

EFFECTIVENESS OF LAND REDISTRIBUTION PROGRAMME IN IMPROVING
THE QUALITY OF LIFE: A CASE OF VHEMBE DISTRICT IN LIMPOPO
PROVINCE

BY

MUKOVHE MAUREEN NTHAI

MINI - DISSERTATION

Submitted in (partial) fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF DEVELOPMENT

in the

FACULTY OF MANAGEMENT AND LAW

(TURFLOOP GRADUATE SCHOOL OF LEADERSHIP)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF LIMPOPO

PROFESSOR T. MOYO

2017

DEDICATION

In memory of my parents Nthai Muravha Benjamin & Nthai Maputo Emily, and my grandmother Malwela Tshinakaho Mushaathama who regretfully did not live to see this work.

DECLARATION

I declare that the **EFFECTIVENESS OF LAND REDISTRIBUTION PROGRAMME IN IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF LIFE: A CASE OF VHEMBE DISTRICT IN LIMPOPO PROVINCE** mini-dissertation hereby submitted to the University of Limpopo, for the degree of Master of Development has not previously been submitted by me for a degree at this or any other university; that is my work in design and in execution, and that all material contained herein has been duly acknowledged.

.....

Full names

.....

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank the following persons for their respective contributions to this mini-dissertation:

- My husband, Murovhi Mashudu David for his unconditional love, support and encouragement.
- My four children, Fhumulani, Vhengani, Zwanga and Mashudu (Nghamula) for their understanding during my studies.
- A special thank you to my supervisor Prof T Moyo for her guidance, support and encouragement.
- My respondents in Mavungeni CPA (Ntwanano Poultry Farming); Tshilande Family and Mr T.W Mathidi for their willingness to participate in this study.
- My former supervisor, Mr Peta P.P for his support and guidance during my studies.
- Above all, the almighty God for his grace and mercy during my entire studies.

ABBREVIATIONS

ANC-African National Congress

CARP-Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Programme

CASP- Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme

DAFF-Department of Agriculture and Rural Development

DLA-Department of Land Affairs

DRDLR- Department of Rural Development and Land Reform

DLRC- District Land Reform Committees

DUATs - *Direitos de Uso e Aproveito de Terra*

FAO-Food and Agricultural Organization

GDP-Gross Domestic Product

ID- Identity Document

IDP- Integrated Development Plan

ICT- Information and Communication technology

LDLA- Limpopo Department of Land Affairs

LRAD- Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development

MCM- Ministers Coordinating Committee

NARYSEC- National Rural Youth Service Corps

NDA-National Department of Agriculture

NDP- National Development Plan

NLARCC- National Land Allocation and Recapitalization Control Committee

NTC- National Technical Committee

PDARD- Provincial Department of Agriculture and Rural Development

PLAS- Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy

PJTC- Provincial Joint Technical Committee

RDP- Reconstruction and Development programme

RSA- Republic of South Africa

SADC-South African Development Committee

SADCC-South African Development Coordination Committee

SLAG- Settlement Land Acquisition Grant

TOR's- Terms of Reference

ABSTRACT

While there are a fair number of studies on land reform in South Africa, there are knowledge gaps on the impact of some specific forms of land redistribution on livelihoods of beneficiaries. The purpose of this study therefore was to assess the impact of the land redistribution in the case of selected farms in the Vhembe District, Limpopo Province, South Africa.

A qualitative research method was used and twelve households were interviewed. A number of indicators were used to assess impact. These included household income, job creation, empowerment and sustainability. The selection of indicators was informed by a comprehensive literature review on land redistribution, not only in South Africa but in other parts of the world as well. The findings from the study revealed that the land redistribution beneficiaries are faced with challenges such as poor infrastructure on redistributed farms, limited or lack of access to affordable inputs and lack of financial support immediately after redistribution. These and other challenges makes life for the intended beneficiaries very difficult which in the end makes land redistribution ineffective. A major factor which explains the failure of these farms appeared to be the inadequate planning of post-settlement support. Even though land was effectively transferred to the beneficiaries, the little support they have received in terms of financial, infrastructural and marketing support, for example, has limited their capacity to utilise the land productively and cost effectively. The study recommends that the government and other agencies should consider providing comprehensive support to these communities until they are able to run on their own.

Substantial research should be carried out to rethink strategies on land redistribution, particularly on how to handle the issue of title deeds which currently appears problematic in the context of the farms that were studied. Finally, the training programmes for land redistribution beneficiaries should also include training current legislation on land redistribution issues in order to adequately prepare the new land owners for any unexpected challenges as has occurred in the case of the farms that were studied.

Table of Contents

DEDICATION.....	i
DECLARATION.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
ABBREVIATIONS.....	iv
LIST OF FIGURES.....	x
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND.....	1
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Background.....	5
2.1. The different models of land reform in South Africa.....	7
2.2. Policy and legal background of land redistribution.....	8
3. Statement of the problem.....	10
4. Aim of the study.....	13
5. Objectives.....	13
6. Research questions.....	14
7. Definition of key concepts.....	14
8. Significance of the study.....	18
9. Summary.....	19
10. Outline of the Report.....	19
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	22
2.1. Introduction.....	22
2.2. Land and redistribution: review of global trends.....	23
2.3. Land redistribution in South Africa: historical perspective.....	29
2.3.1. The natives land act 27 of 1913.....	30
2.3.2. The native trust and land act 18 of 1936.....	31
2.3.3. The group areas act 41 of 1950.....	32
2.3.4. The group areas act 36 of 1966.....	32
2.3.5. The new democratic South Africa.....	33
2.4. Theoretical perspectives: land redistribution and livelihoods.....	35
2.5. Land and redistribution and livelihoods: a review of evidence.....	53
2.6. Issues emerging from the literature.....	62
2.7. Conclusion.....	71
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	74
3.1. Introduction.....	74
3.2. Research Design.....	75

3.3. Study Area	76
3.4. Target Population	78
3.5. Sampling methods and procedures	79
3.6. Measurement	83
3.7. Data collection procedures and methods	84
3.7.1. Data sources	85
3.7.2. Procedures	86
3.7.3. Ethical considerations	86
3.7.4. Methods	87
3.7.5. Instruments	88
3.7.6. Data on Livelihood	89
3.8. Data analysis	92
3.9. Reliability and validity	93
3.10. Limitations of the study	94
3.11. Conclusion	94
CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS	95
4.1. Introduction	95
4.2. The Process of land redistribution	96
4.3. Description of the farms	102
4.4. Ownership and control	104
4.5. Support systems	107
4.6. Impact of land redistribution on livelihoods	109
4.7. Challenges	112
4.7.1. Political dimensions	112
4.7.2. Commercialization	114
4.7.3. Financial support	115
4.8. Sustainability of Land Redistribution.	116
4.9. Future plans	117
4.10. Interpretation of the findings	118
4.11. Conclusion	122
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	124
5.1. Introduction	124
5.2. Summary of findings	124
5.3. Recommendations	130
5.4. Limitations of the study	131
5.5. Conclusion	131

6. REFERENCES 133
ANNEXURE A: INTERVIEW GUIDE 146
ANNEXURE B: APPLICATION FORM 147
ANNEXURE C: EDITING CONFIRMATION LETTER..... 148
ANNEXURE D: REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH 149

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1. Map of the Limpopo Province.....	78
Figure 4.1. Purchased farm in Musina.....	103
Figure 4.2. Recently purchased farm overgrazed.....	107
Figure 4.3. Office block.....	111
Figure 4.4. Goat handling facility.....	115
Figure 4.5. Ripe tomatoes without market.....	116

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1. Status of farms.....	102
Table 4.2. Demographic information.....	104

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1. Introduction

Inequality in land ownership and landlessness are still at unacceptable levels in many countries (Byamugisha 2014:2). In every historical era in the progress of humanity, land has been a means for livelihood, self-possession and identity. Several African nations, notably, South Africa, Namibia, Kenya, Ivory Coast, Mozambique and Zimbabwe are wrestling with this sentimental problem of land inequity and inequality. Thus, evidently, Zimbabwe's land reform is one of the latest and most controversial but it points to the urgency and importance of addressing inequality in terms of land redistribution (Sibanda 2010:68).

Most regions of the global South, as well as the global North, have a long history of land 'grabbing' on a large scale. In the North, the best-known episodes have been the European and particularly the British enclosures (White; Borras Jr; Hall; Scoones & Wolford 2012:623). The dispossession of the native people of North America and Australasia, and, arguably, some historical episodes of forced socialist collectivization (White *et al* 2012:623) should be recalled. In many regions of Africa and Latin America, land was first grabbed by pre-colonial rulers in chronic territorial wars with each other, then by colonial governments and increasingly by foreign or domestic corporations (White *et al* 2012:623).

Land remains a basic source of livelihood for the majority of Africans and is key to the development of agriculture, tourism, mining, housing and industry (Moyo 2007:60). Land redistribution has also been used as a political weapon. For, example, as argued by Sibanda (2010:27), the ruling party successfully used it as a ploy in order to win the elections when it rallied the masses to invade and take over white owned farms in Zimbabwe. When international donors pressured the ruling party in the run-up to the parliamentary elections of 2000 by suspending aid and loans the government simply fixed the result in its favour. The judiciary was reshaped, local institutions in rural areas were narrowly politicised, and laws were passed which granted local agencies the powers necessary to crush opponents of

land reform (Mamdani 2009:8) were passed. In Zaire, Mobutu's National Conference in 1991 opened the door for politicians in eastern provinces to mobilize electoral constituencies around promises of land restitution (Boone 2011:1334). In Kenya land seizure and reallocation were surely used to boost support and turnout for the ruling party among poor and landless Kalenjin and Maasai people (Boone 2011:1328).

The separation of people in South Africa along racial lines was accompanied by massive forced removals of Africans, Indians and coloured people resulting in widespread dispossession of land and other properties and the severe restriction of social, economic and political rights. This resulted in one of the most unequal societies in the world with a relatively small white minority enjoying high standards of living while the great majority of the black population was consigned to a life of extreme exploitation and poverty (Matukane 2011:11).

The African people could no longer produce enough food to feed themselves as families and keep livestock. They had to survive on small or slave wages, which could hardly meet their own family needs, let alone being generous and readily share with neighbours. Colonialism and Apartheid brutalized African people, turning them hostage to perennial hunger and want, and related diseases and social strife and disorders (Green Paper on Land Reform 2011:2).

The fact that in many countries the current land ownership distribution has its origins in discriminatory policies rather than in market forces has long provided a justification for adopting policies aimed at land reforms. Land reform has been very successful in Asia (Japan, the Republic of South Korea, and Taiwan) and a positive impact has been reported in African countries such as Kenya and Zimbabwe in the early phases of their post-independence land reform (Deininger, Feder, Gordillo de Anda & Munro-Faure 2003:14). Land reform in Latin America failed to live up to their objectives and remain incomplete (Deininger *et al* 2003:14).

The land question in Kenya is a colonial legacy. The colonisation of Kenya first by the Omani Arabs at the coast and then by the British towards the end of the 19th century, had a great impact on land relations in the country (Kabukuru 2015:30). In Kenya, traditional systems that stabilised through centuries of evolution were

suddenly disrupted through expropriation of large parts of the country by the application of laws that were alien to the African customary way of life (Kabukuru 2015:31). In Kenya, there has been growing interest in land because the land question was not addressed successfully at the time of independence in 1963, although issues of land access and control significantly shaped the struggle for independence (Binswanger-Mkhize; Bourguignon, Van Den Brink 2009:87).

The land question has continued to shape Kenya's political and economic life. The significance of land issues came to the fore immediately after the December 2007 general election following a flawed and hotly disputed presidential election vote count (Binswanger-Mkhize *et al* 2009:88).

All land in Mozambique belongs to the state and in accordance with the 1997 Land Law (*Lei de Terras 19/97*), it cannot be purchased or sold. Individuals, communities and corporations gain access to land through the acquisition of Land Use and Benefit Titles, known as *Direitos de Uso e Aproveito de Terra* (DUATs), which are typically granted for terms of up to 50 years, with the potential for subsequent renewal for an equal period (Clements & Fernandes 2013:52).

Since the end of the Mozambican civil war in the early 1990s, the Mozambican state has undergone a profound transformation in which it has abandoned many features of its state-centred economy in favour of a free-market, capitalist economy. Central to this transformation, in 1997 the state passed a radical new land law (*Lei de Terras 19/97*), which guarantees the rights of individuals and communities to occupy and develop land and transfer land-use title (Lunstrum 2008:339).

Recent experiences in Zimbabwe show that agrarian structure is unsustainable on both economic and justice grounds in the long term and that, following land reform, many smallholders have been successful at 'accumulating from below' and engaging in markets, including for export, despite numerous constraints (White *et al* 2012:626). Agrarian structure refers to rapid fundamental change in the relations of land, livestock, cropping and community. The relationship between the land and community is very important and for a country's land reform to be sustainable it must not be defined by large commercial farms. There is a need to subdivide the land

reform farms if they are too big for the new land reform beneficiaries. Inability of land reform in Zimbabwe to make economic development resulted in the fall in agricultural production and it had a dramatic negative impact on the economy of the country.

There are different reasons why land redistribution has often been proposed. In most instances, and this is particularly so in the case of Africa, historical inequalities in land ownership and control have been the key factor in the push for just and equitable redistribution. However, there are proponents of land reform who are more concerned about perceived efficiency that it is likely to achieve rather than purely for reasons of equity and political redress. The World Bank for example, is a major proponent of some form of land redistribution. It advocates the breakup of large corporate plantations in favour of small farmer-based agricultural development strategies (White *et al* 2012:624). In the Bank's opinion, small farmers have demonstrated greater efficiency than large-scale holdings.

Radical land reforms, in the context of revolutionary regime change, saw the division of large privately-owned land-holdings and their redistribution to tenants and landless workers, sometimes with the goal of creating a stable and productive mass of relatively homogeneous 'family farms', and in other cases as a first step towards eventual socialist collectivisation (White *et al* 2012:624).

Development thinking has shifted significantly as compared to the last decade. Development discourse in the 21st Century has been marked by global campaigns against poverty, inequality, gender discrimination and exclusion. The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) which have been adopted by most African nations, place significant emphasis on achieving inclusive and sustainable development. The agenda calls for nations to increase their efforts to deal with inequality and poverty because they are not sustainable (Giovannucci; Scherr; Nierenberg; Hebebrand; Shapiro; Milder & Wheeler 2012:48).

South Africa is planning to alleviate poverty and reduce inequality by 2030. The plan is to change the life chances of millions of the citizens, especially the youth (National Development Plan 2011:14). The world's undernourished live in just seven countries Bangladesh, China, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia

and Pakistan. Nearly all countries, even some of the wealthiest, have some level of food insecurity (Giovannucci *et al* 2012:6).

Eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, including extreme poverty, is the greatest global challenge and an indispensable requirement for sustainable development. In South Africa and most developing countries land redistribution has been targeted as a way that can reduce poverty and inequality among the landless and rural poor. Reducing poverty and inequality, particularly for women who provide most of the family's food, is key to solving hunger (Giovannucci *et al* 2012:8).

There are significant indications of climate-related problems already being recorded in many regions particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa. Climate related uncertainties manifesting as drought, floods, temperature fluctuation, and crop disease pose what could become the greatest challenge to agricultural production and food security. China, the world's biggest food producer and consumer, has had to relocate millions of people due to water shortages and the Chinese authorities estimate more than 150 million people will eventually need to be relocated from agricultural areas that are being gradually engulfed by deserts (Giovannucci *et al* 2012:24).

2. Background

In 1994, as a result of colonial dispossession and apartheid, approximately 87% of the land was owned by whites and only 13% by blacks (Lahiff 2007:1578; Buthelezi 2007:1; Binswanger-Mkhize 2014:255). The Minister Gugile Nkwinti announced that by 2012 post-apartheid land reform had transferred 7.95 million hectares into black ownership (Mahlange 2013:18), which is equivalent, at best, to 7.5% of formerly white-owned land. Whites as a social category still own most of the country's land and redressing racial imbalances in land ownership is land reform's most urgent priority (Walker 2013:1). The application of these discriminatory laws and practices resulted in extreme inequalities in relation to land ownership and land use (Kloppers & Pienaar 2014:707).

In South Africa, land has always been a source of conflict. The history of conquest and dispossession, of forced removals and a racially skewed distribution of land

resources have left South Africa with a complex and difficult legacy. In 1994 the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) was introduced by the African National Congress as an engine to unlock the rural economy. The RDP's main aim was for land reform to eradicate poverty.

A large population of black South Africans were forced, during the Apartheid era, into impoverished and overcrowded reserves, homelands and townships through decentralization. Because of lack of industries or mines, this posed a serious problem as black South Africans depended on salaries for a livelihood. Thus, subsistence farming was the only reliable option for most of the rural people. Since this form of farming was not backed by good access to finance to purchase quality seeds and fertilizers, it resulted in poor harvest (Mamphodo 2006:2).

In rural communities social relationships are much deeper as they tend to be historical and inter-generational. Colonialism and Apartheid sought at all times, and by all means to destroy this mutuality amongst peoples of different cultures, who constituted the same society. Of all such means used, the Natives Land Act, Act no. 27 of 1913, and the migrant labour system are the ones which wreaked the most havoc in African rural communities, by seriously undermining the virtues of Ubuntu, as people lost their ability to give as it disappeared with the loss of their land (Green Paper on Land Reform 2011:2).

According to the 1997 White paper on Land Policy, the purpose of land redistribution is to provide the poor with access to land for residential and productive uses in order to improve their income and quality of life. The programme aims to assist the poor, labour tenants, farm workers, women as well as emergent farmers. Redistribution of land will largely be based on willing-buyer, willing-seller arrangements.

According to Hall & Ntsebenza (2007:13), what land reform is for and who should benefit and how it should be pursued are often treated as technical economic questions, but at its heart the land question is political and about identity and citizenship; production and livelihoods; and can be resolved only through political processes. Because the land issue is by far more than the land, it will remain among the most difficult issues to negotiate in contemporary South African politics.

South Africans perceive the land issue as important to them and their country (Gibson 2009:140). Black South Africans are more concerned about the past than other races in South Africa. Attitudes, beliefs and actions regarding land issues are likely to be shaped by at least two major forces. Those who suffered from the land policies of the past may simply seek restorative justice, the righting of the wrong that they experienced and those without land today may, whatever their histories, seek redistributive justice: land on which to live and work. On the other one hand, land preferences may reflect individual self-interest (Gibson 2009:141).

2.1. The different models of land reform in South Africa

According to the Green Paper (2011:4) the principles of land reform are de-racializing the rural economy; democratic and equitable land allocation and use across race, gender and class; and, a sustained production discipline for food security. The long-term goal of land reform is social cohesion and development.

The Department of Rural Development and Land Reform was therefore mandated in s.25 ss5-7 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 1996, to conduct land reform based on the following three pillars:

Redistribution: This responds to various needs and aspirations of people for land, in both rural and urban areas, in an equitable and affordable manner while at the same time contributing to poverty alleviation and national economic growth. Redistribution is conducted in terms of the Provision of Land Assistance Act, No 126 of 1993.

Restitution: which aims to restore land or provide comparable redress for rights in land which was dispossessed after 19 June 1913. Restitution is done in terms of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, No 22 of 1994 as amended.

Tenure Reform: This aims to upgrade the different land tenure arrangements currently restricting tenure security for the previously disadvantaged, in both urban

and rural areas. Tenure Reform is done in terms of the Extension of Security of Tenure Act, No 62 of 1997.

2.2. Policy and legal background of land redistribution

The Legal basis for redistribution is provided by the Provision of Certain Land for Settlement Act 126 of 1993, amended in 1998 and now entitled the Provision of Land and Assistance Act 126 of 1993 (known as Act 126). Whereas the original Act allowed for the granting of an advance or subsidy 'to any person', the 1998 amendment specified the categories of persons that could be assisted. These included 'persons who have no land or who have limited access to land, and who wish to gain access to land or to additional land', and persons wishing to upgrade their land tenure (DLA 1998:5).

Land redistribution policy, under Settlement Land Acquisition Grant (SLAG) was directed at the poor: i.e. the landless or land hungry, although remaining within a market-based willing-buyer/willing seller structure. During this phase, land redistribution mainly took the form of 'pilot' programmes in various provinces. Households were able to access a once-off grant or payment of R16, 000.00 called the SLAG. Grants were targeted at low-income households (Jacobs 2004:5).

The government's land redistribution policy has undergone a number of shifts since 1994 (Jacobs, *et al*, 2003:1). While government is currently addressing many of the problems around design and implementation of the redistribution programme, fundamental weaknesses within the land reform policy remain. One is the imagined nature of the policy-making process, with major changes in policy going largely unexplained in official statements or publications, e.g. SLAG has been effectively replaced by LRAD in the absence of a clear public policy statement.

Land redistribution was introduced in 1994 with other land reform programmes (restitution and land tenure). Its main purpose was to redistribute land to poor and the landless for residential and productive uses to improve their income and quality of life (DLA 1997:6). It has been under implementation since then, but the programme has been changing its sub programmes. The programme started with

the implementation of Settlement Land and Acquisition Grant (SLAG), then Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) and now the Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy (PLAS).

In 1999 the change in policy direction was initiated. The new policy direction was consolidated in 2001; SLAG was replaced by a new programme called the Land Redistribution of Agricultural Development (LRAD). The land redistribution policy has shifted to be more in line with the Growth, Employment and Redistribution Programme (GEAR) as it favoured and promoted entrepreneurship (Jacobs 2004:5). In 2001 Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) was introduced and implemented until 2009. Grants were paid to individuals not to households as was the case with SLAG. The programme only focussed on land for agricultural development.

Currently the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform is implementing Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy (PLAS) which was introduced in 2009/2010. The programme is also focussing on the concept of the 'willing buyer, willing seller' and the farms are registered in the name of the State (Title holder). The land is then leased to qualifying beneficiaries through interviews (DLA 2007:11).

The Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy (PLAS) was adopted as an official policy in 2006, and saw the state becoming the 'willing buyer' of land for redistribution, by actively using market opportunities where they arise and, in some instances, approaching landowners to sell (Lahiff 2008). The Provision of Land and Assistance Act, Act No. 126 of 1993 Section 10(1) (a): gives legal effect to the proactive acquisition of land. The Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy (PLAS) was officially launched in 2006 after LRAD was phased out. PLAS aims to support local government to develop area-based planning and improve coordination among the institutions responsible for land reform. The objectives of PLAS are to contribute to growth, employment creation and equity (DLA 2006:4).

3. Statement of the problem

Post-apartheid South Africa faces a variety of challenges that emanated from the injustices caused by apartheid. One of the earliest challenges faced by the first democratically elected government was how to address the unequal distribution of land in the country. The South African government has shown commitment to eradicating the inequalities and injustices of the past and has initiated a comprehensive land reform programme with a strong constitutional basis, however this programme has to date not been concluded (Kloppers & Pienaar 2014:677).

In 1994 the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) introduced an integrated socio-economic policy framework aimed at eradicating the legacies of the past through the redress of inequalities and building a vibrant and democratic South Africa. The reasons for introducing the RDP included the fact that South Africa was identified as a country with one of the highest income inequalities distribution and consequently an extremely high incident of poverty (Kloppers & Pienaar 2014:688).

The RDP recognised that poverty was the single worst burden on the country and that poverty affected millions of people, especially those living in rural areas. The first democratically elected government inherited a country characterised by extreme levels of poverty, a worsening unemployment problem and unacceptable inequalities in the levels of income (Klopper & Pienaar 2014:688).

The land question comprises several dimensions; it concerns not only land use and economic production, but also population movements and settlement patterns, territories and identities, inequalities, and development (Binswanger-Mkhize *et al* 2009:87; Karuti 2009:87).

Of the world's 1.1 billion extremely poor people, about 74 % (810 M) live in marginal areas and rely on small-scale agriculture. While the world currently produces enough food to feed everyone, at least one billion people remain under food insecurity (Giovannucci *et al* 2012:6). Between 1990 and 2011, the number of people living in extreme poverty has halved, to around one billion people, or 14.5 percent of the

world's population and this translates to 17.0 percent of the developing world's population (Policy Research Report 2015:6). Sub-Saharan Africa has the highest proportion of undernourished people (Giovannucci *et al* 2012:6).

In 2015 the population of South Africa was estimated at 54, 96 million, 51, 3 % females and 48, 7 % males (Stats SA 2015:1). It is well known that South Africa's inequality levels are among the highest in the world (Woolard; Liebbrandt & McEwen 2009:98). There were approximately 22 million poor people in South Africa in 1993, compared with 26 million in 2008. Poverty rates differ dramatically by race and gender. Africans are much more likely to be poor than any other race group, and that African females are significantly more likely to be poor than African males (Woolard *et al* 2009:98).

Poverty is a key development challenge in social, economic and political terms is not only in South Africa but throughout the developing world. In post-apartheid South Africa, fighting the legacy of poverty and under-development has always been a central theme of Government. This was indicated in the Reconstruction and Development Plan (RDP) of 1994 and repeated in the National Development Plan (NDP 2011:2).

South Africa has progressed in reducing extreme income poverty, due to a progressive, pro-poor tax system which provides a basic social protection, while employment targets have remained a challenge. Females are more impoverished than males in South Africa, with a poverty headcount of 58, 6% as compared to 54,9 % for males (Stats SA 2014:26).

Extreme inequality in land distribution and underutilization of vast tracts of productive land coexists with deep rural poverty a case for redistributive measures to increase access to land by the poor can be made, both politically and from an economic perspective (Deininger *et al*, 2003:14). To ensure productive use of land, land reform needs to be combined with other programmes at government's disposal i.e. the recapitalization and development grant. A need to integrate land reform into the broader context of economic and social policies aimed at development and poverty

reduction, and implementation programmes in a decentralized way with maximum participation by potential beneficiaries is needed.

The RDP acknowledged that land represented the most basic need for the rural population, a need that resulted from the discriminatory practices of the past regime. In order to effectively address the issues of inequality, poverty and landlessness caused by the "injustices of forced removals and the historical denial of access to land" the programme identified the need for the establishment of a comprehensive national land reform programme.

The aim of the land redistribution programme was to strengthen the property rights of communities already occupying the land and provide access to land for those previously deprived of the right to be the owners of land. Within the context of redistribution, the RDP set the ambitious target of transferring 30% of all white-owned agricultural land to black South Africans over a period of five years (Aliber & Mokoena 2002:5; Lahiff 2007:17; Aliber & Cousins 2013:140; Binswanger-Mkhize 2014:255; Kloppers & Pienaar 2014:690)

The land reform programme as defined in the RDP document is aimed at encouraging the use of land for agricultural purposes and providing productive land in order to raise income and productivity. The reform programme is based on the redistribution of land to those who need it, but cannot afford it and those who were deprived of the land due to the system of apartheid.

According to the Department of Land Affairs (1997:34), the land reform programme aims to effectively redress the injustices of forced removals and the historical denial of access to land; ensure security of tenure for rural dwellers; eliminate overcrowding and the supply of residential and productive land to the poorest section of the rural population it also aims to raise incomes and productivity; and implement provision of support services. The government will build the economy by generating large-scale employment and increase rural incomes.

The Land Reform Programme tries to solve specific problems that include poverty issues, food insecurity, unemployment, lack of infrastructure and services. The

principal form of natural capital and basic livelihood asset in rural areas is land, from which people produce food to solve the problem of food insecurity. Poverty eradication in rural areas may be overcome by access to land and security of land rights. With access to land, peasants may practise subsistence farming which becomes their source of income generation. Farming can reduce unemployment through families having access to land thus increasing labour and production (Mamphodo 2006:3).

The research seeks to assess the impact of the land redistribution programme in improving the quality of life. Since the land redistribution programme aims to redress imbalances, to what extent are the beneficiaries' socio-economic needs met? It is also expected that the findings of the study may hold potential that could influence policy on land redistribution and may open more questions for further study.

4. Aim of the study

The main aim of the study was:

- To assess the effectiveness of the land redistribution programme in improving the quality of life (poverty alleviation, employment creation and the creation of sustainable livelihoods).

5. Objectives

The main objectives of the study were:

- To get an in-depth understanding of the effectiveness of land redistribution programme and how it has impacted on the quality of life (livelihoods) of the intended beneficiaries.
- To assess the factors affecting effectiveness (quality of life) of the intended beneficiaries.

6. Research questions

- To what extent is the land redistribution programme benefiting the intended beneficiaries?
- What are the factors affecting the effectiveness (quality of life) of the intended beneficiaries?

7. Definition of key concepts

Land Reform.

The term land reform has several meanings. The definition of land reform is not easy. This is due to differences in land types, farming methods, the history of land acquisition, general social and economic conditions and political aims. Still, however, a definition is important (Baye 2013:146). According to Kloppers & Pienaar (2014: 693-694) land reform aims to contribute to economic development, both by providing beneficiaries with the opportunity to engage in productive land use and by increasing employment opportunities through encouraging greater investment. Buthelezi (2007:36) views land reform as reforms that increase the ability of the rural poor and other socially excluded groups to gain access to land and to exercise effective control over land. Lastly, according to De Villiers (2008:8) **land reform** is about training and assisting people, preparing them for challenges, providing them with strategic partners and enabling them to make a successful living out of their land. Government can throw as much money as it wants at land acquisition, but if new owners do not have the capacity to manage the land and to implement sound farming practices, the money will serve little purpose. A balance must therefore be struck between the quantity of land reform (actual hectares handed over) and the quality of land reform (the ability to manage the land successfully).

There is a consensus between the definition that is used by Kloppers & Pienaar (2014:693-694) and Buthelezi (2007:36); both definitions talk about addressing the issues of landlessness. For this study the definition that will be used will be from De Villiers (2008:8). The study is focusing on the assessment of the effectiveness of the

land redistribution programme on the quality of lives for the beneficiaries. Land alone cannot improve the quality of life. There are skills that are needed by beneficiaries to be able to manage the land successfully.

Land redistribution

According to Kirsten, Van Rooyen & Ngqangweni (1996:218) land redistribution is the process involving providing the poor with land to improve their livelihoods. According to (RSA 2012:7) land redistribution aims to reallocate land to the landless poor, labour tenants, farm workers and emerging farmers for residential and productive uses in order to improve their livelihoods and quality of life. There is consensus in the definitions of land redistribution. However, for the purpose of this study the definition by Kirsten, Van Rooyen & Ngqangweni will be used as it focusses on improving the livelihoods of beneficiaries after gaining access to the land.

Restitution

According to Gibson (2009:139) land restitution is the right to restoration or compensation for dispossessions as a result of past racially discriminatory laws or practices. On the other hand Vermuelen (2009:2) sees restitution as when the ancestral land is restored to the initial owner or comparable compensation attributed. There is consensus in the definitions of restitution as they are all referring to the restoration of land and compensation for people who were dispossessed from their ancestral land as a result of past racially discriminatory laws or practices and comparable redress is paid.

Land tenure

According to Gibson (2009:139) land tenure is defined as changes in the legal basis of land ownership to provide legal standing and security in land ownership (for example, the formalization of informal land rights, especially in rural areas and the former 'homelands'). According to FAO (2002:7) land tenure is the relationship, whether legally or customarily defined, among people, as individuals or groups, with

respect to land. ("Land" is used here to include other natural resources such as water and trees.) Land tenure is an institution, i.e., rules invented by societies to regulate behaviour. Rules of tenure define how property rights to land are to be allocated within societies. They define how access is granted to rights to use, control, and transfer land, as well as associated responsibilities and restraints. In simple terms, land tenure systems determine who can use what resources for how long, and under what conditions (FAO 2002:7).

The definitions for land tenure by FAO and Gibson are consensus because they both refer to the legal status of the individuals or groups in land ownership. However for the purpose of this study the definition that will be adopted is the changes in the legal standing of land ownership and security in land ownership irrespective of gender and age.

Livelihood

According to Chambers & Conway (1991:6) livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (stores, resources, claims and access) and activities required for a means of living: a livelihood is sustainable if it can cope with and recover from stress and shocks, maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets, and provide sustainable livelihood opportunities for the next generation; and which contributes net benefits to other livelihoods at the local and global levels and in the long and short term.

The commonly used definition is a livelihood that comprises the capabilities, assets, which include both material and social resources, and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with, and recover from, stresses and shocks and maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets, both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resource (State of the World's Volunteerism Report 2011:41).

A mobile and flexible term, 'livelihoods' can be attached to all sorts of other words to construct whole fields of development enquiry and practice. These relate to locales (rural or urban livelihoods), occupations (farming, pastoral or fishing livelihoods), social difference (gendered, age-defined livelihoods), directions (livelihood pathways,

trajectories), dynamic patterns (sustainable or resilient livelihoods) and many more. Livelihoods perspectives start with how different people in different places live (Scoones 2009:172).

There is consensus in the definitions of livelihoods. The definition that will be adopted for this study will comprise the capabilities, assets which include both material and social resources of the beneficiaries who benefitted from land reform which will enable them to improve their standard of living.

Efficiency

Efficiency measures the ability of how the various programme converts inputs into outputs (staff, time, and budget allocation) i.e. redistributed farms and productivity of those farms (Genesis Analytics 2014:57). In a more general sense, it is the ability to do things well, successfully, and without waste. According to (Skogan 1976:279)

Efficiency is the conversion of inputs into outputs using fewer resources. There is consensus in the definitions of efficiency. The definition that will be adopted for this study is the ability of beneficiaries to avoid wasting materials and resources by doing things well without wasting time and effort.

Sustainable livelihoods

According to Roe 1998 in Majale (2002:5) sustainable livelihoods is a call to reduce the complexity and uncertainty that gives rise to demands for sustainable livelihoods in the first place and Majale (2002:5) indicated that sustainable livelihoods can be seen as a way of thinking about the objectives, scope and priorities for development, in order to enhance progress in poverty elimination. Nevertheless while sustainable livelihoods may mean many things to many people, Krantz (2001:6) indicated that sustainable livelihoods could serve as 'an integrating factor that allows policies to address 'development, sustainable resource management, and poverty eradication simultaneously'. There is consensus in the definitions of sustainable livelihoods especially with Majale and Krantz because they consider issues of development which must alleviate poverty in a sustainable manner. However for the purpose of

this study, the definition that will be used will be addressing development issues and sustainable resource management while eradicating poverty at the same time.

Livelihood approach: is a way of thinking about the objectives, scope and priorities for development. It focuses on the multiple resources, skills and activities that people draw upon to sustain their physical, economic, spiritual and social needs. Ultimately, it is an attempt to redefine development in terms of what human beings need and, would add, in terms of what they can contribute to one other's well-being (State of the World's Volunteerism Report 2011:41).

Effectiveness:

Effectiveness is the accuracy and completeness with which users achieve certain goals. Indicators of effectiveness include quality of solution and error rates (Frokjaer, Hertzum & Hornbaek 2000:345). According to Genesis Analytics (2014:60) effectiveness is measured by the extent to which the programme meets its set outputs. Additional measure of effectiveness of the programme is the degree to which it contributes to achieving its stated results.

For the purpose of this study effectiveness will be defined as the degree to which the objectives (something is successful in producing a desired result) of the targeted problem are solved (success).

8. Significance of the study

The study intends to make recommendations which could improve the impact of land redistribution in South Africa. It is expected that this study intend to generate and contribute to the general body of knowledge and a better understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of land redistribution programme in Limpopo Province. It is also expected that the findings of the study may hold potential that could influence policy on land reform and may open more questions for further study.

9. Summary

Globally, land redistribution is a strategy which some countries have pursued in response to poverty and inequality. This was the case in regions like Latin America and Asia. In Africa, inequality in land ownership was one of the reasons for the liberation struggles which many countries had to forge. In South Africa, apartheid discriminatory legislation led to unjust and unequal allocation of land, leading to the marginalisation and exclusion of millions of the black population. In order to redress these historical imbalances and injustices, the democratic government embarked on a series of reforms. These included land reform which took the form of land tenure reform, land redistribution and land restitution. The underlying rationale for these reforms was to eradicate poverty and inequality.

The main purpose of land redistribution is to provide the poor with access to land for residential and productive uses in order to improve their income and quality of life. In South Africa the long term goal of land reform is social cohesion and development. This can only be achieved through supporting the land reform beneficiaries with technical support, extension services, finance and marketing. The aim of the research therefore was to assess the impact of land redistribution on the quality of life of the beneficiaries. The study focussed on the Vhembe District in Limpopo Province. The area was selected because it is one of the Municipalities which has benefited in terms of receiving land under the land redistribution programmes. Whereas substantial information exists on the number of households which have received land, it is not so evident what the impact has been on their quality of life, hence the decision to embark on a systematic research study of this nature.

10. Outline of the Report

This study is made up of five chapters

Chapter 1: Introduction and background

This chapter introduces the study and gives the background of the problem to be studied. It includes what has been studied which relates to the current study,

problem statement, aim and objectives of the study, research questions, the significance of the study, definition of the concepts to be used in the study.

Chapter 2: Literature review

This chapter introduces the literature reviewed about land redistribution internationally, in Africa and in South Africa. The study reviewed what other researchers are saying about the problem and how they addressed the problem studied. The study focussed on the effectiveness of the land redistribution programme in the Vhembe District of Limpopo Province and the impact on the quality of life for beneficiaries of land redistribution in South Africa.

Chapter 3: Research methodology

In this chapter the research paradigm, methodology and the method were outlined. The choice of instruments, sampling methods, data collection procedures as well as the method of analysis was described in detail. The case study method was used to evaluate the effectiveness of Land Redistribution programme and the quality of life for the intended beneficiaries. The population of the study was purposefully selected from the land redistribution projects in Vhembe District of Limpopo Province.

Chapter 4: Presentation and interpretation of research findings

The chapter presents the findings of the research and the interpretation thereof based on the stated aim, objectives and research questions which were outlined in chapter 1.

It also describes the research design, the identification of the study population, selection of the sample, the data collection methods which were used and also the methods of data analysis.

Chapter 5: Conclusion and recommendations

This chapter concludes the study by revisiting the research problem, its aim, objectives and key research questions. It summarises the main research findings and discusses the extent to which the research provides answers to the questions which were posed at the beginning of the study. Most importantly, the chapter draws policy lessons from the investigation and makes the necessary recommendations which arise out of the study. Finally, it identifies areas for future research.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature on land reform globally as well as in the context of South Africa. At a global level, it gives examples of regions and countries that have undertaken such reforms, the rationale for those reforms and their socio-economic impacts. It describes the South African context in more detail since it is the focus of the investigation. The chapter explains the legislative context which has shaped the land reform issue.

The discussion is important because there are very clear policy expectations in terms of what the reforms were meant to achieve and that will be the yardstick against which the impact on livelihoods will be measured. The chapter also presents some theoretical perspectives on land reform-the political, social and economic arguments that advocate such a process. In particular, it reviews the literature on the impact of land reform and the factors that determine the livelihoods and quality of life for land redistribution beneficiaries. Such a review is useful for this investigation because, in developing the indicators of analysis, the researcher borrows from some of this literature. An important dimension of the chapter also relates to the available evidence on the livelihoods of land reform beneficiaries after land reform. The researcher critically examines a number of studies with a view to distilling the factors that determine the effectiveness of land redistribution on quality of lives for land reform beneficiaries. Once again, these are important for the design of indicators for the present research. Finally, the chapter identifies where knowledge gaps, exist and this helps to locate the likely contribution of the current study.

The chapter is structured as follows.

The chapter have the introduction which introduces the arguments with regards to the assessment of the effectiveness of land redistribution on quality of lives for beneficiaries.

Section 2.2 reviews global trends in land reform, focusing on the rationale, approaches, successes and failures where they have occurred. The purpose of the section is to contextualise land reform within a global context.

Section 2.3 will critically examine land redistribution in South Africa, focusing on the history of land allocation and ownership, the legislation and policies upon which the policies were anchored, the provisions in the new Constitution in 1994, and subsequent progress on such reforms since that period.

Section 2.4 presents a theoretical perspective and reviews different perceptions on the link between land redistribution and livelihoods and how they impact on the quality of lives.

Section 2.5 critically reviews the evidence in terms of impact and effectiveness of land reform. It is based on an empirical review of the experiences of selected countries in Africa. The emphasis is to assess how land redistribution impacted on the quality of life to those that benefited from the reforms and to assess the factors that contributed to success or failure.

Section 2.6 identifies issues that are emerging from literature and it is clear that in most countries there is a need to consider subdividing the land reform farms to ensure food security. There is a need for provision of credit and support services to land reform beneficiaries.

2.2. Land and redistribution: review of global trends

The colonization of Africa included the appropriation of land for white settlers and colonial corporations predominantly in Southern Africa (Angola, Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland, Zambia, and Zimbabwe), Kenya, and Côte d'Ivoire. Just before and immediately after independence from the late 1950s through to the 1970s, several of these countries undertook land reforms to redress colonial and post-independence land ownership inequalities and regressive land use policies (Byamugisha 2014:2).

Governments across Africa, Asia, and Latin America recognize customary land rights by issuing formal titles to local people. Policy-makers in parts of Latin America and Africa implement programmes that redistribute land from large landowners to landless people and tenants. All these programmes seek to enhance the land rights of disadvantaged groups by way of land redistribution (Silkor & Muller 2009:1307).

Growing landlessness, historical grievances and demands for redistribution are some of the significant issues underlying demands for a comprehensive national land policy and a constitutional framework for the administration of land. On the eve of independence, the colonial administration initiated a land redistribution programme intended to prevent land-hungry peasants from destabilizing the economy and to provide opportunities for the new African elite to engage in farming (Byamugisha 2014:88).

Many countries have been struggling with land reform for years. Australia, for example, has for various reasons (and after more than a decade) been unable to effect substantial land reform in favour of the Aboriginal people. Many other countries such as Brazil, Chile, Kenya, Mexico, India and Namibia are also battling with their land reform processes. There were recently mass demonstrations in India's capital, New Delhi, with rural farmers and particularly women demanding more access to land and governmental support. Namibia is experiencing increasing complaints regarding the slow pace of its land reform process, while Zimbabwe is the poster child of the disaster that can be wreaked when land reform goes wrong (De Villiers 2008:4).

South Africa, Zimbabwe and Kenya's land reform policy making were overwhelmingly informed by the logic of the market. These programmes were predominantly attributed to the political compromises that were reached in the negotiation process towards black majority rule in Kenya, Zimbabwe and South Africa (Kariuki 2004:10). The shortcomings of the land redistribution and willing seller-willing buyer programmes initiated in the post-independence period can largely be attributed to excessive power by the World Bank and the financial support that was promised during the negotiation process (Akech 2010:25; Lahiff 2007:1592).

Land reform was a key component of the socialist revolutions shaking many countries in Europe, Latin America and Africa. Socialist movements considered it a crucial element of the desired processes of social transformation. Land reform was the primary vehicle by which to break the power base of “the modern class” and enlist the support of the peasantry in the revolution (Silkor & Muller 2009:1308). Land is an important source of life, social status and political power (Sibanda 2010:97).

Despite these reforms, inequality in land ownership and landlessness are still at unacceptable levels in many countries. The most extreme example of land ownership inequality is in South Africa (Byamugisha 2014:398). In Africa, colonial settlements left such a legacy of unequal land distribution that even independence struggles and negotiations were unable to correct the situation. Although the rise of social movements and more progressive governments has led to serious attempts to correct the highly unequal distribution of land, this has been done primarily through government-led compulsory land acquisition (expropriation) and distribution programmes, many of which have been slow, administratively costly, and often unaccompanied by measures to develop redistributed land (Byamugisha 2014:344).

In the late-colonial and post-colonial decades both governments and civil society groups in many countries attempted to correct some of these historical distortions by land reforms or other means of breaking up large private or corporate estates and their redistribution to smallholders. Some of these initiatives were modest reformist measures intended to stem the radicalisation of the rural poor as a political force while others were adopted by newly independent post-colonial states engaged in nationalist projects of indigenisation (White, Borrás Jr; Hall; Scoones & Woolford, 2012:624).

In 1975, after the overthrow of the imperial monarchy, Ethiopia experienced the most radical land reform so far undertaken in the continent, a transformation that abolished all forms of tenancy and vested control of the land in the state. That very same redistributive reform today serves to facilitate a spatially differentiated but no less extensive process of land alienation (Makki & Geisler 2011:3). Land issues are politically sensitive in Ethiopia and have been at the heart of political conflicts and

reforms (Holden & Bezu 2016:411). The land is also an important source of life, social status and political power (Sibanda 2010:97).

Zimbabwe was colonised by the British in the last decade of the 19th century. With the arrival of settlers in 1890, ownership of the land became a contested issue. The land question emerged as a colonial creation, and its trajectory is painfully complex. The whites expropriated land from the black majority (Sibanda & Maposa 2014:56).

In Kenya, there has been growing interest in land because the land question was not addressed successfully at the time of independence in 1963, although issues of land access and control significantly shaped the struggle for independence (Binswanger-Mkhize, Bourguignon & Van Den Brink 2009:87). The constitutionalizing of land matters in Kenya has raised disappointment with the failure to resolve Kenya's land issues and runs the risk of spilling over and being perceived as a failure of the Constitution itself (Manji 2014:126). As stipulated in their constitution all land in Kenya belongs to the people of Kenya collectively as a nation, as communities and as individuals (Manji 2014:118).

The land reform programme failed to address the problem of landlessness because the objectives of the initial phase of reform centred on economic interests: how to maintain a stable economy after independence. The reform prioritized issues of equity and economic efficiency on the assumption that giving Africans access to holdings in the White Highlands would reduce social tension (Binswanger-Mkhize *et al* 2009:114).

Mozambique possesses 36 million hectares of arable land, of which 5.7 million hectares are estimated to be currently under cultivation. Of the total population of Mozambique (21.4 million), 14.3 million live in rural areas and agricultural production is almost solely derived from the labour of small farmers cultivating plots of land averaging 1.3 hectares (Batistella & Bolfe 2010 in Clements & Fernandes 2013:51). Approximately 80 per cent of the Mozambican population is involved in the agricultural sector, with the majority of the produce either used for subsistence, or

marketed at the regional, provincial and national levels (Clements & Fernandes 2013:51).

Even in apparently land-abundant areas such as northern Mozambique. Land is unequally distributed among households as many households do not possess as much land as they desire.

Moreover, village power relations and gender are key determinants of access to land, making differences in land holdings tough. This poses a major question of Mozambique's land legislation principles, in particular its blanket endorsement of customary property arrangements and customary leaders' powers over land issues (Silkor & Muller 2009:1313).

Ethiopia is one of the countries that has received attention as sources of land for international investors, while land access is increasingly difficult for rural households in the densely populated highlands of Ethiopia, where land sales are strictly prohibited and smallholders only are allowed to rent out part of their land for a shorter period (Holden & Bezu 2016:410).

Land is a socio-economic resource that is critical in the livelihoods of rural people (Moyo 2013:5393). For centuries, women particularly those in rural areas, have been connected to land in various ways and to varying degrees. They have used the land for both social and agricultural purposes (Moyo 2013:5393).

The Philippines has long been known for its high inequality in distribution of wealth and income (Fuwa 2000:1). Partly due to its historically high inequality there has been long erratic incidence of peasant unrest and rural revolutions there. The Philippines land problem refers to one of the most rooted in legacies of colonialism and to recall a long, bloody history littered with half-hearted land reform laws. Nowhere else in Asia has the land problem suffered so deeply and for so long or produced so many failed attempts at land reform like the Philippines (Borras, Carranza & Franco 2007:1557).

Land redistribution is in fact power redistribution, while decentralisation is a development process that inherently involves power. The market-led policy model in land reform is a prime example 'de-politicizing' development, a framework propagated by neoliberal-dominated institutions like the World Bank. Past experience suggests that development interventions pursued from within this framework are likely to lead to elite capture and anti-poor outcomes (Borras *et al* 2007:1563).

Land is one of the most highly valued possessions of human society. In Ethiopia, the most ancient system of landholding is the communal land tenure system. This system is characterized by all members of society having the communal right to land in accordance with the ancient organization of the society based on the family, the clan and other larger lineage groups. People freely exploit the resources of the land (Gebeyehu 2011:567).

According to Mamphodo (2006:8) the purpose of land reform in different countries appears that the main goal of land reform is to advance the socio-economic status of the people who were previously landless. South Africa follows exactly the same goals, but it is not known whether the programme is successful or not. Although the agricultural activities and other livelihood options are affected by various factors (climatic conditions, markets, infrastructure, physical conditions), unequal access to land and insecure land tenure have the most profound effect on the livelihoods of smallholders in Africa (Economic Commission for Africa 2004:6).

Different countries initiate land reform under different historical conditions, economic climate, and customary rights and with country specific goals i.e. productivity, efficiency, equity, access to assets, rural development, improvements in the context of a particular state ideology (Ruhiga 2011:34). The importance of land and labour rights to women in sub-Saharan Africa is on account of the predominantly agrarian nature of livelihood activities, whose low technological base makes labour a critical factor (Tsikata & Amanor-Wilks 2015:1).

The goals of land reform in Kenya includes equitable access to land; security of land rights; sustainable and productive management of land resources; transparent and

cost effective administration of land; and elimination of gender discrimination in law, customs, and practice related to land and property in land (Manji 2014:118).

Agriculture is the human endeavour likely to be most affected by changes in climate (Giovannucci *et al* 2012:35). There is a need for demonstrating the importance of natural resources for sustainable economic development, not only because the poor often rely disproportionately on access to natural resources to meet their immediate needs, but also because degradation of natural resources can have profound impacts on the health and livelihoods of the poor as well as future growth prospects (Policy Research Report 2015:14).

Land reform has been viewed by many development experts as a potential strategy for reducing poverty and fostering rural development. Government statistics indicate that agriculture is the largest contributor to the Malawian economy; it accounts for 38% of the national Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and 80% of export earnings. The sector also provides employment for 85% of the population (Mendola & Simtowe 2015:53).

2.3. Land redistribution in South Africa: historical perspective

When the National Party government came into power in 1948, it started to review the so-called “native” policy. The review resulted in the introduction of the separate development policy. In 1959, the promotion of Bantu Self-government Act was promulgated to establish the Bantustans. Africans were divided along ethnic lines and grouped together accordingly to form what was called ‘separate self-government Bantu national units’. This system entrenched the position of traditional leaders and headmen as colonial and apartheid agents of indirect rule (Kloppers & Pienaar 2014:707).

The then National Party government's strategy of territorial segregation, population resettlement and political exclusion was founded on a history of conquest and dispossession enforced through oppressive land laws. The South African land law has also been employed to establish the political ideology of racial segregation by

means of spatial separation of race groups, thereby creating a controversial body of statutory law which was called apartheid law (Kloppers & Pienaar 2014:680).

The effect of this racially-based segregation legislation was to force black people to be “permanent tenants” with very limited rights. The first of these racially based segregation laws was the *Natives Land Act 27* of 1913, which in 2013 the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform celebrated its centenary.

The implementation of separate development resulted in the second spate of mass forced removals, which took place from the 1960s through to the 1980s. Africans in ‘black spots’ (areas where Africans had acquired freehold title to their land outside the Bantustans) were forced to move to the Bantustans. About 3.5 million people were removed from urban and white rural areas including ‘black spots’ areas into Bantustans (Mamphodo 2006:21).

A large population number of black South Africans was forced, during the Apartheid era, into impoverished and overcrowded reserves, homelands and townships through decentralization. Because of the lack of industries or mines, this posed a serious problem as black South Africans depended on salaries for livelihood (Mamphodo 2006:2).

2.3.1. The natives land act 27 of 1913

The *Natives Land Act* laid the foundation for apartheid and territorial segregation and, for the first time, formalised limitations on black land ownership. The Act introduced ethnic differentiation based on the mistaken belief that differentiation between dissimilar races was fundamentally necessary according to section 1(1) of the Act:

Except with the approval of the Governor-General -

a native shall not enter into any agreement or transaction for the purchase, hire, or other acquisition from a person other than a native, of any such land or of any right thereto, interest therein, or servitude; and

a person other than a native shall not enter into any agreement or transaction for the purchase, hire, or other acquisition from a native of any such land or of any right thereto, interest therein, or servitude there over.

The Act effectively prohibited sharecropping contracts between white landowners and black farmers, resulting in many black farmers losing a substantial portion of their income, which in turn resulted in further economic hardship for them. As a law based on racial segregation, it is clear why this piece of legislation was singled out in the redistribution programme as the effective starting point for apartheid. This Act represented the first step in effecting racially based segregation, a system which was furthered through the *Native Trust and Land Act* 18 of 1936.

2.3.2. The native trust and land act 18 of 1936

The *Native Trust and Land Act* made provision for the establishment of the South African Native Trust, a state agency to administer trust land, and "to be administered for the settlement, support, benefit, and material welfare of the natives of the Union" (Kloppers & Pienaar 2014:682). The Act abolished individual land ownership by black people and introduced trust tenure through the creation of the South African Development Trust (SADT), which was a government body responsible for purchasing land in "released areas" for black settlement.

In terms of section 2(1) of the Act, certain areas of land (including land identified in the *Natives Land Act*) were transferred to the Native Trust to be administered by the Trust. Vested in the Trust was land reserved for the occupation of natives and land within the scheduled native areas as identified in the *Natives Land Act*. The *Native Trust and Land Act* was an important instrument used by the then government to facilitate its policy of racial segregation.

The Act stripped black South Africans of their right to own land or even to live outside demarcated areas without proper authorization by the relevant authorities. It is clear that this Act furthered the objective of racial segregation, which eventually necessitated the need for land reform.

2.3.3. The group areas act 41 of 1950

The *Group Areas Act* of 1950, described as the "second wave" of evictions, was used by the then National Party government to forcibly remove black, coloured and Indian people from designated "white areas". The aim of the Act was to provide for the establishment of group areas and for the control of the acquisition of immovable property and the occupation of land and premises. The Act established three groups of people - a white group, a native group and a coloured group.

The Act made provision for the establishment of group areas designated for the exclusive use and ownership of members of a particular group

2.3.4. The group areas act 36 of 1966

The *Group Areas Act* of 1966, replaced the *Group Areas Act* of 1950. The aim of the Act was to consolidate the law related to the establishment of group areas and to regulate the control of the acquisition of immovable property and the occupation of land and premises. The Act showed numerous similarities with the *Group Areas Act* of 1950 and also established three groups for the purposes of the Act; white, Bantu and coloureds. Section 13 of the Act prohibits the acquisition of immovable property in a controlled area, while section 20 placed restrictions on the occupation of land in a controlled area.

The Act also stated that no person who is a member of any group shall occupy and no person shall allow any such person to occupy any land or premises in a specified area which was not lawfully occupied except under the authority of a permit.

It is evident that the effects of these Land Acts are morally and practically unacceptable and that the Acts had to be repealed in order to achieve a more equal distribution of land ownership. The following section will provide a brief overview of the measures taken between 1991 and 1997, which were aimed at addressing the inequalities brought about by the Land Acts.

2.3.5. The new democratic South Africa

Since its transition to democracy, South Africa has implemented a multifaceted programme of land reform to address problems of historical dispossession and rural poverty, relying heavily on the concept of “willing buyer, willing seller”. In 1994, South Africa had approximately 82 million hectares of white-owned agricultural land. The new democratic government promised to redistribute 30% of this land, or 24.5 million hectares, to the previously disadvantaged by 2014 (Hall 2004:24; Lahiff 2007:2; Binswanger-Mkhize 2014:255; Kloppers & Pienaar 2014:690).

By the end of 2009, the government had acquired 6.7 million hectares of that land, which equals approximately 26% of the 24.5 million hectare target. Since 2009 it is estimated that a further 1.25 million hectares were redistributed, bringing the total to 7.95 million hectares, about one third of the target of 24.5 million hectares by 2012. Other government statistics indicate that 4 813 farms had been transferred to black people and communities between 1994 and 2013, benefiting 230 886 people (Binswanger-Mkhize 2014:255).

Land reform is a national priority and is further entrenched in Section 25 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 (Act No.108 of 1996). A three-pronged land reform programme aiming at tenure reform, restitution and land redistribution, was launched in 1994. According to s.25 ss 5 of the constitution of South Africa 1996 it places an obligation on the state to 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 constitution makes it clear that the right to property is not absolute. Property may not only be subject to restriction or regulation by the state but may be expropriated for a public purpose or in the public interest. The public interest is clearly stated to include land reform (RSA 1996:1253).

According to Mc Cusker & Schmitz (2008:81) land redistribution gives historically disadvantaged citizens eligibility to benefit from land procured through a willing-buyer, willing-seller approach. Land redistribution does not imply that the

beneficiaries applying for land were disposed from it, rather it is a mechanism used to address South Africa's highly unequal racial distribution of land.

The rural land issue nevertheless remains a political sensitive point on the agenda of the South African government, specifically as rural land allocation was one of the cornerstones of the apartheid policy. When apartheid ended in 1994, 87% of the rural land was controlled by 50,000 white commercial farmers, with the total rural black population dependent on the balance of land within the former homelands (White Paper on Land Reform 1997:23).

The land reform programme thus aims to achieve objectives of both equity (in terms of land access and ownership) and efficiency (in terms of improved land use), while also contributing to the development of the rural economy. These objectives, and the preferred means of achieving them, are described in the 1997 White Paper: "The purpose of the land redistribution programme is to provide the poor with access to land for residential and productive uses, in order to improve their income and quality of life. The programme aims to assist the poor, labour tenants, farm workers, women, as well as emergent farmers. Redistributive land reform will be largely based on willing-buyer willing-seller arrangements. Government will assist in the purchase of land, but will in general not be the buyer or owner" (White paper on land reform 1997:61).

Land reform in South Africa came to the fore as a result of the Zimbabwean government's departure from a 'willing-seller, willing-buyer' model to violent and large scale commercial farm invasions of 2000 (Sibanda 2010:5). The violent large scale and fast tracked farm invasions of 2000 in Zimbabwe, had strong meaning for the ANC and landless people in South Africa, where severely skewed land ownership patterns that are in favour of the minority white people persist. Before then, while the need for land reform was acknowledged, it was not so much a topical issue as it became after Zimbabwe's large scale land expropriations (Sibanda 2010:5).

Ethiopia has a similar land tenure system to those in China and Vietnam and also recently achieved promising economic growth, indicating that Ethiopia may be able

to follow the economic development path of these Asian countries. However, Ethiopia remains far behind. Vietnam and China are also gradually allowing greater market activity in the land sector such as mortgaging of land and, in Vietnam, even land sales. The use of more long-term lease contracts is a natural step in this direction. The land rental restrictions in Ethiopia that only allow smallholders to rent out a maximum of 50% of their land are designed to avoid outmigration and the development of a class of absentee landlords. The issues of the land as a safety net remain politically important (Holden & Bezu 2016:421).

2.4. Theoretical perspectives: land redistribution and livelihoods

Land reform has been used by governments in both developed and developing countries as the main policy tool to redress excessive historical inequalities in land ownership (Bangwayo-Skeete; Bezabih; Zikhali 2010:319). In South Africa land reform is complexly connected to the national transformation processes, which however unfold within complex matrices of the global capitalist business, economic and political environments. Considering the current overall low contribution of agriculture into the GDP of South Africa, it could be argued that there would be a potential to worsen the business economics of agricultural land with the allocation of land to the previously disadvantaged communities (Sebola & Tsheola 2014:119).

The objectives of land reform in Southern Africa tended to combine various elements of the wider social, economic, and political objectives, focusing on stabilizing the postcolonial nations by easing historical grievances and accommodating immediate land needs. Although there are refined variations in the objectives, which are reviewed periodically, those variations mainly have been functionalist efforts to alleviate poverty, promote rural development, and rehabilitate displaced people (Moyo 2009:340)

According to the White Paper on Land Reform (1996:10) land redistribution issues of importance include:

- How to respond appropriately to the widely differing needs and aspirations of people for land, in both urban and rural areas, in a manner that is both

equitable and affordable, and at the same time contribute to poverty alleviation and to national economic growth;

- How to address the urgent and immediate cases of landlessness and homelessness which often result in land invasions;
- How to make available commonage for poor residents of rural towns who wish to supplement their incomes.

Land reform is not merely an economic programme aimed at spreading social and economic justice but also a political programme borne out of a negotiated settlement aimed at balancing the interests of the landowners with those of the land-deprived majority of its population within a market orientated economic framework (Kariuki 2004:5). Land reform works most effectively when it is part of an overall strategy for rural development, or what is referred to as agrarian reform. Rural needs such as improved access to credit; price reforms and improved physical infrastructure must also be met. One issue is that a minimum plot size might exist, although clearly minimum size will vary depending on the context (Jacobs 2010: 6).

South Africa is characterised by large scale commercial agriculture which is called industrial agriculture which was predominantly practised prior to the eighties. This type of agriculture is characterised by highly capitalised infrastructure and machinery, large scale farming units, reliance on high volumes of external inputs such as fertilisers and pesticides, and is heavily dependent on government subsidies (Hart 2003:16). Large farms and farms that cannot rely on family labour inputs are inherently incapable of matching the efficiency with which small farmers use the abundant factor (Sender & Johnston 2004:145).

Land reform in South Africa to date has involved the transfer of relatively large commercial farms in their entirety to groups of beneficiaries. The country's large commercial farming units, typically in the range of 100 to 1,000 hectares arose historically from a combination of ecological and political factors, including forced dispossession of black occupiers, generous state subsidies to white owners under apartheid, and various forms of forced labour. Many new beneficiaries of land reform undoubtedly would prefer to gain access to relatively small areas or subdivision of

land on a household basis, but more often than not they have found themselves owning large farms as part of a sizable collective which most of the beneficiaries are unable to manage (Lahiff & Li 2014:39).

According to Aliber & Cousins (2013:162) the impacts of land redistribution on the livelihoods of beneficiaries and others have been mixed in most countries. According to Binswanger-Mkhize, Bourguignon & van den Brink (2009:10) rural development undoubtedly is an effective engine for economic development and poverty reduction and its effectiveness in reducing rural poverty depends on the form that it takes. The vast majority of farmers in developing countries are smallholders. The superior efficiency of small farmers arose out of reliance on family labour, use of affordable capital and the hire of machinery from rental markets (Ruhiiga 2011:30).

The social version of land reform also argues that smaller-scale production is inherently unproductive, and that the urbanization trends since the 1980s are irreversible (Moyo 2014:339). Van den Brink (2006: 19) reports that small farmers operate their holdings using mainly family labour capital they can afford and hire machinery from rental markets.

Some political economists therefore stressed the need to concentrate extremely limited investment resources only on those rural areas and institutions with the greatest capacity to increase marketed output (Sender & Johnston 2004:143). This is the main reason for small scale superior efficiency (Ruhiiga 2011:34). This position was earlier raised by Deininger & Binswanger (1999: 249) who report that small holder farms are desirable from an equity and efficiency perspective in the belief that providing services and infrastructure without restructuring land access and ownership at household level will improve living standards misses one critical issue (Ruhiiga 2011:35).

According to Binswanger-Mkhize *et al* (2009:11) it is often assumed that small-scale farms are backward and that breaking up large farms will result in a loss of efficiency in the economy. In reality, nearly a century of research by agricultural economists all over the world has produced a counterintuitive stylized fact: small-scale farmers generally use land, labour, and capital more efficiently than large-scale farmers who

depend primarily on hired labour. At the micro-level, there is an abundant literature that suggests that small-scale farms are more productive than large-scale farms, seemingly indicating that land redistribution can boost living standards and aggregate productivity (Keswell & Carter 2014: 251).

According to Bangwayo-Skeete, *et al* (2010: 321) technical efficiency declines with farm size and the education level of the household head while it increases with increased family size and age of household head. Agriculture generally contributes to the structural transformation of economies through labour provision, capital, foreign exchange and food provision to the large population (Sebola & Tsheola 2014:118).

Arguments against land redistribution have been based largely on the wrong assumption that small-scale farmers are either unable to contribute to such an export strategy or cannot contribute to an equally productive development strategy based on expanding domestic markets (Moyo 2014:341).

According to Aliber & Cousins (2013:141) where land reform beneficiaries manage to use the redistributed farms productively in the application of the LCSF model the poverty reduction benefits are typically immaterial; this merely reflects the manner in which the characteristic capital-intensity of the LSCF model is out of sync with South Africa's rural unemployment crisis. More generally, the LSCF model fails to take into account social realities, not least the abilities and aspirations of rural dwellers, and results in 'land reform projects' that are intrinsically unworkable and prone to collapse.

The large scale commercial farming model applicable to former white minority in South Africa is strongly supported by the government; yet it has been a total failure for farm beneficiaries who lack the experience, technical knowhow and finances (Ruhiga 2011:35). This finding is in agreement with Lahiff (2007:1588) who concluded that the failure to subdivide is the single greatest contributor to the general underperformance of land reform projects. There is no convincing rationale for the government's refusal to subdivide land, other than perhaps the inherent costs

involved in surveying, demarcation, subdivision and identification of recipient households (Ruhiiga 2011:35).

In most countries land reform and the concept of 'viability' is possibly the most noticeable display of how the LSCF model informs the implementation of land reform and it is also, ironically, the lens through which the deficiencies of land reform policies are viewed by policy-makers (Aliber & Cousins 2013:141). Moyo (2014:339) argues that the benefits of large-scale farming are overestimated, given their historical privileges, social costs, and environmental sustainability.

Since the fact that Ethiopian land reform goes beyond land redistribution, it includes changes in both land tenure and agricultural organization. It also supports other rural development measures such as: changes in the technology of agriculture, facilitates farm credit and cooperatives for farm-input supply and marketing, and extension services to facilitate the productive use of the land reallocated. The danger with these wider prescriptions is that they may discourage governments from doing anything until they can do everything (Baye 2013:146).

In reaction to the contemporary phenomenon of land grabbing and the negative assumptions that are made about the consequences of large-scale agriculture for food security and employment, White *et al* (2012:625) has reviewed the historical evidence on the productivity and employment generation record of 'plantation farming and large-scale farming' in twentieth century in sub-Saharan Africa. He concludes that large-scale farms have not always been less productive, or less labour absorbing, than small ones, but that they are generally marked by relatively low quality of employment.

According to Moyo (2014:339) the debate is on the provision of credit, services, electricity, irrigation, and marketing infrastructure enjoyed by the large-scale farming sector. There is a need and demand of a generalized shift in the national policy framework that would challenge the historical privileges and provide for the new land reform beneficiaries. The lack of support infrastructure for post settlement support is noted in South Africa and this led to the collapse of most land reform farms (Ruhiiga 2011:33). May *et al* (2002:299) further added that the provision of services, such as

water and electricity, and facilities, such as schools and clinics, are central determinants of the physical quality of life of land reform beneficiaries which are sufficiently important for inclusion into study.

Land reforms have historically either taken place along collective or individual household lines and most successful in terms of raising agricultural output. Agrarian reform has been one of the main aims of peasant movements, the intended outcome being to democratise rural sectors through land distribution, and to improve the lives and livelihoods of smallholders. However, such democratisation may not extend to smallholder women (Jacobs 2004:2; Lahiff 2007:18).

The new models for linking agribusiness investment to the needs of small- and medium-scale farmers suggest that profitability, social equity, and poverty alleviation may be mutually supportive, if investments are carefully crafted (Giovannucci *et al* 2012:46). Basically, land has been rural women's source of livelihood. In both the agricultural and the rural economy, rural women have provided the bulk of the labour force in the production, processing and marketing of food (Moyo 2013:5393).

According to Moyo (2014:339) the social version of land reform is based on the argument that agro-industry is sufficiently modern and competitive, as well as highly rewarding in its export capacity, to permit any intervention in the sector to be confined to the purpose of providing a measure of security to dispossessed and unemployed workers until employment can be generated elsewhere in the economy. The related argument is that the problem of unemployment can no longer be dealt with by means of agrarian reform (as had been the formula in the past) because that would destroy the agro-industry.

It often comes as a shock to those who equate efficiency with the visible signs of modernized, highly mechanized commercial farms that achieve very high crop yields and these yields can be raised enormously by applying lots of fertilizers and pesticides; but because that does not necessarily mean that a profit will be made, achieving high yields can be inefficient. In practice, large commercial farmers often achieve higher yields than family farmers on the land they cultivate. At the same

time, large commercial farmers often use only a small fraction of their land for crops, leaving much arable land idle and forested (Binswanger-Mkhize *et al*, (2009:11).

Access to land is part of a multiple livelihood strategy that is particularly important for poorer households. On the other hand, concerns have been expressed that land reform, unless it is conducted 'properly', could endanger the commercial agricultural sector and even national food security, if agricultural land is redistributed to beneficiaries who make less productive use of it than those from whom it was acquired (Antwi & Oladele 2013:274).

According to the study conducted by May *et al* (2002: 299) food security is the first element affected by land reform. This can be through a direct relationship such as the growing of food or cash crops that are either eaten by the household or traded. Well-being may also be affected through an indirect relationship, because of access to secure tenure, households are able to reallocate their income towards greater food security, receive services and invest in improved shelter. This in turn, improves their health, enhances their quality of life and thus frees up time for productive activities (Chambers, 1988 in May *et al* 2002:299).

South African agriculture is of a highly dualistic nature, whereby a developed commercial sector coexists with large numbers of small farms on communal lands. Close to half of the South African population continues to reside in rural areas and most people are engaged in agriculture on a very small scale. They depend largely on non-agricultural income, including local wage employment and welfare grants, for their livelihoods, often migrating to cities to search for better opportunities. What is needed are interventions that progressively reduce dependency on welfare support (Ruhiiga 2011:33).

The preservation of large scale white owned farms was featured as a key prerequisite to attaining food security in South Africa, Kenya and Zimbabwe. State support of these sectors was evident in these countries. In Zimbabwe, from the 1930s, macro-economic and agricultural policies protected large scale commercial farming (LSCF) access to capital, technology, foreign currency and commodity markets which helped to boost their agricultural production. In South Africa, white

farmers were an important political constituent of the apartheid state. Past governments and associated institutional structures protected and subsidised production and made available large tracts of land, water supply and cheap labour (Kariuki 2004:10; Aliber & Cousins 2013:141).

According to Lahiff (2007:17) the concept of business model in land reform has two main dimensions which need to be taken into account the type of land-use and the socio-economic arrangements associated with it. In order to improve the effectiveness of business models in land reform, both these dimensions will have to be addressed (Lahiff 2007:17). For the business model to improve the livelihood of the intended beneficiaries it will require a more effective use of formal business planning (Lahiff 2007:18).

According to Lahiff (2007:18) a number of critical areas can be identified. Those will require attention if more realistic and effective land reform farms are to be turned into business models which are to be developed to assist beneficiaries in improving the livelihoods of intended beneficiaries as follows:

- Realistic assessment of the needs of the beneficiaries, including socio-economic status, skills, current livelihood activities and aspirations for the short and longer term.
- Capacity building within beneficiaries of land reform to develop leadership skills that promote effective and accountable leadership and encourage the widest possible participation in decision-making processes.
- Development of a variety of land-use options, ranging from small scale, semi commercial and commercial and including both collective and individual options. Where possible, a number of options should be allowed to co-exist, allowing for different individuals or sub-groups within beneficiaries to proceed in different directions and at different paces, depending on their particular circumstances.
- Greater attention to the distribution of benefits including land access, cash income and employment opportunities (Lahiff 2007:18).

According to Hart (2003: 26) the type of agriculture that is to be adopted must coincide with the availability of local resources and the environment. Where the necessary inputs are scarce the project must make provision for this and ensure that subsequent access to these is sustainable.

- The type of agriculture that is to be adopted must coincide with the availability of local resources and the environment.
- Planning must be done in conjunction with the beneficiaries to avoid conflicts.
- Farmers must design their own agricultural systems based on their needs, skills and resources with the support of officials and stakeholders. Stakeholders must not dictate the required system.
- Where project beneficiaries do not have sufficient funding, the state must ensure that funding is available to the project to ensure its success and continued participation of the beneficiaries.
- Sustained commitment of stakeholders is as important as that of the beneficiaries. Terminating funding during a project and prior to any assessment has serious negative effects especially if the success of the project relies on this funding.
- The beneficiaries' immediate concerns seem to be with food security and then for commercialisation of their produce. This is probably directly related to their existing standard of living and availability of other livelihood sources. The emphasis on these two concerns will differ from individual to individual and needs to be determined.
- Transparency and a good relationship amongst stakeholders and farmers is important for sustainability.
- High numbers of farmers and proposed large-scale projects are not necessarily desirable. What is important is the ability to get access to and make sustainable use of agricultural land for agricultural purposes, be they food security, commercial production or both.

The land reform initiatives of the Philippines government have been the combination of (though not limited to) regulation on land tenancy, resettlement on public lands, expropriation and redistribution of private lands (Fuwa 2000:2). In the 1980s to 90s, the Philippines government generated one of the most successful government land

redistribution programmes in the contemporary era, known as the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Programme (CARP). CARP was aimed at redistributing 10.3 million hectares of land to four million peasants (Borras *et al* 2007:1559)

Throughout the colonial period, land reform in Zimbabwe as in several other African nations was expropriated through force and colonial legislation. Sibanda and Maposa (2014:55) observed that during independence in 1980, 6000 white farmers retained 39% of the prime land, adding up to 15, 5 million hectares of agro-ecological farmland, whereas one million black households were confined to 41.4% of land that constituted 16.4 million hectares of marginal land. Apparently, agriculture was the mainstay of the economy and one of the most important economic sectors which accounted for 40% of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and employed more than 70% of the population.

Land reform and the forces of modernization have had a mixed effect on the status of women in Africa. Few agrarian reform or resettlement programmes have significant numbers of female beneficiaries or even pay attention to gender as a beneficiary category (Economic Commission for Africa 2004: 11).

Beyond agriculture, land has a wide array of uses in the organisation of livelihoods and is also the basis of social and political power, and therefore at the heart of gender inequalities in the control of resources (Tshikata & Amanor-Wilks 2015:1). For any meaningful change to take place in rural women's lives, it is critical that they participate in land discourses as informed citizens and not as underdogs. They can only achieve this if they are equipped with the relevant knowledge, training and skills which will enable them to contribute effectively towards their own development, that of their communities and also be able to defend their rights whenever they are violated. It is therefore imperative that women become active players in processes that are meant to improve their quality of life (Moyo 2013:5394). There is space for women to invent or reinvent traditions that enhance their access to economic resources (Mama 2009:44).

According to Moyo (2014:340) the political version of land reform also has various tendencies and is not necessarily distinct from the economic version. The political

version may be subdivided into micro and macro tendencies, the latter being the most closely associated with economic thinking. Ruhiiga (2011:29) argues that land is an economic asset that enables people with access to enter and take meaningful part in social economic life of local communities. Some argue that agrarian reform is therefore a revolutionary political concept rather than a reformist one (Jacobs 2010: 2). Agrarian reform is considered to have a wider meaning than 'land' reform. A situation of 'agrarian' reform covers not only a wide redistribution of land but also the provision of infrastructure, services and, sometimes, a whole programme of redistributive and democratic reforms. 'Land' reform refers to a narrower redistribution of land, usually to a limited group of beneficiaries (Jacobs 2010: 1).

In Kenya land has been a major resource for political support and has been illegally and irregularly allocated to politically connected individuals in total disregard of the public interest, including the potential of inequitable land distribution to stimulate unrest among the ethnic groups that do not benefit from such allocations (Akech 2010:18).

Kenya's history is incredibly complex, as has been its political relationships to other African nations (Mutua & Gonzalez 2013:13). In the 1960s, Kenya attained its independence from Britain and a massive programme of land transfer was undertaken to transfer 1, 2-million acres of formerly European owned, large-scale farms into the hands of African smallholders. The programme, called the Million Acre Settlement Scheme, involved 35 000 African families. The scheme helped to meet the economic demands of colonial Kenya's white settler community, the political objectives of the nationalist leadership, the land grievances of Kenya's poor, and the aspirations of the emerging middle class (Kariuki 2008:148; Boone 2011:1322).

Land reform policy in Zimbabwe was implemented in three phases characterised by critical shifts in economic policy and performance and by changes in the electoral political circumstances. Between 1980 and 1989, land reform was based on state-led purchases of land on the market and its allocation to selected beneficiaries, in the context of heterodox economic policies, which enabled increased public spending on social services and peasant agriculture. From 1990, neoliberal policies restricted

state interventions in markets, in general and restricted social welfare subsidies (Moyo 2013:30).

In Kenya the Njonjo Commission noted in its deliberations that most of the problems relating to land arise mainly from the failures of the authorities concerned to enforce and comply with the law as it exists. These same authorities create new procedures which are inappropriate or inconsistent with existing laws (Kabukuru 2015:1). Kenya's most deeply rooted political conflicts have their roots in the weak foundations put in place to implement land reform. Since independence a minority of Kenyans had become wealthy, to the exclusion of those who had fought for independence (Kariuki 2008:149).

Ethiopia is a country in which land has represented the safety net and access to land has been a constitutional right for all since the radical land reform in 1975. Recent development has made it impossible to continue to provide this constitutional right, and land's function as a safety net is fast eroding due to rapid population growth and land fragmentation. Youth are increasingly landless, and non-farm employment opportunities are increasingly necessary (Bezu & Holden 2016:411).

Currently, land redistribution in South Africa continued to be an emotive, unresolved and political discourse and practice, whilst the international countries provide for business economics imperatives. Attempts by the democratic government to adopt a reasonable compensation model of the willing-seller, willing-buyer has failed to deliver redistributive justice to the previously disadvantaged (Sebola & Tsheola 2014:113).

The Philippines state is not exceptionally powerful or progressive; neither is Philippine society. From 1988 to 1993 the CARP process was dominated by anti-reform policy currents resulting in dismal outcomes. The process was marked by nepotism, corruption and repression and the non-participation of rural social movements (Borras *et al* 2007:1559). There is no systematic effort to monitor ownership of agriculture lands. The effects of land distribution and the subsequent land transfer actions of agrarian reform beneficiaries on landownership are not known (Borras *et al* 2007:1559).

Land, a central pivot of power, is often at the heart of agrarian conflict. The key problem that faces any land reform programme is the institutionalised and skewed nature of the social relations that are borne out of control, access and use of land and its accruing benefits (Kariuki 2004:5). Any programme of land reform has to certainly deal with the provoked issue of property relations and their constitutional basis. It is therefore important to envision land reform processes as networks of power relations in institutionalised form (Kariuki 2004:5). Land redistribution has been utilized in many developing countries. Often, this happened in the wake of social and political revolution. In some cases, however, land reform is made a means to increase the efficiency of the family land and reduce poverty (Baye 2013:149).

Land is central in promoting rural livelihoods in Africa because access to land and security of tenure are the main means through which food security and sustainable development can be realized because the livelihoods of over 70% of the population in Africa are mainly linked to land and natural resources exploitation (Economic Commission for Africa 2004:4). The lack of internal cohesion in production sectors, the low levels of infrastructure, constrained access to land as a resource undermine the growth of an agrarian economy. In the absence of a source of employment, rural areas generally do not have a reliable domestic income base (Ruhiga 2011:36).

The original target of settling 162 000 black farmers in Zimbabwe was not achieved. Inadequate planning and support for small-scale black farmers, linked to the allocation of farms to politicians and senior officials, resulted in a drastic fall in agricultural production. Only 72 000 black farmers were settled on 12 hectare plots in terms of the family farm model by 2000. The British government withdrew its support for the land reform programme, after only spending 3% of the original agreed funding. That resulted in land redistribution slowing down, despite the adoption of land expropriation laws. In the third phase, an escalating social crisis, which culminated in extreme political polarisation by 1997, saw the land redistribution programme shift towards land expropriation, leading to extensive land redistribution and increased state interventions in the economy, alongside bitterly contested elections (Moyo 2013:30).

Aliber & Cousins (2013:164) argue that smallholder farming on subdivided commercial farms has the potential to support large numbers of rural producers, and that small-scale agriculture combined with other livelihood sources can benefit many of the rural poor. Policies are based on the assumption that only LSCF is 'real agriculture', and that land reform projects must be based on some version of this model to be 'viable', are part of the problem, and often contribute directly to project failure. New thinking is required to inform policy and planning if land reform in South Africa has to make more than a marginal contribution to poverty reduction. The production model that beneficiaries of commercial farms are compelled to apply has produced disastrous results leading to the entire collapse of production on acquired farms (Ruhiiga 2011:35).

Zimbabwe was once accorded the role of ensuring food security in the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC), the forerunner of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) region until the year 2000. The healthy picture earned Zimbabwe the status of being the bread basket in Africa South of the Sahara. Nevertheless, the land reform programme has not retained this prestigious status for Zimbabwe. Instead, judged in the context of the impact of the fast track land reform programme, Zimbabwe plunged from being a 'bread basket' into being 'bread case' of the region (Ndhlovu-Gatsheni 2009:1147). Among other reasons, the land reform lacked adequate government financial support, the new and inexperienced farmers failed to feed the nation, and the land question created hatred from the international community, which turned Zimbabwe into a pariah state (Sibanda & Maposa 2014:55).

The Zimbabwean experience has thus far proved that dealing with the agricultural land issue outside of a thorough business economics consciousness is a costly exercise that threatens both human dignity and the country leadership status (Sebola & Tsheola 2014:119).

In Kenya for those without access to political power, politically driven exclusions from owning land has bred deep resentment, especially where the political patrons and administrators who control access to land are perceived to favour members of their own ethnic communities (Akech 2010:17). There were simply no institutional

mechanisms for ensuring fairness among the potential beneficiaries. Whether or not one could be a beneficiary therefore tended to depend on their access to political power.

Zimbabwe's land reform of the year 2000 resulted in a massive agrarian restructuring with huge economic, social and political consequences (Scoones, Marongwe, Mavedzenge, Murimbarimba, Mahenehene, Sukume 2012:2). In Zimbabwe, wholesale land redistribution at the end of the 2000 resulted in the near collapse of the country's commercial agriculture when land was transferred from white farmers to blacks who had little farming experience and inadequate equipment (Antwi & Oladele 2013:274).

Land tenure reform in Kenya was believed to have led to the overall increase in productivity among the African middle class and peasantry in the 60s, 70s and early 80s mainly as a result of the lifting of colonial restrictions on access to land, the growing of cash crops and access to agricultural inputs (Kariuki 2008:146). In the 80s and 90s production levels failed to match the increase in population, due to land tenure problems such as continuous uneconomic land subdivisions and poor agricultural and land-use policies (Kariuki 2008:147). The decline in agricultural production experienced in the late 80s and 90s was partly due to political instability, lack of redistributive strategies, and the related phenomenon of official corruption.

By mid-1961 it was clear that the million acre scheme was a total failure and should be replaced with a more comprehensive settlement scheme (Kariuki 2008:149). Some of Kenya's most deeply rooted political conflicts have their roots in the weak foundations put in place to implement land reform. Since independence a minority of Kenyans had become wealthy, to the exclusion of those who had fought for independence (Kariuki 2008:149). Land redistribution through the willing seller willing buyer approach did not address the problem of landlessness successfully; instead, it triggered other sets of problems that threatened to destabilize the country (Binswanger-Mkhize; Bourguignon & Van Den Brink 2009:88).

In the Brazilian state of São Paulo, the promise of better livelihoods under lease arrangements and job employment have induced many land-reform beneficiaries to

abandon their land-reform settlements and lease them to sugarcane companies and to a lesser extent, this is similar to what is happening in the province of Isabela in the Philippines where the country's largest operational sugarcane ethanol project is found (Borras Jr & Franco 2012:42).

The government of Mozambique has been one of many developing countries promoting land redistribution, welcoming large-scale foreign investments in national agricultural land and indicating concessions as a viable means to generate state revenue to reduce poverty and provide jobs and national food and energy security (Borras *et al.* 2011:224) although many households do not possess as much land as they desire (Silkor & Muller 2009:1313).

The Mozambican President, Armando Guebuza, said that 'biofuel development will not dislodge Mozambican farmers from their lands'. According to the Mozambican leader, underutilised or empty lands would be cultivated for biofuels, and the same initiative would avoid using lands used for food production (Borras *et al.* 2011:217). De Schutter and Li in (Borras Jr; Figc & Suarez 2011:216) argue that that the notion of existing, available marginal lands is fundamentally flawed as investors are looking not only for available lands, but also lands that have sources of water.

The 'land' question in Southern Africa concerns livelihoods, but is also central to a link of other political and symbolic issues concerning traditional authority and new types of citizenship; communal versus individual rights, and what a democratic outcome might look like in rural areas (Jacobs 2004:1). Land is a main source of the income-generating economy involving accumulation of revenue through property tax and from mixed outputs of agricultural land. The land issue in South Africa should rather be solved from a mutual balance of the business economics of agricultural land and socio-politics of equality (Sebola & Tsheola 2014:118).

The willing-seller-willing-buyer principle, as mediated through the market institution which was brokered by the British government launched the Million Acre Scheme (Kariuki 2008:150; Kabukuru 2015:33). Under this stop-gap scheme that prevented radical land reforms, land was bought from departing white settlers and subdivided among Africans (Kabukuru, 2015:33). The scheme also concentrated the possession

of property in the hands of a few politically powerful individuals (Kariuki 2008:150). In Kenya, three powerful political families are estimated to own more than 1 million acres of rural land, while at least 4 million rural Kenyan citizens are landless and at least 11 million own less than 1 hectare.

The agreements in Kenya, Zimbabwe and South Africa carried relevant but limiting views to the land question, the government could not expropriate the land without compensation and the distribution of land was to be done through the willing-seller and willing-buyer approach, hence institutionalising the market mechanism as the central one in land redistribution (Kariuki 2004:11).

In South Africa, there is glaring evidence attesting to the value that people attach to land. The numerous land confrontations between the landless masses and the government are a sign that people need land and it is an important resource (Sibanda 2010:97). The Land Redistribution programme has gone through quite a number of phases since 1994. Traditionally, agrarian or land reform is confined to redistribution of land; in a broader sense, it includes related changes in agricultural institutions, including credit, taxation, rents and cooperatives (Antwi & Oladele 2013:274). Currently South African contribution to the Gross Domestic Products (GDP) has declined to at least 2% in the last four decades (Makhura 2013 in Sebola & Tsheola 2014:119) while Mozambique's contribution to GDP is almost 31% (Sebola & Tsheola 2014:119).

Besides appreciating the importance of land to indigenous people, another lesson that South Africa can draw from the case of Zimbabwe is the need to expedite the land reform process. In Zimbabwe, the process of land reform was so slow that it in fact 'stimulated the desire to have land' (Mamdani 2009:11). In 1980, the incoming ZANU PF government called for the purchase of eight million hectares of land to settle 162 000 households. However, even when the ZANU PF government did purchase land for resettlement, it purchased land with marginal or low agricultural potential. As the decade drew to a close, only 58 000 families out of the initial target of 162 000 had been settled on three million hectares of land (Sibanda 2010:98).

High levels of land ownership inequality and landlessness are still a major source of conflict in terms of race relations and economic injustices in countries such as South Africa and Zimbabwe, while in others (notably Côte d'Ivoire, Kenya, and Liberia); they represent gross economic and social injustices that threaten the political and economic stability of these countries (Byamugisha 2014:2).

According to De Villiers 2008 in Buys (2012:22) the inability of the land reform programme in Zimbabwe to make a meaningful contribution towards land redistribution and economic development increased the tensions. In early 2001 "war veterans" invaded white commercial farms. The action was silently supported by government, as it ignored court orders to stop the invasions. The resulting fall in agricultural production had a dramatic negative impact on the economy. The breakdown of law and order encouraged the flight of foreign investments. Less than 300 from the original 4500 white commercial farmers from 1980 are today left in Zimbabwe. The new land users have not been able to maintain agricultural production and the subsequent collapse of commercial farming undermined the total economy (Buys 2012:22).

Many governments are pressured to identify an ideally faster African land reform model that seeks to achieve historical justice, especially given that over 60% of the population derive their livelihoods from smallholder agriculture and rural economic activities (Bangwayo-Skeete, *et al* 2010: 320).

There are general arguments that there is a solution to food and oil crises, and the solution lies in the existence of global reserve agricultural lands that are marginal and under-utilised. Transforming these lands into zones of food and biofuels production for export would result in a 'positive sum' for societies and not undermine the food security of affected local communities as in Mozambique. It will even strengthen weak rural economies in developing countries because it will generate employment and livelihoods to local people (Borras Jr; Figc & Suarez 2011:216).

Overall, the reforms created more problems than they resolved, generated more disputes over land ownership, and resulted in a more skewed distribution of land (Kariuki 2008:147). The redistribution efforts resulted in a concentration of land. The

elite acquired more land while the poor continued to hold onto small patches of land that were insufficient even for subsistence farming. Large holdings were in the hands of the new political and economic elites, who acquired many of them through the markets and/or through political support (Binswanger-Mkhize *et al*, 2009:114).

2.5. Land and redistribution and livelihoods: a review of evidence

Politically, it is safe to suggest that both the process and the willing buyer willing seller approach did not yield expected results. However, it is acceptable that dispossession of the majority of their land resources and rendering them into a pool of poorly skilled and educated labour force was not economically viable, hence apartheid capitalism became self-destructive. Public administration, political science and development speeches have not provided practical and academic guidance on how to understand and resolve this historical puzzle of dispossession through land redress without rendering the process and approach reverse apartheid, without business economics content (Sebola & Tsheola 2014:116).

Politicians have exploited these sentiments of ethnic nationalism and have encouraged the members of their communities to evict outsiders, especially during elections. It is quite alarming that each general election since the return of multiparty politics has been accompanied by land clashes that have become worse over the years. As a result, Kenya now has a significant, growing population of internally displaced people (Akech 2010:18). Some have argued that President Jomo Kenyatta postponed the land question (Kabukuru 2015:33).

While large-scale land acquisitions, linked to support of large farm models for production, have their precursors in the colonial plantations and estates, the dualistic economies of the former settler colonies and the latifundia of Latin America there are important contrasts with the contemporary rush for land. The (potentially) enormous scale and speed of expansion of the current deals, which may be more rapid than previous land 'rushes' in colonial or post-colonial history, may mean that they will have correspondingly greater impacts in radically restructuring agrarian economies, transforming livelihoods and rural social relations and, with this, changing the power

dynamics in the countryside across the global South, with major implications for national, and indeed regional and international, politics (White *et al* 2012:624).

Group acquisition has not been openly questioned by organizations representing the landless, perhaps in the belief that beneficiaries will feel better in a mutually supportive group. The limited evidence from existing land reform projects, suggests that large groups do not translate into effective production units or into benefits for members; and many groups collapse into individual production, usually at a very low level of output and with little tenure security for such individuals (Lahiff 2007:1580).

The collective (“community”) basis of many land redistribution farms and the requirement that people organize themselves into groups to access grants under the redistribution programme have also contributed to the prevalence of collective landholding and attempts at collective production. This progression from applying for land as a group to using land collectively was not inevitable, however, especially if beneficiaries were to be given (or insisted upon getting) greater freedom of choice (Lahiff & Li 2014:40).

The amount of land redistributed has been limited and has led neither to sustainable increases in productivity of the redistributed land nor to reducing poverty of the beneficiaries. In a bid to improve the performance and impacts of land reforms, alternatives to government-led compulsory land reforms were initiated especially during the 1990s. These alternatives have been labelled as market-assisted land reforms (as in Zimbabwe and South Africa), often community based; as in Mozambique, Malawi and Ethiopia (Mamphodo 2006:16)

Whilst liberalizing and deregulating the agricultural industry, the democratic government sought to fund emerging farmers, wherein the Land Bank was tasked with providing a variety of products in order to “help emerging farmers enter farming or upscale operations to become commercial” (Sebola & Tsheola 2014:117). Understanding that small-scale emerging farmers consist of high credit risk, the finance requirements for their development loan book were structured differently from those of the commercial loan book (Makhura 2013 in Sebola & Tsheola 2014:117). In 2009 the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform set

aside R 208 Million to provide security to the Land Bank for farmers who were faced with repossession (DRDLR 2011:41).

In countries where market-led land reform (willing-buyer, willing-seller) was used, beneficiaries should not rely exclusively on the state for post settlement support services, but would be able to access services from a range of public and private providers. The past two decades have seen a major reduction in overall state services available to farmers. Whereas large commercial farmers have generally managed to overcome this service decline through their access to a range of commercial and cooperative services, land reform beneficiaries and other small-scale farmers are largely left to fend for themselves (Byamugisha 2014:41).

The willing-buyer willing-seller has been a total failure, so has been the attempt to force beneficiaries into community schemes built on a similar commercial production model (Ruhiga 2011:36). Preconditions of market-assisted land reforms are the need to eliminate distortions that drive up the price of land and the need to improve the functioning of land markets in terms of the transfer of land to efficient users and the deconcentration of land ownership (Moyo 2009:341).

A high level of economic growth contributes to facilitating the transformation of Ethiopian land redistribution in such a way that it does not raise important policy question which concerns whether the prohibition of land sales is beneficial for development and the poor or ties them to the land and makes their transition more difficult. Possible reasons for continued prevention of land sales include; (a) land is formally owned by the state;(b) there is a fear that permitting land sales will lead to distressed land sales and the migration of desperate individuals to the towns and cities which will develop social problems; and (c) the removal of the prohibition will lead to a return of a more in-egalitarian land distribution and the poor will suffer (Holden & Bezu 2016:411).

It has been argued that land reform cannot contribute to equitable growth and development if historically disadvantaged people have to buy land on the open market without subsidized assistance because the purchase price is simply unattainable for the poor in South Africa (White Paper on Land Reform1997:41). To

overcome this challenge the government has provided various subsidy methods designed to assist the potential buyers to purchase and develop land and has also designed a number of programmes that seek to provide services and support to new land owners (Buys 2012:11).

The majority of previously disadvantaged emerging farmers, especially land reform beneficiaries, are finding it difficult to make a success of their enterprises in the complex and risky agricultural sector (Makgaba 2011:22; Moagi & Oladele 2012:96). They are still experiencing poverty as they are only generating low income. Some are even leasing out their lands to white farmers and they believe that they will be better-off with the rental payments from the white farmers, and they commonly depend on the social grants or other sources of income. However, those that are still taking part in agricultural activities are only producing at a subsistence level and therefore defeating the land reform mission of commercializing black-owned farms (Moagi & Oladele 2012:96).

According to Moagi and Oladele (2012:96) the recent prominent failure of group and individual farming enterprises in South Africa on redistributed land have highlighted the crucial need for skills, training, and knowledge transfer, the provision of good information support to resettled communities, land redistributed to beneficiaries, emerging farmers and agribusiness entrepreneurs. The failure of acquired farms to return to the productivity levels before they were transferred casts doubts as to the viability of the programme (Ruhiiga 2011:33).

A number of studies report that women have lower incomes, less access to services and loss of household status through resettlement in land reform programmes. Many wives do benefit through increased food security, but lose autonomy and household power through the husband's enhanced property rights (Jacobs 2004:2). According to (ed. Mama 2009:45) there is emerging evidence that women's land rights may have improved since the land reforms of the 2000s in Zimbabwe.

Many land reforms world-wide usually advocate for equity distribution and efficiency regarding land resources to improve productivity, income and the standard of living of citizens. It has been very difficult for many countries to achieve any appreciable

levels to improve productivity, income and standard of living. However, efficiency of the use of the agricultural land resource, which is the key for the attainment of the afore-mentioned benefits of land reform, has in many cases been compromised. In the end, political rather than productivity goals are achieved with consequent high levels of unemployment, food insecurity and grossly underutilized productive agricultural lands (Antwi & Oladele 2013:274).

Almost 12 % of South African land can be for crop production giving it a fair advantage in producing agricultural products. However, this potential is often limited by the annual rainfall of the country. The productive use of agricultural land should be measured in terms of economic returns generated, despite the nature of its use (Sebola & Tsheola 2014:118).

Key reasons for the limited impact were political resistance and institutional barriers that were often reinforced by the unequal land distribution (Deininger, *et al*, 2003:6). Growing literature has made the case of redistributive land reform on efficiency and equity grounds. Most of the land reforms undertaken during the last 20 to 30 years were politically motivated and have not lived up to expectations (Binswanger & Deininger 1999:249).

Market production is usually the only objective, and business plans typically require substantial loans from commercial banks, purchases of heavy equipment, selection of crop varieties and livestock breeds previously unknown to the beneficiaries, hiring of labor, and often the appointment of a full-time farm manager. Not surprisingly, much of that typically fails to materialize (Lahiff & Li 2014:41).

The failure to subdivide is arguably the single greatest contributor to the failure and general underperformance of land reform projects because it not only imposes inappropriate farm sizes on people (and absorbs too much of their grants in the process, leaving little over for production), but also forces them to work in groups, whether they want to or not (Antwi & Oladele 2013:278). The heavy financing requirements may partly explain the reluctance of the government to subdivide farms between individual beneficiaries (Ruhiiga 2011:33).

As a result, the amount of land redistributed has been limited and has led neither to sustainable increases in productivity of the redistributed land nor to reduce poverty of the beneficiaries. In a bid to improve the performance and impacts of land reforms, alternatives to government-led compulsory land reforms were initiated especially during the 1990s. These alternatives have been labelled as market-assisted land reforms and often community based (Byamugisha 2014:3).

It is surprising that young and more educated people are equally sceptical to legalizing land sales as older and less educated people. It may also appear surprising that the resistance against legalizing land sales has increased from 2007 to 2012 (Holden & Bezu 2016:411). In Latin America, indigenous groups have recently received collective titles to customary lands through various programmes promoting “customary land titling”. Land reform ultimately seeks to improve the livelihoods of disadvantaged groups. This goal raises the question of how community-led strategies affect local livelihoods and, in turn, are conditioned by them (Silkor & Muller 2009: 1312).

The Ethiopian experience was revolutionary as opposed to evolutionary policies. The reform aimed at improving access and security of tenure for small farmers under alternative forms of individual and communal tenure, which do not involve expropriation and compensation. While fully respecting the principle of private ownership (Baye 2013:147) pointed out that landless Ethiopians must have the opportunity to own their land.

In South Africa, rural development and land reform carry additional strategic significance for achieving a higher degree of economic and social equity, creating more employment, and building stronger social cohesion and these objectives to date, have largely not been achieved. It is not an exaggeration to claim that the success or failure in rural development and land reform will play a crucial role in determining the trajectory of South Africa’s economic and social future (Lahiff & Li 2014:27).

The challenges face all stakeholders, including government agencies, land sellers and beneficiaries, with only islands of reported successes regarding the rates of

actual land transfers, transaction prices and productivity rates in post transfer periods. It is also common to find previously productive farms lying idle after the transfers (Mbatha & Antrobus 2012:82).

The post-settlement support for new landowners remains inadequate. There is a trend in government to 'buy now, train later'. While this approach may have some merit, there is a risk that due to the scale of land acquisitions; many communities may appear to be set up to fail. Where farming has become much more scientific in the past two to three decades, new owners seem to be moving in the opposite direction with their emphasis often on subsistence farming as a result of a lack of training and inadequate infrastructural provisions (De Villiers 2008:8).

It has been reported that more than 90% of agricultural land transferred in terms of land redistribution is not being used productively. This situation not only contributes to increasing levels of poverty and unemployment among these land reform beneficiaries, but also threatens food security (Kloppers & Pienaar 2014:678). Such limitation of small scale agriculture by the South African black farmers can be associated with the unproductive land which to some extent limited their capacity to grow crops or rear livestock (Sebola & Tsheola 2014:116).

South Africa is currently no exception to the rule in relation to the Zimbabwean situation when it comes to the economics of agricultural land for redistribution. South African farmers whom most of them are predominantly white minority, face vast of challenges of land reform, new labour legislation and minimum wages, property taxes, skills levies, uncertain water rights, volatile exchange rates, high transport and communication costs, which render the economics of agricultural land to be a risky business practice for farmers in South Africa (Sebola & Tsheola 2014:119).

Market-based land reforms alone do not work. The willing-seller willing-buyer (WSWB) approach applied in South Africa since 1994 has not worked partly because owners of large holdings are unwilling to sell because they have high incentives to hold onto the land. Market purchases from "willing sellers" must be supported by genuinely proactive interventions by the state to remove incentives for large holdings and to tax unused land above a certain threshold to enable beneficiaries to purchase

land at normal market prices (Byamugisha 2014:7). The reforms undertaken included the use of market-based mechanisms for land acquisition and compensation using funds provided by the former colonial masters as agreed to in independence packages (as in Botswana, Kenya, Malawi, Swaziland, and Zimbabwe).

Within the market based land reform system, the state role is often limited to providing financial support to individuals, but more usually groups, trying to buy land from commercial farmers on the famous “willing buyer willing seller” basis. This approach is historical because it often ignores the current reality that power on the ground still resides very much with the white commercial farmers who are in a position to dictate terms and prices to the new buyers. The critique of the market based system is often based on such unequal power relations that dominate the process of land redistribution in these countries (Kariuki 2004:11).

Defining characteristic of South African land reform policy is that beneficiaries, no matter how poor or how numerous are required to step into the shoes of former white owners and continue to manage the farm as a unitary, commercially oriented enterprise; in other words, beneficiaries must adapt to the needs of the ideological paradigm of “big commercial farms,” not the other way around. Alternative models, based on low material inputs, high labor inputs, and smaller units or even household-based production, are actively discouraged (Lahiff & Li 2014:41).

Land reform was expected to alleviate rural poverty, increase agricultural productivity, and strengthen the new nation state. Redistributive land reforms became important state projects throughout the developing world in the 20th century. Land reform was popular in international development because it fit the ambitious goal to bring about economic development by way of state action. Land reform was considered a primary means by which the newly independent nation states could strengthen their authority over rural areas (Silkor & Muller 2009:1308).

According to (De Villiers 2008 in Buys 2012:22) South Africa and Zimbabwe may share some striking similarities regarding the land issue although the two countries also share some equally striking differences. However the similarities have to some

degree excited speculation in some quarters that a radical land reform programme such as the Zimbabwe one might someday replicate in South Africa, both being countries where white minority rule was exchanged for black majority rule, and where an artificial skewed rural land redistribution served as one of the important motivations to change the political landscape.

Land redistribution in the Philippines aims to empower beneficiaries so that they may actively participate in land market transactions and contribute to poverty reduction in rural areas by introducing land tenure improvement in agrarian reform that are faster (Borras, *et al* 2007:1564).

It is however arguable that those centuries of deskilling, neglected skills and financial support of the local Africans cannot be achievable within a short space of time as anticipated by the ANC through land reform policies, given the limitation of the global context (Sebola & Tsheola 2014:114).

The failure to provide land reform beneficiaries with appropriately sized farms in South Africa, and the resulting tensions within many beneficiary groups who benefited from land reform and redistribution are undoubtedly a major contributor to the high failure rate of land reform projects(Lahiff 2007:1583;Binswanger-Mkhize 2014:253; Lahiff & Li 2014:41). One of the ways to minimize the failure of agricultural projects of land reform programme is to undertake periodic evaluation or impact assessment (Antwi & Oladele 2013:274).

The well-developed (private) agribusiness sector that services large-scale commercial agriculture has shown no more than a token interest in extending its operations to new farmers who, in most cases, would be incapable of paying for such services anyway. The assumption that the private sector would somehow “respond” to demand from land reform beneficiaries with very different needs from the established commercial farmers has not been supported by recent experience (Lahiff & Li 2014:42).

2.6. Issues emerging from the literature

The increasing demand for land to produce biofuels and food will result in land grabs in less developed countries, especially by large countries in order to ensure their food security. The increase in meat consumption, requires large quantities of grain and soy to be dedicated to animal feed, as a motivation for future land grabs: “Land grabs in Africa and Latin America will likely continue as China and the Gulf States struggle to protect their food security and accommodate the appetite for meat (Giovannucci *et al* 2012:39)

To address the challenges and improve the performance of land reform, a proper smallholder strategy for South Africa is needed. This should be based on the aspirations of beneficiaries, and needs to be based on evidence from within and outside South Africa. The provision of support services that include the provision of financial resources for investments, inputs and advice is also critical. There should be a single business plan covering all these items, whether for individual beneficiaries or for groups. Resources should be disbursed from a single fund, in tranches for investments, inputs and advice, and preferably against statements of expenditure instead of receipts (Binswanger-Mkhize 2014:265).

It is clear that current land reform policies are not linked to the need to generate transformation of the rural economic landscape nor are they integrated in a rural strategy for growth. Failure to use land reform as a mechanism for re-ordering economic relations in the rural space means that rural communities are not empowered to become active participants in the country’s economy (Ruhiiga 2011:37).

According to Aliber & Cousins (2013:141) it became evident in the late 1990s that the land redistribution programme was plagued with problems of project collapse and idle land and government concluded that the problem was an inadequate adherence to the principle of viability, rather than a misapplication of the principle itself.

For farmers to succeed in their businesses, information support is vital. It can be concluded that the majority of the land reform beneficiaries do not have access to

necessary agricultural information or, the information they receive is just inadequate. The farmers have high information needs particularly in the areas of agricultural inputs, production, market and supply chain and credit. Even though most farmers ranked extension agents as their most preferred source of information, it is imperative that they use other sources of information to enhance their agricultural knowledge and improve their farming businesses in every way possible (Moagi & Oladele 2012:100). According to Keswell and Carter (2014: 250) the impacts of land and other asset transfer programmes will not be instantaneous, but will instead build up over time as beneficiaries respond to, and invest in, these new opportunities.

According to Hall (2007: 3) the South African literature on land reform suggests that outcomes, or indicators, of sustainable livelihoods should include the following:

- More income (from marketed produce, wage employment), increased regularity of income, and more egalitarian distribution of income.
- Increased well-being: Improved access to clean drinking water and to sanitation, improved housing, ownership of household items, and access to fuel for cooking.
- Reduced vulnerability: Improved access to social infrastructure like schools and clinics, increased mobility.
- Improved food security (from self-provisioning and increased disposable cash income) resulting in improved nutritional status.
- More sustainable use of the natural resource base.

According to Conway & Chambers (1991:6) the well-known 'livelihoods pentagon' depicts the dimensions of livelihoods and the interdependent relationship between five dimensions of livelihood assets, or 'capitals':

- human capital (education and skills)
- social capital (relationships and networks)
- natural capital (land and water)
- financial capital (money and loans)
- physical capital (infrastructure and assets).

According to Hall (2007:3) the South African literature on land reform suggests that outcomes, or indicators, of sustainable livelihoods should include the following:

- More income (from marketed produce, wage employment), increased regularity of income, and more egalitarian distribution of income.
- Well-being: Improved access to clean drinking water and to sanitation, improved housing, ownership of household items, and access to fuel for cooking.
- Reduced vulnerability: Improved access to social infrastructure like schools and clinics, increased mobility.
- Improved food security (from self-provisioning and increased disposable cash income) resulting in improved nutritional status.
- More sustainable use of the natural resource base.

According Hall (2007:3) defining success and failure depends on the measure used to assess impact. Some studies focus on the quality and sustainability of beneficiaries' livelihoods, such as: improved food security and nutritional status; increased cash income; improved wellbeing, through access to water, sanitation, housing; reduced vulnerability; and environmental sustainability. Since poor people are often the main beneficiaries of land reform, even modest success in these aspects can enhance livelihoods. Some argue that land reform should be assessed in terms of aggregate farm production and national food supplies, focusing on farm output, profitability, and 'efficiency', rates of financial return, or productivity per hectare or unit of labour. These are relevant for large-scale commercial farming ventures on land reform projects, but livelihood impacts are still important.

The democratic-era funding of farming in South Africa continued to be differentiated. Given that financing alone cannot guarantee success for emerging farmers, government agencies, intermediaries and mentors have provided non-financial support services such as information provision, agricultural activities training, basic farming practices, livestock management, post-production practices, cash flow management and budgeting, business and farm management, marketing of products and monitoring services (Makhura 2013 in Sebola & Tsheola 2014:117). Undeveloped markets for farm produce, lack of access to support infrastructure, the

absence of periodic markets in rural areas where farmers can exchange their produce, competition from largescale commercial farmers and low-producer prices for food crops all create negative multipliers(Ruhiiga 2011:30).

Judging by the current status of land ownership, South Africa still needs more than a decade to redistribute land successfully to black African farmers. It is believed that successful land redistribution to the majority of South Africans (in this case blacks) holds the potential to create an egalitarian society benefiting from the resources of the country of birth. Such a society would unlock the potential of all the citizens to make socio-political progress through conduct of business and the agricultural economics of land (Sebola & Tsheola 2014:114).

One of the ways of minimizing the failure of agricultural projects of land reform programme is to undertake periodic evaluation or impact assessment (Antwi & Oladele 2013:274). The main reason for negative outcomes which lower women's status and livelihood chances has been the allocation of land titles or land permits to 'household heads' who in most contexts are seen as male (Jacobs 2004:2). But, it also reflects the political and economic complexities of implementing and evaluating land reforms that entail an outright transfer of ownership from the wealthy to the poor (Keswell & Carter 2014: 251).

To address the challenges and improve the performance of land reform, a proper smallholder strategy for South Africa is needed. This should be based on the aspirations of beneficiaries, and needs to be based on evidence from within and outside South Africa. The provision of support services that include the provision of financial resources for investments, inputs and advice is also critical. There should be a single business plan covering all these items, whether for individual beneficiaries or for groups. Resources should be disbursed from a single fund, in tranches for investments, inputs and advice, and preferably against statements of expenditure instead of receipts (Binswanger-Mkhize 2014:264).

A number of explanations have been offered for poor livelihoods and production outcomes, including: poor extension and other support to land reform 'beneficiaries' (Jacobs *et al.* 2003:21). In view of the roles played by farmers, it is important to

provide information to boost their production and ensure their economic role in the South African economy. In order for new farmers to succeed in production processes, they need information on operating capital, credit, marketing, training and skills acquisition, extension services and Information and Communication Technology (ICT's). These information needs were influenced by various socio-economic characteristics of farmers and the variation in the type of information needed by individual farmers. The most utilized source of information was found to be extension agents, followed by television (Moagi & Oladele 2012:100).

Land in rural Ethiopia had been more equitably distributed than other African countries. However, whether the distribution of rural land was highly equitable as perceived has not been systematically examined. There was active and direct intervention of the state in the allocation of land. The socialist ideology promoted by the government also gave a rationale for it. The government consequently implemented major policy initiatives attempting to centralize and control the activities of farm households (Baye 2013:151).

While Ethiopia has undertaken a land tenure reform to strengthen individual land use rights, land sales remain illegal in the dominant smallholder agricultural sector. The country has attempted to commercialize agriculture by allowing long-term leases of land to commercial actors that have been allocated large tracts of land, in contrast to the maximum farm size of 2.5 ha in the most recent rural land proclamations that apply to smallholder agriculture. Holden & Bezu (2016:421) reveal that the state is not the only force preventing land sales in the smallholder sector. The large majority of such households continue to prefer to maintain the status quo, although the constitutional right to own land to produce food sufficient for one's own subsistence can no longer be satisfied in many parts of the densely populated highlands (Holden & Bezu 2016:410).

This implies that emerging black farmers do not only face lack of capital support, but also the slow pace of land distribution which the government could have slowed because the adopted models are not benefiting the current beneficiaries as expected (Sebola & Tsheola 2014:119). Most of this strategic partnership left most of the

beneficiaries in debt. Some of these beneficiaries are still struggling to pay those debts.

South Africa has had perhaps the greatest urgency for land reform (Byamugisha 2014:7). Land reform in South Africa has made slow progress in reducing ownership inequality and has had minimal impact on productivity and incomes. In South Africa it can be concluded that, the land reform programme is missing two important aspects that would enable it to make a significant impact on the livelihoods of beneficiaries (Byamugisha 2014:7). Firstly, there is no viable small-farmer path to development, which could enable the millions of households residing in communal areas and on commercial farms to expand their own production and accumulate wealth and resources in an incremental manner. This requires radical restructuring of existing farm units to create family-size farms, more realistic farm planning, appropriate support from a much-reformed state agricultural service, and a much greater role for beneficiaries in the design and implementation of their own projects. Secondly, there is an absence of a sustained focus on implementation, resource mobilization, and timely policy adjustment (Byamugisha 2014:7).

South Africa's slow progress on the issue of economic consciousness in which most of the land being distributed to beneficiaries before have lost economic value because the model in use focused mostly on political solution to land issue while undermining the economic role played by the former land users (Makhura 2013 in Sebola & Tsheola 2014:113).

Since 2008, the South African consumers have endured soaring food prices. Presently, South African farmers are able to hedge grain prices through the South African Futures Exchange and/or "presell a portion of their produce to food processors and wholesalers" (Makhura 2013 in Sebola & Tsheola 2014:117). That is, the case for a willing-seller, willing buyer principles bears no business economics justification as it equally does not provide for socio-political transformative imperatives.

A very important lesson that South Africa can draw from the story of Zimbabwe's land redistribution, is the importance of land to the black African people. It is not a

coincidence that rights to land have played a prominent part in social, political and economic meanings in countries with large peasant societies (Sibanda 2010: 96).

The outcomes of redistribution are always that divisible on prospective beneficiaries, imposing severe limitations on the ability to use the land productively and viably. In such instances even the new owners of land through redistribution can hardly use the land for agricultural activities or any economic purposes other than leisure and political sentimentalism (Sebola & Tsheola 2014:118).

Redistributive land reform has been pursued in South Africa over the past two decades. In South Africa at present, there is near-consensus that land reform has been unsuccessful, with a startling lack of agreement as to its problems and what remedies should be administered. Broadly, land reform is criticized both for its pace. About 8 per cent of commercial farmland has been redistributed over 18 years versus the 30 per cent over 5 years initially targeted and its performance, the livelihoods (and production) outcomes (Aliber & Cousins 2013:140).

South Africa's land reform through restitution and redistribution has failed. In its ingredients of failure, it has caused the government not only the financial loss (money government spends on buying land and equipment's for Black beneficiaries), but also substantial economic loss from the agricultural production (loss of tax revenue from collapsed agricultural projects by Black beneficiaries (Sebola & Tsheola 2014:119).

De Villiers 2008 in Buys (2012:33) argues that in addition to the basic common points found in South Africa and Zimbabwe providing motivation for land reform, it must be recognized that the countries differ in important aspects. South Africa has a more developed industrialized economy less dependent on the agricultural sector, with an average of only a 3% contribution to the gross domestic product. South Africa has passed the agricultural phase, and a break down in commercial farming will have a less severe impact than in the case of Zimbabwe (Buys 2012:23).

High dependence on agricultural land for livelihood can be another reason for resistance to land sales. Economic development and the diversification of the

economy should reduce the dependence on agriculture for livelihood and reduce resistance to land sales. Households and persons who perceive investment opportunities outside agriculture may also believe that the land could be a source of capital for such investments in new livelihood opportunities outside agriculture. Households that are more cash crops oriented may therefore also be more willing to accept land sales as they are better integrated into the market economy. It is also possible that husbands are more cash crop oriented than their wives who have more responsibility for providing and preparing the food for the family and this may result in a gender difference in attitudes towards allowing land sales and in stated willingness to sell land and in valuation of the land (Holden & Bezu 2016:411).

It could be unfair to expect poor South African Black beneficiaries to be able to successfully operate large-scale farming without necessary skills and experience (Sebola & Tsheola 2014:119). Land reform process in South Africa requires a refocus which will ensure that there is equal consideration of business and economic justification in allocating land to the previously disadvantaged beneficiaries (Sebola & Tsheola 2014:121).

Land reform should allow for a range of settlements and not only confine new land owners to adopt a status quo of newly acquired farms which are mostly commercially run by individuals. Such commercial farms do not in most cases address the needs of the rural poor who need land for small-scale family farming. Most black rural communities, who are now landowners as a result of land reform projects, were in the past marginalised and excluded from the mainstream economy therefore they lack skills and capacity to run big commercial farms. Their skill and technology is sufficient for small family farms (Buys 2012:10).

The absence of studies that directly explore the causal impact of land redistribution reflects the shift of land policy over the last 25 years away from redistribution reform programmes, but it also reflects the political and economic complexities of implementing and evaluating land reforms that entail an outright transfer of ownership from the wealthy to the poor (Keswell & Carter 2014:251).

In November 2005, the Minister for Agriculture and Land Affairs told Parliament that 70 percent of land reform projects in Limpopo Province were dysfunctional, a situation she attributed to poor design, negative dynamics within groups, and a lack of post settlement support. In the 2010 to 2011 financial year of the Department of Rural Development and Land reform, 411 farms were reported to have been provided with functional agricultural infrastructure under the Recapitalization and Development Programme, but this does not cover the land reform projects that are in Limpopo province acquired since 1994 (DRDLR 2011:14).

According to the White Paper on South African Land Policy (1997); the main strategic goal is the promotion of economic growth and poverty reduction through land reform. Buys (2012:08) argues that the success of land reform in its contribution to rural development internationally is rooted in the incorporation of what they call the 'four reforms' in rural development: the distribution of land, agricultural research, rural infrastructure (including education) and markets.

In order to address poverty and extreme deprivation, the Reconstruction and Development Programme identified various aspects that needed to be addressed. These included the provision of land through land reform and housing, as well as access to safe water and sanitation, but the subsistence farming was the only reliable option for most people who benefitted from land reform. Because this form of farming was not backed by good access to finance to purchase quality seeds and fertilizers, it resulted in poor harvest (Mamphodo 2006:2).

During the apartheid government the former land users who are whites, were previously receiving massive financial support and subsidies from the apartheid government which ultimately enabled them to run successful commercial agriculture, giving them advantage as exporters of agricultural products, regionally and internationally (Sebola & Tsheola 2014:113).

The main finding in the literature is that there has never been a regular enquiry on the effectiveness of land redistribution programme among the beneficiaries in Vhembe District. It is in the light of this knowledge gap that the present study seeks to investigate the conditions of the living for land redistribution beneficiaries in a

selected project in the Makhado Local Municipality of the Vhembe District to fill the gap and provide a basis for future evaluation studies.

Research shows that it is still an unrealistic question as to how much land reform programme has contributed to the improvement of the quality of life of the beneficiaries, on the reinforcement of the position of women in the ownership, allocation, use of and access to land and the achievements of an integrated rural development programme.

The fundamental objective of this study is to assess the impact of the land redistribution projects on livelihoods of beneficiaries in the Vhembe District of the Limpopo Province. The assessment of the changes or improvement in the quality of life in terms of their physical, financial, food security, employment of the land redistribution beneficiaries.

2.7. Conclusion

Based on the extensive review of theoretical approaches to land reform, there appears to be consensus that such a process is necessary in order to promote equitable access to productive resources and reverse the injustices that led to inequality in land redistribution in most countries. That discussion also showed that land reform can be successful under given conditions such as where beneficiaries were given small farms as in Mozambique and Ethiopia.

However, it can also fail because of relying on the advice from our colonizers and World Bank, policies that are market based and use the willing-buyer willing-seller approach. Lack of financial support by government as the case in Zimbabwe led to the collapse of the land reform farms. In South Africa the commitment of beneficiaries is questionable because they are always waiting for the state to provide and they are misusing the state funds. Those who benefitted from land redistribution and received loans from Land Bank and financial support from the government through (Recapitalisation and Development programme) are also not on the farms.

A review of available evidence from the Phillipines, Latin America and Zimbabwe showed they shared the same history of colonization by other countries and the inequality of which was mostly in the hands of their colonizers. Land reform became very slow because of willing-buyer willing-seller.

Key lessons learned include:

It is also common in Limpopo and other provinces in the country and regions to find previously productive farms lying idle after the transfers. Some of the reasons stated are that the new land reform beneficiary does not have skills to run successful farms and they rely on government for financial assistance. Due to lack of collateral that they can use as security they cannot access loans from financial institutions and this leads to the dilapidating of farms.

Secondly, the slow pace of land reform is not only in South Africa but in other countries where the willing-seller willing-buyer approach was used the same slow pace of land reform was experienced. Evidence shows that this leads to citizens losing patience on the state to deliver on land reform and they end up invading the farms. There are slight variations on the objectives of land reform, but the general view is that reform attempts to address the socio-economic status of those who were previously dispossessed of their land.

Thirdly, there is a need for land reform to shift from being politically motivated and also focus on the economic side of the programme. It should not only end on giving farmers the big commercial farms for previously the disadvantaged. Where there is a need to subdivide the land and allocate to different beneficiaries the state needs to consider that.

Lastly in cases where land is owned by the state as in the case of Mozambique their contribution towards the GDP is high from agriculture. The majority of previously disadvantaged emerging farmers in South Africa, especially land reform beneficiaries, are finding it difficult to make a success of their enterprises in the complex and risky agricultural sector. They are still experiencing poverty as they are only generating low income for those who are generating income while others are living their farms idle. Some are even leasing out their lands to white farmers as they

believe that they will be better-off with the rental payments from the white farmers, and they commonly depend on the social grants or other sources of income. However, those that are still taking part in agricultural activities are only producing at a subsistence level and therefore defeating the land reform mission of commercializing black-owned farms.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter outlines the research methodology the researcher has employed in conducting the study. It describes the research design, area of study, population, sampling methods, data collection, data analysis, ethical considerations and limitations of the study. This is a qualitative study where the researcher used three land redistribution projects which are Mavungeni situated in Makhado Municipality, Balanganani in Musina Municipality and Mamusha Boerdery which is also in the Makhado Local Municipality. The 3 projects selected are not intended for comparative study, but were selected purposefully considering the evolving nature of the land redistribution programme. Due to nature of the Vhembe District, the land redistribution projects have limited numbers in terms of household hence the study will consider 3 projects so that there can be representativity. Purposive sampling study was used to draw the sample of the study. The researcher further used non-scheduled structured interviews for the collection of data.

Section 3.2 explains the research design that was applied for the study. An exploratory research design was chosen primarily because not much prior research on these specific cases had been conducted and so, very little is known about them. A qualitative research paradigm was adopted mainly because a detailed understanding of the complex dimensions of land reform is being sought. Section 3.3 describes the study area in terms of location, population, number of households and jurisdiction in terms of municipal area and the commodities that are currently produced in Vhembe District. Section 3.4 describes the target population and how it was identified while section 3.5 explains how the sampling was done, as it is the procedure by which a given number of subjects are selected in order to represent the population. Section 3.6 explains the measurement that was used for the study. Section 3.7 covers the data collection methods and procedures. Ethical considerations are also explained in detail, the instruments used in the research are also described. Lastly, the reliability and validity of the measures used in the study are explained in order to enhance the credibility of the research.

3.2. Research Design

Researchers are urged to locate their research in a selected paradigm (Doyle, Brady & Byrne 2009:176). Morgan (2007:49) defines a paradigm as the set of beliefs and practices that guide a field and it can be used to summarise the beliefs of researchers. In qualitative research the philosophical assumptions uses the constructivist approach (Creswell 2009:17). According to Babbie & Mouton (2013:644) a paradigm is model or framework for observation and understanding which shapes both what we see and how we understand it.

Qualitative research methods seeks to study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret phenomena in terms of meanings people bring to them. The goal of qualitative research is to develop an understanding of a social or human problem from multiple perspectives (Bless *et al* 2013:220; Creswell 2009:175; Babbie & Mouton 2011:53). Qualitative research techniques are essential in exploring peoples' values, beliefs, attitudes and behaviours. It is also particularly important when dealing with sensitive issues and people's lives through interview. In addition, qualitative method is a naturalistic approach that helps to understand historic processes and human experiences in specific historical settings where the researcher does not attempt to manipulate the phenomenon of interest (Babbie & Mouton 2011:646).

The strength of qualitative research method to my research is its emphasis on words rather than numbers. This is important to reflect and interpret the understandings and meanings of people's past life, social worlds and realities (Bless *et al* 2013: 339; Babbie & Mouton 2011: 270). Qualitative analysis aims at describing and understanding the respondents' lived experiences; examine the way respondents construct personal meaning in their lives; describe the range and diversity of respondents' experience and study people in their natural context (Bless *et al* 2013: 340).

The qualitative research method was used as the main research methodology for the study. The reason why I employed qualitative research method as the main research method is the nature of the research problem and research questions,

which in the case of this study, was an attempt in understanding human past and recent experiences in terms of land redistributed and how it impacted in their quality of lives. Therefore, in considering this reason, qualitative methodology is more appropriate.

The goal is not to provide a broad, generalizable description that is representative of most situations, but rather to describe a particular situation in enough depth that the full meaning of what occurs is made apparent (Borrego *et al* 2009:57; Bouma, Ling & Wilkinson 2012:104).

3.3. Study Area

The study area is Limpopo Province. The province borders the countries of Botswana to the west, Zimbabwe to the north and Mozambique to the east. In the eastern region lies the northern half of the magnificent Kruger National Park, a nature reserve teeming with African wildlife. Limpopo is South Africa's gateway to the rest of Africa, with its shared borders making it favourably situated for economic cooperation with other parts of southern Africa (IDP 2005:6; Trade and Investment Seminar 2016:1).

The biological conditions for farming in Limpopo are characterized by areas of high and low soil fertility and good and poor rainfall areas. Mixed farming systems are practised in the province. In the areas around Levubu, most farmers are practising subtropical crops and in areas around Musina they are practising livestock and game farming (IDP 2016:95). Some of the farms in the province are specializing in extensive livestock ranching, and irrigated orchard farming. Irrigation is mainly practised to enhance productivity in areas that already have high rainfall (e.g. Levubu), rather than in arid areas to compensate for poor rainfall. High-rainfall areas in which irrigation is practised are themselves under increasing water stress and some of the farms do not have water rights (IDP 2016:92).

In terms of agriculture, Limpopo is one of the largest producers of fruit and vegetables in South Africa. The province produces 75% of the country's mangoes, 65% of its pawpaw, 36% of its tea, 25% of its citrus, bananas, litchis, 60% of its

avocadoes, two thirds of its tomatoes. Other products include coffee, nuts, guavas, sisal, cotton, tobacco and timber with more than 170 plantations. Cotton, sunflower, maize, wheat and grapes are also cultivated. Most of the higher lying areas are devoted to cattle and game ranching, earning a reputation for quality biltong, a popular South African delicacy of salted dried meat (Trade and Investment Seminar 2016:4).

Vhembe District is characterised by (four) local municipalities which are Makhado, Thulamela, Mutale and Musina. Mutale and Thulamela are mostly rural municipalities which are mostly characterised by communal areas. The remaining two municipalities Makhado and Musina are characterised by large commercial farms and most of these farms are under claim through the restitution process. However there are few properties that have been redistributed through land redistribution in the Vhembe District. White farmers own the vast majority of these farms due to the racially skewed land policies of the previous apartheid government that denied blacks access to land ownership. The area enjoys hot summers and moderate winters and has an annual rainfall of around 700 millimetres. The vast majority of the inhabitants are Venda speaking black South Africans and the areas in which they live are largely under developed.

The Makhado Municipality is located in the northern parts of Limpopo Province (coordinates 23° 00' 00'' S 29° 45' 00'' E) approximately 100km from the Zimbabwean border along the N1 Route. The municipal area is 8567, 38 km² (or 856 738ha) in size and strategically located on a macro scale along a major passage between South Africa and the rest of the African continent. Approximately 516 031 people currently reside within the Municipality and based on the vastness of the rural populace the municipality can be classified as predominately rural (IDP 2016: 37).

The total population of Makhado increased from 495 261 to 516 031 in 2011. The number of households have increased from 108 978 to 134 889. The Municipality is made up of 5 formal towns namely, Makhado, Vleifontein, Vuwani, Waterval and Dzanani with about 279 villages. The main administrative office is situated in Makhado town with three supporting regional administrative offices in Dzanani, Vuwani, and Waterval (IDP 2016: 38).

The municipality has 38 ward councillors and 37 proportional councillors. There are 14 traditional leaders who are ex-officio members of the municipal council and 10 councillors who are members of the executive committee. The Municipality also has 38 established and fully functional ward committees (IDP 2016: 38). Makhado Municipality is composed of 279 236 female and 236 795 male persons. At present, the local economy is unable to provide sufficient employment opportunities to meet the needs of the economically active population. A youthful population structure also implies a relatively higher dependency ratio (IDP 2016:39).



Source: DRDLR

Figure 3.1. Area map of the Limpopo Province.

3.4. Target Population

According to (Bless *et al* 2013:394) population is defined as the complete set of events, people or things which the research findings are to be applied. Population is

defined as an entire group (or entire scores) that is of interest to the researcher (Wilson & MacLean 2011: 681; Babbie & Mouton 2011:174).

According to Babbie (2013:115) a population for a study is that group of people usually from whom conclusions can be drawn. Almost all members of the population that interest us can never be studied. Every possible observation to them can be made. McMillan & Schumacher (2001:169), a population is a group of elements or cases, whether individuals, objects, or events, that conform to specific criteria and to which generalized results of the research are intended. This group is also referred to as the target population or study group. The target population is often different from the list of elements from which the sample is actually selected, which is termed the survey population or sampling frame. For the purpose of this study the target population will be 12 households (from the 3 selected projects) which were purposefully selected from the selected land redistribution projects in Vhembe District.

For the purpose of this study the unit of analysis is the person from which the researcher collects data from (Bless *et al* 2013: 133). In this study the unit of analysis was the household's head which was either male or female.

The unit of analysis refers to the WHAT of the study: what object, phenomenon, entity, process or event interested in being investigated (Babbie & Mouton 2011:84), however Bless *et al* (2013:395) defines the unit of analysis as the person, object or event from which data is collected and about which conclusions may be drawn. Babbie (2013:97) defines the unit of analysis as the WHAT or WHOM is being studied. In this study it will be the households.

3.5. Sampling methods and procedures

According to (Wilson & MacLean 2011:317;Bless *et al* 2013: 395) a sample is the group of elements drawn from the population that is considered to be representative of the population, and which is studied in order to acquire some knowledge about the entire population.

According to (Bless *et al* 2013: 395) sampling is the technique by which a sample is drawn from the population. Usually the populations that interest human behavioural scientists are so large that, from a practical point of view, it is simply impossible to conduct research on all of them. Consequently, researchers have to obtain data from only a sample of these populations and then extrapolate the findings out to the larger population. Before they draw a sample of the population for analysis, researchers should obtain clarity about the population, or units of analysis, to which their research topic apply (Welman *et al* 2001:47). The sample size in qualitative research is typically small (Babbie & Mouton 2011:279; Bless *et al* 2013:16).

In qualitative research a sample is considered to be adequate if it allows all possibilities or aspects of the researched phenomenon to be identified. When the researcher reaches the conclusion that collecting more data and increasing the sample does not bring any new information, which means that the data saturation has been achieved (Bless *et al* 2013: 164).

According to Babbie & Mouton (2011: 643) purposive sampling is a non-probability sample in which the units to be observed are selected on the basis of your own judgement about which ones will be the most useful or representative. It can also be called judgemental sampling. According to Wilson & MacLean (2011:163) non-probability sampling is techniques that do not specify how likely it is that any member of the population may be selected.

The probability of including each element of the population in a sample is unknown. It is not possible to determine the likelihood of the inclusion of all representative elements of the population into the sample. Some of the elements might have the chance of being included (Bless *et al* 2013:166; Bouma, Ling & Wilkinson 2012:140). Some elements might even have no chance of being included. It is difficult to estimate how well the sample represents the population and this makes generalisation highly questionable (Bless *et al* 2013:166). The main advantage of probability sampling is that it is always cheaper, faster and often adequate for homogenous populations (Bless *et al* 2013:166).

For the purpose of this study a list of all land reform projects that were done through land redistribution in the Vhembe District Municipality was drawn up. The total number of land redistribution projects came to seventeen projects which meant that the population was going to be derived from the seventeen projects. It was decided that three projects from the total of the population were going to be sampled.

Project 1: Mavungeni is a SLAG project. Mavungeni project is situated in Makhado Local Municipality. It is situated in Portion 1 of the farm Vleifontein 310 LS and it is 561.3880 hectares in extent (Property Enquiry Details: 2016:1). This project is the first and oldest land redistribution project in the district. It is the only SLAG project in Vhembe district. The project is owned by eight beneficiaries who are males and females heading households. It currently has a 40 000 carrying capacity poultry structure. They sell their broilers to Mikes Chicken as their main market.

The project received financial assistance from the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Rural Development.

Project 2: Balanganani is an LRAD project which is owned by three beneficiaries who are members of the Tshilande family. It is situated in Musina Local Municipality of the Vhembe District. It is situated in portion 5 of the farm Mondferland 51 MS and it is 119.5038in extent (Property Enquiry Details: 2016:1). The project is 8 years old. The main enterprise in the project is small stock (goats). They are currently selling their goats to the hawkers and in auctions around Musina and Alldays.

Project 3: Mamusha Broedery is a PLAS project which was bought by the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform and is leased to Mr T.W. Mathidi (male) as the beneficiary. It is situated in Makhado Local Municipality. It is situated in portion 0 of the farm Ne Plus Ultra 110 LS and it is 845.1111in extent (Property Enquiry Details: 2016:1). The project is 2 years old. The project is composed of one beneficiary who is a member of the Mathidi family. The main enterprises in the project are citrus, livestock and cash crops. They are currently selling their produce in Gauteng Province and the hawkers around Makhado and Waterpoort.

For the purpose of this study purposive sampling was used. A purposeful sample is one that provides a clear criterion or rationale for the selection of participants, or places to observe, or events, that relates to the research questions (Ezzy 2002:74; Bless *et al* 2013:172; Wilson & MacLean 2011:165). Purposive sampling is based on the judgement of a researcher regarding the characteristics of a representative sample (Bless *et al* 2013:172; Babbie & Mouton 2011:166; Babbie 2013:128). A sample is chosen on the basis of what the researcher considers to be typical units.

Purposive sampling was based on a number of objective criteria such as:

- i. Land occupied by a household was allocated as a result of the land redistribution programme under study. For the purpose of this study the evolving nature of the land redistribution programme will be considered e.g. SLAG, LRAD & PLAS.
- ii. Current status of the farm (projects that are in production were considered)
- iii. Willingness of the household head to participate in the study.
- iv. Gender inclusivity (household heads can either be male or female). Priority will be given to the marginalised and to the needs of women in particular in other words households that are led by women will also be prioritised.
- v. Project that received post settlement support (benefited financially) from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform
- vi. The land redistributed is currently used by the intended beneficiaries.
- vii. Knowledge of the household head about land redistribution programme.
- viii. Projects that were selected represented different commodities within the Vhembe District, e.g. Broiler production, small stock, cash crops, citrus and livestock.
- ix. Commitment by the beneficiaries on their projects all full time farmers in their projects.

The land redistribution projects identified for the study are characterised by people with a history of marginalization and they had access to little or no land; capital and were not trained until after their project had begun. These beneficiaries are poor and often live in marginal environments of the Limpopo Province.

The 3 projects were selected for the study; however they were not selected to be used for comparative study. The projects were selected based on the evolving

nature of the Land Redistribution Programme within the Vhembe District in Limpopo Province. Due to the nature of the projects the number of households was less than ten in all the projects hence the need for the study to make meaningful contribution there was a need to have at least all the redistribution programmes that were implemented in the Vhembe District. The projects must represent all the sub programmes in land redistribution that was implemented in Vhembe District. The selection was based on whether the beneficiaries are still occupying the land that was redistributed to them, current status, willingness of the households to participate in the study, assistance from DRDLR and the commitment by beneficiaries. The projects were also representing some of the commodities that are currently available in the District, e.g. broiler production, goat production, livestock and citrus production. All the identified projects have received financial assistance from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform through the Recapitalisation and Development Programme.

3.6. Measurement

According to (Bless *et al* 2013:395) measurement is defined as different systems used to measure or classify units, enabling comparison. Qualitative research focuses on smaller groups in order to examine a particular context in great detail (Borrego; Douglas & Amelik 2009:57). People are not passive “subjects “who are waiting to be measured (Wilson & MacLean 2011:186). For some researchers, literally everything is data, this includes interview transcripts, recordings and notes, observational records and notes, documents and the products and records of material culture, audio-visual materials, and personal experience materials (Punch 2011:57).

Effectiveness measures the extent to which the Programme’s outcomes are being achieved. Assessing the effectiveness of the Land Redistribution Programme therefore focused on its effectiveness to improve the quality of life and their livelihoods.

It is important to know which variables to measure in a study; this can be taken as the first step. The indicators used to measure effectiveness in this study are

borrowed from chapter two of this study. Such a review is useful for this investigation because the indicators are important for the analysis.

In qualitative research, variable measurement is approached differently. This type of research uses different data, namely, words, images, and subjective observations to give voice to the research participants. As a result, variable measurement comes after the data have been collected and is part of the analytical process (Punch 2011:57; Bouma et al 2012:101).

3.7. Data collection procedures and methods

Collecting data is one of the most important part of the research (Wilson & Mouton 2011:586).The logistics of data collection include reconciling participants, scheduling data collection times, treating participants appropriately and handling and storing the collected data.

In order to conduct the process of data collection, the researcher wrote letters to the identified projects for permission of the beneficiaries to participate in the process of data collection. In the letter, the researcher clearly stated the reason for the study and the purpose of conducting such a study. The permission was granted and the researcher physically contacted all the participants for the interviews.

According to (Bless *et al* 2013: 394) qualitative research is conducted using a range of methods which use qualifying words and descriptions to record and investigate aspects of social reality. Data collection steps include setting the boundaries for the study, collecting information through semi structured interviews, and documents as well as establishing the protocol for recording information (Babbie & Mouton 2011: 178-179).

For the purpose of this study projects that are selected were based on the age of the project, the programme and the number of beneficiaries in each project. These units were known to the researcher and that is why they were explained. The most effective method used to gather information was to ask respondents to express their views directly.

3.7.1. Data sources

Secondary data is data collected by other investigators either in connection with other research problems or as part of the usual gathering of social data for a population census (Babbie & Mouton 2011:647; Bless *et al* 2013:184) Secondary data or analysis is defined as data used in a specific study, although collected by a different researcher for the purpose of addressing a different research problem (Babbie & Mouton 2011:647; Bless *et al* 2013: 395). This occurs when a researcher uses data that has been collected for some other reason to answer a new research question (Bless *et al* 2013: 57).

The researcher made use of secondary sources such as documents which include journals, annual reports from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform; strategic plans for the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform and all other literature that contributed to enriching the findings of this study. The data that was collected from annual reports and strategic plans were the history of the programme and the trend that the Department followed in land redistribution programme. In the journals the information that was collected is the evidence and issues that are emerging relate to the effectiveness of land redistribution in improving the quality of life and livelihoods of the intended beneficiaries after land reform. According to Creswell (2009:180) the advantage of using this type of data is that it enables the researcher to access them at a time that is convenient to the researcher. It also represents the data which is thoughtful in that participants have given attention to compiling them.

The researcher payed attention to accuracy and credibility of the journals, annual reports, and strategic plans. Journals were mostly relied on due to the accuracy of the information that they provide and they are regarded as credible sources for the study.

Data is collected with the primary aim of answering the research question posed by the researcher (Bless *et al* 2013: 394). Primary data is data that was collected by a researcher for the purpose of the study (Bless *et al* 2013:184). Primary data is the

most appropriate to the aims of research, since the data gathering is directed towards answering the specific questions raised by the researcher.

Data were collected using interviews (both structured and unstructured). Interview schedules were used during the interviewing process. The instruments were the most appropriate sources for information in the evaluation of the land redistribution projects. Participants were subjected to those instruments so as to establish the performance of the projects.

3.7.2. Procedures

Interviews conducted involved direct personal contact with the participants who were asked to answer questions relating to the research problem. One way they expressed their views was the non-scheduled interview, which consisted of asking respondents to comment on broadly defined issues. The participants/respondents/interviewed were free to expand on the topic as they see fit, to focus on particular aspects, and to relate their own experiences.

The non-scheduled interview was very useful in exploratory research where the research questions cannot be narrowly defined. It was also an excellent technique when no comparison is sought. The interviewer/researcher was present mainly to record the information.

The study procedure adopted was standardized and made uniform for all the respondents.

3.7.3. Ethical considerations

Ethical issue is concerned with whether the behaviour conforms to a code or a set of principles (Bless, Higson-Smith & Sithole 2013: 28). Ethics are typically associated with morality as it deals with matters of right and wrong (Babbie & Mouton 2011:520). No research project should in any way violate the rights of participants (Babbie & Mouton 2011: 523; Bless *et al* 2013: 31). An important part of protecting people's dignity is understanding and respecting their culture (Bless *et al* 2013: 31).

Participants have the right to know what the research is all about, how it will affect them, the risks and benefits of participation, and the fact that they have the right to decline to participate or to discontinue their participation at any time during the process if they choose to do so (Bless *et al* 2013: 32). It is important to ask participants to sign an informed consent form, which is an indication that they indeed understand what has been explained to them (Bless *et al* 2013: 32). For the purpose of this study the participant will be expected to voluntarily sign a consent form which is attached. Information provided by the participants should be protected and not made available to anyone other than the researchers (Bless *et al* 2013: 32).

The chairpersons of Mavungeni (SLAG); Balanganani farming (LRAD) and Mamusha Boerdery (PLAS) were contacted and gave the permission to talk to them and other members of households who are beneficiaries in the same projects.

3.7.4. Methods

Data collection methods basically refer to the tools to be used in collecting information from the respondents. In this research, an interview schedule was developed and used in order to gather an incisive understanding of the situations and meanings for those involved in the identified (research). An interview schedule is defined as a list of pre-prepared questions or discussion topics for use by an interviewer (Wilson & MacLean 2011: 201; Bouma *et al* 2012:283).

According to Wilson & MacLean (2011: 201); Bless *et al* (2013:193) interviews were the most common way of collecting qualitative data. Interviews are described as a conversation with a purpose. The main purpose of this research is to explore the interviewee's experiences and subjective views on a topic. Interview is a research design that involves asking research participants. It can take several forms which were structured, semi-structured and unstructured interviews. Qualitative researchers prefer semi structured interview or unstructured interviews (Bouma *et al* 2012: 283).

An interview involves direct personal contact with the participants who were asked to answer questions relating to the research problem (Bless *et al* 2013:193). Those

interviewed are free to expand on the topic as they see fit, to focus on particular aspects to relate their own experiences. The interviewer intervened to ask for clarification or further explanation. There is no time limit fixed for completing an interview of this kind.

A semi structured interview is very useful in exploratory research, where the research questions cannot be narrowly defined. It is also an excellent technique when no comparison is sought between the responses of different participants, but when each participant is considered as a specific case. The interviewer was present mainly to record the information (Bless *et al* 2013:194) The interviewers' presence may enhance comprehensiveness and objectivity in the recording of information, but it can also inhibit interviewed people from expressing their true opinions or feelings (Bless *et al* 2013:194).

The data that was collected was addressing the past and recent experiences in relation to effectiveness of the land redistribution in improving the quality of life (livelihoods). The type of information that was received from the beneficiaries talks to their day to day lives. Hence the information was collected using face to face interviews. The reason for that was because the information needed was household specific and could not be generalized for other households.

3.7.5. Instruments

In qualitative research, researchers collect data themselves through examining documents, observing behaviour or interviewing participants (Creswell 2009:175; Wilson & MacLean 2011:199). Researchers are regarded as the key instrument in qualitative research. Researchers are the ones who automatically gather the information. Qualitative researchers exercise great discipline to find out what is going on from the perspective of those who are in the situation being researched (Bouma *et al* 2011: 46). In qualitative research the most commonly used data collection tools are interviews and focus group discussions (Wilson & MacLean 2011: 201; Bless *et al* 2013:21). Interview guides were used to collect data from the selected project.

According to Bouma *et al* (2011: 286) an instrument is a type of qualitative research design that consists of semi directed conversation between the interviewer and the participant. The interviewer has an interview guide consisting of a small list of questions or topics that must be discussed during the interview. The order of the topic is dependent on how the conversation between the interviewer and participant flows (Bouma *et al* 2011: 286; Wilson & MacLean 2011:683). The interviewer's job was to ensure all the relevant topics have been discussed and to probe for information resulting from new topics that are mentioned by the interviewee (Bouma *et al* 2011: 286; Wilson & MacLean 2011:683).

Semi structured interviews worked well for this study; the aspects that need to be addressed were identified in the study and were used for the selected projects. According to Wilson & MacLean (2011:683) semi structured interviews is a one to one discussion between a researcher and a participant on a specific topic. The researcher prepared questions for discussion (Wilson & MacLean 2011:201). Semi structured interviews allow the interviewer to break away from the prepared questions to follow up issues that have been raised by the interviewee and that may not have been anticipated at the outset (Wilson & MacLean 2011:202; Babbie & Mouton 2011:251). This makes the semi structured interview a flexible research tool (Wilson & MacLean 2011:202). The role of the interviewer also entails more than interviewing respondents and jotting down responses (Babbie & Mouton 2011: 252).

According to Bouma *et al* (2011: 287) unstructured interviews is a type of qualitative interview that lacks a questionnaire. Interviewers are given an interview guide, a list of topics that must be discussed in the interview. Participants were encouraged to speak freely about subjects of interest as a way of reducing researcher bias that creeps into directed questions. By speaking freely about the topic, researchers obtained a more authentic version of events or more legitimate observations by participants in their own words.

3.7.6. Data on Livelihood

According to Chambers & Conway (1991:6) livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (stores, resources, claims and access) and activities required for a means of

living: a livelihood is sustainable if it can cope with and recover from stress and shocks, maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets, and provide sustainable livelihood opportunities for the next generation; and which contributes net benefits to other livelihoods at the local and global levels and in the long and short term. The commonly used definition is a livelihood that comprises the capabilities, assets, which include both material and social resources, and activities required for a means of living. (State of the World's Volunteerism Report 2011:41).

There is consensus in the definitions of livelihoods. Most institutions (DFID & FAO) adopted the Chambers & Conway definition of livelihood and the same definition will be adopted for this study. According to DFID sustainable livelihoods is thus an approach to achieving poverty elimination rather than a goal on its own right.

Based on literature most of the authors adopted the Chambers & Conway (1998) livelihood indicators which comprises the capabilities, assets (stores, resources, claims and access) and activities required for a means of living: a livelihood is sustainable if it can cope with and recover from stress and shocks, maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets, and provide sustainable livelihood opportunities for the next generation; and which contributes net benefits to other livelihoods at the local and global levels and in the long and short term.

The study that was done by (May *et al* 2002; Hart 2003; Lahiff 2007; Hall & Ntsebeza 2007; Hall 2009) all focussed on different indicators which were adopted from (Chambers & Conway 1998: 6). May *et al* (2002: 229) focussed firstly on food security and indicated that it improves the health and in turn enhances the quality of life. Hart (2003: 26) in his studies focussed on many livelihoods indicators compared to May *et al* who did the similar study in 2002. Hart focused on local resources and environment, planning, needs assessment, funding, inclusion of stakeholders, food security and the relationship. In 2007 Lahiff did a study which focussed on some of the indicators which can be used to measure the livelihood which are social economic status which includes skills, capacity building, land use development and the distribution of benefits among the beneficiaries.

Within the South African context, there is little agreement on core indicators of 'success' in land reform projects. Most attention to date has been on the number of hectares transferred, and the number of beneficiaries. Little or no attention is paid to the livelihood benefits generated, in either qualitative or quantitative terms (Hall 2007:3). According to the study that was done by Hall (2007:3; 2009:41; Scoones 2009:06; Moagi & Oladele 2013:274) the most common suggested indicators of success in land reform should include:

- improved food security: improved nutritional status from self-provisioning or from increased disposable cash income;
- more income: increased amounts and regularity of income from marketed produce and wage employment, and a more egalitarian distribution of income;
- increased well-being: improved access to clean drinking water and to sanitation, improved housing, ownership of household items and access to fuel for cooking;
- reduced vulnerability: improved access to social infrastructure like schools and clinics, and increased mobility;

According to the study done by Genesis Analytics on the Restitution Evaluation (2014:49) the assessment of effectiveness covered three indicators; the extent to which the Restitution Programme is achieving its targets; the claimants' experiences of the restitution process; and finally the barriers staff face in implementing the Restitution Programme.

Livelihood is homogenous and the main livelihood indicators to be used must be similar amongst all the households to be interviewed. According to FAO; DFID; the mix of indicators should cover all aspects of livelihoods of a livelihood group. For the purpose of this study the indicators that will be used for this study are listed below:

- Description of the farms (Process of land redistribution, size, quality, type of farming, quality of land acquired).
- Demographic data (size of farms, households head, gender, race, education, marital status).
- Ownership and control (skills, knowledge, ability to labour).
- Support services (financial, training, infrastructure, market).

- Livelihoods (income, employment, infrastructure).
- Challenges

Based on the literature there is consensus in terms of the indicators that are commonly used for to measure effectiveness of livelihoods in improving the quality of lives and some of those indicators were listed above and were used for this study. According to my observation some of the indicators that were added are:

- Political dimensions
- Commercialization

3.8. Data analysis

Data analysis involves reviewing each unit of analysis and categorising it according to the predefined categories (Ezzy 2002: 83). After a researcher has completed the task of gathering information, the next step is to move to data analysis. The occurrences are then counted and comparisons made, often using statistical methods. Qualitative researchers are interested in the stories that people tell to themselves about themselves (Bless *et al* 2013: 339). Whether the story is “true” or not is less important than whether it captures a person’s experience of their life and world. Qualitative researchers are interested in context, believing that one cannot understand people without understanding the context in which they live. Context includes the geographical place in which people exist, the family structures around them, their occupations, the economic and political worlds in which they live and their religious context (Bless *et al* 2013: 339).

Thematic data analysis was used. Thematic analysis is a qualitative data analysis approach which identifies and analyses patterns of themes across data sets (Wilson & MacLean 2011:551). Thematic data analysis goes beyond the level of simple counts of items and instead looks for patterns, or themes, across whole sets of data. Thematic analysis acts as a good foundation for qualitative researchers (Wilson & MacLean 2011:551). Thematic analysis is not allied to a specific theoretical framework and so can be applied to different frameworks and a number of different research topics (Wilson & MacLean 2011:551). The goal is to establish that the

results provide convincing evidence sufficient to answer the research questions (Borrego *et al* 2009:60).

In this envisaged study, the researcher transcribed the interviews using NVIVO. NVIVO is a software that allows qualitative researchers to analyse data (Babbie 2013:404). The interviews were read and transcribed using the NVIVO.

The quality of qualitative data analysis depends on following well thought out procedures, and on ensuring that these procedures reveal the structures of understating of participants (Ezzy 2002: 81; Babbie & Mouton 2013:279). Qualitative researchers are interested in context believing that one cannot understand people without understanding the context in which they live (Bless *et al* 2013: 339). Qualitative research is demonstrably trustworthy and rigorous when the researcher demonstrates that he or she has worked to understand the situated nature of participants' interpretations and meanings (Ezzy 2002: 81).

3.9. Reliability and validity

According to (Bless *et al* 2013: 394) reliability is an estimate of the accuracy and internal consistency of a measurement instrument. Reliability is concerned with the consistency of measures or how stable the measure is (Babbie & Mouton 2011:69; Punch 2011:293; Bless *et al* 2013: 222). An instrument that produces different scores every time it is used to measure an unchanging value has low reliability. The interview guides (as an instrument that was used to collect data) are reliable tools to collect data. In this study it was not possible to get the same answer from the different heads of household even if they were in the same project.

Validity is the degree or extent to which a study actually measures what it is supposed to measure (Wilson & MacLean 2011:73; Bless *et al* 2013: 394). Babbie & Mouton (2011:73) indicated that validity is the extent to which your measure is measuring what it is supposed to. If something has validity it is true in the sense that is supported by available evidence (Wilson & MacLean 2011:73-74). For the purpose of this study effectiveness of land redistribution in improving the quality of lives of the

intended beneficiaries relied on the respondents information collected from the interviews.

3.10. Limitations of the study

The nature of the study conducted was exploratory in nature and the researcher used interviews to collect data which was dependent on the information provided by the respondents. The researcher is an official from the DRDLR and involved in the Vhembe District. Therefore the information provided is a reflection of what is happening in the projects. The findings of the study will be limited to the Vhembe District and the results may not be generalized out of the area of research.

3.11. Conclusion

This chapter described the research paradigm, design and method that the researcher followed in conducting the research. The population of the study; the area of the study; the data collection method and instruments to be used to collect that data were also described. The chapter indicated that the study will use the qualitative method for the effectiveness of the land redistribution program in improving the quality of life for the intended beneficiaries. The ethical considerations were taken into account for this study and permission was requested from the chairperson and the beneficiaries. The participants were assured that the information will be treated as confidential and will only be used for research purposes at can only be used to inform policy in terms of land redistribution.

CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction.

The chapter presents the findings of the research and the interpretation thereof based on the stated aim, objectives and research questions which were outlined in chapter 1.

This section covers the analysis of the effectiveness of land redistribution programme in improving the quality of life. The study looked at cases in the Vhembe District. Interviews were held with the beneficiaries who benefitted from the land redistribution programme. The beneficiaries interviewed benefitted from Mavungeni CPA (SLAG) with special focus to Ntwanano Poultry Farming; Balanganani (LRAD) and Mamusha Boerdery (PLAS). Interviews were held differently because the projects fall within the land redistribution but they were purchased through different sub programmes (SLAG, LRAD and PLAS) implemented from the start of the land redistribution programme and the numbers of beneficiaries are not the same.

The projects are situated in different properties around the Vhembe District, Mavungeni is situated in Vleifontein which is under Makhado Local Municipality. The project is composed of eight beneficiaries which are 2 males and 6 females. Mavungeni (Ntwanano Poultry Farming) a chicken farm for broilers with a 40 000 carrying capacity structure. Balanganani Project is situated in Musina Local Municipality and the project is composed of the husband with his two wives. The project is farming with small stock (goats). The last project interviewed is situated outside Vivo in Makhado Local Municipality and the property is leased to Mr Mathidi and he is working with his two sons on the farm. The farm has citrus, arable land and he also has livestock. The field work was to interview the households as they were the identified as the sample in the methodology chapter. The interview was prompted by the research question to get the in depth information on the impact of the effectiveness of the land redistribution programme on the quality of lives of the selected households (intended beneficiaries).

4.2. The Process of land redistribution

The process of land redistribution was detailed in the literature review. Since its transition to democracy, South Africa implemented the land reform programme to address the challenges of land inequality, poverty alleviation and unemployment. Its main objective was to create sustainable jobs for the rural poor and the beneficiaries of land reform. The Land Reform programme is heavily relying on the “willing-buyer, willing-seller” principle. The study only focused on one of the three legs of land reform which is land redistribution.

Land redistribution during SLAG was targeting the previously disadvantaged and there were no clear set criteria that were used except that poor households will qualify for the grant. For the households to qualify for the grant they had to form groups to be able to access the grant. The criteria followed are indicated below:

- Previously disadvantaged households
- Not employed by the state

It is quite evident from the interviews that the beneficiaries heard about the programme from Nkuzi which is an NGO that is responsible for land issues and they just submitted their ID copies.

Land redistribution targeted the previously disadvantaged and the criteria that were set in order to qualify for land under LRAD was listed as follows:

- Previously disadvantaged individuals with special focus on women, farm workers, the youth and the disabled.
- Above the age of 18
- Not employed by the state
- Identify the farm.

The fact that the criteria now included women, the respondent saw an opportunity on that, he accessed the farm with his two wives.

“The husband in a polygamous marriage tried for years to get the farm alone but it was very difficult and I did not get it and then I heard that the Department of Land

Affairs was giving land to women and we applied as a family and it took less than 8 months to get the farm with my wives.

In the findings of this study it was clear that six households' women regarded themselves as employees on the projects that they own.

The new process flow of the PLAS programme which was introduced during the tenure of the current minister Mr Gugile Nkwinti is totally different with the other two programmes except that it is also relying on the willing-seller willing-buyer principle. The minister Mr Gugile Nkwinti introduced the new structures as guided by National Development Plan (NDP). The structures will be detailed below and each with its own functions is composed of members of commodity organisation, Unions representing farmers and several other Departments.

The DLRC is operating outside the administration of the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform. DRDLR is offering secretariat services and advice on policy issues. The DLRC is responsible for the following:

- Identify farms suitable for acquisition by the government.
- Advise the minister on the strategic support needs of such farms.
- Identifying and interviewing potential candidates for farm allocation (through the DBSC)
- Advise the minister on strategic support needs of recommended candidates.
- Advise the minister on resolving land rights conflicts, as might be referred to a DLRC

The criteria for a person to apply for a PLAS farm is listed on the application form that the applicants use to apply for the land without an option to buy (attached as Annexure B).

- Be a member of a previously disadvantaged group i.e. African, Coloured or Indian
- Be a South African citizen
- Be 18 years or older

- Committed to use the land for agricultural activities only
- Be willing to live on or near the land and operate or work full time on it
- Neither holds a position in any political public office nor employed as a civil servant
- Be a "self-starter" who has the ambition and enterprise to make a success of the farming operations
- Be in a position to make an own contribution
- Be an organized entity if applying as a group

However the terms of reference (TOR's) for the DBSC has detailed the qualifying groups and added other important target groups that will need to be considered for PLAS farms which were not indicated on the PLAS application forms. The target groups are listed below:

- The target group for agricultural support shall be Black South Africans, Indians and Coloureds.
- Agricultural Sciences University and college graduates, Agri-business special courses, including NARYSEC participants and managerial and entrepreneurial incubation, learner ships/internship, and agricultural para-professionals.
- Subsistence farmers: Communal/village subsistence farmers, Municipal commonage farmers mainly livestock farmers, and sustained homestead garden producers.
- Further priority, within the target group shall be given to women and the youth who either have basic farming skills or demonstrate a willingness to acquire such skills.
- Special attention shall be paid to the youth with experience or qualifications in the field of agriculture.
- "Special category": (a) Women, including single women,(b) people with disabilities, (c) farm workers/dwellers/tenants ,(d)Military Veterans, as defined in the Military Veterans Act, 2011(Act No.18 of 2011) irrespective of their race, shall also be prioritised.
- This shall however exclude those who served in the Union Defence Force (prior to 1961) and the South African Defence forces (prior to 27 April 1994) who do not fall under the categories defined above.

- Public servants and their spouses shall not qualify to benefit from agricultural support irrespective of them falling under any of the categories identified above.
- The beneficiaries shall therefore sign a declaration to the effect that their spouse is not a civil servant and acknowledge that any misrepresentation in this regard constitutes a ground for immediate termination of the support agreement.

In Vhembe District Mavungeni CPA is the only SLAG project that was bought in the district. It is quite evident from the households that only two households were familiar with the process until the land was bought and later transferred to them.

When the farm was bought we were 98 households but as time went on because there was nothing on the land, the number went down and we ended up deregistering some of the members who were not interested. We are now only 32 on the SLAG farm. Majority of the beneficiaries are in the Mavungeni restitution farm. The idea that we had was that all the other members of the CPA will benefit from the rent that Ntwanano was supposed to pay to the CPA when we were using the structure.

Due to the nature of the processes that was followed there has been a slight difference in terms of the eligibility in terms of land acquisition. In SLAG the poor households qualified and in LRAD individuals qualified and in the PLAS there are new categories that have been introduced to qualify for the land redistribution, e.g. Military veterans, graduates, National Rural Youth service Corps (NARYSEC) participants. All these programmes have been similar in implementation in the sense that they all target the South African citizens from the previously disadvantaged groups which are Africans, Coloureds and Indians, who are not employed by the state.

From the two sampled projects it is evident from their experiences that when they moved onto the farms there was nothing except for the dilapidated fence. The case of the PLAS farm was different as there was a farm house, infrastructure that could

be used. The beneficiaries were happy because they had made statistics, they were now new land owners and they were respectable within the community.

“When we moved into the farm there was nothing. Nkuzi had to build for us a poultry structure and a house with poultry structure, they donated 200 chicks with feeds, medication and we started working”.

All the land redistribution programmes implemented are similar because they all target the previously disadvantaged and they are still continuing with the implementation of willing-buyer willing-seller approach. However in terms of the LRAD and the PLAS programme, the farms that were sampled, the process was properly laid out and they had applied knowing exactly the process.

“When I sent my application I knew the process. I wanted a farm where I could rear my livestock and have a portion for vegetables”. I was shortlisted for the interviews we were fourteen and I had to stay in the queue for almost the whole day. I was the last in the queue. I had to wait for 5 months for the Department to finalise the process.

Changes in land redistribution have become a norm since the 1994. There have been changes in the implementation and the sub programmes of SLAG, LRAD and PLAS. All the changes that are being effected are not fast tracking the process of land redistribution as the Department is still implementing the willing-seller willing-buyer approach and the constitution has the following clauses which are not referring to land acquisition implemented under the willing-buyer willing-seller principle:

In Section 25 (2) Property maybe expropriated only in terms of general application and no law may permit arbitrary deprivation of property;

(2)(a) For a public purpose or in the public interest;

(2)(b) 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.

Section (25) (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:

(3)(e) The purpose of the expropriation

(25)(4) For the purpose of this section:

(a) The public interest includes the nation's commitment to land reform and to reforms to bring about equitable access to all South Africa's natural resources.

Even though the constitution has indicated the above clauses the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform is implementing land redistribution against its own constitution with the principles that are indicated in the White Paper of Land Reform which was adopted in 1997. The expropriation clause is provided for in the constitution and the study that was done in the Phillipines by Borras (2007) where they managed to redistribute a lot of hectares through expropriation and it was cheaper as compared to market led reforms advised by the World Bank.

The findings from the study conducted by Cousins (2013) the government plans to pass a new expropriation law which is consistent with constitutional provisions in Section 25 as stated above to fast track the land redistribution process subject to compensation.

The main conceptual difference between all the land redistribution programmes relates to the ownership. While property rights are transferred completely to the new owners within the SLAG and LRAD programme, the South African government retains the right of ownership within the PLAS. In SLAG the households were assisted with the household grant and in the LRAD programme the new owners are assisted through matching grants to acquire land, while in PLAS the acquired land is merely leased out to promising farmers. There is no need now for new applicants of land to form groups as in SLAG and LRAD because they are no longer contributing towards the purchase of the land. In terms of PLAS they only need to submit the application and wait for the DRDLR to call them for interviews.

4.3. Description of the farms

The following table gives characteristics:

Table: 4.1. Status of the farms

Project Name/ HH	Ownership Status	Location	Size	Land use	HH Size	Size of employ
Ntwanano						
HH1	Title Deed	Makhado	561.3880	Broiler	7	0
HH2	Title Deed	Makhado	561.3880	Broiler	5	0
HH3	Title Deed	Makhado	561.3880	Broiler	2	0
HH4	Title Deed	Makhado	561.3880	Broiler	6	0
HH5	Title Deed	Makhado	561.3880	Broiler	3	0
HH6	Title Deed	Makhado	561.3880	Broiler	6	0
HH7	Title Deed	Makhado	561.3880	Broiler	4	0
HH8	Title Deed	Makhado	561.3880	Broiler	4	0
Balanganani HH 1	Title Deed	Musina	119.5038	Goats	9 + 8	2
HH2	Title Deed	Musina	119.5038	Goats	9	2
HH3	Title Deed	Musina	119.5038	Goats	8	2
Mamusha Boerdery	Lease	Makhado	845.111	Livestock, Citrus and arable land	6	10

Source: field data

HH=Households

In the literature review it was indicated that the newly elected democratic government identified land reform as a key programme to address the triple challenges which are, poverty, inequality and unemployment. The programme was initiated to benefit the historically disadvantaged individuals. This section covers the description of the projects, name of the project, size, demographic information of the sampled projects, the gender, age, marital status, education level and how the beneficiary knew about the land redistribution and their participation on the programme. The three farms selected presented on the table are located in the two local municipalities in Makhado and Musina.

Figure 4.1: Purchased farm in Musina.



Source: Field data

All the selected households benefited from land reform under the land redistribution programme. Out of the twelve households interviewed six households were headed by single mothers. They were also staying with their siblings. All these households were from the marginalised group.

The age groups of the twelve households were between 36 and 78 years, with 36 being the youngest and 78 years being the oldest. Majority of these households were in their early and mid-forties. The findings clearly indicated that there were no youth heading these households.

The education level of the households that participated in this study was very low. Two of the beneficiaries (household heads or respondents) managed to pass their matric which is now grade twelve. Majority of the households' respondents did not

reach matric in terms of their education. It can be concluded that the literacy level of this projects is very low.

The table below provides a summary of the respondents:

Table 4.2: Demographic information

GENDER	RACE	HIGHEST STANDARD	MARITAL STATUS
08 females	Black South Africans	Below matric	06 are single 02 Married
4 males	Black South Africans	2 with Matric	3 married 1 not married

Source: Field data

In the literature review it was indicated that there had been changes in land redistribution programme hence the household numbers were not the same in each project. In the beginning as the implementation of land redistribution the numbers were high in this study and the number decreased as the programme changed. The twelve households interviewed were all adults, two households were between 36-37 years. Majority were between 42- 59 years. The oldest was in the late 70's.

4.4. Ownership and control

This section is responding to the current ownership and control arrangement of the land that has been redistributed. In the literature review the study highlighted the land redistribution programme and illustrated its inception and history since 1994 and the changes that happened during its implementation to date. The reason for the introduction of land redistribution was to redistribute the land to the previously disadvantaged, the poor and alleviate poverty and finally create sustainable jobs for the communities.

During the implementation of the land redistribution programme started with SLAG, then LRAD replaced SLAG and then LRAD was replaced by PLAS which is currently under implementation. The ownership and control pattern has been changing due to policy shift which was affecting the implementation programme. It is evident that SLAG control was affected by the large number of households compared to the other programmes. In the selected projects the ownership and control is different however the SLAG and LRAD projects the ownership is in the form of a title deed. The PLAS farm the ownership is a lease because the title deed is with the state. Eleven of the twelve households are land owners and have title deeds and the remaining household the title deed is with the state.

“I am now a very respectable man around my community because I have a farm now. I am not only a farmer I am a new farm owner with a title deed and that is great, nobody believed that a black man could have a title deed for a farm. When it all started it was like a dream”.

In terms of the ownership eleven of the twelve beneficiaries are happy with the ownership arrangement. The ownership arrangement for the household interviewed as indicated in the table above is that eleven out of the twelve household have title deeds, but only one household is staying on the state farm and was supposed to have the lease but it is not there. Out of the eight households six households say that it is good to be many ideas are shared and help each other whereas others feel that it is a burden to be many in a group as this hampers chances of growth. The fact that some are happy with the idea of being many is because of their level of education and the lack of knowledge and skills to be able to run their farms. This makes life easier if the household heads is surrounded by others. However one male in the group indicated that for him to be in a group is a problem as he is expected to look after the farm but he cannot make a decision without them. For each and every decision needed requires the resolution from the beneficiaries.

In terms of control eight out of the twelve households are not even sure in terms of how the farms are run and controlled on a daily basis. It is evident from the findings that women are owners but they are not participating in the running of the farms and the decisions that are involved in farming. They have emphasized that they are

owners but they are working on the farm as they need an income, if there is no job that can give them salaries why should they stay in the farm. However in the polygamous marriage the women are not on the farm on a daily basis as they stay far from each other but they are involved in the major decision making that concerns the farm. They are conversant with the idea on how they want to take the farm in future. However one household indicated that group acquisition of land specifically for production purposes has a lot of challenges. The control and management of the land with many members who have different interest is a challenge on its own.

“Some of the members never showed any interest from the start of the project, they were just adding the numbers to qualify for the grant, hence the regularization of the CPA”.

The ownership in the PLAS farm is where the household does not understand why they are staying without the lease agreement. Since title deed is with the state they seem to understand but they are not happy. However the control of the land lies with the lease. In other words the beneficiary able to make decisions that concerns the farm.

“I am not happy at all, I am staying on a state farm without a lease agreement and I should be staying with the title deed”.

The lack of title deed is negatively affecting the control in terms of the day to day running of the farm as it is not possible for the beneficiary to invest in the farm as he does not own it and he is not able also to get financial assistance from financial institutions. However the issue of the control on the land is still a problem even on the land that is owned with title deed. The owners are always approaching the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform whereas they should take control of the land.

“When I moved onto the farm I was so happy because I had been farming and I wanted to expand my farming but the government was holding my hands because of the title deed”.

4.5. Support systems

This section is responding to the support systems that the beneficiaries are currently having on their redistributed farms. It was evident from the findings that when two of these projects were bought there was an immediate need for support. Eleven households of the twelve households interviewed made it clear that when these farms were handed over they were not farmable. There was no infrastructure to support the enterprise which the households could continue or start with.

Fig 4.2. Recently purchased farm overgrazed



Source: Field data

It is evident from the findings that the level of education for most beneficiaries of the ten households is below matric. The same households were not experienced in any farming enterprise. Farmers had to identify new enterprises that they could start with.

In terms of training, the Department of Agriculture is supporting the farmers through the trainings offered by Madzivhandila Agricultural College. Most of these trainings are related to the enterprises that they are engaged in. Farmers attend trainings which are beneficial to the enterprises that they are currently producing. All the households interviewed have attended some sort of training. Even though the trainings are not that advanced but they have managed to attend and they seem to appreciate those trainings. However lack of marketing skills in all the households was confirmed as the households are struggling to market their produce.

One male respondent aged 46 indicated that *“he had attended so many trainings in Madzivhandila, he had even lost track of the number, and all this training was related to broiler farming”*.

It is quite evident that all these projects received financial assistance in one way or the other. There are differences in the support given as the eight households are blaming the government for not supporting them comprehensively. The households were happy when they were assisted by the Department with the 40 000 carrying capacity structure, however the situation did not turn out as they expected.

One female aged 45 indicated that *“the support received from Department of Agriculture for the poultry structure destroyed everything. Even our small black market that we were using is gone”*.

It is evident from the findings that financial assistance received by all the households was not adequate. It is clear that the Departments dominate when they are assisting beneficiaries with the coordination of business plans for support because they have to work within a certain budget. It is evident that the state of the farms is somehow based on the advice that the officials provide to the households. There was no proper assessment of the enterprises that the beneficiaries were engaged in, hence the impact of the financial support not bringing the desired results. Eleven out of the twelve household are finding it difficult to make ends meet from the support provided.

One female aged 48 indicated that *“we have been supported we agree, what do we have to show for it. Do you think if I die today, my kids will be interested in this farm”?*

It is quite evident that the projects have been supported but the support is not properly coordinated. The support needs to be coordinated in such a way that after the support the households can be commercial farmers. Looking at the findings from the sampled projects the minimal support that they have received will not make them commercial farmers.

The lessee of the state farm indicated that *“if it wasn’t for the support provided through the drought relief from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform I would have returned the keys”*.

4.6. Impact of land redistribution on livelihoods

This section is responding to observation of any improvement in the respondents’ household as a result of land redistribution. In the literature review it was indicated that in the South African context there is little agreement on the core indicators of success in land reform projects. For the purpose of this study the livelihoods indicators must not only improve the household’s wellbeing as a result of policy interventions, but they must improve it in a sustainable manner. The indicators used for the purpose of this study were discussed below:

- **Income**

This indicator was selected to measure the effectiveness of land redistribution in livelihoods as it had been used by other researchers. From the findings of this study, out of the twelve households only one household indicated that they were making an income and the other eleven households had a lack of income coming from all the farm activities. It was found to be one of the reasons why most of these projects sampled are not working. It can be concluded in this study that lack of participation by women in the farm activities is because that there is no guaranteed income, in other words there is no salary on a monthly basis. However the households indicated that there was an impact that they had seen in their households.

One household that is staying on the farm indicated that the land redistribution programme made an impact *“the poultry structure that was built on the farm changed my life for the better as I am managing to get the little income from the sale of the broilers. I cannot stay at home and wait for the market. The market will find me here”*.

Twelve of the respondents (households) have managed to buy some furniture, build houses, send siblings and their children to tertiary and they are affording to put food on the table on a daily basis but the income is sourced from outside the farm. One

household is rearing broilers at small scale which they are selling at the informal market from their backyard which is far from the farm. One household indicated that the farm is not generating the income as they expected, hence the taking of some of the savings to run this farm.

The 46 year old male respondent further added that I can now afford to buy casual clothes, school uniform and pay school fees for my children. *“Before I joined this project it was a crisis. My life was dependent on borrowing money to take care of my family, social grants and now I can afford to pay a doctor in case a member of my family is sick. I have managed to take my son to Makwarela FET College (Techniven) and the second born is still at high school through the little income I’m receiving from the farm”*.

The finding confirms what was indicated in the literature review with the study that was conducted in the North West Province by Antwi & Oladele (2013). The findings showed that some of the key livelihood indicators were lowly achieved and there was less contribution from the land redistributed farms towards food security. However there were mixed feelings in terms of the impact of the land redistribution programme in improving the quality of lives. Two of the households have made it very clear that to them it was just a waste of time.

One respondent 46 year old female indicated that *“I have been in that farm since 2001 to date there is nothing to show for it. I am still poor even after receiving the land”*.

The 54 old male indicated that *“I am sitting with a transformer which costs more than R 30 000, 00 electricity bill on monthly basis”*.

- **Employment**

There are mixed feelings in terms of employment. Seven out of the twelve beneficiaries are not working at all and they are not even on the farm. Most of these households are women. The land redistribution projects sampled did not create enough jobs as it would have been expected. Two of the projects created only twelve

permanent jobs out of more than 900 hectares combined. Due to lack of the financial support these projects are not operating at full capacity which affects the creation of employment in these projects. From the findings it is evident that lack of financial support and the market are crippling these projects which make it impossible to create employment. If these issues are not addressed there is a possibility of these projects collapsing.

One respondent, a 37 years old female indicated that *“land redistribution projects are not creating employment for us, how is it possible for it to create jobs for the community people?”*.

On the day of the visit there were additional four temporary jobs for the construction of the office, ablution block and the packaging shed.

Figure 4.3: Office block



Source: Field data

- **Infrastructure**

It is evident that when two of the properties were bought, there was nothing in terms of infrastructure and the assets except for the dilapidated fence. All the sampled households still needed assistance from the state or other areas to be able to run these farms. One recent project that was bought through the PLAS programme, in terms of the infrastructure it was more advanced compared to the other two programmes (SLAG & LRAD). However the household is now faced with challenges

of the dilapidated infrastructure (underground pipes, pumps) and the water table in the boreholes was far below what was expected. The land was overgrazed and it will take years for the grass to regenerate.

It can be concluded in this study from the findings that all the sampled projects only bought the hectares. It will need a lot of money for these projects to be fully functional.

The 54 old male indicated that *“I have spent all my savings; this farm is only eating from my pocket”. The Department only gave me R 1 574 000, 00 which did not manage to fix all the underground pipes that are in the farm”*.

4.7. Challenges

In the literature review some of the challenges that the land redistribution (reform) programme is facing were highlighted. This section is responding to the challenges that the selected projects are currently facing.

4.7.1. Political dimensions

It is evident from the interviews conducted with the twelve households that politics is involved in the land redistribution. However there are variations in the way the beneficiaries explain the involvement of politics. In terms of the political dimensions all the household commends the democratic government for introducing the land reform.

The 78 years old male indicated that *“if it wasn’t for the politics I would still be an African man who is not good enough to have a title deed”. Due to politics I am now a farm owner with a title deed”*.

It is evident from the eight household that politics is blamed for the invasions that are currently happening on their farms. The political statements made the communities take them as they are and take action.

“If you see the vacant land that is not in use, take it!!”

“Due to the seriousness of the invasions that are happening in our land, we have tried the court and we have paid lawyers but we came back with nothing. They are still busy invading our land. When we approached the local chief not to demarcate stands in our land he told us that Shangaans (Mutonga) don't have land”.

The involvement of politics is taken in different views. It is quite evident that in some cases even the laws of the country sometimes put our land reform farmers in a certain position.

The laws that are currently in place are sometimes contradictory. In our case we approached the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform when the community started invading our land. We were told that, because they had stayed in our farm for more than 3 months they were now protected by the Extension of Security of Tenure Act (No 92 of 1997). The same Department gave us a title deed but the same Department is unable to assist us. These laws are not applicable to everyone. It is evident that politics has its own dangers as some are above the law and the poor suffer.

In terms of the land acquisition process politics it is now involved. In the LRAD era the process was very fast because the administrators were allowed to run with the process until the end. Now that in PLAS politics is involved it is delaying the process. The many political structures that have been put in place are now delaying the process.

The 48 year old women indicated that *“politics must not be involved in business, the politicians ruined our poultry market and now they are failing to open the Lebowakgomo Abattoir, maybe we were going to get good prices because the abattoir is owned by government”.*

It can be concluded in this study that the involvement of politics in the process of land acquisition is delaying the process and on the other hand destroying the market. However in terms of the sampled projects the eight households are not happy with

the political interference as they blame government for not helping with the invasions on their land.

The 48 year old women indicated that *“If I die today, do you think my kids will be interested in working on the farm”*.

4.7.2. Commercialization

The sampled projects are not yet commercial and there is a need for financial assistance for these projects to be commercial. It is quite interesting that two of the three projects want to introduce new commodities for them to be commercial, e.g. chicken layers and potatoes. However one project wants to expand on what they currently have, they want to continue with the commodity that they currently have.

Due to the nature of the financial support given to the two of the sampled projects it was not possible for them to be commercial farmers. There is a need for these projects to be financed again. However one project was financed in such a way that it was supposed to be commercial but due to the market limitations (lack of formal market for their produce) they are unable to sell their produce.

“We are planning to source funding from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform or the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development to change the structure from broilers and introduce the chicken layers”.

“When we first applied for financial assistance we were told that there was no money in the Department as we wanted a feedlot. Without a feedlot we will never be commercial”. For us to be able to be able to meet the demand and supply our market we need a fully functional feedlot on our farm”.

“I need to introduce potatoes as I am sitting on a potato belt, without potatoes I will never be commercial”.

4.7.3. Financial support.

On all the sampled projects it was evident that all the sampled households have been supported by either the Department of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development and Land Reform and NGO's. The support that was received was not enough as the projects still show signs of distress. There is a need for the comprehensive funding of these projects with the assessment and identification of reliable markets.

From the sampled projects, two out of the three projects received financial support after some time when they received the land. They acknowledged that they had been receiving support since the land redistribution; the problem is that the support was not enough. Government is not supporting this projects to be commercial they are supporting the comprehensive Business Plan so that they can be fully productive.

The respondent expressed frustrations in terms of financial support from government *“I acknowledge that we have been supported for infrastructure (farm house and goat handling facility) and this support took more than 5 years after the land redistribution. This will not take us far”*.

Figure 4.4. Goat handling facility



Source: field data

4.8. Sustainability of Land Redistribution.

From the literature review land reform should be tested against its ability to address equity in land redistribution and livelihood upgrading, reduction of poverty, creation of rural employment and income generating opportunities. This is very critical in land redistribution. It is evident from the findings that the sampled projects failed to meet the objectives of land reform and the creation of sustainable livelihoods for the beneficiaries.

It is evident that access to land is just one factor but there has to be complementation of the land access with support services so that success of land reform can be realised. Land redistribution farms must be utilised at full production (capacity) without compromising the ability of future generation to their own needs. All the sampled projects are not showing any signs of sustainability due to the nature of their operation. They are not generating any income except for the few households that are saying they are managing to put food on the table.

Project management, financial management training is important for the sustainability of land redistribution. There are no signs of financial viability in all these projects. Sustainability can only be achieved if farmers are supported comprehensively and the markets are available for them. There are no savings from their profits for emergencies like drought or heat wave.

Fig 4.5. Ripe tomatoes without the market



Source: Field data

Without support land redistribution will continue to yield poor results in sustaining the livelihoods of rural people and is not likely to meet the objectives of economic development and sustainability with the pace that the government is supporting these projects. From the findings in this chapter it is evident that there is a skills gap that needs to be filled. Due to the literacy levels of the beneficiaries it will take time for the gaps to be filled.

The 42 year old male indicated that *“The Chissa Nyama outlets, stokvels and funerals are mainly the main markets which I am currently using. The Chissa Nyama outlets are mostly operated by unemployed youth, therefore the programme is somehow assisting on job creation and poverty alleviation. Our project is contributing in addressing food security in the area by supplying white meat to the society”*.

The 54 year old respondent indicated that *“I have planted tomatoes and they are now ripe, I have targeted to supply the factory around Vivo with the ripe tomatoes for canning. They have now closed the market because they have canned their tomatoes. We are suffering in the market because we rely on the markets still controlled by the minority”*.

4.9. Future plans

The sampled twelve household are still very positive about the land redistribution. They are hopeful that the land redistribution will turn their life around even if they have nothing to show for it now. They are looking forward to the assistance and are reapplying to the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Rural Development and Land reform. The unfortunate part, is that the 11 households with the title deeds are not considering looking for financial assistance from anywhere, they are not even considering loans from the bank. The household without a title deed was very clear he was looking forward to getting loans from commodity organisations but it was not possible for him to access that because he does not have a title deed.

All the sampled households have future plans for the projects. In Mavungeni they are looking for finance to convert their fully automated broiler structure to a fully

automated layer structure. They have already identified the market for the markets around the Elim and Vleifontein and the surrounding villages area.

In Balanganani they are looking forward to commercializing their farm by adding a feedlot so that they can meet the demand for their market and be commercial farmers, if they do not add the feedlot they will never be commercial farmers looking at the carrying capacity of the farm.

In Mamusha Boerdery it is quite evident that if they continue with livestock only, they will lose a chance to be commercial farmers. The farm is currently overgrazed and the drought that has hit the area is also contributing. This is making life very difficult for the beneficiary.

It is clear that for all these projects there is a need for additional funding.

4.10. Interpretation of the findings

The selected projects are comprised of two dominant ethnic groups (Tsonga/Venda) and they are situated in Makhado and Musina local municipalities of the Vhembe District in Limpopo province. Majority of these people are staying in the rural areas and they are poor and unemployed. The selected projects are associated with a range of conditions including different types of land ownership, different types of land use after land redistribution. However most of the beneficiaries in these projects are related. These projects were bought through different land redistribution programmes that were implemented in Limpopo Province.

In South Africa, the willing-buyer/ willing-seller approach is frequently blamed for the fact that the governments' redistributive programme has fallen well short of expectation. Due to the nature of the land redistribution in South Africa and the continuation of the willing-buyer willing-seller principle most of the farms that were put on the market or acquired through land redistribution were of lower quality. It was evident from the findings of the study that the farms that were acquired were not used immediately after the acquisition as it was not possible to farm on these farms. The new beneficiaries had to wait for government or NGO's to assist.

It is evident from the findings that the process flow, criteria for LRAD and PLAS was clear in terms of the category groups which included women as the beneficiary group and this confirms the argument that was made by Tsikata & Amanor-Wilks (2015) that agrarian reform programmes have significant numbers of female beneficiaries or even pay attention to gender as the beneficiary category. It is quite evident that land redistribution in South Africa recognises women as the category that should benefit and the changes in the programmes did not affect the category groups.

The findings that were presented above confirm the findings Binswanger (1996) has in addition raised as a challenge around ignoring women and farm workers, which he describes as the greatest mistake happening in various parts of Africa but not the case in South Africa. Where land reform has been implemented in ignorance of these marginal groups (farm dweller/workers and women), it has resulted in loss of jobs. In other words having women in the land redistribution does not guarantee that there will be no job losses as it was previously argued by Binswanger.

It is evident from the findings that the projects were not fully productive when they were acquired and it took time for the projects to be supported and they were not fully supported. In the findings of the study conducted by Jacobs (2003) extension services (farming advice), skills development, capacity building; including training and mentoring programmes, financial assistance in the form of grants and credit to assist with farming operations, infrastructure support such as irrigation, fencing, access to markets were identified as areas that needs support. Manenzhe (2007) further confirmed that the interventions from the state when involved should consider what the beneficiaries plans are so that they can increase productivity.

It is evident from the finding that the one project with eight household failed to create enough jobs for the beneficiaries themselves and the community. It is evident from the findings that the there is no income for majority of the households that is coming from the redistributed farms. This finding confirms what May et al (2002) indicated that food security is one of the most important determinants of wellbeing that could be directly affected by land reform. It was further emphasized by Lahiff (2003) that if land reform is to meet its wider objectives, new ways will have to be found to transfer the land and immediately support the beneficiaries. This was further indicated by

Van Zyl et al (1996) that the success of a land reform in South Africa should be tested against its ability to address equity in land distribution and livelihood upgrading, reduction of poverty, creation of rural employment and income-generating opportunities.

It is evident in the study that all the households agree that the involvement of politics assisted them to get land through the land redistribution process. Some of the households feel that if it was not for politics they were not going to get the land because of the provisions in the apartheid government policies. This also confirms the findings of the study conducted by Binswanger & Deininger (1999) that land reforms undertaken in the last 20-30 years were politically motivated and have not lived up to expectations. However there are contradictions with the findings of Akech (2010) that land can be used as a major resource for political support and has been illegally and irregularly allocated which is not the case in South Africa as the land is allocated through the processes which are followed before land is handed over to the new land owners or the beneficiaries.

On the other hand there was variation in terms of politics, due to lack of understating among the households on the control of the land as the new land owners that they must stand on their own. The issue of invasion which is supported by the local chief and influenced by tribalism that the Tsonga do not have land and the land belongs to the Venda's is creating tensions in one of the projects interviewed. The new land owners (Beneficiaries) reported the matter to the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform and it is not within their mandate as they are now legal land owners with the title deed. They had to approach the court which led to court actions and they did not manage to win the case due to financial constraints. The legislations like ESTA were made to protect farm workers and dwellers in a privately owned land which was previously owned by whites which is now a problem as the farm owners are now blacks.

The findings of the study indicates that the effects of land redistribution programme was not visible as the projects sampled have no benefits received in terms of income and employment which were regarded as the main livelihood indicators. These finding confirm what the study conducted by Van Zyl (1996) indicated that it is

evident that land access is just one factor but there has to be complementation of land access with support services so that success of land reform can be realised. If there is no support it will be very difficult for land redistribution programmes to create jobs and for the beneficiaries to have a sustainable income. The finding confirms what May et al (2002) indicated that food security is one of the most important determinants of wellbeing that can be directly affected by land reform. It was further concurred by Lahiff (2003) that if land reform is to meet its objectives new ways will have to be found to redistribute land and immediately support the households benefitting from the land redistribution.

From the findings it was evident that the government officials are dominating when crafting the support for the farmers, in other words they had the support in mind which is not informed by what farmers want. The finding confirms what was discussed in the literature review by May (2003) that farmers must design their own agricultural systems based on their needs, skills and resources with the support of officials and stakeholders. May (2003) further adds that the state must ensure that funding is available to projects to ensure its success and continued participation of the beneficiaries.

It is evident from the findings that the respondents are faced with encounters of financial support, production inputs and the access to market. The study confirms the findings of the land redistribution projects that they are faced with more or less the same challenges as land redistribution beneficiaries in the North West province conducted by Antwi & Oladele (2013) which highlighted the lack of finance, lack of farm inputs which include the production inputs and lack of other infrastructure to support the agricultural activities.

The findings clearly indicate that all these projects have serious challenges with the markets which are impacting negatively on the wellbeing of the intended beneficiaries. On the day of the visit the respondent was harvesting tomatoes and cabbages and there was no market for the product. The tomatoes were so ripe that at the stage they did not have the market because the canning plant around Vivo was closed and there was nowhere else to send those tomatoes.

The signing of the agreements by the government for America and Brazil to supply South Africa with the poultry products is viewed as another way of putting the poultry market in South Africa at risk.

The 42 year old female indicated that *“If the government really cares about us, why did they sign the agreement to supply chickens? The same government has built us the poultry structure and never bothered to secure a reliable market for us”*.

It is quite evident that the respondents appreciated that the programme has provided them with an improved wellbeing. The land redistribution programme from the sampled projects failed to create sustainable jobs for the intended beneficiaries (households). If there is no income amongst the beneficiaries themselves there are no jobs for the local community. For the livelihoods to improve there is a need for a sustainable income and employment. However the impact is questionable from the findings of this study and it concurs with the argument made by (Hall 2007; May & Roberts 2008; Baye 2013).

From the findings it is clear that the financial support they have received is not aligned to what the land redistribution beneficiaries want. It is aligned to the budget that the Departments have and what the officials feel is the right thing to do. The waiting period to be assisted financially by the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform is longer than expected which leads to farms dilapidating. It is clear that the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development and The Department of Rural Development and Land Reform are not coordinating the assistance and aligning it with the markets.

From all the projects there is a need for infrastructure upgrading for these projects to be sustainable, which clearly indicates that when these farms were bought the Department was only, buying the hectares (land redistribution).

4.11. Conclusion

This chapter has presented the main findings of the study. The study highlighted the process land redistribution followed since its inception, the acquisition process until

the approval. The impact of the land redistribution on livelihoods of the beneficiaries was done and the findings were presented in the chapter and the challenges, sustainability of the land redistribution programme was also looked at. The next chapter will summarise the conclusions and make recommendations for further study.

This chapter reveals the challenges that cause ineffectiveness of land redistribution in improving the quality of life in Vhembe District. Some of the factors that cause lack of effectiveness (Improvement of lives) in the study area were revealed and analysed in this chapter. From the findings, it is evident that there is a need for human resource development of beneficiaries and their families in the selected projects. For the projects to be sustainable there is a need for succession planning and youth involvement. In Mamusha the beneficiary has already introduced his two sons and they are full time on the farm working with the beneficiary. There is a need to train them as they are not from an agricultural background. Frequent assessment can also enhance the improvement of the quality of lives and the sustainability of the projects. Data collected in the study was presented, analysed, discussed and interpreted.

In the next chapter an overview of the study, findings, recommendations and the area of future research will be presented.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Introduction

The rationale of conducting this study was to assess the effectiveness of the land redistribution programme in improving the quality of life of the intended beneficiaries. When the government embarked on land reform after 1994, the primary objective was to address the challenges of poverty alleviation, unemployment and inequality. This study focused on land redistribution in the context of a few areas in the Vhembe District. As a government official and a development student dealing with land redistribution and assisting the beneficiaries of land redistribution to get access to land and the development support after land reform, my primary interest was to obtain an in-depth understanding of the effectiveness of land redistribution in improving the quality of lives. A qualitative research design was therefore applied. Data was collected from secondary sources and interviews which were conducted with the heads of the households.

This chapter summarises the study findings, highlights the challenges of land redistribution and draws some policy lessons. Although the findings cannot be generalised since it was based on a small sample, the researcher hopes that the issues that the study raises, require further reflection and point to the need for larger studies that investigate the issues more comprehensively.

This study used three case studies from Vhembe District in Limpopo Province to investigate the effectiveness of land redistribution in improving the quality of life.

5.2. Summary of findings

Impact was assessed using a number of indicators such as income, employment, ownership and control of land, sustainability and empowerment.

The following were the key findings of the study:

a. Ownership and control of land

A positive impact of land redistribution on 11 households is that it enabled them to own land whereas one household have the land they can use which is owned by the government (state). They therefore have an asset which has the potential to sustain them. For people who were hitherto disadvantaged and marginalised, this is an important achievement of the government. Access to land is an important base upon which to achieve their own development.

Ownership can enhance access to credit or loans to develop the farms. However, the study found that the arrangements made by government to retain the title deeds are making it very difficult for some of the farmers to obtain the loans which they require in order to develop the farms.

b. Empowerment

Ownership of land in itself partly empowers the individual to the extent that it is an asset that they can use to improve their lives. However, as shown in the study, owning land in itself does not necessarily bring about development if that land is not productively utilised. In the case of these farms, limited support has left the households frustrated that they are not able to make income out of the land. One of the issues which they raised was that they are not meaningfully consulted by the government officials who are supposed to extend a range of services to them. The top-down approach which such officials are following does not empower communities. Much more needs to be done in order to empower them. The initiatives from the beneficiaries must be enhanced rather than the state basing their arguments on what they think can work rather than what beneficiaries wants. If the state listens to the beneficiaries in terms of the challenges that they are facing and the enterprises that they want it increases the ownership on the side of the beneficiaries and it will enhance and increase productivity if accompanied by financial support and appropriate planning.

c. Household income

Effective utilisation of land can yield high incomes to sustain the beneficiaries. In this study, most of the beneficiaries of the land redistribution were bitter that they hardly had any income from the land. That was largely because they did not receive the support that would have enabled them to develop their farms. Challenges of infrastructure and lack of access to markets, among others, were obstacles. Even though some of the households have built houses, bought furniture and are sending children to school, this was from past savings and not income from the farms.

d. Employment

Because the farming business has been minimal, their capacity to create many new jobs has been very small. Thus, despite the relatively large size of some of the farms, they have not been able to create jobs as had been expected.

e. Skills acquisition

Beneficiaries have acquired some skills through the training programmes offered by the government through the Madzivhandila FET College of Agriculture. This is a positive impact. However, the beneficiaries indicated that the programme could be extended to include other skills such as marketing because lack of marketing skills has made it difficult for them to explore new markets.

f. Government support

Evidence from the study shows that beneficiaries of land redistribution were dissatisfied with the nature and amount of support from the government. This was one of the factors which they attributed to their failure to make income from their farms. During the apartheid era, the white minority regime invested extensively in large scale commercial agriculture. The farms were successful largely because of that government support. In the farms that were studied, lack of comprehensive support led to a total failure for farm beneficiaries who lack the experience, technical knowhow and finance. Fundamentally therefore, the government has to provide

extensive support in terms of credit, services, electricity, irrigation, and marketing infrastructure to the new beneficiaries of land redistribution for these farms to be sustainable. It is evident from the findings that the households received funding however it was not enough to make the projects sustainable hence they are still looking for funding. In addition, land redistribution should be complemented with the support from local institutions and the assistance with the identification of sustainable markets for the land redistribution beneficiaries. Lack of market, access to credit and affordable inputs is negatively affecting the land redistribution beneficiaries.

The literature review in chapter two emphasized that limited post transfer support and the failure to integrate land reform with a wider programme of rural development has severely limited the contribution of land reform in the livelihood and the revival of the rural economy. Land reform should not only be on deracialising land ownership, but also on the redistribution of land and other assets and the reform of agricultural markets.

g. Sustainability

As long as the farms are not productive and are not yielding income for the beneficiaries, they are not sustainable. Furthermore, their failures to generate incomes for the beneficiaries, their frustration at the poor or limited support they are receiving from the government, among others, do not augur well for sustainability. In fact, the frustrations and despondency that the respondents showed might well lead to them abandoning the farms and going off somewhere else to seek paid employment.

h. Legislation

One of the pertinent findings of the study was the lack of familiarity with land reform acts on the part of the land redistribution beneficiaries. As new legal land owners they need to know some of the important legislation that negatively affects them like the ESTA Act. However due to the lower level of education and the skills gap which characterise some of the farmers, it will take time for the new land owners to understand these acts. The study revealed that land reform policies constrained

progress as eight households were affected by the land invasion which is a criminal offence. However, the new land owners took time to address it and were subsequently overtaken by the ESTA Act which protected the invaders. According to the respondents understanding this was a Departmental case, and legally it was not as they are legal owners with the title deed.

The researcher also observed that some beneficiaries who are looking for land now are not interested in the user right reform, but are looking for title deeds. This area requires further research as most of the researchers have not dwelt much on it. The fact that the state is keeping the title deeds to land reform beneficiaries is a serious challenge as land reform is about the title deeds not the user right. This has a negative impact on farmers as they are unable to access loans for production inputs and they have to wait for the state to support them financially which is always not enough and it takes time.

Land reform should be tested against its ability to address equity in land redistribution and livelihood upgrading, reduction of poverty, creation of rural employment and income generating opportunities.

The study shows that it is still an unrealistic question as to how much land redistribution programme has contributed to the improvement of the quality of life of the beneficiaries, on the reinforcement of the position of women in the ownership, allocation, use of and access to land and the achievements of an integrated rural development programme. In the case studies selected the women benefitted in terms of ownership but in terms of the control and the day to day running of the farms they are not involved. However this can be contributed by their level of education and they need to be capacitated.

It is also common in Limpopo and other provinces in the country and regions to find previously productive farms lying idle after the transfers and some of the farmers being not utilised fully. Some of the reasons stated are that the new land reform beneficiary does not have skills to run successful farms and they rely on government for financial assistance. Due to lack of information these farms are waiting for assistance from government. With the household that is occupying a PLAS property

he was prepared to take a loan, however due to lack of ownership of the land that is not possible.

There is a need for land reform to shift from being politically motivated and also focus on the economic side of the programme. Land redistribution farms should create business that will be able to sustain the beneficiaries' households. It should not only end on giving farmers the big commercial farms for previously disadvantaged without support being provided, if the support is provided it must be comprehensive in such a way that even the markets are properly identified. The case studies were supported but the projects are not viable due to the minimal support that was given.

The majority of previously disadvantaged emerging farmers in South Africa, especially land reform beneficiaries, are finding it difficult to make a success of their enterprises in the complex and risky agricultural sector. However, those that are still taking part in agricultural activities are only producing at a subsistence level and therefore defeating the land reform mission of commercializing black-owned farms.

It is evident from the findings that the interference of politics in the process of land acquisition and the provision of financial support is not bringing anything good except slowing down the progress. However, the beneficiaries are hopeful that they will make it in the farming business hence they are requesting financial support from government. For land redistribution farms to function productively, the state will have to intervene and support these new beneficiaries. It can be concluded from the three case studies that there is a serious need for intervention if government wants to achieve the commercialization of the black owned farms.

The objectives of the study were partially achieved. However from the study one can conclude that from the cases that were interviewed if the challenges that they are currently facing are not addressed by the government then the projects will not achieve the main objectives of land reform in general.

5.3. Recommendations

On the basis of the findings from the primary and the secondary data, the following recommendations are made:

- 5.3.1. The government should consider decentralising the process to the province and not involve a lot of structures as this delays the process and the provision of support to land redistribution beneficiaries .The programme is described as being slow whereas the government processes are very long. There is one committee in the district, one in the province and almost 3 committees in the national office where approval is granted. The involvement of politics is delaying the process as some of these structures are political.
- 5.3.2. Training should be comprehensive management training should be considered, business management and marketing so that the farmers are able to manage their enterprises in a sustainable way. The beneficiaries should take responsibility and identify their own training needs with the assistance of officials.
- 5.3.3. The beneficiaries who are having title deeds must understand that the land belongs to them. No matter happens to the land, they are responsible for it. There is no need to always run to the department as some of the issues need the police as it is a criminal offence (invasion in land redistribution farms). However if the issue is not addressed the invaders end up being protected by other legislation facilitated by the same Department that bought the land. Beneficiaries must be familiarised with the legislations that they will come across as the new land owners.
- 5.3.4. Traditional leaders' role in land redistribution must be further researched as their involvement in the programme undermines the new land owners with the title deeds. They must also be familiarised with the land redistribution legislation.

5.3.5. There is a need for beneficiaries to consider introducing their children to farming so that they can start at an early age. However government should assist the current land owners so that the farms can be at full production capacity in order to attract the youth. It is evident from the case studies considered that the youth are not involved in land redistribution.

5.4. Limitations of the study

The study focussed only on the effectiveness of land redistribution programme in improving the quality of life for the intended beneficiaries. The study was supposed to cover all land redistribution projects in the Vhembe District, however due to the time and resource constraints only three projects were selected with a total of twelve households. The study relied mostly on the interviews from selected households in the study. The results cannot be generalised to other areas or projects which were not part of this study.

5.5. Conclusion

The government has been implementing the land redistribution for more than 20 years now. The main objectives of the programme were to alleviate poverty, create jobs and address the inequality in land that was created by the policies of the apartheid government. Although the programme has been under implementation there have been challenges that the beneficiaries of the programme have been experiencing. The study focussed on the three case studies in the Vhembe District and the objective of the study was to what extent is the land redistribution programme benefiting the intended beneficiaries and if they benefit are this benefits sustainable or not?

The findings revealed that financial support is critical to improving the livelihoods of the intended beneficiaries, and that failure to provide it undermines the developmental potential of the farms. Redistributing land alone cannot meet the objective of land reform. This mini dissertation therefore argues that without comprehensive financial support, access to land will continue to yield poor results and it will ultimately not meet the objectives of community and economic

development. The fact that the interviewed project failed to create enough jobs and in the majority of the households, even though they have created some sort of employment there is no income that they are getting from the farms. There is an urgent need to provide beneficiaries with training and financial support to enable land redistribution beneficiaries to use their land and other resources efficiently and effectively.

6. REFERENCES

Adams, M., 1995, '*Land reform: new seeds on old ground?*', Overseas Development Institute Number 6,

African National Congress. , 1994, '*Reconstruction and development programme: A Policy Framework*', Johannesburg, Umanyano Press.

Akech, M., 2010, '*Institutional reform in the new constitution of Kenya*', International Centre for Transitional Justice.

Aliber, M. & Cousins, B., 2013, 'Livelihoods after Land Reform in South Africa', *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 13 (1), 140-165.

Aliber, M., & Mokoena, R., 2002, '*Land reform and agrarian change in southern africa*', An Occasional Paper Series No 21, PLAAS, School of Government, University Western Cape.

Antwi, M.A., & Oladele O.I., 2013, 'Impact of the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development Projects on Livelihoods of Beneficiaries in Ngaka Modiri Molema District, South Africa', *Journal Human Ecology*, 42 (3), 273-281.

Babbie,E., Mouton,J., Vorster, P., & Prozesky, B., 2011, '*The practice of social research*', Oxford University Press Southern Africa (Pty) Ltd.

Ballesteros, M., & De La Cruz, A., 2006, '*Land reform and changes in land ownership concentration: evidence from rice-growing villages in the Philippines*', Discussion Paper Series, No 2006-21.

Bangwayo- Skeete P.F., Bezabih, M., Zikhali. P., 2010, 'Are Zimbabwe's Fast Track Land Reform Farms more Technically Efficient than Communal Farms?', *Quarterly Journal of International Agriculture*, 49(4), 319-339.

Baye T, G., 2013, 'Peasants, Land Reform and Property Right in Ethiopia: The Experience of Gojjam Province 1974 to 1997', *Journal of African Studies and Development*, 5 (6), 145-156.

Binswanger-Mkhize, H.P., 2014, 'From Failure to Success in South African Land Reform', *African Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, 9 (4), 253-269.

Binswanger H.P., & Deininger, K., 1999, 'The Evolution of The World Bank's Land Policy: Principles, Experience and Future Challenges', *The World Bank Research Observer*, 14 (2), 247-76.

Binswanger, H.P., & Elgin, M., 1992, 'What are the prospects of land reform? In Eicher & Staatz [Eds.]', *Agricultural Development in the Third World*, London.

Binswanger-Mkhize, H.P., Bourguignon, C. & Van Den Brink, R., 2009, '*Agricultural land redistribution: toward greater consensus*', The World Bank Group, Washington, D.C.

Bless, C., Higson-Smith, C. & Sithole, S.L., 2013, '*Fundamentals of social research methods: an African perspective*', Juta & Co Limited.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V., 2006, 'Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology', *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3 (2), 77-101.

Buthelezi, N.B.C., 2007, 'The impact of land restitution programme on poverty', MSD: Social Development and Policy, Faculty of Humanities, University of Pretoria.

Buys, M., 2012, 'An analysis of the land redistribution projects in Modimole Municipality, Limpopo province, MDEV, Faculty of Management and Law, Turfloop Graduate School of Leadership, University of Limpopo.

Borras Jr. S.M., 2003, 'Questioning Market-Led Agrarian Reform: Experience from Brazil, Colombia and South Africa', *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 3 (3), 367-394.

Borras Jr. S.M., Carranza, D. & Franco, J. C., 2007, 'Anti-poverty or Anti-poor? The World Bank's Market-led Agrarian Reform Experiment in the Philippines', *Third World Quarterly*, 28 (8), 1557 – 1576.

Borras Jr. S.M., Figc, D., & Sua´rez, S.M., 2011, 'The Politics of Agrofuels and Mega-land and Water Deals: Insights from the ProCana case, Mozambique', *Review of African Political Economy*, 38 (128), 215–234.

Borrego, M., Douglas, E.P. & Amelik C.T., 2009, 'Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Research Methods in Engineering Education', *Journal of Engineering Education*, 98 (1), 53- 66.

Boone, C., 2011, 'Politically Allocated Land Rights and the Geography of Electoral Violence: The Case of Kenya in the 1990s', *Comparative Political Studies*, 44 (10), 1311–1342.

Byamugisha, F.K (ed.), 2014, '*Introduction and overview of agricultural land redistribution and land administration case studies*', International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, The World Bank. Washington DC 20433.

Clements, A.E., & Fernandes M., 2013, 'Land Grabbing, Agribusiness and the Peasantry in Brazil and Mozambique', *Journal of Political Economy*, 2(1), 41–69.

Cliffe, L., 2000, '*Land Reform in South Africa*', *Review of African Political Economy*', 27 (84), 273-286. Roape Publications.

Creswell, J.W., 2009, '*Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*', Sage Publications Inc.

Cooper, D.R., & Schindler, P.S., 2006, *Business Research Methods*, Mc Graw-Hill International Publishers.

Cousins, B., 2013, 'Land Redistribution, Populism and Elite Capture: New Land Reform Policy Proposals under the Microscope', *Journal of the Helen Suzman Foundation*, Issue 70.

Deininger, K., 1999, 'Making Negotiated Land Reform Work: Initial Experience from Colombia, Brazil and South Africa', *World Development*, 27 (4), 651–72.

Department of Land Affairs., 2006, '*Manual on the implementation of the Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy*', Version 2, Government Printers. http://www.ruraldevelopment.gov.za/phocadownload/Land_Acquisition_Warehouse/manual%20for%20the%20implementation%20of%20the%20proactive%20land%20acquisition%20strategy.pdf

Department of Rural Development and Land Reform., 2009, *Annual Report*, April 2009- March 2010, Government Printers, Pretoria, South Africa. <http://www.gov.za/sites/www.gov.za/files/rural-dev-land-reform-annual-report-2009-2010.pdf>

Department of Rural Development and Land Reform., 2011, '*Green Paper on Land Reform*', South Africa. <http://www.gov.za/sites/www.gov.za/files/land-reform-green-paper.pdf>

Deininger, K., & Binswanger, H., 1999, 'The Evolution of The World Bank's Land Policy: Principles, Experience and Future Challenges', *The World Bank Observer*, 14 (2), 247-276.

Deininger, K., Feder, G., Gordillo de Anda, G., & Munro-Faure, P., 2003, '*Food and Agricultural Organization: Land Reform, Land Settlement Cooperatives*', Rome, Italy.

De Villiers, B., 2008, '*Land reform – a commentary*', Policy Paper Issue No. 4, January, 2008. Konrad, Adenauer, Stiftung.

Doyle, L., Brady, A., & Byrne G., 2009, 'An Overview of Mixed Methods Research', *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 14 (2), 175-185.

Economic Commission for Africa., 2004, '*Land tenure systems and their impacts on food security and sustainable development in africa*', Economic Commission for Africa, Ethiopia, Addis Ababa.

Ezzy, D., 2002, '*Qualitative Analysis: Practice and Innovation*', Taylor & Francis Group.

Food Agricultural Organization., 2002, '*Land Tenure and Rural Development*', Land Tenure Studies, Rome, Italy.

Frokjaer, E., Hertum, M., & Hornbaek, K., 2000, '*Measuring usability: are effectiveness, efficiency and satisfaction really correlated?*' *The Future is Here*, CHI Letters, 2 (1).

Fuwa, N., 2000, '*Politics and economics of land reform in the Philippines: a survey*, Chiba University', Matsudo, Japan.

Gary D., Bouma., G. D., Ling, R., & Wilkinson, L., 2013, '*The Research Process*', Canadian Edition, Third Edition, Oxford University Press.

Gebeyehu, T., 2011, 'Land Tenure, Land Reform and the Qalad System in Ethiopia, 1941–1974', *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 46 (6), 567–577.

Genesis Analytics., 2014, '*Implementation evaluation of the restitution programme, restitution evaluation*', Final Report, Full Version, Johannesburg, South Africa.

Gibson, J.L., 2009, '*Land redistribution/ restitution in South Africa: a multiple values, as the past meets the present*', Cambridge University Press.

Giovannucci, D; Scherr, S; Nierenberg, D; Hebebrand, C; Shapiro, J; Milder, J; & Wheeler, K., 2012, '*Food and agriculture: the future of sustainability, a strategic input to the sustainable development in the 21st century (SD21) project*', New York: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Division for Sustainable Development.

Hall, R., 2004, '*A political economy of land reform in South Africa*', Roape Publications.

Hall, R., (ed.), 2009, '*Another country side?* policy options for land and agrarian reform in south africa, PLAAS, School of Government, University of Western Cape.

Hall, R., & Ntsebenza, L., 2007, '*The land question in South Africa: the challenge of transformation and redistribution*', Human Research Council Press; Cape Town, 220-245.

Hart, T.G.B., 2003, 'Land Reform: What Have We Learned?', *South African Journal of Agricultural Extension*, (32), 15-37.

Hockenos, P., (ed.), 2011, State of the worlds volunteerism report, Senegalese expression, United Nations Report, United Kingdom.

Holden, S, T & Bezu, S., 2016, 'Preferences for Land Sales Legalization and Land Values in Ethiopia', *Land Use Policy* 1 (52), 410–421.

Hove, M., & Gwiza, A., 2012, 'The Fast Track Land Reform Programme and Food Insecurity: A Case of Zimbabwe from 1992 to the Present', *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 2 (8), 282-293.

Jacobs, P., Lahiff, E., & Hall, R., 2003, 'Evaluating land and agrarian reform in south africa', An Occasional Paper Series, PLAAS, School of Government, University of Western Cape, South Africa.

Jacobs, S., 2004, 'Livelihoods, Security and Needs: Gender Relations and Land Reform in South Africa' *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 6 (1), 1-19.

Jacobs, S., 2010, 'Agrarian Reform', *Sociopedia.isa*. Manchester Metropolitan University, UK.

Johnson, R.B & Onwuegbuzie, A.J., 2004, 'Mixed Method Research: A Research Paradigm Whose Time Has Come', *Educational Researcher*, 33 (7), 14-26.

Kabukuru, W., 2015, '*Kenya: who will solve the 120-year-old "land question"?*', New African, Land Issue, IC Publications Ltd.

Karuti, K., 2009, 'The Legacy of the White Highlands: land rights, ethnicity, and post-2007 election violence in Kenya', *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 27(3), 325-344.

Kariuki, S., 2004, 'Can negotiated land reforms deliver? a case of Kenya's, South Africa and Zimbabwe's Land Reform Policy Debates', ASC Working Paper 59/2004.

Kariuki, S., 2008, 'We've Been to Hell and Back 'Can a Botched Land Reform Programme Explain Kenya's Political Crisis?', (1963–2008) *Journal of African Elections*, 7 (2), 135-172.

Keswell, M., & Carter, R.M., 2014, 'Poverty and Land Redistribution', *Journal of Development Economics*, 110 (2014), 250–261.

Kirsten, J.F, Van Rooyen, J., & Ngqangweni, S., 2007, 'Progress with Different Land Reform Options in South Africa', *Agrekon* 35 (4), 218-223.

Kloppers H.J., & Pienaar G.J., 2014, 'The Historical Context of Land Reform in South Africa and Early Policies', University of Potchefstroom, *Elektronises Regsblad*, 17 (2).

Krantz, L., 2001, "The sustainable livelihood approach to poverty reduction: an introduction", Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Division for Policy and Socio-Economic Analysis.

Lahiff, E, & Rugege, S., n.d. 'Land redistribution: neglecting the urban and rural poor', *ESR Review*, 3 (1).

Lahiff, E., 2007. 'Willing Buyer, Willing Seller': South Africa's Failed Experiment in Market-Led Agrarian Reform', *Third World Quarterly*, 28 (8), 1577-1597.

Lahiff, E., 2007, 'Business models in land reform', Research Report 27, PLAAS, School of Government, University of Western Cape.

Lahiff, E., 2008, 'Land reform in South Africa: a status report 2008', Research Report 38, PLAAS, School of Government, University of Western Cape.

Lahiff, E & Li, G., 2014, Land redistribution in South Africa: a critical review, in Byamugisha (ed.), World Bank Report, pp 27-54, Washington, D.C.

Lahiff, E., & Scoones, I., 2000, 'Sustainable livelihoods in Southern Africa: Institutions, Governance and Policy Processes', SLSA Working Paper 2, Land Theme Paper.

Lunstrum, E., 2008, 'Mozambique, neoliberal land and reform, and the Limpopo national park', *the Geographical Review*.

McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S., 2001, '*Research in education*', Harrisonburg, Longman.

Majale, M., 2002, 'Towards pro-poor regulatory guidelines for urban upgrading', review of papers presented at the international workshop on guidelines for urban upgrading, Held at Bourton-On-Dunsmore, May 17-18, 2001.

Mama, A., (Ed.), 2009, 'Feminist africa land, labour and gendered livelihoods', *African Gender Institute*.

Mamdani, M., 2009, 'Lessons of Zimbabwe: mugabe in context', *Concerned African Scholars, Bulletin No 82: Summer 2009*.

Mamphodo, A.D., 2006, 'Baseline study of the quality of life of land reform beneficiaries in Limpopo province: a case study of Gertrudsborg', Department of

Agricultural Economics, Extension and Rural Development Faculty of Biology and Agricultural Science, University of Pretoria.

Manenzhe, T.J., 2007, 'Post settlement challenges for land reform beneficiaries: three case studies from Limpopo province', Master Philosophy, mini-thesis, Faculty of Economic and Management Sciences, University of the Western Cape (UWC).

Manji, A., 2014, 'The Politics of Land Reform in Kenya 2012', *African Studies Review*, 57, 115-130.

Makhado District Municipality Integrated Development Plan 2016/2017. (Online). Available from: <http://www.makhado.gov.za/docs/reports/REVIEWED%202016-17%20DRAFT%20IDP%20-%20Copy.pdf>. (Accessed 27 August 2015).

Makki, F., & Geisler C., 2011, 'Development by dispossession: land grabbing as new enclosures in contemporary Ethiopia', Paper presented at the International Conference on Global Land Grabbing 6-8 April 2011.

Matukane, E., 2011, 'Sustainability of land restitution project with reference to shigalo land restitution project in makhado municipality Limpopo province', MDEV Mini Dissertation, Faculty of Management and Law, University of Limpopo.

May, J; Stevens, T & Stols, A., 2002, Monitoring the Impact of Land Reform on Quality of Life: A South African Case Study, *Social Indicators Research*, 58 (1/3), 293-312.

Mbatha, N.C. & Antrobus, G.G., 2012, 'A cooperative benefits framework in South Africa's land redistribution process: the case of sugarcane farmland transfers' *Agrekon*, 51 (4), 81-104.

Mc Cusker, B., & Schmitz, P., 2008, 'Modelling Land Redistribution in Limpopo, South Africa', *South African Geographical Journal*, 9 (2), 80-96.

Mendola, M. & Simtowe F., 2015, '*The welfare impact of land redistribution: evidence from a quasi-experimental initiative in Malawi*', *World Development*, 72, 53-69, Elsevier.

Moagi T.M. & Oladele O.I., 2012, 'Analysis of Information Needs among Redistribution for Agricultural Development Beneficiaries in Waterberg District, Limpopo Province, South Africa', *Journal of Human Ecology*, 39 (2),95-102.

Morgan D, L., 2007, 'Paradigms Lost and Pragmatism Regained Methodological Implications of Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Methods', *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1 (1), 48-76.

Moyo, S., n.d., 'The political economy of land acquisition and redistribution in Zimbabwe, 1990-1999', SARIPS, Harare.

Moyo, C.S., 2013, 'Rural Women and Land, the Inseparable Twins: A Case of South Africa', *Gender and Behaviour*, 11 (2), 5393-5401.

Mutua, E.M., & Gonzalez, A., 2013, '*Ideographs of suppression: jomo kenyatta's independence day speech*'. *African Yearbook of Rhetoric* 4 (1), 12-19.

National Planning Commission., 2011, *National development plan: vision 2030*, South Africa.

Ndhlovu-Gatsheni, S.J., 2009, 'Making Sense of Mugabeism in Local and Global Politics: So Blair, keep your England and let me keep my Zimbabwe', *Third World Quarterly*, 30(6), 1139-1158.

Palmer, R., 2000, '*Report on the international conference on agrarian reform and rural development (ICARRD)*'. United Kingdom: Oxfam.

Policy Research Report., 2015, '*A measured approach to ending poverty and boosting shared prosperity: concepts, data, and the twin goals*', World Bank Group.

Property Enquiry Details, 2016., Deeds web, <http://www.deeds.gov.za/ITSODEedsWebB/deedsweb/prod-farm-results.jsp? Office=> [Accessed 25 June 2016].

Punch, K.F., 2011, *'Introduction to social research quantitative and qualitative approaches'*, Sage Publications.

Republic of South Africa., 1996, *Constitution of the republic of South Africa*, Act 108 of 1996, Government Printers, South Africa.

Republic of South Africa., 1997, *White paper on South African land policy*, Government Printers. Pretoria, South Africa.

Ruhiiga, T.M., 2011, 'Land Reform and Rural Poverty in South Africa', *Journal of Social Sciences*, 29 (1), 29-38.

Scoones, I., 2009, 'Livelihoods Perspectives and Rural Development' *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 36 (1), 1-38.

Sebola, M.P., & Tsheola, J.P., 2014, 'Economics of Agricultural Land Restitution and Redistribution in South Africa: Willing-Seller, Willing-Buyer Business Imperatives Versus Socio-political Transformation?', *Journal of Human Ecology*, 46 (2), 113-123.

Sender, J., & Johnston, D., 2004, 'Searching for a Weapon of Mass Production in Rural Africa: Unconvincing Arguments for Land Reform', *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 4 (1&2), 142–165.

Sibanda, N., 2010, 'Where Zimbabwe got it wrong - lessons for South Africa: A comparative analysis of the politics of land reform in Zimbabwe and South Africa', Master of Arts in International Studies, Department of Arts and Social Studies, Faculty of Arts and Social Studies, University of Stellenbosch.

Sibanda, F., & Maposa R.S., 2014, 'Beyond the Third Chimurenga?: Theological Reflections on the Land Reform Programme in Zimbabwe', 2000-2010, *Journal of Pan African Studies*, 6 (8), 54-74.

Silkor, T., & Muller, D., 2009, 'The limits of state-led land reform: an introduction' Elsevier Publications', Personal copy, *World Development*, 37 (8), 1307–1316.

Stibbe C.B., & Dunkley, G., 1997, 'Land reform and land policy', The Progress Report.

Tashakkori, A & Creswell, J.W., 2007, 'Editorial: The New Era of Mixed Methods', *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1 (1), 3-7.

Trade and Investment Seminar., 2016, *MEC's speech-ANHUI province inward mission, the ranch hotel, Limpopo*. 29th June 2016. <http://www.ledet.gov.za/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Address-by-MEC-Trade-and-Investment-Seminar-29th-June-2016.pdf>

Tsikata, D & Amanor-Wilks (Eds)., 2009, '*Land, labour and gendered livelihoods*', Feminist Africa Issue No 12, African Gender Institute.

Vhembe District Municipality, *Integrated Development Plan 2005/2006*. (Online). Available from: <http://www.limpopo-dlgh.gov.za/documents/idp/vhembe/Vhembe-District-Municipality-IDP.pdf>. (Accessed 22 August 2015).

Welman, C., Kruger, F., & Mitchell, B., 2005, *Research Methodology*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Wegerif, M., 2004, 'A critical appraisal of South Africa market based land reform policy: the case of land redistribution for agricultural development programme in Limpopo', PLAAS, School of Government, University of Western Cape.

Walker, C., 2013, 'The distribution of land in South Africa: An Overview', Fact Check 1: The Distribution of Land in South Africa: An Overview.

White B., Borrás Jr. S.M., Hall R., Scoones, I. & Woolford., 2012, 'The new enclosures: critical perspectives on corporate land deals', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 39 (3–4), 619–647.

Wilson, S & MacLean, R., 2011, '*Research Methods and Data Analysis for Psychology*', McGraw-Hill Education Publishers, Shoppenhangers Road, Maidenhead, Berkshire.

Woolard I., Liebbrandt, M., & McEwen, H., 2009, 'The persistence of high income inequality in South Africa: some recent evidence, poverty and inequality, pp 98-100.

Vermeulen, S.E., 2009, 'A comparative assessment of land reform programme in South Africa and Namibia', Master of Philosophy (Political Management), Department of Political Science, University of Stellenbosch.

Southafrica.org,intranet,<http://www.southafrica.info/about/geography/limpopo.htm#.Vf4M7> [Assessed 20 September 2015].

STATS SA (http://www.statssa.gov.za/?page_id=739&id=4) [Assessed 20 September 2015]

ANNEXURE A: INTERVIEW GUIDE

The interview schedule aims to evaluate effectiveness of land redistribution in improving the quality of life: A case of Vhembe District in Limpopo Province. The information provided will be for study purposes and will be treated with confidentiality. Participants are urged to provide answers that are honest. In order for the study to achieve its intended goal it will rely on the correctness of your answers and the provision of actual (personal) situation.

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR 12 HOUSEHOLDS HEADS.

1. What is the name of your project?
2. How old are you?
3. What is your marital status?
4. How many are you in your household?
5. What is the highest standard that you have passed?
6. How did you find out about this programme?
7. When did you start with your project?
8. When did you decide to get involved in this programme?
9. How many hectares is your project occupying and what is the current land utilisation?
10. What is the current ownership and control arrangement in your project?
11. What are the support systems received since the redistribution of land?
12. To what extent is the land redistribution benefiting you and your family?
13. Do you observe any improvement in your household as a result of land redistribution?
14. What are the challenges that you are currently facing in land redistribution?
15. In your opinion did politics play a role in land redistribution?
16. How sustainable are the benefits which have been realised through land redistribution in your household?

ANNEXURE B: APPLICATION FORM

ANNEXURE C: EDITING CONFIRMATION LETTER

ANNEXURE D: REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH