

The Complexities of Food (in)Security in Amathole Municipality, South Africa

Ncube Ntombizehlile¹ and Pius T. Tanga^{2*}

University of Fort Hare, PB X1314, Alice-5700, South Africa

Telephone: + 27 40602 2195, Fax: +27 40602 2553

E-mail: ¹<ntombinto@gmail.com>, ²<ptangwe@ufh.ac.za>, ²<tanga8_2000@yahoo.co.uk>

KEYWORDS Factors. Food Shortages. Global. Household. Poverty

ABSTRACT The aim of this study was to examine the complexities surrounding food insecurity of the rural-household dwellers in the Goshen community, Amathole Municipality in South Africa. Quantitative method of data collection was utilized in the study. The data was collected using household survey questionnaires. The findings show that they are numerous factors that affect food security of the inhabitants in this rural area. Amongst them being the lack of resources which remain as one of the factors that are affecting food security at household level. The results painted a bleak picture whereby, most of the Goshen inhabitants are severely food insecure. The study, therefore, recommends that the government should encourage people to come up with innovative ideas that can transact in the marketplace and for the Goshen residents to initiate agricultural-related enterprises through the provision of a package that would motivate households to participate in agricultural activities.

INTRODUCTION

Food security has been a global concern for a considerable period of time. For the international community, managing of food security is a vital component in the endeavour to achieve the first of the Millennium Development Goals (FAO 2012). It is beyond dispute that many countries, and particularly countries in the African continent, frequently face drastic shortages of food. In terms of policy, governments have an obligation to address food crises in order to guarantee the safety and well-being of their citizens, but most people continue to suffer from shortages of food in those countries in which food crises persist. For this reason the issue of food shortages remains a key global concern, particularly in the agendas of the organisations which fall under the auspices of the United Nations. Poverty and food security continue to constitute issues which have serious and, in many cases, dire implications for many of the people of South Africa, despite the fact that Section 27 of the South African Bill of Rights (1996) states that everyone has a right to sufficient food and water. Moreso, Pereira and Drimie (2016) state that the challenges of food insecurity make it difficult to achieve the constitutional right of all South Africans to adequate food, despite national and international commitments

to meeting these rights. In most developing countries, the poor spend over half of their income simply providing food for themselves, and, in a great many instances, with considerable difficulty (FAO 2012).

Food security in a community may be said to exist when all of the people, at all times, have access to sufficient nutritious food, which is safe to consume and which meets both their dietary needs and their food preferences, for an active and healthy life (FAO 1996, 2002). In general terms, the concept of food security refers to the nature of the accessibility to food, the availability of food and the sustainability of the food supply. For Misselhorn et al. (2012), increased food production remains a cornerstone strategy in the effort to alleviate food insecurity. Although, in global terms, food production has kept pace with demand, at present approximately one billion people in the world do not have enough food to eat and a further billion lack proper and adequate nutrition (Misselhorn et al. 2012). According to the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations, it has been found that although there has been a reduction in the number of people who are undernourished during the period covered by the past 20 years, the number of people suffering from chronic undernourishment is still unacceptably high, and the eradication of hunger remains a major global problem which requires further attention (FAO 2012). Food insecurity continues to escalate in

*Address for correspondence to

many countries and the rate of development in many developing countries continues to be hampered by food shortages. However, reasons behind the persistence of hunger and malnutrition in South Africa are complex and interrelated, economic, socio-political and related to agro-food issues (Pereira and Drimie 2016).

Food shortages have become more distressing due to de-agrarianisation, whereas food production has increasingly lagged behind population growth (Misselhorn et al. 2012; Ncube et al. 2014). However, agriculture is seen as the means to address the global food crisis and alleviate poverty, particularly in Africa (NEPAD 2009). In the developing nations, agriculture plays a vital role as it provides food for the 800 million children, women and men who are malnourished (FAO 2011). On the contrary de-agrarianisation is taking place and threatening food accessibility in many nations (Ncube et al. 2014). Oldewage-Theron et al. (2006) also put an emphasis that there is an urgent need in South Africa for research on the underlying causes of malnutrition and food insecurity as there is limited empirical data for the other groups in society like the females, males and the elderly.

South Africa is one of the countries that are said to be food secured at the national level, but this notion is debatable when it comes to the situation at household level. According to Koch (2011) the South African nation is unlikely to feature at the top of the international dialogues on food security. South Africa is a net-exporter of agricultural commodities; it is not landlocked but despite these positive indicators more than 14 percent of its population is vulnerable to food insecurity. HSRC (2004) reckons that 25 percent of the children aged 6 years old have developmental stunted by malnutrition. According to De Klerk et al. (2004), despite this national status of being food secured, it has been estimated that about 1.5 million South African children are malnourished, with 14 million people prone to food insecurity, 43 percent of the households suffer from 'food poverty' (National Treasury 2003). Thus, food security is still a glaring problem that has to be improved from a national perspective.

Problem Statement

The issue of food insecurity is a glaring concern affecting the international community, es-

pecially the developing countries. This concern of food security has left many nations and communities concerned about how the problem can be resolved. Although policies and various measures have been set to address food insecurity, the situation hasn't abated. They are various factors that are still impinging household food security in Goshen. Despite the enforcement of the social welfare support system in South Africa, still the percentage of people who are food insecure is still too high. Poverty and hunger, as stated in the Millennium Development Plan, number one is still an important issue that has to be addressed at all levels (internationally, regionally, nationally and at the community level). Thus, focus on poverty and food security is still one of the top issues that are affecting the people of South Africa. Therefore, this research examines the factors that affect food security of the rural household dwellers in Goshen and thereafter brings forth possible recommendations for policy environment.

Literature Review

In order to assess food security in any particular context, it is important to establish exactly what the term connotes within the context of the study. Food security is a multidimensional term which includes the nature of access to food and the availability and sustainability of the supply of food, which can be problematic, even in countries which are said to enjoy food security at the national level. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) (2002), the discussions which were held to solve international problems concerning the availability of food in the mid-1970s led the concept of food security being formulated as a crucial one, indicating a greater need for remedial action. The FAO (2002) quoted in the United Nations' "Technology and Innovation Report" (2010: 37) states that food security "... exists when all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life." Of great significance in this definition is its focus on the food security of individual people, which implies food security at the household or family level.

It is imperative to note that global food situation is redefined by various factors such as population growth, availability of arable land,

water, climate change, food availability and food accessibility (Premanandh 2011). To achieve food security, three essential and vital criteria need to be met and these include food availability (supply), food affordability (pricing) and food accessibility (demand) (FAO 2011). Mukute et al. (2002), assert that, what these three facets of food security caution against is that on one hand, food may be available in a community but unaffordable to people due to high prices. Furthermore, food may be available and inexpensive in a community but not meeting the nutritional and qualitative nature of providing all household members with energy needed to live active, healthy and productive lives. According to Rosegrant, Cline (2003) global food security will remain a worldwide concern for the next 50 years and beyond. Climate variations and HIV/AIDS are also crucial factors that are said to be affecting food security in many regions.

South Africa is largely deemed a food secure nation producing enough staple foods or having the capacity to import food, if needed in order to meet the basic nutritional requirements of its population (FAO 2012). South Africa is self-sufficient in most foods, but a large portion of its population doesn't benefit from the resources. Hendricks (2005) postulates that despite the fact that South Africa is known to be nationally food secure, 73 percent of the country's households experience food insecurity. This, however, shows that they are various factors that still affect the food security of the South African inhabitants. This is despite the political and economic advances made since 1994, South Africa continues to experience major challenges of poverty, unemployment and steep increases in food and fuel prices and these factors relegate the country's inhabitants to food insecurity (Koch 2009). According to Labadarios et al. (2009) poverty, unemployment, steep increases in food and fuel prices are adverse conditions that have relegated ordinary South Africans to vulnerable situations as they are struggling to meet the basic household needs.

The South African government has come up with various measures to resolve the issue of food insecurities and amongst the measures being the social grants system. This social grant system is a measure that has been used so as to wipe away disparities of the apartheid era and boost food security for the families. Although this is a noble act by the government, the simple

transfer of funds to the victims of poverty or the food insecure is not enough to sustain the recipients let alone the whole family (Tanga 2007).

Food insecurity is still alarming in many regions and the Eastern Cape Province is said to be heavily struck by poverty. According to Clara (2007:5), 'De-organization has reached alarming levels in the Eastern Cape with rural households intensely dependent on social grants for survival.' Agriculture has been one of the factors that are there to address food security, but the recent decline in agricultural activities has a negative impact on household food security (Ncube et al. 2014). Agricultural activities which had been the indigenous pursuits for the African people's food systems have declined due to the state support in the form of grants. In a way the state fund, in the form of grants has created a dependency syndrome as many are no longer motivated to farm, but depend on the grants for survival (Clara and Du Toit 2007).

Theoretical Framework

The study anchored on the sustainable livelihoods (SL) approach which appeared in the research literature in the 1980's. This Sustainable Livelihoods idea was first introduced by the Brundtland Commission on Environment and Development. This approach produces a holistic view on what resources are important to the poor and not only looking at the physical and natural resources but also considering the social and human capital. SL is a person-centred approach (Krantz 2001). SL approach asserts that a livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stress and shocks, maintain its capabilities, while not undermining the natural resource base. Sustainability is the main objective of the sustainable development approach (Krantz 2001). However, this SL approach is going to be helpful in research as a guide to dig deeper into the causes of household food insecurity and to further look deeper into the sustainability of the Old Age Grant in boosting food security in South Africa.

METHODOLOGY

Population and Sampling strategy

Quantitative research method was used in this study. The population in this study refers to the Goshen community members who are Old

Age Grant holders. A survey was the chosen method for this study. For the survey sample, stratified random sampling was utilized and this helped the researcher to stratify the population in a way that the population within a stratum is homogeneous with respect to the characteristic on the basis of which it is stratified (Kumar 2011). Thus a sample of 127 breadwinners and also grant recipients within the Goshen community was sampled.

Data Collection Method

A survey questionnaire was the tool utilized as a means to collect data. Particularly, a Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS) measurement tool was used to collect data. This tool provides the means for food security programs to easily measure the impact of their programs on access, utilization and the nutritional quality of household food insecurity. Thus, in light of this research tool was utilized, so as to explain further the factors that affect food security at household level.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

For quantitative analysis a pre-coding book was used. After data collection it was coded using the household Food Insecurity Access Scale Score. There after calculations were done so as to determine the levels of food (in) security. Inferential statistical was then used in this study. This quantitative data was presented in graphs, tables and charts as a way to summarize the results. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyse the data.

RESULTS

Biographical Information

The study was conducted in Goshen community which falls under the Amathole District Municipality. The survey questionnaire was administered to 127 respondents of which 127 managed to complete their questionnaires fully. Of the 127 respondents, 60 percent were females and 40 percent were males. Of the 127 respondents, all of them were black and also Old Age Grant recipients. Fifty-six out of the 127 were between 60 and 65 years of age while the rest were almost equally distributed between “65-

70” and “above 70” years of age. These interviewed respondents were breadwinners in their various homes the majority of these breadwinners had a low level of education with some who never went to school. The findings revealed that just above eighty percent (102 out of 127) of the respondents had not gone beyond primary level of education, while 18.11 percent had gone up to secondary school and one respondent had attended tertiary education. The majority (55 out of 127) of the respondents reported that three to four people live in their households while only about 13.4 percent reported that more than six occupants stayed in their households. These households constituted of extended family members.

Factors that Affect Household Food Security

The findings reveal that many factors affect household food security and include household size, depending upon the breadwinner, meal consumption per day and participate in income generating activities.

Household Size

The respondents were asked how many people lived in, their households from the time they started receiving the grant income. For 28 percent the figure was between one and two members. The largest group, comprising 43 percent of the respondents, 55 out of 127, reported that between three and four people lived in their households. A further 15 percent were living in households shared by between five and six people, and 14 percent were found to live in households with more than six people. Table 1 summarises this distribution.

Table 1: Number of household members

<i>Number of household members</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
1-2	36	28.35
3-4	55	43.31
5-6	19	14.96
More than 6	17	13.39
Total	127	100

Dependency Upon the Breadwinner

Table 2 provides a graphic representation of the various reasons behind the dependency of

members of households, other than the intended beneficiaries, on the grant income. It was found that 68.78 percent of the respondents confirmed that one of the chief reasons for their dependency upon the breadwinner's support since most of these breadwinners were also grant recipients was unemployment. A further 32.22 percent did not regard the fact that the other members of their households were unemployed as a problem, despite the increased pressure on the recipient of the grant holder or main provider for the family to share the money with the other members of their households. Of these respondents, 10.23 percent were taking care of orphans, whereas 89.76 percent did not have orphans in their households.

Table 2: Reasons for depending upon the breadwinner's source of income on the part of members of households other than intended beneficiaries.

<i>Reasons for depending upon breadwinner's source of income</i>	<i>Yes %</i>	<i>No %</i>
Unemployment	68.78	32.22
Orphan	10.23	89.76
Grandchildren	48.03	51.97
Sickness or disability	22.05	77.95

It was found that 48.03 percent of the respondents took care of grandchildren, while the remaining 51.97 percent did not have children or grandchildren. When they were asked about illness or disabilities among the members of their households, 22.05 percent of the respondents indicated that a member of their households suffered from an illness or a disability, while 77.95 percent gave a negative response to the question.

Meals Consumed Per Day

The factors that affect food security were also measured by looking at the number of meals that are consumed per day. On the number of meals per day that their households had had one week prior to the administration of this questionnaire, about 56 percent of the respondents reported having had at least three meals per day, just over 94 percent had had at least two meals per day and all had had at least one meal per day. However, this information did not provide that exact diet that these people consumed.

Participation in Income Generating Activities

Participation in income generating activities was a key factor that was investigated. Thus, a question was posed, inquiring whether the respondents were involved in any income generating activities as it is one of the measures that people take so as to boost food security. However, the results show that 79 percent of the respondents were not involved in any income generating activity and thus leaving 21 percent of the respondents involved in income generating activities. In other words one in every four respondents reported a member participating in an income-generating activity. This in a way shows little participation in other supplementary measures to boost the income earned in a particular household. This little participation in income generating activities has a negative impact on food accessibility as more pressure is placed on the grant income alone.

Causes of Food Shortages

When asked about the causes of food shortages, 111 of 127 respondents, or 87.4 percent, cited inflation as the main cause, followed by a lack of agricultural production, which was cited by 48.0 percent. Poor salaries were cited as the least significant cause of food shortage, which may very well be owing to the fact that the respondents were elderly and mainly retired on the grounds of age. Table 3 provides a graphic representation of the way in which the respondents responded to the question.

Table 3: Causes of food shortages

<i>Causes of food shortages</i>	<i>Yes %</i>	<i>No %</i>
Climatic variations	27.56	72.44
Lack of water	36.22	63.78
Lack of farm inputs	48.03	51.97
Grant and inflation	87.40	12.60
Increase in household size	37.01	62.99
Death of a bread winner	20.47	79.53

Household Food Insecurity Access Scale Results

The HFIAS measuring tool used in this study used 9 frequency-of-occurrence questions which asked how often conditions of food insecurity had occurred during the previous four weeks. The access-related condition of house-

hold food insecurity was used as a means of interpreting the results which had been collected. These indicators provide specific disaggregated information about the behaviour and perceptions of the households surveyed. The percentage of the households which responded affirmatively to each question, regardless of the frequency of the conditions experienced, were measured.

It was found that the respondents experienced the conditions at various levels of severity. They were asked whether they were worried that their households would not have sufficient food and the findings showed that 64.57 percent of the respondents were worried "often", with 28.35 percent saying that the condition occurred "sometimes" and 7.09 percent maintained that it was "rare."

Lack of Resources

The results also showed that 54.33 percent of the respondents felt that they were "often" faced with a situation in which their households could not eat the kinds of food which they preferred, owing to a lack of resources. 42.52 percent experienced this condition "sometimes", 1.57 percent maintained that it did occur, but on "rare" occasions and the remaining 1.57 percent felt that they did not experience conditions of this sort ever. The results also revealed that 50.39 percent of the households in the study experienced a condition in which they had a limited variety of food, owing to a lack of resources, while 42.52 percent said that they experienced this kind of scenario "sometimes", for a further 3.15 percent it was "rare", and 2.36 percent said that they never experienced a state of affairs of this sort.

In addition, 39.37 percent of the households "often" ate food which they would not choose to eat as a result of a lack of resources, 53.54 percent said that this happened "sometimes", 5.51 percent said that it was "rare" and 1.57 percent "never" experienced this condition. From the results it is evident that despite the fact that the households were worried about not having enough to eat or a lack of resources, 63.78 percent said that they "never" experienced the condition of having no food at all in their households as a result of a lack of resources, while 7.09 percent said that they "rarely" experienced the condition of not having food at all. For 19.69

percent the reply was "sometimes" and 9.45 percent responded that they experienced this condition "often". It was found that 53.54 percent of the households did not experience the condition of going to bed hungry owing to having no resources, while 17.32 percent said that this condition was "rare", 22.83 percent said it happened "sometimes" and 6.40 percent experienced this condition "often".

DISCUSSION

There are various factors that affect food security at the household level and they include: household size, depending upon the breadwinner, causes of food shortages, lack of resources and climatic variations. The results of the t-tests revealed that an increase in household size had a significant effect in relegating the beneficiary together with his or her household to a food insecure state ($\chi^2 = 12.8916$, $p = 0.0049$) indicating a high significance level.

The lack of resources was identified as one of the core factors hindering adequate food security at the household level. Lack of resources led most of the people to eating un-preferred kinds of food (monotonous trend), having a limited variety of food and more people to worry a lot about their food security. These are the factors that have been noted amongst the majority of the people in Goshen as they affect food security at household level. Thus, the results further pointed that these respondents had anxiety and were uncertain about their food supply, which indicates unsustainable food supply. This is supported by the Sustainable livelihood approach that views sustainability as the main drive of the approach thus, in this instance the livelihood assets were affected leaving the inhabitants of Goshen food insecure. The results also revealed that there were some who were affected by insufficient food intake which had physical consequences that included going to bed hungry, at times sleeping without food, but responses to these factors were minimal. According to Pereira and Drimie (2016) the challenges of food security continue to make it difficult to achieve the constitutional right of all South Africans to have adequate food, despite national and international commitments to address to meet the rights to food.

The results of this study show that the external threats that the residents of Goshen are

exposed, like unemployment, death of a parent, are amongst other forces that relegate people to vulnerabilities and thus as an adjustment measure, they end up in the care of the elderly since they have a source of income to make a living. These situations put more pressure on the front and affirmed in the words postulated by Tanga (2008) that the grant income is an insufficient measure to cater for one person and let alone the whole family. An adverse weather condition is also a factor impinging on food security, as shown by the findings of this study. The respondents commented on the adverse weather conditions that they were subjected to as part of the contributing factors towards low agricultural production. Interesting to note is the fact that those who stated these results were only a few and those are the same people who had gardens in their homes. Therefore, it can be highlighted that the dry spells which the community experienced, to some extent has led the people to leave some parts of the land fallow as they do not reap much under such climatic variations. However, this factor has discouraged some of the fellow community members from practising agriculture as they also lack farm input and reliable donors who can fund their projects. In addition, the decline in agricultural activities in this community might also be attributed to de-agrarianisation. This decline is even affecting the attempts for some folks to have food secure homes or even to have food produce that can ease the pressure on the grant income and avert food insecurity (Ncube et al. 2014). This has affected the sustainable livelihood assets which are required to make a living. These assets are the basis or foundation of the sustainable livelihoods framework and they constitute the means by which the autonomy of rural households (Carney 1998). Natural capital in this instance was affected by the weather patterns in Goshen village.

The odds of household with a garden were approximately 3 times likely to indicate that they were affected by climatic variations as compared to those who were never involved in agricultural activities (95% Confidence Limits = (1.2997, 6.7644)). When further calculations were done the odds of a household with a garden were 0.4 times likely to indicate that they lack farm inputs as compared to those without gardens (95% Confidence Limits = (0.2207, 0.9138)). Furthermore, calculations were made and households with gardens were 2.2 times likely to indicate

that they had unemployed occupants as compared to households with employed household members (95% Confidence Limits = (1.0667, 4.7121)). According to Ncube et al. (2014) agricultural activities have significantly dwindled, threatening the food security of many household.

Little or poor participation and investment of grant income in income generating activities has also been revealed by the study as a factor hindering food security at the household level in the study area. The results outlined that about one in every four respondents reported a member participating in an income-generating activity. This shows that there is little involvement in income generating activities that can boost or supplement the grant income within a household. The results show that the external threats that the residents of Goshen are exposed, like unemployment, death of a parent, are amongst other forces that relegate people to vulnerabilities and thus as an adjustment measure, they end up in the care of the elderly since they have a source of income to make a living. These situations put more pressure on the grant recipients. According to Cooper (2009), the human asset includes the skills, knowledge, ability to work and good health which enables people to pursue various strategies in order to secure a livelihood. However, this is the chief asset owned by the poor, but in this study it was mainly not used to forge a livelihood and this lead to the people depending on the grant.

The chi-squared tests that were run in order to see significant associations amongst various variables. These tests statistically proved that there is a significant association between lack of participation in income generating activities and the respondents being faced with food shortages just before month end (Chi-sq = 5.9222, $p=0.0150$). This significance noted in the people who are not involved in any income generating activity and food shortages indicates that in such households a lot of pressure is placed on the income or grant received by the breadwinner to an extent that it limits the attempts of having food secure homes.

Correlations Between Demographic Variables and Asset Value Variables

The Chi-squared results also showed significant associations between demographic variables and asset value variables. There is another

er interdependent significant relationship that was noted between the respondents who had a garden with elderly female respondents owning a garden (Chi-sq=10.9331, $p = 0.0273$), households with unemployed member also being involved (Chi-sq = 4.6167, $p = 0.0317$), orphans also participation in gardening (Chi-sq = 4.3230, $p = 0.0376$). However, drawing from the theory of the Sustainable livelihoods approach, the human asset refers to the skills, knowledge, and the ability to labour and good health that enables people to pursue different livelihood strategies and achieve their livelihood objectives (Cooper 2009). Thus, this human capital is now used mainly by unemployed females with the main objective to boost their food security levels, but still the results show that none in Goshen community is either food secure or mildly food secure, instead they are faced with a challenge of food shortages. The fact that women were the ones who were mainly involved in gardening and unemployed shows the division of labour that is in Goshen. The chi-squared tests also reveal other significant association between the respondents who were participating in income generating activities and the few respondents who were owning small businesses (Chi-sq=10.7282, $p = 0.0011$). These results, however, show little involved in income generating activities; despite the fact that most people are severely food insecure.

HFIAS Measurement Tool Variables' Means by Class HFIAS Category Variables

Using the HFIAS measurement tool the households were grouped into four categories of household food insecurity (access) namely: food secures category one, mildly food insecure in category two, moderately food insecure being category three and severely food insecure is a category four. Categorization looked at how the respondents experienced the various conditions of food insecurity. Out of the four categories created, respondents fell in either Category 3 (Moderately Food Insecure) or Category 4 (Severely Food Insecure). Forty-four percent of the respondents fell into Category 3 (moderately food insecure) while 56percent fell into Category 4 (severely food insecure). Respondents in category 3 and category 4 reported a significantly more orientation to worrying that the household will not have enough food

($t=2.39$, $p\text{-value}=0.0183$). Respondents in Category 4 (severely food insecure) significantly experienced the "conditions" like sleeping without food ($t= -9.95$, $p\text{-value}= <.0001$), going to bed hungry ($t=-13.6$, $p\text{-value}= <.0001$) and spending days out without food ($t=7.16$, $p\text{-value}= <.0001$). The reasons behind these scores in category 3 and 4 might be due to lack of resources and sustainable supplementary measures to curb food insecurity. When looking at the Sustainable Livelihood approach it is evident that the people of Goshen rely more on one asset which is the financial capital and more strain on this capital has caused most of the households to end up food insecure as it is overburdened.

These households were categorized as increasing food insecure as they responded affirmatively to more severe conditions and experiencing those conditions more frequent. The respondents who fell in category 3 scored lesser than the category 4 respondents. This indicates that despite being food insecure, category 3 respondents indicated to be affected by food insecurity at a lesser extent than category 4 respondents. Category 3 respondents scored a significantly lower mean HFIAS Score as compared to Category 4 respondents ($t=-7.36$, $p\text{-value}= <.0001$). The lower scores in category 3 however, shows the lesser severity of food insecurity conditions that affected these respondents, but worry seemed to be a highly significant factor that was affecting the category 3 and category 4. More-so, worrying that the household will not have enough food was a significant factor ($t\text{-test } t=2.39$, $p\text{-value}=0.0183$) affecting the respondents in the study. Sustainable livelihood approach looks at the sustainability of the measures taken so as to forge a livelihood and states that a livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks, maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets while not undermining the natural resource base (Scoones 2009). However the fact that worry amongst the respondents was of high significance also shows that the livelihood of the Goshen villagers was unsustainable.

There were highly significant differences (see t -values and p -values in the Table 3) between Category 3 respondents' mean scores and Category 4 respondents' mean scores with no respondents in Category 3 having gone without food for the past 30 days. These factors in a way

show that category 3 respondents were likely to be affected by anxiety about lack of resources and insufficient quality of food. On the other hand the category 4 respondents were burdened by anxiety caused by their uncertainties about lack of resources, insufficient quality of food and even insufficient food intake which has got its physical consequences. According to FAO (2011), food security is built on three pillars that must be satisfied for it to be met. The three pillars are essential to the attainment of food security and they include food availability, food access and food use. However, from the results of this study category 4 respondents' show that food security pillars were all not met nor satisfied thus leaving these respondents severely food insecure.

CONCLUSION

From the findings it may be concluded that, despite the social welfare strategy of providing the Old Age Grant to the elderly, it is not a sufficiently effective means of either combating poverty or ensuring food security at the household level. This is borne out by the fact that in a relatively large sample of 127 randomly selected respondents in the community, not one was found to be remotely food security, with most being found, by empirical measurement using an internationally accepted scale, to be severely food insecure, with fewer relatively better off in the moderately food insecure category. Lack of adequate resources, limited variety of food and no access to food are amongst the factors that were found to be having a negative effect on food security of the Goshen households. However, success in poverty alleviation and food security will surely require more than a social grant alone for it to be achieved.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study and the ensuing conclusions, the following are recommended:

- There is a need for policy makers to rethink and to consider very seriously the sustainability of the policies which they seek to implement in order to eliminate food insecurity. There is a pressing need in Goshen for community development projects to be established, in accordance with achievable

and sustainable objectives, in order to progress towards the elimination of food insecurity.

- The social work profession could also help the people to tap their natural resources in order to be able to use them for survival. This could be done by setting up co-operatives or start-up community projects. Social Workers are in a position to ensure that the members of the community start projects in order to sustain themselves, that these projects are sustainable, and that the people receive training in order to improve their efficiency.
- There is a need for a paradigm shift in the way in which incomes from the Grant are handled in households. People need to be made conscious of the fact that the income from the Grant should not be seen as the main source of income for their households, and of the need look for other sources of income. A change from their present mindset would also help people to become involved in other activities or projects which could assist them to curb food insecurity.
- There is need for people to be encouraged to come up with innovative ideas that have a transactable value in the marketplace as this could help them to improve their worth.

REFERENCES

- Carney D 1998. Implementing the sustainable rural livelihoods approach. In: D Carney (Ed.): *Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: What Contribution Can We Make?* London: DFID.
- Clara J, Du Toit A 2007. Adverse Incorporation and Agrarian Policy in South Africa. Unpublished Conference Paper. South Africa. From <<http://www.afesis.org.za/Sustainable-Settlements-Articles/agrarianisation-or-de-agrarianisation-in-the-eastern-cape-the-implications-for-job-creation-in-the-agricultural-sector>> (Retrieved on 26 February 2013).
- Cooper N 2009. Promoting sustainable livelihoods: Making welfare reform truly personal. *A Journal of Policy Review*, 17(2): 171-182.
- De Klerk M, Drimie S, Aliber M, Mini S, Mokoena R, Randela R, Modiselle S, Vogel C, De Swardt C, Kirsten J 2004. Food Security in South Africa: Key Policy Issues for the Medium Term. *Position Paper for the National Treasury*. Pretoria: Human Science Research Center.
- FAO 2012. *The State of Food Insecurity in the World: Economic Growth is Necessary but Not Sufficient to Accelerate the Reduction of Hunger and Malnutrition*. Rome: FAO.

- Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) 2002. The State of Food Insecurity in the World, 2001. Rome. From <<http://www.fao.org/docrep/005/y4671e/y4671e06.htm>> (Retrieved on 26 February 2013).
- Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) 2011. The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2011. From <<http://www.fao.org/docrep/014/i2330e/i2330e.pdf>> (Retrieved on 14 February 2011).
- Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) 2004. *The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2004: Monitoring Progress Towards the World Food Summit and Millennium Development Goals*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization.
- Grobler W 2016. Perceptions of poverty: A study of food secure and food insecure household in an urban area, South Africa. *Journal of Procedia Economic and Finance*, 35: 224-231.
- Labadarios D, Davids JD, Mchiza Z, Weir-Smith G 2009. *The Assessment of Food Insecurity in South Africa*. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.
- Misselhorn A, Aggarwal P, Ericksen P, Gregory P, Horn-Phathanot Help Age International, Ingram L, Wiebe K 2012. A vision for attaining food security. *A Journal of Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 4: 7-17.
- Mukute M, Mnyulwa D, Kimakwa S 2002. *Seed Security for Food Security*. Harare: Pelum.
- National Treasury 2003. Intergovernmental Fiscal Review. National Treasury, Republic of South Africa. From <<http://www.treasury.gov.za/publications/igfr/2003/title.pdf>> (Retrieved on 16 March 2013).
- Ncube N, Tanga PT, Bhumira B 2014. The impact of de-agrarianisation on the socioeconomic well-being of rural inhabitants in South Africa. *Journal of Human Ecology*, 48(3): 399-406.
- Oldewage-Theron WH, Dicks WG, Napier CE 2006. Poverty, household food insecurity and nutrition: Coping strategies in an informal settlement in the Vaal Triangle, South Africa. *Journal of the Royal Institute of Public Health*, 120(1): 795-804.
- Pereira L, Drimie S 2016. Governance arrangements for the future food system: Addressing complexity in South Africa. *Journal of Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, 58(4): 18-31.
- Tanga PT 2007. Social grants and the fight against poverty in South Africa. *Journal of the Faculty of Social Sciences*, 11(1 and 2): 1-20.
- Tanga PT 2008. The impact of old age pension on household and social relationships. *Review of Southern African Studies*, 12(1 and 2): 184 -215.

Paper received for publication on July 2016
Paper accepted for publication on November 2016