

**THE IMPACT OF LAND REFORM ON THE LIVELIHOODS OF FARM  
WORKERS. THE CASE OF THE OAKS/WILLOWS CITRUS FARM.**

**M.P PAKO**

**2013**

**TITLE**

**THE IMPACT OF LAND REFORM ON THE LIVELIHOODS OF FARM  
WORKERS. THE CASE OF THE OAKS/WILLOWS CITRUS FARM.**

**By**

**Marupeng Phillip Pako**

**Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of  
Masters in Development Studies at the Nelson Mandela  
Metropolitan University**

**December 2013**

**Supervisor**

**Ms Aisling De Klerk**

DEPARTMENT OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION

EXAMINATION SECTION – NORTH CAMPUS

PO BOX 77000

Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University

Port Elizabeth 6013

Tel : +27 (0) 41 504 3206 / 504 3392

Fax : +27 (0) 41 504 9206/ 504 3064

**DECLARATION BY STUDENT**

**NAME:** MARUPENG PHILLIP PAKO

**STUDENT NUMBER:** 211202657

**QUALIFICATION:** MA (DEVELOPMENT STUDIES)

**TITLE:** THE IMPACT OF LAND REFORM ON THE LIVELIHOODS OF FARM WORKERS, THE CASE OF THE OAKS/WILLOWS CITRUS FARM IN MARULENG LOCAL MUNICIPALITY, LIMPOPO PROVINCE.

**DECLARATION**

In accordance with rule G4.6.3, I hereby declare that the above-mentioned treaties/dissertation/thesis is my own work and that it has not previously been submitted for assessment to another university or for another qualification.



**SIGNATURE:** .....

**DATE:** .....22 November 2013....

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the God of Mount Zion (Swika la Thaba ya Sione) for lighting up my way with good health and strength to fulfil my dreams.

My special thanks to my brother Wily for being there for me all the way. To my family and extended family, thank you for your support. I would also like to thank my supervisor, Ms Aisling de Klerk and all who contributed to this work.

## ABSTRACT

South Africa's social, economic and political landscape was shaped by a long and bitter history of land reform and dispossession. It is against this background that the land reform policy was introduced. According to the Department of Land Affairs the objective of land reform was to alleviate poverty and improve the livelihoods of the poor.

Since the introduction of the land reform policy in South Africa, there is no empirical evidence that land reform is improving the livelihoods of its beneficiaries and other affected groups such as farm workers. However government focus has been on how much land was redistributed to the previously disadvantaged and dispossessed.

The study sought to assess the impact of land reform on the livelihoods of farm workers with specific reference to the Oaks/Willows Citrus farm in Maruleng Local Municipality, Limpopo Province. The study focussed on whether this land reform project achieved its intended objective of improving livelihoods and alleviating poverty.

The following groups participated in the study: The farm workers, project committee members, representative of the traditional leader and a representative of the Department of Rural development.

The study found that the livelihoods of the farm workers had not improved after the implementation of this land reform project. The study also revealed that government intervention with post settlement support programmes to monitor progress or offer assistance with regard to farm management and extension services, is very important to ensure that land reform projects achieve their intended objective of reducing poverty and improving the livelihoods of the poor.

# CONTENTS

	<b>PAGE</b>
COVER PAGE	i
TITLE PAGE	ii
DECLARATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
APPENDIX	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
TERMS AND ACCRONYMS	ix
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT</b>	
1.1 Summary of the chapter	1
1.2 Background to the study	1
1.3 Problem statement	2
1.4 Research question	2
1.5 Sub-foci /sub-questions	2
1.6 Aims and objectives of the study	2
1.7 The scope and scale of the study	3
<b>CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	
2.1 Introduction	6
2.2 Land ownership under apartheid	6
2.3 The legal framework for South Africa's new land reform policy	7
2.4 The pillars of the land reform policy	9

2.4.1 Land restitution	9
2.4.2 Land redistribution	10
2.4.2.1 Settlement/land acquisition grant (SLAG) and land redistribution for agricultural development (LRAD)	10
2.4.2.2 Proactive land acquisition strategy (PLAS)	12
2.4.2.3 Land and agrarian reform project (LARP)	13
2.5 Tenure reform	14
2.6 Land reform and livelihoods	15
2.7 Progress and challenges	15
2.8 Conclusion	16

### CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction	17
3.2 Research method	17
3.3 Sampling and population size	17
3.4 Data collection techniques	18
3.4.1. Interview	18
3.4.1.1 Advantages of interview technique in data collection	18
3.4.2 Questionnaire	19
3.4.2.1 Advantages of questionnaire technique	20
3.4.3 Documents review	20
3.4.4 Observation	21
3.5 Data collection and analysis	21

### CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction	22
4.2. Land redistribution	22

4.3. The transfer of the farm to the community	23
4.4. Farm management	25
4.5. Impact on the livelihoods of farm workers	26
4.6. Analysis of the findings	27
<b>Chapter 5: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	
5.1 Introduction	29
5.2 Summary of the chapters	29
5.3 A brief summary of the study area	30
5.4 Recommendations	31
5.5 Conclusion	31
<b>6. BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>7. APPENDIX 36</b>	
A. Interview questions for members of the project committee	36
B. Interview questions for a representative of the traditional leadership	38
C. Interview questions for a representative of Department of rural development and land reform	39
D. A questionnaire for farm workers	39
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	
Figure 1: A map of Limpopo showing Maruleng Local Municipality	3
Figure 2: A photo of part of the Oaks portion of the farm	25
Figure 3: A photo of part of the Willows portion of the farm	25
Figure 4: A photo of what used to be farm buildings	26
Figure 5: A photo of what used to be farm buildings	27



## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 1: The division of the Municipality into 7 main areas</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Table 2: Population composition</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Table 3: Population of Maruleng Municipality</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>TERMS AND ACCRONYMS</b>	<b>ix</b>

**AgriBEE:** Agricultural Black Economic Empowerment

**Apartheid:** A policy of separate development implemented by the old Nationalist government.

**ARDC:** Agricultural and Rural Development Corporation

**ASGISA:** Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative for South Africa

**Bantustands:** Areas designated for black settlement under apartheid rule

**BBBEE:** Broad Based Black Economic Empowerment

**CAP:** Communal Property Association

**CRDP:** Comprehensive Rural Development Programme

**DLA:** Department of Land Affairs

**IFAD:** International Fund for Agricultural Development

**LAND REDISTRIBUTION:** Acquiring land for the purpose of distributing it to the disadvantaged.

**LARP:** Land and Agrarian Reform Project

**LCC:** Land Claim Court

**LRA:** Land Rights Act

**LRAD:** Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development

**MEC:** Member of Executive Council

**OECD:** Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

**PLAS:** Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy

**RDP:** Reconstruction and Development Programme

**RESTITUTION:** the return of land to the people who were dispossessed after 1913

**SLAG:** Settlement/Land Acquisition Grant

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

### 1.1 SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

This chapter introduces the context of the research and background to the study area. It further deals with the research problem and questions, and concludes by outlining the scope and scale of the study.

### 1.2 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Since the dawn of the New South Africa, government came up with legislations, policies, strategies and implementation frameworks to try and improve the livelihoods of the poor and the landless.

It is against this background that the land reform policy was introduced. The objective of the land reform policy was to alleviate poverty and improve the livelihoods of the poor (DLA,1997:7). When a land reform project collapses attention is often paid to the beneficiaries and not the non-beneficiary workers. However, it is the farm workers (non beneficiaries) whose sustainable livelihoods are shattered. These are the poorest and most vulnerable people who very often have worked on the farm all their lives.

The World Bank, in the 1990's demonstrated the correlation between equitable distribution of land and economic growth over time, to assert the causal relationship between land reform and economic growth (Deininger, 2006). While it is widely believed that land reform has a potential to reduce poverty,

*“there is in fact very little empirical basis on which to conclude that land reform improves the livelihoods of those who are its ‘beneficiaries’. This is particularly true of South Africa, where credible studies of livelihood impacts have been almost non-existent. Not only do we not know whether land reform in South Africa is improving the livelihoods of those who have benefited directly from land transfers, we also do not know what the impact of land redistribution has been on other affected groups such as former farm workers who have been displaced by land reform or incorporated within projects”,(Hall,2007:2)*

It is against this background that the study was provoked to assess the livelihoods of farm workers, (beneficiaries and non beneficiaries) after land reform, in The Oaks/willows Citrus Farm, in Maruleng Local Municipality, Limpopo Province. The study focused on how land reform affected the socio-economic conditions of farm workers in the project.

Poverty reduction is one of the main objectives of the South African government. One of the objectives of the land reform policy was to alleviate poverty and improve the livelihoods of the poor. However there is very little empirical evidence that land reform is improving the livelihoods of those who benefited directly and indirectly from it and its impact on other affected groups such as farm workers (Hall, 2007: 2).

### 1.4 RESEARCH QUESTION

What is the impact of land reform on the livelihoods of farm workers, with specific reference to The Oaks/Willows Citrus Farm?

### 1.5 SUB-FOCI /SUB-QUESTIONS

- What version of the land reform policy has been implemented in the project?
- What is the institutional arrangement that underpins land reform?
- What is the impact of land reform on the livelihoods of farm workers?
- What is being done to sustain the livelihoods of these workers?
- What are the lessons learnt from the project

### 1.6 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The general objective of the study was to investigate the impact of land reform on the livelihoods of farm workers in The Oaks/ Willows Citrus Farm. The specific objectives of the study are:

- To assess the role of the stake holders in the project.
- To assess role of the Department of Rural Development towards the success of the project.
- To assess the contribution of the project towards improving the livelihoods of the workers and reducing poverty.
- To assess the perceptions of the participants or the role players in the project.

## 1.7 THE SCOPE AND THE SCALE OF THE STUDY

The study focused on The Oaks/Willows Citrus Farm which is situated in two villages, The Oaks and Willows, in the Maruleng Local Municipality of Limpopo Province. Maruleng Local Municipality covers a total area of 3 244 km<sup>2</sup>, with a total population of 95 769, according to the 2007 survey (Table 2). About 88,73 % of the population live in rural areas, 2,32 % live in urban and 8, 94 % live on farms (Table 3). The two villages are situated about 35 kilometres from the town of Hoedspruit in the area of Bakone (Mamatja) Tribal Authority.



Fig1. Map of Limpopo showing Maruleng Municipality.

Source:[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Map\\_of\\_Limpopo\\_with\\_Maruleng\\_highlighted\\_\(2011\).svg](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Map_of_Limpopo_with_Maruleng_highlighted_(2011).svg)

The people in these villages depend on a variety of livelihood strategies, which include state pensions, kin dependency, farming, livestock, formal and informal employment, remittance from migrant workers and hawking. The project consists of two farm portions namely The Oaks and The Willows. The total farm size of the Oaks portion is 3 329.76 ha and the Willows portion is 2 592.39 ha.

Place	Code	Area (km2)	Population	Most spoken language
Banareng Ba Letswalo	92201	122.29	6,752	Northern Sotho
Banareng Ba Sekororo	92202	210.51	53,268	Northern Sotho
Hoedspruit	92203	7.17	2,052	Afrikaans
Letaba	92204	21.58	2,483	Northern Sotho
Mametja	92205	316.08	26,702	Northern Sotho
Naphuno	92207	10.36	8,188	Northern Sotho
Remainder of the Municipality	92206	2,543.64	12,929	Tsonga

Table 1. The 2001 census divided the municipality into seven main places: SOURCE:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maruleng\\_Local\\_Municipality](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maruleng_Local_Municipality)

<b>Government</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Type</li> <li>Mayor(2012-02)</li> </ul>	Municipal Council Pule Mafologelo
<b>AREA</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total</li> </ul>	3,244 km2
<b>POPULATION (2007)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total</li> <li>Density</li> <li>Households</li> </ul>	95,769 29.5/km2 (76.sg mi) 24.590
Racial makeup (2001)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Black African</li> <li>White</li> </ul>	98.7% 1.3%
<b>FIRST LANGUAGES (2001)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>North Sotho</li> <li>Tsonga</li> <li>Afrikaans</li> <li>Sotho</li> </ul>	87.0% 7.7% 2.7% 1.1%

Table 2: Population composition

SOURCE: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maruleng\\_Local\\_Municipality](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maruleng_Local_Municipality)

The Government inherited the farm from the former homeland of Lebowa and was leased to different farmers over the years. The farm operated under the name, Agricultural and Rural Development Corporation Ltd. The farm had employed 45 people on a permanent basis and during harvest times had employed up to 170 casual labourers. The farm produced citrus (lemons, navels, Valencia's, delta's, pomelo's). Approximately 43% of the crops were exported, 45% sold to the juice factories, 10% sold to the local market, and 2% was sold from the farm (Agricultural and Rural Development Corporation, 2002:4).

The reconciled total population of Maruleng Municipality is as follows:

<b>RURAL</b>	<b>URBAN</b>	<b>FARMING</b>	<b>TOTAL POPULATION</b>
95,162	2,494	9,591	107,247
88,73%	2,32%	8,94%	100%

Estimated Population by Age and Gender:

	<b>0 – 4</b>		<b>5 – 14</b>		<b>15 – 34</b>		<b>35 – 65</b>		<b>over 65</b>		<b>TOTAL</b>
	<b>No</b>	<b>% **</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>	
<b>MALE</b>	5673	5.75	13663	13.86	16425	17.96	8264	8.38	1429	1.45	45456
<b>FEMALE</b>	5762	5.84	13575	13.74	19184	21.77	11407	8.02	3163	3.20	53094
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11435</b>	<b>11,59</b>	<b>27238</b>	<b>27,63</b>	<b>35609</b>	<b>39.73</b>	<b>19671</b>	<b>16.40</b>	<b>4593</b>	<b>4,65</b>	<b>98550</b>

Table 3. Population of Maruleng Municipality

SOURCE: <http://www.maruleng.gov.za/index.php?page=demographics>

Then the farm was handed over to the community through the Traditional Leadership. Under the management of the traditional leadership, production on the farm declined until operations on the farm stopped. Barely eight years after the handover, the farm stands empty with no signs that there was once a farm that sold to commercial markets and there is not a sign of citrus trees. It is for this reason that the study intended to assess the impact of this land reform project on the socio-economic status of farm works.

## **CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

South Africa has gone through a long bitter history of land reform and dispossession under the apartheid rule, which has changed the social, economic and political landscape of the country. This Chapter gives an overview of South Africa's historical past with regard to land ownership. It examines some of the racially based legislation that was passed by the old system of apartheid. The chapter further introduces the legal framework for the land reform policy, and concludes by analysing the progress that has been made since the implementation of the land reform policy.

### **2.2 LAND OWNERSHIP UNDER APARTHEID**

According to Fourie (2000) there were two major Land Acts that were passed early in the twentieth century. These Acts changed the shape of the South African society and their effects will be felt by generations to come. They were the 1913 Land Act No.27 and the 1936 Trust Land Act No.18. According to these Acts 87% of the land was reserved for Whites, Coloureds and Indians, but mostly for Whites. Only 13% was allocated to Black South Africans.

The Native Land Act of 1913 prevented Blacks from developing new farming activities as well as sharecropping and cash rentals outside the areas designated black (Deininger and May 2000:4) The Trust Land Act of 1936 allocated only 13% of the land to Blacks even though they constituted 80% of the population (De Villiers, 2003:46).

These two Land Acts effectively formalised land dispossession. The implication of these two Land Acts for Black South Africans was that most of the areas they could own legally or occupy were in rural areas. Blacks were only allowed as temporary residents in the cities and towns, which were designated for White, Coloured and Indian ownership (Fourie, 2000). Blacks were prohibited from buying land in urban areas by the Natives Law and Amendment Act of 1937. The Group Areas Act was implemented in 1950. From the 1950s Whites, Coloureds and Indians were forced to live in their own designated race group areas, with Whites occupying the largest amount and best located land ( Fourie, 2000). Following the Group Areas Act was the Bantu Authority Act, which provided for the establishment of tribal, regional and territorial authorities (Thwala, 2003:2).

With the introduction of apartheid after 1948 these Black areas became Homelands or Bantustands. The objective of establishing the Bantustands was to remove the citizens of these homelands from South Africa. Black people, who owned land in areas designated for Whites, had their land expropriated by the apartheid Government. Millions of people were forcefully removed and resettled in Homelands (Fourie, 2000).

According to Thwala (2003:3) the estimated number of black people who were forcefully removed and relocated to homelands and townships was more than 3.5 million.

It is estimated that by the 1980s about 88% of all White South Africans lived in urban areas while Black South Africans constituted only 39% (Thwala, 2003:3). "It was also estimated that in 1985, whites had a housing surplus of 37,000 units. On the other hand, Black South Africans in urban areas and homelands had a backlog of at least 342,000 units and 281,269 units respectively according to Human Awareness Programme, 1989," (Stemela, 2007:43).

According to Fourie (2000), "even though the apartheid planners did not want Black South Africans to be part of the South African state, they did want Blacks to work in the cities. Consequently large urban areas called 'townships' were generally located within the closest homeland area to a city or town so that Blacks could commute to the so-called 'White' cities. A daily commuting distance of 180 kilometres was considered acceptable by the apartheid authorities. In some situations, such as in the case of Soweto, dormitory townships were also developed outside those cities that were too far from homelands. This approach meant that, unlike other cities in the world, the rich lived in the central city and the poor lived in the outside areas. This planning approach also pushed up the cost of service in general and transport costs for the poor in particular". The apartheid policies on land ownership had a severe impact on the social, economic and political lives of the Black masses, resulting in huge inequalities between Black and White. This is confirmed by Deviliers (2003:45), "land has for many years been the key for empowering and disempowering people". "The impact of these policies on the whole social, economic and political fabric of South African society is impossible to measure; the resentment it caused is too deep to fathom, its scars too sensitive to touch", (De Villiers, 2003:46).

However, according to De Villiers (2003:46), more than 70% of the poor people still live in the rural parts of South Africa despite the urbanisation in the past decades. These discriminatory policies were abolished in 1991 with the introduction of the Abolition of Racially Based Measurements Amendment Act No.133. The new Government was faced with an uphill battle eliminating racially discriminatory legislation, as there were over 17 000 separate pieces of legislation involved(Fourie, 2000).

### **2.3 THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR SOUTH AFRICA'S NEW LAND REFORM POLICY**

From the forgoing analysis of the apartheid land policies it is vividly clear that these policies left an almost irreparable mark in the South African society. This demonstrates the huge challenge the new government was confronted with.



The land issue is crucial in the history of South Africa, and the successful resolution of the land questions is critically important for stability, democracy, development and poverty reduction (Cousins:www.larl.org.za). It is widely believed that land redistribution together with other programs of rural development can make an important contribution towards reducing poverty and inequalities. The Freedom Charter of 1955 according to Rugege (2004:2) set the goal of sharing the land: "Restriction on land ownership shall be ended, and all the land redivided among those who work it, to banish famine and hunger...All shall have the right to occupy land wherever they choose." In an attempt to achieve the goal of the Freedom Charter the newly elected democratic government introduced the land reform policy. According to Wegerif (2004:10) South Africa's land reform policies were outlined in the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) which identified land reform as a central force to drive rural development. These ideas were entrenched in section 25 of The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act 108, 1996). According to section 25 of The Constitution,

*25 (1) "No one may be deprived of property except in terms of law of general application, and no law may permit arbitrary deprivation of property.*

*(2) Property may be expropriated only in terms of law of general application*

*(a) for a public purpose or in the public interest;*

*(b) and subject to compensation, the amount of which and the time and manner of payment of which have either been agreed to by those affected or decided or approved by a court."*

The section goes on to give a detailed provision for compensation in subsection 3 as follows:

*(3) "The amount of the compensation and the time and manner of payment must be just and equitable, reflecting an equitable balance between the public interest and the interests of those affected, having regard to all relevant circumstances, including:*

*( a ) the current use of the property;*

*( b ) the history of the acquisition and use of the property;*

*( e ) the market value of the property;*

*(d) the extent of direct state investment and subsidy in the acquisition and beneficial capital improvement of the property; and*

*( e ) the purpose of the expropriation.*

*(5) " The state must take reasonable legislative and other measures, within its available resources, to foster conditions which enable citizens to gain access to land on an equitable basis".*

The Act further explains who is or are entitled to restitution or compensation under what conditions in the following subsections:

*(6) "A person or community whose tenure of land is legally insecure as a result of past racially discriminatory laws or practices is entitled, to the extent provided by an Act of Parliament, either to tenure which is legally secure or to comparable redress".*

*(7) "A person or community dispossessed of property after 19 June 1913 as a result of past racially discriminatory laws or practices is entitled, to the extent provided by an Act of Parliament, either to restitution of that property or to equitable redress".*

*(8) "No provision of this section may impede the state from taking legislative and other measures to achieve land, water and related reform, in order to redress the results of past racial discrimination".*

The above subsections of the constitution provide a legal framework for the establishment and implementation of the land reform policy. The main objectives of the land reform policy was to redress the inequalities of apartheid, to foster national reconciliation and stability to underpin economic growth and improve household welfare and alleviate poverty (DLA, 1997:7).

## **2.4 THE PILLARS OF THE LAND REFORM POLICY**

The Department of Land Affairs released the White Paper on South African Land Policy in 1997, which set out the framework for land reform policy (Jacobs et al. 2003:2) Land Reform in South Africa is based on the following pillars: restitution, tenure reform and land redistribution.

### **2.4.1 LAND RESTITUTION**

Restitution of Land Rights Act (LRA) 22 of 1994 makes provision for restitution of land or compensation to people who were dispossessed under discriminatory laws after 1913. This provision is confirmed in section 25(7) of the constitution as indicated above. Restitution involves the return of land to the people who were dispossessed after 1913. According to the Department of Land Affairs(1997), *"the goal of the restitution policy is [1] to restore land, [2] provide other redistributing remedies to people dispossessed by racially discriminatory legislation, in such a way as to provide support to the vital process of [3] reconciliation [4], reconstruction, and [5] development" (White Paper on South African Land Reform Policy, 1997).*

The government has implemented provincially based restitution commissions and Land Claim Court (LCC), to act as final arbiter in restitution cases (Thwala, 2003:12).

The Restitution process between 1994 and 1998 was very slow. Initially the government set target goals of transferring 30% of medium to high quality white owned farmland to about 600 000 beneficiaries by 31 December 1998 (De Villiers,2003:51).This target was changed several times and the latest deadline of transferring 30% of agricultural land into black hands is 2014 (<http://www.etu.org.za/toolbox/docs/government/land.html>).

By December 1998, the number of claims submitted by December 1988 was 40 000 and of that only 27 claims had been settled, while only six changed hands and claims had been settled by mid 1988 (Didiza, 2006). Less than two percent of the land claimed through the land reform programme had been returned to black ownership (Du Plessis, 2003). The process however began to increase speed by November 2001, where 68 878 claims had been received and 12 863 claims had been settled. The slow progress of restitution is attributed to budgetary constraints. The Department of Land Affairs and Land Court and Land Commission have never had enough financial or human resources to effectively implement the program. With an annual budget of R1.3 billion, it is estimated that the Restitution Programme will only be completed in 2190 (Hall, 2007). According to the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights (2004), 61% of claims had been settled as of 29 February 2004, with 810 292 hectare transferred to an estimated 616429 beneficiaries. At the end of the restitution process when all the 79,694 claims have been settled, a large proportion of the agricultural land in South Africa will still be in the hands of a few thousand white farmers (Commission on Restitution of Land Rights, 2003).

## **2.4.2 LAND REDISTRIBUTION**

Redistribution refers to the acquisition of land by the state for purposes of distribution to those who have no land or who have inadequate access to land.(Rugege, 2004). Land redistribution is about making land available for agricultural production, settlement and non-agricultural enterprises. Land redistribution is aimed at providing the disadvantaged and the poor who do not qualify for tenure reform or restitution with access to land for agricultural purposes, settlement purposes and for non-agricultural enterprises such as ecotourism projects (DLA, 2001:1).

During the first five years (1994-1999) the main emphasis of land redistribution was to provide the disadvantaged and the poor with land for housing and small scale farming purposes.

### **2.4.2.1 Settlement/Land Acquisition Grant (SLAG) and Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD)**

The redistribution programs were underpinned by the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) plan, which replaced the Settlement / Land Acquisition Grant Scheme (SLAG) in 2001 (DLA,2001:1).

The (SLAG) Scheme was an assistance plan for the poor to purchase land by granting them an amount of R16 000 per household. The objective of SLAG was to uplift the status of the poor and to reduce poverty (Wegerif, 2004:11). "The farms financed with land grants and settled by groups (up to 500 households) were far too small to support all of the beneficiaries as full-time farmers. By the end of 2000, the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Affairs had approved 484 projects under the SLAG programme, transferring 780,407 hectares to 55 383 people, with some 14% headed by women", <http://www.etu.org.za/toolbox/docs/government/land.html>

Not only did individuals qualify for the grant, also groups and communities qualified. Because of the unsustainable nature of SLAG, a new approach, LRAD, was implemented in 2001. LRAD is market oriented, encourages market liberalization, less state interference and reduction of subsidies. Unlike SLAG, LRAD beneficiaries don't have to be poor to apply for the grant of R20 000. Moreover those who have more savings in their possession qualify for larger loans and grants to finance their farms (Wachter 2010:72). LRAD grants amount between R20 000 and R100 000 per individual depending on your contribution. One of the objectives of LRAD is to increase access to agricultural land by black people (Africans, Coloureds, and Indians) and to contribute to the redistribution of approximately 30% of the country's commercial agricultural land (i.e. formerly white commercial farmland) over a period of 15 years (DLA, 2001:1).

The Department of Land Affairs (2001:1) outlined the following aims and objectives of LRAD:

- Increase access to agricultural land by black people (Africans, Coloureds, and Indians) and to contribute to the redistribution of approximately 30 % of the country's commercial agricultural land (i.e. formerly 'white commercial farmland') over a period of 15 years
- Contribute to relieving the congestion in over-crowded former homeland areas
- Improve nutrition and incomes of the rural poor who want to farm on any scale
- Overcome the legacy of past racial and gender discrimination in ownership of farmland
- Facilitate structural change over the long term by assisting black people who want to establish small and medium-sized farms
- Stimulate growth from agriculture
- Create stronger linkages between farm and off-farm income-generating activities
- Expand opportunities for promising young people who stay in rural areas
- Empower beneficiaries to improve their economic and social well-being

- Enable those presently accessing agricultural land in communal areas to make better productive use of their land
- Promote environmental sustainability of land and other natural resources.

Grant approval is based on how viable the proposed project is and the total project cost and project profitability (DLA, 2001:2). The types of projects that can be catered for under LRAD include food-safety-net projects, equity schemes, production for markets and agriculture in communal areas. Purely residential projects are strictly not included. Beneficiaries can also get assistance from DLA to access loans from the Land Bank to make up for any shortfalls for any purchased land (Wegerif, 2004:19).

“Despite the shift in the South African Government’s land redistribution policy in favour of settling prospective farmers on their own farms, the implementation of this new programme has not been without major hiccups as quite a number of land redistribution projects are continuing to perform dismally”.(Nogantshi,2011:33).

Many of the land reform projects in the Eastern Cape Province did not get any support from the private sector and also had not made any contacts with the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform since obtaining the land (Hall, 2004:21). There are some beneficiaries of land reform that received infrastructure grants from the Department of Agriculture, but no one of them were receiving any extension services such as training, extension advice, credit, transport and ploughing services, veterinary services and access to input and produce markets(Human Research Council, 2003:72, Hall, 2004:12).

Another cause of the miseries the land reform beneficiaries are experiencing is the poor communication between the Department of Rural Development and Land Affairs and the nine provincial Departments of Agriculture which are responsible for providing state services to farmers (Lahiff , 2005:11)

#### **2.4.2.2 Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy (PLAS)**

Despite the replacement of SLAG with LRAD the pace of the land reform policy did not improve. This resulted in the implementation of the Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy (PLAS) in 2006. Under PLAS, the state becomes the willing buyer of land for redistribution (Lahiff, 2008:7), which means the state buys land directly from the seller. “PLAS depicts a shift from a ‘needs-based approach’ to a ‘supply-led approach’ dominated by the state” ( Wachter, 2010:78).

The state can then transfer the land to beneficiaries on a leasehold basis for three to five years after which the lessee might then be given an option to purchase the land (Lahiff, 2008:8). According to Lahiff (2008:21), PLAS does not say anything about improved selection of beneficiaries, better planning of land and how to increase productivity on the acquired land. However despite the criticism, PLAS has the following advantages according to the DLA:

- Accelerate the land redistribution process
  - Ensure that the DLA can acquire land in the nodal areas and in the identified agricultural corridors and other areas of high agricultural potential to meet the objectives of ASGISA (Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative for South Africa)
  - Improve the selection and identification of beneficiaries and the planning of land on which people would be settled
  - Ensure maximum productive use of land acquired
- (Lahiff, 2008:21)

#### **2.4.2.3 Land and Agrarian Reform Project (LARP)**

The Land and Agrarian Reform Project is a strategy that emerged as one of the 24 Presidential Priorities in 2007, with the intent to accelerate land redistribution. According to Lahiff (2008:27) LARP addresses some of the important areas of agricultural support services and agricultural trade. LARP has five major objectives:

- The redistribution of five million hectares of white-owned agricultural farmland to 10,000 farm dwellers and new agricultural producers.
- The increase of black entrepreneurs in the agribusiness industry by 10%.
- The provision of universal access to support services to the targeted groups.
- The increase of agricultural productivity and
- To increase agricultural trade by 10-15% for the target groups.

Another important piece of the land reform policy introduced in 2007 was, area-based planning. According to this piece of policy, consultants will be appointed to develop land reform plans for each district. According to Lahiff (2008:8) this is an attempt to intergrade land reform into Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) of local and district municipalities. The implementation of AgriBEE, as required by BBBEE Act 53 of 2003, is also seen as an attempt to de-racialise land ownership, management and procurement in the agricultural sector by 2008 (Lahiff, 2008:9).

## 2.5 Tenure Reform

Land tenure refers to the establishment of secure and formalized rights especially of farm workers and farm dwellers as well as of individuals within the former homeland and communal areas (Van Den Brink et. al. 2006:1)

Legislation was introduced after 1994 to give people security of tenure over houses and land where they work and stay particularly farm workers and labour tenants. The following laws were introduced to give people security of tenure:

**Land Reform Act 3 of 1996:** protecting the rights of labour tenants who live and grow crops or graze livestock on farms; they cannot be evicted without an order from the court, nor if they are over 65 years.

**Extension of Security of Tenure Act 62 of 1997:** this protects the tenure of farm workers and people living in rural areas, including their rights to live on the land and the guidelines for other rights such as receiving visitors, access to water, health, education and so forth. The Act also spells out the rights of owners, and protects against arbitrary evictions.

**Prevention of Illegal Occupation of Land Act 19 of 1998:** This act puts in place procedures for the eviction of illegal occupants and prohibits illegal occupations.

<http://www.etu.org.za/toolbox/docs/government/land.html>

The following different kinds of tenure exist:

**Private ownership:** when a person or business owns the land or house. You have to register a title deed to say that the property is legally yours, and you can sell the land or home at any time and recover monies invested in the property.

**Communal ownership:** The law allows for people to own land or property as a group by forming a Communal Property Association (CPA).

**Renting:** you can rent your home or land from its owner, which could be a private landowner, a company, a local authority or other institution. There are laws that protect the rights of people who rent. <http://www.etu.org.za/toolbox/docs/government/land.html>

## 2.6 LAND REFORM AND LIVELIHOODS

As indicated in chapter one it is widely believed that land reform has the potential to reduce poverty. “While recognising the important role of agricultural development in addressing poverty and inequalities, it should also be clear that the potential of agriculture and agricultural (land) reform itself to reduce poverty is limited” (OECD.2006, 25).

“Thus, arguments of both equity and efficiency are mobilized in support of programmes of land reform that will lead to greater equality in landholding through the creation of more and smaller units of production. This in turn, it is argued, will bring a range of positive outcomes, at multiple levels, including economic growth and poverty alleviation”.(Lahiff, 2007:10).

“Well-targeted policies can reduce poverty by increasing the opportunities for poor people to gain and maintain secure access to productive assets, especially land, water and other natural resources, together with social assets such as extension services, education and basic health care. The nature of their tenure over productive assets and related factor markets has a direct bearing on the extent of lasting benefit and opportunity for the rural poor to improve their livelihoods.” (IFAD 2001: 71)

These arguments imply that with the right policies and support with regard to rural services from government, land reform has the benefit to reduce poverty and improve livelihoods.

## 2.7 PROGRESS AND CHALLENGES

The new democratic government set itself unrealistic targets for land reform. Redistributing 30% of white owned land within five years and resolving all claims within ten years. Progress has been very slow and new policies have been passed one after another. By the end of the Mandela rule little land had been redistributed or restored. During the Mbeki era the targets were revised, the restitution target extended to 2008 and later to 2011, and 30% of farmland had to be redistributed by 2014. However by 2008 a total of 5.8 million hectares (around 5% of commercial farmland) had been transferred to Blacks through restitution and redistribution. 90% of land claims had been resolved, most of them urban claims, but the majority of large rural claims were still unresolved (Cousins, [www.larl.org.za](http://www.larl.org.za)).

The beneficiaries of land reform however are also faced with serious challenges, ranging from lack of support from the private sector, lack of support from government services such as training, extension advice, credit, transport and ploughing services, veterinary services and access to input and produce markets (Hall, 2004:12).

In an attempt to deal with these challenges the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform has come up with a number of strategies to which were included in the Comprehensive Rural



Development Program (CRDP), which is a strategic plan for 2009-2012. While CRDP promises land reform beneficiaries comprehensive support, the “use or loose it” will help encourage them to make an effort to keep production running on the farm. According to the Comprehensive Rural

Development Programme, the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform has prioritised the recapitalisation and development of all distressed land reform projects implemented after 1994. Strategic partnerships will be established by working with the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and fisheries, the Department of water Affairs, the Land bank and the private sector( CRDP,2009).

## **2.8 CONCLUSION**

South Africa’s land reform policy has gone a long way to deracialise land ownership and redistribute land equitably. The new government of 1994 has taken a bold step to draft pieces of legislation that will enable the black majority to get land that was taken from them through racially based laws, and to have access to land through redistribution. However the pace of land reform has been unacceptably low. Targets had been moved occasionally due to government’s inability to meet them whereas on the other hand the beneficiaries of land reform have not reaped the benefits as many of the land reform projects are dysfunctional or on the brink of collapse. This however contradicts the objectives of land reform as the lives of these people have not changed. This also shows the huge task that the government under estimated, nevertheless policies are been refined to meet these challenges.

## **CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### **3.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter gives an outline of the research method and data collection tools that the researcher employed in the study. It provides reasons why the researcher preferred these methods and concludes by giving an overview of how the data were analysed to reflect the participants' experience.

### **3.2 RESEARCH METHOD**

According to Babbie and Mouton (2001:647), research methodology is methods, techniques, and procedures that are employed in the process of implementing the research design or the research plan as well as the underlying principles and the assumption that underlie their use. This study is a case study research. A case study was more appropriate in this study because one of the purposes of this study was to show where problems were, how they occurred and how to solve them. It was therefore proposed that this study should take on a qualitative research approach.

According to Krefting (1991:214), the qualitative research approach is practical for an empirical understanding of the world and reality from the point of view of the subjects themselves. This research paradigm seeks to understand human and social behaviour from the insider's perspective, that is, as it is experienced by the participants in a particular social setting. It is an intensely personal kind of research, one that freely acknowledges and admits "the subjective bias of both participants and researcher into the research frame" (Ary, et al. 2002: 445). Qualitative methods are mainly subjective in nature, however it is the investigator's skills of observation and interpretation that validates the information (Borg and Gall, 1989:379). Quantitative research presents statistical results represented with numbers, while qualitative research presents data as a narration with words (McMillan and Schumacher, 2001:15). According to Bogdan and Bilden (1992), the main aim of qualitative research is to study human beings as human beings, as well as to reject the ultimate irrational pursuit to quantify all aspects of human belief and experiences. This research approach takes into consideration the natural setting as a direct source of data.

The researcher decided to use the qualitative research approach in the study, because qualitative methods are interpretive methods that try to describe and interpret people's experiences and feelings using human terms such as quantification and measurement (Blanch and Durrheim, 1999:123). In other words qualitative research refers to observations that are not easily reduced to numbers. In this approach data collection was open and flexible.

### **3.3 SAMPLING AND POPULATION SIZE**

The research is a case study of The Oaks/Willows Citrus Farm in Maruleng, Local Municipality of Limpopo. According to Blanche and Durrheim (1999:44) sampling refers to a process of deciding which people, settings, events, behaviour and social processes to observe. The purpose of sampling is to ensure that the evidence obtained enables us to answer the research question, to test a theory, to evaluate a programme or to describe some phenomenon.

The researcher conducted interviews with three members of the project committee, the chairperson, vice chairperson and one member selected randomly. Initially the researcher intended to circulate a questionnaire to ten farm workers. After considering the size of the sample the researcher included 24 farm workers selected randomly in the questionnaire. However because of literacy problems the farm workers completed the questionnaire with the assistance of trained people.

### 3.4 DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES

The qualitative research approach uses a holistic approach, in which the researcher is able to collect a wide variety of data using documents, questionnaires, observations and interviews (Welman, and Kruger, 2001:9) As such, the researcher used the following data collection techniques: interviews/questionnaires, observation and documents' review.

#### 3.4.1 INTERVIEW

Interviewing is a technique that is primarily used to gain an understanding of the underlying reasons and motivations for people's attitudes, preferences or behaviour. Interviews can be undertaken on a personal one-to-one basis or in a group. They can be conducted at work, at home, in the street or in a shopping centre, or some other agreed location (<http://brent.tvu.ac.uk/dissguide/hm1u3/hm1u3text3.htm>).

The interview method is used to identify important variables in a particular area and to formulate penetrating questions for respondents (Welman and Kruger: 2001:24). Interviews are considered to be effective methods of collecting information during research (Rossouw, 2003: 150).

The researcher conducted semi-structured and unstructured interviews with members of the project committee, farm workers, representative of the Department of Land Affairs and the traditional leadership.

The researcher decided to employ the interview method because of its popularity in the social sciences, its flexibility, adaptability, as well as its intention to intensively examine theoretical underpinnings.

##### 3.4.1.1 The advantages of interview technique in data collection

The primary advantage of in-depth interviews is that they provide much more detailed information than what is available through other data collection methods, such as surveys. They also may provide a more relaxed atmosphere in which to collect information—people may feel more comfortable having a conversation with you than filling out a questionnaire (Boyce and Neale, 2006:3).

According to Mahlangu (1978:89-90), the interview technique as a data collection method has the following advantages:

**Flexibility.** This technique is flexible because questions can be repeated in case of misunderstanding.

**Response rate.** People who cannot read and write can still participate.

**Non verbal behaviour.** The interviewer can assess behaviour and the validity of the interviewee's answers.

**Control over the environment.** The interview environment can be controlled with regard to privacy and silence.

**Question order.** The interviewer has control over the order of asking questions.

**Spontaneity.** Once spoken the answer cannot be retracted.

**Answers from respondents only.** No one can answer on behalf of the interviewee.

**Completeness.** The interviewer can ensure that answers are completed.

**Time of interview.** Date, time and place of interview can be recorded.

### 3.4.2 QUESTIONNAIRE

A questionnaire is a set of questions for gathering information from individuals. You can administer questionnaires by mail, telephone, using face-to-face interviews, as hand outs, or electronically (i.e., by e-mail or through web-based questionnaires) ( Evaluation briefs, 2008).

A questionnaire is by far the most frequently used instrument in educational research and its popularity is demonstrated by the number of published studies and students projects in education that employ this instrument for data collection (Nworgu, 2006:1-5). According to Fife-Schaw (2001), the questionnaire is probably the single most common research tool that is relatively well understood and has the advantages of simplicity, versatility and low cost.

This technique is used to gather information by asking people directly about the points concerned with the research. The researcher used open and closed ended questions in the questionnaire. Open ended questions are those which give the respondents an opportunity to present their views. They allow them to digress from the matter at hand.

These questions leave the respondent to decide the wording of the answer, the length of the answer and the kind of matters to be raised in the answer. The advantage of open ended questions is that the information gathered by this method is more likely to reflect the full richness and complexity of the views held by the respondent (Babbie and Mouton, 2001:233). The researcher did not circulate the questionnaire but used the questions to interview the farm workers. According to Corporate Research & Consultation Team, questionnaires are commonly used ( <http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/community/yoursay/Questionnaires.pdf>):

- to collect factual information in order to classify people and their circumstances
- to gather straightforward information relating to people's behaviour
- to look at the basic attitudes/opinions of a group of people relating to a particular issue
- to measure the satisfaction of customers with a product or service
- to collect 'baseline' information which can then be tracked over time to examine changes.

### 3.4.2.1 Advantages of questionnaire technique

According to Corporate Research and Consultation Team the questionnaire technique has the following advantages:

- Can contact a large number of people at a relatively low cost (postal and telephone)
- Easy to reach people who are spread across a wide geographical area or who live in remote locations (postal and phone )
- Respondents are able to complete postal questionnaires in their own time and telephone call-backs can be arranged for a more convenient time
- Telephone questionnaires can make it easier to consult some disabled people
- F2F questionnaires can make it easier to identify the appropriate person to complete the questionnaire
- F2F questionnaires can be longer than postal and phone questionnaires, collect more information and allow the use of 'visual aid.

The questionnaire method allows each respondent the opportunity to provide anonymous feedback on their experience. Structured questionnaires allow for the exploration of patterns and trends which help to describe what is happening and provide a measure of respondents' opinions, attitudes, feelings, and perceptions about issues of particular concern to the evaluator. They also help to identify patterns and trends that merit further exploration using qualitative methods. Questionnaires allow for richer feedback that may provide insight into explanations for what is happening and participants' opinions, attitudes, feelings, perceptions etc.

They also allow for issues to emerge that are not necessarily foreseen by the evaluator. <http://www.shef.ac.uk/lets/evaluate/general/methods-collection/questionnaire>

### 3.4.3 DOCUMENTS REVIEW

"Document review is a formalized technique of data collection involving the examination of existing records or documents", ( [www.ventureline.com/accounting.../D/document-review-definition/](http://www.ventureline.com/accounting.../D/document-review-definition/))

The researcher in his documents reviewed consulted government policy documents, reports and any other relevant documents to the study. Business plans, minutes of the project committee and reports were also analysed in the review to assess the project.

### **3.4.4 OBSERVATION**

Observation is a way of gathering data by watching behaviour, events, or noting physical characteristics in their natural setting. Observations can be overt or covert (<http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/evaluation/pdf/brief16.pdf>)

The researcher conducted a field observation of the project and the living conditions of farm workers.

The advantages of this data collection method provide a benchmark against which the researcher preferred to employ these techniques in his quest to find solutions to the research questions.

### **3.5 DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS**

The researcher conducted semi-structured and unstructured interviews with members of the project committee, representative of the Department of Land Affairs and the traditional leadership. A questionnaire was administered for the farm workers

Four different sets of questionnaires were administered for the interviews with the target groups: members of the project committee, traditional leadership, Department of Rural Development and Land Reform and the farm workers

The researcher made an appointment with members of the project committee in order to conduct the interviews. The chairperson and vice chairperson of the project committee and one member of the committee were interviewed. The interviews took place at the house of the chairperson of the project committee. Each one was interviewed separately.

The researcher also made an appointment with a representative of the department of Rural Development and Land Reform and a representative of the traditional leadership to conduct interviews with them. Initially the researcher had planned to circulate a questionnaire to ten farm workers and collect them later. But because of literacy problems among the farm workers the researcher sought an assistance trained people to complete the questionnaire with the farm workers. The questions were asked in the local language and translated into English. After considering the size of the sample the researcher included 24 farm workers selected randomly in the questionnaire.

Content and discourse analyses, coding, comparing and categorizing, were used to make sense of the data collected. Content analyses refers to the review of documents like books, brochures, written documents, transcripts, reports and visual media (Maree, ed; 2007:101).

The data collected was coded, compared and categorized. The data was analysed and interpreted to reflect the participants' experience. The data collected was validated using interpretive, descriptive and theoretical validity.

## CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS

### 4.1. INTRODUCTION

In this Chapter the researcher presents the findings of the research as documented in the interviews and observations conducted. The Chapter outlines the land reform policy that was implemented in the project and how its implementation impacted on the socio-economic conditions of the farm workers. The researcher interviewed members of the project committee, a representative of the Traditional Authority, a representative of the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform and farm workers. The data collected were compared, verified and interpreted to reflect the findings.

### 4.2. LAND REDISTRIBUTION

The findings revealed that the Limpopo Provincial Government inherited The Oaks / Willows citrus Farm from the former homeland of Lebowa and it operated under the Agricultural and Rural Development Corporation (ARDC). The farm consisted of two portions: The Oaks and the Willows. The farm is situated in the area of Mametja Tribal Authority. The total farm size of The Oaks portion is 3 329.76 ha and the Willows portion is 2 592.39 ha. The farm had 45 permanent workers and had employed up to 170 casual workers during harvest seasons (Agricultural and Rural Development Cooperation, 2002:4).

Section 25(7) of the constitution of South Africa (Act 108 of 1996) provides a legal framework for people who were dispossessed of property to submit a claim. *"A person or community dispossessed of property after 19 June 1913 as a result of past racially discriminatory laws or practices is entitled, to the extent provided by an Act of Parliament, either to restitution of that property or to equitable redress"*.

According to the representative of Mametja Tribal Authority and the chairperson of the project committee there was no land claim was made on the farm. This was not the return of land to people who were dispossessed. However section 25 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act 108 Of 1996), subsection 5 makes provision for land redistribution. *"The state must take reasonable legislative and other measures, within its available resources, to foster conditions which enable citizens to gain access to land on an equitable basis"*.

According to the Department of Land Affairs, land redistribution is aimed at providing the disadvantaged and the poor who do not qualify for tenure reform or restitution with access to land for agricultural purposes, settlement purposes and for non -agricultural enterprises such as ecotourism projects (DLA,2001:1).

The Limpopo Provincial Government handed the farm to the community as part of the land redistribution policy. According to the representative of the Department of Agriculture the farm was handed over to the community because it was within the jurisdiction of the Tribal Authority and that was in line with the objectives of land redistribution, providing the disadvantaged and the poor with access to land for agricultural purposes.

Department of Land Affairs (2001:1) outlined the following as some of the aims and objectives of Land Reform for Agricultural Development:

- The increase of black entrepreneurs in the agribusiness
- Expand opportunities for promising young people who stay in rural areas
- Overcome the legacy of past racial and gender discrimination in ownership of farmland
- Create job opportunities and reduce poverty
- Improve nutrition and incomes of the rural poor who want to farm on any scale
- Increase access to agricultural land by black people
- Empower beneficiaries to improve their economic and social well-being

#### **4.3. THE TRANSFER OF THE FARM TO THE COMMUNITY**

According to the respondents a representative from the office of the MEC had a meeting with the Mametja Tribal community about transferring the ownership of the farm to the community. The meeting agreed that each of the two villages must convene a meeting in which members of the project committee would be elected. Then the two committees met and elected an executive committee consisting of a chair person, vice chairperson, secretary, vice secretary, treasurer, vice treasurer and two additional members. In the interview, members of the project committee revealed that the Agricultural and Rural Development Corporation had identified an investor or a partner (a farmer) who would partner with the community in the project. The project committee met with the partner and agreed on a new business plan for the farm. According to the plan:

- The farmer and the project committee would manage the farm.
- The project would absorb all workers who worked under the ARDC.
- The farmer would get 20% of the profit and 80% would go to the community.
- Communal land that was not used should be part of the project to create more sustainable job opportunities.

According to the chairperson of the project committee and other committee members the handover of the farm was not done transparently. "While the project committee and the partner were still preparing for hand over, the then MEC for agriculture invited the chief and her council to a private hand over of the farm at the local government offices in October 2004", chairperson of the project committee



(verbal interview, 20 July 2013). In the secret handover the chief and two members of her council were appointed project managers. After the hand over the chief did not recognise the project committee and dissolved it. The partner was also fired. The chief and her management committee ran the farm. The community did not accept the disbanding of the project committee. The community continued to use the committee to demand answers on how they were going to benefit from the project. The chief failed to answer them. Then the community wrote a letter to the MEC demanding an explanation on how the farm was handed over to the chief. They wrote another letter to the Premier after they had not received a response from the MEC. The premier sent a delegation to the chief but the chief expelled them. However the delegation met the community and listened to their complaints but the community still did not get an answer.

Then members of the project committee were arrested by the police, allegedly for inciting public violence. They were released on bail. When members of the project committee were busy with the court case the chief and her management committee were running the farm. Because it was harvest season the chief harvested and sold the fruits. According to a foreman on the farm the managers were selling the fruits and taking the money for themselves. There was no bank account to deposit the money. No records of sales were kept. This became clear when one of the farm managers established his own business after the collapse of the project.

After the harvest, farm equipment was not maintained. Water pumps broke, trees were no longer watered regularly and a water tanker was used for irrigation. Workers also stopped working because they were not paid. The trees dried up and died. Operations on the farm stopped. Farm property was vandalised and stolen. From the hand over the farm operated for almost a year. Just after the farm stopped operating, members attending the court case were thrown out of court. But there was nothing to fight for as the project had collapsed. Some members of the project committee lost interest in their role and only the chairperson and the vice-chairperson continued with their work after the court case. They tried to persuade the chief to revive the project and invited potential investors to come and invest on the farm but already one local business man had taken the farm and was running his own business activities there. Then the committee assisted the chief to sell the remaining farm property which included trucks, tractors, ploughs, etc. All payments went to the chief and not even a cent could be accounted for.



*Fig. 2: A photograph of part of The Oaks portion of the farm (24 AUGUST 130)*

#### **4.4. FARM MANAGEMENT**

According to the findings the project committee and the partner were supposed to be the management committee of the farm. This committee had a business plan for the farm. However their plan was never implemented. The new management that took over after the secret handover, did not have a business- nor a management plan. They did not have a business account. There were no income and expenditure records kept.



*Fig 3: A photo of part of The Willows portion of the farm now (24 August 13)*

According to IFAD (2001:71) “Well-targeted policies can reduce poverty by increasing the opportunities for poor people to gain and maintain secure access to productive assets, especially land, water and other natural resources, together with social assets such as extension services, education and basic health care. The nature of their tenure over productive assets and related factor markets has a direct bearing on the extent of lasting benefit and opportunity for the rural poor to improve their livelihoods.” The Department of Agriculture and Land Affairs did not provide the necessary support to the project and as a result the benefits and opportunities anticipated, did not last.

The farmer who was going to go into a partnership with the community was going to impart skill and knowledge to the project needed to sustain it. According to the vice chairperson of the project committee since the collapse of the project and the attempts to revive it, the Provincial Department of Agriculture had never visited to assess the project. "Today there is no single citrus tree on the farm. In fact there is no evidence that the farm once exported citrus overseas", vice chairperson, project committee (2013, July 20, verbal interview). According to him there was no support from the department of Agriculture. Instead the Department contributed to the failure of the project by secretly handing over the farm to the chief and her committee ignoring the community elected committee.

#### **4.5. IMPACT ON THE LIVELIHOODS OF FARM WORKERS**

As indicated in Chapter one, the farm existed during the apartheid era. This means a number of families depended on the farm as a source of employment and income. Of the farm workers interviewed 60% had service of over ten years on the farm. And the remaining 40% had a service of between one and ten years on the farm. The majority of these workers were female and single parents. Most of the farm workers did not finish primary education. Most of them had children of school going age at the time the farm was transferred to the community.

The workers were aware that the farm was being given to the community. According to a foreman on the farm they were officially informed that the farm would be given to the community and that the ARDC would pay them their pension and they would be employed under a new owner. All workers interviewed confirmed they had received their money when the farm was transferred to the community. According to the workers the transfer of the farm to the chief did not benefit them because they lost their income and their employment. During the conflict between the community and the chief, workers did not get their monthly salaries. Some stopped working as they could not work without a salary. Others continued working hoping things would get back to normal until the collapse of the project. Most workers think things went wrong when the farmer who was a potential partner in the project was fired and the project committee dissolved. More than 50% of the workers interviewed did not have a formal job after the collapse of the project. They either survived by selling in the street, depending on government grants, or remittance from children or family members. Some of them sought employment on the neighbouring farms.





Fig 4: What used to be farm buildings



Fig 5: A photo of what used to be farm buildings (24 August 13)

Even though the two villages were electrified more than 60% of the farm workers were still relying on firewood for heating and cooking. This is mainly because they could not afford to buy electricity. Some of the workers were lucky to get RDP houses but most of them were living in poorly built houses. One family with seven members shared a two roomed house.

#### 4.6 ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS

According to the data collected it is evident that this land reform project has a number of reasons why it failed. **The first reason is the secret transfer of ownership to the chief and not the community as planned.** The farm was supposed to be handed to the community under the leadership of the Tribal Authority, managed by an elected committee. But the farm was secretly handed over to the chief and her committee. The chief and her committee did not have a business plan or a management plan. According to Wikipedia, “a business plan is a formal statement of a set of business goals, the reasons they are believed attainable, and the plan for reaching those goals. It may also contain background information about the organization or team attempting to reach those goals”.( [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Business\\_plan](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Business_plan)).

The chief and her committee did not have goals for the project. The project committee and the potential partner had a business plan for the project but it was not implemented.

**The second reason is the role played by the Department of Agriculture and Land Affairs.** The Provincial Department of Agriculture did not offer any support to the project. The Department did not intervene to resolve the conflict between the community and the Traditional Authority. They never made contact with the project. However as indicated in Chapter two this was not the case for this project only. Hall, 2004:21, stated that many of the land reform projects in the Eastern Cape Province did not get any support from the private sector and also had not made any contacts with the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform since obtaining the land. And also beneficiaries of land reform were not receiving any extension services such as training, extension advice, credit,

Transport and ploughing services, veterinary services and access to input and produce markets(Human Research Council, 2003:72; Hall, 2004:12). The chief and her committee did not receive any form of training on farm management, extension advice, credit, transport and ploughing services.

This land reform project did not live up to its objectives of:

- Improving nutrition and incomes of the rural poor who want to farm on any scale
- Stimulating growth from agriculture
- Expanding opportunities for promising young people who stay in rural areas
- Empowering beneficiaries to improve their economic and social well-being

The findings reveal that the project has resulted in a loss of income and unemployment. The farm workers' economic and social well-being has not improved. More than 50% of them did not have formal employment since the collapse of the project.

## **CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION**

### **5.1 INTRODUCTION**

The objective of the study was to investigate the impact of land reform on the livelihoods of farm workers. The study aimed to investigate how farm workers livelihoods were affected after the implementation of the land reform policy in The Oaks/Willows Citrus Farm. The following sub questions were used to guide the study to achieve its objectives:

- What version of the land reform policy has been implemented in the project?
- What is the institutional arrangement that underpins land reform?
- What is the impact of land reform on the livelihoods of farm workers?
- What is being done to sustain the livelihoods of these workers?
- What are the lessons learnt from the project

This chapter draws a conclusion on the findings of the study as documented in the interviews and questionnaires.

### **5.2 SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTERS**

Chapter one introduced the context of the research and background to the study area. It further dealt with the research problem and questions, and concluded by outlining the research objectives

Chapter two gives an overview of South Africa's historical past with regard to land ownership. It examines some of the racially based legislation that was passed during apartheid. The chapter introduces the legal framework for the land reform policy, and concludes by analysing the progress that has been made since the implementation of the land reform policy.

Chapter three gives an outline of the research method and data collection tools that the researcher had employed in the study. It provides reasons why the researcher preferred these methods and gives an overview of how the data were analysed to reflect the participants' experience.

Chapter four presents the findings of the study. It explains the land reform policy that was implemented in the project and how it impacted on the livelihoods of farm workers.

Chapter five analyses the findings and presents a conclusion on the findings and recommendations.

### 5.3 A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE STUDY AREA

The Oaks / Willows citrus farm is situated in the area of Kgoshi Mametja traditional Authority, in Maruleng local municipality, Limpopo Province. Maruleng Local Municipality covers a total area of 3 244 km<sup>2</sup>, with a total population of 95 769, according to the 2007 survey (Table 2). About 88,73% of the population live in rural areas, 2,32 % live in urban and 8, 94 % live on farms (Table 3). The farm consists of two portions, The Oaks and The Willows portions. The total farm size of the Oaks portion is 3 329.76 ha and the Willows portion is 2 592.39 ha. The farm was managed by Agricultural and Rural Development Corporation (ARDC). The farm had employed 45 permanent workers and up to 170 casual workers during harvest seasons. The farm produced citrus (lemons, navels, Valencia's, delta's, pommels). Approximately 43% of the crops were exported, 45% sold to the juice factories, 10% sold to the local market, and 2% was sold from the farm (Agricultural and Rural Development Corporation, 2002:4).

The farm was handed over to the community under the leadership of the Traditional Authority as part of the land reform policy.

The research found that South Africa's land reform policy is based on three pillars: restitution, tenure reform and land redistribution. The community of Mametja tribal authority did not lodge a land claim. The farm was handed over to the community as part of the land redistribution policy. Some of the objectives of land redistribution for Agricultural Development according to the Department of Land affairs (2001:1) are:

- Improve nutrition and incomes of the rural poor.
- Empower beneficiaries to improve their economic and social well-being.
- Increase access to agricultural land by black people.
- Stimulate growth from agriculture.

The research found that the farm workers lost their jobs and more than 50% of them did not have a formal job since the collapse of the farm. This simply means their incomes and nutrition have not improved. Some of them rely on fire wood for heating and cooking because they cannot afford to buy electricity. Their economic and social well-being has not improved.

Since the handover of the farm to the community there was no intervention from the department of agriculture to monitor progress or offer assistance with regard to farm management or extension services. Sections of the farm have been invaded by community members who are conducting private business activities.

## 5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

- Most of the beneficiaries of land reform lack the required skills to become effective farmers. In this regard joint ventures and shared ownership models between commercial farmers and new farmers should be encouraged as an appropriate strategy for skills transfer.
- The most important lesson learned in this project is that community involvement in decisions involving the community is very important. The Mametja Tribal community was involved in the initial stage of the project. The community participated in the election of who should manage the project, but was not involved in the handover of the project. The exclusion of a community elected committee in the handover of the farm led to the failure and collapse of the project. The community must be involved in decisions involving the community.
- Land reform does not guarantee better economic and social well-being for farm workers. A thorough study should be undertaken to determine the skills and the ability of the beneficiaries of land reform before hand over.
- Beneficiaries of land reform should have a proper business plan for the project before handover to ensure success and sustainability. The main cause of the failure of this project is lack of planning. There was no proper plan for the project. The management of the project did not have goals for the project. The beneficiaries of land reform should be given support and business skills to develop a business plan.
- Land reform projects will not be sustainable without support from the Department of Agriculture with regard to extension services such as training, extension advice, credit, transport and ploughing services, veterinary services and access to input and produce markets(Human Research Council,2003:72; Hall,2004:12). These services are essential in farming. The department of Rural Development and land reform must provide extension services to the beneficiaries of land reform, including access to credit and markets.

## 5.5 CONCLUSION

In conclusion this land reform project failed to improve the livelihoods of the farm workers. The transfer of the project to people without skills and a proper plan failed the project. Before decisions are implemented their long-term impact must be assessed. Beneficiaries of land reform must be given the necessary training in farm management and business planning and must be assisted with regard to access to credit and markets.



## 6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Agricultural and Rural Development Corporation**, 2002. The Oaks/Willows, Annual Report.

**Ary, D, et al.**, 2002. *Introduction to research in education*. (4th edition). Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.

**Barbie, E. & Mouton, J.** 2001. *The practice of social research*. New York. Oxford University Press.

**Bogdan, R. & Bilden, S.K.**, (1992). *Qualitative Research For Education: An Introduction For Theory and Methods*. (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

**Blanche, T.M. & Durrheim, K.** (Eds)., (1999). *Research in practice: Applied Methods for the social sciences*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

**Borg, W.R. & Gall, M.D.**, (1992). *Educational Research: An Introduction*. (7<sup>th</sup> ed). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

**Boyce, C. & Neale, P.**, (2006). *Conducting In-depth Interviews: A guide For Designing and Conducting In-depth Interviews For Evaluation Input*. PATHFINDER INTERNATIONAL.

**Commission on Restitution of Land Rights**. 2003: Annual Report April 2002-March 2003.

**Commission on Restitution of Land Rights**, 2004, "Cumulative Statistics as at 29 February 2004" available online. <http://land.pwv.gov.za/restitution>. (Accessed 22/03/2013).

**Cousins, B.**, *Livelihood after Land Reform*, Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAAS), University of the Western Cape. Available: <http://www.lalr.org.za/news/land-reform-in-post-apartheid-south-africa-2013-a-disappointing-harvest-by-ben-cousins>. (Accessed 22/03/2013)

**The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa** (Act 108, 1996).

**DLA**, 2001. *Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development*. [Online] Pretoria: Department of Land Affairs (DLA) Available at: <http://www.nda.agric.za/docs/redistribution.htm#Executive%20summary> (Accessed: 07 / 03 /2012).

**DLA**, 1997., *White Paper on South African Land Policy*. [Online] Pretoria: DLA (Department of Land Affairs) Available at: [http://www.dla.gov.za/legislation\\_policies/white\\_papers.htm](http://www.dla.gov.za/legislation_policies/white_papers.htm) (Accessed: 28/02/2012).

**Deininger, K.** 2006., *Land policy reforms*, in *Analyzing the distributional impact of reforms (Vol. I)* edited by A. Coudouel and S. Paternostro. Washington, D.C.: IBRD/ The World Bank.

**Deininger, K. & May, J.**, 2000. *Can there be Growth with Equity? An initial Assessment of Land Reform in South Africa*. Policy Research Working Paper 2451. Washington D.C. The World Bank.

**De Villiers, B.**, 2003. *Land reform: Issues and challenges*. A comparative overview of

experiences in Zimbabwe, Namibia, South Africa and Australia. Occasional Papers. Johannesburg: Konrad Adenauer Foundation.

**Didiza, A.T.**, 2006. 'Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa: 1994-2006'. Presentation by the Minister for Agriculture and Land Affairs. For the International Conference on Agrarian Reform and rural Development, Brazil 2006. Ministry for Agriculture and Land Affairs South Africa.

**Du Plessis, J.**, 2003. Notes on Restitution in South Africa, Centre on Housing Rights and evictions. Evaluation Briefs: Data collection methods for program evaluation: Questionnaires. (2008, November/ no 14), Available: <http://www.cdc.gov/health/evaluation/pdf/brief16.pdf>. (Date accessed:05/06/2012).

**Fife-Schaw, C.**, (2001). *Questionnaire design*. In Breakwell, G.M., Hammond, S. and Fife-Schaw, C. (Eds.), *Research Methods in Psychology*. p158-174

**Fourie, C.**, 2000. Land and The Cadastre in South Africa: Its History and Present Government Policy Paper presented as a Guest Lecture at the International Institute of Aerospace Survey and Earth Sciences (ITC), Enschede, The Netherlands.

**Hall, R.**, 2004. Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa, A Status report, Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, University of Western cape.

**Hall, R.**, 2007. The Impact of Land Restitution and Land Reform on Livelihoods, Research Report 32, Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, School of Government, University of the Western Cape, Cape Town.

**HSRC (Human Sciences Research Council)**, 2003. Land redistribution For Agricultural Development: Case studies in three provinces. Unpublished report. Integrated Rural and Regional Development division, HSRC, Pretoria. October 2003.

**IFAD (International Fund for Agricultural Development)**, 2001. *Rural Poverty Report 2001: The challenge of ending rural poverty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Jacobs, P.**, 2003. Support for Agricultural Development, Cape Town: Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, School of Government, University of Western Cape. (Evaluating Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa series; No. 4).

**Jacobs, P. et al.**, 2003. Evaluating land and agrarian reform in South Africa: An occasional paper series. PLAAS: UWC BELLVILLE.

**Krefting, L.**, 1991. Rigor in qualitative research: The assessment of trustworthiness: *American journal of occupational therapy*, 45(3): 214-224.

**Lahiff, E.**, 2005. 'Land Reform in the Eastern Cape: The ongoing struggle for resources and secure rights'. *Social Dynamics*, Vol. 31. No.1. Summer 2005.

**Lahiff, E.**, 2007. Land Reform and Poverty in South Africa Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape. Available online.

**Lahiff, E., 2008.** Land Reform in South Africa: A Status Report. Research Report 38. CapeTown: School of Government, University of the Western Cape, Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies.

**Mahlangu, D.M.D., (1978)** Educational Research Methodology. Pretoria: De Jager-Haum.

**Maree, K., (2007).** *First steps in research.* Van Schaik: Pretoria.

**McMillan.J.H.,& Schumacher, S.** (2001). Research in education: A conceptual introduction ( 5<sup>th</sup> Edition). New York. Longman.

**Ministry of Rural Development and Land Reform,** 2009, Comprehensive Rural Development Programme Framework (**CRDP**), <http://www.twk.org.za/sites/default/files/uploads/Development%20Services/Sustainable%20development/The%20Comprehensive%20Rural%20Development%20Programme%20Framework%20July09.pdf>. Accessed: 23/ 10/2014.

**Nogantshi, X.J., 2011.** An assessment of factors affecting the beneficiaries of land reform process with reference to the selected land redistribution projects in Cacadu District Municipality in the Province of the Eastern Cape. Submitted in the partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Masters in Public Administration.

**Nworgu B. G., (2006).** *Educational research: Basic Issues and Methodology.* Wisdom Publishers Ltd. Ibadan.

**OECD,** 2006, OECD Review of Agricultural Policies: South Africa. Paris, Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development.

**Restitution of Land Rights Act (LRA)** 22 of 1994.

**Rossouw, D., (2003).** *Intellectual tools: Skills for the human sciences.* (2nd ed.). Pretoria: Van Schaik.

**Rugege, S.,2004.** Land Reform in South Africa: An Overview. 32 Int'l J. Legal Info. 283. <http://ccs.ukzn.ac.za/files/LandreforminSouthAfrica.pdf>.( Accessed 14/05/2012)

**Stemela, M.B., 2007.** A critical analysis of land redistribution and economic development of farm workers in the Stellenbosch agricultural area. A research treatise in partial fulfilment for the Degree Mphil: South African Politics and Political Economy.

*Department of Rural Development and Land Reform, Strategic Plan 2010 – 2013  
Pretoria News*

[www.info.gov.za](http://www.info.gov.za)South Africa, Year Book, 2010/11. Rural Development and Land Reform

**Thwala, W.D., 2003.** Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa. [Online] Available at: <http://www.landaction.org/display.php?article=60>. (Accessed 20/05/ 2012)

**Van den Brink, R. et al., 2006.** *Consensus, Confusion, and Controversy. Selected Land Reform Issues in Sub-Saharan Africa.* World Bank Working Paper No. 71. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

**Wächter, F., 2010.** An investigation of the South African Land Reform Process, From a Conflict resolution perspective submitted in partial fulfilment for the requirements of the degree of Magister Philosophiae Conflict Transformation and Management.

**Wegerif, M.**, 2004. A critical appraisal of South Africa's market-based land reform policy: The case of the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) programme in Limpopo. Research report no. 19. Cape Town: Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, School of Government, University of the Western Cape.

**Welman, J.C. & Kruger, S.J.**, 2001. *Research Methodology*. New York. Oxford University Press.

**Vice Chairperson**, Project Committee( 2013,July 20,verbal interview).

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Map\\_of\\_Limpopo\\_with\\_Maruleng\\_highlighted\\_\(2011\).svg](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Map_of_Limpopo_with_Maruleng_highlighted_(2011).svg), Accessed: 10/08/2012

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maruleng\\_Local\\_Municipality](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maruleng_Local_Municipality), Accessed: 10/08/2012

:<http://www.maruleng.gov.za/index.php?page=demographics> Accessed: 20/08/ 2012

<http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/community/yoursay/Questionnaires.pdf>. Date accessed: 08/06/2012.

<http://brent.tvu.ac.uk/dissguide/hm1u3/hm1u3text3.htm>. Accessed: 12/06/12

<http://www.shef.ac.uk/lets/evaluate/general/methods-collection/questionnaire>. Accessed : 12/06/12

[www.ventureline.com/accounting.../D/document-review-definition/](http://www.ventureline.com/accounting.../D/document-review-definition/) : Accessed: 14/06/12

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Business\\_plan](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Business_plan)). Accessed: 16/08/2013

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Research\\_design](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Research_design)) Accessed: 10 09/ 2012

<http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/evaluation/pdf/brief16.pdf>. Accessed: 10/09/212

[www.larl.org.za](http://www.larl.org.za), Accessed: 24/08/2013

7. APPENDIX

A. Interview questions

These questions were used to interview members of the project committee.

- 1. Good morning.

The purpose of the interview is to assess the impact of land reform on the livelihoods of farm workers, with specific reference to The Oaks/Willows Citrus Farm. The outcome of this research will assist in making sure that future land reform projects become sustainable.

- 2. How did you get selected to the project committee?-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

- 3. What were the functions of the project committee?-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

- 4. What was your role in the project?-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

- 5. Did you have a business plan for the project?-----

- 6. What were the main objectives of the project? (business plan-objectives)  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

-----  
-----

7. Was there a land claim on the farm?\_-----

8. If yes, who were the claimants?-----

9. Who were the beneficiaries?\_-----

10. Was the transfer of the farm to the beneficiaries transparent? How was it done?-----

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

11. What was the role of the farm workers in the project?-----

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

12. What kind of support did you get from the Department of Land Affairs?\_-----

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

13. What do you think led to the failure of the project?\_-----

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

14. What do you think should have been done?\_-----

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

15. Thank you for your participation in this interview.

## B. Interview questions

**These questions were used to interview a representative of the traditional leadership.**

The purpose of the interview is to assess the impact of land reform on the livelihoods of farm workers, with specific reference to The Oaks/Willows Citrus Farm. The outcome of this research will assist in making sure that future land reform projects become sustainable.

1. What is your position in the traditional leadership? \_-----  
-----
2. Was there a land claim on the farm? \_-----
3. Why was the ownership of the farm transferred to the traditional leadership and not to the community? -----  
-----  
-----
4. What was your role in the running of the project?-----  
-----  
-----
5. Did you have a business plan for the project?-----
6. How was the community going to benefit from the project?-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----
7. Did the project have a business account?-----
8. How did you keep the income and expenditure records of the project?-----  
-----  
-----
9. What kind of support did you get from the Department of Agriculture?-----  
-----  
-----  
-----
10. What do you think led to the collapse of the project?-----  
-----

**C. Interview question for a representative of Dept Rural Development and land Reform**

**This questions were used to interview a representative of the Department of Agriculture.**

The purpose of the interview is to assess the impact of land reform on the livelihoods of farm workers, with specific reference to The Oaks/Willows Citrus Farm. The outcome of this research will assist in making sure that future land reform projects become sustainable.

- 1. Was there a land claim on the farm?-----
- 2. If, no, Why did the Dept of land and Rural Development hand over the farm to the traditional leader?-----  
-----  
-----  
-----
- 3. What kind of support did the Department provide to the project?-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----
- 4. What led to the collapse of the project?-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

**D. Questionnaire for farm workers**

**This questionnaire was used to interview the farm workers.**

**INSTRUCTIONS**

This questionnaire is part of a research project that aims to assess the impact of land reform on the livelihood of farm workers, with specific reference to The Oaks/Willows Citrus Farm. Please complete and hand it back to the field worker.



1. Are you a male or female? \_\_\_\_\_
2. What is your marital status? \_\_\_\_\_
3. How many dependents do you have? \_\_\_\_\_
4. How many are attending school \_\_\_\_\_ Not attending school \_\_\_\_\_
5. Are you employed? \_\_\_\_\_
6. If no, What is your means of survival? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
7. How long have you worked on the farm? \_\_\_\_\_
8. Have you been employed permanently or temporarily? \_\_\_\_\_
9. Did you know the farm was being transferred to new owners? \_\_\_\_\_
10. If yes, how did you know? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
11. Did you benefit from this transfer? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
12. What do you think led to the collapse of the project? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
13. After the collapse of the project what kind of compensation did you get? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
14. What do you think should have been done? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
15. Thank you for your participation.