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ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to examine the impact of the Old Age Grant on boosting the food security of the rural-household dwellers in the Goshen community in the Amathole Municipality in South Africa. The study investigated the extent to which the Old Age Grant ensures the food security of its beneficiaries at the household level. This study was conducted in the Goshen Community, a rural area in the Eastern Cape. Methodological triangulation was adopted for this study, in that a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods of collecting data was employed. The data was collected by making use of household survey questionnaires and focus group discussions.

The findings show that inhabitants of this rural area face numerous challenges, as the grant is not sufficient to provide food security to their households. The results revealed that the grant contributes towards household food security to a certain extent, but that it does not eliminate poverty. It was found that although the Old Age Grant does have its positive aspects, as it helps to provide people with food, its main drawback was made evident by the fact that it does not enable its beneficiaries to achieve independence from the grant system, as most of them never attain food security. The results presented a bleak picture of the state of food insecurity in the Goshen community, in that it was found that most of the inhabitants of Goshen suffer acutely as a result of food insecurity. Consequently, the study recommends that the government should encourage the residents of Goshen to initiate enterprises related to agriculture by means of an initiative to motivate households to participate in agriculture. In addition, it is recommended that the government should develop
proactive measures, and it is quite apparent that there is a need for policy makers to pay careful attention to the sustainability of the policies concerning food security which they seek to implement.
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CHAPTER ONE
GENERAL OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

1.1 Background to the study

Food security has been a global concern for a considerable period of time. For the international community, the 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 wellbeing 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. In most developing countries, the poor spend over half of their incomes 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, Aggrwal, Ericksen, Gregary, Horn-Phathanothai, Ingram and Wiebe (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 many countries and the rate of development in many developing countries continues to be hampered by food shortages.

South Africa is one of the countries in which food security is said to obtain at the national level, but this assessment is debatable when food security at the household level is investigated. According to De Klerk et al. (2004), despite the fact that South Africa enjoys the national status of having food security, it has been estimated that approximately 1,5 million South African children are malnourished, with 14 million people being perpetually on the brink of food insecurity and 43% of households suffering from ‘food poverty’ (National Treasury, 2003). Food insecurity continues to haunt a significantly large sector of the South African population, and the resolution of the crisis engendered by it is vital for the health of the country as a whole.
Food insecurity affects the most vulnerable groupings in society, such as households headed by women and the elderly. Accordingly, it is of great importance to pay particular attention to the social profile of elderly people, people of 60 years of age or older, as they constitute a group which is particularly affected by food insecurity. It is imperative to note that in South Africa people of this age group were born into a system where the majority of them were deprived of education, proper employment and socio-economic opportunities, all of which conspired to relegate them to a chronic cycle of poverty (Makiwane and Kwizera, 2006).

However, various strategies to eradicate food insecurity have been put in place and social protection strategies are being implemented by many governmental bodies as a means of counteracting its effects. In South Africa a strategic framework for action in order to achieve food security was first outlined in the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP, 1994), where food security was given priority and identified as a basic human need (Government Gazette, 1994).

As a measure to prevent food insecurity, the South African government implemented the Social Assistance Act of 2004. This Act regulates the payment of social assistance grants and provides other relief measures. This social grant system is designed to improve and to augment the livelihoods of low income households or individuals, in order to avert poverty and food insecurity (Oliver and Kalula, 2004; Tanga, 2008). In addition, the Old Age Grant is a form of social assistance given to elderly people in recognition of the fact that they constitute a vulnerable group in
society, having special needs and who are most likely to be adversely affected by food insecurity (Statistics South Africa, 2011; Gutura and Tanga, 2013). Although this humanitarian strategy has been implemented by the government in order to assist the elderly, the main challenges faced by recipients of Old Age Grants centre on accessibility to food, the means to produce it and to cater adequately for their households. In addition, the role of elderly people in households has changed, mainly as a result of labour migration, poverty and HIV/AIDS. In a great many instances, although families are no longer able to cater for the needs of elderly family members, the elderly are expected to play an active role in supporting their families with the grants which they receive (Tanga, 2008). Accordingly, the other members of households tend to depend upon the Old Age Grant for survival (Statistics South Africa, 2011). According to Tanga (2007), despite the efforts by the government to provide social assistance and to institute other measures in order to curb poverty, this situation does not seem to be abating, and the grants constitute a fiscal burden for the government.

1.2 Problem statement

While the issue of food insecurity is of great concern to the international community, its adverse effects are felt particularly by the developing countries, where financial constraints tend to make the extent of the problem far greater than it usually is in developed nations. Although policies such as the social grant system have been implemented, these measures are nevertheless insufficient to curb food insecurity. According to Tanga (2007) and Tanga and Tangwe (2013), it has been revealed that
none of the grants is sufficient to maintain the recipients of the grant, let alone their families.

The Old Age Grant, along with other types of grants, has produced a false and cosmetic impression of food security, and does not provide a durable solution to the problems of disadvantaged groups in society, such as the elderly. This is the result of ever-increasing social responsibilities in families being placed on the elderly and the expectations for them to provide for their households, impoverishing them, owing to the small size of their grants. This situation inevitably brings health problems, and the lack of a reliable supply of food further fuels intergenerational poverty.

In some cases, the grants system has served to dislocate people from their earlier economic pursuits, such as agriculture (Ncube, Tanga and Bhumira, 2014). In the case of Goshen it has resulted in the people becoming wholly dependent on cash transfers from the government to provide for their needs. Although the grants are being administered, there is still a limited understanding of the dynamics pertaining to the recipients of grants and their food security status (Sekhampu, 2013). The income grant system does not provide sufficient money to cover the needs of the beneficiaries, as the beneficiaries are not the only ones who are dependent on the money. This situation has adverse consequences for both the elderly and their households, as it results in their being unable to buy the nutritious food needed for a healthy life.
The grants system lacks a proactive strategy to link the beneficiaries of social grants to opportunities for economic activity. Despite the enforcement of the social welfare support system in South Africa, the percentage of people who are affected by food insecurity is still too high. As has been articulated by the first goal of the Millennium Development Plan, it is imperative that poverty and hunger be eradicated at all levels of human society, including the international, regional, national and community levels. This research seeks to examine and to assess the contribution which the Old Age Grant makes towards resolving the problem of food insecurity, and on the basis of its findings, possibly, to make recommendations for the formulation of policy in the future.

1.3 Aim and objectives of the study

The aim of this study is to examine the impact of the Old Age Grant on boosting food security among rural-household dwellers in the Goshen community in South Africa. With this aim as its brief, the study seeks to investigate the extent to which the Old Age Grant provides food security to its beneficiaries at the household level. In order to achieve this aim, the following specific objectives were formulated:

- To find out whether the Old Age Grant brings food security to its beneficiaries.
- To investigate the factors which affect household food security in the Goshen community.
- To investigate the other survival strategies which are employed in order to supplement the Old Age Grant as a means of boosting household food security.
1.4 Research questions

This study seeks to answer the following research questions:

- To what extent does the Old Age Grant enable its beneficiaries to achieve food security?
- What are the factors which affect food security at the household level in Goshen village?
- What are the other survival strategies which are employed to supplement the Old Age Grant as a means of boosting household food security?

1.5 Significance of the study

Policy makers, together with the Department of Social Development, could benefit from this research, as it could help them to adjust, reformulate or restructure existing policies to enable them to address the challenges presented by the issue of food security at the household level more comprehensively than has been possible to date.

The study will also endeavour to develop feasible recommendations which could be adopted by rural authorities, the government and other relevant stakeholders, in order to improve the livelihoods of rural communities by placing emphasis on measures which could boost food security at the household level. The findings of this study could also guide the future practices of community development practitioners, such as social workers and, as a consequence, improve their practices and approaches to the problem of food insecurity.
At present there is a limited amount of information available regarding the household food security status of the people in rural areas, and thus the findings of this study could add to this knowledge base. This research should help to fill some of the gaps in the available literature concerning food security and social security. In addition, this study should provide a foundation for further research in this domain.

1.6 Scope of the study

This research seeks to investigate and assess the impact of the Old Age Grant on boosting food security at the household level. The main focus in this study is on the beneficiaries of the Old Age Grant in the village of Goshen in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa. This area is home to one of the poverty-stricken communities in the Eastern Cape and it falls under the Provincial Integrated Anti-poverty strategy, which was designed by the Department of Social Development in the Eastern Cape (Department of Social Development, 2013). Of great significance concerning this village is the fact that most of the members of this community are the beneficiaries of social grants. The focus in this study is on the household food security of the members of the Goshen community, particularly those receiving the Old Age Grant.

1.7 Definition of Terms

Some of the terms used in this dissertation will be defined in accordance with how they are used in this study. These terms include food security, social grant, Old Age Grant, means test, beneficiaries and household.
1.7.1 Food security

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.” This definition has been adopted for the purposes of this study.

1.7.2 Social grant

According to the South African Social Security Agency (2009), the term ‘social grant’ refers to an income transfer or a financial award provided by the government in the form of a disability grant, a grant for the aged, a war veteran’s grant, a children’s grant and so on.

1.7.3 Old Age Grant

The Old Age Grant refers to a grant paid to an elderly person in terms of Section 10 of the Social Assistance Act of 2004 (No. 13 of 2004). The rationale behind the OAG is that the elderly, or people 60 years of age and older, cannot or should not be expected to work and, in the absence of adequate savings or support from family members, risk falling into desperate poverty.

1.7.4 Means test

This is a test designed to measure a person’s income and assets. Anyone applying for a grant will have his or her income and assets evaluated by SASSA. If these exceed the thresholds set by the government, then he or she will not qualify for a social grant. The criteria employed by the means test are the applicant’s own income
and assets if he or she is not married, and the income and assets of the spouse if the applicant is married (SASSA, 2011).

1.7.5 Household
According to Haviland, Prins and Walrath (2008), a household constitutes the basic residential unit in which economic production, consumption, inheritance, child rearing and shelter are organised and carried out; a household may therefore not be synonymous with a family. For the purposes of this study this definition was adopted.

1.7.6 Beneficiary
According to the Social Assistance Act of 2004 (Act No. 13 of 2004), a beneficiary is any person who receives social assistance in terms of Act No. 13 of 2004 (SASSA, 2009). However, in this study the term “beneficiary” is used interchangeably with the term “recipient”.

1.8 Chapter outlines
Chapter 1: Introduction
This chapter focuses on the introduction of the research topic. The background of the study is outlined, and the problem statement and research questions, together with the aim and the objectives, are explained. An elucidation of the significance of the study also forms part of this chapter.

Chapter 2: Theoretical frameworks and legislative framework
This chapter is dedicated to a review of related literature and theoretical and legislative frameworks are examined.
Chapter 3: Social security and food security
This chapter reviews the literature on social security and food security. Related literature is reviewed in those instances in which it is relevant to the research topic. This chapter also seeks to clarify the gap which this research intends to fill.

Chapter 4: Research methodology
In the chapter devoted to research methodology, the research design, population, sample and sampling strategies of the research are presented. The instruments for collecting data, the methods used to analyse data, the ethical considerations observed during the conducting of the research and the limitations of the study are also described in this chapter.

Chapter 5: Presentation, analysis and discussion of findings
This chapter focuses on the presentation, analysis and discussion of the findings in the light of the current literature and theoretical framework.

Chapter 6: Summary, conclusions and recommendations
This is the final chapter of the research, which gives an overall summary of the findings of the study and the conclusions to be drawn from them, followed by the recommendations made on the basis of the findings and conclusions.
1.9 Conclusion

The impact of the Old Age Grant on boosting food security is worthy of research, particularly in South Africa, where there are various debates centred on the subject of food security. This chapter has introduced the relevant concepts, topics and terminologies pertaining to food security and the social security policies which have been implemented to prevent food shortages. It also discusses the significance of the study and provides a break-down of the structure of the dissertation.
CHAPTER TWO
THEORETICAL AND LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORKS

2.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to provide an outline for the two theoretical frameworks which have been used to underpin this study. It also touches on the legislative frameworks which need to be understood for the purposes of this study. The chapter commences with an overview of the two theoretical frameworks, namely the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach and the Capabilities Approach, which serve to complement each other to provide this study with a sound theoretical background.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

A theory can be useful in that it provides a set of organised principles which, together with contextual knowledge, generate insight into specific situations (Swart and Pettipher, 2005). This research is guided by two theories, namely the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach and the Capability Approach.

2.2.1 Sustainable Livelihoods Approach

The Sustainable Livelihoods Approach was developed by a range of contributors, including researchers, practitioners and policy-makers. According to Chambers (2008), the linking of the three words ‘sustainable’, ‘rural’ and ‘livelihoods’ as terms denoting the sustainable livelihoods approach occurred in 1986, during discussions focusing on the Food 2000 report for the Brundtland Commission. The vision, articulated in this report, was based on a people-oriented development as an
initiative aiming to investigate the plight of the rural poor and their situations. The SLA is part of a wider shift in approaches towards development, during the 1980s and 1990s, towards a focus on human wellbeing and sustainability, rather than economic growth.

Chambers and Conway (1992) produced a working paper for the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) with a definition for sustainable development which has been generally adopted. According to Scoones (2009:175), the definition of a livelihood “…comprises the capabilities, assets and activities for a means of living. 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.” This IDS paper marked the starting point of the SLA, and the approach emerged from the on-going conversations between the two authors, Chambers and Conway.

Unlike other theories and approaches, the SLA is dynamic in that it attempts to understand change and complex cause and effect relationships, and it is intended to provide a conceptual understanding of poverty. Scoones (2009:7) amplifies this understanding of the approach by maintaining that the SLA has laid out a vision for rural people-oriented development which focuses on the realities of poor people. It provides a guiding principle for the practice of rural development which has been developed from the strands of ideas pertaining to livelihoods which were developed throughout the 1980s and 1990s (Chambers 1983; Chambers and Conway, 1992).
Various approaches have been used previously in a bid to address issues pertaining to rural development, and although they were successful in some areas, they tended to lack coherence in others. The SLA was developed in response to dissatisfaction with the results of development efforts in the 1980s (Solesbury, 2003). The Sustainable Livelihoods Approach may be considered as a way of thinking about objectives, scope and precedence concerning development, in order to accelerate progress in poverty eradication (Ashley and Carney, 1999).

Solesbury (2003) notes that the emergence of the sustainable livelihoods paradigm represents a classic paradigm shift in the development glossary, which draws conceptually on changing views of poverty and recognises the diversity of aspirations, the importance of assets in communities and the constraints and opportunities provided by institutional structures and processes in various donor and development agencies. The SL framework is a tool which is often used by development agencies for planning and assessing development interventions. It focuses on how people strategically use the resources available to them to forge livelihoods, and how development interventions affect the available resources and the way in which people interact with them (Parkison and Ramirez, 2006). The Sustainable Livelihoods Approach considers vulnerability as the main factor which shapes how people make their living.

The SLA facilitates an understanding of the underlying causes of poverty by focusing on a variety of factors and various different levels of poverty. Sustainability is the main drive of the sustainable development approach (Krantz, 2001). The Sustainable
Livelihoods Approach shows that poor men and women are active agents responding to social and economic change. Consequently, there is a great need not merely to view these people as clients, but rather as citizens who have the right to democracy, and to give them an opportunity to play a role in decision-making procedures (Cooper, 2009). The strengths of the SLA also include its holistic view of the resources which are important to the poor. These resources do not comprise only physical and natural resources, but also include both social and human capital (Krantz, 2001).

Cooper (2009: 171) maintains that at a practical level, the SLA

- Starts with an analysis of people’s livelihoods.
- Involves people and also respects their views.
- Takes notice of the impact of different policy and institutional arrangements upon people and households and upon the dimensions of poverty which they define.
- Focuses on the importance of influencing policies and institutional arrangements in order to promote the agenda of the poor.
- Works to support people in order to assist them to achieve their own livelihood goals.

The overall conceptual framework for sustainable livelihoods is illustrated in Figure 2.1, which has been adopted from the Department for International Development (2001). The framework is dynamic, in that it recognises both the changes resulting from external factors and those which are the results of people’s own actions. The
starting point of the SLA is the context of the vulnerability within which people are required to operate. Great attention is also paid to the assets upon which people are able to draw for their livelihoods in order to attain sustainability.

Figure 2.1: Sustainable livelihoods framework

Adopted from the Department for International Development (2001:5)
Assets interact with policies, institutions and processes, with the main goal of shaping household livelihood strategies. In turn, livelihood strategies shape the outcomes of livelihoods, which are not simply ends in themselves, as they feed back into the future asset base. The contexts of vulnerability and of the assets which are required to make a living, according to the sustainable livelihoods framework, will be discussed in this chapter.

2.2.1.1 Vulnerability context
The concept of vulnerability is defined as a high degree of exposure to risks, shocks and stress and proneness to food insecurity (Chambers, 1989; Davies, 1996). In general, vulnerability refers to those experiences of high risk events which have an adverse impact upon livelihoods. There are two main aspects of vulnerability in the context under discussion, namely vulnerability to external threats and vulnerability to internal threats. The external threats to livelihoods can comprise factors of risk, such as climate, markets, natural disasters and so on. These risks can take the form of those facing individuals, such as accidents, illness or even death, whereas for the community they can occur as a result of occurrences such as droughts and floods. The internal capability required to cope with factors of this sort is determined to a very large extent by the asset base, support from kin, the community and government safety-net policies. According to Devereux (2002), the ability to deal with risks, when they manifest themselves as problems, depends solely on the assets status of the household of the individual. A household with secure and diverse assets, for example land, family, savings or livestock is in a better position to cope with a shock than a household with meagre or depleted assets. In Africa
diverse social protection schemes have been initiated to provide support to the various vulnerable groups or populations. However, in some cases these social protection measures seek to alleviate vulnerability without tackling its actual causes, while others seek to tackle the perceived causes without providing any immediate improvement in access to food and basic needs.

2.2.1.2 Assets which are required to make a living

Assets are the basis or foundation of the sustainable rural livelihoods framework, as they constitute the means by which the autonomy of individual rural households is achieved and maintained. They are the basic building blocks enabling individuals and households to undertake production, engage in labour markets and participate in reciprocal exchanges with other households. Carney (1998) maintains that a livelihood comprises five assets namely, natural, physical, human, financial and social capital, and these form the core of the SLA. However, other researchers have put forward different categories of assets. As a people-centered approach, the starting point of the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach is people’s own assets and it also takes into account their survival strategies. According to Copper (2009), these assets are divided into five categories:

1) Financial

Financial assets include earned income, pensions, state welfare benefits and maintenance. Financial capital may also refer to savings and capital (Cooper, 2009).
2) Natural

Natural capital comprises the land, water and biological resources which are utilised by people in order to generate a means of survival. These natural resources are of utmost importance to people in rural areas. Livelihoods in rural areas are built around the availability of essential resources such as land, water and vegetation. In rural areas this natural capital is the most freely accessible resource base upon which rural people may depend for their survival. These resources may be divided into two categories, namely renewable and non-renewable resources. Renewable resources consist of those resources which replenish themselves over time, and may include trees, fishery stocks and so on. Non-renewable resources include those which are extracted from the earth, such as metal and oil. These resources are likely to become depleted eventually, and this usually occurs according to the rate of extraction by human agencies.

3) Physical

Physical capital is also referred to as produced capital or economic capital. This asset refers to the tools and equipment needed by people to become productive, along with the basic infrastructure needed to function productively, such as affordable transport and energy, housing and so on (Cooper, 2009).

4) Human

Human assets include the skills, knowledge, ability to work and good health which enables people to pursue various strategies in order to secure a livelihood (Cooper, 2009). This is usually the chief asset possessed by poor people. Jones (2000)
maintains that a lack of human capital in the form of skills and education has a negative effect, as it adversely affects, quite directly, the ability to secure a livelihood in both urban and rural areas. The fact that human capital includes personal health has negative implications for handicapped people among those whose only option for securing a livelihood is labour-intensive work. According to Carney (1998), human capital consists of the labour resources available to households. These resources have both quantitative and qualitative dimensions. The former refers to the number of household members and the time available to engage in income-earning activities, while the latter refers to the level of education, the skills and the health of the members of a household.

5) Social

These are the social resources upon which people are able to draw, and include informal relationships of trust, reciprocity and exchange with families, friends and neighbours. Social assets can also refer to the social resources upon which people draw when pursuing livelihood strategies which require coordinated action (Krantz, 2001; Carney, 1998).

The SLA acted as a useful guide in this research, as it enabled the researcher to attempt an in-depth investigation into the causes of food insecurity in households and to make a comprehensive enquiry into the sustainability of the Old Age Grant as a means of improving food security in South Africa. The SLA was chosen for this study because it offers a fresh insight into an integrative approach, providing the
researcher with the ability to interpret and understand the complexity of food insecurity at the most fundamental level of community society.

2.2.1.3 **The weaknesses of the SLA**

Although the SLA has been widely used in studies of rural development and poverty eradication, concerns have been raised about the failure of this approach to take into account the important role played by the affluent sector of society in the attainment of sustainable livelihoods for the poor. Also undeniable is the fact that little attention has been given to integrating sustainability with other concerns identified by the approach, despite the avowed focus of the approach on sustainable livelihoods (Ashley and Carney, 1999). In addition, some of the issues which are crucial to development are not clearly elucidated or even mentioned in some cases, with the result that there continues to be confusion in the perceived relationship between sustainable livelihoods and the elimination of poverty. According to Small (2007), there are several biases to be detected in the SLA. However, for the purposes of this study the effects of any possible inherent biases in the SLA should be minimised by employing it in tandem with the Capabilities Approach.

2.2.2 **The Capabilities Approach**

Amartya Sen, together with Martha Nussbaum, developed the approach to provide theoretical guidance for the understanding, measuring and promoting of freedom (Pfister, 2012:241). The Capabilities Approach places individuals at the centre of development and also places emphasis on the freedom to choose the life which one desires. Gasper (2007) explains that Sen’s approach arose from dissatisfaction with
subjective assessments and criteria, with command over resources as concepts or measures of wellbeing or advantage, and from the wish for a concept which presents people as reasoning agents with the right to make their own choices. According to Sempiga (2012), poverty should be understood as a failure of basic capability, which is caused by the inability of individuals and communities to choose to participate in activities which provide the needs which are basic to human life. Sempiga (2012:7) maintains that while a capability may loosely be described as the ability to achieve something, a basic capability is the ability to meet a basic need, such as the ability to avoid malnourishment, the capability of becoming educated and so on.

Hick (2012: 2) maintains that the Capability Approach focuses on what people are able to do, as opposed to what they have or how they feel. Sen argues that when analysing an individual’s wellbeing, there should be a paradigm shift of focus from ‘the means of living’, such as income, to the ‘actual opportunities a person has’, namely their functioning and capabilities (Sen, 2009:253). According to Sen (1993), quoted in Chattier (2012:76), “the resources such as income are only the means to enhance people’s wellbeing and advantage, whereas the concern should be with what matters intrinsically and people’s abilities to convert these resources into capabilities.” This is a helpful insight which shifts the focus of poverty from measurements of income based only on money-metric evaluations of poverty, owing to the fact that the Capability Approach provides a more complete analysis of the functioning of capabilities as opposed to material resources alone (Chattier, 2012).
When Sen’s Capabilities Approach is applied, the focus, when making normative evaluations, should be on what people are able to do and not on what they consume or on their incomes, as this theory places great emphasis on the capabilities of people (Robeyns, 2003). However, a complete understanding of this theory necessitates the defining of two key concepts: the word ‘functioning’ refers to the various things a person can succeed in doing or being, for example being healthy, and the term ‘capabilities’ refers to a person’s real freedom to achieve such functioning, for example the ability to take an active and competitive part in a life of a person’s own choosing. Capabilities denote essentially the potential for people to be able to function in society. The Capability Approach places most emphasis on the capabilities which a person may have, irrespective of whether they choose to exercise them or not (Hick, 2012).

According to Walker (2005), the Capability Approach is based on the notion of life and living as a combination of various doings and beings. In this theory the quality of life is assessed in terms of people’s capabilities to achieve valuable functioning. Sen’s Capability Approach relates mainly to freedom in the range of options which a person has regarding decisions concerning the life which he or she chooses to lead. In addition, the Capability Approach acknowledges human diversity such as race, age, ethnicity, gender and geographical location in evaluations of poverty, deprivation and wellbeing (Chattier, 2012). Sen places great emphasis on the crucial importance of having freedom in terms of the work done by an individual. Having the capability or the ability to do, or to choose to do something valuable gives eloquent expression to the inherent value of freedom. According to Chattier (2012), people
ought to have the freedom to obtain food, to have access to health care services and so on.

The focus on capabilities does not in any way play down the vital contributions which material resources can make to the wellbeing of people, but it does point to the fact that inequalities in the distribution of material resources can contribute significantly to inequalities in capabilities (Robeyns, 2003). The strengths of the Capability Approach stem from the fact that capabilities and functioning are properties of an individual. This approach is an ethically individualistic theory, which has the advantage of taking each individual person into account in all normative judgments. Although this approach places its principal focus on individuals, it does not assume that it is dealing with atomised individuals or that the ways in which we function and our capabilities are independent of the concerns of others.

2.2.2.1 The weaknesses of the Capabilities Approach

For Robeyns (2003:64), “one important aspect of Sen's Capability Approach is its underspecified character. The Capability Approach is a framework of thought, normative too, but it is not a fully specified theory that gives us complete answers to all our normative questions.” This approach does not specify or prescribe how to measure inequality or poverty. The approach simply advocates that the evaluative space should be that of capabilities. The weaknesses of this approach seem to be compensated by the strengths of the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach, as it places emphasis on the assets which people need in order to have a sustainable livelihood.
2.3 Legal framework for the implementation of the right to food and social protection in South Africa

According to the Integrated Food Security Strategy (2002), the right to food and social protection are rights enshrined for every South African citizen. The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996) states that all South Africans have a right to access to social security, including social assistance, if they are unable to support themselves and their dependents. The constitutional entrenchment of social security rights has significantly strengthened the mandate of the state to provide comprehensive social protection (Koch, 2011). According to Oliver and Kalula (2004), the constitution grants everyone the right to social protection. By the same token, the constitution obliges the state to take reasonable legislative measures within its available resources to achieve the progressive realisation of each of these rights (Koch, 2011). The constitution places the obligation on the state to ensure that universal access to social security is achieved. One of the successes of the post-1994 era has been the securing of constitutional safeguards for the right to social security and social assistance for those in need of care (Sekhampu, 2013).

According to Sekhampu (2013), the South African government adopted a rights-based approach to food security in 1996, with the aim of reducing the disparities which had been created by the apartheid regime. According to Koch (2011), this food security framework recognises that agricultural production and food security at the national level are not the only considerations demanding attention in the endeavour to make the right to food for all a reality. At present there is still a range of
circumstances preventing this goal from being achieved, including the failure of livelihoods to guarantee access to sufficient food.

South Africa recognises that its people ought to be able to feed themselves, but in those instances where a society or a community is incapable of doing so, strategies, plans and programmes have been put in place in order to help the needy. It is imperative to note that although South Africa’s rights-based approach to food insecurity is linked to poverty alleviation strategies, the policy of issuing grants to disadvantaged communities has been criticised in certain quarters for its lack of the proactive strategies required by a comprehensive remedial approach (Oliver and Kalula, 2004).

2.4 Conclusion

This chapter has examined the two theoretical frameworks which provide the basis for this research. The strengths and the weaknesses of each framework were highlighted, and the chapter also outlined how the weaknesses of one theory are bolstered by the strengths of the other, as value is given to this study by the manner in which the two theories complement each other. The legislative frameworks guiding social protection and the right to food were discussed in detail in this chapter.
CHAPTER THREE
SOCIAL SECURITY AND FOOD SECURITY

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature concerning the Old Age Grant and at the same time not merely to repeat what other authors have said, but rather to evaluate the Grant and to link it to food security. This chapter also identifies certain gaps which this study seeks to fill, and it discusses the concept of food security in the particular context provided by this study. It also provides a general outline of the level of food security in South Africa.

This chapter goes on to discuss social grants from a historical perspective in order to provide a comprehensive understanding of the role of the grant system in strategies for social protection. The social profile of the elderly in South Africa is discussed in order to understand their vulnerability in society. The various types of social grants are discussed, with particular attention being given to the Old Age Grant, and the various assessments of the level of food security enjoyed by the beneficiaries of the Old Age Grant are examined, as are the causes of food insecurity among the beneficiaries of the Grant. Other strategies for survival are also evaluated in order to gain an understanding of the reasons for which the present system fails to bring sufficient improvement to food security.
3.2 The concept of food security

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 accessibility 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 great 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. To achieve food security, three essential and vital criteria need to be met (FAO, 2011):

- Availability of food: sufficient quantities of food need to be available at all times, necessitating an effective and continuous supply of food at both the national and the household levels. The availability of food can be affected by market conditions and the level of productivity achieved by the agricultural sector.

- Access to food: sufficient resources are needed to produce appropriate foods for a nutritious diet in order to enable households to have a sustainable supply of sufficient nutritious food.
• Use of food: Healthy diets require knowledge of basic nutrition, and communities require basic amenities, such as adequate water and sanitation, in order to produce healthy food.

The FAO (2011) also lays a great deal of stress on the importance of affordable healthy food. For Mukute et al. (2002), food security may be compromised in instances where food may be available in a community, but unaffordable to people owing to high prices. In other instances, food may be available and inexpensive in a community, but it may not meet the nutritional requirements of active, healthy and productive lives.

Although Malow’s *Hierarchy of Needs* may imply a diminished importance for food security by classifying food as a primary lower order need (Mukute et al., 2002), food is nevertheless one of the physiological needs which are basic and vital to all human beings for their survival. Indeed, the physiological needs are prior to self-actualisation of any sort. Hopkins, quoted in Devereux and Maxwell (2001:18), supports this view by maintaining that “… food security stands as a fundamental need, basic to all human needs and the organisation of social life. Access to necessary nutrients is fundamental, not only to life *per se*, but also to a stable and enduring social order.” This assessment was also confirmed in the Reconstruction and Development Programme of 1994, where food was cited as a priority and a basic human need (Government Gazette, 1994).
3.3 Poverty and food insecurity

The phenomenon of food insecurity is interrelated with poverty. These two concepts are connected, and to some extent influence each another. Poverty refers to the condition of lacking the means to have access to basic human needs, such as clean water, nutrition, health care, education, clothing and shelter. According to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) report (2006), food insecurity is closely linked to poverty, unemployment and low levels of income.

Africa’s unstable social and political environments have been a contributory factor to food insecurity. Food shortages have become more acute as a result of de-agrarianisation, whereas food production has increasingly lagged behind population growth (Misselhorn et al, 2012, Ncube, Tanga and Bhumira, 2014). However, agriculture is seen as the means to address the global food crisis and to 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, 2007). Nevertheless, de-agrarianisation is a reality, and it threatens the food security of many nations (Ncube, Tanga and Bhumira, 2014).

According to Oldewage-Theron, Dicks and Napier, (2006:795) “in spite of the dramatic progress which has been made in some areas on nutrition… 790 million people in the developing countries are still undernourished and do not have enough to eat.” In the year 2012, for example, statistics revealed that African countries, particularly in the southern, eastern, central and western regions had the world’s second highest Global Hunger Index and that most of these regions were identified
as having alarming levels of hunger (MDG, 2013). Oldewage-Theron et al. (2006) emphasise the urgent need in South Africa for research into the underlying causes of malnutrition and food insecurity, as there is limited empirical data concerning various groups in society, such as the impoverished and the elderly.

3.4 Social profile of the elderly in South Africa

Prior to 1994 South Africa was characterised by racism and discrimination, which resulted in the various racial groups having unequal access to the country’s resources (Patel, 2005). Accordingly, when examining the social profile of the elderly in South Africa, one cannot ignore the historical inequalities, which include limited access to land and education for a very large sector of the population, which in turn has left the elderly in this sector unemployed and without an income (Makiwane and Kwizera, 2006:9).

3.4.1 A brief history of the social security system in South Africa

The policy of separate development implemented by the apartheid regime shaped the evolution of social security policies in South Africa. Patel (2005) maintains that colonialism disrupted and denigrated most traditional forms of social welfare systems, which had been in place to offer social protection by fostering individualism. Koch (2011) explains that during the pre-colonial era individual welfare needs were met through family, kinship, communalism, co-operatives and the society at large, but that the advent of colonialism, with the undesirable changes which it brought to traditional societies, disrupted these traditional modes of social provision.
From the middle of the 17th century to the 18th century South Africa was a Dutch colony. Great Britain acquired sovereignty over the Cape Colony in 1814. Colonialism had many adverse implications and consequences for the country’s indigenous inhabitants, as they had to change their methods of production, their social organisation, their legal and political systems and their systems of welfare provision to meet the demands and the standards of the colonial powers (Patel, 2005). The colonisers brought with them their own notion of civilisation. Colonial administrators tended to believe that Africa was a dark continent in need of civilising. The colonisers viewed themselves as superior, judging the African customs and traditions of social organisation as backward and inferior to their own (Patel, 2005).

During the apartheid era, whites in South Africa enjoyed the benefits of social protection measures designed to protect them from poverty and vulnerability in the form of social pensions (Koch, 2011). These benefits were confined mainly to the white population, while black South Africans were excluded through discriminatory social and economic policies. However, the evolution of social pensions from being grants made on the basis of race to grants made irrespective of race has an interesting history (Schartz, Gomez-Olive, Ralston, Menken and Thomas, 2012). It is essential to understand that during the pre-colonial era the welfare needs of an individual were met through the society, and there was communalism, co-operation and mutual aid (Patel, 2005). These social relations or traditional modes of social provision were later disrupted by the colonial economic system.
South Africa was the first African nation to institute a state pension (Pelham, 2007). This social pension was instituted in 1928 as an income support pension fund, and it was restricted on a racial basis to whites and coloureds without private pensions (Schartz et al., 2012). In 1944 the pre-apartheid government extended the grant to include members of other racial groupings, black Africans and Asians, although the size of the pension payment varied across the different racial groupings. The awarding of grant benefits had a discriminatory component, and the size of the payments varied according to the criterion of race with the ratios of 3:2:1 for whites, Indians and coloureds and black Africans respectively (Patel, 2005; Gutura and Tanga, 2013). During the apartheid era the whites enjoyed from relatively high to very high standards of living, whereas the majority of black Africans were mired in poverty, relegated to low paying employment and received low quality education (Makiwane and Kwizera, 2006).

According to Schartz et al., (2012) from the late 1970s onwards the racially-based gaps in the welfare system were significantly reduced as more funds were allocated by the apartheid government to social assistance schemes. Sienaert (2008) maintains that although by the end of 1980s the divide and rule tactics of the apartheid state had failed, the social pension had come to dominate social assistance in South Africa. In order to attain parity, the government was faced with a choice between reducing the value of the pension for white beneficiaries or increasing it for non-white recipients.
The Social Assistance Act of 1992 is also one of the steps which was taken to de-racialise pensions and achieve equal access to grants (Schartz et al., 2012). Equality was finally reached in 1993, one year before South Africa achieved democracy. According to Schartz, Gomez-Olive, Ralston, Menken and Thomas (2012), “By 1993 the take up rate among the eligible African men and women stood at 80%. At that time the maximum benefit was R370.00 (about $3 per day at the prevailing exchange rate)…”

Sienaert (2008) maintains that after the various measures leading to parity in the social welfare system had been implemented, the post-apartheid South African government inherited a fragmented social security system. The main aim in the development of social security in South Africa had been to maintain support for the white government by providing the economically vulnerable sectors of the white population with either social insurance or social assistance. The post-1994 democratic government adopted an unusually generous pension scheme, which absorbed approximately 1, 2% of the country’s GDP (Patel, 2005). In addition, after democracy in 1994 two other large public transfer programmes were introduced, namely the Disability and the Child Support Grants. All of these grants are provided subject to a means test. However, several commentators, including Samson (2002), maintain that in spite of the country’s existing social security programmes to redress the disparities which were caused by the apartheid policies, poverty and food insecurity still persist.
3.5 Social protection

According to Rogers and Pridemore (2012), social protection may be defined as the ability of the government to insulate its citizens from the problems associated with poverty and the market forces which negatively affect their quality of life. Social protection may also be understood as including any formal initiative which aims to provide social assistance to particular vulnerable groups, social insurance for vulnerability associated with old age and loss of employment, and can also take the form of labour market programmes.

Social protection refers to public measures which are taken to provide income security to individuals. For the ILO (2000:29), the goal of protection is not merely focused on survival but on social inclusion and the preservation of human dignity. Social protection measures play a fundamental part in the creation of a more inclusive and sustainable development pathway. According to Devereux, McGregor, and Sabates-Wheeler (2011), the chief goal of most social protection interventions is to protect minimum subsistence in targeted low-income households. This is done through social security measures. Patel (2005:123) quoted the ILO (1989:29) definition of social security by maintaining that social security is “the protection which society provides for its members through a series of public measures against the economic and social distress that otherwise would be caused by the stoppage or substantial reduction of earnings, resulting from sickness, maternity, employment injury, old age…”.
According to Holzmann, Sherburne-Benz and Tesliuc (2003), social protection is moving up the development agenda. Despite the fact that it was once dismissed as ineffective and detrimental to development in developing countries, it is now understood and conceded that it helps individuals, households and communities to deal with diverse risks or shocks. Social protection is now viewed by some countries as being vital and necessary for accelerating the reduction of poverty and for sustained economic and human development. Ellis, Devereux and White (2009) maintain that there is a growing recognition that too many people in Africa are caught up in chronic poverty and vulnerability, to an extent that even small setbacks in agricultural production or small problems facing people who earn low incomes can have catastrophic consequences and result in distress and hunger. These factors have led to social protection moving up in the development agenda for Africa.

3.5.1 Overview of the orientation of social Security

In order to gain a comprehensive understanding of social protection it is necessary to examine the evolution of social security. Social security was first introduced in Europe and North America. The major focus of its orientation was towards protecting workers in formal employment, with the aim of increasing productivity in the workplace (Oliver and Kalula, 2004). The concept of social security was developed further in England after the publication of the Beveridge Report in 1942, in which the goal of social security was shifted from a focus on employees in an endeavour to guarantee a basic level of income for all citizens. The Beveridge Report recommended that the whole population should enjoy social protection through a combination of
programmes, which included social insurance, social assistance, and allowance for children and free health services (Oliver and Kalula, 2004).

In Africa the Beveridgean model was first adopted by the British for use in their colonies. Although they were introduced in Africa during the colonial era, these schemes were not specifically meant for a selected few white settler communities (Oliver and Kalula, 2004). In the Post-colonial era, various governments adopted these schemes and extended their coverage in their countries. In the SADC region only a few countries have a comprehensive social protection system and some countries still do not have comprehensive cover. South Africa, Namibia and Mauritius are among the African countries having a comprehensive social protection system (Oliver and Kalula, 2004).

Social protection takes the form of cash transfers in many countries. These transfer schemes are aimed at reducing poverty resulting from low incomes by providing immediate cash to families and facilitating human capital development (Miller, Tsoka and Reichert, 2010). A common factor in the Conditional Cash Transfer programmes is that they employ a means test. The main mandate of this cash transfer system is to improve the food security of households or individuals lacking in resources. The African cash transfer programmes are based on the Latin American Conditional Cash Transfers (CCT).

According to Tanga and Gutura (2013), South Africa suffers from high and rising poverty levels and extreme inequality. The social security system is the main
initiative of the government to tackle this problem. This system is a non-contributory cash transfer scheme, which targets mainly the poor. According to Help Age International (2003:15), the introduction of non-contributory pension programmes is often the result of a recognition of the extent to which vulnerability and setbacks can affect the lives of low income elderly people. Transfer schemes of this sort are usually implemented using a means test.

Patel (2005) suggests that there is a great need for social security internationally and that the recognition of the need for measures of this sort has led to the restructuring and re-designing of existing institutions in several instances. In South Africa the democratic government, which assumed office in 1994, initiated a review of the social security system, placing an even greater emphasis than had been placed before on attaining equality. The Taylor Committee was formed. Known as the Committee of Inquiry for a Comprehensive Social Security System for South Africa (2002), its main task was to make recommendations concerning the restructuring and redesigning of the existing social security system. The Taylor Committee maintained that the assumptions underlying social security had been based on European conceptions of social security, and the measures which had been implemented as a result of these assumptions had not necessarily been appropriate for the population of South Africa. The committee identified specific gaps in the existing provision of social security which needed to be addressed by the government. Among these were the limited coverage of children and unemployment. Income securities for the poor, together with unemployment, were addressed by the Basic Income Grant (BIG).
The implementation of the BIG was motivated by the gaps which the committee found in the assistance given to the population of working age and its recognition that not only children, the disabled and the retired needed extensive social protection, as the working class population is vulnerable to loss of employment and becoming impoverished as a result. The BIG Coalition was established in 2001 with the aim of developing strategies to reduce poverty and raise the living standards of the people (Taylor Committee, 2008).

3.5.2 Social security in South Africa

In South Africa the social security system started as a system which gave short-term benefits to workers through contributions, and gave state-financed social assistance to the elderly, the disabled and children from 1910. It is significant to note that the first formal social security system introduced was aimed at both workers and children (Patel, 2005). The Children's Protection Act of 1913 made provisions for the payment of maintenance grants for children and family support grants were introduced with the goal of protecting white families who were living in poverty. Social protection can be delivered to its intended beneficiaries in a wide variety of ways in various forms of transfers. These include:

- Cash
- Food
- Inputs
- Assets

There are various components of social protection: these include social insurance and social assistance. These two components are distinct in the sense that social
assistance includes social relief, whereas social insurance has its main focus on contributory schemes (Oliver and Kalula, 2004). According to Tanga (2007), social assistance policies are aimed mainly at providing support to vulnerable groups such as those whose poverty is the result of low income: these policies are aimed directly at alleviating or reducing poverty. Social assistance seeks to assist people affected by ‘triple f’ to survive shocks to their livelihoods and to preserve their assets. Devereux, McGregor and Sabates-Wheeler (2011) maintain that social protection measures can do more than simply help the poor and the vulnerable to manage risk in the short term, and that it can tackle the underlying causes of their vulnerability. According to Patel (2005), the White Paper for Social Welfare (1997) advocated a comprehensive and integrated social security system, which would include social assistance and social insurance with a system where there would be shared responsibilities among employers, employees, citizens and the state, in order to ensure universal access to and coverage of social security. The social protection programmes are vital because they aim to tackle the manifold dimensions of poverty and deprivation and, accordingly, they can be used as a powerful tool in the fight against poverty and inequality. In the absence of social protection tools, the most vulnerable groups in society in particular are subjected to increased risks of sinking below the poverty line or remaining trapped in poverty for generations (Oliver and Kalula, 2004). From the late 1980s the attention of policy makers was on social protection instruments to ease the impact of the adjustment, but more recently the focus has turned to cash transfers as a measure to address poverty and vulnerability (Adesina, 2011).
Social security; social assistance and social security

Figure 3.1: The basic architecture of the South African social security system.

Source: Adopted from the National Treasury (2010:102)

Figure 3.1 outlines the process by means of which people are able to receive social assistance and the various social security schemes. There are various types of social assistance grants available in South Africa: the Child Support Grant (CSG), the State Old Age Pension (SOAP), the Disability Grant (DG), the Foster Care Grant (FCG) and the Care Dependency Grant. All of these grants are given subject to a means test and eligibility for each grant depends on the means test for that particular grant. The South African government also provides three social insurance mechanisms, namely: the Unemployment Insurance Fund (UIF), the Compensation
Fund and the Road Accident Fund. There are also voluntary insurance schemes, which include medical aids and retirement funds (National Treasury, 2010).

3.5.2.1 Social insurance

Patel (2005:125) defines social insurance as the ‘benefits organised by the state through specified contributions by employers and employees.’ These measures are also referred to as contributory schemes to cover specific risks and needs, which include unemployment, retirement, sickness and maternity benefits. Flarrington and Slater (2006) explain that social insurance involves individuals pooling resources by paying contributions to a state fund or to a private provider to enable them to receive financial support in the event of their facing an unexpected setback or a permanent change in their lives. Kaseke (2010), quoted in Dhemba (2012), observes that the majority of the people in the developing countries are excluded from social insurance schemes.

According to Kaseke (2010) there are three main insurance schemes in South Africa. These schemes include unemployment insurance, the Compensation for Occupational Injuries and Diseases Fund and the Road Accident Fund. According to Flarrington and Slater (2006), social insurance is even appropriate for individuals who are fairly financially secure, as it can play an important role in preventing them from becoming impoverished in the event of a significant setback in their lives. Kaseke (2010) maintains that social insurance plays a pivotal role in averting poverty. It entails a proactive strategy which helps to reduce the exposure to risks among those who benefit from it. However, the impact of social insurance in South
Africa is limited by the fact that only two principal types of risks are covered, namely unemployment and injury sustained while employed.

According to Oliver and Kalula (2004:2), in developing an integrated and inclusive social protection system it is necessary to ensure protection against a wide range of contingencies as stipulated by the ILO Social Security (Minimum Conditions) Convention No. 102. Kaseke (2010) points out that the ILO Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention number 102 of 1952 provides nine categories of social security. These include unemployment benefits, old age benefits, injury during employment benefits, maternity benefits, sickness benefits, invalidity benefits, medical benefits, survivors' benefits and family benefits. However, an analysis of the SADC region reveals that most of the member states do not provide comprehensive cover with their social protection systems and that South Africa is among them (Oliver and Kalula, 2004). Dhemba (2012) points out that the lack of a compulsory social insurance scheme exposes the elderly to poverty traps.

3.5.2.1.1 Unemployment insurance

In South Africa unemployment insurance is provided by the Unemployment Insurance Act No. 63 of 2001 (Kaseke, 2010). According to Oliver and Kalula (2004), the unemployment fund is a system instituted for the protection of workers and their dependents, making provision for coverage against temporary unemployment arising from termination of services, illness, maternity and adoption. This unemployment insurance protects workers against the risk of temporary unemployment. Domestic workers are also covered under this insurance system. There is a degree of social
exclusion in terms of the way in which this insurance grant is administered, as it does not extend to civil servants and non-South Africans who are temporarily unemployed. The fund is made up of contributions collected from both employers and employees in order to cover employees in the event of unemployment. This insurance covers temporary unemployment caused by termination of employment, maternity, illness and adoption (Oliver and Kalula, 2004).

3.5.2.1.2 The Compensation for Occupational Injuries and Diseases Fund

The Compensation for Occupational Injuries and Diseases Fund compensates workers in cases of work-related injuries and illness. This compensation is paid in terms of the Compensation Injuries and Diseases Act (COIDA) 130 of 1993 (Kaseke, 2010). The COIDA act replaces the former Workmen’s Compensation Act of 1941 (Patel, 2005). Employees are compensated for injuries which occur while they are at work. The money for this fund comes from the Compensation Fund, to which employers are required to contribute on the basis of industry-based risk assessment (Oliver and Kalula, 2004). The scheme’s funding the contributions from employers varies according to specific criteria. Domestic workers are not covered under the Compensation Injuries and Diseases Act.

3.5.2.1.3 Road Accident Fund

As Kaseke (2010) explains, the Road Accident Fund is not an employment-based fund. It is financed by the obligatory fuel levy and pays compensation to third parties and the victims of road accidents for any loss or damage suffered as a result of
bodily injuries or death caused by the negligent driving of a motor vehicle (Oliver and Kalula, 2004).

3.5.2.2 Social assistance

The South African Constitution of 1996 makes provisions to provide assistance to poor people who do not have any means to support themselves. According to Section 27(1c) of the Constitution of South Africa (1996), everyone has the right to have access to social security and appropriate social assistance if they are unable to support themselves and their dependents. Social assistance is the most significant mechanism for providing social security to the South Africa population, and it provides a range of benefits in either cash or kind with the intention of providing protection to the most needy members of society (Patel, 2005).

The Social Assistance Act 59 of 1992 is the most important instrument in the administering of social assistance in South Africa, and it regulates the payment of social assistance grants and other relief measures (Oliver and Kalula 2004). According to Flarrington and Slater (2006), social assistance involves non-contributory transfers to those deemed eligible by the society on the basis of their vulnerability or poverty. Social assistance policies aim at supporting vulnerable groups such as the income poor, with the aim to alleviate or reduce poverty (Rogers and Pridemore, 2012). Kaseke (2010) maintains that the South African government uses this social assistance scheme in order to reduce the poverty among vulnerable groups who are needy and without any means to support themselves. The state’s social assistance system has two main components, namely the various kinds of social services which are provided and the payment of the social grants and the
providing of other relief services. Although the state is obliged to provide social security to everyone, there is no universal coverage, as a needs-based approach with reference to specific categories is followed.

Kaseke (2010) maintains that South Africa has one of the most comprehensive social assistance systems in Southern Africa. In South Africa the social assistance system is based on a means test and applied to designated groups in society, which include the disabled, the elderly and the children. The main social grants are the Child Support Grant, the Disability Grant and the Old Age Grant. These grants are non-contributory in nature and monthly payments are made to beneficiaries (Oliver and Kalula, 2004). Owing to the targeted nature of these social services, there are various terms and conditions which govern who receives assistance. According to Oliver and Kalula (2004), if an applicant does not meet the requirements for a particular grant they remain a part of the socially excluded population.

However, according to the South African Social Security Agency (SASSA), there is a continuous expansion of the social safety-net, which reaches 15, 2 million South Africans in the year 2012. Of these beneficiaries approximately 2, 7 million were elderly people and more than 10, 9 million were recipients of the Child Support Grant (Department of Social Development annual report, 2012).

The Department of Social Development (2012) maintains that the provision of social security is a cornerstone of the fight against the effects of poverty on children and older people. According to Kaseke (2010), although social assistance theoretically
assists households which are living in poverty, some grants provide an income which is below the poverty line. Kaseke (2010) maintains that there is an inherent assumption that caregivers will in turn supplement the grant with other sources of income, but most of these beneficiaries take the grant as their main source of income.

3.5.2.2.1 Types of social grants
By contrast with other African countries such as Malawi or Lesotho, South Africa’s government has a strong commitment to social grants. According to Woodlards et al. (2011), social grants are transfers made in cash or in kind to deprived populations. These social grants are a type of social assistance aimed at helping the poor or disadvantaged people in South Africa. Although this social assistance measure aims at reducing poverty by making payments to the beneficiaries of grants, this measure is inevitably limited in its scope, but targeted social assistance measures which aim to reduce poverty by means of cash transfers also form part of the safety-net (Patel, 2005). There are several types of social grants in South Africa, namely those paid to the elderly, people with disabilities, care givers of children and war veterans.

All social grants administered by the South African government are subject to a means test and target vulnerable or poor households and individuals. Beneficiaries of grants need to be South African citizens and to reside inside the country, specifically at the time of the application for the grant. Beneficiaries are required to possess identification documents and, in the case of disabled people, information concerning the nature of the disability and supporting evidence is required. The following types of social grants are available in South Africa:
1) Child Support Grant (CSG)

According to Patel (2005), when the democratic government came to power in 1994 it was faced with racial inequality in the state maintenance grants, as they had been administered on the basis of race, and this provision was not in line with the equity provisions in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa of 1996. In order to bring it into line, the existing programme needed to be either revised or abolished. The South African government decided to expand it to include single African parents and at the same time to equalise the amount of money paid to all race groups. It then appointed the Lund Committee to investigate child and family support in 1996. This committee was convened in order to make recommendations or to redesign the system and to determine whether doing so would be both affordable and sustainable (Patel, 2005). The recommendations made by the Lund Committee were adopted in 1997, and this led to the strengthening of the Child Support Grant. This grant was, and still is, issued to beneficiaries in order to reduce poverty among children (Kaseke, 2010). The CSG is a grant paid to the primary caregiver of the child, and it is paid subject to a means test requiring the primary care giver of the child to meet the criteria laid down in the Social Assistance Act of 2004 (Act No. 13 of 2004). The value of this grant is R 310.00 per month in 2014.

The child support grant (CSG) is South Africa’s largest social cash transfer and it is generally regarded as one of the successful social protection measures, as it has been able to provide great overall benefits to households in the contribution which it makes to help to ensure food security, enable caregivers to buy school uniforms and pay school fees, and to raise the bargaining power of women in households (Tanga
and Gutura, 2013b). However, there has been a great deal of debate whether this grant actually alleviates poverty among its intended beneficiaries. Smit (2008) argues that the child support grant is ineffective as a strategy for poverty reduction because of its low income benefits. According to Peters (2008), the percentage of children living in poverty is still high and approximately 22% of these children are poor. Patel (2005) maintains that the Child Support Grant was received with mixed feelings. Critics have pointed out that as the amount paid by the grant is low, its ability to reduce poverty would inevitably be limited.

2) Disability Grant

The Disability Grant is paid to disabled people in terms of Section 9 of the Social Assistance Act of 2004. In terms of this Act the grant is given to people who are unable to work owing to illness or a disability (SASSA, 2011). Only people who are poor receive this grant and a means test is administered to the applicants to determine whether they qualify to receive it (Gutura and Tanga, 2014). The value of this grant is R1350.00 per month in 2014. A medical model is used to determine the eligibility of the grant applicant. However, this model has been criticised for excluding people who deserve support of this sort, such as those who are infected with HIV/AIDS (Kaseke, 2010).

3) Care Dependency Grant

This grant is given to children with severe mental or physical disabilities who require permanent home care. The caregiver receives the grant in order to take care of a child who has a severe disability (SASSA, 2011). The grant is given to disabled
children from birth until they reach the age of 18 years. In order to receive the grant, the mother or the guardians, together with the child, are required to be permanent residents in South Africa. As part of the means test for this grant, a state medical officer must assess the child before the grant is approved. The value of this grant is R1350.00 per month in 2014.

4) **Foster Care Grant**

The Foster Care Grant is one of the grants which increased steadily in the year 2000. This type of grant is intended to provide financial support to people caring for children who are not their own by birth, but who are willing to provide the children with a safe and secure nurturing home environment (Patel, 2005; SASSA, 2011). An investigation is usually conducted by the Social Worker from the Department of Social Development or from Child Welfare and a report is sent to the court for the final decision concerning the placement of the child to be made. If the application is successful, the foster parent will receive a monthly grant of R830.00 for each child in his or her care.

5) **Grant in Aid**

The Grant in Aid Grant is paid to people who are already receiving another grant, such as an Old Age Grant, a War Veteran’s Grant or a Disability Grant, but who need full-time care to be provided for them (Patel, 2005). The additional grant is given to pay the full-time care-giver, who is required to meet the criteria laid down in
Section 12 of the Social Assistance Act of 2004 (Act No. 13 of 2004). The amount payable to these beneficiaries is R310.00 per month.

6) War Veteran’s Grant

The war veteran grant is paid to people who are 60 years of age and above. This grant is paid to a person who is a former soldier who fought in the First World War (1914-1918), the Second World War (1939-1945), the Zulu Uprising (1906) or the Korean War. The criteria which are used to assess eligibility are stipulated in the Social assistance Act of 2004 under section No. 11. The amount paid to these beneficiaries is R1370.00 per month in 2014.

7) Old Age Grant (OAG)

South Africa was the first country in Africa to institute a state pension and it has the longest history as a country with provisions for social welfare, although it also has the shortest history of democratic elections with universal suffrage (Pelham, 2007). The Old Age Pension grant constitutes the largest grant made by the national government in monetary terms (Sekhampu, 2013). Each month elderly South Africans draw a non-contributory state pension, which is paid to elderly people in terms of Section 10 of the Social Assistance Act of 2004. Recipients of the Old Age Pension receive a monthly payment of R1370.00 in 2014, made subject to a means test.

According to the Old Persons Act No. 13 of 2006, an older person is defined as a person who is 65 years of age or older in the case of a male, and 60 years of age or
older in the case of a female (SASSA, 2011). The Old Person’s Act No. 13 of 2006 aims to establish a framework to empower and protect the elderly, thereby promoting their status, rights and wellbeing. The differentiation in terms of age and gender was challenged in 2006, as it was seen to be unfair, restricting the access to the grant for males and negating the right to equality for all which is enshrined in the Constitution (Wachipa, 2006).

Oliver and Kalula (2004) maintain that these disparities in terms of gender undermined the efforts to achieve an integrated and inclusive framework of social protection. Amendments were made to resolve the discrepancies by means of the Social Assistance Amendment Act No. 6 of 2008, in which the eligibility of men to receive the grant was reduced from 65 years to 63 years. In 2009 further amendments were made to the Act and men’s eligibility was reduced to 61 years, with equality finally being reached in 2010, when the eligible age was reduced to 60 years for men (Government Gazette, 2006).

According to the United Nations (2006), 60 years is accepted as the standard year for the commencement of old age. Accordingly, an old person is defined as anyone who is 60 years of age or older. However, this definition of old age is by no means universally accepted or agreed upon (Popple and Leighninger, 2011). Differences in perceptions regarding the commencement of old age have been found between the developing countries and the developed countries.
According to Help Age International (2003), it has been found that in some instances, and particularly in rural areas in developing countries, a more traditional definition of old age tends to be used, in which age is estimated for most older people owing to the fact that at the time they were born no records of dates of births were kept, making the UN’s numerical definition of old age inappropriate in developing countries. HAI (2004) suggests that signs of ageing, which include the colour of the hair, poor eyesight and afflictions which affect old people particularly are criteria which should be used to estimate the age of an old person in the African context. Old age is generally regarded as the stage at which elderly people either receive, or are eligible to receive, the statutory retirement pension.

3.6 Causes of food insecurity among Old Age Grant beneficiaries:

3.6.1 Chronic Poverty

According to Bello, Letete, Rapapa and Chakobane (2008), one of the greatest problems facing many developing countries, and particularly Sub-Saharan African Countries, is chronic poverty. The persistent state of poverty is noticeable mainly among vulnerable groups such as the elderly and women. Many families are now dysfunctional in that they are now unable to see to the wellbeing of their elderly relatives as had traditionally been the case when members of the extended family and the community at large took care of them (Fernandez-Castilla, cited in Lombard and Kruger, 2009).

Dhemba (2012) views this notion of individualism, as opposed to a consciousness of one’s obligations to one’s family and community, as a reflection of the dominance of
misplaced notions of productivity and the conclusion that older people are no longer worthy of investment. According to Tanga (2008), the elderly people in Lesotho are playing a role which should be performed by their children. Instead of their children taking care of them, they are obliged to shoulder much of the responsibility for their families. Although the Old Age Grant has been found to provide an important safety-net for the elderly in South Africa and other developing countries where it has been introduced, the grant has become a principal source of income for the members of the households of the elderly people who receive it (Tanga, 2008).

Dhemba (2012) maintains that apart from the increasing risks of poverty, industrialisation and urbanisation have contributed towards numerous pressures and vulnerabilities for older people. Industrialisation and urbanisation have brought disruptions to the very social networks which were traditionally a source of social security for the elderly, as able-bodied young people are migrating from their rural homelands to cities in search of wealth (Koch, 2011). This trend has left the elderly vulnerable owing to their advanced age, making them particularly prone to food insecurity.

### 3.6.2 Aging

People’s living standards often decline as they get older. According to Barrientos (2003), it is argued that the strong decline in economic opportunities and the deterioration of health which usually accompany advancing age are the key factors which explain the high incidence of poverty and vulnerability among older people and their households. Elderly people are particularly prone to illness, and their health is
often further compromised by poor nutrition, limited access to good medical care and poverty.

Popple and Leighninger (2011) explain that with the onset of old age there is usually a steady physical, intellectual and emotional deterioration. As a consequence, as people grow older they also tend to become increasingly dependent on other people. These effects are offset, to a certain extent, by the fact that in South Africa everyone is entitled to free primary healthcare services. In addition, older persons, who are beneficiaries of old-age grants, are entitled to receive free secondary healthcare services in public hospitals (Burns, in Lombard and Kruger, 2009).

Any investigation conducted into the care of the aged in South Africa cannot overlook the inequalities of the past. The elderly have, perhaps more than any other group, borne the brunt of a system in which the majority of the people were deprived of education, land, employment and socio-economic opportunities, which conspired to relegate them to chronic poverty (Makiwane and Kwizera, 2006).

Most of the elderly people in South Africa are unable to break out of the bondage of poverty and to provide for their old age through the acquisition of secure retirement benefits (Wachipa, 2006). Bello et al. (2008) maintain that as long as elderly pensioners have dependents who are themselves not wage earners, the old age pension programme may not alleviate poverty in their households sufficiently, condemning these households to a vicious cycle of poverty from which they do not
have the means to break out. This state of affairs is precisely what is connoted by the term “poverty trap”.

According to Dhemba (2012), the situation of the elderly is disconcerting because they are plagued by both poverty and the infirmities of old age, both of which mitigate to a great extent to their ability to care for themselves. Help Age International (2000:5), quoted in Dhemba (2012), points out that poverty and social exclusion remain the stumbling blocks to the realisation of human rights for older people. This situation is observed to be most acute in Sub-Saharan Africa, where elderly people are among the poorest (Ferreira, 2005).

The United Nation (2006), quoted by Schatz et al. (2012), predicts that “13% of the South African population will be over 60 years in 2050 compared to just 7% in 2006.” As they point out, not only is the elderly population increasing, but the dramatic increase will also double the burden brought by the illnesses to which the elderly are particularly prone, including diabetes, hypertension and stokes. Barrientos (2006) maintains that population trends confirm that demographic transition is taking place much faster in developing countries than it has in the developed countries. Despite the dramatic increase of the size of the ageing population which is being projected, many of the developing countries which are going to be faced with this situation are still handicapped by slow rates of economic growth, persistence of poverty, inequality and discrepancies in basic services and governance. As a result, these developing countries will be hindered by the availability of limited funds to establish
or strengthen social protection systems to accommodate and to care for this ageing population (HAI, 2003).

Patel (2005) suggests that poverty and social exclusion remain the main stumbling blocks to the realisation of human rights for older people the world over, maintaining that as people live longer, there is a growing trend for there to be proportionally fewer people who are working and paying taxes, resulting in diminished resources being available for social programs. Addressing the challenges of caring for their growing ageing populations will require enormous commitment on the part of these developing nations to providing care for their most vulnerable people.

3.6.3 Inadequate safety-nets

Poor households are typically characterised as having few income earners and many dependents. They are often dependent on the transfer of funds from relatives who have become migrant labourers and social security grants, making them vulnerable to food insecurity. In the case of rural households, they are particularly vulnerable to food insecurity owing to their reliance on handouts. These poor rural households often have the additional disadvantages of having few, if any, economic activities in close proximity to their communities, a lack of agricultural support services and limited opportunities for employment.

According to the study conducted in South Africa by Tanga (2007), it was found, after administering interviews to several officials in the government, municipality and NGO sectors, that no grant is sufficient to maintain even the recipient, let alone his or
her whole household. This is a clear indication of the inadequacy of the safety-nets, as they still leave the poor food insecure. According to Barrientos (2006), pensions can be effective instruments for reducing poverty and vulnerability in households having elderly members. Barrientos (2006) goes on to maintain, on the strength of the survey data obtained in Brazil and South Africa, that pensions are effective only when there is no extensive sharing of the income provided by pensions. Old age pensions need to be augmented by other programmes designed to reduce poverty in poor households which do not have older members.

According to Tanga (2008), although in South Africa the old age pension is five times larger than the one granted by the pension scheme in Lesotho, and households have access to other cash transfers such as the Child Support Grant and the Disability Grant, recipients claim that they have no money left after buying their basic household needs. This is an indication that in developing countries, non-contributory pensions will certainly not act as more than a basic social protection instrument. The lack of purchasing power among the other members of the household recipients places great strain on the income received from the social grant, with poverty being an inevitable consequence for that household. Limited opportunities for generating an income in the rural areas also contributes significantly towards reliance on government grants.

The problem is often further exacerbated by the facts that households which rely on social pensions are not only poor but also tend to be large (Edmonds, 2002). As a result, pensions are very unlikely to keep these households above the poverty line,
making it hardly surprising that only very few beneficiaries of social grants are able to invest in income-generating activities (Tanga, 2008).

3.6.4 Changes in living arrangements and care-giving

Although people receiving pensions in the developed countries are usually self-sufficient, receiving a pension in South Africa does not increase the likelihood of an elderly person living alone. Rather it is associated with an increased household size and changes in the household, with children frequently migrating to the household of the elderly pensioner or pensioners (Edmonds, 2002). This is very common in black African communities. In most cases it is left to the elderly women to assume the role of primary care-giver, as the middle generation is often forced to migrate in search of employment, and some will have been lost owing to the HIV/AIDS pandemic (Burns, Keswell and Leibbrandt, 2004).

South Africa’s high prevalence of HIV/AIDS resulted in a nation having many elderly and very young people, owing to the fact that a great many people from the middle generation are dying from the pandemic. This has in turn led to widespread hunger among the people left behind, making them vulnerable and in great need of social protection. When an application for an Old Age Grant is assessed the means test is applied to the income of the individual beneficiary and his or her partner, if the applicant is married, but not to the income of the members of their households (Flarrington and Slater, 2006). This makes conditions extremely difficult for households comprising many members who are solely dependent on the grant as the main source of income for the whole family. Consequently, there is at present
only a limited understanding of the dynamics pertaining to the lives of those who receive the Old Age Grant and the state of their food security.

3.6.5 Inadequate and unstable household food production

Hunger and malnutrition in South Africa also stem from insufficient and unstable food supplies at the household and intra-household levels. Most rural smallholder farmers are unable to rely on their farming to feed their families owing to the narrow production base of their operations (Ncube, Tanga and Bumhira, 2014). These farmers are now, by default, deficit producers, obliging them to become consumers of purchased foods (IFPRI, 2005). Most of these households now rely on incomes from sources other than farming to meet their household needs. According to Woolards et al. (2011), the income received from grants is very often used to provide food, education and so on for other members of the household rather than the specific needs of the intended beneficiary of the grant, demonstrating the extent to which grants are misused in order to provide some form of income to households. Dhemba (2012) concurs by maintaining that the social pension system in South Africa has turned into a poverty alleviation programme for households rather than a means of support for the elderly people whose livelihoods the Old Age Grant is intended to ensure.

Dhemba (2012) points out that although it is documented that poverty among the elderly in Lesotho and South Africa has been reduced by the introduction of the Old Age Grant, there are nevertheless exclusion measures inherent in the criteria which are applied in order to assess eligibility and the benefits themselves are inadequate.
In both South Africa and Zimbabwe the efficacy of these public social assistance measures is still compromised by the application process which is employed in order to grant benefits. Dhemba (2012) explains that the application process entails a rigorous means test which tends to exclude many deserving applicants from receiving social assistance.

3.6.6 Lack of support

To a great extent, the elderly in households which rely upon their Old Age Pension grants for survival are often not adequately supported in these households. According to Tanga (2007), in many such households the elderly who provide the income are usually excluded from decision-making. This is particularly prevalent in households headed by female pensioners. A study conducted by Tanga in South Africa in 2007 revealed that 90.9% of the beneficiaries of grants were unable to invest any of the money which they received from their grants, but instead were obliged to spend it on groceries, pointing once more to the insufficiency of the grants, which, in the absence of other means of support, tends to result in food insecurity for the households which have come to depend upon them for an income.

3.6.7 The impact of unintended beneficiaries on the ability of pensions to provide for intended beneficiaries

According to Burns et al. (2004) and Gutura and Tanga (2014), it has been found that South Africa’s social pension system has played an important role in the welfare needs of not only its intended beneficiaries but also of a great many unintended beneficiaries. Tanga (2008) explains that it is not uncommon in Africa for people to
engage in gestures of solidarity among themselves, especially in order to help the needy. Schatz and Ogunmefun (2005) maintain that the Old Age Grant is often considered as a subsidy to sustain the intergenerational households. However, the use of the income from grants by unintended beneficiaries and intergenerational households overburdens the grant, resulting in grants not providing sufficient benefit to intended beneficiaries.

The findings of Burns et al. (2004) indicate that there have been notable improvements in the health of children, particularly in the case of girls living with grandmothers who are eligible for pensions, in increased school attendance and decreased child labour. The results of research conducted by Tanga (2007) show that some orphans are also benefiting from pensions or grants received by the elderly. The phenomenon of orphaned children being taken care of by their grandparents is common not only in South Africa, only but also in Zambia, Uganda and Tanzania (Deininger, Garcia and Subbarao, 2001). In South Africa 60% of orphans live in grandparent-headed households (Monasch and Boerma, 2004). It has been noted that unemployed family members tend to attach themselves to elderly relatives who are receiving an income from the Old Age Grant, in order to have access to these funds. By contrast, Burns et al. (2004) point to the tendency for unemployed people to move from the rural areas to urban areas, resulting in influxes from the rural areas, which in turn diminish their chances of finding employment in the city.
3.7 Food security in South Africa

South Africa is, to a large extent, deemed to be a food secure nation, producing sufficient staple foods and having the capacity to import food, if needed, in order to meet the basic nutritional requirements of its population (FAO 2008). According to Koch (2011), South Africa is unlikely to feature at the top of the agenda at any international conference on food security. The country is self-sufficient in most foods, but a large portion of its population does not benefit from these resources. Aliber and Hart (2009), support the view that while South Africa seems to be food secure at the national level, the same cannot be said about households in rural areas, which are affected by poverty and food insecurity. Like many other developing countries, South Africa is battling with food insecurity, ill health, poverty, unemployment and crime (Sekhampu, 2013). Koch (2011) maintains that food insecurity in South Africa is mainly the result of a lack of purchasing power. To a very large extent, this is the result of a large sector of the population having been effectively excluded from participating in the economy by the policies of the apartheid government, whose legacy in this respect can still be felt today. This state of affairs obliged the post-1994 South African government to consider social grants as measures to be implemented in order to eliminate the disparities of the apartheid era and improve food security for families (Altman, 2009). Although the gesture on the part of the government is a magnanimous one, the simple transfer of limited funds to the victims of poverty and those who lack food security is not enough to sustain the recipients themselves, let alone their extended families (Tanga, 2007). According to Woolard, Hartegen and Klasen (2011), there is evidence that the money flowing into households through
grants is being used, in part, to advance the health and education of members of households rather than sustain the actual intended beneficiary.

According to Economic Development in the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism in the Eastern Cape (2013), the Eastern Cape has one of the highest levels of food insecurity in South Africa, with approximately 78% of the households in the province classified as being food insecure. This percentage of food insecure households is much higher than the national average of 64% (Department of Economic Development, Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Eastern Cape, 2013). According to Clara (2007:5), “De-agrarianisation has reached alarming levels in the Eastern Cape, with rural households being intensely dependent on social grants for survival”. Agricultural productivity, which has always supplied the principal source of food for rural African people, has declined as a result of the support received from the state in the form of grants (Ncube, Tanga and Bhumira, 2014). Only a small portion of rural people still make a living from farming and this has had a crippling effect on communities in terms of dramatically increasing poverty and food insecurity.

The issue of food security has been given priority in South Africa to the extent that it has been included in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa of 1996. Other initiatives, such as the RDP of 1994, have identified food security as an objective whose addressing needed to be given priority, obliging the government to prioritise public spending in order to eliminate food insecurity in the disadvantaged communities which had been subjected to the disparities and the ravages of
apartheid and left unable to fend for themselves as a result (Sekhampu, 2013). The grant system is at the heart of the measures which the South African government has implemented in order to resolve the issue of poverty and inequalities (Van den Heever, 2007). The policies which were implemented after 1994 increased spending on social programmes, which include school feeding, Child Support Grants, free health services for children between 0 and 6 years of age and for pregnant and lactating women, pension funds for the elderly and endeavouring to provide water to all by means of a community public works programme (Sekhampu, 2013).

Efforts to address the serious problem of food insecurity also led to the implementation of the Integrated Food Security Strategy in 2002. The vision of the Integrated Food Security Strategy is to attain universal physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food by all South Africans at all times, in order to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life (Department of Agriculture, 2002). According to Economic Development in the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism in the Eastern Cape (2013), 78% of the people in the province of the Eastern Cape are food insecure, making it difficult to monitor exactly the progress made towards greater food security. Jacob (2009), quoted in Sekhampu (2013:148), maintains that “approximately 80% of the households could not afford to buy a basic nutritional basket of food costing an average of R262.00 per person per month (at 2005 prices).”

The South African social security system was designed as a measure to alleviate poverty among groups who cannot be expected to participate completely in the
labour market and who live on low incomes: vulnerable groups such as the elderly, people with disabilities and children (Sekhumpa, 2013). According to the South African Constitution, the Social Assistance Act of 2004 and the White Paper for Social Welfare of 1997, “everyone has the right to social security”, and the elderly constitute a primary group to be targeted for service delivery. However, the right to social security in the form of grants is a strategy which is not sufficient to maintain either its intended beneficiaries or their extended families (Tanga, 2007). Sekhumpa (2013) maintains that while the government’s spending on social grants has increased in recent years, research still indicates that this has not reversed the drift into poverty for the majority of the recipients. Food security remains a vital issue, which still needs further research for appropriate recommendations to be made and equally appropriate policies to be implemented. It is a truism that food is a vital need for survival, but it is nevertheless particularly so in the case of the elderly (Devereux and Maxwell, 2001).

Food shortages in southern Africa constitute a perennial problem, and long-term projections indicate that regional food production per capita might diminish in the future (Rosegrant, Paisner, Meijer & Witcover, 2001). Food crises and constant shortages of food compromise human wellbeing, with hunger and malnutrition posing grave challenges to governmental and non-governmental institutions, policy and decision makers at all levels (Misselhorn, 2005).
3.8 Other survival strategies to supplement the Grant and address food insecurity

In this section survival strategies which may be followed to supplement the Old Age Grant in order to address food insecurity will be discussed.

3.8.1 Community projects to supplement the Grant

It has been found that community projects are playing a significant role in the lives of the inhabitants of various communities and that they are also helping to supplement the basic incomes provided by the Grant. According to Tanga (2007) and Tanga and Tangwe (2014), following research conducted in the Eastern Cape, there are limited numbers of projects being undertaken by communities to supplement incomes from the Grant, but in a great many instances a lack of the know-how needed to carry out the projects and a lack of funding limited their effectiveness.

As has already been noted, Clara and Du Toit (2007:5), have drawn attention to the effects of de-agrarianisation in the Eastern Cape by maintaining that “de-agrarianisation has reached alarming levels in South Africa’s Eastern Cape province, with rural households intensely dependent on social grants for survival.” This has had a negative impact on agricultural activities and has produced an undesirable side-effect, in that the introduction of the social assistance grants has encouraged people to become less self-reliant than they had previously been (Ncube, Tanga and Bhumira, 2014). The people’s food systems have declined as a result of state support in the form of grants. According to Altman et al. (2009), income security is one of the vital components in any strategy designed to alleviate food insecurity.
Owing to the fact that only a small portion of people still make a living from farming, attempts by communities to rid themselves of poverty and food insecurity have been crippled (Clara and Du Toit, 2007). According to Woolard et al. (2011), there is evidence that as a result of incomes from grants not being used for the intended beneficiaries of the grants alone, the policy has produced additional side-effects in people’s attitudes towards working. The grants seem not only to promote migration in search of employment, but there also seems to be mixed evidence of grants being a disincentive for members of households who are of working age to look for work (Woolard et al, 2011).

3.8.2 Family support

Traditionally, older people in African society were absorbed into and cared for by their extended families, and they also played a role in the raising of their grandchildren. However, in a great many instances the tables have been turned and there has been a reversal in roles, with the elderly becoming the household’s sole provider and taking care of the younger generation (Kimuna and Makiwane, 2007, Tanga, 2007, 2008). In South Africa this phenomenon has been accelerated by a dramatic increase in deaths among young adults as a result of the HIV/AIDS pandemic. According to UNAIDS (2004), Sub-Saharan Africa accounts for as many as 80% of the world’s orphans resulting from AIDS. The traditional system of caring for the elderly has been stretched owing to a lack of support and, in many cases, even the breakdown of the traditional support mechanism has resulted. According to Woolard et al. (2011), there is evidence that the money flowing into households through grants is being used, in part, to improve the health and education of the
younger members of the households rather than to sustain the intended beneficiaries of the grants. Tanga (2007) concurs with those who have pointed out that the misuse of incomes from grants to meet needs other than those of the intended beneficiaries has resulted in incomes from grants being insufficient to meet the needs of those to whom they have been awarded on the basis of a means test. A study conducted by Kasere in 2012 also highlighted the fact that money from grants is normally shared in the extended households of the intended beneficiaries. Accordingly, the Department of Social Development (2006) has concluded that the benefits of the OAG indirectly accrue to a much larger number of people than the one constituted by successful applicants for the Grant in the guise of support given to dependents. It is precisely this reality which causes the grant system to become an insufficient measure towards alleviating the plight of those for whom it was introduced.

Lombard and Kruger (2009) maintain that the Old Age Grant creates a network of dependency, in which entire households become dependent on the income from the grant for sustenance, instead of the young adults in these households looking for employment in order to support the elderly. The implications of this scenario are twofold. It could indicate that the income from grants consolidates families and prevents their disintegration by offering a support structure to the needy family member who receives the grant. On the other hand, this scenario could merely highlight the dependency on the beneficiaries of grants which is created among the other members of their households.
3.9 Gaps which this research intends to fill

Of the concerns which have been raised in this review of the perceptions pertaining to the Old Age Grant, the chief one is surely that the Grant is insufficient to meet the needs of its intended beneficiaries and their households. Despite the fact that the Department of Social Development (2012) maintains that the provision of social security is a cornerstone in the fight against the effects of poverty on children and older people, poverty nevertheless continues to exist and to threaten the most vulnerable groups in society. According to Kaseke (2010), although social assistance theoretically improves the lot of households which are living in poverty, the fact that some grants provide incomes which are below the poverty line is cause for grave concern. Kaseke (2010) maintains that there is an inherent assumption that the beneficiaries of grants will in turn supplement the grant with other sources of income, but the fact of the matter is quite different, in that most beneficiaries of grants take the grant as their sole source of income, without trying to generate a supplementary income by other means.

Despite the fact that the social security system is designed to eradicate poverty in South Africa, an enormous number of people still remain trapped in poverty. As Schatz and Ogunmefun (2005) have noted, this situation is not helped by the fact that the Old Age Grant is generally perceived to be a subsidy to sustain intergenerational households. However, it has been pointed out quite unequivocally in this chapter that social security in the form of grants is a strategy which is both an insufficient and an inadequate measure to maintain either the intended beneficiaries
of grants or their extended families, the expression of whose needs inevitably accompanies the awarding of grants (Tanga, 2007).

Although food security has rightly been identified as being of great importance, to date greater emphasis has been placed on the status of the country’s food security, rather than that of individual households. It has already been noted that according to Koch (2011), South Africa is unlikely to feature at the top of the agenda in international discussions concerning food security. South Africa is a net-exporter of agricultural commodities, a state of affairs which is aided by both the country’s agricultural productivity and the fact that it is not landlocked. However, despite these advantageous circumstances, more than 14% of the population is vulnerable to food insecurity. In the light of this, Aliber and Hart (2009) advanced the argument that while South Africa seems to be food secure at the national level, the same cannot be said about those households in the rural areas which are mired in poverty and constantly subject to food insecurity. Accordingly, the status of food security status in South Africa remains a debatable issue and this research intends to make an empirical study of this phenomenon at the household level, thereby filling existing gaps and adding valuable knowledge to the current literature.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

This chapter seeks to outline the methodological framework employed in this study for the purpose of collecting the data required to ascertain the effectiveness of the Old Age Grant as a means of improving the food security of households. An explanation of how the field work was undertaken will be given, and the research design of this study and the justification of the research methods will be discussed in detail. The population, together with the sample sizes used in this study, will be outlined, as will the sampling techniques and the instruments used to collect data. This chapter also explains how the data was analysed and details the ethical considerations which were respected while collecting the data at Goshen Village in the Eastern Cape.

4.2 Study area

The study was conducted in the Eastern Cape province of South Africa. According to Statistics South Africa (2000), households in the Eastern Cape are among the poorest in the country, with nearly 70%, or nearly a million of a total of 1.33 million households in the province spending less than R1 000.00 per month on food and necessities, and only 7.6%, or slightly more than 100,000 households spending more than R3 500.00 per month. The Amathole district municipality was randomly selected among the local districts. The Amathole municipality is subdivided into local municipalities, and a random selection among the local municipalities and wards was made, with Ward 12 of the Amahlathi local municipality being randomly chosen as
the area of study. The Goshen community is situated 8km away from Cathcart, where the Amahlathi local municipality is located. Goshen is situated 4 Km from the nearest tarred road, which is the N6 highway. The people in this community rely mainly on the social grants and agriculture to provide their livelihoods. However, it is important to note that despite the availability of land and that some of the people still engage in agriculture, there is a significant decline in agricultural activities in the area and most of the land now lies idle. The Goshen community is one of the poorest and it is situated in one of the most remote areas in the Eastern Cape. It is one of the villages which are listed in the Anti-Poverty Roster which was compiled by the Department of Social Development in the Eastern Cape (Department of Social Development, 2013). Most of the houses in this area are constructed from wood and mud, and zinc is used by these villagers to provide roofs for their houses. One of the reasons for choosing this general area for the study is the fact that it is an under-researched one.

4.3 Research Design

According to Trochim (2006), a research design provides the structure of the research: it acts as a type of "glue" to hold all of the elements in a research project together. The research design is, in effect, the blueprint which guides the research and provides its logical framework. Mouton (2001) defines a research design as a plan or blueprint of how one intends to conduct the research. In this study the researcher employed an explanatory case study in order to solicit information concerning the effectiveness of the Old Age Grant as a means of improving food security at the household level. An explanatory or analytical approach was employed
to find the types of relationships which could be established between the various variables of the research. Statistical methods not only established correlations among certain variables, but also provided additional qualitative data, and proved to be very useful as a means of providing greater depth to perceived relationships. The descriptive and analytical data are presented in this chapter.

4.4 The Research Approach

The study applied a mixed methods approach, which is also known as triangulation, to collect data. De Vos et al. (2011), explain that triangulation refers to the use of more than one approach to the investigation of research questions in order to enhance confidence in the resulting findings. Methodological triangulation, which is the use of more than one method of gathering data, was used in this study by making use of both qualitative and quantitative research methods. According to Creswell (2003:18), a mixed methods approach is one in which the researcher tends to employ a pragmatic approach in the acquisition of knowledge. It employs strategies of enquiry which involve collecting data either simultaneously or sequentially in order to gain the best understanding of the research problem. As the study of the effectiveness of the Old Age Grant as a means of improving food security at the household level is a multi-dimensional one, multi-disciplinary techniques are appropriate to research conducted in this particular domain. Accordingly, a mixed methods design was considered the best research method to facilitate investigation of the problem. The main advantage of a mixed methods approach is that it allows concurrent procedures to be employed by converging both quantitative and qualitative data to analyse the research problem (Creswell, 2003).
The use of these two methods widens and deepens understanding of the phenomenon being investigated. According to Flick (2004:27), a quantitative approach is used in triangulation for purposes of confirmation and one is normally used to confirm if the instruments are appropriate for making measurements concerning a concept. However, there are pitfalls and problems which can accompany performing an analysis of the Old Age Grant as a means of improving the food security of the inhabitants of households, as there appear to be no specific and accepted ways to measure food security in South Africa. According to Altman et al. (2009), in South Africa there are no generally accepted or regulated ways of measuring or monitoring food security, which presents a challenge for this study in its attempt to measure precisely the contribution which the Grant makes to address food security.

Qualitative research methods were used in order to complement quantitative methods. A qualitative approach is generally used when “the inquirer often makes knowledge claims, based primarily on constructivist perspectives, for instance interviews” (Creswell, 2003:22). Qualitative methods were used in this study with this perspective in mind, as they allowed a great deal of information to be gathered from the participants. This information was sifted to the extent that only information which provided answers to the research questions was actually used.

4.5 Population

According to De Vos et al. (2011), “population” refers to groups of individuals who possess specific characteristics. Babbie and Mouton (2001:175) define a population
as that aggregation of elements from which a sample is selected. For the purposes of this study the population refers to the population of recipients of the Old Age Grant from which the 127 respondents to the questionnaire were randomly selected, the population of members of the community of Goshen from which 14 were purposively selected for the focus group discussions, the population of all of the social workers working in the community, and the population of local government officials from which the 4 who participated in the study were selected. According to the census conducted in 2011, the Goshen community falls under Ward 12 of the Amahlathi local municipality and has a population of 7509 inhabitants (Census, 2011). The age of 60 years was used in this study to identify and classify the elderly, as the age of 60 years accords with the nationally accepted definition of elderly people in South Africa (SASSA, 2011).

4.6 Sample

A sample is a finite part of statistical population whose properties are studied in order to gain information about the whole population. When dealing with people, a sample can be defined as a set of participants selected from a larger population for the purpose of a survey (De Vos et al., 2011). In this study 2 sets of samples were used. The first set consisted of 127 recipients of the Old Age Grant in the village of Goshen and a survey questionnaire was administered to them.

The second sample set consisted of 20 participants: 14 members of the community, 2 social workers and 4 people from the local government who were working in Goshen Village formed the focus group. Leedy and Omrdon (2005) define a focus
group as an interview which includes face-to-face rapport with several participants, simultaneously. The 20 participants for the focus group were purposively selected, which precluded all of the elements within their respective populations from having an equal chance to be selected for the various samples, but the logic behind the selection criteria which were applied was based on the consideration of the rich information which could be acquired from this selected group. The focus group participants were chosen by the researcher using her own judgment in the selection of the sample, as she had worked with the community before and was sufficiently well-informed regarding those participants who might provide the richest information concerning this community. The total number of the overall sample was 147.

4.7 Sampling Techniques

When explaining sampling, Hofstee (2006) maintains that the researcher carefully draws or chooses, from the whole population, a section which may be utilised for analysis in response to the research questions. In this study two sampling techniques were used. The selection of the survey sample made use of stratified random sampling, but purposive sampling was used to obtain the focus group sample.

4.7.1 Stratified random sampling

In the course of applying stratified random sampling in order to obtain the survey sample, the researcher first divided the population into four strata, which were identified as A, B, C and D. Map No.1 shows how the population was stratified. The geographical distribution of the population was obtained by making a study of the
geographical make-up of the village. It was found that there were areas in which a
great many households were concentrated, while in others the populations were
sparser. The strata were used in order to present a clear and accurate picture of the
Goshen community. Stratum A consisted of 10% of the overall population, and 13
elements were drawn from this stratum. Stratum C consisted of 11% of the
population and 14 elements were drawn from it. This was done because these strata
were inhabited by relatively few people. However, 100 questionnaires were
administered in the B and D strata, as they comprised 79% of the overall population,
and accordingly 100 elements were chosen from them to form part of the sample. A
stratified random sampling method was used chiefly to ensure that the sample
obtained was a representative one. The population was stratified in a way which
ensured that the population within a single stratum was homogenous with respect to
the characteristics on the basis of which it was stratified (Kumar, 2011).
4.7.2 Purposive sampling

To obtain the second sample for the focus group discussions, use was made of purposive sampling. According to De Vos (2011), purposive sampling can be a very valuable type of sampling in explanatory research. Purposive sampling, also known as selective sampling, was used in order to exercise judgment when selecting the participants and the types of data to be used in the research. Its use and application was based on the judgment of the researcher in order to permit selections to be made with a specific purpose in mind: in this case, the reason for the use of a non-probability sample being to generate rich and in-depth descriptive data regarding the state of food security situation in Goshen Village. For Babbie (2007), non-probability sampling techniques usually offer the best chance to obtain rich qualitative data and
accordingly, the participants in the sample were chosen from the overall population using the judgment of the researcher, in order to achieve the objectives of the study.

Purposive sampling was used also for the purpose of acquiring in-depth information concerning the research problem. De Vos (2011) maintains that the sample selected is generally small when compared with the samples which are drawn for the probability sampling associated with quantitative research designs. This study made use of a sample obtained from purposive sampling, consisting of only 20 participants. Focus group discussions were employed in order to capture the narratives and the views of the participants. The participants were selected according to the following criteria:

- Willingness to participate
- Informed consent
- Residents of Goshen
- Members of the community who have in-depth knowledge of the Goshen community.

### 4.8 Instruments for collecting data and their administration

In this study a household survey questionnaire and interview guides were used as a means of collecting data. The questionnaires were designed to be used in face-to-face interviews with the respondents. In the first phase of the study 127 questionnaires were administered to elderly persons who were recipients of the Old
Age Grant. The second phase of the study made use of a group made up of 20 ward
committee members and the social workers in the area.

4.8.1 Questionnaire

In this study 127 questionnaires were used as a method for collecting data. Babbie
(2007: 246) explains that a questionnaire is a “document containing questions and
other types of items designed to solicit information appropriate for analysis.” The
questionnaires were administered in their own local language to elderly people in the
Goshen community who were receiving the Old Age Grant. The survey questionnaire
used in this study adopted the Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (Coates,
2007) and also included some sections which contained questions which were
considered as having the potential to provide the best answers to the research
questions. The questionnaires issued constituted the main instrument which was
used for the collection of data in this phase of the study.

The questionnaire comprised four sections, which included:

• Section A: Background and biographical information.
• Section B: Household socio-economic information.
• Section C: Other sources of income besides the Old Age Grant.
• Section D: Assessment of assets.

Section A, which covered background and biographical information, contained
questions on demographic characteristics including age, gender, race, ethnicity,
marital status, educational level and the number of people living in a household.
There were questions concerning bread winners and the number of people staying in each household.

Section B concentrated on socio-economic information and included nine frequency-of-occurrences questions which were asked in order to determine how often a food insecurity condition occurred. There were four response options representing the range of frequencies: 0 = none, 1 = rarely, 2 = sometimes and 3 = often. The respondents answered all the questions on behalf of their households and all the members of these households. There are time frames used in the application of food insecurity scales, which make use of 12 months, 6 months or 30-day recall periods (Coates, 2007). However, in this study a 30-day recall period was used, as it was felt that accurate and reliable responses were more likely to be associated with a shorter recall period, owing to the fact that the questionnaires were administered to the elderly.

Section C investigated whether or not the beneficiaries of the Old Age Grant had other sources of income and whether these were higher than the Grant. The respondents were asked about the uses to which the money was put, and this section also probed for information concerning other strategies for survival which the respondents might be using.

Section D investigated the physical assets which the respondents had, with the chief purpose of evaluating the types of services which it might be appropriate to introduce
and other recommendations which could be made in order to help the people of Goshen.

4.8.2 Interview guide

An interview guide was used in the focus group discussions in order to guide them, for the purpose of gathering data which would supplement the data obtained by administering the questionnaires. The key informant in the community of Goshen formed the focus group, which was made up of members of Goshen community members and social workers who work with them.

Each focus group was facilitated by the researcher with the help of two assistants. Discussions with the participants were guided by a structured, semi-directive interview questionnaire. In order to capture the data completely, the researcher asked for permission to use an audiotape recorder during the sessions, and this request was granted by the participants. The recordings helped to obtain an accurate transcription of the opinions expressed by the participants in the research notebooks, and these were used later during the analysis of the data. Samples of these questionnaires are included in this study as Annexure A. In addition, the effectiveness of the focus group discussions was ensured by adhering to a time limit, thereby controlling the discussions in order to allow each participant to express his or her viewpoint.
4.9 Analysis of data

This study made use of two stages to analyse the data which had been collected. The first stage was a quantitative analysis of the data. The preparation of the data at this stage involved checking the validity and reliability of the data collected, coding the data and entering it into a computer database, using Microsoft Excel (Elliot, Hynan, Reish and Smith, 2006). Care was taken to ensure both the validity and the reliability of the study. According to Bashir, Afzal and Azeem (2008), the validity of the tools used in the study determines whether the research truly measures that which it is intended to measure. As the term implies, reliability refers to performance over time, and in the context of this research, reliability indicates that similar results could be expected if the research were repeated under identical circumstances. The questionnaires were screened, in order to ensure that they were properly completed, to allow the validity and the reliability of the data to be checked. Only information which answered the research questions was entered into a pre-coding book, which had been drafted prior to the collecting of the data, in order to analyse it. The data was coded using the Household Food Insecurity Access Scale Score and entered into Microsoft Excel before being transferred to the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for analysis. The Household Food Insecurity Access Score (HFIAS) was used to measure the degree of food security in the households of the recipients of the Old Age Grant. The HFIAS tool was adopted from the Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance (FANTA). The Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS) for Measurement of Food Access Indicator Guide, Version 3, is used to estimate the prevalence of food insecurity in the United States, annually. This method was developed by Coates et al. (2007). The HFIAS score is a continuous
measure of the degree of food insecurity or access to food in a household during the past four weeks or 30 days. First, a HFIAS score variable needed to be calculated for each household by summing the codes for each frequency-of-occurrence question.

The frequency-of-occurrence questions are coded as 0 for all cases where the answer to the corresponding occurrence question is “no”. The maximum score for a household is 27, when the response to all nine frequency-of-occurrence questions is “often”, which has a response code of 3. The minimum score is 0, when the response to all frequency-of-occurrence questions is “no”. The higher the score, the greater is the level of food insecurity and the more limited is the access to food in the household. The lower the score, the less is the food insecurity experienced by a household and the greater is its access to food. The average Household Food Insecurity Access Scale Score is then calculated by dividing the sum of HFIAS Scores in the sample by the sample size.

The average HFIAS score is a continuous variable and it is a sensitive means of capturing small increments or changes over time. Once it has been calculated, the Household Food Insecurity Access Prevalence (HFIAP) Status indicator may be calculated. The HFIAP indicator categorises households according to four levels of household food insecurity: food secure, mildly food insecure, moderately food insecure and severely food insecure. Households are categorised as increasingly food insecure as they respond increasingly affirmatively, indicating that they experience severe conditions of food insecurity or that they experience these
conditions frequently. A food secure household experiences none of the food insecurity conditions, or merely experiences worry, but rarely. A mildly food insecure household worries about not having enough food sometimes or often, or may be unable to eat preferred foods, or tends to have a more monotonous diet than it would desire, and may eat some foods which are considered undesirable, but only rarely. A mildly food insecure household does not cut back on quantity, nor does it experience any of the three most severe conditions of food insecurity, namely, running out of food, going to bed hungry, or going a whole day and night without eating.

A moderately food insecure household sacrifices quality more frequently than a mildly food insecure one, by having a monotonous diet, or by eating undesirable foods sometimes or often, and might have started to cut back on quantity by reducing the size of meals or the number of meals, rarely or sometimes, but does not experience any of the three most severe conditions. A severely food insecure household has graduated to cutting back on the size of meals or the number of meals often, and may experience any of the three most severe conditions, even infrequently or rarely: any household which has experienced one or more of these three conditions even once, in the last four weeks or 30 days, is considered severely food insecure. Following the classification of households according to their food insecurity status, the causes and coping strategies were evaluated using descriptive statistics, which employed both frequency and means.

According to De Vos et al. (2011), inferential statistics are techniques which allow the use of samples to make generalisations about the population from which the
sample was drawn. Inferential statistical analysis was used in this study, specifically the T-test, parametric statistical analysis and the chi-squared tests. Graphs, tables and charts were used to summarise the results obtained from the quantitative data.

The second stage was the analysis of the qualitative data. According to De Vos et al. (2011), the analysis of qualitative data transforms data into findings. This involves reducing the volume of the raw information, sifting it into patterns of significance and constructing a framework for communicating the essence of what the data reveals. The data was sorted in order to determine the common themes which emerged from it. The Sustainable Livelihoods Approach and the Capability Approach were used to analyse the themes as they emerged. These themes were grouped together and later interpreted as the findings of the study.

4.10 Ethical considerations
This study adhered to the ethical standards laid down for conducting research of this sort, including the right of the respondents to privacy and to answer questions voluntarily. Before conducting the research, permission was sought from the Local Government authorities and the members of the Goshen community, as a matter of protocol. Officers from the Department of Social Work who were working with the inhabitants of Goshen Village were contacted to help to locate participants for the study, as the Department operates in the ward and its officers are on familiar terms with its inhabitants. Permission to conduct the research in the ward was requested and obtained from the councillor who represents it, and he became a participant in the focus group discussions, which limited the effectiveness of the study to an
extent, as his presence did add a degree of bias to the responses of the other participants.

4.10.1 Informed consent

Consent was obtained from the participants by explaining the objectives of the study and what it entailed to them. In compliance with the requirements of informed consent, the participants were informed of the goal of the study and were not at any time forced to participate in it, as they were told that participation was voluntary. The participants in the focus group discussions were also informed that a tape recorder would be used to record the proceedings. This information was also provided in the informed consent form (Annexure A) and this consent form was read to the participants in order to check that the information was clear and understood by them. The forms were signed by the participants before the focus group discussions began.

4.10.2 Anonymity and confidentiality

Confidentiality in research is defined by Strydom (1998: 28) as “a continuation of privacy, which refers to an agreement between persons that limits others’ access to private information, except in reporting research results as agreed, and that the information will not be used for any purpose other than research.” Great value is attached to privacy in most societies and, as a result, researchers need to ensure that the right to privacy of those who agree to participate in their research is respected. Issues of privacy can pertain to personal details such as age, political beliefs, religion, finance and family. As personal details of this sort were included in
this research, the anonymity of the participants was maintained. In order to maintain confidentiality, the participants were not asked to provide details concerning their identities, postal addresses and so on. They were told that the information which they provided would be used for research purposes only. The identities of the respondents and all the filed information obtained from the instruments which were used to collect the data will not be disclosed at any time.

4.11 Limitations of the study

During the conducting of the research, problems were inevitably encountered and required to be resolved. Among the chief of the initial problems faced was the matter of overcoming the logistical problem of locating the households of the recipients of the Old Age Grant, and the additional one of walking the distances between one homestead and another, within a fairly widely spread out village. As the initial dates for collecting data coincided with the SASSA payment days, it was necessary to reschedule them in order to resolve the problem.

The second obstacle concerned perceptions of the respondents. The participants viewed the researcher as an outsider, tended to anticipate that the interviews would resolve, at least in part, some of their concerns regarding social grants and food security. Some participants believed there would be a benefit from taking part in the interviews. To correct these perceptions, explanations were given and the people were told that the study was an academic enquiry, as opposed to an intervention by the government which could bring immediate concrete responses to the problems encountered by the community. In some instances, these explanations were very
time-consuming, which delayed the commencement of the survey itself. However, the participants gave their consent and participated freely in the discussions.

The third obstacle was encountered during the two focus group discussions. The participants felt strongly that the researcher should help by using her findings to convince the relevant authorities to act to improve their circumstances, obliging the researcher to respond to these arguments by emphasising the fact that this research is academic work and for the purposes of acquiring knowledge and information only.

4.12 Conclusion

This chapter outlines the steps and techniques which were adopted and used to conduct this research. It also gives an outline of the population samples and sampling techniques which were used, and the research procedure and instruments which were used to collect the data. It then goes on to provide an overview of the techniques which were used to analyse the data analysis phase. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected and analysed in accordance with the standards and the ethics which pertain to research in the social sciences. The next chapter presents the findings and interprets these in terms of the research objectives.
CHAPTER FIVE
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Introduction
This chapter presents, analyses and discusses the results generated through the application of the methodology described in the preceding chapter. The results were obtained from the focus group discussions which were conducted and the household survey questionnaires which were administered. The chapter is divided into three sections. The first contains the results of the quantitative analysis, which are presented as simple descriptive statistics. The trends and levels which emerged from the data obtained from the questionnaire have been presented in the form of tables and graphs. The second section contains the qualitative results of the interviews, which are presented according to the themes which emerged. The feelings and opinions expressed are described and interpreted in human terms, rather than subjected to quantification and measurement. The last section provides a discussion of the findings of the study.

5.2 Presentation of quantitative findings
The main aim of this study was to investigate the impact of the Old Age support Grant as a means of improving food security at the household level in the rural area upon which the study focuses. The quantitative data was collected through the use of a household survey questionnaire. The objectives of the quantitative survey were to provide detailed biographical information concerning the beneficiaries and to assess the impact of the Old Age Grant as a means of improving food security at the
household level. The results are presented in accordance with the structure of the questionnaire.

5.2.1 Biographical information obtained from the respondents

The study was conducted in the Goshen community, which falls under the Amathole District Municipality. The Old Age Support Grant survey questionnaire was administered to 127 respondents, and all 127 managed to complete their questionnaires successfully. Of the 127 respondents, 60% were females and 40% were males. Figure 5.1 shows the results which were obtained.

![Figure 5.1: Demographic make-up of the sample in terms of gender](image)

5.2.2 Race

All the respondents in this community were black and no other racial group was represented. All of the respondents were Xhosa-speaking and elderly.
5.2.3 Age

Table 1 shows the age distribution of the respondents. 44.09% fell within the range of 60-65 years, with 26.77% in the range between 65 and 70 years, those above 70 years of age constituted 29.13% of the sample population.

Table 1: Age distribution of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60-65yrs</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-70yrs</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 70yrs</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.4 Marital status

The marital status of the respondents is shown in Figure 5.2, with 39% of them being single and forming the largest group, while 37% were married, either legally or traditionally, 19% were widows, 3% were cohabiting and 2% were divorced.
5.2.5 Education

The educational levels of the respondents are shown below in Figure 5.3. 64.57% of them, the largest group, ended their schooling at the primary level of education, followed by 18.11%, who had secondary education, while 15.75% indicated that they had never attended school. By correlating the information it can be shown that more than 80% of the respondents, 102 out of a sampler of 127, had not gone beyond the primary level of education, and only one had received tertiary education.
5.2.6 Household size

The participants were asked how many people lived in their households while they were receiving the Old Age Grant. For 28% the figure was between 1 and 2. The largest group, comprising 43% of the respondents, 55 out of 127, reported that between 3 and 4 people lived in their households. A further 15% were living in households shared by between 5 and 6 people, and 14% were found to live in households with more than 6 people. Table 2 summarises this distribution.

Table 2: Number of household members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of household members</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>127</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.7 Dependency upon the Old Age Grant

Figure 5.4 provides a graphic representation of the various reasons behind the dependency of members of households, other than the intended beneficiaries, on the Old Age Grant. It was found that 68.78% of the respondents confirmed that one of the chief reasons for their dependency upon the Grant was unemployment. A further 32.22% 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 to share the money with the other members of their households. Of these respondents, 10.23% were taking care of orphans, whereas 89.76% did not have orphans in their households.

It was found that 48.03% of the respondents took care of grandchildren, while the remaining 51.97% did not have children or grandchildren. When they were asked about illness or disabilities among the members of their households, 22.05% of the respondents indicated that a member of their households suffered from an illness or a disability, while 77.95% gave a negative response to this question. Figure 5.4 shows the graphic representation of the reasons behind other members of households being dependent upon the Old Age Grant.
5.2.8 Participation in income-generating activities

When the participants were asked whether they were involved in any income-generating activities, 79% disclosed that they were not involved in income-generating activities of any sort, while the remaining 21% confirmed that they were. This distribution is shown in Figure 5.5 below.

Figure 5.4: Reasons for dependency upon the Old Age Grant on the part of members of households other than intended beneficiaries
Figure 5.5: Participation in income-generating activities

5.2.9 Meals consumed by households per day

Figure 5.6 shows that of the 127 respondents, 55.91% were able to have 3 or more meals per day, while 38.58% had 2 meals per day and the remaining 5.51% ate once a day.

Figure 5.6: Consumed meals per day
5.2.10 Time frame

When the respondents were asked to rate their lifestyles from the time they started to receive the Old Age Grant, 13.39% felt that they had not noticed any changes, 33.07% that their lifestyles were now better, with 28.35% rating their lives as fair and 25.20% maintaining that they were worse off than before.

![Bar chart showing lifestyle changes over time](image)

**Figure 5.7: Time frames**

5.2.11 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. Once the data had been obtained, the analysis of the HFIAS was then grouped into four different types of indicators:

- Household Food Insecurity: Access-related Conditions
5.2.12 Household food insecurity: access-related conditions

The access-related conditions of household food insecurity were used as a means of interpreting the results which had been collected. These indicators provide specific disaggregated information about the behaviours 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, was measured and Table 3 below shows the level of the severity at which the households of Goshen are experiencing the condition.

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% of the respondents were worried “often”, with 28.35% saying that the condition occurred “sometimes” and 7.09% maintained that it was “rare.”

The results also showed that 54.33% 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% experienced this condition
“sometimes”, 1.57% maintained that it did occur, but on “rare” occasions and the remaining 1.57% felt that they did not experience conditions of this sort ever.

The results also revealed that 50.39% 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% said that they experienced this kind of scenario “sometimes”, for a further 3.15% it was “rare”, and 2.36% said that they never experienced a state of affairs of this sort.

In addition, 39.37% of the households “often” ate food which they would not choose to eat as a result of a lack of resources, 53.54% said that this happened “sometimes”, 5.51% said that it was “rare” and 1.57% “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% 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% said that they “rarely” experienced the condition of not having food at all. For 19.69% the reply was “sometimes” and 9.45% responded that they experienced this condition “often”.

It was found that 53.54% of the households did not experience the condition of going to bed hungry owing to having no resources, while 17.32% said that this condition
was “rare”, 22.83% said it happened “sometimes” and 6.40% experienced this condition “often”. Table 3 shows these Household Food Insecurity Access-related Conditions.
Table 3: Household Food Insecurity Access-related Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>RARE</th>
<th>SOMETIMES</th>
<th>OFTEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Did you worry that in your household you would not have enough food?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>28.35</td>
<td>64.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Were you or any household member not able to eat the kinds of foods you preferred because of a lack of resources?</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>42.52</td>
<td>54.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Did you or any household member have to limit the variety of foods you ate because of lack of resources?</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>44.09</td>
<td>50.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Did you or any household member eat food that you preferred not to eat because of a lack of resources to obtain other types of food?</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>53.54</td>
<td>39.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Did you or any household member eat a smaller meal than you felt you needed because there was not enough food?</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>60.63</td>
<td>30.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Did you or any other household member eat fewer meals in a day because the food was not enough?</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>66.14</td>
<td>18.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Was there ever no food at all in your household because there were no resources to get some (or any)?</td>
<td>63.78</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>9.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Did you or any household member go to sleep at night hungry because there was not enough food?</td>
<td>53.54</td>
<td>17.32</td>
<td>22.83</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Did you or any household member go for the whole day without eating anything because there was not enough food?</td>
<td>72.44</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.13 Household food insecurity: access-related domains

The HFIAS frequency-of-occurrence questions are related to 3 different domains of food insecurity or access. The data is presented by grouping the responses to the generic frequency questions into three chief domains, namely:

- Anxiety and uncertainty about the supply of food in the household
- Insufficient quality
- Insufficient food intake and its physical consequences

The results show how the respondents scored in each domain. In the domain of anxiety and uncertainty about the supply of food in the household, the results point quite clearly to the fact that most of the people in Goshen are uncertain about the supply of food in their households. Of the respondents, 64.57% reported that this anxiety affected them “often”, 28.35% responded with “sometimes” and the smallest number said that they were “rarely” by uncertainty.

Included among the HFIAS frequency-of-occurrence questions are several which pertain to the quality of the food which the respondents consume. These questions fall under the domain of “insufficient quality” and the results show how the respondents scored in it. It was found that 48.03% of the respondents were faced with the condition of having food of insufficient quality affecting them “often”, while for 46.72% the answer was “sometimes”, and for the remaining tiny minority of 3.41% it was “rarely”.  

The third domain focuses on insufficient food intake and its physical consequences, with respondents who scored highly in this domain being most acutely affected. The largest group, 36.22%, reported that the condition affected them “sometimes”, followed by 13.86%, for whom it was “often”, and finally the smallest group, 10.89%, for whom it was “rare”. These results have been tabulated in Table 4.

**Table 4: Domains and responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qn</th>
<th>Domain One (N=127)</th>
<th>Domain Two (N=381)</th>
<th>Domain Three (N=635)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response 1</td>
<td>Response 2</td>
<td>Response 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.09%</td>
<td>28.35%</td>
<td>64.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>Response 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.03%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>Response 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.2.14 Household Food Insecurity Access Scale score**

The HFIAS score was used in this study to measure the degree of food insecurity access experienced by the households of Goshen during the previous four weeks. The higher a household scores, the more food insecurity they experience, and
conversely the lower the score, the less food insecure a household is. The results of this study indicate that none of the respondents is 100% food secure, or even mildly food insecure. It was found that 44.09% are moderately and 55.91% are severely food insecure, despite the fact that all of the respondents were recipients of the Old Age Grant. The average HFIAS score for the sample was 16.05 and individual scores ranged from 0 to 27. Average HFIAS Score = 2038 / 127 = 16.05
### Table 5: HFIAS Score categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qn</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Food secure**: 0.00%
- **Mildly food insecure**: 0.00%
- **Moderately food insecure**: 44.09%
- **Severely food insecure**: 55.91%
5.2.15  **Food scarcity time frames**

Of the 127 respondents who completed the household survey questionnaires, 80% reported that their households experienced food shortages mainly just before the end of the month, while the remaining 20% indicated they could have food shortages at any time of the month. Figure 5.8 below shows these results:

![Figure 5.8: Food scarcity time frames](image)

5.2.16  **Causes of food shortages**

When asked about the causes of food shortages, 111 of 127 participants, or 87.4%, cited inflation as the main cause, followed by a lack of agricultural production, which was cited by 48.0%. Poor salaries were cited as the least significant cause of food shortage, which may very well be owing to the fact that the people who were
interviewed were elderly and mainly retired on the grounds of age. Figure 5.9 provides a graphic representation of the way in which the respondents replied.

Figure 5.9: Causes of food shortages

5.2.17 Adjustment to food shortages

The study found that reducing the intake of food was by far the most common response to shortages, with 81.1% reducing intake and 76.4% reducing the number of meals per day. Only 7.1% cited the disposal of household goods as a means of combating shortages of food. The distribution of responses is shown in Figure 5.10
5.2.18 Expenditures on food

The study found that 60% of the people in Goshen spend 75% of their incomes on food, while 37% spend between 51% and 75% on food, and the rest spend between 25% and 50%.

5.2.19 Analysis of assets and needs

Of the 127 respondents, 110 or 86.6% reported that their households own land, 49.6% owned a garden, 28.3% owned fowl-runs, 26.8% owned livestock and 11.0% owned agricultural equipment. Less than 10% owned a small business, building tools or a vehicle, or were still formally employed.
5.3 Presentation of qualitative data

Qualitative analysis was undertaken through the use of focus group discussions, which were conducted in Goshen Village. These focus group discussions were used in order to gain more information on the contribution which the Old Age Grant makes towards ensuring food security at the household level, in order to complement the data obtained by administering the household survey questionnaires. Thematic analysis was used to analyse the data obtained from the focus group discussions. Transcriptions were made of the tape recordings of the discussions, which were guided in the hope that they would help to answer the three research questions, namely: (i) To what extent does the Old Age Grant enable its beneficiaries to be food secure? (ii) Which are the factors which affect food security at the household level in Goshen Village? (iii) Which other survival strategies are employed to supplement the Old Age Grant in order to improve food security at the household level? The group for the focus group discussions comprised 14 members of the community, 2 social workers and 4 local government authorities. The analysis of their responses produced the results in this phase of the research, and these will be presented according to the themes which emerged.

5.3.1 Insufficient food intake

Of the 12 members of the community members who participated in the study, 11 felt that the Old Age Grant makes a positive contribution towards the livelihoods of the elderly, but complaints were expressed regarding the insufficiency of the money to provide all of the basic necessities. One of them said
“...this grant that we are getting is a good support measure from the government, but still the R1200.00 is not enough, even when one is buying the basic commodities only, and this leaves us having insufficient food to put on the table.”

During the focus group discussions 11 community members and 2 social workers were of the opinion that, despite the annual increase in the Grant, the money was still not enough to cater for household needs and that it left most of the people still poverty-stricken and living in atrocious conditions. In addition, 9 of the community members pointed out that the Grant money was being diversified to cater for other household expenses, rather than being used to buy food only. All 14 of the community members felt that the money was not sufficient and explained that on many occasions they had been left with nothing and had been obliged to take food on credit from the shops.

One of them said:

“...our government has tried by all means to help us by giving us the Grants, but still the money that we receive is not enough to cater for all our household expenses. In our families this Grant money is further sub-divided so that it covers some of the household expenses to an extent, but we end up with no choice but to borrow more money from loan sharks.”
That the Grants have created a culture of dependency was made apparent by the 12 community members, who confirmed that the Grant had become their main source of income, and that they had no other form of support to supplement the Grant.

5.3.2 Responsibility placed on the elderly

The 2 social workers reported that the responsibility to provide for every member of their households had been placed on the elderly, which has had adverse implications and consequences for their ability to achieve food security for their households. One of the reasons behind the displacement of the duty to provide food for households is unemployment. One of the social workers said:

“There is a widespread concern when it comes to who fend[s] for the household here in Goshen. Thus, what the Department has noted is that most of the people in Goshen are now depending on the Old Age Grant income to sustain the household and little involvement in income generating activities being also noted.”

The 14 community members participating in the study felt that the fact that the young adults continued to be unemployed had led to many becoming either solely dependent on the social grants or else leaving the community in order to seek employment in the towns. The trend towards urban migration has resulted in the elderly being obliged to take care of their grandchildren while the parents go out to seek greener pastures elsewhere. One of the participants said:

“Our children are forced to go and look for employment opportunities in other towns like Cape Town and Johannesburg. This is due to
certain difficulties that they face and they end up leaving their own children under our care (the grandparents), but the main problem is that they do not support their children. The Grant money meant for the children’s support remains with the parent and we, as the grandparents, are forced to share our own Grant money with the dependents.”

Complaints were voiced by all of the participants, who explained that some parents leave their children with their elderly parents without providing adequate support for the children. All of the participants mentioned that although some of these young adults were receiving the Child Support Grant, they nevertheless did not send any of this money to support their children, for whose support the Child Support Grant was being paid to them, leaving their elderly parents with the problem of supporting their grandchildren using their money from the Old Age Grant. It was found that in most cases where there were orphans, they are taken into the care of the elderly, when there are elderly relatives, and this too increases both the number of the people in a household and the number who are dependent on the Old Age Grant received by an elderly person.

11 of the 14 members of the community participating in the study also pointed to the fact that the elderly have been left to take care of the young generation, rather than the other way around, as had been the case in traditional society for generations, owing to the frequency with which members of the younger generation return to Goshen bedridden and unable to walk or do any work, and end up in the care of the
elderly. The plight of the elderly is compounded by their often being required to care for as many as two generations below them in their families, placing intolerable strain on both the physical and the financial resources of people who had, in the past, been the ones to receive care from others in their old age. The effects of this state of affairs on their Old Age Grants hardly needs to be spelled out, particularly in view of the fact that most of the elderly people in Goshen rely on the Grant and they have no other stable supplementary income to complement the grant.

5.3.3 Causes of household food insecurity

The results from the focus group discussions revealed the causes of food insecurity at the household level, and unemployment was a variable which drew a great deal of discussion. 13 community members and the 4 local government authorities seemed worried about the role played by employment as a vital factor for achieving food security. The community members maintained that the people of Goshen lack opportunities for employment, and cited this as one of the main factors affecting household food security adversely. One participant said:

“Most of our children are not working and this in a way is making it hard for them to be able to support our families, thus, the grant that we get from the government is now a support measure for the household and not for one intended beneficiary.”

7 of the community members felt that among the most important of the other factors affecting their food security was the lack of agricultural production. They explained
that the members of the community have the main asset, which is land, but that most of the land was lying fallow, as they cannot farm most of the areas.

11 of the community members felt that attempts at agricultural production were severely compromised by the fact that what they end up producing is too little to support them and their families. They also pointed to a lack of external support to fund agricultural projects within the community, maintaining that this had demotivated the residents of Goshen.

During the discussions one participant said:

“…people in Goshen community have lost hope in getting help to support their agricultural activities. In fact we have people promising to help us run our projects, but they talk only, and there is no implementation.”

5.3.4 Measures supplementary to the grant

The 14 community members pointed out that while most people in the rural areas of South Africa depend on agriculture as their main strategy for survival and the residents of Goshen also practised small-scale farming, most of the land in the community was now lying idle. They maintained that the decline in agricultural activities had started to cripple the community, and that the lack of agricultural activity had made it difficult for the other residents of Goshen to become involved in agriculture.
The responses given by the 4 members of the local government authority and the 2 social workers also pointed to the fact that while the principal asset of the people of Goshen was the land which the people own, many were failing to make good use of this available resource to make a living. 9 of the community members maintained that the failure to help the Goshen community to be able to make full use of their land had resulted in most of these residents continuing to live in poverty and unable to achieve food security. One of the participants said:

“… as Goshen residents we wish to supplement the grant by also practicing agriculture, but still we can’t afford it, and this has demotivated us in Goshen and some view agriculture as a practice done by the elderly and uneducated.”

5.4 Discussion of findings

The discussion of the findings focuses on an analysis of both the quantitative and the qualitative data. This study was guided by two theories, namely the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach and the Capabilities Approach. The Capability Approach postulates that poverty should be understood as a basic capability failure (Sempiga, 2012). This is caused by the inability of individuals and communities to choose appropriate activities or lifestyles which are basic to providing the needs of human existence. These two theories were chosen because they were perceived to be able to help to analyse the state of food security in Goshen Village and also to determine whether the money provided by the Old Age Grant promotes the food security of its beneficiaries.
In this study certain variables such as dependency on the money from the Grant were investigated, in order to measure the levels of significance of this dependency and the number of members to be found in a single household headed by a recipient of the Grant. The t-test technique was used to measure significance. In the case of 43.32% of the respondents, it was found that between 3 and 4 people lived in their households, while only 13.4% reported that their households had more than six occupants. The number of people per household who were solely dependent on the Old Age Grant for their survival was found to range between 1 and 13, with a mean of 3.7087, which did not differ significantly from a mean of 4 (t = -1.61, p-value = 0.1107). The t-tests which were run produced a t-score of -1.61, revealing that the dependency of the number of occupants in a household living with a recipient of the Grant was either not a significant factor in this study, or that it might be a chance factor affecting these households. The modal and median numbers of dependents was four.

For 63.8% of the respondents the main reason for their dependents becoming dependent on the Old Age Grant was unemployment, while 10.2%, the smallest group, attributed their dependency to orphanhood. Approximately one in four respondents reported that a member of his or her household participated in an income-generating activity, demonstrating that there is generally very little attempt being made to supplement the income from the Old Age Grant in most households. From the results it is quite clear that the most common response to occurrences such as the death of a parent or unemployment in Goshen is for the people who have become vulnerable as a result to attach themselves to elderly relatives who
receive the Old Age Grant, as it does provide an income, however meagre. This inevitably places great strain on the resources of elderly people, particularly in view of the assessment of Tanga (2008) that the income from the Grant income is insufficient to sustain one person, let alone an extended family.

The results of this study also bear out the assessment made by Makiwane and Kwizera (2006) that the majority of the people in South Africa were born into a system in which they were deprived of education, proper employment and socio-economic opportunities, all of which conspire to relegate them to a chronic cycle of poverty. The qualitative results showed quite clearly that most of the residents of Goshen are trapped in just such a chronic cycle of poverty, with their main source of income being the Grants received by their elderly relatives. These results also concur with the view of Kaseke (2010), who maintains that there is an inherent assumption in the awarding of the Old Age Grant that recipients will endeavour to supplement the income received from it with other sources of income, but, as has become abundantly clear from the findings of this study, most of recipients of the Grant in Goshen take it as their sole source of income, and, in many cases, even try to provide for extended households with it.

Sempiga (2012:7) maintains that “a capability is loosely described as the ability to achieve something, whereas a basic capability is the ability to meet a basic need, for instance the ability to avoid malnourishment, a capability to be educated, the ability to be well nourished.” However, the study found that most of the respondents lacked the capability to provide basic needs for themselves as a result of the income
which they received from the Old Age Grant being insufficient, leaving them unable to overcome the conditions of severe food insecurity which they face and equally unable to escape from the poverty trap.

The participants pointed out that most of the people who would normally take care of the elderly are unemployed and, in some cases, uneducated, giving them very little opportunity to obtain employment with a level of salary which would enable them to supplement the Grant received by their elderly relatives. It was also found that these circumstances had created a culture of unproductive borrowing among the residents, obliging most of them to take food on credit from the nearby shops and leaving them at the mercy of the “loan sharks” or illegal money lenders, in the hope that when they receive their Grant they will be able to repay the loan and the extortionate interest levied upon it. These findings supported the quantitative results, which revealed that the randomly selected respondents fell into two categories only, namely the moderately food insecure and the severely food insecure, with most of them falling into the latter category. This interpretation of the data pointed quite clearly to the fact that the Old Age Grant, in itself, is an inadequate measure either to eradicate poverty or to end food insecurity among the people of Goshen, however noble the motivation behind the introduction of the Grant may have been. Where the people of Goshen are concerned, the Grant cannot provide a sustainable livelihood, and neither can it enable them to cope with or to recover from the pressures brought by their dismal circumstances.
Tanga (2008) has pointed out that families are no longer able to cater for the needs of their elderly relatives and that, instead, the elderly are often expected to play an active role supporting the families with the Old Age Grant which they receive. The chi-square tests showed that an increase in the size of a household contributed significantly to relegating the beneficiary, together with his or her household, to a food insecure state (chi-sq. = 12.8916, p = 0.0049, indicating a high level of significance).

According to Booysen (2004), a study conducted in South African among households affected by HIV, revealed that the Child Support Grant reduced the incidence of poverty by 8%, the Foster Care Grant reduced it by 6%, and the Old Age Pension reduced it by 48%. However, the results of this study suggest that while the Old Age Grant has the potential to improve food security to a certain extent, it is equally apparent that improvements brought by the Grant can only, at best, alleviate the symptoms of food shortages, but not attack their root cause. The results of this study show that the effectiveness of the Old Age Grant is limited and that, to a very great extent, the people of Goshen lack food.

According to Miller, Tsoka and Reichert (2010), cash transfers are aimed at improving incomes which are below the poverty line by providing immediate cash to the families and facilitating the development of human capital. However, in this study it was found that while the Old Age Grant may reduce income poverty, it has not eradicated poverty by any means in Goshen, as the results show that the most of the
population is still severely food insecure, the least adversely affected group is moderately food insecure, and that no-one at all is 100% food secure.

In terms of the number of meals consumed by households per day, it was found that 56% of the respondents reported having at least three meals per day, slightly more than 94% had at least two meals per day, and all had at least one meal per day. These responses indicate the ‘effect sizes’ or the margin with reference to which the people at least have something to put on the table, which would appear to be a positive indication. On the other hand, it was also found that a great many of the people consumed a limited variety of food as a result of a lack of resources, a good many did not have sufficient food and many were worried that they would not have sufficient food, all of which point to a precarious and problematic level of food security in Goshen. The lack of resources with which these respondents are faced indicates very clearly the instability, the deficiencies and the lack of sustainability in their food supply.

In addition, as was shown in the quantitative results, most of the people often found themselves consuming kinds of food which were not to their liking, having a limited variety of food and also often worrying about having insufficient resources.

The worry among the recipients of the Grant about not having sufficient food in their households was quantified in the results in terms of the ‘effect size’, with 64.57% of the respondents worrying “often” that their households would not have sufficient
food, a further, 28.35% responding with “sometimes”, and a small group comprising 7.09% answering that the occurrence was “rare”.

According to the FAO (2011), food security has three main criteria which need to be met. These are the availability of food in terms of the supply, affordability in terms of pricing and accessibility in terms of demand. The study found that all 3 of these criteria had been compromised in Goshen Village, and that there had been a correspondingly accelerating decline in food security as a result. Tanga and Tangwe (2014) painted a bleak picture of the plight of beneficiaries of social grants in the Eastern Cape as a result of the ever-increasing and sky-rocketing prices of food and fuel. As has been noted, the results of the research established that no households in Goshen were either food secure or even mildly food insecure, and that most were found to be severely food insecure with a smaller number moderately food insecure, despite the fact that all of those interviewed had been beneficiaries of the Grant beneficiaries. However, the degree to which these households were found to have been affected by food shortages did vary. Mukute (2002) maintains that although food may be available and inexpensive in a particular community, it may not be of sufficient quality or have sufficient nutritional value to provide the members of the community with the health and the energy needed to live active, healthy and productive lives. The fact that nearly all of the residents of Goshen have to subsist on a monotonous diet consisting of small quantities of food, to worry about the availability of food and even go to bed hungry in some instances, indicates quite clearly that the community is impoverished.
When questioned whether the Grant had an effect on the access to food for their households, 61.4% of the respondents reported an improvement, 13.4% reported no improvement and the rest reported that conditions had actually deteriorated since their households started receiving the Old Age Grant. However, the results do show that 61.4% of the recipients of the Grant in Goshen value the remittances from the government and that they bring some improvement to their lives, even though the issue of whether or not the Grant is sufficient to enable its intended beneficiaries to achieve food security is a highly debatable one. Tanga and Tangwe (2014) found the beneficiaries of social grants to be appreciative of the efforts on the part of the government to assist them financially, but this is essentially a matter of subjective perceptions, and the findings of the study indicate that only a comprehensive strategy designed to eradicate poverty is likely to alleviate the plight of the people of Goshen.

5.4.1 Correlations between variables

Chi-square tests were run in order to obtain data concerning the associations between variables.

5.4.1.1 Correlations between demographic variables and variables concerning measures to adjust to food shortages

The variables were tested against one another with the aim of finding out whether there are relationships between the variables identified in the study. Table 6 shows these variables and their significance. Chi-square tests were run in order to detect significant associations among the various variables. These chi-square tests proved
statistically that there is a significant relationship between a lack of participation in income-generating activities and the respondents being faced with food shortages just before the end of the month (chi-sq = 5.9222, p = 0.0150). This significance points to the fact that people who are not involved in any income generating-activities will inevitably place the income obtained from the Old Age Grant under severe pressure, in many cases precluding the maintaining of food security at all times, particularly towards the end of each month.

A significant relationship was also found between an increase in the number of members of a household who depend solely on the Old Age Grant and the number of respondents who answered “yes” when they were asked whether they felt that the Grant was not increasing at the rate of inflation (chi-sq = 15.9285, p = 0.0012) in the case of respondents answering “yes”, and (chi-sq = 12.8916, p = 0.0049) in the case of increased size of households. This relationship also shows how inter-related these three variables are and the significance of their combined impact. However, this noticeable impact is, to some extent, exaggerated by the fact that food shortages are also aggravated by increases in the size of the Grant not keeping pace with the rising prices in the stores.

In addition, there is an interdependent relationship between households with unemployed dependents and those households reducing their expenditure on items other than foodstuffs (chi-sq = 5.2222, p = 0.0223) and households reducing the number of meals they eat per day (chi-sq = 4.4735, p = 0.0344). This relationship highlights the measures taken by households with unemployed dependents to adjust
to the reality of the insufficiency of the income from the Grant to cater for all needs of the household, resulting in their reducing both their intake of food and other household expenditures.

The chi-square results also showed that there was another interdependent relationship between variables in the case of the respondents who rated their situations as being worse than they had been before the time at which they started receiving the Grant and a tendency among them to buy on credit from the shops (chi-sq = 14.0071, p = 0.0029), borrowing from relatives and friends (chi-sq = 7.9792, p = 0.0464) and borrowing money from money-lenders (chi-sq=10.9813, p= 0.0118). The results also showed that those who fell into this category were very likely to be severely food insecure, with food shortages resulting in their falling prey to a culture of continual debt.
Table 6: Significant associations between demographic variables and variables concerning measures taken to adjust to food shortages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment measures to food shortages</th>
<th>Demographic variables (chi-sq value (p-value))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income generating Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When one encounters food shortages</td>
<td>5.9222 (0.0150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of agricultural Inputs</td>
<td>4.1071 (0.0427)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant not increasing at the rate of inflation</td>
<td>15.9285 (0.0012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in household size</td>
<td>12.8916 (0.0049) 6.4505 (0.0111) 7.4605 (0.0063)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing from shops for future payment</td>
<td>7.9465 (0.0188)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing from friends and relatives</td>
<td>5.9271 (0.0149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in non-food household expenses</td>
<td>5.0284 (0.0149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the number of meals per day</td>
<td>4.4735 (0.0344) 4.2191 (0.0400) 11.0329 (0.0115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting a loan from money lenders or bank</td>
<td>10.9813 (0.0118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the number of meals per day</td>
<td>6.0325 (0.0140)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.1.2 Correlations between measures to adjust to the causes of food shortages and asset value variables

Conducting chi-square tests to establish correlations between measures to adjust to food shortages and asset variables produced significant relationships between those respondents who confirmed that they had gardens and those who confirmed that they were affected by climatic changes (chi-sq = 6.9516, p = 0.0084), and between those respondents who complained about lack of farm inputs (chi-sq = 4.9447, p = 0.0262) and those who complained that the Grant did not increase at the rate of inflation (chi-sq = 4.4338, p = 0.0352).

The chi-square results also produced interdependent relationships between variables between respondents who confirmed that they kept fowls and those who maintained that the grant did not increase at the rate of inflation (chi-sq = 7.2421, p = 0.0071) on one hand, and those who had increased the size of their households (chi-sq = 9.8012, p = 0.0017) and those who reduced the amount of food which they consumed (chi-sq = 4.4552, p = 0.0348) on the other.

The chi-square results also showed that there is no significant relationship between variables for respondents who felt that climatic changes affected them and those who confirmed that they had livestock (chi-sq = 4.3126, p-value = 0.0378). There was also no significant relationship between variables between those respondents who had increased the size of their households and those who had a kraal (chi-sq = 5.5664, p-value = 0.0183). Table 7 illustrates these relationships.
Table 7: Significant associations between measures to adjust to the causes of food shortages and asset value variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustment measures</th>
<th>Asset variables (chi-square values (p-value))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climatic variations</td>
<td>6.9516 (0.0084)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of farm inputs</td>
<td>4.9447 (0.0262)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant not increasing at the rate of inflation</td>
<td>4.4338 (0.0352)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing household size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing amount of food</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.1.3 Correlations between demographic variables and asset value variables

The chi-square results also showed significant relationships between demographic variables and asset value variables. Another significant interdependent relationship was found among those respondents who had a garden and elderly female respondents owning a garden (chi-sq =10.9331, p = 0.0273), households with
unemployed members also being involved (chi-sq = 4.6167, p = 0.0317), and orphans participating in gardening (chi-sq = 4.3230, p = 0.0376). In terms of the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach guiding this study, human assets refer to the skills, knowledge, the ability to labour and the good health which enables people to pursue various strategies in order to achieve the objectives associated with a secure livelihood (Cooper, 2009). In the case of this study, human capital is being used mainly by unemployed females, with the main objective of improving their levels of food security, but the results show that no-one in the Goshen community is either food secure or mildly food secure and that, instead, they are faced with serious food shortages. The fact that women predominated among the unemployed people who were involved in gardening illustrates the division of labour which is to be found in Goshen.

The chi-square tests also produced another significant relationship between the respondents who were participating in income-generating activities and the few who owned small businesses (chi-sq = 10.7282, p = 0.0011). Overall, however, the results showed little involvement in income-generating activities, despite the fact that most of the people are severely food insecure. Table 8 shows more of these relationships.
Table 8: Significant relationships between demographic variables and asset value variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset variables</th>
<th>Demographic variables (chi-sq value (p-value))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age (p-value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>7.4982 (0.0235)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>9.8344 (0.0073)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small businesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural implements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.2 Mean responses obtained from applying the Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS)

The respondents scored high points when they responded to worry, kinds of food which they did not particularly like and a limited variety of foods, with mean scores not significantly different from 2.6 (t = -0.46, p-value = 0.6498) for worry, 2.6 (t = -1.90, p-value = 0.0594) for kinds of food which they did not particularly like, but which they were obliged to consume as a result of a lack of resources and 2.5 (t = -1.25, p = 0.2126) for a limited variety of food, indicating that chance may be playing a part in these findings. The respondents reported that they experienced the “three conditions” more “often” than sometimes or closer to “often” when compared with any other variable. The respondents were likely to score “sometimes” in the variables food not preferred, small quantities of food and fewer meals, as the means lie significantly between 2.0 and 2.4. Table 9 illustrates these findings. The respondents recorded low scores in the last three variables, meaning that they were likely not to have experienced the “three conditions” during the previous 30 days. All of the respondents reported having worried at some stage about food security (minimum = 1).
Table 9: Mean responses from applying the Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>h0=</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worry</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2.5748031</td>
<td>0.6238600</td>
<td>1.0000000</td>
<td>3.0000000</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>0.6498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinds of food not preferred</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2.4960630</td>
<td>0.6155913</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0000000</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>0.0594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited variety</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2.4251969</td>
<td>0.6728249</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0000000</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>0.2126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food not preferred</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2.3070866</td>
<td>0.6487083</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0000000</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>0.1090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small quantities</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2.1811024</td>
<td>0.6948487</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0000000</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
<td>0.0561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few meals per day</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2.0236220</td>
<td>0.6231585</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0000000</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>0.1696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No food whole day</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0.7480315</td>
<td>1.0762110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0000000</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>0.1140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to sleep hungry</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0.8188976</td>
<td>0.9953648</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0000000</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>0.3603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days without food</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0.4724409</td>
<td>0.8528828</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0000000</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-1.69</td>
<td>0.0944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFIAS Score</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>6.0472441</td>
<td>3.2485852</td>
<td>3.0000000</td>
<td>7.0000000</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.0000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.2.1 Mean scores obtained from the HFIAS measurement tool in terms of variables for the two HFIAS categories identified

T-tests were run using the 4 HFIAS categories, namely: food secure (category 1), mildly food insecure (category 2), moderately food insecure (category 3) and severely food insecure (category 4). It was found that the respondents fell into only 2 of the 4 categories created, namely either category 3 (moderately food insecure) or category 4 (severely food insecure). 56 respondents fell into category 3, while 71 fell into category 4. Respondents falling into category 3 were found to be significantly more inclined to worry more than the respondents in category 4 (t = 2.39, p-value = 0.0183). The reasons behind these scores for respondents falling into categories 3 and 4 respectively may include a lack of sustainable supplementary measures to curb food insecurity. Respondents in category 4 were significantly more likely to have experienced the “three conditions”, namely going to bed hungry, going to bed without having eaten any food at all and going for days without food, while those in category 3 might not have endured privations quite as severe. It should be quite self-evident that the experiences of going to bed hungry or without food constitute indicators identifying these people as being severely food insecure, owing to the lack of a sustainable food supply, depriving them of access to food and food of sufficient quality for healthy living. These results support the analysis of food security offered by Mukute (2002), for whom the 3 essential criteria to be met for food security are the availability of food in terms of supply, the affordability of food in terms of pricing and accessibility to food in terms of demand. As has already been noted, for Mukute (2002) these criteria can be affected by phenomena such as food being available in a community, but unaffordable owing to high prices, or food being available and
inexpensive in a community, but not being of sufficient quality or providing sufficient nutritional value and so on, all of which were found to be quite evident in the study conducted in Goshen.

Respondents in category 3 recorded significantly lower mean HFIAS scores compared with those in category 4 ($t = -7.36$, $p$-value = <.0001), indicating less severe food insecurity among respondents falling into category 3. However, despite the fact that these respondents experienced a lesser degree of food insecurity than those in category 4, they recorded significantly higher scores in terms of their tendency to worry about not having sufficient food, and there was a significant difference ($t$-test $t = 2.39$, $p$-value = 0.0183) in their mean score, with respondents in category 3 being more likely to have experienced worry than those in category 4.

As the $t$-values and $p$-values in Table 10 show, there were very significant differences between the mean scores of respondents in category 3 and those in category 4 in terms of having gone without food, with no respondents in category 3 having gone without food during the previous 30 days. Nevertheless, the difference found concerning the tendency to experience anxiety about a lack of resources and being obliged to eat food of insufficient quality between the 2 categories was a significant one, despite the fact that those respondents falling into category 4 were found to be severely food insecure and to be threatened by the effects of malnutrition. While the value of speculation in research may be debatable, it does seem plausible that the lower scores recorded by respondents in category 4 could be the result of feelings of hopelessness and resignation.
There was a significant mean difference between the HFIAS scores \( (t = -7.36, \ p\text{-value} < 0.0001) \) of the respondents in the two HFIAS categories, with those in category 3 scoring a lower HFIAS Score than those in category 4. The respondents in category 4 had a higher score than the grand mean score of 16.05.

**Table 10: Mean scores obtained from the HFIAS measurement tool in terms of variables for the two HFIAS categories identified**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category 3 Mean</th>
<th>Category 4 Mean</th>
<th>Mean diff</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worry</td>
<td>2.7143</td>
<td>2.4648</td>
<td>0.2495</td>
<td>0.6138</td>
<td>2.39*</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.0183*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foods not preferred</td>
<td>2.4821</td>
<td>2.507</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.6179</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited variety</td>
<td>2.4286</td>
<td>2.4225</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.6755</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.9602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foods not preferred</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.3521</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
<td>0.6493</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.3806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small quantities</td>
<td>2.2321</td>
<td>2.1408</td>
<td>0.0913</td>
<td>0.6961</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.4644</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.3 Results of t-tests to measure worry across measures taken to adjust to the causes of food shortages.

T-tests were run to check the significance of the differences between worry scores across measures taken in response to the need to adjust to the causes of food shortages. The four variables employed for measures to adjust were a lack of agricultural activity, increased size of households, borrowing from shops and a reduction in the number of meals consumed, and these produced significantly different worry scores. In relation to the causes of food shortages in households,
respondents who reported a lack of agricultural activity were more highly likely to worry, close to “often”, than those who did not (t = 3.61, p-value = 0.0005). Respondents who reported having not increased the sizes of their households were less likely to worry about a lack of resources (t = -2.44, p-value = 0.0173). There was a significant difference (t = -2.66, p-value = 0.0090) in the mean worry scores of respondents who reported that they borrowed food from shops. Those who borrowed were less likely to worry or to be faced with severe food shortages, but these results also point to a culture of borrowing which has been created as a result of the Grant being insufficient to meet the needs of recipients and their households. Respondents who adjusted to their food situations without reducing the number of meals per day were more likely to worry than those who did (t = 2.47, p-value = 0.0147). The fact that respondents did adjust by reducing the number of meals consumed per day points to the factors of uncertainty and the lack of sufficient resources, conditions which are realities for the residents of Goshen. These results concur with the assessment of Tanga (2008) that, despite the Old Age Grant being found to provide an important safety-net for the elderly in South Africa and in the other developing countries in which it has been introduced, it has become a main source of income for many households, and in some cases the sole source of income, and consequently, the pressure brought by the needs of entire households are being placed on the Grant. Table 11 shows the results.
### Table 11: Significant results of t-tests to measure worry across measures to adjust to the causes of food shortages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean worry score</th>
<th>t-test result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of agricultural activities</td>
<td>2.7705 (N=61)</td>
<td>2.3939 (N=66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in household size</td>
<td>2.383 (N=47)</td>
<td>2.6875 (N=80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow from shops</td>
<td>2.4138 (N=58)</td>
<td>2.7101 (N=69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing meals</td>
<td>2.6495 (N=97)</td>
<td>2.3333 (N=30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.4.4 Significant results of t-tests to measure worry across asset value variables

T-tests were run to check the differences between worry scores across responses to asset value variables. The three variables which produced significant results were land, kraal and other. Respondents responding with a “yes” to the variable “land” had a significantly higher mean worry score ($t = 2.02$, $p$-value = 0.0458). Respondents who reported owning land tended to worry more than those without land. This may
indicate that those respondents having land as an asset were people who are used to farming it in order to improve their household food security, but that, as a result of changes in climatic conditions, most of them have been affected adversely, resulting in low food production among those practising agriculture. Respondents who did not have a kraal and those who responded “yes” to “other”, tended to worry significantly more than their counterparts did (t = -4.82, p = <.0001).

**Table 12: Significant results for t-tests: worry scores across asset value variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean worry score</th>
<th>t-test result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Diff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>2.6182 (N=110)</td>
<td>2.2941 (N=17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraal</td>
<td>1.9091 (N=22)</td>
<td>2.7143 (N=105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3 (N=2)</td>
<td>2.4571 (N=125)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.5 HFIAS categories tested across measures to adjust to the causes of food shortages

Chi-square tests were run for measures to adjust to the causes of food shortages across the respondents' HFIAS categories. A significant relationship was found between whether the respondents fell into category 3 or 4 and their responses to poor salaries (chi-sq = 5.6716, p-value = 0.0172) and also across borrowing food from shops (chi-sq = 20.3559, p-value<.0001) (See Table 13). Odds ratios were calculated and respondents in the moderately food insecure category were found to be 0.1821 times as likely to attribute poor salaries to the causes of food shortages as those in the severely food insecure category. The severely food insecure respondents were found to be 5.49 times more likely to attribute poor salaries to the causes of food shortages compared with those who were moderately food insecure (1/0.1821 = 5.49). The other variables, such as borrowing money or food from friends and relatives did not show any significant differences (chi-sq = 1.7001, p-value = 0.1923). Reducing household expenditure (chi-sq = 0.4074, p-value = 0.5233), reducing meals (chi-sq = 0.2671, p-value = 0.6053), taking a loan (chi-sq = 0.1157, p-value = 0.7338) and receiving food aid (chi-sq = 2.4635, p-value = 0.1163) were some of the variables which produced no significant differences. Table 13 shows these results.
### Table 13: Chi-square tests for HFIAS categories across measures to adjust to the causes of food shortages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>dF</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>poor salaries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6716*</td>
<td>0.0172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>borrowing shop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.3559**</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>borrowing friend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7001</td>
<td>0.1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selling property</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.6400</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reducing expenditure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4074</td>
<td>0.5233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reducing meals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2671</td>
<td>0.6053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food aid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4635</td>
<td>0.1165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1157</td>
<td>0.7338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reducing food</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3901</td>
<td>0.2384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unpaid credits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6606</td>
<td>0.4164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.4.6 Statistical inferences from odds ratios

Odds ratios tests to measure the relationships among variables were run and the results are presented in the sections below.
5.4.6.1 Statistical inferences of odds ratios for increase in household size across grandchildren and orphan variables

The odds ratios of a household with orphans in Goshen are 4.5 times more likely to indicate an increase in household size compared with one having no orphans (95% confidence limits=(1.3016, 15.5580)). Further statistical calculations were made and it was found that the likelihood of a household with grandchildren increasing in size was 2.78 times what it would be for one without grandchildren (95% Confidence limits=(1.3231, 5.8808)). Table 14 shows these calculations.

Table 14: Statistical ratios for increase in household size across orphan and grandchildren variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mantel-Hanzsel Odds Ratio (OR)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>orphans</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
<td>1.3016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.5580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grandchildren</td>
<td>2.7894</td>
<td>1.3231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.8808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.6.2 Statistical inferences from odds ratios for HFIAS categories across measures to adjust to the causes of food shortages

The odds ratios for respondents falling into HFIAS category 3 were approximately 0.2 times as likely to indicate that the members of the household earned poor salaries compared with those in HFIAS category 4, who were severely food insecure (95% confidence limits = (0.0390, 0.8509)). When further calculations were made, it was found that respondents falling into HFIAS category 4 were approximately 0.2
times as likely to report that they borrowed food from the shops on credit as a result of food shortages (95% confidence limits = (0.0796, 0.3834)).

**Table 15: Odds ratios for HFIAS categories across measures to adjust measures to the causes of food shortages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mantel-Hanzsel Odds Ratio</th>
<th>95% Confidence Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor salaries</td>
<td>0.1821</td>
<td>0.0390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing from shops</td>
<td>0.1747</td>
<td>0.0796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.4.6.3 Statistical inferences from odds ratios for the variable keeping fowls against measures to adjust to the causes of food shortages**

The odds ratios for a household which keeps fowls were found to be 3.5 times more likely to indicate an increase in household size compared with households which have not increased in size (95% confidence limits= (1.5669, 7.8180)). When further calculations were made, the odds of a household which keeps fowls were found to be 0.4 times as likely to report that they reduced food in their households as a result of food shortages (95% confidence limits= (0.1509, 0.9511)).
Table 16: Statistical ratios for the variable fowls across measures to adjust to food shortages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mantel-Hanzsel Odds Ratio</th>
<th>95% Confidence Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in household size</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>1.5669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3788</td>
<td>0.1509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing food</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.8180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.6.4 Statistical inferences from odds ratios for the variable garden across measures to adjust to food shortages

The odds of a household with a garden indicating that they were affected by changes in climatic conditions were found to be approximately 3 times as likely compared with those who were not involved in agricultural activities (95% confidence limits = (1.2997, 6.7644)). When further calculations were made, the odds of a household with a garden indicating that it lacked the capacity to engage in agriculture were found to be 0.4 times as likely as one without a garden (95% confidence limits = (0.2207, 0.9138)). Making further calculations resulted in households with gardens being 2.2 times as likely to indicate that they had unemployed occupants compared with households which had members who were employed (95% confidence limits = (1.0667, 4.7121)).
Table 17: Statistical ratios for garden across measures to adjust to food shortages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mantel-Hanzsel Odds Ratio</th>
<th>95% Confidence Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climatic changes</td>
<td>2.9650</td>
<td>1.2997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of farm inputs</td>
<td>0.4491</td>
<td>0.2207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>2.2420</td>
<td>1.0667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.7 HFIAS categories across asset value variables

Chi-square tests were run for asset value variables across the HFIAS categories to which the respondents had been assigned. Highly significant relationships were found to exist between the category level, or whether respondents fell into category 3 or 4 and the variables fowls (chi-square value = 9.7502, p-value = 0.0018) and kraal (chi-square value = 7.2481, p-value = 0.0071). Respondents in the moderately food insecure category were 0.2560 times likely to own fowls compared with those in the severely food insecure category, which may be expressed as severely food insecure respondents being (1/0.2560 =) 3.91 times more likely to own fowls compared with moderately food insecure respondents (See Table 18).
Table 18: Chi-square tests for HFIAS categories across asset value variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>land</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0678</td>
<td>0.7946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0776</td>
<td>0.7805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fowl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.7502*</td>
<td>0.0018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kraal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.2481*</td>
<td>0.0071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>livestock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.9975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0354</td>
<td>0.8508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farm equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0098</td>
<td>0.9213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building tools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0354</td>
<td>0.8508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vehicle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5342</td>
<td>0.4649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2920</td>
<td>0.5890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0891</td>
<td>0.7653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6027</td>
<td>0.2055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key words

DF – degrees of freedom

Prob – p-value

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter presented the results obtained from both the quantitative and the qualitative data and their analyses. The findings rejected the hypothesis that receiving a Grant is likely to increase the number of members of a household who are dependent on the Grant. The results of the study revealed that most of the
people in Goshen are either severely food insecure or, at best, moderately food insecure. Little participation in income-generating activities was found to be a factor which aggravated food shortages, and undesirable norms, such as a culture of borrowing, had become established as a means of adjusting to food shortages in the village.
CHAPTER SIX
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Introduction
The aim of the study was to investigate the impact of the Old Age Grant as a means of improving food security at the household level. This was done by identifying a number of objectives and research questions in order to obtain an overall understanding of the role played by the income from the Grant in the community and to find out whether the Grant improves food security. The fieldwork in the Goshen community was made possible by the 127 recipients of the Old Age Grant and the 20 people who formed the group for the focus group discussions agreeing to participate in the research. In the previous chapter, the results of the study were presented, analysed and discussed. In this chapter, a summary of the findings of the study is presented, as are the conclusions which were formulated as a result of the study, and recommendations are made.

6.2 Summary of the findings
This study was based on the following research questions: (a) To what extent does the Old Age Grant enable its beneficiaries to be food secure? (b) What are the factors which affect food security at the household level in Goshen village? (c) What are the other survival strategies which are followed in order to supplement the Old Age Grant as a means of improving food security in households? All of these questions were intended to enable the researcher to assess the effectiveness of the Old Age Grant as a means of improving the food security of the inhabitants of the households in the rural community of Goshen Village. It is noteworthy that, to a very
large extent, the research findings were able to answer the research questions on which the study was based.

At the outset it should be noted that most of the recipients of the Old Age Grant who participated in the study were female, and that it had been found that most of the respondents ended their schooling at the primary school level, and that some had not had the privilege of going to school at all.

6.2.1 The extent to which the Old Age Grant enables its beneficiaries to be food secure

The results of this study indicated that, to a large extent, the Old Age Grant does not enable its intended beneficiaries to become food secure, despite the fact that the social grant system is an important initiative which has been designed and implemented to improve the livelihoods of low-income households or individuals, in order to avert poverty and food insecurity (Oliver and Kalula, 2004). This study found that most of the people interviewed were severely food insecure, with relatively few being only moderately food insecure. The bleak picture painted by the results is one in which the people of Goshen are obliged to try to subsist in extremely deprived conditions: for the overwhelming majority of them the attainment of food security seems unlikely unless more comprehensive and appropriate interventions are made.
6.2.2 Factors which affect food security at the household level

There are various factors which affect food security at the household level, and these include a lack of resources and external factors. These factors are briefly summarised below.

6.2.2.1 Lack of resources

A lack of resources was identified as one of the core factors hindering the attainment of adequate food security at the household level. Despite the fact that the Department of Social Development (2012) maintains that the provision of social security is a cornerstone of the fight against the effects of poverty on children and elderly people, poverty still exists and threatens the most vulnerable groups in society. The results showed conclusively that to a very large extent, the people of Goshen lack the resources needed to help them to overcome the debilitating effects of food insecurity, and that while the Grant may, to an extent, counteract some of the symptoms of food insecurity, it is a long way short of alleviating the plight of these people. The study found that some of the respondents felt that their conditions had become even worse than they had been before they started to receive the Grant. Although some of the respondents interviewed felt that they had become better off from the time that they started to receive the Grant, none of them is ever likely to cease to be dependent on it or to attain food security as a result of receiving it.

6.2.2.2 External factors which affect food security and place pressure on the Grant

Another factor which affects food security at the household level and places pressure on the Old Age Grant is the use of the Grant to support entire households. It is quite
evident from the results of the study that enormous pressure is being placed on incomes from the Old Age Grant when they are diversified in this way, particularly in the light of the findings concerning the correlation between people being unemployed and those living with recipients of the Grant. Some of the elderly respondents pointed to the displacement of duties which had occurred in relatively recent times, in which, instead of the elderly recipients of the Old Age Grant being taken care of by their children, the trend had been reversed, with the elderly taking care of their children and children’s children. This phenomenon has placed pressure on incomes from the Grant, to the extent that it has caused both recipients of the Grant and the members of their households to become increasingly food insecure.

A lack of resources has led to most of the people having to resort to subsisting on monotonous diets consisting of foods which are not particularly to their liking, having a limited variety of food and to people experiencing worry and anxiety about their food security. These circumstances have been found to be pervasive in their effects upon food security at the household level in Goshen. These findings concerning the levels of worry and anxiety among the respondents also served to indicate that their food supply is at present unsustainable. It has already been noted that significant numbers of the respondents suffered as a result of insufficient intake of food, which was sometimes manifested in their going to bed hungry or even without having any food at all, but fortunately the responses concerning this level of severity appeared to be minimal for the present.
6.2.2.3 Adverse weather conditions

Adverse weather conditions also constitute a factor impinging on food security, as the findings of this study have shown. In the previous chapter, some of the respondents spoke about the adverse weather conditions to which they were often subjected as being one of the factors contributing towards low agricultural production. It is significant to note, though, that only a few of the respondents cited this factor and that these were the same people who had gardens in their homes. Accordingly, it may be concluded that the dry spells which the community experiences have, to some extent, led to the people leaving some parts of the available land to lie fallow, as they are unable to produce much food under climatic conditions such as these. This, in turn, seems to have discouraged other members of the community from practising agriculture as they also lack farming equipment, input and reliable donors to fund their agricultural projects. In addition, the decline in agricultural activities in this community might also be attributed, at least in part, to de-agrarianisation. The decline in agricultural activities is certainly contributing towards food insecurity, as any food produced should ease the pressure which is, at present, being placed on incomes from the Grant.

6.2.2.4 The Grant does not increase at the rate of inflation

Most of the respondents in the study expressed concern about increases in the Grant not keeping pace with the rate of inflation, and this was found in both the qualitative and the quantitative data. The respondents pointed out that food prices in the shops were going up, but at a greater rate than that of increases in the income from the Grant. This trend will inevitably compromise the attempts of many to have
food secure homes, and the results of the study have shown that none of the respondents was anywhere near being food secure.

6.2.2.5 Low participation in income-generating activities

Little participation and investment of income from the Grant in income-generating activities has also been found to be a factor hindering food security at the household level in the study area. The results show that approximately one in every four respondents reported a member of their households participating in an income-generating activity, which shows that there is little being done to supplement the incomes from the Grant in most households.

6.2.3 Survival strategies which are followed to compensate for the inability of
the Old Age Grant to ensure food security in Goshen

It was found that the most common response to food shortages was a tendency to reduce the number of meals consumed per day. Some of the respondents even reduced the amount of food consumed per meal, and others tended to take food on credit from shops.

It was also found that many of the respondents were obliged to resort to a monotonous diet, owing to the fact that they could not afford nutritious foods which were to their liking, and that some quite often went to bed hungry. All of these findings indicated the degree of severity of conditions in Goshen and, in equal measure, the inability of the Grant to assist people to overcome them. The culture of unproductive borrowing which has resulted confirms this assessment and identifies a
very worrying consequence of the failure of the Grant to ensure food security at the household level in the village, as the debts incurred from loan-sharks require repayment at extortionate rates of interest, depleting each month’s Grant payment and effectively reducing its actual monetary value significantly by doing so.

6.3 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 secure, 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.

It has already been noted that the Grant has been found to help to reduce food insecurity in a great many cases without tackling its root causes, and that the recipients of the Grant are still living in terrible poverty with insufficient resources of both food and finances. The study also points to a weakness in the system, as no programmes have been introduced to teach the elderly recipients how to use money wisely or to develop other means of obtaining an income in order to supplement the Grant. This assessment would suggest that as a strategy, the Grant is a remedial one, which lacks the proactive components and measures which a comprehensive strategy, designed to develop sustainable livelihoods for people who are at present
impoverished, would need to incorporate. If such a strategy were to be implemented, the elimination of food insecurity would need to be identified as a key goal to be accomplished within the overall ambit of assisting the members of South African society who have been most adversely affected by the cruelty and the inhumanity of the policies of apartheid and their grim, lingering legacy. This would be the very least which those who fought for change in South Africa could do for those who bore the brunt of the economic ravages wrought by apartheid, whose cries have not been properly heard, despite the advent of democracy.

6.4 Recommendations

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

- 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. It would be a matter of common sense to suggest that ideas could be borrowed from those communities which had been food insecure, but which have managed to overcome food insecurity by achieving sustainable livelihoods.

- The residents of Goshen need to be encouraged by the government and other important stakeholders to initiate agricultural enterprises by introducing programmes which would motivate households to participate in agricultural activities. An initiative of this sort could supply the impetus needed by creating
easy access to water, supplying basic farming equipment and so on, in order to assist the people of Goshen to increase the base of their food production, which would automatically ease existing pressure on income from the Grant by providing another means of food security. The potential psychological benefits for the people should not be overlooked, as beginning to perceive themselves as capable could contribute to their sense of self-reliance and lift them out of the gloom created by being dependent upon income from a Grant which is insufficient to meet their needs and which results in their becoming mired in debt and poverty.

- 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 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 mind-set would also help people to become involved in other activities or projects which could assist them to curb food insecurity.

- Decisions concerning what needs to be done in order to achieve food security also need to be made by the people of Goshen themselves, owing to the fact
that they know their area and their community best, and people from the outside or government officials should only guide the people to act in accordance with their real needs and not present solutions without consulting them. Accordingly, members of the community ought to be involved in any discussions about their community, and the organisations which work with the community need to be trustworthy and reliable.

- There is a need for the Department of Social Welfare to develop initiatives to help the recipients of the Grant to prevent food insecurity. This could be done by introducing a system in which the recipients of the Grant are involved in projects which help them to supplement the income from the Grant, such as food gardens in which they are able to produce their own food. The positive results from such an initiative would be twofold, in that food production in the community would be increased and dependence on the the Grant would be diminished.

- The prevailing level of food insecurity needs to be assessed, in order to determine the causal factors which contribute to the problem. In addition, programmes to eliminate food insecurity need to have a long-term focus with defined objectives, of which the most important would be the elimination of food insecurity and sustainability.

6.5 Suggestions for future studies

This study could not attempt an exhaustive investigation of the problem of food insecurity in this part of the Eastern Cape. The following suggestions are made for future studies:
As this study was conducted on a small scale, there is a need to continue this research throughout the Amathole municipality in order to develop strategies which could be implemented by the government or the municipality to eliminate the problem of food insecurity at the household level.

There is also a need to conduct research of this type in Goshen using different research methods in order to compare the results and to determine whether there are any significant differences in the assessment of the levels of food insecurity. Further studies of this phenomenon would also help to widen the knowledge base concerning the concepts of social grants and food security.

There is also a need to conduct research in the specialised area of food security on a wider scale, both to investigate the measures taken by the government to overcome food insecurity and also to assess the sustainability of the policies which are being implemented in order to eliminate food insecurity.

6.6 Implications for social work practice

In conditions where poverty is either prevalent or pervasive, the role of social work focuses, to a very large extent, upon empowering those whom it seeks to help to become independent and self-sufficient. This is in effect the mandate of social work in this particular context, and, in order to fulfil it, social workers in their practice play roles in order to help their clients in a holistic manner. It is felt very strongly that the conclusions of this study have definite implications for social work practice, specifically in the endeavour to help the recipients of the Old Age Grant to be able to improve the level of food security in their households. The social work community needs to combat the problem of food insecurity from the perspective of the role
which it plays in community development, namely by developing projects which are able to serve the interests of all of the affected groups of people in order to end food shortages and hunger. The means to do so, successfully, must surely lie with the social work community assuming an activist’s role by campaigning for interventions by the government, in the form of programmes which would be offered to all recipients of the Old Age Grant, to encourage both self-reliance in the future, while at the same time improving and widening their present food production base. It is also important to introduce developmental perspectives into social work practice classes and policy courses. The developmental perspective in social work needs to be emphasised by social workers becoming actively involved in organisations which focus on helping society by improving the lives of recipients of social grants. Publications promoting the developmental perspective of social work also have an important role to play by informing policy makers, project managers and development workers of the crucial areas requiring attention, in the endeavour to improve the overall wellbeing of the people, such as the present plight of the elderly who receive the Old Age Grant.

It is also of vital importance to make policy makers aware of the need to prioritise the needs of the elderly recipients of the Grant and those of the social workers who work with them, and this needs to be achieved through sufficient research which focuses on the needs of the elderly recipients of social grants and bringing the results of this research to the urgent attention of the relevant policy makers.
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APPENDIX 1: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WORK
UNIVERSITY OF FORT HARE: ALICE CAMPUS

Introduction
I am a Masters’ student in the Department of Social Work / Social Development, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, University of Fort Hare carrying out a study on the topic the impact of the Old Age Support Grant on boosting food security at household level in South Africa: the case of Goshen community.

You are kindly requested to assist in providing answers to the questions that follow. I will like to inform those of you who will be participating in the focus group discussion that I will be tape recording and taking notes. All responses will be used for academic purposes only. I assure you that whatever information that you would provide will remain confidential and anonymity is guaranteed. If you accept to participate in this study, please sign the informed consent form.

Thank you for agreeing to be part of this study. Before we start, I would like to emphasize that:

• Your participation is entirely voluntary.
• Some of the questions may be emotionally trying.
• You are free not to answer any question.

• You are free to withdraw if need arises.

• A tape recorder will be used to capture the information for those participating in the focus group discussion.

Consent with the requirement of research, the information given will be kept confidential since no personal details, contact numbers and physical addresses will be required. As a requirement from the University Research Committee and to show that I have read the consent form to you and you understood may you sign this consent form.

Signature ____________________________ Date __________________________
APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR THE FOCUS GROUP

1. What impact does the Old Age Grant have on its beneficiaries?
2. To what extent does the Old Age Grant cater for the needs of its beneficiaries?
3. To what extent does the Old Age Grant enable its beneficiaries to be food secure?
4. To what extent is the grant able to meet the needs of its beneficiaries?
5. To whom is the responsibility to supply food in the family placed on and why is it so?
6. What are the causes of food insecurity amongst the Old Age Grant beneficiaries?
7. To what extent is the Old Age Grant able to sustain its beneficiaries for the whole month?
8. What are the problems that are faced by the grant beneficiaries?
9. What are the survival strategies that are put in place to supplement the Old Age Grant and boost food security at household level?
10. What adjustments or possible solutions have you made to avoid food shortages if any or improve your diet?
11. Are there other members of the family employed and supporting the family?
12. Are there any other organisations or people who are helping the household in kind or cash?
APPENDIX 3: Survey Questionnaire for the Old Age Grant beneficiaries

Section A: General information

This section contains questions regarding personal information. Please put an ‘X’ where appropriate.

1. Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Coloured</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>60yrs-65yrs</th>
<th>65yrs-70yrs</th>
<th>Above 70yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Cohabiting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. Level of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never went to school</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Tertiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. How many people live in this household?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>5-6</th>
<th>More than 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. How many members are solely dependent on this Old Age Grant for their survival?

8. Why are these members depending on the Old Age Grant?(reason)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unemployment</th>
<th>Orphans</th>
<th>Grandchildren</th>
<th>Sickness/Disability</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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9. Is there any member of the household who is participating in any Income Generating Activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. On average how many meals do you have per day (in the past 7 days)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>1 meal</th>
<th>2 meals</th>
<th>3 meals and above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How do you rate your level of access to food nowadays from the time you started receiving the Old Age Grant as compared to the former years before receiving the grant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Worse off</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section B: Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS) Measurement Tool (Adapted from FANTA, 2006)

For each of the following questions, consider what has happened in the past 30 days. If the answer is yes, indicate whether this happened never, rarely (once or twice), sometimes (3-10 times), or often (more than 10 times) in the past 30 days?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
<th>CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Did you worry that in your household that you will not have enough food?</td>
<td>0 = No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If yes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Rarely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Often</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Were you or any household member not able to eat the kinds of foods you</td>
<td>0 = No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>preferred because of a lack of resources?</td>
<td>If yes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Rarely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Often</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Did you or any household member have to limit the variety of foods you</td>
<td>0 = No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ate because of lack of resources?</td>
<td>If yes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Rarely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Often</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Did you or any household member eat food that you preferred not to eat because of a lack of resources to obtain other types of food?  
   0 = No  
   If yes:  
   1 = Rarely  
   2 = Sometimes  
   3 = Often  

5. Did you or any household member eat a smaller meal than you felt you needed because there was not enough food?  
   0 = No  
   If yes:  
   1 = Rarely  
   2 = Sometimes  
   3 = Often  

6. Did you or any other household member eat fewer meals in a day because the food was not enough?  
   0 = No  
   If yes:  
   1 = Rarely  
   2 = Sometimes  
   3 = Often  

7. Was there ever no food at all in your household because there were not resources to get some (or any)?  
   0 = No  
   If yes:  
   1 = Rarely  
   2 = Sometimes  
   3 = Often  

8. Did you or any household member go to sleep at night hungry because there was not enough food?  
   0 = No  
   If yes:  
   1 = Rarely  
   2 = Sometimes  
   3 = Often  

9. Did you or any household member go for the whole day without eating anything because there was not enough food?  
   0 = No  
   If yes:  
   1 = Rarely  
   2 = Sometimes  
   3 = Often
## SECTION C: Food shortages and possible solutions

1. **When do you encounter food shortages?** (you may tick more than once)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any time of the month</th>
<th>Just before month end</th>
<th>Before harvesting</th>
<th>After drought</th>
<th><strong>Other times:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. **What is causing food shortages in your household?** (tick if yes cross if no)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes in climatic conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of water sources/reservoirs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of agricultural inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrenchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants not increasing at the rate of inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in household size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of the main food provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **What adjustments or possible solutions have you made to avoid food shortages if any or improve your diet?** (you may tick more than one option)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borrow food from shops for future payments</th>
<th>Reduce the number of meals per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borrow money from friends or relatives</td>
<td>Relied on food aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispose household goods or other assets</td>
<td>Reduce in the amount of food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in non-food household expenditure</td>
<td>Did not pay credits already owed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. On average, what percentage of your income did you spend on food?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&lt;25%</th>
<th>25%-50%</th>
<th>51%-75%</th>
<th>&gt;75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Section D: Assets and Needs Analysis

1. Which of the following resources and skills do your household members have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Arable land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Backyard garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Chicken Fowl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Kraal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Livestock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Small business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Agricultural equipment tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Building tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Car/Tractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>Water for crop production/ livestock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>Other (specify):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>