

**SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACT OF AGRICULTURAL FOOD  
SECURITY AND POVERTY ALLEVIATION PROGRAMMES IN MOPANI  
DISTRICT, OF LIMPOPO PROVINCE**

**Masters Degree in Development**

**E Matjokana**

**2013**

**Socio-economic impact of Agricultural food security and poverty alleviation programs in Mopani District, of Limpopo Province**

**By**

**Edward Matjokana**

Mini Dissertation Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Development in the Faculty of Management and Law, (School of leadership) at the University of Limpopo

**Supervisor: Prof** Frederick Ahwireng-Obeng

**2013**

## **ABSTRACT**

The objective of the study is to evaluate the socio-economic impact of poverty alleviation and food security projects implemented by the Department of Agriculture in Limpopo Province. Data were collected from beneficiaries, stakeholders and literature. The analysis is based on the status of the projects before the intervention and the present status after the implementation of the programme.

In most instances the beneficiaries and stakeholders were not part of the plenary for the programme. Observations also show that it seems interest and ability in agricultural activities was not tested before implementing the programme. Sustainability of a project depends on the involvement of all relevant key players, stakeholders and beneficiaries, from the initial stage through monitoring and evaluation stages, to closure of the project.

## **DECLARATION**

I declare that the mini-dissertation report entitled “Socio Economic Impact of Agricultural Food Security and Poverty Alleviation Programmes in Mopani District of Limpopo Province” is my own work and that it has not been conducted and submitted before any degree or examination in any other University. All the sources used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged as complete references.

----- DATE-----  
Matjokana E

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

Firstly, I would like to acknowledge my Supervisor, Professor Frederick Ahwireng Obeng, for his patience and assistance in my work. I also thank the Department of Agriculture Limpopo Province for the time given and access granted to secure information during data collection. I further acknowledge the beneficiaries and community stakeholders who responded to my questionnaire.

## LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

1. Table 3.1	page 26
2. Table 3.2	page 27
3. Table 3.3	page 28
4. Fig: 4.1	page 30
5. Fig: 4.2	page 30
6. Fig: 4.3	page 32

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Pages</b>
Abstract	i
Declaration	ii
Acknowledgement	iii
List of Tables and Figures	iv
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Introduction	4
1.2 Definition of Concepts	5
1.3 Problem Statement	5
1.4 Research Questions	5
1.5 Aim of the Study	5
1.6 Objectives of the Study	6
1.7 Significance of the Study	6
1.8 Ethical Considerations	6
1.9 Layout of Chapters	7
<b>CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 Social Capital and Poverty Alleviation	8
2.2 Responsible Use of Resources and Land	10
2.3 Financial Support of Agricultural Projects	11
2.4 Coordination of Scientists, Extension and Stakeholders	12
2.5 Sustainability and Contribution to Livelihood	15
2.6 Research Questions	17
<b>CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>18</b>
3.1 Study Area	18
3.1.1 Egg Production Project	18
3.1.2 Micro Enterprise Project	18
3.2 Sample Selection	18
3.3 Data collection	18
<b>CHAPTER 4: DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATIONS</b>	<b>23</b>
4.1 Introduction	23
4.2 Capacity of Beneficiaries and Sustainability	23
4.3 Community and Stakeholders' Involvement	25
4.4 Coordination of programmes within the Department of Agriculture	25
4.5 Impact of the Project on Livelihood of Beneficiaries	26
<b>CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS</b>	<b>28</b>

5.1 Conclusions	28
5.2 Recommendations	29
5.3 Implications	35
<b>REFERENCES</b>	37
<b>ANNEXURE</b>	39
Annexure A: Consistency Matrix	39
Annexures B-D : Questionnaires	40



# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

### 1.1 Introduction

The majority of the population in South Africa lives in rural areas and depends on agriculture for their livelihood. Agriculture, therefore, plays an important role not only for the people who depend on it, but also for the general economy of the country. For agriculture to affect the majority of the people positively, new practices and technology have to be incorporated in the agricultural development system.

This present study examines the various approaches that the government employs in fighting poverty through different programmes linked to the development of agriculture in the country. The study specifically evaluates programmes that are being carried out in the Mopani District which is situated in the Limpopo Province. Limpopo Province is one of the poorest provinces in South Africa. After the country became a democracy in 1994, the government increased its efforts to improve the situation of many rural areas, which were neglected during the apartheid period. However, there are a number of challenges facing these efforts, general poverty being one of these challenges. Illiteracy is also another challenge. Furthermore, people are unable to translate or use new technological methods of good agricultural practices.

The study evaluates the implementation of different agricultural activities that are meant to improve the livelihood of the rural communities. Agriculture, mining and tourism have been identified as some of the sectors to be used to address issues related to poverty and unemployment. Between 40 and 50 percent of South African population can be classified as living in poverty while 25 percent of the population can be categorized as ultra-poor (National Treasury, 2003).

The majority of people in Limpopo Province rely heavily on agriculture for household food security. Departments have been mandated to participate in

the process of fighting poverty and securing food. The Department of Education has introduced feeding schemes at schools as one of the means of helping poor families in rural communities to provide food for learners. The Department of Health and Welfare, initiated food parcels as a way of providing food for rural poor families. The Department of Public Works introduced multi programmes aimed at the poor, disabled and the unemployed members of the society.

Over the past decade, the Department of Agriculture supported poverty alleviation and food security through food gardens. Communities differ in levels of poverty and challenges they have in securing their food. Different strategies and plans are therefore necessary to address different levels of poverty and challenges of securing food. Most projects in the province are, basically, in line with the strategic goal of the national Department of Agriculture, which is to focus on the generation of equitable access to competitive agricultural sector, and contribute to a better life for all.

Layers projects, vegetable gardens, broiler projects and microenterprise projects have been identified as ways to address the question of food security and malnutrition, especially for children in the rural areas, by encouraging subsistence production to lessen the impact of escalating food prices. Wealthy people may see the increase in food prices as insignificant, but for those struggling to put bread on the table, a rise in the price of essential goods may have devastating consequences.

Implementation of agricultural programmes is done through extension unit of the Department of Agriculture by means of transferring technology, direct participation in projects and provides advisory services. Sustainable agricultural development requires the coordination and participation of all relevant parties in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. In an effort to make projects more effective and efficient, people participation is crucial. The participation of intended beneficiaries is critical, but merits and limits need to be taken into consideration.

Agricultural poverty alleviation and food security projects, which form part of this programme, may be outlined in detail as follows:

*Egg Production projects*

For these projects, a household is given 36 layers, cages and feeds for three months. Beneficiaries are expected to sell 24 eggs and use 12 for their family consumption per day. After three months, beneficiaries are expected to buy feeds on their own from the egg sales. The total number of beneficiaries participating in the Mopani District since 2003 is 260.

*Micro enterprise projects*

Micro-enterprise projects are those projects that are being revitalized to increase production from subsistence to business, thus being able to create sustainable jobs. The projects were initiated by other departments and transferred to the Department of Agriculture for support and maintenance. The revitalization process focuses on both vegetable and broiler projects and the total number of projects in the Mopani District is thirty. The process is in phases of five projects per phase. Beneficiaries are capacitated to be able to run the project on their own by being involved in the implementation of the project. Contribution by beneficiaries is through the provision of labour during the infrastructural rehabilitation of the projects.

The overall objective of the special programmes on food security and poverty alleviation is to bring about rapid and sustained increase in food production, and to improve the livelihoods of people through the adoption of improved agricultural technology. The aim is to increase farm output, which will, in turn, increase wealth and attract the youth to participate in agricultural activities.

The other objective of agricultural projects is to capacitate beneficiaries on agricultural project management for sustainability. The projects are expected to generate profit that is in line with the minimum wage of R650 per month.

In vegetable projects, the programme provides basic activities, which include soil analysis, water survey, drilling and testing of water quality. The programme also provides land preparation and installation of four hector irrigation system. Beneficiaries are provided with production inputs for one season. The production inputs include seedlings, pesticides, fungicides and fertilizers. Beneficiaries further receive trainings on production, marketing and records keeping.

In broiler production, basic interventions by the Department of Agriculture, includes construction of six broiler units with carrying capacity of five hundred chicks, installation of electricity and provision of three thousand day old chicks.

## **1.2 Definition of Concepts**

**Poverty:** Inability to access basic household needs, such as food, shelter, education, health and failing to retain a minimal standard of living (World Bank, 2003).

**Project:** This is a set of planned activities to achieve a specific objective and should be specific, measurable, achievable, and realistic and time terminated (World Bank, 2003).

**Alleviation:** A complete removal of an obstacle that hinders progress for the attainment of a specific objective (Delgado, 1997).

**Food security:** Secure food now and for the future (FAO, 2004).

**Sustainability:** Continuers' availability of a product, without depleting the basic natural resource (Kate *et al.*, 2005).

**Impact:** Provision of change or an effect as a result of specific activity, project or a programme (World Bank, 2003).

**Livelihood:** The standard of living or the lifestyle pattern with reasonable means of living (Ashley, 2001).

**Socio economic:** The availability of resources needed for balancing the social needs of the house hold or the community (Shapiro, 2004).

**Social capital:** Social capital refers to social network through which social actors enhance livelihoods and alleviate poverty, within specific economical, ecological and social structural contexts (Bebbington, 1997).

### **1.3 Problem Statement**

The socio-economic impact of agricultural poverty alleviation and food security projects seems to be unsustainable, as it is unable to meet the primary objective of improving the livelihood of the communities.

### **1.4 Research Questions**

1. What was the status of poverty before the implementation of the programmes of food security and poverty alleviation?
2. What are benefit and costs of projects to beneficiaries?
4. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the programme?
5. What interventions could be employed for the projects to generate reasonable income and sustainable benefits?

### **1.5 Aim of the Study**

The aim of the study is to evaluate the socio-economic impact of agricultural poverty alleviation and food security projects in the Mopani District, Limpopo Province. The evaluation will focus on the previous and present status of beneficiaries as well as the challenges in implementing the programme. Lastly, the study provides recommendations as informed by the findings from the evaluation.

### **1.6 Objectives of the Study**

- 1.6.1 To evaluate the approaches and plans used for the implementation of the projects.

- 1.6.2 To evaluate the socio economic impact of food security and poverty alleviation projects in rural communities and to document the difference it brings.
- 1.6.3 To identify strategies and tools to improve, support or restructure poverty alleviation projects to be in line with the objectives, which include a sense of ownership by beneficiaries, generation of reasonable income and improved livelihood and sustainability.
- 1.6.4 To evaluate the involvement of beneficiaries and other stakeholders in the community.

## **1.7 Significance of the Study**

Food security and poverty alleviation is one of the key areas of development. A nation that has enough to eat becomes a strong nation. As such, examining or investigating food security and poverty alleviation programme is one of the ways of attempting to bring positive changes to rural communities. Food security and poverty alleviation projects are important economic endeavours that attempt to improve the social welfare of rural communities. In a number of developing countries, the majority of the population lives in rural areas. These are areas where social and economic developments are crucial. It is imperative, therefore, that efforts to uplift the general life of the people be carried out.

## **1.8 Ethical Considerations**

Ethical principles as set by the Ethics Committee of the University of Limpopo for confidentiality were followed. Participants were not forced to be part of the study. In other words, their participation was voluntary. Informed consent was obtained from the participants.

## **1.9 Layout of Chapters**

The study comprises five chapters as follows

### **Chapter 1: Introduction and Background**

This chapter presents the introduction of the study. It introduces the problem statement, motivation of the study, and outlines the objective of the study.

### **Chapter 2: Literature Review**

This chapter entails literature review with theoretical arguments that support the rationale behind the study. Several books, journals and policy documents such as Acts, Bills and other relevant legislations are used to give the study background information and theoretical underpinning. .

### **Chapter 3: Methodology of the Study**

This chapter outlines the research method to be used and gives detailed selection of the study area and how data will be collected. Analytical techniques and tools to be used to analyze the data will also be identified in this chapter.

### **Chapter 4: Presentation, Analysis and Interpretations**

This chapter presents the findings of the analysis of the various factors or selected variables that impact the poverty alleviation programme on the livelihood of beneficiaries in the Mopani District.

### **Chapter 5: Conclusions, Recommendations and Implications**

This chapter provides the summary of the study and gives conclusions based on the findings. The chapter incorporates and identifies areas for further research in the area of poverty alleviation and food security.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1 Social Capital and Poverty Alleviation**

Many research projects have been completed in the past regarding food security and poverty alleviation, but most challenges are without solutions, resulting in unsustainable agricultural projects. The development and sustainability of agriculture-based enterprises in rural society is slow in improving the social capital, hence it raises many questions. Social capital refers to social network through which social actors enhance livelihoods and alleviate poverty, within specific economical, ecological and social structural contexts (Bebbington, 1997).

Social capital has quantifiable effects such as low crime rates, better health, better educational achievement, and greater levels of income and lower rate of abuses (Putnam, 2000). In societies where social capital is well developed, the communities are able to make effective use of existing resources. Generally, social capital refers to a society's capability to deal with social, economic and environmental problems. The linkage among environment, agriculture, poverty and social capital are complex resulting in developing countries being criticized for their inability to reduce poverty and contribute to sustainable agricultural development (Pretty, 2002).

Current research and observation indicate that un-sustainability and poverty are linked, and the only feasible way out of the current crisis is to integrate resources. The linkages between population, poverty and environmental quality have long been the subject of debate and concern. Some have argued that low-living standards in the rural areas contribute to increased pressure on natural resources, which in turn aggravates poverty. However, some argue that environmental degradation and rapid population growth are both consequence of poverty (Brundtland 1987).

Distribution of resources should have systems that are protected in such a way that they reach the intended clients or beneficiaries. Corruption and the



inability to maintain minimum standards of civil peace have proved to be a great hindrance to poverty alleviation (Dollar & Pritchett 1998).

The agricultural sector is crucial to rural development and contributes significantly to any initiative to alleviate poverty. During the past ten years, agriculture in South Africa has undergone fundamental changes from dualistic services (two separate services for commercial and small-scale farmers), to a single amalgamated service, focusing on the needs of both the previously disadvantaged small-scale farmers and the large-scale commercial farmers (DAFF, 2005).

Five thousand Commercial farmers in Limpopo Province occupy approximately 70% of the total prime land area, using the most advanced technology. Small scale farmers of about 273000 are operating on the remaining 30% of the provincial agricultural land, with 80% being Women (Statistics South Africa, 2002).

Availability of land, financial resources and water may not be the only factors for improving the social capital, without technology and proper understanding of agricultural risks. Technological information contributes a lot to sustainability of agricultural schemes and projects. During the apartheid era, only Whites were allowed access to technological information, and even the educational policy ensured that whites gained preferential access to more skilled work in the upper level of the economy (Ramphela & Wilson, 1989). Most developing countries lack the expertise and financial resources that scientific farming requires. Agricultural production requires skills in agricultural finance to enable the farmers to understand production assets such as land, machinery, and knowledge of fundamental principles of controlling capital and using it efficiently.

Equal opportunity and affirmative action in production is still for the majority of White farmers as most financial institutions and banks in place doubt the inherent capacity of Blacks (Horwite, 1991). Marketing of small-scale enterprises have very little or no access to national markets as they may not

compete large-scale producers, since they cannot meet the market requirements, due to lack of resources (Charles & Whitlock, 1987).

## **2.2 Responsible Use of Resources and Land**

Limpopo Province has diverse soils which vary in productivity. These soils are also vulnerable to various forms of degradation which may be physical, chemical and biological. Lack of economic development results in difficulties in protecting the environment, since many thousands of poor people will be forced to drain the natural resources further in their immediate vicinity, ignoring the ethics of sustainable use of the environment (Lyston, 1991). Many countries cannot feed themselves because food production is inadequate to meet the needs of the growing population.

Food supply depends on natural resources, which need to be used sparingly, while on the other hand generating enough income to manage the production process and costs. Poverty causes rapid change and puts huge additional pressure on the already overburdened natural resources.

Poverty, hunger and environmental degradation are among the foremost challenges the world now faces, with poverty being the key concern. Hunger is said to be a consequence of poverty and poverty may be both a cause and the consequence of resource degradation. It has been argued that poverty is caused by lack of entitlement and the distribution size of operational landholding. It might be rather hard to try to tackle poverty through agricultural development in situations where the distribution of land right is highly inequitable. It is not only poverty but also institutional failures that were the root causes of environmental degradation (Dasgupta et al., 1994). Other researchers argued that poverty was not the root cause of environmental degradation, and highlighted that institutional and market failure played both as a catalyst as well as a direct factor causing environmental degradation and indigenous poverty (Ravnborg, 2003). Externally generated changes to environmental management of the community lead to the degradation of resources (Jodha,1998).

Most African communities are said to be failing, without considering the fact that they were allocated land through the Group Areas Act, which allowed them to occupy only some areas while Whites, Coloured and Indians were granted land through Act no 53 of 1986 which was without restrictions. The Southern African Regional Poverty and Development Network (SARPN) hosted a two-day conference on land reform and poverty alleviation on 4th and 5th of June, 2001 at the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) in Pretoria, South Africa. The central intention of the conference was to establish a set of policy recommendations and guidelines derived from regional perspectives of the Land Reform policy. Land reform has the potential to make a direct impact on poverty alleviation through targeted resource transfers, particularly in the rural areas. It is viewed as an instrument for redressing the inequalities and access to economic opportunities and resources. This conference intended to explore these arguments according to Southern African country experiences of land reform and poverty alleviation.

### **2.3 Financial Support of Agricultural Projects**

Financial institutions in many developing countries have suffered large losses, some are insolvent and others have actually failed agricultural development (World Development Report, 1989). It is also very difficult to develop and sustain small-scale farmers since they are identified by the size of land they use; low income and they lack sustainability (Agricultural Policy of S.A, 1998). Policy makers in developing countries are faced with the need to pursue three challenging goals simultaneously, which are Agricultural growth to keep up with the rapid increasing population, how agricultural growth interact with the environment and how poverty alleviation interacts with the environment. To achieve this critical triangle of goals, much more must be learned about the links among agricultural growth, poverty alleviation and sustainable use of financial and natural resources (Vosti & Reardon, 1997).

Agricultural co-operatives are a widespread phenomenon in both developed and developing countries. In South Africa, commercial agricultural co-operatives have developed into major business institutions in the evolving

agricultural economy and rural society. Co-operatives also supported various forms of rural life and it is an important role player in rural society. Collective action is the logical route to empowerment for farmers since they will be able to identify members' needs and consolidate demand, aggregate members' economic power and address market failures (Hagedorn, 1992). Sustainable agricultural projects depend mostly on the coordination of four key factors, which are researched production technology, responsible use of natural resources, funding, and marketing.

The main emphasis of food security and poverty alleviation is on promoting national and regional food security through linking certain deliverables to Comprehensive Agricultural Support Program (CASP). The programme adds the vital element of post-settlement financial support to the work already done to promote the participation of previously disadvantaged individuals through access to land (Annual Report 2004/05). The department further launched the Micro-Agricultural Financial Institution of South Africa (Mafisa). This is the first State-owned scheme to provide micro and retail agricultural financial services on a large, accessible, cost-effective and sustainable basis.

#### **2.4 Coordination of Scientists, Extension and Stakeholders**

The efforts by the Department of Agriculture of financing beneficiaries through different programmes and schemes in Limpopo Province are in place, but the coordination of components and stakeholders is questionable. Agricultural research should be geared towards solving problems that will make a difference to the life of the poor, directly or indirectly. Economists should be well placed to investigate and analyze economic issues and also need to recognize the contributions and influence of people from other disciplines to avoid the limit to technical cures for social pathologies (Lipton, 1999).

Research and development efforts will have to embrace a widening span of disciplines across the natural and social science, including new methods of analysis and approaches. Participatory projects are more difficult and significantly more expensive to run but yield better results (Robb, 1999; and Sutherland et al., 1999). Sustainable agricultural development requires the

coordination and participation of all relevant parties in planning, monitoring, implementation and evaluation (Conyers & Hill, 1975).

Without a close link among extension, economists and research, feedback from the field will never be realized, thus resulting in research becoming excessively academic with no relation to farmers' real challenge and needs. This leads researchers to focus on technically optimal situations rather than under practical field conditions. The main mandate of extension is to mobilize farmers and farmer groups while extending information from researchers to beneficiaries and meeting farmers' needs as well. The ignoring of extension technicians will then result in the extension service rapidly running out of anything to extend (Benor et al., 1984).

Agricultural extension is expected to support farmers in the province by providing appropriate information on a wide range of alternatives in production and marketing in the province. Therefore, the extension should be properly trained on agricultural technology. It is not possible, even in highly developed countries, to encourage farmers rapidly to adopt new technology and more efficient practices based on continuously advancing research without clearly understanding them.

To bring research results and new agricultural techniques to farmers, someone must teach farmers how these practices should be employed and adopted under their own individual farming and resource conditions. The extension's role in agricultural development is largely catalytic and therefore, often difficult to quantify. Without the extension's guidance, farmers often are unable to fully exploit the opportunity available to them. In many countries, extension is disregarded by those concerned with agricultural development. Extension is theoretically regarded as an important prerequisite for agricultural development as research, but why is it often neglected by government and others (Benor et al., 1984). Good communication, strong interaction and effective collaboration are primary requisites for sustainable agricultural food security and poverty alleviation projects.

There are differences between research and extension, which have, in many instances, prevented collaboration and linkage between research and extension. Research workers are considered professionals and consequently enjoy status and benefits while extension workers are in contact with low-status farmers, resulting in research problems being investigated not in accordance with the priority needs of agricultural producers. Extension has also been criticized because it has been ineffective in persuading farmers to adopt a particular recommendation, when, in fact, the technology being promoted may not have been appropriate to farmers' conditions. In some instances, extension has been ineffective because of inadequate resources, poorly trained field staff, mobility challenges and non extension responsibilities causing role conflict (Elliot, 1977).

The central objective of making the most efficient use of resources available to governments and farmers is achieved through encouraging and facilitating feedback from farmers to researchers through extension personnel who visit and advise farmers on a regular fixed schedule, thus helping research to solve the actual production constraints faced by farmers (Benor & Harrison, 1984). Research is crucial to maintain the sustainability of agricultural productivity and ensuring that technological innovations flow from researchers to farmers through the extension agent, meaning that the link between a researcher and extension should be strengthened (NDA, 2005).

Other countries have their own ways of reducing poverty. The existence of a socially conscious government in South Africa has placed the need to address poverty and inequality firmly at the centre of the nation's agenda. This is reflected in the poverty audits that have been undertaken, as well as in the range of policy documents and strategies that have been developed in the first years of the democratic government.

Numerous policies and programmes have been formulated and implemented over the past six years. These policies and programmes have different implications for different actors and spheres of government. Some of the

programmes require action by the national government, while others are implemented by sub-national government agencies.

Local governments are set to play an important role in the growth and development of the country including the implementation of poverty alleviation and food security programmes in the rural areas. For local governments to be effective in their local economic development and poverty alleviation roles, a number of issues need to be considered which include identification of felt needs by beneficiaries, balanced allocation of resource in relation to needs. It should be understood that food security and poverty alleviation is fundamentally a national problem and need to be viewed within the national context (*White Paper on Local Government Systems, 1998*).

Agricultural, poverty alleviation and food security projects seem to be planned and implemented without the involvement of beneficiaries, extension technicians and other stakeholders in identifying the felt needs and ensuring impact on the livelihood of rural communities. The Department of Agriculture has projects and approaches that are very useful in community development and poverty alleviation, but not properly coordinated in line with the primary objectives. In many cases, production of agricultural projects has been taken as the only achievement, without looking at other key factors for sustainability and improvement of the livelihood of the people by generating reasonable income. Agricultural projects are known as risky enterprises, and for projects to be sustainable there are enabling factors that need to be taken into consideration, some of which are quality production, marketing strategies, formation of commodity groups, ownership and responsible use of natural resources.

## **2.5 Sustainability and Contribution to Livelihood**

The basic challenge for sustainable agriculture is to make better use of available physical and human capital (Perret, 1999). Livelihood comprises capabilities, assets and activities required for a reasonable means of living. The main objective of poverty alleviation and food security projects is to improve or have an impact in the change of the livelihood of rural

communities. Sustainable livelihood approach is widely adopted in development planning in South Africa. It includes poverty alleviation through different programmes such as agricultural programmes that close the inequality gaps and those that address HIV/AIDS. Good governance can have a significant impact on domestic and foreign investments and economic growth (Mauro, 1995).

The achievement by the government through all these programmes should not be only political, but also social and economic, and should have signs of impact on the livelihood of communities. Rural local government is acknowledged as an area of political power where certain individuals and groups benefit more than others from different socio- economic activities in the community.

Agriculture is one of the contributors to community economical development by providing employment, but has challenges affecting its sustainability. The lack of sustainability of agricultural projects could be the fact that markets usually fix prices and requirements and farmers battle alone with the price of production inputs. Land and water are the basic resources for the sustainable agricultural projects. Many countries are currently experiencing water scarcity and increased water competition. Predictions are that about one-third of the world's population will begin to experience severe water scarcity by 2025, which will affect the agricultural sector adversely, with the potential to worsen poverty levels in rural areas (Seckler et al., 1998).

The more sustainable agricultural projects are, the higher the standard of living. And that naturally brings about improved health. The idea that agriculture can be the engine of overall growth is not new, it was advocated by Mellor (1966) and supported by several development specialists (Hayami & Ruttan, 1971), but does it work?, or should we look at other non-agricultural activities to fight poverty. Another argument is that sustained non-agricultural growth, particularly in the poorest countries, is not easy without first addressing agriculture (World Bank, 1997).



The growth of agriculture in Taiwan, Japan, Malaysia and South Korea laid a firm foundation for industrialisation, leading to broader economic development (Mellor, 1995). Improvement in a country's livelihood is mostly in urban societies, roads, and communication services in many rural areas are often not available. Most of the fruits of development are evident in urban areas by paved roads, good communication networks and general services. Poor infrastructure in rural areas decreases market opportunities and the terms of trade of farmers and thus limits their ability to improve their income.

## **2.6 Research Questions**

1. Are poverty alleviation and food security programs impacting on the social capital?
2. Is agricultural land available and is it used responsibly?
3. Is there adequate financial support to agricultural food security and poverty alleviation projects?
4. Is there any coordination between scientist, extension and stakeholders?
5. Are there any signs of sustainability and improvement to the livelihood of beneficiaries?

## CHAPTER 3

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 Study Area

The study was based on agricultural poverty alleviation and food security projects with special focus on layers and micro enterprise projects in the Mopani District. The programme focused on rural communities in the district.

##### 3.1.1 Egg Production project

In this project, a household was given 36 layers, cages and feeds for three months. Beneficiaries were expected to sell 24 eggs and use 12 for their family consumption per day. After three months, beneficiaries were expected to buy feeds on their own from egg sales. The total number of beneficiaries participating in the Mopani District since 2003 was 260.

##### 3.1.2 Micro Enterprise Project

Micro- enterprise projects were revitalized to increase production from subsistence to business. The projects were initiated by other departments and transferred to the Department of Agriculture for support and maintenance. The revitalization process focused on both vegetable and poultry projects and the total number of projects in the district is thirty (30). Beneficiaries were capacitated to be able to run the project on their own by being involved in the implementation of the project. Contribution by beneficiaries was through the provision of labour during the infrastructural rehabilitation of the projects.

##### *Sample selection*

The selection was focused on two (2) poultry projects, seven (7) vegetable project and twenty-five (25) layer beneficiaries.

##### *Data collection*

Primary data were collected from stakeholders in targeted communities, such as councillors, tribal authorities and religious organizations. Interviews and questionnaires were used. Beneficiaries from the targeted communities were

interviewed individually and as a group through their committees. Secondary data were collected from departmental documents and other literatures.

Beneficiaries who received layers were interviewed through a questionnaire focusing more on the enterprise, expenditure, income generated, eggs consumed and the entire business evaluation. Broiler and vegetable micro enterprise projects beneficiaries were also interviewed using a questionnaire focusing on project size, number of beneficiaries, challenges, expenditure, income generated and profit obtained. Stakeholders were interviewed using a questionnaire focusing on their knowledge about the programme, their participation in the programme and their judgement and evaluation in terms of improvement in the livelihood of beneficiaries. The primary and secondary data collected are outlined in the tables below.

**Table 1: Layers Beneficiary**

Beneficiary	G E N D E R	A G E	Tradition al Authority	Number of layers	Averag e Eggs produc ed/Mon th	Averag e Eggs sold/ month	Averag e Eggs consu med/ month	Expenditure For feeds/mont h ( R )	Monthly Income (50c/egg)	Layers replaced
1 Mabunda M	F	47	Makhuva	36	1 865	1700	165	300	850	yes
2 Mbombi B	F	42	Makhuva	36	1 974	1874	100	300	937	yes
3 Ngobeni K H	F	30	Makhuva	36	1067	967	100	300	483.50	no
4 Baloyi M S	F	37	Makhuva	36	986	920	66	300	460.00	no
5 Mikansi S N	M	42	Makhuva	36	879	781	76	300	390	no
6 Chuma V M	F	39	Hlaniki	36	360	320	40	150	160	no
7 Rivele M D	M	52	Hlaneki	36	863	720	43	300	360	yes
8 Rikhotso A	F	45	Hlaniki	36	910	840	70	300	420	no
9 Makhubele D	F	38	Hlaneki	36	1041	1002	39	300	501	yes
10 Mongwe N S	F	41	Hlaniki	36	891	850	41	300	425	yes
11 Rikhotso A	F	35	Mahumani	32	1000	950	50	300	475	no
12 Ngobeni S	F	52	Mahumani	31	1200	1100	40	300	550	yes
13 Muzimba V M	F	43	Mahumani	35	1609	1500	100	300	750	yes
14 Mthombeni M	M	51	Mahumani	21	550	500	50	150	250	no
15 Malatjie S T	M	55	Mahumani	13	390	300	90	150	150	no
16 Ngobeni M S	F	50	Shiviti	24	675	550	125	150	275	no
17 Makhubele J	F	53	Shiviti	35	571	521	50	150	260.50	yes
18 Shongani N	F	58	Shiviti	31	562	502	60	150	251	no
19 Maluleke M A	M	61	Shiviti	32	420	400	20	150	200	no
20 Chabalala G	F	47	Shiviti	9	270	250	20	150	125	no
21 Rihlampfu R	M	66	Dzumeri	33	782	664	118	150	332	yes
22 Rikhotso G	F	68	Dzumeri	33	765	599	66	150	299.50	no

23 Tivani S H	F	49	Dzumeri	32	691	640	51	150	320	no
24 Malatjie M M	F	52	Dzumeri	21	550	500	50	150	250	no
25 Mabunda M	F	58	Dzumeri	36	1024	920	104	300	460	yes

Income generation may be observed from comparing the expenditure on feeds for layers and the income received from egg sales monthly. The initial objective of the layer programme was for beneficiaries to secure basic food and be able to sustain the project for food security. Most of the layer beneficiaries are females with children, who depend on government grants for survival. The identification of beneficiaries was done by the local councillors in coordination with the traditional authorities.

In most instances, ill health and the level of poverty were the key factors in the selection, and not interest and ability. Egg production needs care, energy and space: things most of the economically disadvantaged people do not have. Production level of eggs differs from one beneficiary to the other and the income generation will obviously also differ.

Generally, all beneficiaries obtained 36 layers with the average production of one egg per layer daily. The initial thinking by the planners of the programme was that out of the 36 or more eggs produced, 30 eggs would be for sale and 6 for family consumption on a daily bases. Layers beneficiaries are expected to replace their layers after 12 months for sustainable production to happen. The poultry and the food gardens members are expected to produce and market the produce while generating income to sustain their projects.

Table 1 above represents the data collected from layers beneficiaries reflecting the sustainability of the programme, looking mostly on the replacement percentage of layers after 12 months and the income generated monthly.

**Table 2: Poultry and Vegetable Micro enterprise Project**

Project name	Enterprise	Project size	Number of beneficiaries	Challenges	Expenditure/ Production	Income Generated	Seasonal/ profit sharing
Ntsuxeko	Vegetable garden	6ha	13	Water	R2600	3500	R150
Vuxa	Poultry	4 B/ houses	11	In puts and market	R1900	3745	200
Rasiwana	Poultry	2 B/ houses	7	Market	R27000	63000	600
Hanyanyani	Vegetable Garden	4ha	41	Water and infrastructure	R3010	4600	100
Hluvukani	Vegetable	6ha	30	Infrastructure	R1300	3775	200
Dyondza ku rima	Vegetable	4ha	29	Land and marketing	R1890	3550	250
Zava	Vegetable	6	22	marketing	R2100	5600	400
Zamani	Vegetable	2	15	Water and marketing	R1050	3000	250
Thlarihani	Vegetable	7	25	Water	R1450	4680	150

The micro enterprise projects aim at generating reasonable income of R650 per beneficiary on a monthly basis, with the main objective of improving the livelihood and alleviating poverty in the society. Table 2 shows the number of hectares, number of beneficiaries, expenditure and income generated seasonally. The challenges encountered are also outlined in the data collected. The improvement, sustainability and the failure of the project may be realised from the income generated as compared to the expenditure of the projects. The data tabulated also reflect the improvement or change on the livelihood of the beneficiaries through observing the amount shared after production, which is aimed at basic family needs.

**Table 3: Stakeholders Involvement and Support to Projects**

Stakeholder	Traditional Authority/Ward/ Area	Knowledge of programme	Participation and Support Programme	Change in the livelihood of beneficiaries
SANCO	Mahumani	yes	no	no
Royal council	Hlaniki	Yes	yes	yes
Ward counselor	Dzumeri	Yes	yes	No
Royal council	Shiviti	No	No	No
Ndlandlamuka	All	Yes	No	No
District Municipality	Mopani	Yes	No	Yes

Sustainability of projects established for communities lies mostly on the support by stakeholders in the vicinity. The administrative operations of communities differ, and the understanding of the differences will only be

obtained from the community leaders. The involvement of stakeholders enables the planners to design a tailored approach in establishing projects that will impact positively on the livelihood of beneficiaries. Table 3 above shows the involvement levels of stakeholders in the plenary, implementation and evaluation on the impact of poverty alleviation and food security projects.

**CHAPTER 4**  
**DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

**4.1 Introduction**

To be in line with the objective of the study, dependent and independent variables were selected using analytical techniques and tools that are descriptive. The analysis of the collected data employs a variety of methods which are subjective; objective, participatory and formal depending on the data types. The data collected vary from one project to the other, but generally the analysis includes sustainability of the projects, community and stakeholder involvement, capacity of beneficiaries on agricultural activities and impact on the livelihood of beneficiaries.

**Fig: 1 Layers project**

Total no of beneficiaries	Income above R400	Income below R400	Layers replaced	No replacement
25	11	14	10	15

**Fig: 2 Micro enterprises**

Number of projects	Profit sharing above R400	Profit sharing below R400	Project under production
9	2	7	4

**4.2 Capacity of Beneficiaries and Sustainability**

The observation reveals lack of capacity of beneficiaries in terms of maintenance and care of the layers, project planning, marketing and packaging. In some instances, beneficiaries were sharing a room with the layers for shelter and security which affects the layers' laying pattern. Marketing of eggs is done locally without specific buyers. This results in sales variation on a daily bases affecting the monthly income. Funds are being spent on beneficiaries some of whom are too old to handle the activities of the projects. Others are too ill, and can only qualify for food parcels, but not income generating projects. The prising of eggs could not compete with the

prices practised in the shops in the village, thus resulting in more eggs being consumed and less been sold in some instances.

Thirty-six layers normally require two bags of laying mach monthly at the price varying between R150 to R180 per bag which is also a challenge to beneficiaries. In most cases, when comparing the income generated from egg sales and the amount spent on feeds, they are almost the same. During the survey some beneficiaries did not even realise that they were making losses, since they were augmenting their egg sales income with the government grants which they were receiving monthly. Sustainability has a lot to do with planning, and planning has to do with the objective of the project which was not done with most of the agricultural projects. The inclusion of old and ill beneficiaries is the evidence that agricultural poverty alleviation projects were not differentiated from social grants.

Food security and poverty alleviation projects were only provided with infrastructure and production inputs only, which will not guarantee sustainability but only visibility for recognition. The study observed the failing of projects with very expensive infrastructures due to insufficient water in the drilled boreholes. In poultry projects, some projects are incomplete due to poor planning, some perishable materials such cement have dried out. In some instances, water survey becomes the last aspect to be considered after construction of poultry houses. Once that happens, it becomes almost impossible to relocate the structures. The study also reveals that most of beneficiaries of agricultural projects are old and may not stand the rapid changes and activities involved in sustainable agricultural development.

For a project to be sustainable, certain factors have to be considered. The factors below were not taken into consideration in the projects under discussion. Such include the following:

- Level of interest of beneficiaries;
- Capacity and energy of beneficiaries;
- Interventions by stakeholders;



- Monitoring and evaluation by all parties; and
- Production and market linkage.

**Fig: 3 Stakeholders involvement**

Number of stakeholders	Knowledge of the programme	Participation in the programme	Impact on the livelihood
7	5	2	2

### **4.3. Community and Stakeholders' Involvement**

The layers' programme in particular seems to have multiple objectives and is not a community based initiative, since beneficiaries were identified during the implementation phase of the programme.

The multiple objectives observed include politics, academic experiments and poverty alleviation. The programme seems to have come as an initiative from the national Department of Agriculture for implementation by provinces without following the necessary rules of project management, which includes joint planning, implementation and evaluation.

The community structures seem to have not been involved in terms of identifying their felt needs. Looking at the average level of knowledge of the programme itself by community leaders could be the evidence of lack. Planning of the poverty alleviation and food security projects did not include the necessary actors responsible for the implementation. Actors in poverty alleviation and food security projects are extension technicians, economists, scientists, counsellors, traditional leaders, beneficiaries and NGOs operating in the communities. The most important tool for sustainable project is the relationship between specific implementers, funders and beneficiaries themselves.

### **4.4 Coordination of programmes within the Department of Agriculture**

It seems there is no effective coordination between extension, researchers, and economists in the Department of Agriculture in Limpopo Province. This coordination was going to assist in the understanding of each other's roles,

constraints as well as the significant challenges faced by farmers or beneficiaries.

Decentralised extension services have long been a feature of federal countries. Many developing countries are now decentralising extension in the expectation that the service will be closer to the client (Smith, 1997). The decentralisation of extension services should not only focus on the extension technicians, but also include the researchers and economist for these services to be realistic and relevant to the beneficiaries' real needs for sustainability of projects. Market linkages and agro processing seem to have been ignored during the planning and implementation of poverty alleviation and food security from the data analysis.

#### **4.5 Impact of the Project on Livelihood of Beneficiaries**

The main objective of the project was to improve the livelihood of specifically identified beneficiaries by generating reasonable income, reducing vulnerability, improving the well-being of community members and ensuring food security.

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) are important aspects as they enable the implementers and stakeholders to continuously assess the impact of their interventions. The socio-economic impact to beneficiaries should start with measurable change such as cash incomes and yields, but with more focus on assessing the contribution they make to livelihoods of beneficiaries. The evaluation on the improvement on the livelihood does not show any change after the program's intervention.

The level of poverty in most layer beneficiaries is still the same, especially those that depend on eggs as a source of income. The main objective of the projects established in the province is to improve the livelihood of beneficiaries, but due to lack of proper monitoring and evaluation very little or no impact is perceived.

The data collected reveal also that technical intervention was not taken into account for good quality products to compete the market requirements. The monitoring of the project to ensure that project resources reach the targeted group was not done during the implementation process. Poverty has basically not decreased as far as the beneficiaries are concerned. The parties involved in the planning and implementation of the project have different objectives. The national Department of Agriculture planned projects without the involvement of the necessary stakeholders who are responsible for the implementation and the evaluation of the impact of the project.

The top-down approach has a negative influence on never sustainability of project, resulting in beneficiaries not having sense of ownership. Most layers beneficiaries, as observed from the data did not replace the layers since they did not accumulate enough funds from the business. The achievement of the project is that beneficiaries had access to eggs, addressing their nutritious needs for a period of twelve (12) months. For most part of the surveyed area, the socio-economic impact on the livelihood of beneficiaries seems to have not been achieved as anticipated.

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS**

#### **5.1 Conclusion**

The Limpopo Province's Department of Agriculture has very good programmes aimed at contributing to the economy of the province and alleviating poverty. Funds spent by the department on projects and programmes from 2003 to date are over a billion rand, but it is still very difficult to say that the targeted communities' needs have been addressed and poverty is reduced.

Like in most agrarian societies of Africa, land tenure arrangements under traditional agricultural systems are still under customary law, which puts emphasis on inherited rights to have access to land in order to grow food for their families. Land reform measures have also been found to be inefficient, because land alone is not enough. Those who have access to land often lack the resources to use it.

Agricultural projects seem to have been not properly planned with the involvement of all the potential stakeholders. The involvement of relevant stakeholders in the rural communities avoids institutional conflicts, and enhances sustainability of projects, which then contributes positively to the livelihood of the society. Poverty, as a social problem, calls for a social solution since it is not merely the lack of income among a collection of individuals, but affects the whole society, and can be reduced by organising and guiding poor people towards helping themselves.

Some of the challenges faced by most agricultural projects include budget, settlement pattern, and weakness of coordination between the various spheres of government. It has also been observed that there are no complementarities of government departments on food security and poverty alleviation projects; instead there is competition for clients. Poverty alleviation and food security projects in the Department of Agriculture are planned from

supply-driven ideology, and not demand led, with very little or no involvement of implementers and beneficiaries.

Food security and poverty alleviation projects implemented by the Department of Agriculture seem to be not initiated by the beneficiaries, which is contrary to the notion of the department that says “nothing about farmers without farmers”.

## **5.2 Recommendations**

Communities must be empowered and a mechanism be put in place in order to initiate, facilitate and monitor sub-projects. Community workers should be involved to ensure that project resources reach the poorest communities, as well as foster involvement of the poor in decisions that affect their daily lives. The involvement of stakeholders has a very strong influence on sustainability of poverty alleviation, especially in enabling the local communities to voice concerns and become involved in decision-making. These involvements will also enhance client ownership.

Decentralisation of resources allocation and decisions to municipalities and communities allow for a more transparent and efficient interaction for sustainable development of projects. Beneficiaries of projects need to be capacitated technically about the project and their interest should be tested before the implementation of any project to ensure growth and development and to guard against risky situations during the process.

Technical assistance and training are indispensable inputs to a successful and sustainable project investment. Community members need encouragement, skills, stimulation and guidance in order to participate in appraisal or assessment among the various tasks of the community workers and facilitators.

Sustainable agricultural development need to be supported by different social groups with diverse interest, since agricultural projects should have ecological, economical, and social targets. Therefore, governance should involve the civil society and NGOs in political decision processes.

The evaluation process with both social and economic indicators will also assist in measuring the impact of the programme on the targeted group. Agricultural programmes and projects require quality production, closer and intensive supervision through a highly effective management information system, which tracks progress and identifies possible bottlenecks and provide solutions to challenges. The following factors need to be taken into consideration for a sustainable and reasonable income generating project: selection criteria; identification of felt needs of communities through participatory approach and closer involvement of stakeholders; complementarities of departmental components; and proper distribution and coordination of developmental resources

#### *Selection criteria*

The criteria used for selection of the beneficiaries for sustainable poverty alleviation projects should be based on the interest, knowledge and ability of the participants, and not the level of poverty. People who are passionate about what they want to do, work harder and more focused than those who do not have passion. Strategies for smallholder agricultural development need to take cognisance of the fact that the skills and interests of rural residents are not the same.

Government initiatives to reduce poverty through smallholder agricultural development should focus on those that are interested and have the necessary skills to undertake the project with success. Sarageldin (1995:38) states that:

[U]ndeniably, a sound broad-based development strategy is required to have a significant effect on the reduction of poverty. The comprehensive strategy, however, must be supplemented by special attention to the needs of the ultra-poor, those who are truly hungry, whose condition is beneath any definition of human decency. It is not just sensible economic and political and social policy, it is a moral imperative.

### *Identification of felt needs and involvement of potential stakeholders*

Potential stakeholders in rural development such as traditional leaders, counsellors and community developmental forums are key to sustainability of agricultural projects. The public sector has a critical role in allowing and facilitating markets and growth (Siegel, 2000).

Monitoring on the implementation and impact of the projects becomes manageable with the involvement of potential stakeholders. The Department of Agriculture should recognise that there are different categories of smallholder farmers requiring different approaches (Machethe et al., 2004). Eicher (1994) also stresses the point of different approaches to different class of farmers by pointing out that an agricultural strategy that relies on a standard package of technological approach is too narrow to assist the diverse agrarian societies in Africa. Different communities have different needs, therefore to meet these needs proper strategies are necessary. There will be no success without specific strategy for specific community.

### *Complementarities of departmental components*

The Department of Agriculture has different useful components that should be carefully coordinated to complement each other and avoid duplication while encouraging responsible use of state funds with sustainable and completed projects.

### *Coordination and proper distribution of developmental resource*

Agricultural developmental resources need to be distributed properly to encourage high volume production, which will move projects from subsistence to business. In other words, the final target should be growth and development.

### *Contribution to the livelihood of the society*

Poverty alleviation and food security projects should be moved from subsistence to business through proper market linkages and quality production. The more community members are employed, the higher the

standard of living of the society. An agricultural market requires bulk production, quality and consistency. Poverty alleviation problem cannot be solved by promoting smallholder agricultural projects alone, but more emphasis should be given to the promotion of agro-industry which would be a good link to markets, attractive to youth and would yield better in terms of reasonable income generation.

Such investments also facilitate the development of the non-agricultural sector and are especially effective in reducing rural poverty because they have a direct effect on employment during the industrial construction phase (IFPRI 1998; and Fan et al., 1999). Sustainable agriculture has the potential to directly or indirectly influence the health of rural people by providing basic foods, which in turn allow adult to be more active and children to attend school with the necessary energy while improving on the livelihood status. As such, it is of crucial important to take food security seriously. This issue should be given the support it deserves.



### *Funding*

For a project to be completed and be sustainable, the total requirements in terms of personnel, technology and economic resources should be properly



calculated, made available and be within the time frame of start and finish to avoid escalation of prices of materials and other unforeseen circumstances.

Different funding programmes should be developed to assist different levels of farmers to move from subsistence, smallholder farmers to commercial farming. This will definitely reduce poverty and many people will find employment. In most developing countries, agriculture and related activities provide most of the employment in rural areas. For any funded project to succeed there must be a strong commitment, on the part of government, to ensure that funds are used appropriately where it was intended, and that corruption is controlled. Proper monitoring by both donors and implementing agencies, with mechanisms in place to fix any problems identified, determine the success and sustainability of the project.

#### *Succession plan and involvement of youth*

Agricultural projects or activities need energy which fades as farmers grow older. Therefore, succession plan must be put in place. The youth are the natural successors, so these have to be prepared in time, through training, so that when the time arrives for them to occupy their positions, the transition can be swift and smooth

#### *Ownership of land*

The traditional agricultural land tenure system should be revisited to allow African farmers to have ownership of land, to be able to access funds from financial institutions for their expansion and growth; move from subsistence to business farming. The incidence of poverty is correlated with the size distribution of operational landholding. Hence, it might be pointless to try to tackle poverty through agricultural development in situations where the distribution of land rights is highly inequitable (Balisacan, 1993).

#### *Formation of cooperatives*

Farmers should be encouraged to form cooperatives. This will enable them to access funding as cooperative, joint bulk marketing, which will strengthen their technical and economic situation.

### *Formation of study groups*

To avoid competition, farmers should be encouraged to participate in the sharing of information on the day-to-day experiences through study groups. Such special groups will help farmers to grow faster and produce good quality bulk products, while contributing to the social capital of the society and eventually to the country as a whole. Their discussions will assist them in indentifying problems and finding proper ways of dealing with them.



### *Project phases*

For both sustainability and reaching the primary objective of the project, the Department of Agriculture should ensure that project phases are not compromised by planners and implementers. Instead of following the phases step by step, planners and implementers or service providers may decide to combine certain phases or even all phases. This should not be allowed to happen because each phase has its specific objective that cannot be left out. As it has been pointed out earlier, these phases should be followed sequentially for optimum result to be obtained.

A project goes through six phases as outlined by Haughey (2000). It includes the definition of the project goals with measurable objective, project needs being set-up before the start of the execution, detailed plan of project execution including cost, time and resources being put in place, execution to deliver the project product, project control being on track by taking corrective actions, and lastly project closure by accepting the deliverables and disband all elements which were running the project.

### **5.3 Implications**

The Department of Agriculture have programs and initiatives that are aimed at the primary and secondary objectives. For the department to meet its objectives, principles of community development should be considered. Implementation of a programme without following project phases as outlined earlier in the recommendations could result in fruitless expenditure. The government will spend a lot of funds on programmes with very low yields in terms of the improvement of the livelihood of the intended targets.

The primary objective of poverty alleviation and food security program as stated earlier is to improve the livelihood of the society, and the secondary objective may be considered as the political gain. In most instances, the intended primary objective is not met as anticipated. This impact negatively on the government since only political gains are realised while communities are still leaving below bread line. The measuring of achievement by the government seems to be based on spending and not the impact and the sustainability of projects. The failing of agricultural programs have a negative influence as well on the participation and interest of youth in agricultural activities. The programmes in the Department of Agriculture seem to be unattractive to youth as compared to other institutions such as mining and tourism.

The government should involve youth in designing agricultural programmes, aimed at youth development. This could be another means of reducing unemployment, since youth occupies higher percentage of unemployment in the province. The most threatening implications of executing a project without

insuring that all the required elements are put together and all role players are involved, include the following: exceeding budget; not meeting customer expectations; inconsistency; favours; achieving goal through high stress level; waste of time and money; and, lastly, unforeseen internal and external events impacting the project (Haughey, 2000). A properly planned programme should have pre and post project plan and resources. This will insure the sustainability of the project. A programme without proper plans might become unsustainable resulting in beneficiaries leaving the project for other income generating activities.

## REFERENCES

- Ashley, C., & Maxwell, S. (2001). Rethinking Rural Development. *Development Policy Review*, 19(4): 395-425
- Baliscan, A.M. (1993). Agricultural growth, landlessness, off-farm employment and rural poverty in the Philippines: *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 41: 533-562.
- Bebbington, A. (1997). Social capital and rural intensification. Local organizations and island of sustainability in the rural Andes. *Geography Journal*, 163: 189-197.
- Conyers, D., & Hills, P. (1975). *Principles of Development*. London: Longman.
- Dalgado, C L (1997), Africa Changing Agriculture (World Bank, 2003).
- Dasgupta, P.C, Folke, Maler, K.G. (1994). The environmental resource and human welfare. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(3): 206-208.
- Development Strategies, 2020 Vision Breif 42 International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington D C.
- Duncan, H. (2000). *An Introduction to Project Management*. New York: SMART .
- Eicher, C.K. (1994). *African Agricultural Development Strategies*. London: The Macmillan Press.
- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) (2004). *Social-economic analysis and Policy Implications of the Roles of Agriculture in Developing Countries*. Summary report FAO: Italy.
- Fuggle, R.F., & Rabies, M.A. (1999). *Environmental management in South Africa*. Pretoria: National Government Publications.
- Horuits, F.M. (1991). *Managing Resourceful People*. New York: Rustical Press.
- Hyden, G. (1990). Gender and rural livelihood in Kenya. *The Journal of Development Studies*: 35(2) 72-95
- Jodha, N.S. (1998). Poverty and environmental resource degradation *Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(3): 202- 204.
- Lyston, M. (1991). *Impact Assessment and Sustainable Resource Management*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Machethe, C.L., & Mollel, N.M. (2004). Smallholder irrigation and agricultural development in Oliphant River basin in Limpopo Province, Water Research Commission. Pretoria.
- Mauro, P. (1995). Corruption and growth: *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 110:681-712.
- Mellor, J. W. (1966). *The Economics of Agricultural Development*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Mellor, J.W. (1995). *Agriculture on the road to Industrialisation*. Johns Ithaca, NY: Hopkins University Press.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Ravnborg, H.M. (2003). Poverty and environmental degradation: The Nicaraguan Hillside. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 4 (3): 215-216.
- Ramphela, M., & Francis, W. (1989). *Uprooting Poverty*. Cape Town: D P Publications.
- Seckler, D., Molden, D., & Barker, R. (1998). Water Scarcity in the Twenty-first century, IVAU Water Brief 1, International water institute: Colombo.

- Shapiro, T. (2004). *The Hidden Cost of Being African American: How wealth perpetuates inequality*. Oxford University Press
- South Africa (2005). *Extension and Advisory Services in Agriculture: Norms and standards*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- South Africa (1998). *Agricultural Policy of South Africa*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- South Africa (1996). *Statistics South Africa: Annual report*. Pretoria: Government Publishers.
- South Africa (2003). *Intergovernmental fiscal review - National Treasury*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

## APPENDIXES

### Appendix A: Consistency Matrix

<b>Sub problem</b>	<b>Research question</b>	<b>Source of data</b>
Social capital and poverty alleviation	What is the level of contribution to social capital by poverty alleviation projects?	Lipton (1999) Bebbington (1997) Statistics RSA(2003) Pretty (2002) Brundtland (1998) DAFF (2005) Horwite (1991) Ramphela &Wilson, (1989) Aaron et al., (1973) Charles & Whitlock, (1987)
Responsible use of resources and Land	Is the use of basic natural resources in perfect balance?	Ransburg & Sono (1994) Jodha (1998) Lyston 1991 Ravnborg, H.M. (2003) Marais 1989 SARPN conference (2001)
Financial support of Agricultural projects	What are the risks in funding agricultural projects by institutions?	World development report (1989) Agricultural policy (1998) Vosti &Reardon (1997) Annual report 2004/5 Strategic plan (2006)
Coordination of Scientists, Extension and Stakeholders	Are there any complementarities amongst potential role players?	Lipton (1999) Conyers &Hill,(1975) Benor, Harrison &Baxter(1984) Elliot (1977) White Paper on Local Government systems (1998)
Sustainability and contributions to livelihood	Is there any improvement in the livelihood of the beneficiaries?	Perret (1999) Sen (1999) Seckler et al., (1998) Hayami& Ruttan (1971) World Bank(1995)

## Appendix B: Questionnaire of Stakeholders

*Administered by Matjokana E*

Ethical principles as set by the University of Limpopo for confidentiality will be observed, and confidential information will be treated as such.

1. Name of the organization/Stakeholder-----
  
2. In which ward/Traditional Authority /Municipality is your organisation operating? -----
  
3. Is your organisation aware of the functioning of agricultural projects in your area of operation? -----
  
4. If “yes”, mention two Agricultural projects? -----
  
5. Was your organisation involved in these projects-----
  
6. If “yes”, what was it role and contributions? -----
  
7. Did these projects bring any change to the livelihood of the community? ----
  
8. If “yes’, to what extent?  
.....  
.....  
.....



## Appendix C: Questionnaire for Beneficiaries of layers

*Administered By Matjokana E*

Ethical principles as set by the Ethics Committee of the University of Limpopo for confidentiality will be observed and confidential information will be treated as such.

1. Name and Surname-----
2. Traditional authority-----
3. Gender-----
4. Number of layers received by you-----
5. How many eggs are produced monthly? -----
6. How many Eggs are sold monthly-----
7. How many eggs are consumed monthly? -----
8. What is your monthly production expenditure? -----
9. What is your monthly income from sales? -----
10. When did you replace your layers? -----

**Appendix D: Questionnaire for Micro Enterprise Projects (Broiler and vegetable)**

*Administered by Matjokana E.*

Ethical principles as set by the Ethics Committee of the University of Limpopo for confidentiality will be followed, and confidential information will be treated as such.

1. What is the name of the project? -----
2. What is the commodity of your project? -----
3. What is the size (ha) of your project? -----
4. How many members are currently benefiting from the project? -----
5. What is your seasonal production expenditure? -----
6. What are the challenges facing your project? -----
7. What is the income of your project seasonally? -----
8. What is the average seasonal profit of the project? -----
9. How much are you sharing among yourselves seasonally? -----