

Impact of the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) Projects on Livelihoods of Beneficiaries in Ngaka Modiri Molema District, South Africa

M.A. Antwi¹ and O.I. Oladele

Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, North-West University, Mafikeng Campus, Mmabatho, 2735, South Africa

¹*E-mail: mike.antwi@nwu.ac.za*

KEYWORDS Land Reform. Projects. Beneficiaries. Impact. Livelihoods. South Africa

ABSTRACT. The fundamental objective of this study was to evaluate the impact of the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) projects on livelihoods of beneficiaries in the Ngaka Modiri Molema district of the North-West Province. Under the ownerships of LRAD beneficiaries, the majority of the projects undertake combinations of livestock, grains and vegetable production. Qualitative and quantitative analyses were performed on the data collected using structured questionnaire from randomly selected forty-seven LRAD projects in the study area. Graphs, histograms and tables were used to present the results of frequency indicator variables. The results of the analysis showed that some of the key indicator variables were lowly achieved; such as low quality of infrastructure, few skills training, less contribution to food security, poor savings and financial constraints. The positive aspects revealed by the results of the study include: access to sizeable productive agricultural lands; improved participation of women and youth in farming; household supply of food stuffs from the projects; earning of some form of monthly income from farm produce sales; some of the projects, even though small in number, have some good farming infrastructure; through the projects, though grossly inadequate, some have means of transport and farm machinery; the projects created some permanent and temporary jobs; and established some beneficial linkages. An integrated agrarian reform support programme will go a long way in improving productivity of the projects if it consists of a package in support services, rural infrastructure and co-operatives. The main function of such unit should be training, acquisition and distribution of agricultural inputs/equipment to agrarian project beneficiaries and there should also be extension of special grant to support government's efforts.

1. INTRODUCTION

Past land policies were a major cause of insecurity, landless citizens and poverty in the country (CDE 2008). The democratic government in 1994 opted for a three-pronged land reform policy to redress the historical injustice of land dispossession, denial of access to land and forced removals: Land Restitution to restore land or provide financial compensation for people dispossessed of their land in the old dispensation; the Land Tenure reform (Under the Land Restitution Act of 1994, persons or communities who lost their property as a result of apartheid laws or practices after 1913 were invited to submit claims for restitution (return of land) or compensation (usually financial); and the Land Redistribution. The Land Redistribution programme has gone through quite a number of phases since 1994. The first phase was called SLAG (Settlement Land Acquisition Grant) which operated between 1994 and 2000. The Settlement Land Acquisition Grant was a R16 000 cash grant for which poor and landless black South Africans

could form a group to apply to buy and develop farm land.

The basic grant was supported by other grants, that is, for planning, facilitation, and dispute resolution. In most cases, farms financed with land grants and settled by groups (up to 500 households) were far too small to support all of the beneficiaries as full-time farmers (Department of Agriculture and Land Affairs 2001). It was unsuccessful and plagued with group dynamics problems due to its group approach and insufficient grant system. The second phase of the land redistribution which is the focus of this paper was called Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) programme and operated between 2000 and 2008. The main aim of the programme among others was to empower beneficiaries to improve their economic and social wellbeing through better productive use of land acquired through the redistribution programme. The third phase (current) of the land redistribution is called the Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy (PLAS). The government's target is 30 per cent by 2014, thus distribution of

24.6 million hectares of 82 million hectares own by white commercial farmers in South Africa.

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 co-operatives. Although agrarian reform can result in lower agricultural productivity, especially if it includes collectivization, it may increase productivity when land is redistributed to the tiller. 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 imperil 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. In Zimbabwe, wholesale land redistribution at the end of the 1900 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 (Columbia Encyclopedia 2008). A study using state-level variation in reform implementation, also find that the land reforms had a significant and positive impact on income growth and accumulation of human and physical capital in the reform households (Deininger et al. 2008).

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 very appreciable levels of the two. 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 under-utilized productive agricultural lands.

One of the ways to minimize the failure of agricultural projects of land reform programme is to undertake periodic evaluation or impact assessment. A study (World Bank 2004) found that evaluation or impact assessments of development activities can provide government officials, development managers and civil society with better means of learning from past experi-

ences, improving service delivery, planning and allocation of resources, and demonstrating results as part of accountability to key stakeholders. After ten years of LRAD implementation, most of South African land reform supporters and opponents alike hold widespread perception that, where redistribution has occurred, it has not improved agricultural productivity or benefited the majority of participants in terms of livelihoods.

The fundamental objective of this study was to assess the impact of the LRAD projects on livelihoods of beneficiaries in the Ngaka Modiri Molema district of the North-West Province. Thus assessment of the changes in the physical, financial, food security, employment, human and social capitals of the LRAD beneficiaries, intended or unintended at the time of the evaluation to which the intervention has contributed.

2. MATERIALS AND METHOD

The desktop information and data collection and analysis indicated that approved and transferred land reform projects in the District Municipality from 1997 to March 2009 were ninety. Out of this, 5 were SLAG projects; 3 for Commonage; 72 for LRAD; and 10 for PLAS. Under the ownerships of LRAD beneficiaries, the majority of the projects undertake combinations of livestock, grains and vegetable production. Based on the number of LRAD projects in the district, random sampling was performed and 47 (65%) of all the active projects under LRAD sub-programme which is the focus of this study were selected. Typological stratification was not considered since over ninety percent of the projects have common farm enterprises combinations namely cattle, maize, goats, vegetables and poultry. Data was collected using a structured questionnaire from the selected LRAD projects in the study area. Qualitative and quantitative analyses were performed on the data collected. Indicator areas, indicators, measurements and tools of their analysis guided the development of the questionnaire. The main livelihood indicator variables used included: infrastructural (physical), social, financial, employment, efficiency of funds administration and food security. Graphs, histograms and tables were used to present the results of frequency indicator variables. Ethical procedures were strictly adhered to.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The range of sizes of land available to the projects is presented in Table 1. The sizes of the land at the disposal of the beneficiaries range between 5 and 1600 hectares. The sizes of land of the majority (66%) of the projects lie between 1 and 300 hectares with only 2% having more than 900ha. Using state-level variation in reform implementation in the Philippines, it was found that the land reforms had a significant and positive impact on accumulation of physical capital (Deininger et al. 2008).

Table 1: Farm sizes of projects (n=47)

Range	Frequency	Percentage
1 – 300 hectares	31	66
301 – 600 ha	11	23
601 – 900 ha	4	09
> 900 ha	1	02
Total	47	100

The results regarding participation of women, youth and interest of beneficiaries is presented in Table 2. The results show that over 96% of the project beneficiaries were interested in farming. The reasons given regarding their high interest in farming was most often based on political history rather than expectation of financial and better standard of living. Women participation in the projects is very important in that women play a very important role in ensuring household food security. Levels of youth participation in the projects are also very essential for many reasons including succession of the old participants as well as their possible assistance in the drudgery activities. The results of the analysis show that, representation of women and youth in the execution of the projects were 46% and 41% respectively. Deere and León (2001) argue that, it does not matter whether women or men enjoy enhanced land access but that, increasing women's claim to land, whether as joint or individual owners, can be expected to have positive income and welfare effects both for women and for their children. Even though Women/youth/minority groups in the projects as well as reached by the projects are less than 50%, the sub-programme's objective of expanding the opportunities of promising young people who stay in the rural areas can be said to be on course.

Table 2: Beneficiaries' interest in farming and women/youth participation in the projects (n=244 project beneficiaries)

Item	Category	Per cent
<i>Beneficiaries' Interest in Farming</i>	Interested in farming	96
	Not interested in farming	4
<i>Gender and Youth Participation in the Projects</i>	Women	46
	Men	54
	Youth	41

The financial aspects of the projects with respect to government investment are presented in Table 3. Government invested the taxpayers' money as grant in land and production capital with the aim of establishing sustainable land reform agricultural projects. This taxpayers' money has been invested by the LRAD beneficiaries under consideration on farm infrastructure, implements, livestock and production to generate income. The project beneficiaries invested R37, 623, 129.64 in farm purchases to establish the 47 projects included in the study at an average of R800, 492.12 per project. The government provided R21, 449, 993.01 of the above farm purchase investment as grant/loan at an average of R456, 382.83 per project. Besides this, the government provided some production capital to the projects.

Table 3: Government investment in the projects (n=47)

Item	Total	Average/Project
Grant	R21, 449, 993.01	R456, 382.83
Farm purchase	R37, 623, 129.64	R800, 492.12
Loan	R16, 173, 136.63	R344, 109.29

The results of finance-related impact of the projects are presented in Table 4. Regarding efficiency of fund administration, only 17% of the projects received their funding in less than 3 months period from application date. It took between 3 to 6 months for about 26% of the projects to receive their funding for the purchase of the land while 57% of the projects took over 6 months to receive the funding after approval of their application by the Department of Land Affairs. The impact of income from the project is critical for the food security of the beneficiaries, acquisition of resources and the sustainability of the projects. The results show that, the majority of the project members (64%) earned a

monthly income of less than R1 000 from the projects while some 13% of them earned a monthly income of between R1 000 and R2 000. About 23% of the project members indicated that they earned more than R2 000 per month especially projects with very few beneficiaries. Incomes accruing to farmers are very important motivating factor in the present world since this help them take care of their dependants as well as ensuring food security. It is LRAD's cardinal objective (Department of Agriculture and Land Affairs 2001) to improve beneficiaries' income, nutrition, social and economic wellbeing.

Table 4: Finance-related impact from the project (n=47)

<i>Item</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Grant Release</i>	< 3 months	17
	3 to 6 months	26
	> 6 months	57
<i>Monthly Income</i>	<R1000	64
	R1000 to R2000	13
	>R2000	23
<i>Annual Gross Farm Income</i>	<R15000	47
	R15000 to R30000	25
	>R30000	28
<i>Annual Gross Expenditure</i>	<R15000	51
	R15000 to R30000	23
	>R30000	26
<i>Average Annual Net Farm Income</i>	<R1000	77
	R1000 to R10000	21
	>R10000	2
<i>Savings</i>	Yes	38
	No	62
<i>Financial Records</i>	Yes	89
	No	11

A study in Brazil by Buainain et al. (1999) found that land reform has clearly been shown to be economically viable having scope of increasing beneficiary income up to 5-fold. The average annual farm income per project among the study sample was R27, 150.00. The average annual farm operational expenditure was found to be R26, 250.00, hence average net farm income of R900. This is too little considering the huge investment in the farm purchase and production capital. Again, this is an average value and does not reflect much on the differences in the farm incomes among the respective projects. The average annual Net Farm Income (NFI) from operations of some 77% of the projects was less than R1, 000. Savings can be made by the projects only if NFI accrue. The study found that only 38% of the projects have made some

savings from the NFI made from the projects' activities. The majority (62%) of the projects did not save. This result is consistent with that of Leite et al. (2004). Savings culture may help the projects to secure credit from many financial institutions.

All beneficiaries (100%) of the projects indicated that their projects had created some jobs. In all, 660 jobs were created by all the LRAD projects in the study (Table 5). It was quite impressive to observe that 37% of these jobs were permanent (mainly the direct project beneficiaries) with 63% as temporary. The creation of employment by projects was seen to play an important role in extending the benefits of the project to the larger community as many people were engaged. This provided a source of income for some of the community members who would otherwise not be employed. The majority of the jobs created were temporary; most of the workers living within the immediate communities of the projects' locations. The temporary jobs were normally engaged during land preparation, planting, weeding, and harvesting activities especially for vegetable production. The projects also engaged services of many service providers for some of the afore-mentioned activities. About 83% of the projects made use of between one and five service providers while 17% used more than six service providers. It was also claimed by some of the project leaders that the achievements in some of the projects helped the participants to realize their potential and instilled a sense of pride, responsibility and high esteem among the beneficiaries. The agricultural projects also made some positive impacts on the communities including: selling of cheaper and quality vegetables to the communities; supplying local shops with fresh and quality products; and creation of temporary jobs. It is hoped that the potential impact of the projects in creating jobs for their respective communities will increase further when all the projects are in full operation.

Table 5: Employment created by the projects (n=47)

<i>Type</i>	<i>Number created</i>	<i>Percent (%)</i>
Permanent	244	37
Temporary	416	63
Total	660	100

The various aspects of infrastructure on the projects are presented in Table 6. One of the

ways in which LRAD projects have contributed to development of many land reform beneficiaries of the study area is through the establishment of infrastructure which has improved the quality of lives of some of the beneficiaries and communities. The study established that 51% of the LRAD projects in the study area had over 50% of the required established infrastructures for their operations. About 49% of the projects at the time of the study had less than 50% of their operational infrastructural needs. The types of infrastructure established included among others: irrigation systems, electricity, farm houses, fencing, offices, chicken houses, farm machinery, and vehicles. The study found that about 94% of the infrastructure was fully owned by the beneficiaries while 6% were either rented or partially owned. Only 15% of the projects rated the quality of their infrastructure as excellent; 49% rated the quality of their infrastructure as good while 36% of the projects classified their infrastructure as poor. The study also established that 83% of the infrastructure on all the projects in the study area was acquired as part of the purchased land while 17% was acquired after the land purchase by the beneficiaries themselves. Using state-level variation in reform implementation in the Philippines, it was found that the land reforms had a significant and positive impact on accumulation of physical capital (Deininger et al. 2008).

Table 6: Infrastructure aspects of the projects (n=47)

<i>Item</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Project Infrastructure</i>	Acquired <50% of required	49
	Acquired >50% of required	51
<i>Infrastructure Ownership</i>	Owned	94
	Renting	6
<i>Quality of Infrastructure</i>	Poor	36
	Good	49
	Excellent	15
<i>Functional Status of Infrastructure</i>	Non-functional	11
	Partial	19
	Fully	70
<i>How Infrastructure Acquired</i>	Part of land purchase	83
	Acquired after land purchase	17

Table 7 shows the aspects of skills training and technology adoption on the projects. The study established that prior to joining the LRAD projects most of the beneficiaries did not have good farming skills. Most of the LRAD projects

involve and require diverse levels of skills and capacity. One of the major contributions that each of the projects has made to the direct beneficiaries is to expose them to different training and skills development. The results show that the projects have given training to the direct beneficiaries. These capacity building initiatives have imparted some of the much needed knowledge, skills, as well as confidence of the participants. A study in Pakistan found that more extension contact through training and visiting programme in the country increased farmers' technical knowledge and induced earlier adoption of technology (Hussein et al. 1994). It is expected that smallholder growers would benefit from more training. The results indicate that 72% of the LRAD projects in the study area received 1 or 2 skills training; 13% received 3 to 5 skills training with 15% receiving more than 5 skills training since their establishments.

Most of the training was primary production oriented such as livestock production, crop production and general farm management. Most of the skills training were organized by the North-West Department of Agriculture, North-West farmers' co-operatives (GWK) and others such as the First National Bank (FNB). Some of the projects on the other hand engaged in a number of farm environmental management skills training. About 42% of the project participants expressed the view that the impact of skills received from training on the projects performance is high. However, 28% of the participants rated the impact of the skills received from training on the projects as low, while 30% of them did not recognize any impact from the acquired skills on the projects' performance. All the projects participants (100%) indicated that they will require training in some relevant skills in future in order to improve their performance. Among the areas which the beneficiaries are interested to be trained are game and wild life management, vegetable production, livestock breeding, soil and irrigation management, poultry production, vaccination programmes, repair of farm machinery, farm management and book keeping.

Leadership is one of the critical factors that affect the success or failure of community projects. The building of leadership capacity among projects is therefore very important. It is clear from Table 8 that the majority (94%) of the leaders among the LRAD projects in the study area has attended between 1 and 5 capacity build-

ing training during the period of their involvement with the projects. About 64% of the leaders rated their level of satisfaction of the training attended to be below 40%. This is a clear indication that the majority of the leaders of the projects were not satisfied with the training. Again the majority (62%) of the project leaders described the training given as not useful. On the other hand the majority (62%) of all project beneficiaries in the study area perceive their leaders as not quite good. Only 18 and 20% of them perceive their leadership as excellent and good respectively. The general indifference perception about leadership displayed by the beneficiaries show that the managements of the projects are quite ineffective.

Table 7: Aspects of skills training and technology adoption on the projects (n=47)

Item	Range	Percent
Number of Skills Training Received	1 to 2	72
	3 to 5	13
	>5	15
Impact of Skills Training Project	No impact	30
	Low	28
	High	42
Environmental Management Skills Training	Yes	51
	No	49
Projects Requesting for More Skills Training	Yes	100
	No	0

Table 8: Skills training aspects of the project leaders (n=47)

Item	Range	Percent
No. of Skills Training Received by Project Leaders	1 to 5	94
	>5	6
Level of Satisfaction of Training Received	<40%	64
	40 to 70%	8
Usefulness of Training Received	>70%	28
	Useful	38
Perception About Project Leaderships	Not useful	62
	Excellent	18
	Good	20
	Not quite good	62

The results of the study regarding food security among the project beneficiaries (Table 9) show that the majority (85%) of the households in the projects were food secure. This is a positive impact of the LRAD projects on the beneficiaries. The main source of the food security was through food produced from the projects and purchasing of some of the food using income from the projects and other sources such

as employment outside the projects and pension claims.

Majority of the projects produce both crops and livestock products. About 66% of the beneficiaries indicated that the LRAD projects contribute less than 50% of their food security while only 34% of the beneficiaries' food securities depend solely on the contribution from the LRAD projects. Many studies (CSIR 2005; CASE 2006; SDC 2007) have revealed the limited impact of most South African land reform projects in terms of productive land use and household livelihoods. This has been attributed to many factors, but the most widely cited are inadequate or inappropriate planning, a general lack of capital and skills among intended beneficiaries, a lack of adequate post-settlement support from state agencies, most notably local municipalities and provincial departments of agriculture and poor dynamics within beneficiary groups.

Table 9: Food security of project beneficiaries (n=244 beneficiaries)

Item	Category	Percent
Food Security	Food secure	85
	Food insecure	15
Contribution of Project to Food Security	Contributes ≤50%	66
	Contributes 100%	34

The results of the analysis of impact of the projects on communication, networking and linkages are presented in Table 10. The impact of the projects on communication between other organisations and the projects was assessed and found that most of the projects had telephone either as land lines or cell phones. The results show that about 30% of the projects had Telkom land lines while 98% of them had cell phones. This made it easier for the members to gain access to the telephone when needed. About 77% of the projects stated that the reliability of telephone networks in the projects was good. About 96% of the responding beneficiaries rated the effectiveness of communication within the projects to be between good and excellent. Good communication is important not only within the project structures but also for interactions with the outside community. The establishment of linkages with beneficial organisations and individuals most often adds value to projects. According to the results of the study, about 94% of the projects had established at least five linkages

es while 6% of the projects have established six or more links with other organisations and institutions such as the Department of Labour, Department of Social Development, Municipalities, the Provincial Department of Agriculture, GWK and Pannar. These linkages were used to share information and other support besides money such as skills training. It also facilitated the procurement of quality inputs and equipments. Generally increased productivity on developing farms or land reform farms may be attributed to factors, such as, improved cultivars, greater application of fertilizer and pesticides, more advanced technology, all strongly promoted by well-established relevant linkages.

Table 10: Impact of the projects on communication, networking and linkages (n=47)

Item	Category	Percent
<i>Type of Telephone Used</i>	Land line	30
	Cellular phone	98
<i>Reliability of Telephone Network</i>	Good	77
	Poor	23
<i>Effectiveness of Communication within Projects</i>	Good	96
	Poor	4
<i>Established Linkages</i>	≤5 linkages	94
	≥6 linkages	6

Agricultural extension not only provides skills training but also advises and assist farmers to source some important technical services. They may also facilitate the introduction or adoption of new technologies by farmers. The main link between the LRAD projects and the Provincial Department of Agriculture is the agricultural extension support. The result of the analysis (Table 11) shows that about 62% of the projects received between one and three visits by the agricultural extension officer during the 2009 farming season while 15% of the projects had between 4 and 7 visits by the extension officers. However, 23% of the projects indicated that the extension officers responsible for their area visited the projects on more than seven occasions. Most of the beneficiaries indicated their dissatisfaction with the frequency and the quality of the agricultural extension services. However, the importance of agricultural extension services to the LRAD projects cannot be over-emphasized. A study in Zimbabwe (Owens et al. 2003) found that access to agricultural extension services, defined as receiving one or two or more visits per agricultural year from an extension worker,

increases farm production by 15% in resettlement areas.

Table 11: Agricultural extension visits on the projects

Number of extension visits to projects	Percent
One to three visits	62
4 to 7 visits	15
More than 7 visits	23

Despite the fact that the South African government has devoted considerable energy and expenditure to the process of land and agrarian reform, a broad spectrum of stakeholders agree that some land reform projects are experiencing several challenges, which have led to some farms being abandoned or operating sub-optimally. Presented in Table 12 are the major constraints facing the LRAD projects in the study area.

Table 12: Constraints faced by the LRAD projects in the study area (n = 47)

Type of constraint	Percent
Lack of finance	81
Lack of reliable sources of water	43
Poor/Lack of farm equipment	36.2
Poor fencing	36.2
Lack of farm machinery	32
Lack of farm inputs	30
Lack of irrigation infrastructure	21.3
Drought	21.3
Poor infrastructure	19.1
Lack of electricity	17
Lack of governmental support	15
Lack of marketing information	15
Lack of security	13
Lack of storage facilities	12.8
Poor extension services	12.8
Lack of access to veterinary services	10.6
Lack of skills training	8.5
Lack of skilled labour	8.5
Lack of kraals	8.5
Financial assistance withheld by the DLA	8.5
Lack of transportation	6.4
Group dynamics problems	4.3
Lack of grazing camps	4.3

A study on land reform in the twenty years after independence in older resettlement areas in Zimbabwe (Jacobs 2003) revealed that, some of the land allocated has been abandoned or not fully utilized. This is due to the lack of resources such as fertilizers or tractors, and especially, the lack of access to credit. The problem is "just the question of inputs". Equally, two farms in the

study area between Mafikeng and Lichtenberg have been leased back to some white commercial farmers due to the lack of finance to purchase inputs and production operations. Providing land to beneficiaries without the necessary production support programme will definitely result in serious under utilisation of the agricultural land resource and low productivity. As shown in Table 12, the major constraints faced by the LRAD projects in the study area include among others: lack of finance (81%); lack of reliable sources of water (43%); poor/lack of farm equipment (36.2%); poor fencing (36.2%); lack of farm machinery (32%); lack of farm inputs (30%); lack of irrigation infrastructure (21.3%); and drought (21.3%).

Pivotal to successful farming among others are: reliable source of funding, good underground source of enough water and irrigation infrastructure, reliable and quality farm inputs, equipment and machinery. The majority of the projects (81%) are faced with financial constraints. A critical analysis of the major constraints shows that many if not all of the constraints will be solved if a proper solution is provided to the financial constraints. The issue of unavailable farm equipments, broken fences, lack of farm machinery and farm inputs as well as the lack of irrigation infrastructure can be resolved if the project beneficiaries can access credits at reasonable interest rates with longer flexible terms of payment.

Other constraints that adversely affecting the projects include the lack of market information (15%), poor extension services (12.8%), lack of access to veterinary services (10.6%), lack of skills training (8.5%) and financial assistance withheld by the Department of Rural Development and Land Affairs (15%). A study (SDC 2007) indicates that, provincial departments of agriculture participate in the approval of land redistribution grants but provide little agricultural support to these projects. Inadequate support to the beneficiaries of land reform has been a recurring complaint almost since the inception of the programme. Many studies have shown that beneficiaries experience severe problems accessing services such as training, extension advice, transport and ploughing services, veterinary services, and access to input and produce markets (HSRC 2003; Hall 2004; Lahiff 2007; SDC 2007). Furthermore services that are available to land reform beneficiaries tend to be supplied by provincial departments of agriculture

and a small number of NGOs, but available evidence suggests that these serve only a minority of projects (SDC 2007). The performance of the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP) and the Micro Agricultural Finance Institute of South Africa (MAFISA), on these projects leaves much to be desired. About 15% of the projects in the study area found the administration of their funds by the Department of Rural Development and Land Affairs very poorly executed. They expressed their dissatisfaction regarding the appointment and payment of service providers.

4. CONCLUSION

The fundamental objective of this study was to evaluate the impact of the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) projects on livelihoods of beneficiaries in the Ngaka Modiri Molema district of the North-West Province. Under the ownerships of LRAD beneficiaries, the majority of the projects undertake combinations of livestock, grains and vegetable production. Qualitative and quantitative analyses were performed on the data collected using a structured questionnaire from randomly selected forty-seven LRAD projects in the study area. Graphs, histograms and tables were used to present the results of frequency indicator variables. The results of the analysis showed that some of the key livelihood indicator variables were lowly achieved; such as low quality of infrastructure, few skills training, less contribution to food security, poor savings and financial constraints. The positive aspects revealed by the results of the study include: access to sizeable productive agricultural lands; improved participation of women and youth in farming; household supply of food stuffs from the projects; earning of some form of monthly income from farm produce sales. The major constraints faced by the LRAD projects in the study area include among others: lack of finance; lack of reliable sources of water; poor/lack of farm equipment; poor fencing; lack of farm machinery; lack of farm inputs; lack of irrigation infrastructure; and drought.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

An integrated agrarian reform support programme will go a long way in improving productivity of the projects if it consists of a package in

support services, rural infrastructure and co-operatives. The main function of such unit should be training, acquisition and distribution of agricultural equipment to agrarian project beneficiaries. There should be extension of a special grant to support government's efforts. The issue of unavailable farm equipment, broken fences, lack of farm machinery and farm inputs as well as the lack of irrigation infrastructure can be resolved if the project beneficiaries can access credits at reasonable interest rates with longer flexible terms of payment. The performance of the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP) and the Micro Agricultural Finance Institute of South Africa (MAFISA) should be improved.

REFERENCES

- Buainain M A, da Silveira J M, Souza H M, Magalhães M 1999. Community-based Land Reform Implementation in Brazil: A New Way of Reaching out the Marginalized? *Paper presented at the Global Development Network (GDN) Conference in Bonn, Germany, December 5-8, 1999.*
- Byerlee D, Heisey PW, Hussain SS 1994. Impacts of the training and visit extension system on farmers' knowledge and adoption of technology: Evidence from Pakistan. *Agricultural Economics*, 10(1): 39-47.
- Centre for Development and Enterprise (CDE) 2008. *Land Reform in South Africa: Getting Back on Track*. Transmedit Place, 5 Eton Road, Parktown, Johannesburg 2193, South Africa. ISBN: 978-0-9802628-0-3.
- Cinarao R, Heredia B, Leite S, Medeiros L, Palmeira M 2004. *Impactos dos assentamentos: um estudo sobre o mciorural Brasileiro*. Sao Paulo, Brazil, Editora UNESP.
- Columbia Encyclopedia* 2008. 6th Edition. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Community Agency for Social Enquiry (CASE) 2006. *Assessment of the Status-quo of Settled Land Restitution Claims with a Developmental Component Nationally*. Research Conducted for the Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate, Department of Land Affairs, South Africa.
- Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) 2005. *Review of Communal Property Institutions*. Pretoria: CSIR.
- Deere CD, Leon M 2001. Who owns the land: Gender and land titling programmes in Latin America. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 1(3): 440-467.
- Deininger K, Jin S, Yadav V 2008. Impact of Land Reform on Productivity, Land Value and Human Capital Investment: Household Level Evidence from West Bengal. *Agricultural and Applied Economics Association Series, No. 6277*, July 27-29, 2008, Orlando, Florida.
- Department of Agriculture and Land Affairs 2001. *Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD): A Sub-programme of the Land Redistribution Programme*. Pretoria, South Africa.
- Hall R 2004. *LRAD Rapid Systematic Assessment Survey: Nine Case Studies in the Eastern Cape*. Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape.
- Hoddinott J, Kinsey B, Owens T 2003. The impact of agricultural extension on farm production in resettlement areas of Zimbabwe. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 51: 337-358. Pretoria: Commission on Restitution of Land Rights.
- Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) 2003. *Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development: Case Studies in Three Provinces of South Africa*. Integrated Rural Development.
- Jacobs P 2003. Support for Agricultural Development. *Evaluating Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa, Series No. 4*. Cape Town. Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies. School of Government, University of the Western Cape.
- Lahiff E 2007. Willing buyer, willing seller, South Africa's failed experiment in marketed agrarian reform. *Third World Quarterly*, 28: 8.
- Sustainable Development Consortium (SDC) 2007. *Clarification of the Numbers of Claims and Land Reform Projects to be Settled or Achieved*. Cape Town, SDC.
- World Bank 2004. *Monitoring and Evaluation, Some Tools, Methods and Approaches*. 2nd Edition. Washington, DC: World Bank.