come from provincial departments. Municipal plans are a combination of supporting infrastructure development for large-scale commercial production (with irrigation and biofuels featuring quite strongly) and support to individual projects in which only immediate members benefit.

**TABLE 4: AGRICULTURAL PLANS IN MUNICIPAL IDPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>DISTRICT / MUNICIPALITY</th>
<th>AGRICULTURAL PLANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRA</td>
<td>Emadlangeni</td>
<td>Large-scale soya bean production and development of the dairy industry for processing in Newcastle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dannhauser</td>
<td>Biodiesel, soya meal, livestock, flour mill, leather tannery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Small-scale food garden and poultry poverty relief projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amajuba DC</td>
<td>Establishment of soya bean and dairy processing facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creation of district ‘agricultural hub’ for production and processing of dairy, soya, vegetables and beef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Formation of agricultural co-operatives with ‘emerging’ and commercial farmers, with representation on Agricultural sub-committee – emphasis on production of soya for biofuels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRC</td>
<td>Amahlathi</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture investments in rehabilitation of Keiskammahoek, Zanyokwe and Horseshoe and establishment of other irrigation schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Agriculture support for livestock improvement across entire municipality, support to individual projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Agriculture biofuel project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DM &amp; LM support for mechanisation (tractors, ploughs), commongage fencing, combating soil erosion, removal of noxious weeds, tree-planting, wetlands rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small amount of support for co-op development; fencing of grazing and arable land, dipping tanks, land reclamation (projects), community gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DSD support for food security projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSG</td>
<td>Okhahlamba</td>
<td>LM sponsoring individual poultry and piggy projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nkuzi</td>
<td>Makhado</td>
<td>District – support for co-ops and commodity associations, project-based support; establishment of fresh produce market in the district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCLC</td>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td>Pasture strengthening programme on commongage land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP</td>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td>Agri-industrial development corridor along the N7 incorporating Elandskloof, Citrusdal and Clanwilliam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCOE</td>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td>Handful of vegetable gardening projects and plans to support 100 food gardens, including rainwater tanks and stalls for informal trading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrading of irrigation system at Suurbraak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support for agro-processing, identify commongage land that can be made available for small scale farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRALSO</td>
<td>Mbizana</td>
<td>Siyazondla programme – supporting individual projects, mainly around Mbizana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mbhashe</td>
<td>District to support vegetable (subsistence and commercial) and cotton production, biofuels, maize, sunflower, sugar beet, sugar cane, soya, sorghum farming and milling, fruit and wool production and processing, livestock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
<td>Provincial funds almost entirely allocated to Stellenbosch in Cape Winelands District – only 1% to entire Breede Valley municipality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2 Land reform and tenure

In all the municipalities except for Mbizana and Mbhashe, both of which are in the former Transkei, private land is the dominant form of land ownership. Cederberg, Breede Valley, Swellendam and Hessequa are overwhelmingly dominated by private land ownership, with small portions set aside as Act 9 land “coloured reserves” under apartheid. Okhahlamba, Amahlathi, Makhado and to a lesser extent Amajuba have some ‘communal’ areas but private property is still dominant. In the first three, the Tshintsha Amakhaya research sites are on communal land. In the case of Makhado, the research site is on restitution farms governed by Communal Property Associations. In Amajuba, the focus is on tenants and farm dwellers on commercial farms.

Given the Constitutional Court challenge to the Communal Land Rights Act (CLRA), land ownership in the former homelands remains in the hands of the state by default. Different levels and branches of the state also own other land. Some national departments own land, and municipalities own commonage around the towns. The information on the percentage of land owned by the state is not readily available for every municipality, but ranged from 4% in Amajuba district to 13% in Overberg District (under which Swellendam falls).

If information on demographics and agriculture is weak and outdated, that for land reform is even worse. Land reform as a competency resides at the national level, although some of these responsibilities have been devolved to provincial and in some cases even district level. The information management systems are notoriously weak and efforts to get up-to-date, accurate data on land reform at a municipal level encounter a fragmented and disorganised bureaucracy. Some information is at district level, some at provincial level and some at national level. The overall lack of information is confirmed by the fact that the most recent IDPs and SDFs (2011-12) rely on land reform data from 2004 and 2005 at best.

In Amajuba DM 211,000 ha (approximately 30% of the district’s land area) is subject to land reform (restitution claims, redistribution or labour tenant claims). The 2010 district IDP reported 8,628 unresolved labour tenant claims, but the report did not state what year that information was derived. About 73,000 ha had been transferred up to 2007 (11% of total land area). In Emadlangeni, there were 10 land redistribution projects (as at 2004) covering 25,000 ha (approximately 0.7% of the municipal area). Labour tenants had received 3,136 ha. Thirty nine restitution claims in the municipality were identified in 2003 but there was limited information even within the municipality. In Dannhauser there were nine restitution claims (figures from 2007, but still being cited in 2011). There were significant labour tenant claims, in a cluster just west of Dannhauser town, and spread across farms west of the N11. Commongage for grazing was released around Dannhauser/Emafu. Newcastile had 27 land reform/restitution projects on the books. An estimated 3,470 ha (6% of land) in Okhahlamba was transferred through land reform between 1994 and 2007. This was a mix of labour tenant projects, redistribution and restitution.

Amahlathi had 188 restitution claims, of which 95 were in and around Keiskammahoek. The latter has been pegged as the Keiskammahoek Land Restitution Zone, which is categorised as a district Development Support Zone. The municipality had approximately 23-24 land redistribution projects. The majority of land around Keiskammahoek is municipal (85%) or state-owned, with less than 5% under private ownership. Mbhashe and Mbizana are overwhelmingly dominated by ‘communal’ lands apart from proclaimed towns, and therefore redistribution and restitution are less relevant. Mbhashe had two unsettled land claims and in Mbizana 25 restitution claims were lodged, with two settled.

In Cederberg, eight land reform projects had transferred 5,600ha (less than 1% of agricultural land) and there was an outstanding restitution claim at Wupperthal. Churches hold around 34,000ha around Wupperthal, and there is some 2,400ha of commonage, mainly around Lambert’s Bay and Clanwilliam. In Swellendam, 18 land reform projects were listed (the biggest was on 194ha). Just 2% of land in Overberg district known to be black-owned, and only half of this is through land reform (36% of total black-owned land is Act 9, and 13% is restitution/redistribution). One percent of landholdings in the district are less than 1ha in size, distributed amongst 69,000 smallholders. The district places an emphasis on peri-urban land for housing as part of land reform. In Barrydale, 133ha of commonage were made available to black smallholders and in other places, no commonage was available. There has been an increase in farm purchases for retirement, leisure, ecotourism and part-time farming. Key land demand is for food for household consumption and for housing.

Breede River had 20 LRAD projects on the books in the early 2000s, covering 3,900ha. These were mainly around Touwsrivier and De Doorns. There were another nine settlement projects (housing) covering 47ha. The emphasis of municipal plans is on commonage and agri-village
development. The municipality states there is limited open land available around Rawsonville, where 26% of the land is under intensive agriculture.

In Makhado, portions of the municipality, mainly in the east, are under traditional authority (perhaps 20% of the municipal area), but private property dominates as a whole. There were 28 settled restitution claims, comprising 484 claims if each individual claim is counted. There were another 14 partially settled claims, comprising 168 claims if each individual claim is counted. The total area under claims is 44,000ha. For Vhembe as a whole, 18% of the land area was under claim, of which about half the claims (and land area) were gazetted.

Table 5 shows the key tenure issues at the different research sites. Insecure tenure and lack of access to land are primary issues in commercial farming areas, and land governance arrangements are of key importance in areas under traditional authority.

### TABLE 5: FORMS OF TENURE AND KEY TENURE ISSUES IN THE RESEARCH SITES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>MAIN TENURE TYPE</th>
<th>KEY TENURE ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle, Dannhauser, Emdadlangeni, KZN</td>
<td>Tenancy on private commercial farms</td>
<td>Evictions, tenure insecurity, squeezing of conditions of tenancy, lack of services, fencing of communal cropping fields, agri-villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amahlathi, EC</td>
<td>Restitution in former Ciskei homeland (betterment scheme)</td>
<td>Governance arrangements, land allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okhahlamba</td>
<td>‘Communal’ land</td>
<td>Governance arrangements, land allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makhado, Limpopo</td>
<td>Restitution farms on commercial farms that were expropriated by the state for inclusion into Venda homeland under apartheid</td>
<td>Governance arrangements, exclusion of non-claimants from land access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa, WC</td>
<td>Commonage, tenancy on commercial farms</td>
<td>Lack of rental or land use agreements, flat rate rentals, confusion about who owns land, no rules governing land allocation and access, agri-villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg, WC</td>
<td>Commonage, church land</td>
<td>Access to commonage and farm land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam, WC</td>
<td>Tenancy on private commercial farms, Act 9 land, commonage</td>
<td>Access to commonage and farm land, agri-villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbizana and Mthashe, EC</td>
<td>Communal land, restitution on communal land expropriated under apartheid for conservation</td>
<td>Governance arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
<td>Tenancy on private commercial farms, informal settlement</td>
<td>Evictions, security of tenure, permanency of settlement, land access, agri-villages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no data about the number of women actually gaining access to land from the land reform programme. Even where restitution numbers are provided, this only indicates the original claimants but does not say anything about who is actually on the land at the moment and how it is being allocated or used, and by whom.

Although the information is very fragmented, it is clear that very limited redistribution of land is taking place, across the board. Restitution claims constitute the greatest portion of land potentially to be transferred, because this is a statutory requirement. Labour tenancy claims exist but they apply mainly to KZN and portions of Mpumalanga, and even in these places the amount of land transferred through this sub-programme is negligible. In some municipalities, particularly in the Western Cape, commonage is an important part of the programme but the amount of land is also small. There are issues around contracts and the fairness of agreements to lease or access commonage.
In some municipalities, the redistribution programme is non-existent. Large, privately-owned farms held by whites remain in place and, especially in areas where high value production is taking place, are closed off from any consideration of redistribution. Escalating land prices are cause for concern especially in the municipalities along the east coast (Swellendam, Hessequa), where the purchase of land by people outside the municipality for tourism and leisure is increasing demand for land. This results in a reproduction of skewed economic relations in favour of the wealthy.

There are scattered redistribution projects in some of the municipalities, but they are isolated from one another and land redistribution is not integrated into municipal plans or strategic orientations. Because the municipalities see their responsibility primarily as services and housing, they only consider land in relation to these issues. Land reform is seen as a provincial and national issue and the municipalities have not integrated it into their plans except once land has been transferred. Even then, transferred land is overwhelmingly considered to be private land and therefore not the responsibility of the municipality. Thus, there is a major disjuncture between the IDPs, SDFs and local economic development strategies on the one hand, and land reform on the other. These do not intersect in any of the municipalities.

Apart from the disconnection between municipal plans and priorities, and provincial and national land reform plans and priorities, there is a deeper conceptual problem with the way land reform has been conceived to date. Land reform is conceptualised as a set of projects that may be subject to the same sets of criteria, principles and support mechanisms. Projects can be considered to be the tactical level of an intervention – where the project is located, what is produced there etc., are very flexible. But land reform lacks a clear strategic focus.

6.3 Black farmers

Very little information is available on black farmers in these municipalities. In the Western Cape research sites, where commercial agriculture dominates (Cederberg, Breede Valley, Hessequa and Swellendam), the main form of land available to black farmers is commonage land, which is very limited in extent. Hardly any land reform has taken place in these municipalities, so there are few if any commercial black farmers apart from those using commonage. In most cases commonage is being used for livestock, but there is little information about who these farmers are and to what extent they are producing commercially. The other type of commercial production in these areas is the group project model where black farmers are organised into government-sponsored projects where the design is developed by external consultants with the aim of entering established markets. Alternatively, there are welfarist food garden projects supported by government.

In the Overberg district (where Swellendam is located), there are 654 (mostly group) smallholder projects on 14,000ha. But less than 2,000ha of this is cultivated. About one third of this is under irrigation. There are also 96 food garden projects on 401ha in the district, mainly vegetable production and livestock (mainly poultry and pigs). Fifty-six percent of these projects produce for their own consumption and 37% produce for informal markets. In Swellendam itself, black farmers around Sturbrak and Barrydale are mostly doing mixed farming, and at Swellendam and Buffelsjagriver they are mainly doing livestock. In Hessequa there are a number of smallholder farmer associations, with some focusing on livestock and others on cultivation. In those municipalities where there are former homeland areas (Amahlathi, Mbizana, Mbhase, Makhado, Okhahlamba, and to a lesser extent, Amajuba) there is a wide base of black smallholder production, but this is seldom commercial in the sense of producing primarily for the market.

Most black farmers -- whether on commonage, on land reform farms, in tribal authority areas or with pieces of land on privately-owned commercial farms -- face similar challenges regarding consistent production. This is especially so when coupled with the necessity of competing with concentrated production and processing from entrenched white farmers and agri-businesses. Land sizes are mostly very small (apart from land reform farms where they are, arguably, too big). Lack of water, long distances from formal markets, lack of appropriate training or extension services, insufficient resources, assets or access to credit (necessary for sustained commercial production in the dominant model of farming in South Africa), poor or decaying infrastructure (e.g., the former homeland irrigation schemes, roads, railway lines, loading and storage facilities, refrigeration) and sometimes difficulties in acquiring labour are fundamental challenges. Processing is dominated by agri-businesses, and supermarkets dominate the retail sector, resulting in farmers being price-takers. Contracts are seldom signed unless farmers can operate at a scale and consistency that is out of reach for the vast majority. There is very little documented information about the extent to which women are producing food. It is generally accepted that women are very active in cropping, especially on small pieces of land, while men tend to dominate livestock production.

These obstacles to consistent smallholder commercial
production highlight the potential importance of a focus on informal and local markets rather than a single strategy of seeking to integrate smallholder farmers into established corporate value chains. Local conduits for produce do exist in all the municipalities and local areas, but large scale producers dominate even these markets. We saw, for example, how hawkers and local grocery stores source from big producers rather than from smallholder farmers in the immediate area. Building on existing ‘informal’ mechanisms (i.e. those not registered in the formal system) of food procurement and distribution offers an additional strategic orientation that can operate alongside a strategy of aiming for access to formal value chains via large-scale processors and retailers. Women are also very active in the ‘informal’ distribution of food both in fresh form (e.g., street trading and informal fresh produce markets) and in processed form (e.g., home milling, prepared food for sale in the street).

7. Institutional analysis

Two critical features of the institutional environment are applicable across the municipalities. The first is the disconnection between policy making and planning on the one hand, and implementation on the other. With regard to land reform and agricultural programmes this is most apparent in the institutional disconnection between land and agricultural policy on the one hand and municipal planning and budgeting on the other. This means that farmers are required to engage with provincial departments of agriculture (some of which have district and municipal offices, although still very far from many farmers), provincial land reform offices and land claims commissions, local extension officers (without whom they would be entirely ignored by provincial agricultural and land reform budgeting and planning processes), municipal IDP and LED managers, and municipal portfolio committee members, MECs and land and agriculture ‘champions’. For technical support they will also be required to interact with commercial farmers, agricultural research institutions and university departments, and NGOs (where these exist).

Lack of transport, communication infrastructure and resources make this an almost impossible task. Therefore, the first institutional issue that needs to be considered is the fragmentation and difficulty in accessing the state. This fragmented institutional environment is exacerbated in the context of weak systems of government, including lack of resources and capacity, staff vacancies and high staff turnover, which get worse the closer to the ground it goes. Generally, the strength and capacity of local government is in direct proportion to the economic strength of the area. Most of the research sites are located in very marginal economic areas, either in relation to other municipalities or within the municipality. This leaves us with the question of what can be done in the face of continued lack of government support, without writing off efforts to engage with government where possible.

The second critical feature of the institutional environment is the lack of black farmer organisation. While institutions such as NAFU may exist, they mostly function at a provincial level with limited local presence, and have a very particular constituency they work for (commercial farmers seeking to integrate into the established agricultural structure). Government has actively supported the formation of agricultural co-operatives and commodity associations amongst black farmers (notably in Makhado). While this is a positive step, it is not always easy for more marginalised black farmers to gain access to these structures. In a number of the research sites (Cederberg, Swellendam, Hessequa, Okhahlamba, Amahlathi, Mbizana and Mhbashe) farmers have formed their own associations or farm dweller organisations (Hessequa, Breede Valley and Amajuba). These are mostly small and tend to be structured on a project basis (i.e., all the members work together in production). The next step of farmer organisation – linking farmers that work independently from one another into a single structure – has yet to be realised in most places. In many cases, where local leadership is developed, it is quickly siphoned off into higher levels, whether in government or the private sector. There is lack of active participation in local structures by women in most places, although in some very local organisations, membership is predominantly or primarily women (e.g., Cederberg, Swellendam and Breede Valley).

Conflict resolution and building group cohesion need to be strengthened across the board, though it should be recognised that there is no end-point to these dimensions of organisation-building.

NGOs play an important role in facilitating local organisation, although it is necessary to be conscious of the dynamics between NGOs and community-based structures (e.g., NGOs are sometimes seen as bringing resources and knowledge to passive groups, and are seen to create relationships of dependency). A full scoping of the range and types of NGOs working in the research sites will be a necessary step in the unfolding of the work of Tshintsha Amakhaya partners. In some places this has been done already, revealing possibilities for collaboration. For example, in Amajuba the KZN Council of Churches is active on land and tenure issues; in Okhahlamba a number of NGOs are working in the research area on social and agricultural issues.
8. CONCLUSION

This situation analysis report provides a very general backdrop to the municipalities in which the Tshintsha Amakhaya research sites are located. The municipalities are a mixture of sparsely populated and very densely populated areas, a distinction that overlaps with the divide between municipalities dominated by commercial farming areas and those where former homeland areas are predominant. Despite this, socio-economic conditions are very similar across the municipalities, especially in the rural areas i.e. very poor conditions, with a slow encroachment into some service backlogs (especially domestic water and electricity). Although there is an unevenness in population growth, with some municipalities experiencing population decline and others experiencing rapid growth in their populations, all municipalities are experiencing growth in urbanisation. This raises the importance of peri-urban land and land close to the urban edge as a component of land reform. Unsurprisingly, agriculture is the dominant economic activity in the municipalities where commercial farming predominates. In the other municipalities, community, social and government services (i.e., mainly welfare and government employment) are the dominant economic sectors. Tourism is of growing importance in many municipalities, but particularly in those where commercial farming predominates. There is limited manufacturing in these municipalities. Where it exists, it is mostly agro-processing, with the notable exception of Newcastle/Amajuba, which has a strong industrial base.

Land reform is very limited across the board, but especially in the Western Cape. Restitution appears to be the major driver of land reform, primarily because it is statutory and claims were put in early on in the land reform process when there was still significant political momentum. Redistribution is largely non-existent, and labour tenant claims transfer very small portions of land. In some places commonage is an important part of land reform. This only highlights the failure of the remainder of the programme, since the amount of commonage land is very small. Black farming is mainly on a very small scale, and there are immense obstacles to consistent surplus production. These obstacles are well-known and little has been done to tackle them in the past 15 years. Government policies and programmes tend to emphasise a few, big, high external input projects with the aim of integrating into established formal markets. Despite the rhetoric, limited support is provided to smallholder black farmers outside of these few favoured projects.

Key institutional challenges are the weakness of local government, the disjuncture between provincial- and national-level agricultural and land reform planning and local municipal integrated development planning, and the weakness of local farmer organisation.
acronyms

AFRA  Association for Rural Advancement
AgriBEE Agricultural black economic empowerment
BCE  Basic conditions of employment
BCEA Basic Conditions of Employment Act
BRC  Border Rural Committee
BSE  Bovine spongiform encephalopathy
CLRA Communal Land Rights Act 11 of 2004 (declared unconstitutional)
CPA  Communal Property Association
CRDP Comprehensive Rural Development Programme
CWP Community Work Programme
DAFF Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
DoA (Provincial) Department of Agriculture
DM District Municipality
DRDLP Department of Rural Development and Land Reform
DSD Department of Social Development
FSG  Farmer Support Group
E Cape Eastern Cape
EPWP Expanded Public Works Programme
GHI Global Hunger Index (IFPRI)
GHS General Household Survey (Stats SA)
HH Household
HSRC Human Sciences Research Council
IDP Integrated Development Plan
IFPRI International Food Policy Research Institute
ISRDP Integrated Sustainable Rural Development Programme
KZN KwaZulu-Natal
LM Local Municipality
LRC Legal Resources Centre
MDG Millennium Development Goals (UN)
NAFU National African Farmers Union
NAMC National Agricultural Marketing Council
NGO Non-government organisation
Nkuzi Nkuzi Development Association
NPC National Planning Commission
RDP Reconstruction and Development Programme
S&T Strategy & Tactics
SALDRU Project for Statistics on Living Standards and Development
SCLC Southern Cape Land Committee
SDF Spatial Development Framework
SPP Surplus People Project
SPSS Statistical Package for Social Sciences
Stats SA Statistics South Africa
TA Tshintsha Amakhaya
TCOE Trust for Community Outreach and Education
TRALSO Transkei Land Services Organisation
UIF Unemployment Insurance Fund
UN United Nations
VAT Value added tax
W Cape Western Cape
WFP Women on Farms Project
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