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ABSTRACT

The Land Reform projects are primarily challenged by post-settlement support. They mainly rely on government grants to survive and in some instances, projects have failed due to lack of sufficient post-settlement support. There are many government and private institutions and mandated and private businesses that offer post-settlement support to LRAD beneficiaries. Their impact can only be measured against improvements in the livelihoods of beneficiaries. While land reform has been in existence in SA, the main source of support evidently seems to have been the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP) in the form of a government grants. The existence of other sources of post-settlement support cannot be ignored, but the extents to which these support mechanisms are combined have contributed to the improvement of sustainable livelihood of the beneficiaries, as measured through livelihood assets. The main aim of this study is to explore how the LRAD beneficiaries in the Witzenberg Municipality in the Western Cape employ their livelihood strategies. It explores the types of support received by the beneficiaries and how the support has been used. To determine the progress made through the post-settlement support received by the beneficiaries in an attempt to achieve rural livelihoods strategies, the study discusses the status of the farms during the inception and also the current status. Many studies done by role players and academics in the field of land reform mainly explore the monetary benefit and ignore or pay less attention to the livelihood in five capitals. The needs confronting beneficiaries in the form of livelihood strategies are presented in the form of capital; for example, physical, natural, human, social, economic and financial capitals. This paper seeks to establish an understanding of how beneficiaries of land reform achieve their livelihood, given the constraints of post-settlement support to land reform in South Africa.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This study concentrates on post-settlement support for the beneficiaries of the Land Reform and Agricultural Development (LRAD) programme in South Africa as a means of ensuring their improved livelihoods. To ensure successful land reform, the livelihoods of the beneficiaries of land reform in South Africa and elsewhere on the continent remain critically important. Aliber and Cousins (2013) argue that although the redistribution is not a new concept, the impact on the livelihoods of the recipients has been questionable. As development officers in the field of agriculture are working every day with land reform beneficiaries, it is clear that something with regard to post-settlement support is not properly aligned. The land reform farmers are forever looking for assistance; for example, technological or financial knowledge. Is this happening by default or is it just about farmers having developed a dependency syndrome?

The reality is that there are many forms of support available; for example, the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP), The Land Bank and other commercial banks and also non-governmental organisations with foreign aid. Some of this funding is being received almost daily. These forms of support are not efficient and effective enough to bring the significant impact expected. According to Lahiff (2001: 4), there is no adequate support for the beneficiaries in terms of services and infrastructure and business plans are unrealistic. Wagerif (2004) and Du Toit (2004) are just two scholars who point out that land reform has ‘failed’ in its objective to create jobs.

Most scholars are able point out that the problem revolves around the question of efficiency and effectiveness, but they still do not reveal the actual root cause of the problem or provide a solution. The study seeks to identify the root cause of the problem and to suggest a solution to deal with it in order to ensure effectiveness and efficiency of post-settlement support to land reform. This chapter introduces the main questions, aims, objectives, methodology and chapter outline of the treatise.
1.1 RESEARCH PROBLEM AND QUESTIONS

The research is guided by the main problem: post-settlement support for the beneficiaries of the LRAD. What are the challenges of post-settlement support to land reform beneficiaries for sustainable livelihoods, food security and employment in the agricultural sector?

The research is guided by the following sub-questions:

- Is post-settlement support effective and efficient enough for the beneficiaries of land reform?
- What institutions are responsible for giving post-settlement support?
- Are they playing their roles?
- Are they visible or accessible enough?
- In order to access their support, what are their requirements or criteria?
- Are these institutions profit-making or non-profit-making?
- Do beneficiaries have traits that make them compatible with the available support and give them eligibility?
- Is the available support relevant to the needs of the beneficiaries?
- Are the agents of change – the institutions responsible for farmer settlement support – skilful enough to drive the available support?
- Have the beneficiaries seen improvements in their livelihoods as a result of post-settlement support?

1.2 AIM AND OBJECTIVES

The aim of this research is to contribute to the existing body of knowledge, with more emphasis on suggesting possible solutions to improve efficiency and effectiveness of post-settlement support to the beneficiaries of land reform in South Africa. This research intends to achieve the following objectives:
• To study the impact of post-settlement support on the livelihoods of the beneficiaries;
• To document the negative and positive experiences of the beneficiaries in relation to the efficiency and effectiveness of posts-settlement support;
• To find out the types and forms of support available;
• To find out the challenges facing those involved in post-settlement support for the improvement of beneficiaries’ livelihoods;
• To identify the pitfalls in relation to alignment of available support services from different agencies;
• To add to the existing body of knowledge about post-settlement support for beneficiaries of land reform;
• To evaluate progress made with regard to food security and job creation through land the reform programme.

1.3 CONTEXTUAL BACKGROUND

Land in South Africa, on the African continent and elsewhere in the world has been the most sensitive issue in terms of ownership, ranging from historical to current ownership arrangements. As recorded in South African history, on 19 June 1913, a law called the Natives’ Land Act of 1913 (Act No. 27 of 1913) was passed and this entailed a systematic dispossession of land by the State (Pepeteka 2013: 1). Dating back to the Natives’ Land Act of 1913 (Act No. 27 of 1913), the people of the republic were dispossessed of their land and as a result, segregation and inequality deepened amongst the landless. After Apartheid ended in 1994, the ruling party – the African National Congress (ANC) – sought to tackle issues of access to land. The policies on restitution and redistribution were passed in parliament (White paper, 1997). Since 1997, the government has settled people on land for farming purposes. The constitution of the Republic of South Africa makes a clear provision in three different aspects of
improving access to land; namely, restitution, redistribution and tenure reform which were originally conceptualised in the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) (Pepeteka 2013: 2).

1.3.1 Meeting the challenges of 'Sustainable Livelihood'

The most significant challenge to the beneficiaries of land reform in South Africa is the kind of life that they live after being settled on the farms and the quality of life in terms of livelihood strategies. According to Hall (2007: 3), there are five dimensions of livelihood described in their symbiotic relationship to assets or ‘capitals’: human capital (education and skills), social capital (relationships and networks), natural capital (land and water), financial capital (money and loans) and physical capital (infrastructure and assets). In the context of land reform, the pressing question is whether all these factors lead to improved livelihood of the beneficiaries of land reform in South Africa and elsewhere across the globe. The fundamental goal for post-settlement support is in fact trying to achieve the latter capitals.

1.3.2 Need to address food security within livelihood context

One of the aspects of post-settlement support to the beneficiaries of LRAD is to ensure that the land is used productively, employment is created and there is contribution to the food security (DRLR 2011b), as cited by Aliber et al. (2013: 92). One of the roles of the LRAD in South Africa is to address the issue of food security, which is, in general, challenging and paramount, especially in Africa. According to Crush (2012), there is a visible relationship between food security and migration. He further suggests that these two issues cannot be dealt with separately as is done through the two international agencies, namely, the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and the International Organisation for Migration (IOM). This has been observed in Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Malawi and many other African countries, where people are moving from one country to another simply because they are starving in their own country.
For example, food security in Johannesburg is crucial to the people living in the city. The demand for local food production and the distribution of healthy food, which produces an environment that is friendly to the existing ecological systems, remains a challenge. According to the study done in 2008 about Johannesburg Poverty and Livelihoods, Crush et al. (2012) emphasise that ‘the urban poor, residing in certain pockets of the city such as informal settlements and the inner city areas, are particularly vulnerable and struggle to gain access to services and opportunities to improve their livelihoods’.

1.3.3 The Gap

The gap in terms of land reform lies in the difference between pre- and post-settlement livelihood status. This study attempts to zoom into the livelihood of the land reform beneficiaries by looking into the status of each livelihood strategy in detail. Many studies seem to focus more on monetary benefits for the beneficiaries and dwell less on other assets. This is done by following the concept of Sustainable Livelihood (SL) Approach as outlined by Krantz (2001), who emphasises that a livelihood is only considered sustainable when it is in a position to cope with stress and recover from stress and shock. The capabilities and assets need to be preserved or enhanced, while the natural resource base need not to be destabilised (Krantz, 2001).

The most important aspect of land reform is whether the beneficiaries are supported in such a way that they can meet their needs for sustainable livelihood. There is a difference between pre- and post-settlement support to the beneficiaries of land reform; failure to manage this difference could be disastrous. Post-settlement support is the crucial intervention, without which the beneficiaries cannot consider access to land as a means to a better life. According to Aliber et al (2003: 305), the failure of land reform projects does not solely rest upon the post-settlement support. Again, his suggestion does not stretch to livelihoods of the beneficiaries in relation to the support or how the means of livelihoods are achieved by LRAD beneficiaries.
There are a number of private and public institutions offering post-settlement support to the beneficiaries of LRAD, yet there is still a contestation that the support is not sufficient and effective enough. This study intends to look at the livelihood outcomes which are: more income, increased well-being, reduced vulnerability, improved food security and more sustainable use of natural resource base (DFID, 1999).

1.4 METHODOLOGY

The methodological approach in this study is qualitative as it is not dealing with statistical information. Although a qualitative approach was used, some of the work was of a quantitative nature. However, the bulk of the work was qualitative since interviews were used in order to gather the information.

This was a case study of the Koekedouw farmers in the Western Cape. Interviews were used to gather information, some of which included primary and secondary data collected from farmers, government officials and private support-givers. All forms of correspondence were used. These included the original business plan, letters and agreements between these parties. The desktop information was also used as another form of necessary information.

The entry point into the Koekedouw farms started with the organisation itself. The chairperson of the organisation received a formal request and this request stipulated the number of farms to be targeted. This included all the member farms. The number of farm workers was also clearly stated. Officials from the Department of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR), the local municipality and one commercial bank were interviewed.
1.5CHAPTER OUTLINE

The thesis is outlined as follows:

**Chapter 1** introduces the background, design and the key concepts of the study.

**Chapter 2** focuses on the review of the literature and adapts the sustainable livelihoods theory, land reform, rural poverty alleviation, food security and employment for the study.

**Chapter 3** focuses on the methodology that was used to gather the data for the study.

**Chapter 4** focuses on presenting the findings and presents a discussion of those findings.

**Chapter 5** focuses on the conclusion and recommendations of the study.
2.1 LAND HISTORY, LAND REFORM AND LIVELIHOOD

Land reform has recently taken its toll in the whole world. As in South Africa, land reform has taken different approaches and for specific reasons. An example is the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development. This chapter debates the land history in South Africa and other African countries in which land reform has taken place. The focus is on the broader land reform beneficiaries; in particular Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development. While looking into LRAD, the focus is on the relationship between pre- and post-settlement support to beneficiaries of LRAD as measured through their improvement in their livelihood.

2.1.1 South African Context

In the Republic of South Africa, the land question has a history dating back to the Natives’ Land Act of 1913 (Act No. 27 of 1913), in which the people of the republic were dispossessed of their land, resulting in segregation and inequality which deepened amongst the landless. After Apartheid ended in 1994, the ruling party, the ANC, sought to tackle issues of land access through the land reform process. Policies on restitution and redistribution were passed in parliament (White paper, 1997). Since 1997, people have been settled on land by the government for farming purposes, but significant improved livelihood is yet to be seen.

The constitution of the Republic of South Africa makes a clear provision in three different aspects of enhancing access to land; namely, restitution, redistribution and tenure reform. This provision was originally conceptualised in the RDP (Pepeteka, 2013: 2).
Although there are beneficiaries who have been settled on the land reform farms, there have been numerous studies on unsuccessful land reform – for example, Kleineikeboom farm south of Wellington in the Paarl area in the Western Cape – and lack of post-settlement support for the beneficiaries. According to Lahiff (2001: 4), there is no adequate support for beneficiaries in terms of services and infrastructure and business plans developed by the government are said to be unrealistic.

Wagerif (2004) is one scholar who points out that land reform has failed in its objective to create jobs. Furthermore, Du Toit (2004) has stated that land reform in South Africa is ‘a failure and a scandal’. Although some scholars have criticised the outcomes of the land reform programme and its achievements in improving the livelihood of its beneficiaries, in his study, Hebinck (2008) states that: ‘Land reform is more than an economic modernisation project’. It should not be looked at in a uni-linear way as it cannot only be measured by linking policy to observed outcomes.

Land reform has been taking place in South Africa over the past two decades. This process was meant to change the imbalances of the past and relate directly to improving the livelihoods of the previously disadvantaged under Apartheid. Aliber and Cousins (2013) argue that although the redistribution is not a new concept, the impact on the livelihoods of the recipients has been questionable. Fourie and Schoeman (2010: 151), in their case study about the beneficiaries of the Nkumbulenzi community land claim, state that the resettlement phase seemed to be problematic, as the beneficiaries were not able to see improvement to their livelihoods.

Factors such as poor extension services, inadequate skills and too little money per beneficiary are the underlying causes for poor livelihood achievement for land reform beneficiaries (Jacobs et al., 2003; Manenzhe, 2007, cited by Aliber & Cousins, 2013). Manenzhe (2007) further acknowledges that although land has been transferred to the people at an accelerated pace in the second democratic transition (1999-2004), it has always been of limited equity. Deininger (2003), Hall (2003) and Lahiff (2001), cited by
Manenzhe (2007), state that major investment in training, technical assistance and provision of resources beyond transfer of land are fundamentally imperative in order to achieve a greater equity and efficiency benefit.

Appropriate and high-yielding agricultural technologies, enhancement of local markets offering good output prices, seasonal financial support for purchased inputs and secure and equitable access to land are some of the key elements to successful farming (Dorward et al., 2004, cited in Mandizadza, 2010). According to Hall (2007), for development activities to be effective, an ongoing interaction between those requiring support and those determining the support to be comprehensive and responsive, is required. Due to the lack of credible studies and the small base of information, it remains difficult to conclude whether land reform improves the livelihood of the beneficiaries or not (ibid). The impact of land reform on the poverty of the its beneficiaries is extremely limited due to lack of reliable empirical data on all aspects of the programme (Lahiff 2007, cited in Maluleke et al., 2008: 1).

The Land Reform policy discussion that took place in Polokwane in 2012 revealed some key issues that needed to be addressed. These issues were that:

(i) the majority of dispossessed people become wage-workers;
(ii) the land reform process should be fast-tracked without disruption to the current food security and agricultural activities;
(iii) resources should be mobilised in order to reverse the human and the material situations of those that were displaced by the previous land policies.

They further identified that there is a need for the State to enhance and deepen skills development, infrastructure development and credit access to ensure that the producers who fall under the category of smallholder farmers are fully supported (land reform discussion policy, Polokwane, 2012). The Land Bank was also discussed and it was noted that this institution needs strengthening and transformation (land reform discussion policy, Polokwane, 2012).
It was during this policy discussion that a new agenda to the land reform approach was established – the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP) (land reform discussion policy, Polokwane, 2012). Under the CRDP, strategic coordination and integrated broad-based agrarian transformation would take place (land reform discussion policy, Polokwane, 2012).

**A successful case**

This is an experience of one person working with LRAD projects as an extension officer. The case of the Adama Farmworkers Trust (AFWT) is one of the success stories worth telling in the land reform arena in South Africa. There are perceptions that the land reform programme is a total failure, yet there are success stories. This project is found in the Drakenstein Local Municipality, Cape Winelands District in the Western Cape; the researcher is personally involved in this project. It is a ‘share-equity scheme’ formed by farm workers and the Bosman Family Trust. Lahiff (2007) indicates that equity groups are less common and are criticised for perpetuating highly unequal relations between white owner-managers and black worker-shareholders and for providing little material benefit to farm workers. In this project, farm workers bought shares in the business of the Bosman Family Trust with the help of the Department of Land Affairs. The farm workers were incorporated into management positions, their housing was improved, facilities to take children to school in town were made available, sporting activities were initiated and, in addition, beneficiaries were able receive dividends from the inception of this project. With support from the Provincial Department of Agriculture, the project is growing. Lahiff (n.d) argues efficiency-based land reform where he states that this notion of economic transformation is associated politically with well-established regimes, whose aspirations are beyond the agrarian sector. Equity arguments are more driven by the ideas of social transformation and the focus is on the emancipation or uplifting of the disadvantaged groups. The regimes in this case are more concerned with seeking the majority or the popular base (Lahiff, n.d). It should be noted that through the experience of working with equity schemes, the researcher has learned that
these models are sustainable, but benefits are long-term when compared to agrarian models.

An unsuccessful case

This is also a reflection of the researcher’s personal experience while working with LRAD projects as an extension officer. The Klein Eikeboom Farm Workers Trust was started in 2002 between the landlord and his workers on a dairy farm. The white owner held 49% of the trust, while the black owners held 51% of the shares. The farm struggled for eight years due to lack of skills, access to a market and insufficient support. The 15 people involved in the project worked very hard to make the project improve their livelihoods. There was a collective effort by the owners who held the sentiment, ‘We are not workers; we are owners’ (Nieuwoudt, 2010: 58). This lack of support led to the project failing to service its debt with the Land Bank and as a result the farm was auctioned. The history behind the failure of this project reflects that the initial reasoning to create this project was more for social than business reasons.

2.1.2 Namibian Context

Namibians share common characteristics with South Africans in terms of land reform. The development’s objective of land reform in Namibia serves as a good example to reflect upon when looking into South African land reform situation. The lessons learnt from the Namibian situation are important to refer to when analysing land reform in South Africa. Namibia gained independence in 1990 when it emerged from the colonial regime. The new government, under the leadership of SWAPO, introduced an initiative to address the land question in its few months of tenure of office as the ruling party. In 1991, a National Conference on Land Reform and the Land Question was held and it was at this conference that the land reform programme was developed (Scoones et al., 2010).
The basic objective of the land reform programme in Namibia was to redress the injustices that were created by large-scale land dispossession and to reduce poverty and inequality (Scoones et al., 2010). The Ministry of Land and Resettlement (MLR) was tasked with the responsibility of acquiring commercial farms on a ‘willing seller, willing buyer’ basis, and to make sure that the land was allocated to the successful applicants. Although land reform in Namibia was intended to reduce poverty, the poverty reduction policies and strategies did not share the same vision due to poor integration. For example, the Third National Development Plan (NDP3) makes propositions about eradicating hunger and poverty in the poor rural communities, but improving access to land through land reform had featured as one of the strategies in support of land reform projects (Scoones et al., 2010).

*Lessons for SA*: there was absolutely nothing wrong with Namibian approach to land reform in order to reduce poverty and improve the livelihood of its own people. The major problem involved policy making which did consider the issue of coordination as paramount importance, especially with regard to supporting those that had settled on the land. The same applies to the South African land reform processes, where there are funds in the hands of many different institutions or service providers. For example, the Small Enterprise Development Agency, DOA, DRDLR and DTI all have funds from the government and each of them administers the funds in their own way while doing almost the same thing. This is a typical example that reflects inefficiency resulting from lack of coordination.

### 2.1.3 Zimbabwean Context

In the 1980s, the British occupied land in Matabeleland – now called Zimbabwe. As happened in other parts of the world where colonisation took place, it was through this process that Zimbabweans lost their land to the British settlers and were forcefully removed and pushed to the marginally poor areas where their livelihoods were always
depressed. It was through the liberation struggle that in 1980 that Zimbabwe gained independence (Mandidzadza, 2010).

Although Zimbabwe gained independence in 1980, the majority of the people were still living below the poverty line due to landlessness or unfair distribution of land.

Table 1: Land Apportionment in Southern Rhodesia in 1930
(Adapted from: The Zimbabwean Land Apportionment Act)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
<th>% OF THE COUNTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Areas</td>
<td>49,149,174</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Reserves</td>
<td>21,127,040</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassigned Areas</td>
<td>17,793,300</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Purchase Area</td>
<td>7,464,566</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Area</td>
<td>590,500</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undetermined Area</td>
<td>88,540</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96,213,120</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows how the land was distributed in Zimbabwe during the colonial era. The current state of land ownership, which has a bearing on the economic state in Zimbabwe, is the result of the 1930 land apportionment. Mujeyi (2010) states that beneficiaries of land reform who were settled on the land did not have support in terms of input; they mainly sourced their input from their own purchases in the formal retail markets. He further indicates that only a small fraction of the beneficiaries received assistance from the Government of Zimbabwe through the inputs credit scheme (ibid). Mujeyi (2010) shows that the hyperinflationary conditions that existed by the time fast-
tracking land reform started in Zimbabwe had a devastating effect on the livelihood of the beneficiaries of land reform. He further alludes to the fact that market arrangements by the government were not helping the poor farmers – for example, maize and wheat farmers – but rather getting them deeper into the pit of unsustainable investments (ibid). He also indicates that at the same time the issue of market arrangements also introduced the element of convenience, especially with regard to the use of multi-currencies (ibid).

Mujeyi (2010) also points out the issue of marketing regulations as a setback for the settled beneficiaries and suggests that deregulation should be considered in order to give birth to free markets in which price would only be determined by market forces. Apart from the regulations, Mandizadza (2010) states in his findings that transport and communication networks are also limiting factors with regard to enabling farmers to market their produce for a realistic return on investment. Mandizadza further argues that market access, credit access and wage employment are some of the impediments which continue to fail to support rural livelihoods. The other element or approach to livelihoods as indicated by Mbereko (2010) is that the settled beneficiaries had low social networks and poor infrastructure.

2.2 THE SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOOD APPROACH

2.2.1 Sustainable livelihood concept

The term ‘sustainable livelihood’ has become popular in academic discussions about alternative methods of development. According to Scoones (1998), the notion of sustainable livelihoods has been fundamental in issues of ‘rural development, poverty reduction and environmental management’. Krantz (2001) defines sustainable livelihood as a concept that expands past the popular limiting definitions of sustainable livelihoods, which mostly limit themselves to low income as causes of poverty but omit to include other equally important aspects that contribute towards the manifestation of poverty. Krantz adds that the definition of the sustainable livelihoods concept should include
factors that play a role in influencing the ability of poor people to make a living, and also focus on how to ‘withstand and recover from stresses and shock’. In their studies, Chambers and Conway (2002) have unpacked sustainable livelihoods by defining the different terms individually; namely, being made up of ‘capabilities, assets and activities required for a means of living’. They further define sustainability as the ability to provide for the current needs without affecting the needs of future generations adversely. Majale (2002), on the other hand, defines a sustainable livelihood as ‘a way of thinking about the objectives, scope and priorities for development in order to enhance progress for poverty reduction’. Based on various definitions by different scholars, it can be accepted that sustainable livelihood is basically about ways and means of making a living without compromising the future.

According to Krantz (2001), there are various approaches to a sustainable livelihoods concept. However, these approaches have weaknesses and strengths. Krantz adds that the strengths of a sustainable livelihood are: provision of a general view of the resources that are essential to the poor and ‘understanding the underlying causes of poverty’. Krantz also states that the weaknesses of the approaches of a sustainable livelihood are that they do not address the issue of how to identify the poor – which it is aiming to benefit – nor do they address underlying issues, such as gender.

According to Ashley and Carney (1999), the approaches of sustainable livelihoods are people-centred in that people and how they make their livelihoods are the main focus of this concept. The study of Ashley and Carney (1999) is further supported by Krantz (2001), who states that, where necessary, people are involved in the ‘identification’ and execution of poverty reduction interventions that concern them.

2.2.2 Sustainable livelihood framework

Krantz (2001) states that the sustainable livelihood approaches are used differently by various institutions. However, there are commonalities in the use of this approach. The commonalities which Krantz highlights are focused on the livelihoods of the poor, analyses the people's livelihoods in order to identify the relevant and necessary
intervention and the involvement of the people in identifying and executing the intervention.

Hall (2007: 3) indicates that the well-known ‘livelihood pentagons’ depict the dimensions of the livelihoods and their symbiotic relationship in five dimensions of livelihood assets, or ‘capitals’, such as human capital (education and skills), social capital (relationships and networks), natural capital (land and water), financial capital (money and loans) and physical capital (infrastructure and assets). Hall (2007: 3) further indicates that the outcomes or indicators of livelihoods should at least include the following: more income, increased well-being, reduced vulnerability, improved food security and more sustainable use of natural resources.

Beneficiaries experience livelihood differently depending on the nature, location and general management of the project and the efficiency and effectiveness of post-settlement support they receive. In the case of the Dikgolo project in Limpopo, some of the beneficiaries indicated that their lives are better since they received land, but some were found to be worse off than they were before they had land (Lahiff et al., 2008). These different states of livelihood are the results of different contributing factors, such as poor extension services, lack of adequate infrastructure, lack of reliable markets, poor farming practices and – in some cases – poor farms. The general perception or myth about failing LRAD is usually limited to finance. Lubambo (2011) argues this by indicating that some of the factors affecting the performance of the land reform projects are not limited to access to funds, member conflict, theft and sense of ownership.

According to Glopp (2008), the sustainable livelihood approach is guided by what is termed the Sustainable Livelihood Framework (SLF). The SLF is instrumental in understanding how poor people perceive poverty and how agencies can use that to understand poverty from poor people’s perspectives. Glopp goes on to indicate that the SLF is aimed at conceptualising how poor people operate within the different situations to which they are exposed; these can be limiting, enabling or even ‘shocking’ in nature. The SLF also aids in understanding how the poor utilise the various ‘livelihood assets’ that are available to them. Krantz identifies these assets as being tangible and
intangible and they can be categorised in four main categories; namely, natural capital, human capital, economic capital and social capital.

2.2.3 The Capitals of the sustainable livelihoods framework

With regard to the five assets of a sustainable livelihood framework, this study attempts to determine how the beneficiaries of LRAD have managed to achieve these assets as a result of post-settlement support. As part of the major component of this paper, the impact of these assets is critically examined.

2.2.3.1 Natural capital

This refers to the resources that exist in the natural environment – including water, land and air – which are making it possible for the flow of services that are useful for achieving livelihoods (Scoones, 1998: 7). The argument is how these natural resources, which the LRAD beneficiaries have accessed through land reform processes, have been used to achieve better livelihoods. It is a well-known fact that resources such as land, water and air quality cannot work separately in order to be productive and generate income for the beneficiaries. Post-settlement support then becomes needed to make sure that these resources are used fruitfully to unleash their productive potential.

2.2.3.2 Economic capital

The capitals referred to as economic or financial capitals include access to cash, credit, loans and savings, while the fundamental economic assets include basic infrastructure, production equipment and access to technologies (Scoones 1998: 8). Access to credit facilities, loans and own funds are fundamental problems in the rural development sphere, especially because people do not have collateral to secure financial assistance from funding institutions. Most of the LRAD beneficiaries do not have anything that they can use to secure financial assistance. Most of them have properties in the rural settlements, but these properties – since are in the rural areas – are worth almost nothing in terms of security value. Most of the beneficiaries do not even have bankable businesses.
2.2.3.3 Human capital

The ability of the human assets to pursue different livelihoods is crucially important. These assets include beneficiaries’ skills and knowledge, good health and physical capability (ibid). The total combined capability of the beneficiaries needs to be sufficient to run a particular farming business, to enable the beneficiaries to carry on the duties and successfully achieve some livelihood strategies. The more healthy, skillful and knowledgeable beneficiaries are, the more they are capable of pursuing the possible livelihoods strategies at their disposal.

2.2.3.4 Social Capital

Social resources include networks, social relationships, affiliations and associations and are critical in pursuing different aspects of livelihoods (ibid). These resources are important, as they play a crucial role in terms of influence achieved and access to other means and ways of achieving different livelihoods. In fact, there are so many things that one cannot access if one is not socially inclined. The social state in a particular community gives access to some resources that cannot be accessed by everyone in the same community.

2.2.3.5 Physical Capital

Physical capital refers to means of production by way of infrastructure development. The infrastructure referred to includes roads, irrigation systems, dams, water supply and market places. The main question asked with regard to infrastructure development is: How good are the available capitals to ensure a good livelihood? To what extent do these infrastructural capitals need to be improved for better livelihood?

2.2.3.6 Conclusion

The different livelihood approaches cannot be separated, as they work hand-in-hand. A combination of two or more of these approaches can only achieve some livelihood strategies. Scoones (ibid) suggests that these capitals work in sequence and states that one particular type of livelihood resource is basically an ‘essential precursor for gaining access to others’. For successful livelihood strategy, there should be at least
more than one of the livelihood capitals working together; for example, social capital
cannot work unless there is capable human capital, and human capital cannot work
unless there are adequate natural resources. The same natural resources require the
financial capital to be productive. One can go on and on in circles and will still not find
any one capital that can work on its own without relying on another.

An interesting metaphor will be established on how the beneficiaries of LRAD achieve
these livelihood strategies as a result of post-settlement support. How did the
beneficiaries manage to have the different capitals for successful livelihood
approaches? Have they been able to access knowledge and finance, and become
socially inclined and economically viable in their businesses as a result of post-
settlement support?
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY FOR LAND REFORM AND BENEFICIARY SUPPORT

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes:

(i) the research methods followed in identifying the case study;
(ii) the methods used in identifying the respondents;
(iii) data collection processes followed, and
(iv) the method used to verify the findings.

The chapter outlines the process followed and justifies the choice of methodology and its suitability to accomplish the intended results. It also explains the step-by-step process followed in the design and the use of data collection tool.

3.2 METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH AND PARADIGM

Research methodology:
This study focuses on the qualitative approach.

According to Biber and Leavy (2006: 5), qualitative research has an exciting interdisciplinary landscape that is rich in generating knowledge. The qualitative research method involves a holistic approach, meaning that it is reflexive and process-driven and in the end produces culturally-situated and theory-enmeshed knowledge through an ongoing interplay between theory and method, researcher and researched (ibid).

The qualitative approach that was used has given the researcher enough space to interact with the respondents during the interviews. Being descriptive and explanatory
made it very easy and interesting and allowed the respondents to open up when answering. This helped to get more inside information and more clarity than it could have been with closed questions.

Research paradigm:

Interpretivist

This paradigm focuses on participant’s subjective experiences and how they relate to each other regarding the project – in this case Koekedouw Farmers. The researcher relies on the participants to obtain more information about Koekedouw farmers. The information has been recorded accurately for the correct interpretation of the participants’ views and opinions.

3.3 THE CASE CONTEXT, RESEARCH ASSUMPTION LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATIONS

The case background: The Koekedouw farming community is relatively small. Only five farm managers (one from each farm), four extension officers, one official from Nedbank, two officials from the Land Bank, one official from the Witzenberg Municipality and one official from Absa Bank were interviewed. Furthermore, due to the nature of the study, time was very limited and this resulted in the selection of specific key people.
This research was carried out in the local municipality of Witzenberg, Cape Winelands District in the Western Cape. In this municipality, there are many farmers who have benefitted from the land reform programme, but the study focused on the case of the Koekedouw farmers. Koekedouw is an organisation which comprises five individual farm members. Each member owns a piece of land received from the government under the land reform programme and all five farms were used for this study. These farms are close to each other. They had almost similar circumstances and yet they have achieved different levels of success. It was very helpful to understand how each of them managed to make or not make a better living, given the constraints with which they were confronted.
Research Assumptions and Delimitations

The study took into consideration the following assumptions:

Not all land reform projects fail due to solely post-settlement support. Post-settlement support is key and fundamental to the success of LRAD farms. Not all the intended participants in the study finally participated in the study; some of the beneficiaries did not know what was happening on their farms due to positions they occupied – forefront leaders of each project should be kept informed of what is happening on their farms.

The people in the area were predominantly Afrikaans speaking. As the researcher’s understanding of Afrikaans is only about 65%, it would have been difficult to conduct the interviews in Afrikaans. Therefore, the most knowledgeable people in the projects who could easily and fluently express themselves in English were selected. This was also done to avoid the use of translators or interpreters, as they are sometimes too costly, difficult to manage and at times not available. The level of education was low for the majority of the beneficiaries. There was a general lack of understanding relating to the kind of business in which they are involved. There were discrepancies about who owned the business, as few of the beneficiaries were currently involved and the majority of them were not involved. Lastly, the majority of the beneficiaries were in conflict with each other; this research is only limited to Koekedouw farmers and not the rest of LRAD beneficiaries in the rest of the country. Due to financial constraints, the use of electronic voice recording device was not possible.

It was decided not to embark on the entire community of LRAD in the area since not all the LRAD farms are dependent on post-settlement support from financial institutions (for example, equity share schemes). Only the farm managers were interviewed, as it was discovered that they expressed themselves well in English. Finally, the questions were limited to areas where it could be observed whether there had been improvement in the
livelihood of the beneficiaries. This made it possible to use sustainable livelihood pentagons to measure the improvements made thus far.

### 3.4 Research Design and Methods

Due to the nature of the projects studied and the total number of available farms that could be studied, a case study research design was employed. According to Anastas (1999), a case study is useful in narrowing down a broad study and making it easier to study and analyse the problem and suggest solutions.

A qualitative method of research in the form of semi-structured interviews was used in gathering the data. Semi-structured interviews are a ‘qualitative method of enquiry that combines a pre-determined set of open-ended questions with the opportunity for the interviewer to explore particular themes or responses further’ (www.toolbox.net.au). Semi-structured interviews are used to ‘collect data in a variety of research designs’, may introduce the question or a topic in different ways to achieve appropriation for each interview and it gives an opportunity to the participants to respond in their own way using their own words (Matthews & Ross, 2010: 221). Semi-structured interviews had a series of questions with probes/open-ended questions that made it possible to obtain additional information with clarity. This made it possible to probe while considering that respondents might feel threatened by some of the questions. These questions were left and asked later using different phrasing (Leedy, 1997: 199).

The tool used to gather information from the respondents was an interview guide (see appendices A and B) consisting of questions in order of category. The questions were used for a number of reasons, including giving the respondents opportunities to express their answers using their own words and also to give the answers that came closest to describing the appropriate responses (Stopher, 2012: 145). These questions were constructed in a manner that sought to reduce the chances of impairing the study (Leedy, 1997: 221).
In addition, another semi-structured interview guide was used to collect information from government and private stakeholders involved in providing support to the beneficiaries of land reform. The reason for using two different sets of questions was that the information required from the stakeholders was different from that required from the beneficiaries.

The questions for the farmers/beneficiaries had two parts: The first part was about profiles of the farms/beneficiaries and the second part collected demographic information about farms and beneficiaries. The interview was personally administered by the researcher while visiting the farms in order to observe the situation on the farms and interview the respondents. This approach also helped to ask follow-up questions in cases where respondents gave answers that required probing for clarity.

The questions for the stakeholders (government officials and banks) were e-mailed to them. Pre-notification e-mails were sent to the selected stakeholders as a means of building expectations and to reduce the possibility of respondents disregarding the questions when they received them. Telephone calls were also made in order to prepare the respondents in advance. The pre-notification e-mails included a brief description of what the study was about and the purpose of the results. Furthermore, the e-mails served to inform stakeholders of the confidentiality of their identities in the final research results. Telephone calls were also made in order to clarify ambiguous information provided by the respondents and to obtain responses to unanswered questions where possible.

3.5 RESEARCH PROCESS

3.5.1 The entry point and key respondents

A sample of respondents from the farmers was selected. According to Webster (1985), as cited by Mugo (2002), a sample can be defined as a ‘finite part of a statistical population whose properties are studied to gain information about the whole. The entry point into the study was choosing a sample of key respondents from each farm as
convenient sampling, which is sometimes associated with fewer costs to the researcher, in terms of time, effort and money’ (Marshall, 1996). Four farms were chosen, based on the fact that they were adjacent to each other. Research on the farms commenced in more or less the same year and season. Only the managers on these farms were interviewed, since they were the ones who were well informed about everything taking place on the farms. One extension officer from the Department of Agriculture, an official from the local municipality and an official from the commercial were also interviewed. All these respondents were identified as key respondents representing their institutions.

As was intended, the above information reflects on the initial target of the respondents. The initial intention was to have as large a sample as possible, but some of the respondents did not reply and they did not state their reasons for this lack of response. No follow-ups were made with them since participation was voluntary. It was also important that the researcher did not make demands on the respondents, since it was important to maintain good relationships.

3.5.2 Reflections from the field work

Taking into account that the respondents and the researcher know each other well and that they have a good working relationship, it was not difficult to approach them. Visiting the farms was very easy since all the farms were adjoining. Making appointments to see them on same day in order to save costs was impossible and as a result the interviews took place over two days. The researcher managed to interview three of the five farmers on the first day and two on the next day.

Officials from the institutions received questions via e-mail, and the completed questionnaires were e-mailed back to the researcher. They first received phone calls to ask whether they were prepared to participate in the process. This was done to prepare them and make sure that the questions were sent to those who agreed and also to make sure that they became aware that they are participating voluntarily.
3.5.3 The empirical challenges

The empirical challenge in this study was that, although it was made very clear to farmers that the researcher was visiting them in a private capacity, the researcher was still received and treated in the same way as he was when visiting in an official capacity. In some of the discussions, the farmers would refer to experiences they had had during the course of the researcher giving them services as a government official. Some of them were trying not to jeopardise their chances of being funded by my taking the side of the farmers. They knew that the next morning they would be knocking on the researcher’s door looking for financial support.

3.6 DATA ANALYSIS

As the study used qualitative data, it was important to analyse data from ‘forward to backward’ and ‘backward to forward’ as supported by Hardy & Bryman (2004: 1). The approach taken for this analysis was more exploratory in nature. After collecting the data from the two groups – namely, the farmers and the post-settlement supporting institutions – some of the grouping of the answers was done. A huge exercise was the writing down of the responses of each respondent while noting the main fact from each respondent. As a social developmental practitioner, it was not about the numbers, frequencies or modes, but the impact that post-settlement support has on the livelihood of the beneficiaries.

After the responses were organised by themes, the main issues that were most prevalent were firstly considered as common characteristics related to specific questions. All the questions were grouped in the same way in order to avoid the chances of having lengthy discussions that could lead to too much time needed to reach conclusions. The other important aspect in analysing the data was that the researcher focused on responses that were making contributions to answering the research questions. Even though all the information provided by the respondents was equally important and valuable, it was important that the researcher focused on the information that clearly attempted to answer the research question.
The analysis indicates that statistical information on the questions should lead to the use of mixed methods. The procedural systemic approach was used with the intention of ensuring that the flow of information was smooth and without destructive errors. It was also done to ensure that the procedure was systemic and able to lead to sound conclusions (Hardy & Bryman, 2004: 2).

3.7 VERIFICATION

Reliability: The reliability in this study was tested by making sure that the research question was clear and the sub-questions and features of the design were also found to be congruent with the questions. The researcher was clearly articulated and described within the context of this research. The findings were well in support of each source used throughout the entire research work. Relevant sources were used, time frames adhered to with reasonable deviations and the respondents were as suggested in the research concept. The quality of work was assured by avoiding possible bias and deceit, since the respondents had had long working relationships with the researcher (Miles & Huberman, 1994: 278).

Validity: The information was validated by taking a position of ethnographic authority which is referred to as analytic-procedural adequacy. This process is based on the assumption that gives rise to validity as something that can be achieved from adherence to a ‘systematic analytic procedure’ (Lee & Fielding, 2004: 543). It should be clearly stated that since the data was gathered through interviews, the micro-analysis was used as recommended by Agar & Hops (cited in Lee & Fielding, 2004: 543).

The validation was done by looking into statements that supported each other and also statements that contradicted each other. As this was a backward and forward process, it was practical that the information could be concluded without too many assumptions being made. The presence and the absence of the information during data analysis helped to identify whether there was background information on the statement, as the absence of information has potential to lead to poor and unreliable information (ibid).
3.8 ETHICS

This researcher regarded the issue of ethics very seriously. The human subject was not the main part of this research. The elements of the research where the human element was involved should be stated in the purpose of the research, it should be for professional use and the research findings should present honesty and should be without distortion. It was stated that participation was voluntary in this research. This research did not deal with sensitive and/or vulnerable individuals. It was planned that should it come out in the process that such individuals were involved, measures were put in place to properly and professionally communicate with all the organisations concerned so that ethical standards were adhered to at all times (Leedy, 1997:116).
4.1. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the data collected from the farms and institutions responsible for post-settlement support are discussed and analysed. Based on the responses, the background of the farms, empirical findings, discussion on the situation on the farms and livelihood implications are discussed in greater detail. Information in this chapter is only limited to the farms and the institutions that responded to the study.

Figure 2: Combined agricultural landscape
4.2 EMPIRICAL FINDINGS FROM THE FARMS

4.2.1 Trevor Boerdery (Farm I)

Trevor Boerdery is an LRAD fruit and vegetable farm, producing mainly stone and deciduous fruits. This farm was once owned by a Caucasian farmer and it is not known why the farm was sold. The farm covers a total of 46 hectares and was acquired in 1999 by four beneficiaries who are relatives. From 1999 to 2014 the total number of beneficiaries grew from four to eight, as some new family members joined the project. Four of the beneficiaries are aged between 19 and 35 and are regarded as youth, and the other four are aged between 36 and 50. Three of the beneficiaries are employed outside the project (Interview I, 6 September 2014).

When this project started, there were no fruit trees planted on the farm. Currently, 24 hectares of the farm has been planted with fruit and the remaining 23 ha are in production. The beneficiaries are selling some of their products directly to local and international markets, while some produce is sold indirectly through fruit packers and marketing companies. Part of the produce is sold raw, while some is sold as value-added product. The project manager, who is also a board member of the Breede Overberg Catchment Management Agency (BOCMA), receives a stipend from BOCMA for attending the board meetings. He has a Master’s degree in education and has also attended short courses in agricultural production (Interview I, 6 September 2014).

According to the manager, Mr Trevor Abrahams, who is also a beneficiary of the Trevor Boerdery project, the project has received significant support from the Department of Agriculture through the facilitation of change agents from the department. He indicated that with the help of the change agents – ‘change agent’ in this context refers to the different organisations that provide goods and services to the LRAD farms – the department assisted him with infrastructure, implements, production inputs, planting materials, training and market access experienced through exposure trips, including overseas trips. Furthermore, the change agent facilitated the mentoring services as well as linkages with the different support groups, such as mentors, banks and fruit commodity and other government institutions. It was also indicated by the project
manager that the change agents have demonstrated skillfulness in their work and have become excellent at their jobs, especially since 1994. Although Mr Abrahams has indicated that the support from the change agent and the Department of Agriculture has been significant in his farming practice, he has expressed some challenges in terms of other forms of support. Mr Abrahams indicated that they are still in need of support to access more land and value chain facilities such as packing, cooling and controlled rooms. Economies of scale, labour costs and production costs were also major challenges. However, it was indicated by the manager that there have been significant improvements due to the post-settlement support which they received for the project. He emphasised that the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP) should be given as a grant and not as a loan (Interview I, 6 September 2014).

Mr Abrahams has received support from different institutions, some of which are profit-making while the others are not. All these institutions have different requirements in order to render support. The requirements include business plans, tax clearance certificates, water rights, financial history, compliance certificates and global Good Agricultural Practice (GAP). He further indicated that they get regular weekly visits from profit-making institutions such as fertiliser companies, and bi-monthly visits from the change agent from the Department of Agriculture. Mr Abrahams indicated that support from the different institutions is critical for his business and that it has added to his learning and the success of his business (Interview I, 6 September 2014).

4.2.2 La Vouere (Farm II)

The La Vouere project is a 110-hectare farm. It produces deciduous and stone fruit and racing horses are bred on the farm. The farm was acquired through the LRAD programme in 2003 with own contribution of R500 000, which was paid by the beneficiaries as an outstanding balance to reach the costs of the farm. The project leader, Mr Raymond Koopstad, has now quit his job to give attention to the project. R500 000 was acquired from the sale of the project leader’s house and from the savings of a business that he had had before venturing into farming. Some of the members were related and others were from the surrounding community. It was not disclosed how many were related and how many were community members. Three of the previous
beneficiaries have passed on, while the other three resigned from the project. Currently, the farm is managed by Mr Raymond Koopstad, who is actively involved in farmers’ organisations such as African Farmers Association of South Africa (AFASA) and United South African Agricultural Association (USAAA). There are 24 beneficiaries. The project manager has a degree in education, short courses in fruit production and financial management, and is currently studying towards a certificate in business compliance. Seven of the beneficiaries are between the ages of 19 and 35, while 12 are between the ages of 36 and 50. Five are over the age of 51. None of the beneficiaries have any form of extra income. The farm was previously owned by a Caucasian; it is not known why the previous owner sold the farm. Currently, the whole farm is in production and products are sold directly to the market in their raw state (Interview II, 6 September 2014).

The farm manager reported that the La Vouere project has received support from both governmental and non-governmental organisations. The personal loan that was received from the bank has enabled the project managers to purchase inputs and install an irrigation system on the farm. The support which was received from the Department of Agriculture through the facilitation of the change agent has enabled the project members to prepare the soil for planting, plant four hectares of fruit trees and purchase two racing mares. He further indicated that the requirement for the support by the different institutions include a business plan, financial statements, tax clearance, soil analysis reports, certifications, market contracts and safety compliance (Interview II, 6 September 2014).

Although Mr Koopstad mentioned that they have received support from the Department of Agriculture as well as a loan from the bank, the support they received was not sufficient as they still need funds for production capital, upgrading of the infrastructure on the farm, main line irrigation, harvesting bins, reservoirs, a fork lift truck and shaded netting for the fruit during the harvesting season. He says that they are reliant on free services from private institutions. On the issue of change agents’ skillfulness, Mr Koopstad indicated that although he perceives them to be highly skillful, there are only a
few available, thus, either the extension support is minimal or the office is understaffed (Interview II, 6 September 2014).

However, through the support of the different institutions, the project members have learnt about the importance of food security to the country, and also relationships with fellow farmers. In general, Mr Koopstad has indicated that there are a lot of opportunities available in farming for the previously disadvantaged (Interview II, 6 September 2014).

4.2.3 Deheuwel Estate (Farm III)

The Deheuwel Estate project is an 18-hectare family-owned farm, owned by four beneficiaries who are active members of the farmers’ organisation, AFASA. Three of the beneficiaries are between the ages of 19 and 35 and one is older than 51. The farm was acquired through the LRAD programme in 1999. The beneficiaries have about 14 years of farming experience on the same farm. The main commodity of this farm is deciduous fruit. When the farm was acquired, it was not in production and there were no trees planted. Currently, only four hectares of the farm are planted and in production. No formal markets exist and the produce is sold raw direct to the informal market (Interview III, 6 September 2014).

According to the project initiator and farm manager, Mr Denis Jacobs, the project receives support from different institutions which are governmental, private or profit-making. These are: the Department of Agriculture, chemical companies, Department of Rural Development and Land Reform and the fruit industry. The requirements for support from these institutions include business plans, financial statements, soil and water analysis reports and proof of markets. Through these institutions, they have received funds for an irrigation system covering 6 hectares and planting material for 4.2 hectares. Although the project has received support, Mr Jacobs still feels that they should be further supported in order to be able to have working capital and purchase a bakkie, a truck, a tractor, sprayers, forklift, harvesting bins and implements. With regard to skillfulness and level of support that the change agents offer, Mr Jacobs revealed that although the officials are skilled, they would do better with more change
agents so that when the one is on leave, there would be someone available to help with problems. He mentioned that he has not seen much improvement in his livelihood from the farm and has invested much on the farm without good return. He mentioned lack of mentors, implements and working capital as his main challenges. It was indicated that the employees on the farm receive income from other jobs outside the farm, such as delivery jobs for shops and work in cafés. Mr Jacobs reported that his relationship with other farmers is good, and he added that the lack of funding and support from some institutions has led to some farmers re-selling the farms back to the previously advantaged white people (Interview III, 6 September 2014).

4.2.4 Dampies Boerdery (Farm IV)

The Dampies Boerdery project is a 13.2-hectare fruit-producing LRAD acquired farm with an initial four beneficiaries. This farm was acquired in 1999 and enjoys good relations with neighbouring farmers. There is currently only one beneficiary on the farm, Mr Dampies, who obtains extra form of income from his wife’s work as a seasonal worker. One beneficiary has since passed on and the other two were bought out by Mr Dampies as they were not showing any interest in farming. Eleven hectares of the farm are currently planted, but only eight hectares are in production. The produce from this farm is marketed directly and indirectly to the pulp industry and some is sold as raw produce to the neighbouring farmer. The current beneficiary is a member of AFASA (Interview IV, 6 September 2014).

According to Mr Dampies, he received support from the different institutions to plant eleven hectares of fruit trees and to cover labour costs, inputs, a tractor, pump irrigation infrastructure, market linkages and training. Mr Dampies indicated that he receives support from government and private institutions, such as extension services from the Department of agriculture, chemical companies and private extension officers who visit on a weekly and monthly basis. According to Mr. Dampies, the prerequisite for getting support from these institutions is having business plans, completed request forms, soil test results, water rights and budget and cash flow statements. However, it was indicated by Mr Dampies that, although he is receiving support, he is not accessing support for markets, mentorship and certification or cooling and storage facilities. He
indicated access to markets and economics of scale as his biggest challenges. He further indicated that the extension officials are skillful and helpful and he learns a lot from them. Although a lot is still lacking in terms of support, his farm is breaking even. In general, Mr Dampies indicated that the Department of Agriculture is always willing to assist farmers like him (interview IV, 6 September 2014).

4.2.5 Table and the chart representing the land planted since inception of the farm

Table 2: Percentage of productive land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm Name</th>
<th>Size of Farm</th>
<th>Total hectares planted</th>
<th>Hectares in production</th>
<th>Percentage productive land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Boerdery</td>
<td>46ha</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dampies Boerdery</td>
<td>13.2ha</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Vouire</td>
<td>110ha</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Heuwel</td>
<td>18ha</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above information shows how the farms have progressed in terms of planted land since land was given to the beneficiaries. All these farms have the same environmental and climatic conditions, and have similar status in terms of natural resources potential to produce. Trevor Boerdery has 50% of its total farm productive, on total land of 46 ha. Dampies Boerdery has 61% of its total farm productive from 13.2 ha of total land. La Vouire has 5.4% of its total farm productive from 110 ha of total land. De Heuwel has planted 23% of its total farm productive from 18 ha total land.
The below information shows decreases and increases on different farms in terms of the beneficiary numbers, from the inception to the current situation. There is an increase in Trevor Boerdery. De Heuvel's number of beneficiaries remains the same. There is a decrease in number of beneficiaries for both La Voire and Dampies.

Figure 3: Differences in the number of initial and current beneficiaries
4.3 EMPIRICAL FINDINGS FROM THE INSTITUTIONS

4.3.1 Commercial bank (Institution I)

According to the commercial bank, their involvement with land reform beneficiaries is usually required when the beneficiaries need to open banking accounts. When this happens, the bank arranges training and question and answer sessions where farmers are extensively trained on how to manage their bank accounts. This is important because any potential funder would need to see the financial behaviour of a business when making a decision to provide funding. The prerequisite of the bank to the beneficiaries is a willingness to admit to their need for help. Furthermore, in order to receive help, the beneficiaries need to have proof of identity, proof of residence and compliance with Financial Intelligence Centre Act (FICA). Moreover, the people who are part of a group and want to open an account need to provide the bank with the necessary legal documentation, such as the constitution and business registration documents.

The one major challenge experienced by the bank is the lack of follow-through by the beneficiaries, as they lack the necessary means like transport and funds to keep on visiting the bank for more support. Regarding the challenges and advice on the land reform project, the manager of the selected bank indicated that basic financial training should be offered to the beneficiaries in order to ensure that they have an understanding of financial management. According to the manager, this requires involving the right trainers and trainees; the trainers must be experts in the subject of financial management.

The bank manager further indicated that in order for projects to be successful, there is a need for commitment and accountability from the beneficiaries. He also indicated that due to lack of experience in handling funds and responsibility, most projects fail. According to the bank manager, hard work, commitment, patience, skilfulness and the willingness to succeed are characteristics of a good farmer. The bank manager concluded by indicating that his bank is always ready and willing to assist any farmer who shows commitment and willingness to making a success of their project.
4.3.2 Department of Agriculture (Institution II)

According to the extension officer interviewed, the support that the department offers includes inputs, infrastructure development and wages. Training and market access overseas are also part of the support offered by the department. However, in order to qualify for support, the beneficiaries need to have farm land, water rights from the Department of Water Affairs and a completed request form for funding. As a department, they face challenges such as lack of skills in relation to the type of commodity pursued, lack of financial management skills and large numbers of beneficiaries on a small piece of land. The officer indicated that if a project is to work, the number of beneficiaries allocated to a piece of land should be limited to one or two and selection of these beneficiaries should be based on merit. Passion for farming, knowledge of the business goals and commodity know-how should characterise the farmer if land reform is to work. He further mentioned that good training, improved advisory services and exposure to markets should be priorities in the improvement of farmers. The officer indicated the importance of support of the Land Bank and the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) to the farmers. He also said that the approach to land reform should be revisited, especially on the question of beneficiary numbers.

4.3.3 Municipality (Institution III)

According to the Local Economic Development (LED) official from the municipality, the support that is offered to the beneficiaries is in the form of land, water, electricity and sewage. In order to qualify for municipal support, the municipality needs to be involved from the onset. It was indicated by the LED that the challenges which are perceived as contributing to the failure of the land reform projects are lack of skills, too many beneficiaries in a project and lack of sufficient mentorship programmes. The LED also mentioned that passion, commitment, good communication and people skills should characterise farmers. Access to funding, mentorship programmes and the recruitment process were identified as needing immediate attention, while job creation and people empowerment were identified as indicators of success by the LED.
4.4 DISCUSSIONS ON EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

4.4.1 Infrastructure support

The data has revealed that there has been significant improvement, led by the support received from different institutions. The number of hectares planted has increased on all the farms as a result of post-settlement support. The beneficiaries were supported with much-needed farming assets such as tractors, irrigation systems, pack sheds, storage facilities and cool rooms. It should be emphasised that without this infrastructural support, a farm could work, but farmers would have to rely on renting these items, and this is not sustainable.

4.4.2 Institutional support services and the relevancy of the support

The institutions responsible for support services are prevalent and on top of their game. The government institutions have been involved from the inception of these farms, dating back to 1999, and they are still involved. The private institutions have also been involved and have never shown an indication that they will cease supporting these farms, even though some of the farms have clearly shown signs of unsustainable growth. The business, markets and technological skills transfer from private and public institutions are flowing into these farms which make it clear that should these services be fruitfully used, then the positive outcomes are imminent. Most of these beneficiaries had no farming background and the services from these institutions are beneficial.

4.4.3 General characteristics of LRAD beneficiaries

The majority of the LRAD beneficiaries do not have business skills, have had little farming experience during their farming inception and they do not fully understand the farming business, especially technical issues. This assumption does not apply to all beneficiaries, because some of them had tertiary education. Even though the qualifications were not related to agriculture, they are classified as learned people who can differentiate between good and bad business decisions. Most of the beneficiaries were found to have unhealthy banking accounts and that was making them become ‘unbankable’. This made it almost impossible to access business loans from commercial
banks. The farming information is also difficult to obtain from LRAD beneficiaries, due to poor record keeping. They are not competent in the market due to poor production management and, in some instances where the produce is good, they are found to be lacking good markets and therefore their produce is bought below premium prices.

4.4.4 Relating the livelihood framework to the findings

Sustainable livelihood is the concept that looks into a combination of various capitals (assets) or resources in order to achieve livelihood strategies. Those capitals are physical, natural, economic, human and social (Scoones, 1998).

4.4.4.1 Physical Capital

The beneficiaries of LRAD have access to physical capital by means of support through infrastructure development. Through its grant system, the government has supported the beneficiaries with infrastructure such as irrigation systems, trellising, dams and pack sheds. If it was not for this infrastructural support, it would have been difficult for these beneficiaries to reach the levels that they have. Fruit and vegetable farming without irrigation systems, trellising materials, pack sheds and dams is not possible in the farming fraternity.

4.4.4.2 Natural capitals

The use of natural capital is fundamental, especially in agriculture, where land, water and environmental factors are considered together in order to achieve sustainable livelihood. The government of South Africa has made a combination of natural capitals in the form of land reform to the beneficiaries, which was the first step towards employment, poverty reduction and closing the inequality gap. Sometimes, the land includes water rights, environmental compliance and good air quality, depending on the area. These physical capitals are primary means for production. For the beneficiaries who have received these capitals, it can be concluded that one of the most important capitals for them to meet their livelihood has been met, as the environment has enabled them to create a better livelihood.
4.4.4.3 Economic or Financial Capital

The economic or financial capital gain in the LRAD proved to be positive by the fact that the beneficiaries are able to create employment for themselves and others. For more than ten years, the beneficiaries have been able to live on these farms and make a living from their produce. There is income generation in the form of employment and equity sharing. Through the development of their farms, some have been able to access loans from financial institutions and grants from different institutions.

4.4.4.4 Human Capital

In terms of human capital development, it is evident that with the support received from the different institutions, the beneficiaries have been able to develop their skills to run farming businesses. They have been trained by the Department of Agriculture and other interested institutions, such as chemical companies. There are continuous programmes – especially from government and commodity organisations – to empower these beneficiaries and develop them to become better business people. They also received life skills and soft skills training through the Department of Agriculture.

4.4.4.5 Social Capital

The social capital element has been significantly improved, as the farmers have been able to affiliate to farmers’ organisations such as AFAASA and NAFU. They have also become members of commodity organisations such as Hortgro, SATI and VinPro and also have relationships amongst themselves, in which they even share the implements. In addition, they have created an organisation in which they run a mechanisation centre. The relationship between these farmers is good and works for all of them.
4.5 EMPIRICAL FINDINGS IN RESPONSE TO THE QUESTIONS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

4.5.1 Effectiveness and efficiency of post-settlement to the beneficiaries of LRAD

The study found that the most prevalent forms of support are coming from the government in the form of grants and also from private institutions, namely, commercial banks. From the time the beneficiaries took over the farms, many improvements have been identified, especially in the form of training, infrastructure, input and implements and food security (Manenzhe 2007:103). In addition, the farmers have been linked with possible markets in order to sell their produce. The government is mainly responsible for the increase in the number of hectares planted and the provision of tractors, stores and machinery. These are the main contributing assets which enable these farms to carry on with their farming business.

4.5.2 Institutions responsible for giving post-settlement support to the beneficiaries of LRAD

Institutions that were identified as actively involved were the Department of Agriculture (DOA) with CASP, technical advices, training and market linkages, the commercial banks offering loans, land banks offering loans with lower interest rates, and general support from institutions such as local government and NGOs. This study found an opposing opinion to that of Manenzhe (2007:112). In his studies, Manenzhe claims that there is an absence of post-settlement support in the form of grants, extension advice and appropriate planning.

4.5.3 Role-playing by the post-settlement support institutions

Respondents’ responses show that all the institutions are playing their supporting roles. The challenge in this aspect is that each and every institution has its own package to offer in different forms and sizes. For example, the role played by the Department of Agriculture is quite different from the role of the local municipality. The DOA is offering tangibles, while the role of the municipality is mainly to mobilise resources for the
farmers from different sources. Aliber et al. (2013: 268) highlight lack of support from commercial banks and also point to the government support as being too little.

4.5.4 Beneficiaries’ livelihood improvement as a result of post-settlement support

The beneficiaries’ livelihood has improved significantly because of support they received from different institutions through different agents. It should be stated that the level of improvement differs from farmer to farmer. In general, the visible evidence such as employment creation, infrastructural improvement, involvement and participation in the organisations, such as the farmers’ union, is an indication of a certain degree of improvement in their livelihood. Aliber et al. (2013: 268) express the view of an extension officer as a complete opposite to the latter, and that one particular approach of land reform, SLAG, is a disaster, meaning it did not positively contribute to the livelihood of the beneficiaries.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, INSIGHT AND CONCLUSION

5.1 SUMMARY

There is a wealth of information and study surrounding the issue of land reform in South Africa. Even though there is much information on this subject, there is still a paucity of information around the alignment of post-settlement support programmes from different institutions and how they impact on the livelihoods of the land reform beneficiaries. Furthermore, there is still scanty research on how the beneficiaries of land reform are making their livelihoods outside the land reform programme. Based on the latter, this research has taken the case study approach in attempting to understand how the different institutions involved in the post-settlement support strategy have been aligned in support of the land reform beneficiaries to ensure that their livelihoods are indeed improved.

The results of the study will therefore not be necessarily applicable to all the land reform beneficiaries in the Western Cape or even in South Africa. However, the results will shed light into the Koekedouw land reform beneficiaries’ challenges and also give an idea of the challenges that might be affecting land reform beneficiaries elsewhere. The uniqueness of the Koekedouw farmers is that they are close to each other and share many similar problems. These issues include access to finance, infrastructure, markets and sufficient land.

The result of the study shows an increase in the number of hectares planted since they received the farms. Even though the number has increased, the farms still struggle to reach a point where they do not need to depend on the government grant system. The norm in terms of sustainable fruit farming is that a farm should have a minimum of 40 ha planted and in production. When we look at all these farms, they are all under the 40 ha benchmark. This means that they are all surviving by receiving grants from the
government. With this kind of situation, it can easily be concluded that the dependency syndrome on the grant system has been created. All these farms have been receiving grants in the form of inputs, wages, implements and infrastructure since their inception.

The post-settlement support has been effective in that if it had not been available, all these farms would have been sold to other people. The grant system is effective because it is free and farmers do not need to pay it back, unlike loans from commercial banks. The support received from the government contributes directly to the profits and the total farm net worth. The commercial banks still find it difficult to finance these farms as they are not profitable businesses. Of all four farms, only one farm was able to access a loan from a commercial bank. One of the commercial banks approached for the study refused to participate, stating that they did not wish to be involved in land reform farms.

The stringent requirements by the commercial banks are difficult for the LRAD beneficiaries to meet. It is understandable, as they are profit-makers and cannot take risks in businesses such as land reform farms. Even if the banks become interested in using the property as collateral, the small farms would not be able to pay back the loans and be sustainable. The farms in which commercial banks invested money, were eventually sold under auction by the banks. This was seen in the early stages of this study in the case of Kleineikeboom.

5.2 IMPLICATIONS

The respondents indicated that the main visible institution is DOA. This is understandable, as the DOA is primarily responsible for farmer support and development. The other institutions are visible as and when required. The requirements for access to support by each institution are based on the risk management mandate, especially from commercial banks, while government institutions are more concerned with social development.
Apart from qualifications and previous knowledge about farming, the study shows that the beneficiaries are very willing to learn and accept the hardships of farming in order to become successful. From the information gathered from the different beneficiaries, the most successful farmer had a Master’s degree and it should be noted that the qualification was not related to agriculture. Although there is no evidence to connect his level of education with his success, an assumption can be made for a positive correlation of the two elements. The rest of the farmers were found to be not bankable, making it practically impossible for commercial banks to invest in their businesses. As bookkeeping and record management were not up-to-date, there was no back-up information which could be used as reference in decision making.

With regard to change agents, the most visible agent was the extension officers from the DOA. It was noted and pointed out that the extension officers from the DOA are well qualified, knowledgeable and skilful enough to provide extension services to these farmers. The least educated extension officer who is involved in these farms had a minimum qualification of a 4-year Bachelor’s degree in agriculture, with exceptional cases of others having Master’s degrees in business administration (MBA). It was not that easy to determine the skills and level of education of the agents from the private sector, but it seems that the farmers were very keen on their services, stating that they are mainly specialists in their fields of service. The farmers indicated that without the services of these agents, it would have been difficult for them to farm since most of them were not farmers by profession.

5.3 INSIGHT

An adequate support system to the infrastructure is required in order to make these farms viable. Without infrastructure, it is almost impossible to farm successfully. The roads, water use and communication infrastructures should be attended to in order to make it easy to move and transport goods and services to and from the farms. The roads and the networks for communication are in bad condition. If these roads were maintained, this would help to keep the implements in good condition for longer.
Every farmer should be part of the programme to ensure the continuation of human development capital. The management of people, relationships, assets and production should be put in place to assist the beneficiaries. Private and public institutions and individuals should be lobbied to offer their support to these farms. Mentorships should be arranged in order to offer farmer-to-farmer training and knowledge sharing.

The issue of land should be addressed, as the beneficiaries are operating below their potential due to lack of sufficient land. They have marginally small pieces of land that cannot reach commercial level simply because they are too small. Local and international markets should be made available to the beneficiaries; most of the struggle is due to access to poor markets. The large commercially established farmers should also contribute time to assist the emerging producers, since they cannot compete in terms of volumes.

**5.4 CONCLUSION OF THE STUDY**

There is a wealth of information and studies surrounding the issue of land reform in South Africa, but there is still scant information around the alignment of post-settlement support programmes from different institutions and how they impact on the livelihoods of the land reform beneficiaries. Furthermore; there is little research on how the beneficiaries of land reform are making their livelihoods in other ways. Based on the latter, this research has taken the case study approach in attempting to understand how the different institutions involved in the post-settlement support strategy have been aligned in support of the land reform beneficiaries and in ensuring that their livelihoods are indeed improved.

The results of the study will therefore not be necessarily applicable to all the land reform beneficiaries in the Western Cape or even in South Africa. However, the results will shed light on the Koekedouw land reform beneficiaries’ challenges and also give an
idea of the challenges that might be affecting land reform beneficiaries elsewhere. The uniqueness of the Koekedouw farmers is that they are close to each other and share many similar problems, which include access to finance, infrastructure, markets and sufficient land.

The result of the study shows an increase in the number of hectares planted since the beneficiaries received the farms. Even though the number has increased, the farms still struggle to reach a point where they do not need to depend on the government grant system. The norm in terms of sustainable fruit farming is that a farm should have a minimum of 40 ha planted and in production. When we look at all these farms, they are all under the 40 ha benchmark. This means that they are all surviving by receiving grants from the government. It can therefore be concluded that the dependency syndrome has been created by the grant system. All these farms have been receiving grants in the form of inputs, wages, implements and infrastructure.

The post-settlement support has been effective; namely, if it was not there all these farms would have been sold to other people. The grant system is effective because it is free and farmers do not need to pay it back, unlike loans from commercial banks which have to be repaid. The support received by the government contributes directly to the profits and the total farm net worth. The commercial banks still find it difficult to finance these farms as they are not profitable businesses. Of the four farms, only one farm was able to access a loan from a commercial bank. One of the commercial banks approached for the study refused to participate, stating that they were not interested on becoming involved with land reform farms.

The stringent requirements by the commercial banks are difficult for the LRAD beneficiaries to meet. This is understandable, as they are profit makers and cannot take risks on businesses such as land reform farms. The farms are too small for the banks to become interested in using the properties as collateral, as the loan that that the farm requires would not be able to be repaid in order for it to be sustainable. Where the
commercial banks invested money in farms, those farms where eventually auctioned by the banks; this was the case with Kleineikeboom.

Lack of interest from other financial institutions, such as commercial banks, is a contributing factor towards the problems faced by the land reform beneficiaries. The role of commercial banks in the sector is of paramount importance, as it is across all other business sectors. There is room for improvement in support for the emerging farming community by the commercial banking sector. Even though there is an indication that some of the beneficiaries of land reform have access to loans and facilities with commercial banks, it should be mentioned that the access is too difficult for emerging agricultural players. The risk associated with the emerging community is over-managed.

The objectives of the study were discussed and the pitfalls and the gaps that relate to support for the beneficiaries of LRAD were examined. The positive and the negative experiences of the beneficiaries were well documented and identified and possible solutions were suggested. During this study, it was concluded that the post-settlement support provided to the beneficiaries of LRAD is to some degree efficient and effective. There is clear evidence that the livelihood of the beneficiaries has improved as a result of post-settlement support from various supporting institutions. Good progress has been made to date, as the situation has improved significantly.

The study adds to the existing information that relates to post-settlement and livelihood of the beneficiaries of LRAD. It also makes a provision for further research in this subject.
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ANNEXURE