

https://dspace.org/

How have media institutions been reporting on land and agrarian reform developments in South Africa? A case study of the post-green paper on land and agrarian reform (2011)

Muvondori, Michael

2016-01-28
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/19379

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to investigate how the media have been reporting on land and agrarian reform developments in South Africa focusing on the post green paper (2011). Land and agrarian reform has been a sensitive field in the post-apartheid South Africa mainly because of the racial disparity on land ownership and the widening gap between the rich and poor. This study explores the literature available on land and agrarian reform, tracing the history of dispossession back to 1650 when Jan van Riebeck built a Fort in Cape Town in the shape of designated reserves. The 1894 Glen Grey Act, the 1913 Native Land Act and the 1936 Native Trust and Land Act as well as sundry other apartheid racist laws led to forced removals of native South African from their fertile lands into reserves, whilst the minority whites were acquiring vast tracks of farmland (Hendricks 2000, Baldwin 1975).

This study further explores post apartheid government's efforts to reverse the history of dispossession. The Department of Land Affairs introduced sundry policy interventions since 1994 which were supported by the Constitution of South Africa and in line with the dictates of the RDP program. These include the White Paper on Land Affairs (1997) policy framework, and several laws on land tenure, restitution and redistribution. South African democracy is more than two decades old, yet the land reform process is far from achieving the 30% target which had been set to be met in five years. More than three quarters of the productive agricultural land is still in the hands of the white minority, communal tenure system have not yet fully been addressed, farm labourers are still working under squalid, land restitution has been successful mainly on urban financial compensation claims and some rural land claims are still to be resolved.

The media is the main vehicle which the government is using in communicating their land and agrarian reform policies, laws and developments. The study also debunks on the current media debates on how it has been reporting on developmental issues, particularly land and agrarian reform. Researchers argue that the duty of the South African media to inform has shifted towards a Western tradition which privilege economic, political and intellectual elites whilst ignoring the grassroots voice (Genis 2006:111-112). In order to validate this claim, the study used the agenda setting theory as a plumb-line. This theory argues

that the media institutions and journalists are influenced by major institutions of society such as the economic, political and financial organizations when choosing what they want to focus on and the angles their stories will take.

In order to effectively investigate the how the media has been reporting on land and agrarian reform developments in South Africa, both quantitative and qualitative content analysis were used. The researcher collected 192 stories from the following five media houses, *Mail and Guardian* (weekly newspaper), *Daily Maverick* (online daily news), *SABC News Online* (online daily news which captures SABC News radio and television channels), *Farmers Weekly* (weekly farmers' magazine) and *Business Day* (daily business newspaper). The stories which focused on land and agrarian reform during the period September 2011 and August 2014 were selected from these media institutions using purposive sampling techniques.

The findings were gathered, analysed, and compared. The key findings of this research were that the media partially fulfilled its role as a disseminator of land reform information. This is seen in the wide coverage of major land reform events during the study period. Of concern however, are the sources which were used, set agendas, story structures and the quality of journalistic writing. This study also established that each media outlet had its own preferred sources who dominated the land reform discourse. Most of the stories represent the interests and voice of the minority elite at the expense of the landless and the marginalised rural communities. Most criticism to the land reform proposals came from organised commercial agriculture and opposition parties. These emphasised the threats of land reform changes to food security, economic and financial viability of some proposals as well as their potential to destabilise the agricultural sector and the economy at large.

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is my own unaided work. It is submitted for the degree of Master of Arts in Development Studies in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted for any other degree or examination in any other University.

Michael Muvondori

_____

30th July 2015

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My appreciation goes to Professor Samuel Kariuki, my supervisor for the intellectual guidance and support during the research period.

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my parents, Matthew and Linah Muvondori. I am thankful to them for their love, counsel, support and labour in order to meet my academic and other needs until today. Thank you for giving me the gift of having you in my life! Ndinotenda (thank you)

To all my friends and siblings, thank you for your support

Table of Contents

Abstract i

DECLARATION iii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

LISTS OF TABLES v

LIST OF ACRONYMS vi

CHARPTER ONE 1

1. Introduction 1

1.1. Background and rationale for the study 1

1.2. The South African Land Question Overview 1

1.3. Land and Agrarian Reform and Media Reporting 3

1.4. Research Question 4

1.5. Theoretical Framework 5

Chapter 2 7

2. Literature Review 7

2.1. Debates on Land and Agrarian Reform 7

2.1.1. The Land and Agrarian Reform Objectives 7

2.1.2. The land reform developments and debates 7

2.1.3. The White Paper on South African Land Policy 1997 10

2.1.4. The Green Paper on Land and Agrarian Reform 18

2.2. Land and Agrarian reform, Agenda-setting and Media Reporting 22

2.3. Functionalist Theory – Agenda-setting and the role of the media 22

2.3.1. Information Dissemination 22

2.3.2. Citizenship and Citizen-Framing of Development 23

2.3.3. Public Listening and Engagement 23

2.4. Development journalism Theorisation in Africa and Agenda Setting 23

2.4.1. Media Agenda and Modernisation Perspectives....24
2.4.2. Media Agenda and Dissociation from Dependency....24
2.4.3. Media Agenda and Participatory Communication....25
Chapter 3....26
3. Research Methodology....26
3.1. Introduction....26
3.2. Content Analysis of News Articles....26
3.2.1. Content Analysis....26
3.2.2. Media Selection....28
3.3. How Articles will be Collected, Sampling Techniques and Data Gathering....29
3.4. Mediums which have not been considered....30
3.5. Significance of the Study....30
4. Quantitative content analysis....31
4.1. Media Coverage on Land and Agrarian Reform, September 2011 to August 2014....31
4.2. Themes which gained prominence....31
4.2.1. Farmers Weekly,....32
4.2.2. Business Day....34
4.2.3. SABC News Online....36
4.2.4. Daily Maverick....38
4.2.5. Mail and Guardian....40
4.3. Writers....41
4.3.1. Farmers Weekly....41
4.3.2. Business Day....42
4.3.3. SABC News Online....42
4.3.4. Daily Maverick....42
4.4. Sources....43

4.4.1. Farmers Weekly 43

4.4.2. Business Day 44

4.4.3. SABC News Online 44

4.4.4. Daily Maverick 45

4.4.5. Mail and Guardian 46

Chapter 5 - Qualitative Content Analysis 47

5.1. Thematic Analysis and Agenda Setting 47

5.1.1. Land Redistribution Programme 47

5.1.2. Land Redistribution Targets 47

5.1.3. Willing Seller Willing Buyer 48

5.1.4. Just and Equitable Compensation Policy 50

5.1.5. Nationalisation and Land Expropriation 50

5.1.6. Land Restitution 51

5.1.7. Restitution of Land Rights Amendment Bill 52

5.1.8. The land reform bills – an election ploy or a necessity to address the land question? 54

5.1.9. The Expropriation Bill 55

5.1.10. The Property Valuation Act 57

5.1.11. Land Tenure System 58

5.1.12. New Land Management Institutions 63

5.1.13. Post Settlement Support 64

5.1.14. Food Security 65

5.1.16. Small or large scale farming? 67

5.1.17. 50 – 50 Land Sharing - Strengthening the relative rights of people working the land policy framework 68

5.2. Comparative analyses and agenda setting 70

5.2.1. Critique of the Green Paper on land reform 70

5.2.2. Land Reform and the Constitution 71

5.2.3. Neglected themes 73

5.2.4. Writers and Sources 74

5.2.5. Journalistic Writing Standards 76

Chapter 6 79

6. Conclusion 79

Bibliography: 83

Appendix 92

LISTS OF TABLES

Table 4.1:	Number of Stories per media outlet	31
Table 4.2:	Farmers Weekly - Key Themes, September 2011 – August 2014	32 - 34
Table 4.3:	Business Day - Key Themes, September 2011 – August 2014	35 -37
Table 4.4:	SABC News Online – Themes, September 2011 – August 2014	37 - 38
Table 4.5:	Daily Maverick – Key Themes, September 2011 – August 2014	38 - 39
Table 4.6:	Mail and Guardian – Key Themes, September 2011 – August 2014	40 - 41

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AgriBEE	Agriculture Black Economic Empowerment
ANC	African Nation Congress
ANCYL	African Nation Congress Youth League
AZAPO	Azanian People's Organisation
BCCSA	Broadcasting Complaints Commission of South Africa
DA	Democratic Alliance
DLF	Department of Land Affairs
DRDLR	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform
EFF	Economic Freedom Fighters
FF+	Freedom Front Plus
LRDAP	Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development Programme
NAREG	National Reference Group
NUMSA	National Union of Metalworkers of South Africa
PLASS	Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies
RDP	Reconstruction Development Program
SALGA	South African Local Government Association
SLAG	Sustainable Livelihoods in Agriculture Grant

CHARPTER ONE

1. Introduction

1.1. Background and rationale for the study

The National Land Summit (2005) marked the beginning of a more radical rhetoric from different land and agrarian reform stakeholders. The African National Congress' Polokwane elective conference resolved that land and agrarian reform should be one of its key policy priorities. Soon after the ANC electoral victory in 2009, President Jacob Zuma established of a new Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR) and a month later, he announced that a comprehensive rural development strategy will be the government's third most important priority (Jacobs 2012:171). It is on this premise that land and agrarian reform ought to be viewed as a national concern and it deserves comprehensive media coverage. However, Genis (2006:111-112) argues that the duty of the South African media to inform has shifted towards a Western tradition which privilege economic, political and intellectual elites whilst ignoring the grassroots voice.

This study is informed by Genis (2006)'s research on how the media covered the National Land Summit (2005). She found that the five newspapers under her study "did not fulfil their societal roles in full," and "the manner in which newspapers operate and decision-making takes place in newsrooms require further scrutiny." (Genis 2006:113). There is therefore need to explore how the media has reflected on the land and agrarian reform developments since the publication of the Green Paper on land and agrarian reform, and further critically analyse the discourses and ideologies surrounding the coverage.

1.2. The South African Land Question Overview

South Africa experienced a greater extent of dispossession following colonial conquest than any African country. This vicious process started around 1650 when the European settlers landed at Cape of Good Hope and it progressed for more than 300 years (Lahiff 2007:1578). The 1894 Glen Grey Act, the 1913 Native Land Act, the 1936 Native Trust and Land Act as well as sundry apartheid racist laws such as the Natives Resettlement Act of 1954, The Native Trust and Land Amendment Act of 1954 led to forced

removals of native South African from their fertile lands into reserves, whilst the minority whites were acquiring vast tracks of farmland (Hendricks 2000, Baldwin 1975). White settlers appropriated more than three quarters of the agrarian productive land under these suppressive laws, confining the indigenous people to reserves in the remaining marginal portions of land (Hall and Ntsebeza 2007:11).

When democracy dawned in 1994, 86% of the land was in the hands of white minority who were about 13% of the population, and the majority 85% of blacks owned only 13% of the land. In 1996, less than one percent of the white population owned and controlled over 80% of farmland whilst 76.7% of the African population had access to less than 15% of agricultural land, with insecure tenure rights (Kariuki 2007). The amount of land held per person was slightly more than one hectare for blacks and 1 570 hectares for whites (Hendricks 2001). This shows the asymmetrical structural inequality of land ownership in the new South Africa.

Murray and Williams (1994:316) argues that the rural and landless communities demanded land right from independence. The unbanning of the African National Congress (ANC) led to effective repealing of a wide array of racist legislation in respect of land segregation in 1991, and made most landless black South Africans hopeful and expectant that land will be transferred back to them with the advent of democracy (Hendricks 2001; Hall and Ntsebeza 2006:16).

The land and agrarian reform policy as embedded in the Reconstruction and Development Program (RDP) and the White Paper on Land Affairs under the willing seller willing buyer principle, focused on a three pronged approach: land redistribution, land tenure and land restitution. The land redistribution target was set on 30% by 1999. However, by March 2004, only 2,9% of commercial land had been redistributed.

By 2009 just 6.9% of agricultural land had been transferred and more than a quarter (26%) of this land is generally arid in Northern Cape Province. The government further extended the year to meet the 30% target to 2025 through the Land and Agrarian Reform Programme (LARP) document (Greenburg 2010:4).

The second decade of democracy witnessed a policy shift on the land and agrarian question. The 2005 National Land Summit was a turning point on land policy. The summit criticized the government's free market policy on land reform and advocated for a policy shift in order to meet the 30% target by 2014 (Genis 2006:6-7). The media has been instrumental in informing and engaging the public on the ongoing land reform debates.

Due to pressure from different sectors of the population, and obvious evidence of the weaknesses of the market-led land reform approach, the government was compelled to throw away the willing seller willing buyer approach and adopted the just and equitable compensation approach where the government has a central active role. Since 2009, the government has been developing and reviewing policy and legislative documents in order to create a proper framework for the functioning of the new strategy.

1.3. Land and Agrarian Reform and Media Reporting

South Africa's print media industry has 23 daily and 14 weekly major urban newspapers; most of them are published in English. There are also a number of regional and community newspapers, most of them are delivered free of charge. There is also ballooning new media (online) and social media is effectively bridging between the media and the society. 12.4 million South Africans buy the urban dailies, and community newspapers have a circulation of 5.5 million (Media Club South Africa 2014). There are 14 national weekly magazines and *Farmers Weekly* is the only one which specifically focuses on agriculture and land reform related issues. The broadcast industry (TV and radio) is dominated by the public broadcaster, the South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC) with three national television stations and 18 radio stations.

Without any shadow of doubt, the media plays a pivotal role in informing, educating and engaging the public on the ongoing developments in most countries. In the Third World, most mass media theorists perceive the media institutions as both instruments for and aspects of a wider socioeconomic development. The South African media has been reporting on land and agrarian reform developments since the 1913 Native Land Act. During the Colonial and Apartheid era, however public media reportage

was under strict government control and the reportage was as per the dominating state ideology. However, this underwent a radical change with the dawn of democracy and scrapping of the apartheid era's draconian laws (Genis 2005:37; Wasserman 2005:6).

Notable post-apartheid work has been done by Genis (2006) in her thesis titled: *Land Reform in the News, an Analysis of how certain South African Newspapers covered Land Reform before and after the 2005 National Land Summit*. Other media reporting contributions are not explicit to land and agrarian reform. There is therefore need for research on how the media is reporting the ongoing land and agrarian reform developments. This study shall use media coverage on the land and agrarian reform developments since the publication of the green paper on land and agrarian reform (2011) as a case study.

1.4. Research Question

Having researched most of the media stories on land and agrarian reform developments since the publication of the green paper on land and agrarian reform (2011), so many questions arise: whose ideological perspectives is the media representing? Are they the ideas of the ruling political elite, or of those who own the means of production (capitalists – neo-liberalism), or of the outsiders who hold the key to finances (World Bank, IMF), or the grassroots and landless people? Are they ideas of the journalists themselves independent of outside pressure or are they a result of in-depth study on land policies? (Fairclough 1995:14 – 15).

This study shall undertake to investigate and find answers to some of the critical questions raised above. The core question is: *How have media institutions been reporting on land and Agrarian Reform developments in South Africa? A case study of the Post-Green Paper on Land and Agrarian Reform (2011).* In order to demystify of this question, some specific questions shall be investigated, these include:

- **What was reported?** Which sections of the land and agrarian reform policy documents and developments received much attention? Was the reportage comprehensive? What was not

reported? Which topics received little attention? Did the media comprehensively cover the issues around land and agrarian reform developments?

- **What are the dominant topics and themes?** Which themes in relation to the three pillars of land and agrarian reform are dominant? What was reported on the role of the state in the land market in relation to what the policy documents articulates? How are the effects of these policies portrayed in relation to investor confidence, food security, reconciliation, peace and the constitution? Are there any biases towards certain viewpoints? How is the land reform agenda represented? What does the choice of words and pictures signify?
- **Who are the reporters?** Did the media institutions use their own staff? Are most of the stories written by columnists? Are they guest / expert writers? Are they letters to the editor?
- **Who were the sources used?** Who was interviewed or consulted for comment? Are they government officials? Are they experts from land research institutions or Universities? Are they from organised commercial agriculture? Are they from Landless Peoples' Movement? Was the grassroots voice incorporated? Are the sources balanced in their analysis?

1.5. Theoretical Framework

This research shall make use of the agenda-setting media theory in a bid to understand how the media determine what to prioritise, who has influence over such decisions and how it is fulfilling its role as a bridge between different sectors of society. An agenda is a list of items to be discussed at a meeting, usually drawn up by the person chairing the meeting, who has the power to arrange them in the order of importance (Nel 2005:56). Terms such as "hidden agenda" or agenda-setting" in relation to news suggest that editors and journalists have the power to decide which items are the news of the day (Branston and Stafford, 1996:134). The power of "agenda-setting" is based on the fact that the media do not necessarily dictate to its audience what to think (or how to act), but it can influence what people think (and talk) about. In this study the media agenda and its role shall be considered within the context of development journalism (McQuail 2005:99). The emphasis is on how the media institutions choose what to focus on, and how they are influenced by major institutions of society such as the economic, political and financial

institutions (Newbold at al 2002:22). Doyle (2002:126) argues that the media agenda is influenced by the desire for a greater market share and long term pressures on revenues. It is essential to critically analyse the dominant voice in the media and their weight of power economically or politically or otherwise.

Since journalism is a culturally construed practice, journalists are therefore responsible for agenda setting (Banda 2007:143). Given South Africa's asymmetrical background, Genis (2005:4) emphasised that past injustice should inform how the media agenda, and development reporting should focus on redressing past injustices, accelerating and deepening the process of transformation and development. The media have a responsibility to provide a primary arena for debate and create a communicative space where citizens freely and comfortably discuss core issues which affect them (Genis 2005:22).

Chapter 2

2. Literature Review

This chapter shall consider the vast literature available on the key issues on the topic under study. Firstly, it shall mull over the theoretical debates and contemporary issues on land and agrarian reform. Secondly, contemporary discussions on the role of the media (agenda-setting perspectives) in land and agrarian reform and lastly, different theories on the media-society relationships

2.1. Debates on Land and Agrarian Reform

2.1.1. The Land and Agrarian Reform Objectives

Given the historical differences caused by the colonial and apartheid governments, the South African democratic government inherited a country with structural rural poverty, racial inequality, the co-existence of economic growth and declining living standards. Former president Thabo Mbeki called this dilemma "two economies" which needs to be harmonised (Cousins 2006:220). The land and agrarian reform program seeks to restructure the agricultural sector, redress the injustice of colonial and apartheid dispossession and transform social and economic relations in the countryside (Hall 2006:87).

The land and agrarian reform agenda was embedded in the Reconstruction and Development Program (RDP) which viewed it as the "driving force of a programme of rural development" (Kariuki 2009:3-4). The 1997 White Paper on South African Land Policy explains in detail the mandate of land and agrarian reform policy (Wegerif at al, 2005:34).

2.1.2. The land reform developments and debates

Across the world, land is one of the most traded properties on the market. However, scholars such as Gutto (2014:5) argue that viewing land as property makes it a mere commodity in the market economies or market economic thinking. He further asserts that, the land is "grossly under-conceptualised and under-theorised in the prevailing mainstream or dominant paradigms under capitalism, imperialism and neo-colonialism". In the frameworks of Pan-Africanism and African Renaissance theory which he called,

"The Wangari-Maathaist Conception and Theory of Land and its Centrality to Life", Gutto presents a critical reflection of popular discourses with the media and in scholarly works on issues of land, land reform and social contestations. He critiques the dominant media and scholarly contemporary superficial conceptualisation and theorisation of socio-economic rights by arguing that land rights are at the centre of human and people's rights and freedoms.

In the South African context, Walker (2003:807 - 808) argues that the land question is a "descriptive phrase rather than a theoretical construct, with two major elements". Firstly, the shameful history of dispossession, where 3,5 million natives were forced into Bantustans. This historical narrative dates back uninterrupted for 350 years (Lahiff 2007:1578); and secondly, the decline of black peasant agriculture over the past century and the accompanying poverty. The land question is embedded in discourses around rights, social justice and identity that operate generally within a group rather than an individual paradigm (Walker 2003:808). The arguments for land reform are many and wide ranging. "There are political, economic, social as well as moral reasons why there should be a radical transformation process in land ownership patterns in South Africa" (Gumede, 2014:51).

There are various schools of thought on the approach to land and agrarian reform available. The most dominant schools of thought on land and agrarian reform include the Marxism, agrarian populism and neo-liberal commercial farming (Bernstein 2006:28). The classic agrarian question in Marxism is based on an attempt to solve the problems of industrialisation as well as the "transitions to capitalism (and the socialism)". Agrarian populism on the other hand emphasises the importance small scale, peasantry and cooperative agriculture. The neo-populist has however adapted the World Bank's conception of market led reform, making it a blend of agrarian populism and neo-liberal policies (Bernstein 2006:36-37). Following the advice of the World Bank, the ANC government adopted market friendly approach to land and agrarian reform (Murray and Williams 1994). Hendricks (2001:290) however says opposing views were ignored and the workers' unions were demoted to the function of "marginal players"

Much of the recent debates question why the land and agrarian reform has failed to meet its targets. Some scholars have argued that the solution to fair, equitable and efficient land and agrarian reform is by

recognising the central role of the state in the land market. They argue that there is growing evidence that markets need help from the government to reach their full potential (Genis 2006:28). One major problem of "free markets" is that they are "never truly free" they are "bound by social and political power-relations which determine their regulation." (Kariuki 2004:10). Bernstein (2013:23) argues that market friendly policies have "done little, if anything to transform the circumstances of the dispossessed" (Bernstein 2013:23). Scholars from the mainstream economics (Post Washington Consensus scholars) agree with the same notion on the active role of the state (Stiglitz 2004:53, D'Arista 2003:24, and Williamson 2004:8). In a nut shell, the South African state should take an active role in managing the land market, as well as setting up proper policy and legal frameworks for land reform for fair, efficient and equitable land and agrarian reform.

Bernstein (2006) argues that with contemporary globalisation and the massive development of the productive forces of capitalist agriculture, there is no longer an agrarian question of capital but rather an agrarian question of labour which should be oriented on rectifying the failures of capitalism to create adequate employment and fairly redistribute land. Moyo (2006), on the other side sees the land question as a critical social question and the land as a basic source of livelihoods. The land question should therefore be considered within the frameworks of other livelihoods and socio-economic development paradigms such as tourism, mining, housing and industry.

There are ongoing debates on the effectiveness of the land and agrarian reform implementation in ensuring significant social transformation. South African democracy is more than 20 years old yet racial differences on land ownership have stubbornly remained (Jacobs 2012:174). Land redistribution policy has been slow. The white commercial farmers have successfully managed to hold on to their hegemonic influence and dominance on land and agrarian reform policies (Cousins and Scoones 2010:33). AgriSA (Farmers Union) have effectively lobbied against small-scale agriculture. They argue that for the sake of food security, commercial agriculture should be promoted and subsistence farming is inefficient and unproductive. The government should focus on de-racialising commercial agriculture instead of redistributing the land to small scale farmers (Cousins 2006: 228). This is in line with the government's

Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development Programme (LRDAP) (2001) and the Agriculture Black Economic Empowerment (Agri-BEE) policy documents which focused mainly on raising an elite group of black commercial farmers unlike their predecessor the Sustainable Livelihoods in Agriculture Grant which focused on giving agricultural grants to the rural poor (Atkinson 2007:78, Cousins 2006:223). A detailed discussion on small or large scale farming options is on 2.1.3.5.

In a nutshell, agrarian neo-populism in the form of "market friendly" land reform is driven principally by ideologies and political considerations rather than by the overt socio-economic rationale of "efficiency and equity" (Bernstein 2006:41-42). Since 2009, the new government under President Jacob Zuma has been suggesting a series of seemingly pro-poor agrarian policy documents. These include the Green Paper on Land and Agrarian Reform (2011), the Property Valuations Bill, the Expropriation Bill, and the Restitution Land Rights Amendment Act (2014). It is still to be established whether these policies will bring a solution to the land reform demise or not.

2.1.3. The White Paper on South African Land Policy 1997

The adoption of the neo-liberal GEAR strategy in 1996 meant that "state-led and demand-driven developmentalism" had been marginalized (Kariuki 2004:8). The land and agrarian reform policy was embedded in the Reconstruction and Development Program (RDP). Even though it lacks detail on land reform the RDP viewed land reform as the "driving force of a programme of rural development" (Kariuki 2009:3-4). A more detailed modus operand was explained in the 1997 White Paper on South African Land Policy. The white paper proposed a three-pronged land reform programme – restitution, redistribution and tenure reform (Wegerif at al, 2005:34). These pillars are explained below.

2.1.3.1. Land Redistribution Programme

The white paper explains that the purpose of the Land Redistribution Programme is to address the livelihood needs of the poor, the marginalised, labour tenants and women in need of land for residential and productive purposes. It enables the eligible individuals and groups who were defined as, "the poor of the poorest" to obtain a Settlement/Land Acquisition Grant to a maximum of R15 000 per household for land purchase. After a review in 1999, the grant was increased to R16 000. By mid 1998, 250 000 people

in 279 projects had received land through the Land Redistribution Programme (White Paper on South African Land Policy 1997:12; Cliffe 2000:274). However, this policy largely excluded the whole bulk of other poor people who needed help. Also it appealed much to poverty alleviation rather than land redistribution. There is evidence that the willing seller willing buyer approach was efficient in some places without the assistance of the government. One study in KwaZulu-Natal found that between 1997 and 2001 there were 76 363 hectares of land transferred to the previously disadvantaged groups through private mortgage, private cash purchases and non-market private transfers (mainly bequests) compared to 45, 121 hectares transferred through the SLAG project. On average the land transferred without government assistance was of higher quality (Driver 2007:11).

The government went further to promote a new breed of agrarian capitalists, black commercial farmers. The post 1999 policy and legislative reforms showed little political will in addressing the land question as it had been expected by the rural mass and the landless. The 2001 Land Redistribution Distribution for Agricultural Development Programme (LRDAP) had much stronger commercial bent than its predecessor, the Sustainable Livelihoods in Agriculture Grant (Atkinson 2007:78). The LRDAP was unequivocally commercial agriculture oriented even though it claimed to cater for all groups. It offered grants which were between 20 000 and 100 000 through state-owned land banks. The requirements were too lofty for the poor and the beneficiaries were required to make a contribution in cash or kind. The focus was mainly on the black elite and small group projects which were amassing their grants to buy white-owned agricultural land (Lahiff 2007:1581). The Agri-BEE, an affirmative action related policy advocates for redistribution of land to black "entrepreneurs" and at the same time oppose the radical reform in favour of the poor. Kariuki (2009:5) argues that the policy failed to generate a substantial amount of black farmers. The Acquisition Municipal Commonage policy enabled municipalities to acquire grants to buy land for use by the poor typically for grazing purposes and not extensive land redistribution as one would expect in a racially lop-sided environment (Lahiff 2007:1581).

In a bid to fast track land reform, former President Mbeki's government introduced the Pro-Active Land Acquisition Strategy (2006) where the state was to proactively get into the market and buy the land

instead of waiting for the beneficiaries' applications for grants. Out of the 4,362,601 hectares of land redistributed since independence, 1,243,117 hectares were redistributed in the past five years (2009 – 2014) through this strategy.

In order to effectively and immediately reverse the trajectories of the past land dispossession of colonialism and apartheid, scholars have been advocating for more proactive land redistribution strategies. They have warned that poor strategies as the ones in place may lead to a violent full-blown land grabbing exercise, "setting the scene for an economic catastrophe of even greater proportions than the Zimbabwean land reform crisis" (Dlamini at al 2013:8). The Centre for Development Enterprise (2008) warned that Zimbabwean land grabs by masses was a result of the failure of redistributing land through market friendly policies.

2.1.3.2. Land Restitution

The political authority of master narrative ensured that land restitution emerged as a visible pillar in the land reform program since 1994 *(Walker 2008:50*). The Restitution of Land Rights Act of 1994 was passed with the aim to roll back the legacy of the land dispossession resulting from colonialism and apartheid. It was meant to rectify the discriminatory practices of forced removals which led to millions of natives being dumped into Bantustans and under the yoke of traditional leaders *(Centre for Law and Society 2013*).

Approximately 79, 602 land claims were lodged by 1999 deadline and a total of 241 claims had been finalised, involving the restoration of 311 484 households (83 378 beneficiaries) by March 1999 (Cliffe 2000:274). It should be noted however that most of those claims which were cleared early were for urban land and were settled through cash compensation rather than return of land. Also, an estimate 9 000 rural claims which involved millions of people remained outstanding by 2005 (Driver:2007:68). By June 2011, 76, 263 had been finalised. By 2013, half of the land already acquired for restitution was still to be transferred to the beneficiaries yet most of the rural claimants have been waiting for more than a decade (Centre for Law and Society 2013:2). National Planning Commission (2011:21 cited in Sender 2014:12) argues that 70 % of the 10, 000 hectares of citrus farms in the Eastern Cape which were transferred

through land reform policy is under "distress". Lahiff (2008:18) argues that the beneficiaries of restored land in high profile restitution resettlements such as Khomani San, in the Northern Cape, and Elandskloof, in the Western Cape received little post settlement support.

The land reform programmes lacked proper planning, coherence and strategic livelihoods strategy. Anseeuw and Mathebula (2008:34)'s study in Mole Mole land reform projects (Limpopo Province) showed interesting differences in income structure between the types of land reform: "None of the restitution projects is producing agricultural products. Of the five restitution projects, two are urban claims, one relies on extra-agricultural activities (leasing to other farmers, etc.) and the other two have entirely collapsed. In contrast, the LRAD projects rely only on agricultural production (in accordance with the LRAD programme's objective). The SLAG projects combine both. In all types of land reform, some projects make no income at all".

The grassroots ANC members and radical civil societies and land organisations such as the NGOs affiliated to the former National Land Committee, the Landless People's Movement and the Alliance of Land and Agrarian Reform advocated for a more radical land and agrarian reform. They advocated for "restorative justice" where the "stolen" land must be returned to its rightful owners with minimum compensation through the direct intervention of the state (Lahiff 2007:1584). Muiu at al (2009), argues that apartheid inequality will not be eliminated without a radical land reform program. In line with these radical proponents, Driver (2007:69) argues that it is "ethically and ideologically wrong to expect victims of apartheid to contribute financially to buying back land stolen from them".

2.1.3.3. The land tenure system

Scholarly literature shows that communal land tenure is a common problem in Africa where, "more than 90 per cent of the rural population's access to land is through indigenous customary mechanisms, and around 370 million of them are definably poor" (Kariuki 2009:8). In South Africa, around 43 per cent of the population (approximately 20 million) reside in privately owned large scale commercial farms and communal areas (former reserves), yet these constitute mere 13% of the land area of the country.

Several tenure legislations were put in place in order to facilitate the land tenure reform. These include the 1996 Interim Protection of Informal Land Rights Act, the 1998 Land Rights Bill and the 2004 Communal Land Rights Act. However, in the former homelands, traditional leaders still enjoy high levels of powers on the allocation of land whilst farm workers have remained insecure in the white-owned farms. More is required to redraft the legal framework – which the government is doing (Driver 2007:68, Cliffe 2000:274).

According to Anseeuw (2006:6) the tenure reform is the slowest and it has made little progress in changing the tenure system of the land occupied by black populations. The land tenure system has continued to deprive the rights of the farm workers in the hands of the white farm owners, and the homelands residents who are in the hands of the traditional authorities. Regardless of the guarding documents such as the 1955 Freedom Charter which advocates for redistributing the land to the landless and land ownership by those who work on it, the new government did not do much to shape policies in that line. This is regardless of the opposing and Freedom Charter advocacy voices. Workers' unions were demoted to the function of "marginal players" (Hendricks 2001:290). The government kept on changing policies. In 1995, the government published the Rural Development Strategy for the Government of National Unity. This policy document had little to say about farm labourers, mentioning them only in passing even though they are among the "most impoverished rural constituencies" (Atkinson 2007:69).

Cousins (2006:227; 2007:283) argue that the agrarian question of the dispossessed (of labour) has not yet been resolved. Structural unemployment, poverty, food insecurity, land hunger, gender imbalances and continued rule of chiefs mean that the struggle for democracy and against oppression and exploitation continues. The lack of strong institutional and management bodies which are aimed at securing land rights of farm workers, labour tenants and revamping the administration of traditional leaders who have been widely criticised as corrupt led to dismal failure of the tenure system.

2.1.3.4. Key Normative Claims

There are two major challenges facing the land reform programme. The first is to speed up the transfer of land. The second is to support productive use of transferred land. Greenberg (2010:4) asserts that the programme is hampered by very weak delivery systems and institutions, inadequate budgets, top-down implementation, and extremely poor provision of agricultural support.

Lahiff (2007:1588) argues that the government has implemented "highly conservative farm (or project) planning". The farm plans failed to properly subdivide large properties and imposed unrealistic business plans on the farmers. The market-led reform beneficiaries are not expected to rely on the state for post-settlement support services but from public and private providers whose interest is mainly profit maximisation. Sender (2014:16) argues that the South African state have not invested in irrigation over the past two decades. The total land of irrigated area to the total area cultivated remains below 10 per cent compared to an Asian average of about 34 per cent (FAOSTAT 2011 in Sender 2014:16).

To help farmers write proper proposals, the government out-sourced consultancy and some of these never consulted their clients and most of those who did lacked appropriate skills and gave superficial assistance. Cliffe (2000:278) concluded that, "While scarcely preventing the emergence of a very considerable bureaucracy, these measures inhibited the emergence of an agency that could institutionalise the lessons of the experience that was accruing and the build-up of a trained and experienced cadre of professionals that could perform the many and complex tasks required." As a result the newly resettled farmers have been facing difficulties accessing critical services such as credit, training, extension advice, transport, ploughing and veterinary services as well as input and produce markets (Lahiff 2007:1590). Policy implementation has also been hampered by human resource constraints. In the first decade of democracy, the Department of Land Affairs was highly understaffed, and the employees critically needed further training. This made it difficult for the administrative capacity to meet political expectations and this trend is on-going (Kariuki 2004:10).

2.1.3.5. Small scale or commercial farming?

In the 1990s and 2000s, there was a drop in agricultural output compared to the 1960s in the Sub Saharan Africa and some scholars predicted persistent food insecurity throughout the region (Devereux and Maxwell 2001:1 cited in Oya 2010:2). This threat was explained from many different angles. Organised commercial agriculture, effectively lobbied and influenced ANC against small-scale agriculture. They argued that for the sake of food security and other critical agricultural production components, only commercial agriculture is real agriculture. Subsistence farmers were considered to be inefficient and unproductive, and the solution to rural poverty is rural – urban migration and land reform should focus on "deracialising" commercial agriculture (Cousins 2006: 228). Their argument followed the World Bank's line of thinking which is used to justify large-scale farming and neo-liberalism on the basis of economic efficiency, rather than on political or equity basis (Driver 2007:72).

In support to this point, Sender and Johnston (2004:143, 151) expressed concern over the weakness of the empirical support and "robust" African evidence of the efficiency of small-farm production. They dispute the empirical authenticity of the Sub-Saharan Africa case studies of successful small farms in countries such as Malawi, Kenya and Madagascar. They argue that the researches have been "flawed by methodological shortcomings". In South Africa, they gave case studies in Western Cape which proves that a shift to small scale farming would not increase farm employment. Sender (2014:16) argues that there is abundant evidence of the failure of the small scale farmers. Small scale holders farm a "tiny" fraction of total irrigated area and their performance is below agronomic potential. Sender (2014:17) concluded that the rhetoric of current ANC government on small scale farmers and its failure to make them viable has deep historical and electoral roots since the National Party which like the ANC was compelled to support small farmers in the 1940s and 1950s even though they were inefficient and uncompetitive.

Other scholars however critique this idea; case studies from Brazil and other South American countries as well as Asia has proven that with government support, small scale farmers can be more efficient and a better approach to equitable redistribute wealth. Fraiser at al (2013:24) argues that it is possible to achieve equitable and fair redistribution of land without inhibiting agricultural production, through land sharing.

With the help of economic calculations and case studies, they show that sharing land could help fast-track the development of a farming skills and related competencies' equilibrium between black and white farmers. They further demonstrate that the gains in land sharing far outweigh other programmes of land reform that have been used and suggested thus far.

Other scholars in support of small scale farming, such as Driver (2007:72) and Cousins (2006: 228), argue that since agriculture is the primary economic activity in the rural areas, land reform programme which focuses on small scale farming is critical. For rural transformation and to overcome poverty, rural communities require social, economic and political opportunities at all levels, small and large scale *(NDP: 221 - 222).* This means multiple livelihoods sources, including agriculture at different scales, formal employment, remittances, welfare transfers and micro-enterprises must be promoted *(Cousins 2007:229).*

2.1.3.6. The Role of the state and land reform Budgets

Both scholars and politicians have also been advocating for the central role of the state in development and that markets should not be left operating "freely" (Kariuki 2004:10, Stiglitz 2004:53, Williamson 2004:24, Bernstein 2013:23). Former President Thabo Mbeki reiterated the same notion in 2006's State of the nation adress, and the then Minister of Agriculture and Land Affairs emphasised the need of a proactive land acquisition strategy where the state as a lead driver in land redistribution rather than beneficiary driven (Lahiff 2008: 14). Such criticism resulted in the pro-market willing seller willing buyer principle being replaced by the just and equitable compensation approach (See 5.1.3 and 5.1.4).

Since independence, land and agrarian reform has not been a priority sector in budgetary plans. The government has been criticised for lack of political will and commitment to the set targets of land reform. In its passive position, the state's national budget has over the years proved that land and agrarian reform is not a key priority sector. This is expressed in the national budget allocations where the Department of Land Affairs never received more than 0.5% of the national budget before 2005. The Commission on Restitution of Land Rights estimated that approximately R13.5 billion was needed to deal with all the

outstanding claims yet only R445 million was allocated in the 2005/6 Medium Term (Cousins 2007:224, Report on Land Summit 2005).

The Department of Land Affairs' budget for the first decade totalled to R7.3 billion, less than half of World Bank's recommendation in five years. This same decade budget was less than half of the Department of Defence's R15.27 billion allocation in the 2001/2002 financial year (Walker: 2005:816). Up to 2005, the government's anti-poverty strategies such as the Agriculture Black Economic Empowerment (Agri-BEE) and the Department of Land Affairs were underfunded which made it difficult for them to make significant contribution to integrating the second economy into the first (Cousins 2006:223). After 2009, the budget went slightly higher and the new government focused on recapitalising the redistributed land. In the 2010 – 11 financial year, R435 135170 was allocated for land recapitalisation programme and R638 430 000 was allocated in the 2011 – 2012 financial year (DRDLR 2012). This was in line with the proposed active role of the state in land reform and also the fact that land and agrarian reform had been set as the government's third national priority (see 1.1).

2.1.4. The Green Paper on Land and Agrarian Reform

The green paper was published on the 31st August 2011 by the Department of Rural Development and Land Affairs. It was set as a tentative government report on land and agrarian reform policy, and it focused on the policy statements of the 1997 White Paper as well as other programmes and products of the then Department of Land Affairs (Rudman 2012:422).

From its lengthy and meandering introduction clustered with disjointed array of critical themes, the green paper advocates for a paradigm shift on the land question and redressing past injustice. It argues that land should be seen as a national asset which is paramount for national sovereignty and the history of dispossession must be fully addressed in order to achieve true racial reconciliation. The Green Paper focused on eight key areas, namely:

i. Problem statement

ii. A vision for land reform

iii. Principles underlying land reform

iv. Current challenges and weaknesses: Rational for change

v. An improved trajectory for land reform (Institutions)

vi. The strategic thrust for land reform

vii. Land reform experiences elsewhere and

viii. Challenges and constraints (DRDLR 2011)

The green paper was published in order to set in motion a consultation process and to stimulate constructive debates as well as to volte-face a novel path for land and agrarian reform. The DRDLR aimed at generating ideas and responses to the policy questions facing land reform. These include, why the state should continue in transforming land relations; how important is land reform in South Africa today; is South Africa still primarily an agrarian society and many others. It also raises questions on reversing the history of dispossession, addressing the plight of wageworkers, tenure issues and ensuring land reform paradigm shift whilst avoiding disrupting agriculture and food security (DRDLR 2011).

The green paper is underpinned by three key principles; firstly de-recialisation of the rural economy for shared and sustained growth; secondly, democratic and equitable land allocation and use across gender, race and class; and lastly, strict production discipline for guaranteed national food security (DRDLR 2011).

The Department (DRDLR) established the National Reference Group (NAREG) which was an inclusive structure that represented varied interest groups ranging from beneficiaries to organised agriculture, from civil society to academics and experts on land and agrarian issues. Six working groups were established which would in turn report to NAREG on their reflections and contributions to the proponents of the green paper. The six groups are as follows:

i. The Land Management Commission (LMC).

ii. The Land Rights Management Board (LRMB) and its local structures (to handle matters including the draft Land Tenure Security Bill, ESTA/evictions and agri-villages).

iii. The Land Valuer-General where fair market value compensation for property is discussed.

iv. The threefold (3-Tier) system of land ownership (state land, private ownership with certain restrictions and leased land). The committee also attends to aspects such as land ceilings and the right of first refusal.

v. Communal land Tenure.

vi. Legislative Amendments; to the Restitution Act and the Communal Property Associations Act.

There were several opinions for and against the green paper and the outcomes of the NAREG working groups from different interest groups. Most of the NAREG working groups could not agree on some fundamental issues and the right path for the new policy direction.

On the legislative amendment to the Land Restitution Act, AgriSA argued that after several consultative meeting there was no consensus on any specific proposal (AgriSA 2012). The AgriSA, other organised agricultural bodies, agribusiness and commercial banks also criticised the suggestion that the Valuer General should regulate land prices. They argued that the Valuer General should play an advisory and monitoring role not a regulatory one and there should always be recourse to the courts when disputes about valuations arise (AgriSA 2012:5). The DA (2011), argued that such green paper proposals will not pass the constitutional muster. SALGA (2011) argued that there is potential overlap between the role of the Land Valuer General and the local government (municipalities), and because of that it is difficult to deliver substantial input in the discussion forums.

On Land Rights Management Committee (LRMCs), NAREG working group agreed that there is need for these to be created since evictions from farms remain a sensitive and controversial issue and the plight of the farm workers has to be addressed as soon as possible. They also suggested that the Department should consider amending Extension of Security Tenure Act (ESTA) as opposed to proceeding with the Land

Tenure Security Bill. However, AgriSA called for further research on the judgements of the Land Claims Court and gaps in ESTA. SALGA argued that the green paper suggests that these will include the municipals council but it does not shed light on the kind of relationship and functions of each of these to avoid conflicts and duplication of responsibilities.

FW de Klerk Foundation (2012) argued that the green's strong language came close to hate speech. The Executive Director, Dave Steward argued that, "the inflammatory historic analysis is irreconcilable with the Constitution's goal of healing the divisions of the past." An academic from the SA Institute of Race Relations, Anthea Jeffrey (2012) argued that the green paper shows ANC's strategy and tactics of eradicating inequality by taking the wealth from the whites and transferring it to blacks instead of growing the economic pie, which have its roots in Lenin's theory of imperialism. PLAAS argued that the green paper was a disappointment and it failed to provide an honest analysis of the nature and shortcomings of land reform policy (PLAAS 2011). Hall (2011) argues that the green paper offers little policy direction for important but controversial land reform. South African Local Government Association (SALGA) argued that the draft green paper was "scant" on specifics and "silent" role of the local government which made it difficult to make any meaningful comments (SALGA 2011).

The contents of the green paper resulted in several bills and acts which were introduced between 2012 and 2014. These include, draft Land Tenure Security Bill, Extension of Security Tenure Amendment Bill (ESTA); Land Restitution Amendment Bill which was signed into law in 2014; Property Valuation Bill which is already an Act; strengthening the relative rights of people working the land policy framework and many more. These land reform bills and policy proposals have been suggested amid scholarly criticism that land reform in South Africa has been a "dismal failure" and there is lack of policy and legislative clarity and direction (Gumede 2014:52). It is in this context that one will argue that the green paper brings forth new hope to the landless and marks a shift on the land policy arena. The legal amendment bills and policy documents, which were developed between 2011 and 2014 attest to the potency and gravity of the green paper. Following this argument, one can agree with Rudman's accession

that the Green Paper should be regarded as a "subtle shift or a rhetoric issue but the consequences of this shift, will not be subtle but rather a great leap toward a new paradigm in agrarian reform."

2.2. Land and Agrarian reform, Agenda-setting and Media Reporting

There are several on-going debates on the role of the media in society. Sundry theories have been developed in an attempt to explain this relationship. This section shall focus on two issues: firstly, agenda setting and the role of the media (development communication/journalism in particular) in land and agrarian reform in South Africa. Secondly, a summary of development journalism theories in the African context.

There are several contemporary perspectives to media and its relationship to the society. As propounded by McQuail (2005:94-106), there are seven media-society theories. These are: the mass society theory, Marxism, functionalism, critical political economy, social constructionist, communication technology determinism and the information society theory. This section does attempt to summarise the major themes and ideologies from these theories within the context of development communication/journalism.

2.3. Functionalist Theory – Agenda-setting and the role of the media

Media role in land and agrarian reform developments can be summarised in the following: information dissemination, citizenship and citizen-framing of development role, and public listening and engagement. These are discussed below.

2.3.1. Information Dissemination

First and foremost, the role of the media is to inform. It is the public's constitutional right to be informed. Both the Press Ombudsman's code and the Broadcasting Complaints Commission of South Africa (BCCSA) refer to this fundamental right (Wasserman 2005:5). Berger (2004:23) argued that development journalism is about "providing context and educational information – not just the what, but also the how and why of your stories". This then means the writers of stories should set an agenda not only to inform but also to constructively critique in a balanced manner.

2.3.2. Citizenship and Citizen-Framing of Development

The media must recognise that people are not consumers of media products but are citizens whose voice must be heard (Banda 2007:146). However, most audience research in South Africa focuses on the purchasing power of consumers to attract advertising. This shows much ignorance of audience citizenship (Morna 2007:275). Audience citizenship does not mean compromising the ethical standards of fairness and impartiality, it rather means journalists must appreciate the fact that only citizens can "name and frame" their issues effectively regardless of their education level or social background (Banda 2007:146). The media should therefore be an eye and ear of the ordinary citizen (Genis 2005:4). Banda (2007:146) concluded by saying, "that might mean more telephone lines opened up for citizen participation; more cameras made available for outside broadcasting; more reporters assigned to attend to people's issues and problems; greater use of ordinary people and ordinary people's associations in news stories; and less use of 'experts' or politicians".

2.3.3. Public Listening and Engagement

Journalists must learn the art of listening especially to grassroots voice and allow other people's ideas to influence reporting. Banda (2007: 146) has this to say, "Listening to citizens is transformative, because it is humbling. It will almost invaluably result in a deeper connection with the people. It will compel the journalist to change reporting techniques. The journalist might welcome alternative news sources, focus groups and consensus conferences." There is need to broaden participation in the development process and actively engage the citizens in key issues which affect them.

2.4. Development journalism Theorisation in Africa and Agenda Setting

Development journalism theorisation has gone through three historical phases. The first was the modernisation paradigm, followed by the dependency-dissociation paradigm and lastly participatory communication (Banda 2006:2-3).

2.4.1. Media Agenda and Modernisation Perspectives

The Neo-Marxist Approach (Frankfurt School) to media studies was propounded and developed by think tanks such as Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno and Herbert Marcuse. They argued that the general public are being controlled and manipulated by the media owners for the advantage of the capitalists' quest for profit maximization. Based on this argument, the media can be viewed as mere propaganda of the top elite class through the media owners (Guess 1981, Wiggershaus 1986). From a development communication perspective, the media was viewed as a vehicle to transfer the first world's technology and socio-political culture to the backward third world. The spread of innovation will then help the developing world to shift towards the modern society (Banda 2006:2-3). Banda (2007:144) summed it up this way, "the modernisation approach is a top-down development strategy that emphasised the centrality of the institution of journalism in the ethnographic process of development". This approach raises questions and need for enquiry on the approach of media reporting on issues which affect grassroots population and farmers.

2.4.2. Media Agenda and Dissociation from Dependency

This approach is centred on the ideologies of the then newly independent Third World countries who advocated for distancing themselves from the ideological influence of the Developed World. In Africa, political leaders championed the campaigns for a revolutionary media. These include Nkrumah of Ghana, Kaunda of Zambia and Nyerere of Tanzania. The focus was to establish public media which would press forward a revolutionary agenda, and open a platform for mass education on development. This model was state centric and used the media to spread the government's propaganda and it was also used as an instrument for social control (Banda 2007:144; Ansah 1988:7). Viewed in Nkrumah's 'revolutionary' terms, it is easy to see why development journalism has become so 'demonised' over time, attracting the disdain of some Western scholars and human rights activists. Clearly, though, one cannot throw the baby out with the bath water (Banda 2006:2).

2.4.3. Media Agenda and Participatory Communication

This is also known as the 'multiplicity' or 'another development' paradigm which focuses on participatory communication or another communication (Servaes 1991). This has its foundation in Stuart Hall's ground breaking work on two-way symmetric communication (Procter 2013). Hall (cited in Procter 2013) argued that there is need to understand the dynamics between the encoder (sender) – decoder (receiver)'s transactional relationship. Both are active participants and meaning to the message is given based on several other factors in the communication context. There is therefore need to study and understand media's semiotics and representation on land and agrarian reform issues for us to comprehend meaning (Ott at al 2010). In the ongoing land and agrarian reform debates, the media therefore has a task to ensure that they write stories which stimulate discussion from the grassroots levels and pay attention to the voices of (for instance) the farmers who stand to benefit from post settlement support or farm workers who stand to benefit from new land tenure and yet at the same time capturing the voices of the white farmers who stand to lose their land as well as the viewpoints of academics.

Chapter 3

3. Research Methodology

3.1. Introduction

Realities are unique, plural, simultaneous, and local phenomena. They are a product of interactions between people through their symbolic practices of expression and interpretation (Lindolf and Taylor 2011:8). In order to understand these realities, questions must be asked and answers must be found. In simple terms, this process is what is called research. It involves systematic exploration, guided by well constructed questions, producing new information or reassessing old information (Bertrand and Hughes 2005:184).

Social research involves two main paradigms, quantitative measurement and qualitative interpretations (Genis 2006:43). These approaches can be used in media research collectively or singular. Media research can focus on the institutions, or audience and/or texts. Research on texts is based on an understanding of two common categories of media research. Firstly, those which focus on researching textual content. These include content analysis, semiotics, phenomenology and hermeneutics. Secondly, those which focus on researching textual structure and discourse. These include structural analysis, narratology and discourse analysis (Bertrand and Hughes 2005:ix).

In this study, the broad question of how the media has been reporting on land and agrarian reform developments since 2011 will be investigated through content analysis. The reasons for such a choice are explained in section 3.2.1.

3.2. Content Analysis of News Articles

3.2.1. Content Analysis

Content analysis is a methodical coding and replicable technique for organising text into meaningfully compressed categories. Berger (1991:25) defined content analysis as a research technique that "is based on measuring the amount of something (violence, negative portrayals of women, or whatever) in a

representative sampling of some mass mediated popular art form". It has been used in media studies, and portrayed in the literature as a suitable technique for both inductive and deductive research methods (Ooesthuzien 2000:79; 2012:4). In inductive content analysis the categories are derived from data and in deductive content analysis the research is dependent on an existing theory or model (Elo and Kyagas 2007:109).

The purpose of content analysis is to provide knowledge, new insights and a representation of reality. It is a means of learning and understanding humanity by examining what they produce through different mediums. Generally, media outputs helps the researchers to identify and learn behaviour patterns, values and attitudes of those involved in news production process (Ooesthuzien 2000:79, 2012:4; Berger 1991:25).

Content analysis has more advantages than disadvantages when dealing with media texts, particularly press analysis. These include the fact that it is easy to get information from the both the present and past (Bertrand and Hughes 2005:184). It also enables a researcher to sift through large volumes of data in a systematic fashion and it can establish correlation as well as time order of effects (Oosthuizen 2012:4). However, content analysis cannot control other factors which could explain the hypothesized relationships like a well executed experimental design (Bryman 2008:608). There are also problems of the extent of representation of sampling, establishing units of measurement, category definitions and interpretation (Bertrand and Hughes 2005:184).

As a research method, content analysis is a systematic and objective means of describing and quantifying phenomena (Elo and Kynga 2007:109). It can be used together with a mixed methods approach. Bryman (2008:603) defined a mixed methods approach as explorations that combine quantitative and qualitative techniques. This argument is supported by Boytnton (2005:27) who asserts that the two methods can be used individually or in combination. Quantitative content analysis involves objective, systematic and quantitative description of media reports, considering things such as occurrence of words and themes (Genis 2006:45 – 46). Qualitative content analysis on the other hand will be essential in developing an

understanding in relation to the social construction of events and meanings in these media reports (Bryman 2008:592). In this research, quantitative content analysis shall precede qualitative content analysis.

3.2.2. Media Selection

For the purpose of this study, three print media publications *(Business Day, Mail and Guardian, and Farmers Weekly)* and two new media publications *(The Daily Maverick and SABC News Online)* has been carefully selected.

For print media, one daily business oriented newspaper has been selected. Two weekly publications, one weekly newspaper, and another weekly farmer's magazine have also been selected. Two online publications include *SABC News Online* which correspond with several print and broadcaster mediums, and *The Daily Maverick.* These mediums and justification for their selection is summarised below:

3.2.2.1. Business Day

This is the biggest daily business newspaper, owned by Avusa Communications (Times Media Group) and Pearson. It has a circulation of 36 1100 and readers of 76 000. It reports on corporate news, black economic empowerment, economic policy, corporate governance and financial markets. Since land and agrarian reform is also a business issue, Business Day is crucial in this study

3.2.2.2. Mail and Guardian

Is a weekly newspaper established in 1985 as Weekly Mail. It is mainly owned by New trust Company Botswana (87.5%) and the Guardian (10%). It is distributed throughout South Africa and in neighbouring countries. In most cases, it carries in-depth investigative – fact finding news. It has a circulation of 50 230 and readership of 428 000 (Media Club South Africa 2014).

3.2.2.3. Farmers Weekly

This is an English agricultural magazine owned by Caxton and CTP Publishers and Printers Limited, whose focus is on reporting on farmers' issues and serves as a mouthpiece of the agricultural industry. By

June 2013, it had readership of 142 000 (SAARF 2013). This magazine is essential in this study considering that it appeals mainly to the farmers who are directly affected by the changes in land and agrarian reform.

3.2.2.4. The Daily Maverick

This is a unique blend of news, information, analysis and opinion online medium based in Johannesburg. It is a free to air and non-payment media channel, independently owned by a private company with no affiliation to any other media group (political party or religious organisation). It is funded entirely through advertising.

3.2.2.5. SABC News Online

This the news site of the South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC). The SABC is a public broadcast, responsible for 18 radio stations and three television stations. The new media brings together several news pieces from different walks of life, both locally and internationally. It also provides audio and video bulletins.

3.3. How Articles will be Collected, Sampling Techniques and Data Gathering

Content analysis includes coding instrument design, sampling frame design and coding methods. These are important for a meaningful and interesting content analysis study (Ooesthuzien 2000:79; 2012:4). This study shall identify all available articles for the three print mediums on the Land and Agrarian Reform policy document from each newspaper for the period September 2011 to August 2014.

On collecting media stories for the newspapers, the researcher made use of two options: Firstly, available articles on SA Media, an online database under Sabinet. The stories were identified using key word searches such as, "land reform, willing buyer seller willing buyer, land restitution bill, land tenure, land reform policy documents". Secondly, the researcher visited the South African National Library in Pretoria and went through the newspaper archives. This helped to identify some crucial stories which had been

omitted or overlooked on Sabinet. For online mediums, the researcher went through the online database of those mediums and retrieved all relevant stories for the period in question.

There are two kinds of sampling techniques, probability and non-probability sampling. Probability sampling includes simple random sampling, systematic random sampling, stratified and cluster sampling. Non-probability sampling includes purposive, quota and convenient or availability sampling (Bertrand and Hughes 2005:184). A purposive sample has been used and only newspaper articles on land reform developments and policy documents during the period under study were considered.

3.4. Mediums which have not been considered

Due to viability, time and resource constraints broadcast media (television and radio) were not considered. The mediums of other languages were also not been considered due to language barrier, time constraints for translations and financial shortfalls. Print media was chosen because most people use it as an avenue for comprehensive story analysis. Mcdonald (2007:446) argues that after listening to radio and watching television, most people depend on the print media for in-depth news.

3.5. Significance of the Study

This study will substantially add to the body of knowledge on the relationship between the media, and land and agrarian reform in South Africa. Such information will be critical in helping the media institutions to mould and guide their reporting in ethical, responsible and developmental manner. It will also inform policy makers on future policy reviews as well as giving them an understanding of the perspectives of the media on land policies. The study will also inform future researches in this area and help shape development journalism frameworks.

Chapter 4

4. Quantitative content analysis

4.1. Media Coverage on Land and Agrarian Reform, September 2011 to August 2014

The media under study covered almost all key events and policy documents on land and agrarian reform during the period under research. More stories were written on major events and this determined the distribution of the stories throughout the period. Major events include the publication of the green paper on land and agrarian reform in 2011, the publication and passing of several bills which followed as well as the 1913 Land Act centenary celebrations in 2013. A total number of 192 stories were selected, analysed, and compared. *Business Day* had more stories than any other outlet excusably because it is a daily newspaper and the business nature of land reform issues. Table 4.1 below illustrates this.

Table 4.1: Number of Stories per media outlet:

Media Outlet	**Number of Stories**	**As a Percentage**
Farmers weekly	39	20.3%
Business Day	62	32.3%
SABC News Online	38	19.8%
Daily Maverick	30	15.6%
Mail and Guardian	23	12.0%
Total	**192**	**100**

4.2. Themes which gained prominence

As indicated in Chapter 2.3.1, it is the public's constitutional right to be informed. The media fulfils this role by choosing what to report on and what to give more emphasis. In this study, several themes have

been identified which in-turn depict the media's set agenda. The themes which gained prominence between the periods September 2011 to August 2014 vary with the media outlets. Below is a quantitative summary of the most predominant themes per media for the whole period and in each year.

4.2.1. Farmers Weekly,

Themes which gained prominence between the periods September 2011 to August 2014 include debates on the four-tier land tenure which appeared 14 times; land restitution (17 times); missing land reform targets (11 times); reopening of land claims (12 times) and expropriation (9 times). A summary of these themes are tabulated on Table 4.2.

In 2011, the five most prominent themes compared to other years include land tenure (28.6%); land restitution (29.4%); willing seller willing buyer (57.1%); corruption (44.4%); and land redistribution (57.1%). In 2012, the five most prominent themes include, land restitution (29.4%); land tenure (28.6%); willing seller willing buyer (42.9%); nationalisation (33.3%) and criticism of the green paper on land and agrarian reform (75%).

In 2013, the five most prominent themes compared to other years include, reopening of land claims (33.3%); fair and equitable compensation (42.9%); post settlement support (37.5%); the office of Land Valuer General (33.3%); and land reform expenditure (33.3%). In 2014, the five most prominent themes compared to other years include, reopening of land claims (50%); investment in agriculture affected by land reform (60%); unrealistic land reform expenditure (44.4%); failure to meet land reform targets (36.4%); and land tenure (28.6%). The method used to calculate these percentage figures are shown on Formula 4.1 below

Fig 4.2: Farmers Weekly - Key Themes, September 2011 – August 2014

No//	Theme	2011	2012	2013	2014
1	Emphasis of food security	3	2	2	2
2	A critic on the emphasis of food security	1	-		

3	Land audit	2	2	1	
4	Land Tenure (ownership)	4	4	2	4
5	Willing Seller Willing Buyer	4	3		
6	Fair and Equitable Compensation Principle		2	3	2
7	Corruption	4		2	3
8	Criticism of the Green Paper	1	3		
9	In support of the Green Paper	3			
10	Land Restitution	5	5	3	4
11	Post settlement support	2	1	3	2
12	Land Redistribution	4	2		1
13	Commercial farmers to embrace land reform	1			
14	Land reform targets	2	2	3	4
15	Land valuer general	3	1	3	2
16	Land Management Committee	3	1	2	2
17	Centenary anniversary of Native Land Act (1913)		1		
18	De-racialisation of commercial farming		1		
19	Investment affected by Land Reform		1	1	3
20	Land reform expenditure	1	1	3	4
20	Land reform budget	1	1		
21	Re-opening of land claims (Restitution)		2	4	6
22	Land disputes			2	1
23	Nationalisation	3	3	2	1

24	Land Reform a vote-political ploy				2
25	Tribal Authorities		1		1

Formula 4.1

Percentage Formula: $\left\{\frac{\text{Number of stories per theme per year}}{\text{Summation of the story for the four years under the same theme}}\right\} \times 100$

4.2.2. Business Day

Most of the above themes which gained prominence in the *Farmers Weekly* also gained eminence in *Business Day*. Land tenure appeared 15 times; land restitution (11 times); expropriation (15 times); missing land reform targets (10 times). Other themes which were prominent includes the bill proposal on sharing 50% of the land with farm workers (10 times); an emphasis on the danger of land reform programs to food security (10 times); need and lack of post settlement support (13 times); land redistribution (11 times); maladministration and corruption (9 times); a critic of the willing seller willing buyer approach (15 times) as well as the just and equitable compensation (9 times). A summary of these themes are tabulated on Table 4.3.

In 2011, the five most prominent themes compared to other years include willing seller willing buyer (57.1%); land tenure (46.7%); land restitution (54.5%); failure to meet land reform targets (50%); and land reform budget (30.8%). In 2012, five most prominent themes compared to other years include, expropriation (20%); post settlement support (23.1%); maladministration and corruption (33.3%); just and equitable compensation (22.2%); and land restitution (18.2%). In 2013, the five most prominent themes compared to other years include, post settlement support (38.6%); land redistribution (45.5%); in support of the green paper on land agrarian reform (83.3%); debates on amending the constitution (57.1%); and just and equitable compensation (33.3%). In 2014, the five most prominent themes compared to other

years include, land reform budget (30.8%); land reform a political election ploy (100%); the bill proposal on sharing 50% of the land with farm workers (100%); land reform creates instability in agriculture (100%); reopening of land claims (100%). The method used to calculate these percentage figures are shown on Formula 4.3

Table 4.3: Business Day - Key Themes, September 2011 – August 2014

No//	**Theme**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**
1	Emphasis of food security	2	1	3	3
2	Property Rights	3		1	1
3	Land audit			2	1
4	Land Tenure	7	2	3	3
5	Willing Seller Willing Buyer	8	2	2	2
6	Just and Equitable Compensation	1	2		
7	50 – 50 Sharing				10
25	Emphasis on Skills for Farm Workers not land reform				2
9	Criticism of the Green Paper	1		4	
10	In support of the Green Paper	1		5	
11	Expropriation	4		4	4
12	Constitutional Amendment	2		4	1
13	Land Reform creates instability				6
14	Land Restitution	6	2	2	1
15	Re-opening of Land Claims				5
16	Land Reform bills a political ploy				4

17	Post settlement support	4	3	5	1
18	Land Redistribution	3		5	1
19	Failure to meet land targets	5	1	2	2
20	Maladministration and corruption		3	3	
21	Land valuer general	2			1
22	Land Management Institutions	3	1		1
23	Land reform Budget	4	2	3	4
24	Traditional Authority				1

Formula 4.3

Percentage Formula: $\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of stories per theme per year}}{\text{Summation of the story for the four years under the same theme}} \right\} \times 100$

4.2.3. SABC News Online

The themes which gained prominence in *SABC News Online* include land tenure (10 times); willing seller willing buyer (9 times); land restitution (14 times); post settlement support (8 times). A summary of these themes are tabulated on Table 4.4.

In 2011, the three most prominent themes compared to other years include, willing seller willing buyer (33.3%); land tenure (20%); post settlement support (25%); In 2012, the five most prominent themes compared to other years include, willing buyer willing seller (55.6%); failure to meet land reform targets (75%); post settlement support (37.5%); just and equitable compensation (66.7%); and land restitution (28.6%). In 2013, the five most prominent themes compared to other years include, land tenure (40%); land expropriation (40%); land restitution (35.7%); failure to meet land reform targets (40%); and land redistribution (40%). In 2014, the five most prominent themes compared to other years include, the bill proposal on sharing 50% of the land with farm workers (100%); land reform policies criticised (66.7%);

debates on constitutional amendment (50%); reopening of land claims (83.3%); and land reform policies criticised (66.7%). The method used to calculate these percentage figures are shown on Formula 4.4.

Table 4.4: SABC News Online – Themes, September 2011 – August 2014

No//	Theme	2011	2012	2013	2014
1	Emphasis of food security		1		
2	Small or large			1	
3	Land audit	1			
4	Land Tenure	2	3	4	1
5	Willing Seller Willing Buyer	3	5	1	
6	Just and Equitable Compensation	1	2		
7	50 – 50 Sharing				2
8	Land invasions				1
9	Land reform a political election ploy	1	1		
10	Land reform policies criticised	1	1		4
11	Reopening of land claims			1	5
12	Expropriation		1	2	2
13	Reconciliation				1
14	Financial Compensation			1	
15	Constitutional Amendment	1	1		2
16	Land Restitution	1	4	5	4
17	Post settlement support	2	3	2	1
18	Land Redistribution	1	2	2	
19	Failure to meet land targets	1	3		
20	Nationalisation	1	1		
21	Land valuer general	1			

22	Land Management Institutions			1	
23	Land reform Budget		1	1	
24	Traditional leaders		2	1	

Formula 4.4

Percentage Formula: $\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of stories per theme per year}}{\text{Summation of the story for the four years under the same theme}} \right\} \times 100$

4.2.4. Daily Maverick

The most prominent themes in *Daily Maverick* include the following, land tenure (10 times); land restitution (12 times); expropriation (9 times); nationalisation (6 times) and willing seller willing buyer (6 times). In 2011, the four most prominent themes compared to other years include, nationalisation (33.3%); land management institutions (20%); small or large scale farming (25%); expropriation (11.1%). In 2012, the five most prominent themes compared to other years include, land restitution (41.7%); failure to meet land reform targets (60%); expropriation (33.3%); willing seller willing buyer (33.3%); and traditional leaders (50%). In 2013, the five most prominent themes compared to other years include, land tenure (40%); willing seller willing buyer (50%); land reform policies criticised (50%); land expropriation (33.3%); and land redistribution (66.7%). In 2014, the five most prominent themes compared to other years include, land tenure (40%); the bill proposal on sharing 50% of the land with farm workers (100%); just and equitable compensation (100%); land reform budget (50%); land restitution (33.3%). The method used to calculate these percentage figures are shown on Formula 4.5.

Table 4.5: Daily Maverick – Key Themes, September 2011 – August 2014

No//	**Theme**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**
1	Emphasis of food security		1	1	1

2	Small or large	1		2	1
4	Land Tenure	1	1	4	4
5	Willing Seller Willing Buyer		2	3	1
6	Just and Equitable Compensation			2	
7	50 – 50 Sharing				2
8	Land reform a political election ploy			2	3
9	Land reform policies criticised			1	1
10	Reopening of land claims				1
11	Expropriation	1	3	3	2
12	Constitutional Amendment			1	
13	Land Restitution	1	5	2	4
14	Post settlement support		1		
15	Land Redistribution		1	2	
16	Failure to meet land targets		3	1	1
17	Nationalisation	2	1	1	2
18	Land valuer general			2	
19	Land Management Institutions	1	1	2	1
20	Land reform Budget			2	2
21	Traditional leaders		1	1	

Formula 4.5

Percentage Formula: $\left\{ \frac{\text{Number of stories per theme per year}}{\text{Summation of the story for the four years under the same theme}} \right\} \times 100$

4.2.5. Mail and Guardian

The most prominent themes in the *Mail and Guardian* include land tenure (11 times); criticism of land reform policies (7 times); land expropriation (6 times); the controversies around the Valuer General and judicial powers (7 times), and the bill proposal on sharing 50% of the land with farm workers (7 times). In 2011, the most prominent themes compared to other years under study include land tenure (45.5%), willing seller willing buyer (50%), land expropriation, debates around the land management institutions (71.4%) as well as the controversy surround the Office of the Valuer General (71.4%). In 2012, most of the themes were emphasised twice. These include land expropriation, nationalisation, land tenure and the government's failure to reach its own set targets. In 2013, land restitution, land redistribution, land tenure and failure to meet targets were repeated twice each. In 2014 the two most outstanding themes were the reopening of land claims and the bill proposal on sharing 50% of the land with farm workers. The method used to calculate these percentage figures are shown on Formula 4.5.

Table 4.6: Mail and Guardian – Key Themes, September 2011 – August 2014

No//	**Theme**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**
1	Emphasis of food security		1	1	1
4	Land Tenure	5	2	2	2
5	Willing Seller Willing Buyer	2	1	1	
6	Just and Equitable Compensation		1	1	
7	50 – 50 Sharing				7
8	maladministration			1	
9	Land reform a political election ploy				2
10	Land reform policies criticised	2		1	4
11	Expropriation	1	2		3
12	Constitutional Amendment		1		
13	Land Restitution		1	2	2

14	Land Redistribution			2	
15	Failure to meet land targets	1	2	1	
16	Nationalisation		2		1
17	Land Valuer general and Judicial Powers	5	1		1
18	Land Management Institutions	5		1	1
19	Land reform Budget		2	2	4
20	Reopening of land claims			3	5

Formula 4.5

Percentage Formula: $\left\{\frac{\text{Number of stories per theme per year}}{\text{Summation of the story for the four years under the same theme}}\right\} \times 100$

4.3. Writers

Writers do have most influence in shaping and setting the news agenda. Writers are influenced by their own ideological standing and perspectives of their institution on any given theme. This will in turn determine the kind of sources they will use and angles the stories will take.

4.3.1. Farmers Weekly

The 39 stories are a product of 17 writers. Eight of these are staff members and nine are external writers. 30 of the stories were written by media staff and the other nine are opinion pieces by external writers. Opinion pieces include those written by politicians such as Minister Gugile Nkwinti and Democratic Alliance Member of Parliament Athol Trollip. Tabulated analysis is on the appendix 2.

4.3.2. Business Day

The 62 stories were written by 24 people, 13 are staff writers and 11 external writers. 51 stories were written by media staff and 11 by external writers. Hopewell Radebe (Land and Agriculture Editor); Wyndham Hartley (Parliamentary Editor) and Paul Vecchiatto (Political Correspondent) wrote of most of the stories by the media staff (54.9%). Opinion pieces were written by people from varied backgrounds: researchers (Doreen Atkinson, a Researcher at Free State University); lecturers (Nomalanga Mkhize, a Lecturer at Rhodes University); economists (Trudi Makhaya); farmers (Anthony Evans, a Grain Farmer); and politicians (Dr Wilmont James, DA Member of Parliament). Tabulated analysis is on the appendix 4.

4.3.3. SABC News Online

Of the 38 stories 28 are not acknowledged their writers, they are acknowledged as "SABC". Two are acknowledged as "SAPA" - South African Press Association. SAPA is an internationally acclaimed and credible news supplying organisation. The rest eight are acknowledged to their rightful eight writers and each wrote a single story. It is not clear why most writers' names are kept hidden. Tabulated analysis is on the appendix 7.

4.3.4. Daily Maverick

The 30 stories were written by 16 writers. Greg Nicolson wrote 26.7% of the stories whilst Ivo Vegster wrote 13.3%, and Rebecca Davis and Sipho Hlongwane wrote 6.7% of the stories each. The rest contributed a single story each. The Daily Maverick's writers' journalistic approaches are unique from other mediums. Most of the columnists and writers who are extensive and thorough in their fields of speciality. This explains why all of their stories are in-depth. Tabulated analysis is on the appendix 9.

4.3.5. Mail and Guardian

The 23 stories were written by 13 named writes and other writers' names are enveloped in the words "staff writers" (2) and South African Press Association "SAPA" (6). Kwanele Sosibo and Andisiwe Makinana wrote six (26.1%) of the stories. Lynley Donnelly wrote most of the opinions (4). Just like in Daily Maverick where reputed scholars such as Professor Andres du Toit wrote opinion pieces, a

renounced land reform scholar, Professor Ben Cousins also wrote opinion pieces for Mail and Guardian as well. Tabulated analysis is on the appendix 5.

4.4. Sources

It is critical to acknowledge that sources influence the set agenda based on their perspectives. Since it is the prerogative of the media to choose sources, the media's penchant can therefore be seen through most frequently quoted sources. This section shall go through an analysis of the sources used by all mediums.

4.4.1. Farmers Weekly

50 sources were used in the stories under study between September 2011 and August 2014. The most used sources were established institutions and government departments. The Department of Rural Development and Land Reform was the most quoted source. Seven different staff members were quoted in 13 stories. The most quoted staff was the minister, Gugile Nkwinti (six times). Also highly quoted source was AgriSA – an association of organised commercial agriculture. Five staff members we quoted in six stories and the most quoted was the Vice President, Dr Theo de Jager. Kwanalu, another organised agriculture association was quoted in seven stories. Sandy la Marque, Kwanalu`s CEO was quoted in six stories. Three of TAU SA members were quoted in four stories. Standard Bank's Agri-business sector was quoted in three stories - Dr John Purchase the CEO and Willie du Plessis the head were quoted.

Democratic Alliance (DA), a political party was also vastly quoted. Four of its staff members were quoted in seven stories and the following were most quoted staff members (twice), Athol Trollip and Kevin Milehan (Spokespersons of Rural Development and Land Reform) as well as Lindiwe Mazibuko (Parliamentary Leader). Two Professors from Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAAS) were quoted in five stories. Professor Ruth Hall was quoted in three stories and Professor Ben Cousins was quoted in two stories. The head of South African Institute of Race Relations, Dr Anthea Jeffery was quoted in four stories. The rest of other sources were not used frequently. It is critical to note that the stories did not capture the voice the beneficiaries of land reform but rather kept the discourse at policy and elite political level. Tabulated analysis is on the appendix 1.

4.4.2. Business Day

42 sources were used in the 62 stories under study. Just like Farmers Weekly, the most used source was the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform and was quoted in 54.8% of the total stories. Five staff members were used as sources and the Minister Gugile Nkwinti was quoted in 20 stories. The Minister of the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Tina Joemart-Petterson and his predecessor Senzeni Zokwana were also used thrice and once respectively.

Also largely quoted source is the Democratic Alliance. Six staff members were used as sources in 12 stories (19.4%). The most quoted staff members are Kevin Mileham (4 times) and Lindiwe Mazibuko (3 times). Three staff members from AgriSA were quoted in five stories. AgriSA President Johannes Moller and Vice President Dr Theo de Jager were quoted in two stories.

African National Congress (ANC) discussion documents were quoted in three stories. Congress of South African Trade Union (COSATU) policy documents were used once. The African National Congress (ANC) General Secretary, Gwede Mantashe and ANC Youth League Deputy President Roanld Lamola were quoted once. Freedom Front Plus was also used as source. President Dr Pieter Mulder was quoted twice and the same with the Spokesperson, Pieter Groenewald. Other political parties which were used as sources include Agang SA and Congress of the People.

Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAAS) Professors, Ruth Hall and Ben Cousins were quoted twice each in different stories. Two staff members from University of Cape Town were also quoted in two stories. Other academics who were used includes Professor Nick Vick from Stellenbosch University and Professor Johann Kirstern from University of Pretoria. Tabulated analysis is on the appendix 3.

4.4.3. SABC News Online

The most quoted source is the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (21 times). The sources used ranges from the national and provincial department to land claims commissions. Of the 11 staff members, Minister Gugile Nkwinti was the most quoted source (42.9%). The quoted provincial

departments are Western Cape and Northern Cape; and the Land Claims Commission was always sourced out to provide updates on the reopening of land claims. Two of the City of Cape Town staff were quoted once each.

The President of the Republic of South Africa, Jacob Zuma was quoted in seven stories and former President F W de Klerk was quoted once in August 2014 – critiquing the recent land reform bills which to him seems to be moving away from the constitutional provisions on property rights. Two Chiefs and King (Goodwill Zwelithini) were used were used as sources once each. Four staff members from African National Congress (ANC) were used as sources, once each. These include Baleka Mbete, the National Chairperson and Zizi Kodwa, the Spokesperson. In 2014, the Economic Freedom Fighters were used as sources twice. The quoted staff members were the Commander-in-Chief, Julius Malema and the Spokesperson, Mbuyiseni Ndlozi. Other political parties which were quoted (once) include the Azania People's Organization (AZAPO) and United Democratic Party (UDP).

AgriSA and its provincial arms were quoted four times. The Vice President, Dr Theo de Jager was quoted twice. The provinces which were quoted include Agri Wescape and Agri North West. Other associations which were also quoted include the Council for Advancement of South Africa's Constitution, and African People's Convention (once each).

The writers also managed to capture the perspectives of grassroots people. However, only three beneficiaries were quoted throughout the period under study. Two of them are Amos Njoro, a Vaal area resident and land reform beneficiary; Phillip S'khakhane, a KwaGubeshe Community resident and claim applicant. Tabulated analysis is on the appendix 8.

4.4.4. Daily Maverick

Unlike other mediums above, the most frequently used source was the Democratic Alliance, an opposition party. Five staff members were used as sources in eight stories. Helen Zille, the party President was used twice and Mmusi Maimane, National Spokesperson was used thrice. Five of the ANC's staff members were quoted in seven stories. Between 2011 and 2012 Julius Malema (the then Youth League

President) was quoted thrice. Other members were quoted once. These include Gwede Mantashe (Secretary General), Mandla Mandela (MP), and Ronald Lamola (Youth League Vice President). Freedom Front Plus's President, Dr Pieter Mulder was quoted once. Communist Party's General Secretary Blade Nzimande was quoted twice; whilst COSATU's President S'dumo Dlamini was quoted once.

Three staff members from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform in four stories. Minister Gugile Nkwinti was quoted in two of the stories and President Jacob Zuma five times. The government's policy documents were quoted in nine stories.

The *Daily Maverick* used sources which other mediums did not utilise. One story focused on book reviews, *In the shadow of policy*, edited by Professor Ben Cousins and Paul Hebinck; and *Trajectories of Change in Northern Limpopo* edited by Michael Aliber. It also carried stories which were quoting other media institutions. Thesinclude Sunday Times (Mondli Makhanya – Columnist), City Press (Carin du Plessis - journalist), and Sunday Independent (Shanti Aboobaker – journalist). Tabulated analysis is on the appendix 10.

4.4.5. Mail and Guardian

The most used source was Minister Gugile Nkwinti who was quoted 18 times (37.5%), followed by Professor Ruth Hall who was quoted 5 times (10.4%). Five members of ANC, four of EFF, three of DA and two of FF+ were quoted once each, whilst Hellen Zille (DA President) was quoted thrice. Two staff members from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform were quoted once each and the spokesperson Mtombeli Mxotwa was quoted twice. Other people who were used as sources include Agriculture and land reform researcher, Stephen Greenberg. The government policy documents were used as key source three times. It is also essential to note that unlike other mediums, discussion papers were used as sources as well. In this instance, Anika Claassens's paper on *Communal Lands, Property*. Tabulated analysis is on the appendix 6.

Chapter 5 - Qualitative Content Analysis

5.1. Thematic Analysis and Agenda Setting

5.1.1. Land Redistribution Programme

The Green Paper is based on three core principles, de-racialising the rural economy, democratic and equitable land allocation and use across race, gender and class, and a sustained production discipline for food security. It further asks how South Africa is going to transform systems and patterns of land control and ownership, address the historical inequality created by accumulation by dispossession, and transform the current economic structures which have produced and are continuing to produce net factors which undermine the economic liberation of the historically dispossessed.

There has been an on-going debates on the need for land reform for agricultural purposes in South Africa. Whilst the angry Pniel residents in the Northern Cape marched to the Kimberly High Court and the department of land affairs demanding land; the AgriSA president Johannes Moller was quoted saying black natives do not want to become farmers but they want money. This then mean if land claimants are given land, they will not productivity use it. His point is substantiated by the fact that out of approximately 79, 000 land claims received, more than 71, 000 of the claimants preferred financial compensation. However this analysis is biased and lacks substance since most of those claims were urban based, not rural based *(SABC News Online, 4 January 2012; Business Day 13 August 2013)*.

5.1.2. Land Redistribution Targets

As indicated in the first Chapter (1.2), from the onset, the land and agrarian reform policies were marred with unrealistic and unattainable targets *(Hall 2009:157).* The government's set targets were directly against the scholarly argument that land reform, unlike other sectors of the economy, "requires many years if not generations to master" (Dlamini, 2013:6). The 30% land redistribution in five years suggestion is a dream which is still to be realised. By March 2004, only 2, 9% of commercial had been redistributed via the restitution, redistribution and tenure reform sub-programmes. By 2008 only 4% had been transferred. This mismatch between intentions and practical outcomes signify the failure of the 1994

land reform roadmap. The 2005 National Land Summit pushed the 30% target year to 2014 *(Hall and Ntsebeza 2007:16*; *Cousins 2006:223; Hall 2009:157*). In 2012, Minister Nkwinti confirmed that the 2014 target may not be met and it was further pushed to 2025. He argued that the government's "obsession" to chase after the 30% target led to "wasted pile of money" by the state. He argues that the government should focus on the quality not the quantity of redistributed land *(Business Day, 2nd March 2012)*. However, Cousins (2007:229) argues that in order to achieve the land reform targets, the government must focus on both the quantity and quality of land reform as well restorative justice. The *Business Day* called these impracticable targets "arbitrary" meaning uniformed, illogical and subjective (*1st September 2014*). ANC National Chairperson, Baleka Mbete also called for strategies to "boost and inject speed" in land reform in order to ensure acceleration *(SABC Online, 28 April 2012)*. In his 2012 state of the nation address, President Jacob Zuma called the land redistribution process "slow and tedious" *(SABC Online, 9 February 2012*).

There are also other echoes which argue that South Africa had moved close to 30% target by 2012. University of Pretoria Professor, Johann Kirsten argued that the government statistics are based on limited facts and figures. They exclude land private transactions by blacks which exceed the government's *(Business Day, 14 August 2012).* This argument justifies the notion that the willing seller willing buyer principle is yielding intended results. However, most private transactions between the white commercial farmers and blacks are still exclusive to the elite class and the poor remains excluded in such land transactions. By reporting this perspective without engaging the marginalised and landless poor, the media has reinforced an agenda to promote the elitist voice.

5.1.3. Willing Seller Willing Buyer

Globally, the willing seller willing buyer principle has proven to be controversial and problematic and in South Africa it has been the same (Dlamini at al: 2013:25). As indicated in the first Chapter (1.2), most scholars argue that in South Africa, this principle has been limited and uneven in its reach (Hall 2009:6). Under this principle, the government is not an active buyer perse, but will provide supporting grants and services to those in need of the land (White Paper, Department of Land Affairs, 1997; See 2.1.3.1). This

places the land market at the centre of land reform whilst marginalising and obscuring the role of the state (See 5.1.15). Sam Moyo (cited in Tong 2014:31) argues that South Africa lost an opportunity to develop and implement a radical but orderly land reform programme.

The media played a pivotal role in appraising the efficacy of the willing seller willing buyer principle. All the mediums under discussion carried sundry stories which demanded an alternative policy option compared to the views which advocated for maintaining the status quo. This is the same rendition voiced out in the 2011 green paper. In order to understand the spirit of the green paper, one must consider the strong voices on the need for a paradigm shift on land policy both from scholars, civil societies, land organisations and politicians. Some scholars have been arguing that the willing seller willing buyer strategy will not achieve the policy's objectives and there is a radical change away from the market friendly approach (Dlamini at al: 2013:25). For most analysts, the greatest weakness of willing seller willing buyer approach is its failure to deliver and the government's blame is on its deference to the market *(Walker 2005:819).* The National Union for Metalworkers of South Africa, Secretary General, Irvin Jim argues that more decisive actions must be taken in order to deal with white monopoly capital and their hold on key strategic sectors of the economy such as land *(Mail and Guardian, 8 – 14 June 2012).* Hall *(2006:106)* argues that the willing seller willing buyer approach makes land acquisition difficult since it is contingent on the willingness of current owners to sell the land at the prices that grant applicants can afford. Land market prices are exorbitantly higher than the grants which the beneficiaries were receiving.

In a bid to fast-track land reform, the government introduced the Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy in 2006 which according to the Institute of Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAAS) has helped picking up land delivery through redistribution *(Business Day, 16 July 2012*). However, a land reform analyst, Michael Aliber supported the scraping of the willing seller willing buyer approach. He argued that negotiations between the land owner "reluctant sole seller" and the government "desperate buyer" are steeply skewed in favour of the land owner, who can easily manipulate the whole process (*Business Day, 13 March 2012*). Black Management Forum (BMF) advocated for an alternative land reform instead of

willing seller willing buyer principle *(SABC, 18 November 2011).* AZAPO says the government's willing seller willing buyer principle is failing and the best alternative is nationalisation of land *(SABC Online, 6 March 2012).* Counter to these arguments, the Council for the Advancement South Africa's Constitution (CASAC) argues that the willing seller willing buyer principle is constitutionally (section 25) not an impediment to land reform *(SABC Online, 18 May 2012*).

5.1.4. Just and Equitable Compensation Policy

As indicated in 5.1.3, failure of willing seller willing buyer principle resulted in calls for an alternative approach to land and agrarian reform. This issue topped in most land reform and political conferences since the end of the first decade. These include the 2005 National Land Summit, the 2007 ANC Polokwane Conference, the 2012 ANC Mangaung Conference and the 2013 Native Land Act Centenary. All these major gatherings affirmed the green paper's clear resolution, to do away with the willing seller willing buyer principle and come up with an alternative policy. This paved way for the adoption of the just and equitable policy. This new approach is meant correct the mistakes of the first principle and rectify the fallout on the pace of land reform (Tong 2014:31). The new approach is also meant to deal with land sales and avoid inflating of land prices. The policy stipulates that the government is not compelled to pay market land prices but rather it can pay what is "just and equitable" based on land valuations *(Business Day 6 March 2012).* As much as the media has welcomed the new approach, they have concerns on how the land management institutions will operate and the too powerful position of the Valuer General. The land management institutions will be discussed later in this chapter (5.1.13).

5.1.5. Nationalisation and Land Expropriation

The Business Day (*1st September 2011*) viewed the release of the draft Green Paper on land reform as a threat to the status quo and may result in the changes to the constitution in order to do away with the "willing buyer, willing seller" concept and to allow expropriation by the state for the purposes of increasing black land ownership. Most radical proponents such as The National Union for Metalworkers' secretary general, Irvin Jim advocated for constitutional amendment to facilitate expropriation without compensation. He argued that the Freedom Charter can only be implemented through nationalisation and

such an effort requires constitutional amendment on the property clause *(Mail and Guardian, 8 – 14 June 2012).* The ANC Youth League under former President Julius Malema has been calling for the same. AfriForum laid criminal charges against the ANC Youth League Deputy President, Ronald Lamola over his call for farm invasion and expropriation without compensation. They argued that such comments incites violence and intimidates farmers *(SABC 22 June 2012; Mail and Guardian 5 July 2012).* Greg Nicolson's article titled "Malema marches for economic slavery" is a clear agenda against an extremist-nationalist ideology. He argues that Julius Malema's "economic freedom" propaganda of nationalisation and land expropriation without compensation are "lies! lies!" *(Daily Maverick, 25 October 2011).* Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF) Commissar, Floyd Shivambu argues that the money being used to pay for land should be used to increase agricultural productivity *(Mail and Guardian, 21 – 27 February 2014).* Three articles by Daily Maverick after the 2014 general elections show a clear agenda against the Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF) policy on land reform and frustration of their parliamentary seats victory. The first is titled, "EFF: revolution is now inside parliament (and will be televised)" by Rebecca Davis and another is titled, "The land issue – and the hooligan now in Parliament" by Johann Redelinghuys. The third story is titled "Expropriation without compensation: It's game on!" *(2nd, 22nd and 24th June 2014).* The Business Day's Land and Agriculture Editor, Hopewell Radebe, emphasised de Jager (Agri SA Deputy President)'s concern that commercial farmers were facing immerse uncertainty due to threats of expropriation *(12th December 2011).*

5.1.6. Land Restitution

As have been discussed in chapter 2.1.3.2, approximately 79, 602 land claims were lodged by 1999 and 76, 263 had been finalised by June 2011. However, for the claims which were lodged, only 10 483 claims are from the rural areas and 69 119 from urban areas. Sundry rural applicants could not meet the deadline due to several reasons (*Business Day,3 February 2012; Hall 2004:656, 661; AdHoc Committee on 1913 Land Act - 2013).* Minister Gugile Nkwiti revealed that only 5 000 land claimants opted for land, whereas 71 000 opted for monetary compensation. Half of the land already acquired for restitution is still to be transferred to the beneficiaries yet most of the claimants have been waiting for more than a decade

(SABC, 27 September 2013; Centre for Law and Society 2013:2). The slow process was partly because of the department's internal administrative challenges and also because the white land owners developed tactics to delay the process whilst harvesting from the land. Letsoalo and Thupana (2013:303) argue that white landowners managed to turn restitution into a willing seller willing buyer programme. They ask, "How can land that has been designated for restitution in terms of the Restitution Act be willingly sold?" Mtombeli Mxotwa, spokesperson for Rural Development and Land Reform defended the delays in the land claims process arguing that there are several legalities involved and since South Africa has not implemented the Zimbabwean "fast-track" approach, the time length is justifiable *(Farmers Weekly, 3 February 2012).*

5.1.7. Restitution of Land Rights Amendment Bill

Given the time limits and sundry challenges which had been faced on the implementation of the Restitution Land Rights Act 22 of 1994 and the Restitution of Land Rights Amendment Act of 2003, amendment of the law was inevitable. In 2013, the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform tabled the draft Restitution of Land Rights Amendment Bill where written submissions were invited. The bill seeks to re-open a window of opportunity for land claims to those who missed the December 1998 cut-off date *(Mkamba 2014).* It seeks to amend the Restitution of Land Rights Act, 1994, to further regulate the appointment, tenure of office, remuneration and the terms and conditions of service of judges of the Land Claims Court; to make further provision for the advertisement of claims; to create certain offences; to extend the Minister's powers of delegation; and to provide for matters connected therewith *(Restitution of Land Rights Amendment Bill 2013).* The bill opens a window for communities who were dispossessed before 1913. This can be seen as a response to the advocacy by Khoisan community and activists groups such as South African Progressive Civic Organisation (SAPCO) and AfriForum who launched protests demanding that the Khoisan be afforded their rights and that they may be able to launch their pre-1913 dispossession claims *(Daily Maverick, 22 February 2012). Farmers Weekly* (31 August 2013)'s story on the Land Rights Restitution Amendment bill focused on the KwaZulu Natal Restitution Support Association who praised the progress as "a ground-breaking development in the history of this

country". What is interesting on these stories is the fact that the journalists chose to focus on grassroots land movements. This in is in line with the notion that, "development journalism must be engaged and engaging. It must actively seek to engage citizens in developmental problem-solving" (Banda 2007:46). See 2.4 for further deliberations on development journalism.

The passing of the restitution bill was preceded by the news on the re-opening land claims during the President's State of the Nation Address on the 13th February 2014. The National Assembly passed the bill into an act later in the month. The main purpose of the act is to re-open the restitution claims to allow those who could not lodge their claims on the 1999 deadline. The new deadline is June 2018. The National Council of Provinces (NCOP) approved the bills discussed above in order to pave way for the government to reopen land claims and set prices for the land. The amendment was passed following a heated and emotional debate in the national assembly. Freedom Front Plus, MP, Pieter Groenewald strongly objected against any opening of another claims window. The proposed changes in agriculture have also been disapproved based on the argument that large scale farmers are more profitable than small-scale farmers *(Mail and Guardian Online, 25 February 2014)*. The Business Day's article on this issue focused on the fact that the new Act may bring policy instability even in other sectors such as forestry and fisheries *(28 February 2014).* The government owned magazine, Land News *(Volume 1, 2014)* carried stories in defence of the Department's land reform efforts. In one of the articles, it responds to the *Mail and Guardian* comment piece titled "ANC land policies: Talk left, walk right?" The writer disputes all arguments against land reform and applauds actions of the Department. In another article, it explains how people in Mpumalanga welcomed the reopening of land claims with great enthusiasm. This is clear evidence on how the media set agenda which best suits the interest of those who owns it or who have influence of its affairs. For more understanding on agenda setting theory, see Chapter 1 (1.5).

The KwaZulu Natal Restitution Support Director, Bheki Mbili praised the progress as "a ground-breaking development in the history of this country". In the same article, The Landless Peoples' Movement welcomed the developments but expressed concern over the fact that the white landowners will be paid for the successfully claimed land *(Farmers Weekly 31 August 2013).* Redinger criticized the land reform

efforts as a waste of money. He supported his argument with three case studies of failed resettled farmers under restitution in Emtongemi in Kranskop, Waterfall in Greytown and the Mist Belt Area in Kranskop *(Farmers Weekly, 17 May 2013)*. Congress of the People (COPE), MP, Wilie Madisha argued that "productive land under commercial farming cannot be reduced to subsistence-type farming" *(Business Day 3 June 2013).*

The bill also stipulates that the claimants must have the ability to use the land productively and the restitution process will not transfer full ownership to claimants *(Restitution of Land Rights Amendment Bill 2013).* This therefore means that the claimants will be the state's tenants and has made scholars such as Professor Cheryl Walker to question the capacity of the state to monitor the tenants and the resources to support them. In a well crafted heckler article, a reporter, Denene Erasmus, emphasised Lindiwe Mazibuko and Dr Pieter Mulder arguments that not all eligible claimants want land for agriculture and the government should rather focus on the development of communal areas *(Farmers Weekly, 5 July 2-13).* KZN Farmers Union, Kwanalu questioned the constitutionality of extending the window period beyond 1913. Its CEO, Sandy la Marque said the reasons given by the government for land claims re-opening are not sound *(Farmers Weekly, 24 May 2013).* Another reporter, Robyn Jourbert also wrote an unbalanced article which heavily criticized the re-opening of land claims and emphasised that this will be destructive to the agricultural economy. He cited anti-restitution amendment bill unions such as Kwanalu, SA Sugar, and reference groups. The KZN Restitution Support was only quoted on the statistics of the claims which have not yet been finalised and the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform Kwazulu Natal was quoted where it agreed on the need for land audits *(Farmers Weekly, 20 September 2013*). Former President F W De Klerk warned that any radical change in land reforms and existing property laws will be catastrophic *(SABC Online, 27 August 2014).*

5.1.8. The land reform bills – an election ploy or a necessity to address the land question?

The green paper culminated in the introduction of several land reform amendment bills and policy frameworks as discussed in Chapter 2.1.4. In 2014, critics of the bills argued that re-opening of land claims was nothing but an election ploy, so are other proposed land reform bills. Democratic Alliance

MP, Kevin Mileham argued that the estimated R179 billion price tag is a confirmation of that the restitution bill proposal was mere politicking for the advantage of the ruling party *(Business Day 10 February 2014).* A Grain Farmer, Anthony Evans, argued that reopening of claims will not solve the country's land reform problems. He argued that the government must focus on settling all claims which are still pending since 1999 and on provide post-support settlement on the already resettled farms. AgriSA shares the same sentiments *(Business Day, 23 April and 23 June 2014).*

Some scholars criticized the involvement of traditional leaders in land reform. Rhodes University Lecturer, Nomalinga Mkize, questioned if the re-opening of land claims will benefit the communities or the traditional elite. She gave an example of Zulu King Goodwill Zwelithini who is working on a mega claim on behalf of the "Zulu nation" and the claim is even stretching to other provinces (*Business Day 15 July 2014).* King Zwelithini announced that plans to launch a mega land claim were at advanced stage on the 16th August 2014 *(SABC Online, 16 August 2014).* Mkize also warned of counter claims which may lead to conflicts and legal wars such as happened in the platinum-rich Bafokeng claims between the traditional authorities and communities (*Business Day, 15 July 2014).* Agri North West (Agri NW) chairperson, Boeta du Toit shared the same sentiments. He argued that large group dynamics in land claims are detriment to the success of land reform *(SABC online, 18 June 2013).*

In defence of the re-opening of land claims, Minister Gugile Nkwinti said it was necessary for national reconciliation, national building and national healing. Land claims will also help to create rural jobs and fast track rural development *(Business Day, 9 July 2014).* The lodgement of claims was opened on the 1st July 2014 and 100 claims had been received within nine days. By 23 August 2014, 12 000 claims had been received.

5.1.9. The Expropriation Bill

The Expropriation Bill is an attempt to extend the state's power to confiscate property. It seeks to "provide for the expropriation of property for a public purpose or in the public interest, subject to just and equitable compensation; and to provide for matters connected there with" *(Expropriation Bill 2013).* The

39 page bill explains in detail the powers of expropriation, investigation and valuation of property, intention to expropriate and expropriation of property, compensation for expropriation, access to court, urgent expropriation and withdrawal of expropriation as well as other related legal matters. Scholars argue that expropriation of land should not be totally abandoned, but it "must be used as a tie breaker" (Gumede 2014:63).

The Business Day's Land and Agriculture Editor, Hopewell Radebe emphasised Agri SA Deputy President, de Jager's concern that commercial farmers were facing immerse uncertainty due to threats of expropriation. The story goes on to blame the incompetence, corruption and mismanagement within the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform for land reform failure not the market friendly policy approach. Freedom Front Plus MP, Pieter Groenewald asserted that South Africa is already loosing commercial farmers to country such as Australia *(Business Day 12 December 2011; 25 June 2014).*

Other critics of the bill do partly acknowledge the need for expropriation in order to fast track land reform but they are advocating for expropriation without compensation. The media portrayed these critics' rhetoric with scepticism and downright denunciation. The ANC Youth League and The National Union for Metalworkers have been advocating for the abolition of the property clause and amendment of the constitution in order to facilitate expropriation without compensation *(Daily Maverick, 21 June 2014; Mail and Guardian, 8 – 14 June 2012).* It is interesting that even without Julius Malema, the ANC Youth League has continued reiterating the same sentiments even though with limited energy. Its Deputy President, Ronald Lamola argued that the land was taken "through violence and wars of dispossession", so it requires legislation with the same force for restoration. He also led campaigns for the amendment of section 25 of the constitution to enable expropriation without compensation *(Daily Maverick, 21 June 2012).* EFF leader, Julius Malema claims that expropriation without compensation is necessary for there to be genuine reconciliation *(SABC Online, 26 April 2014).* Nationalisation and expropriation without compensation without compensation has been EFF's main campaign vehicle towards the May 2014 elections *(Daily Maverick, 29 July 2013).* Retaliating on EFF campaigns, *Daily Maverick* quoted President Jacob Zuma warning the Young Communist League against political parties whose appearances were not consistent with reality. S'dumo Dlamini (COSATU President) also warned against counter-

revolutionaries who seemed to be militant or revolutionary *(Daily Maverick, 29 July 2013).* Cousins (2012) argued that with the status quo in the ruling party, expropriation without compensation is politically unfeasible. He argued that ANC is a multiclass alliance that includes property owning capitalists and a growing middle class and partly because of the possible ramifications of such a move on agriculture and investment *(Mail and Guardian, 5 July 2012*).

5.1.10. The Property Valuation Act

There has been ongoing scholarly debate on property rights. Some scholars argue that the "mistake" emanated from the compromise reached during the transitional negotiations. This resulted in the constitution entrenching that, "no one may be deprived of property except in terms of law of general application , and no law may permit arbitrary deprivation of property" *[South Africa 1996, Section 25(1)]*. This establishes the property rights of the existing owners of the "stolen" land whilst offsetting the right to return to their land for the millions of the dispossessed and their descendants *(Ruth 2004:660).* The constitution however also empowers the state to expropriate land not only for a public purpose but also in the public interest *(Walker 2008:68).* It is on this basis that property valuation for expropriation is critical.

The Property Valuation Act seeks to "provide for the establishment, functions and powers of the Office of the Valuer - General; to provide for the appointment and responsibilities of the Valuer - General; to provide for the regulation of the valuation of property that has been identified for land reform as well as property that has been identified for acquisition or disposal by a department; and to provide for matters connected therewith" (Property Valuation Bill 2013). Rudman *(2012)* argues that this is a good strategic move since a Valuer - General can bring certainty and clarity around valuations and expropriations processes.

Even though the bill is meant to deal with exorbitant land market prices and procedural guidelines, Pierre de Vos argues that the bill does not cover certain problems such as lack of coherent long term strategy and speedily addressing the current untenable, racially skewed, land distribution *(Daily Maverick, 13 June 2013).* Anthea Jeffery argues that the bill threatens the property of all South Africans and it gives too much exclusive powers to the Valuer-General. Of concern also is the fact that even though the Valuer-

General is supposed to be autonomous, he or she is elected by the Minister. It also empowers the government to proceed with expropriation even if there is a dispute over compensation due *(Business Day 10 June 2014).* AgriSA argued that the bill proposal is ill-considered and unacceptable, which Deputy Minister Mncebisi Skwatsha strongly objected (*SABC Online, 13 August 2014).*

5.1.11. Land Tenure System

Moyo (2013) argues that both the government and farmers are not satisfied with the progress made in tenure reform. As discussed in chapter 2.1.3.3, the land tenure system has continued to buttress the ubiquitous violation of the farm workers' labour rights and their capricious eviction by the white farm owners (Kariuki 2007:109). Traditional authorities are gaining more influence at the expense of the communal (homelands) households. Land tenure reform is a constitutional mandate and the constitution (1996) makes the following stipulations, "A person or community whose tenure is legally insecure as a result of past racially discriminatory laws or practices is entitled, to the extent provided by an Act of Parliament, either to tenure which is legally secure or to comparable redress". The Green Paper explains a single land tenure framework which integrates multiple forms land ownership.

The media has taken different angles on reporting on land tenure reform developments depending on the inclination of their sources and interpretations of the journalists. As Minister Gugile Nkwinti has indicated, the tenure system defines both economic and political relations in every economy *(Farmers Weekly, 1st November 2013).* In the last three months of 2011, Land tenure was quoted 7 times in *Business Day;* 4 times in *Farmers Weekly* and *Mail and Guardian*; twice in SABC News Online and once in *Daily Maverick*. An excellent narrative of the four-tier land tenure system is an opinion piece written by Minister Gugile Nkwinti in *Farmers Weekly*, (1st November 2013), which is titled *Green Paper Update.* The story is well written in a public relations format under six well crafted subtitles: the tenure system, private ownership, foreign ownership, communal land, supporting institutions, and dealing with the legacy of the 1913 Land Act. It is however void of a critical balance since the minister is the sole source and his perspectives stand out clearly up to the end. It also lacks the development journalism component of the voice from below and public engagement. Most of the stories focused on particular areas of interest

especially on foreign ownership. For *Business Day*, (25 February 2013)'s story "*Nkwinti gives details of changes to land tenure system*," focused mainly on foreign ownership and shows a clear agenda to critic the proposed ban on foreign land ownership. The story merely mentions other arms of the tenure system in passing. This makes the title of the story to be misleading. Most *SABC News Online* stories lacks detail and proper media discourse to engage in. For instance, in a story Baleka Mbete where calls for acceleration in land reform, (28 April 2013), the writer merely mentions her stance on foreign ownership and does not explore other voices from other corners of social life. In actual fact the story has a single source, then it merely refer to what Minister Nkwinti had said a month earlier. An exceptional critic however is well presented in the *Daily Maverick*. The story was written by Professor Andries du Toit (*Land Reform – cloud cuckoo or calculus of power? 11 August 2014).* The opinion piece is arguably a more analytic, balanced and in-depth on land tenure. However it also lacks the below-up citizen's engagement just like other mediums'.

Another controversial question is, who are the original owners of the South African land? As indicated in the first chapter (1.2), most scholars including Hall, Ntsebeza, Cousins and many others agree to the notion that native black South Africans are the original occupiers of the land, hence owners. They however lost their land through the wars of dispossessions and forced removals. This is why some radical proponents argue that it is wrong to pay for "stolen" land. (See expropriation without compensation, 5.1.9).

However, there is another left-wing school of thought which deserves consideration. In a clear agenda to distort the history of dispossession, Freedom Front Plus President, Pieter Mulder argues that there is sufficient proof that there were no Bantu-speaking people in place such as the Western Cape and North-western Cape. He argued that black South Africans had no claim to 40% of South Africa's land. This ideology has been vastly criticized and the media have managed to show both side of the coin without partiality. President Jacob Zuma warned Mulder not to arouse controversy and sentiments on land issue with such "callous and careless" comments *(Mail and Guardian, 1st March 2011; SABC Online, 16 February 2012*). A reporter, Sipho Hlongwane argued that Freedom Front Plus "(Minus)" is an excellent

reminder of how terrible the old apartheid country was *(Daily Maverick, 19 February 2012*). Another reporter, Stephen Grootes argues that everyone accepts that land was taken from blacks by whites "unless you are Pieter Mulder, and believe what you were taught in history class by a white teacher back in the days before 1994." *(Daily Maverick, 28 February 2014).*

Furthermore, one will argue that land tenure indeed deserves the much needed attention considering the controversies surrounding all its four arms: privately owned land, foreign ownership, communal land, as well as state and public land. Below are some distinct reflections evident in the mediums on the land tenure system.

5.1.11.1. State and public land: Leasehold

The government has been purchasing vast tracks of agricultural land from commercial farmers with a mission to redistribute it to the landless blacks. This is a strategic move on redistributing wealth and correcting the past imbalances. However, most of the purchased land and successful land claims have not been handed over to the intended beneficiaries. Minister Gugile Nkwinti said 22% of all land in South is state owned. However, the released 2013 land audit results showed that the state owns 14% of all land holding in South *Africa (Business Day, 25 March 2014).* TAU SA's Danie du Plessis argues that this is not economic and is tantamount to political control of land and people *(Farmers Weekly, 17 January 2014*). It is on this premise that the private land owners and some scholars have been arguing that the government is focusing a lot of effort and spending too much on redistributing privately owned land, neglecting the land that it currently owns (Gumede 2014:61). AgriSA President, Johannes Moller argued that the resettled farmers cannot use their land as collateral since its owned by the state and as result they are struggling to raise adequate capital *(Business Day, 13 August 2013).* The CEO of the Standard Bank's Agricultural Business Chamber, John Purchase argued that the state should not own agricultural land because history has shown that state land is underutilised *(Business Day, 25 June 2012).*

5.1.11.2. Privately owned land: Freehold

Private ownership is basically freehold even though to a limited extent. Minister Nkwinti announced that his department would establish maximum size for large-scale, medium-size and small-scale farmers in a bid to break the concentration and monopoly of ownership. This will especially focus on breaking the monopoly of 37,000 white predominated commercial farmers sector who are in control of the agricultural sector *(Farmers Weekly, 1st November 2013; Business Day, 25 February 2013).* Pieter Mulder argued that the problem with land ownership is that the Green Paper limits the amount of land one person can own. He sees this as a threat to food security *(Farmers Weekly, 16 September 2011).* This illustrates a clear agenda against land redistribution for restorative justice and a continual pursuit of neo-liberalism. The land audit results released in 2013 unfortunately did not show demographic and racial representation of land ownership (*Business Day, 25 March 2013).*

5.1.11.3. Land owned by Foreigners: Freehold

ANC Mangaung Policy Conference resolved that in principle foreigners should not own the land - it should rather be leased to them. Minister Nkwinti indicated that the department is facing a constitutional challenge with this resolution and currently there is a combination of limited freehold and leaseholds *(Farmers Weekly, 1 November 2013).* This system is prevalent in a lot of countries, both developed and developing. In South Africa, foreigners will only occupy land under set regulations and obligations (Rmutsindela and Mogashoa: 2013:3014). Leases will be for a minimum of 30 years. This would not however apply to permanent resident who are allowed freehold with limited extent *(Business Day, 25 February 2014).* ANC National Chairperson, Baleka Mbete expressed concern that land reform was slow yet foreigners own vast tracks of land *(SABC Online, 28 April 2012).* Ga-Rankuwa resident, Tshepo Diale also supported the policy saying, "We don't want to find ourselves being guests in our own yard" *(Farmers Weekly, 30 September 2011).*

5.1.11.4. Communally owned land: Communal Tenure

Tenure reform has two distinct components: securing the rights of the people living on communal land and those living in farms (farm dwellers) (see 2.1.3.3). Pre-1994 laws empowered the land owners to control land issues in ways most suitable to them. As part of forced removals, they could easily get eviction court orders to evict farm dwellers without providing any reason. Between 1960 and 1983, 3.5 million people had been forcibly removed. 1.1 million of these were from white owned farms. These evictions continued even after 1994 – upto 2002 (Wegerif at al 2005:33 - 34). The constitution (Section 26(3)) stipulates that "no one may be evicted from their home, or have their home demolished, without an order of court made after considering all the relevant circumstances. No legislation may permit arbitrary evictions". Land Tenure Security Bill has been established which aims to provide for agri-villages so that farm workers can settle off farms *(Farmers Weekly, 3 February 2012).* Ongoing policy suggestions on solving the farm workers' tenure rights have led to the drafting of, "strengthening the relative rights of people working the land bill" which the media, organised commercial agriculture and some scholars have vehemently criticised. See part 5.1.18.

Of much controversy also are policies on communal areas which are under the jurisdiction of traditional authorities. Most scholars critic their role and their relevance in the post-apartheid democratic society. Ntsebeza (2006:33) argues that the only way traditional authorities can be democratic is by abandoning their hereditary and subject them to election by people and allow the participatory egalitarianism. The 2004 Communal Land Rights Act (CLaRA) which was later declare unconstitutional by High Court reads, "if a community has a recognised traditional council, the powers and duties of the administration committee may be exerted and performed by such council" (Section 21(2)). Ntsebeza (2006:287) argues that this gives enormous and unprecedented powers to structures with a majority unelected members". The Green Papers acknowledges the complexity of the communal land tenure and pointed out the need for extensive consultations and constitutional compliance. It also indicated the need of a different policy articulation following the nullification of the Communal Land Rights Act (CLaRA), *(Daily Maverick, 26 August 2011).* Major debates on communal rights are centred on the role of traditional authorities in the present democracy. There have been continued criticisms from the opposition parties, scholars and land

reform oriented non-governmental organisations on the government's communal tenure and the strategic position which traditional leaders occupy. Scholars argue that individual entitlement to land is the most secure source for improved livelihoods (Hall, 2007; Cliffe, 2007; Gumede, 2014).

Agricultural Business Chamber's John Purchase argued that for agriculture to substantially contribute to the economy and job creation there is need to establish tenure security for communal farmers *(Business Day, 21 February 2012*). Democratic Alliance argued that ground-breaking land reform should start with the restoration of land-ownership rights for South Africans living on traditional and communal land owned by kings and chiefs *(Business Day, 12 September 2011*). Gutto (2011) regretted lack of courage demonstrated by the green paper in failing to challenge "the unconstitutional practices by traditional leaders that denied land rights and security of tenure to some citizens" *(Business Day, 18 November 2011).* Hall (2011) said there is no any discussion about what changes will be made to communal tenure system. AgriSA's deputy President Theo de Jager says communal land should be transferred to those who actually occupy it because this will lift out millions of rural dwellers from poverty and will open access to bankable assets which they can use as guarantee when borrowing loans *(SABC Online, 25 July 2012*).

5.1.12. New Land Management Institutions

The green paper proposed the establishment of administrative institutions and it details the mundane technicalities of the powers and functions of each agency (See 2.1.4; Jacobs 2012:176). These include autonomous though not independent body, the Land Management Commission (LMC). Its main functions incorporate advising, coordinating, regulating, and auditing the Department's land management issues. The paper also proposed the creation of Land Rights Management Board (LRMB) and Land Rights Management Committees (LRMCs). These are made up to protect the land-tenure rights of farm dwellers and workers. They are made up of representatives from different stakeholders and they play a pivotal role serving as a bridge between the Department and farmers, they provide coordination, communication management, legal representation services, educating the farmers and many more *(Green Paper 2011; Business Day, 6 Mar 2012).* The proposal was heavily criticized in the media. Hall *(2011)* asks an array of "pessimistic" questions: "Why create new institutions to carry out departmental functions? Why would

the department not make its own policy and manage its own affairs?" She argues that establishing new institutions will achieve nothing but politically it will remove the policy process from the public purview. The fact that the suggested bodies will be autonomous but not independent from the Rural Development and Land Reform department will centralise power and obscure the locus of and status of the policy process. Jacobs *(2012:176-177)* expressed concern over the overlap with the existing deeds registry, which keeps a repository of land valuation data and transactions, and he argues that expecting these regulatory bodies to correct for 'land market failures' merely reinforces the myth that property markets can work for the resource-poor landless. Both agencies focus on cleaning up peripheral administrative irregularities and inefficiencies that have bedevilled land reform, but fail to pave the way to an alternative agrarian framework. However, in defence of the new institutions, Tshepo Diale argued that the green paper has been unfairly criticised. He argues that the Land Management Commission will help to ensure that land reform is fair to both beneficiaries and landowners, whereas the office of the Valuer-General will provide a national, comprehensive, reliable and collated hub of property values *(Farmers Weekly, 30 September 2011).* Minister Nkwinti explained how the institutions will work and proved that there won't be any overlap between existing and new institutions *(Farmers Weekly, 1st November 2013).*

5.1.13. Post Settlement Support

As discussed in chapter 2.1.3.4, most scholars and analysts have critiqued the government's policy on redistribution and post settlement support and implementation for the demise of the failing land reform projects. They argue that lack of infrastructure, business acumen, training, capital, transport, extension services and access to the market are among others significant factors that have obstructed land reform (Hall, 2007; Gumede 2014).

The National Development Plan (2011) emphasised the need to ensure that black farmers are given adequate "mentorship, chain integration, preferential procurement and meaningful skills transfer". However, the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform has been blamed for lack of post settlement support for the resettled farmers. A reporter, Osiame Molefe argued that land reform programmes have failed to make its beneficiaries sustainable farming enterprises *(Daily Maverick, 4 June*

2012). Cousins (2012) blamed the department's understaffed, inexperienced officials, mismanagement and corruption for poor post settlement support *(Mail and Guardian, 5 July 2012*). Professor Nick Vink argued that the department has moved away from the vision of the National Development Plan (NDP) and has neglected putting in place necessary mechanism whereby new entrants to farming can acquire land in a manner that does not bankrupt them from the outset. Farmer support programmes should be made available to all farmers regardless of their size. He further argues that there is evidence that most beneficiaries are worse off than before *(Farmers Weekly, 24 June 2014*).

5.1.14. Food Security

Scholars have been arguing that land reform should be understood in the continuity of food production and it must not compromise food security (Dlamini at al, 2013:6). In pursuing this agenda, the media chose to over-emphasise the risk which land and agrarian reform may have on food security, and ignored the positive light which it has on agrarian transformation. As discussed in Chapter 2.1.2, calls from different quarters of the population have been that the government should not sacrifice food security for the sack of land and agrarian reform. AgriSA has been the greatest advocates for this point. Agri SA Economist, Dawie Maree said "Our food security depends on a successful land reform process, which shouldn't interrupt the production of food, as is the case in South Africa" (*Farmers Weekly, 30 September 2011*). In 2011, this topic was covered four times in *Famers Weekly* and AgriSA was used as a main supporting source thrice. Food security remained a topical issue for the years which followed and AgriSA was the main voice behind it.

Freedom Front Plus and Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Pieter Mulder immediately criticised the Green Paper on Land and Agrarian Reform as unconstitutional and a threat to food security soon after it had been made public *(Business Day 1st September 2011).* African Farmers Association of South Africa identified the uncertainty surrounding land reform and climate change as major threats to food security and agriculture *(SABC Online, 24 October 2012).*

The following stories' assessment of the Green Paper clearly shows the media agenda to emphasise the importance and exigency of food security over land and agrarian reform. *Business Day* (2nd September 2011) argued that food security must be treated with "the wisdom of Solomon and the speed of Usain Bolt". AgriSA Vice President, Dr Theo de Jager argued that if the land reform fails, then everything in agriculture fails. He further proposed that farmers (agriculture) must organise themselves and come up with a plan to deal with land reform instead of keeping on responding to "gorilla" like pieces of legislation like the Green Paper (*Famers Weekly* 30 September 2011). Democratic Alliance's Athol Trollip blamed the government for lack of communication with famers as a major threat to food security *(Business Day 21 February 2012).*

However, as much as other sources acknowledged the importance of food security, Professor Ben Cousins argues that commercial farmers (AgriSA) are selfishly overemphasising the dangers that the land reform process presented to food security (*The Farmers Weekly* 21 October 2011).

5.1.15. Role of the State and land reform budgets

By making land and agrarian reform its third key priority in 2009 (See Chapter 1.1), President Jacob Zuma has reaffirmed the new active role of the state and the Departmental budgets have been revamped compared to the first 15 years of democracy (See 2.1.3.6). The media has responded differently to the new role of the state and budget allocations. *Farmers Weekly* (25 May 2012) reported that the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform received R8.9 billion for 2012/2013 budget year. The Minister indicated that R2.7 billion would be used to provide access to 320 000 hectares of agricultural land obtained from land reform and R1.2 billion would be spent on the recapitalisation of 595 unproductive farms of land reform beneficiaries in 2012. Even though inadequate this was a positive increase on budget allocations. However, the government received more criticism in 2013 when the Finance Minister announced budget cut by half a billion regardless of the fact that spending was growing by 2.2%. Most academics and rights lobby groups raised concerns about the government's seriousness on opening a new window for claims if they are hindering the smaller budgets (*Business Day*, 28 October 2013). The 2013 midterm budget allocated R2.9 billion to land restitution and in 2014/2015 financial year, the department

was granted just 9.5 billion (*Mail and Guardian, 17 to 24 April 2014; Business Day, 10 February 2014*). By the beginning of 2014, R25.2 billion had been used to settle 59, 000 of the 77,000 restitution claims since 1998 (*Business Day, 10 February 2014).*

The budgets are still meagre considering the sundry mega-billion cost bills and Acts which are to be are on the department's table. These include the amended restitution act which the cost of settling the expected claims is pegged at R179 billion. DA MP Kevin Mileham called the budgets, "simply insufficient" and questioned where the estimated R129 – 179 billion for the new claims until 2018 will come from. (*Business Day*, 10 February 2014). If the Strengthening the relative rights of people working on the land bill passes then that means more billions will be required for land reform. Commenting on the new bill, the Head of the Centre of Excellence at Absa Agribusiness, Ernst Janovsky said, "I don't think there is enough money in the country to do that on any scale" (*Mail and Guardian, 17 to 24 April 2014*). In a nutshell, as the media portray it, the department's budget allocation does not match with the government's rhetoric on its active role in the land market and prioritising and fast-tracking land reform.

5.1.16. Small or large scale farming?

One contentious debate in the land question is the one introduced in Chapter 2.1.3.5 is: what is good for post colonial African economies - large or small scale farming? The World Bank's leading agents, Klaus Deininger and Hans Binswinger (1993) argued that South Africa "faced a choice between a large-scale reform programme or decades of peasant insurrection". The government focused on ensuring an "orderly" land redistribution and small-scale farmer development, as well as a "suitably reformed large path of development" (Bernstein 2013:25).

However, Carol Paton argues that the aim to introduce more black farmers to the land is honourable but not viable. She used the findings the Bureau for Food and Agricultural Policy to prove that subdividing farms will not be economically viable (*Business Day, 25 February 2013). Farmers Weekly* (3 January 2014) carried a critique of land reform and subdividing commercial farms to promote small farming is a political campaign strategy. The focus in the story was on the politics of the land reform policies and what

it failed to capture is the need for agrarian transformation which turnaround rural marginalisation and alleviate the plight of millions of the rural poor. The South African Institute of Race Relations Chief researcher, Anthea Jeffery argued that land reform developments will prolong the uncertainty over land title and detriment food security *(Business Day, 13 August 2013).*

Agri North West (Agri NW) chairperson, Boeta du Toit argued that small-scale farming concept does not have the capacity to feed the nation and is a waste of land *(SABC online, 18 June 2013)*. Jeffrey Moller asserts that the government should focus on the quality instead of the quantity of the redistributed land *(Business Day, 13 August 2013).* This means the government should develop the land and ensure that they create an enabling environment for efficient agriculture. The Land Bank (2011) reported that the success rate of emerging black farmers was 43% – 57% and the failure is due to poor developmental infrastructure and poor government post-settlement support services *(Business Day, 23 April 2012).* These arguments are clear set-agenda to prove to the read that small-scale farming is not only too small but bad for the economy also. This anti-small scale farming ideology is supported by scholars such as Sender and Johnston *(2004:2).* However, scholars such as Hall (2007), Gumede (2014) and Cliffe (2007) argue that small scale farming should be practised alongside commercial farming. South African rural economy has been marginalised for the past century and it goes without saying that promoting commercial farming at the expense of small-scale farming is at the detriment of rural development. In a nut shell, the media has focused much on pro-commercial farming and have not given enough attention to the opinions advocating for promoting small scale farming.

5.1.17. 50 – 50 Land Sharing - Strengthening the relative rights of people working the land policy framework

The government released a new policy proposal on *"Strengthening the relative rights of people working the land"*. The policy document proposes of ceding 50% of all commercial farms to workers and is based on the argument that farm workers have paid for the right to part ownership of the farms they work on. The government will need to pay for the 50% of farms to be shared and the money will be used for investment and capacity building of the workers preparing them for management. The workers will not

get the compensation money to avoid double payment. The money will also be used to pay the workers who will opt out of the arrangement. Dlamini at al (2013:10) postulates that land sharing can be "a means to advance land reform, especially in South Africa given the evident heterogeneity in farming skills and related farming competencies". They further argued that land sharing could help in efficiently rearranging opportunities and competencies, minimise transaction costs, and overcome existing knowledge gaps which are a result of the past skewed apartheid agricultural policies. The head of the centre of excellence at Absa Agribusiness, Ernst Janovsky bewailed that, "I don't think there is enough money in the country to do that on any scale" *(Mail and Guardian, 17 to 24 April 2014).* The policy proposal takes up a radical notion that, idea that, "workers have already paid for their 50% through the years of exploitation and underpayment" *(Business Day, 30 June 2014).* Legal expert Tembeka Ngcukaitobi questioned the constitutionality of this argument. He argues that "as soon as property is taken away involuntarily, it must be recognised as an expropriation". The fact that the money the government pays does not go directly to the owner but to an investment and development fund has made some critics to equate the policy document with expropriation without compensation *(Business Day, 24 June 2014*). AgriSA declared the proposal "ill-considered and unacceptable" *(SABC Online, 13 August 2014).*

Some analysts have argued that this policy will have drastic unintended consequences. Professors Ruth Hall and Andries du Toit argued that this, "does not offer any useful benefit to workers" *(Mail and Guardian, 17 to 24 April 2014).* du Toit argues that the policy focuses on permanent farm workers and it excludes the majority who are temporary, short term contracted as well as almost all female farm workers who are most vulnerable and exploited will not materially benefit from this ill-defined equity share arrangement *(Daily Maverick, 11 August 2014).*

In defence of the policy proposal Deputy Minister of Land Reform and Development, Mncebisi Skwatsha said the proposal "will go a long way in addressing many years of discrepancies in fully recognising farm-workers" (*SABC Online, 13 August 2014*). Minister Nkwinti argued that the proposal will bring stability and conformity with the constitution, "if the people who work the land are not part of the

ownership system they will destabilise it. Stability is directly related to the question of ownership." *(Business Day, 24 July 2014).*

5.2. Comparative analyses and agenda setting

5.2.1. Critique of the Green Paper on land reform

The year 2013 marked the 1913 Native Land Act centenary and President Jacob Zuma listed land reform as one of the five priority areas. By the end of the first decade, it was clear that there was need for a paradigm shift on land and agrarian policy. This affirmed his emphasis on agrarian transformation when he came to power in 2009 *(Jacobs 2012:171*).

The media has a tendency to sensationalise certain issues in order to fulfil their set agenda. Most immediate media and interest groups responses to the release of the green paper were negative. The Business Day (*2nd September 2011*) called the green paper "half-baked" that is overloaded with political gunk and is little short of a useless polemic. The Black Management Forum said the green paper falls short of addressing the land question *(SABC Online, 18 November 2011).* PLAAS (*20011:1*) said the Green Paper was a secretively drafted great disappointment. AgriSA emphasised that land reform executed hurriedly and faulty could lead to serious economic ramifications for South Africa (AgriSA, 2011). Professor Ruth Hall (*Sunday Times, 25 September 2011*) concluded that by obscuring the direction of land reform, the government has simply failed to make policy and not making policy is a political act. Hall concludes that, "what we have now is a ministry with a plan that isn't and the ghosts of two former plans". After a two constructive page analysis, she argued, "my point is not that the Green Paper is barking up the wrong tree. The problem is that it is barking up none. It is just barking".

A story in the *Business Day* (2nd September 2011) written by David Gleason provides a contextual analysis of the Green Paper. Having critically analysed it, he calls it a "half-baked" paper that is overloaded with political gunk and is little short of a useless polemic. He bemoans over section five of the Green Paper which lists eight challenges and weaknesses, and then offers absolutely no solution. Such

analysis by the media on the Green Paper requires in-depth study to uncover the legitimacy of the criticism and is a call for further research.

However, one will argue that some of the analysis and criticism against the green paper policy document were superfluous and bigoted. Most of instantaneous media comments to the green paper publication signify a lack of understanding of the green paper's purpose and a clear set agenda to discredit the department's efforts. The green paper was meant to stimulate debate which would lead to the detailed plans, policies and strategies which the media was already nailing the government for. So it was justifiable for the Department to come up with a small document which headlight all key areas for public discussion and debates.

5.2.2. Land Reform and the Constitution

The government has a complex duty to navigate difficult terrains because it has to fulfil the expectations of several stakeholders, from those of the landless to those of organised commercial farmers yet the constitutional rights of both parties and the dictates of the law have to be upheld. The South African Constitution obligates the government to carry out land reform and the White Paper on Land Reform was developed in 1997 in order to "operationalise" the constitutional mandate (Gumede 2014:10). Most of the recent legislative and policy documents have been questioned by the media, politicians and some scholars on their alignment with the constitution. It is crucial to highlight that scholars, media and interest groups have been challenging the constitutionality of some of the land reform policies and laws prior to 2011. An exceptional example is the criticism which was weighed on the Communal Land Rights Act of 2004 (CLARA). CLARA was challenged on its constitutionality in the High Court and it was declared unconstitutional on substantive and procedural grounds. However, Gumede (2014) argues that the High Court did not consider the substantive arguments within CLARA. The green paper on land and agrarian reform (2011) received criticism from different quotas of society. The *Business Day (1st September 2011)* was quick to declare that the green paper would not pass the constitutional muster. It quoted DA's Lindiwe Mazibuko saying the creation of the Land Management Commission would violate the constitutional property rights. This was however criticised by the PLAAS through *Mail and Guardian*

(21st September 2011); the article argued that the grounds for declaring were wrong. In the same article, the spokesperson for department of rural development and land reform, Mtobeli Mxotwa argued that only people with land are questioning the constitutionality of the green paper. This then means instead of responsible reporting where the media verify facts, the media in question presented opinions of their sources as they are without seeking another opinion.

The media also reported that due to the green paper's rhetoric on expropriation, "a constitutional amendment was inevitable" (*Business Day, 1st September 2011*). However, the green paper refers to land expropriation with compensation which is allowed by the constitution. As the *Daily Maverick* (*13 June 2013*) correctly highlighted, The South African constitution obliges the state to "take reasonable legislative and other measures, within available resources" to effect land redistribution. Section 25 clearly states that the state can expropriate property "forcibly, if necessary to achieve this purpose". The media's rhetoric that the state will have to amend the constitution in order to facilitate expropriation was therefore out of place. In fact, the media failed to push the state to fast track land reform through expropriation since it was constitutionally feasible during the willing seller willing buyer principle and during the current just and equitable compensation principle.

On Land Restitution Act amendment, the media also questioned the constitutionality of extending land claims window beyond 1913 through the Land Restitution Amendment Bill *(Farmers Weekly, 24 May 2013*). The DA and FF+ questioned the constitutionality of the proposed legislation but they could not find legal grounds to challenge the bill in court and finally it was passed into a law *(SABC News Online, 1st July 2014*). This again shows that the media rushes to criticize anything which is a threat to their established agenda and attempt to authenticate their set agenda using their preferred sources.

The media nailed it right on constitutional amendment cries in order to facilitate expropriation without compensation. Chris Gibbons calls this the "eternal cry of the Pan Africanist: Africa for Africans" (*Daily Maverick, 21 June 2012*). This includes the continued brawl by the EFF and its leader, Julius Malema. His oratory on expropriation without compensation and nationalisation of key resources is centred on constitutional amendment. Malema has been agitating against "paying for the stolen" land since he was

ANC Youth League President. Other supporting institutions to this motion include the AZAPO, NUMSA as well as the ANC Youth League Deputy President, Ronald Lamola in this campaign (*Mail and Guardian, 8 June 2012; Daily Maverick, 15 October 2011; SABC News Online, 22 June 2012*). NUMSA view the property clause in the constitution as "an impediment to social and economic transformation" (Daily *Maverick, 6 June 2012*). AZAPO argued that the only way the country's land dispossession can be addressed and land reform targets met is through constitutional amendment in order to facilitate expropriation without compensation (*SABC News Online, 6 March 2012*).

5.2.3. Neglected themes

There are some key themes which were either neglected or merely received a mention in passing. It is critical to highlight some of themes and debunk their coverage.

5.2.3.1. Gender Equality and Land Reform

The Department of Land Affairs expressed consistent commitment to gender equality, both for the departmental staff and land reform beneficiaries since 1994. The 1997 White Paper emphasised the importance of gender equality and out of it the department developed its Gender Policy. Walker (2005:305) lamented the lack of accountability in the department on gender policy; sundry weaknesses of rural women's movement and consequently "diluted presence of gender concerns in national debates on rural development".

An analysis of the crude numeric indicators of land reform beneficiaries signifies a major patriarchal bias. Walker (2003:123, 126) argues that even though there has been undoubtedly consistent commitment to gender equity as expressed by non-racism and non-sexism major policy objectives and legal frameworks, poorly crafted policy contents, institutional and operational weaknesses in the Department of Land Affairs has led to dismal failure of the gender equity agenda. Professor Jaichand (2013) argues that there is need to balance South Africa constitutional obligations with traditional law in order to accommodate women's right to the land and offer equitable access to widows.

On the period under study, women affairs on land reform remain hushed in the media arena. All mediums did not effectively to demystify women affairs on land reform and most importantly their access to land through inheritance. Just as Genis (2006:64) indicated that women received little attention in the media on land reform, the same transpired during the period in study. Not even a single story mentioned women land affairs and their plight for land. By this, the media has failed to engage citizens and allow them to influence media agenda.

5.2.3.2. Components of the Land tenure system

This was widely covered; especially issues on foreign ownership, land owned by the government and private land ownership. However, there are pockets which received little attention. On communal land, traditional authorities and their role in land reform were not fully covered. As much as the media seemed to be against the traditional authorities gaining more power on land reform, it has not brought forward possible solutions.

An opinion piece by Athol Trillip in *Farmers Weekly* (1st June 2012) critiques the green paper on land and agrarian reform, and the Traditional Courts Bill but fails short of proper solution. There were also no follow up stories to do justice on this subject. Traditional authorities are also critiqued for their role in land claims. A story in *Business Day* (15 July 2014) criticizes the involvement of traditional authority in land restitution claims, particularly the Zulu King, Zwelithini, but it does not provide a solution to the plight of the communal lands and how traditional authorities should be assimilated into land reform issues.

5.2.4. Writers and Sources

Being a source or writer of a story certainly is a powerful position to be in. Those who want to write for the media – from inside a newsroom as journalists, or from outside as publicists or sources – should recognise the power they are carrying and they must be conscious of their responsibilities (Nel 2005:3).

As have shown prior, most stories were written by staff writers and a few wrote the majority of the stories. For instance, Greg Nicolson and Ivo Vegster wrote 40% of the stories for *Daily Maverick,* and

Kwanele Sosibo and Andisiwe Makinana wrote six (26.1%) of the stories for *Mail and Guardian*. This kind of monopoly by a few writers negatively affects media agenda since it encourages profound influence on the dominant ideologies and themes by a minority. Taken as a whole, the most used source is the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform. In *Farmers Weekly*, seven different DRDLR staff members were quoted 13 times. In *Business Day*, five DRDLR staff members were used 23 times. In *SABC News Online*, 11 staff members were quoted 21 times. In *Daily Maverick*, three DRDLR staff members were quoted four times, and in *Mail and Guardian*, four staff member were quoted 21 times. More questionable is how *SABC News Online* has been so biased towards the DLRRD as the main and sometimes sole source. Between September and December 2011, only six sources were used in four stories. Two of the stories had a single DLRRD source and the other two had two sources each, one DRDLR staff member and another non-government. This falls short of basic journalistic principle of Cross-checking for balance. Cross-checking for balance can be summed up in Hennessy (1997:168)'s words: "The more sources you use, the more cross-checking of information you can do to verify facts, the more likely you are to arrive at a balanced and accurate picture." One will argue that shows a set agenda to do "public relations" for the department instead of upholding journalistic reporting standards. The overall use of the DRDLR as the main source in most stories is however justifiable considering that it is considered the first land reform news source and defender of government policy. What is deficient are more sources for cross-checking.

Another questionable reporting is on journalistic objectivity is in line with which political sources which were used. Journalistic objectivity can be divided into two: factualness and impartiality. Factualness is a form of reporting dealing with statements that can be checked against other sources, and which are then without comment. Factualness can be divided into truth and relevance. Impartiality is an attitude adopted by reporters. This can be divided into balance and neutrality (*Nel 2005:53-54*). The most used political party source was Democratic Alliance (DA). In *Farmers Weekly*, four of their staff members were quoted in seven stories. In *Business Day*, six DA staff member were quoted in 12 stories whilst three ANC sources were used in six stories and two FF+ staff members were quoted in four stories. In *Daily*

Maverick, five DA staff members were used in eight stories. Also five ANC staff member were quoted in seven stories and FF+ was quoted once. In Mail and Guardian, four DA staff members were quoted six times. Five members of ANC, four of EFF, two of FF+ were quoted once each. Interestingly, *SABC News Online* did not use DA as a source. Four staff members from ANC were used as sources, once each. Two staff members of EFF and one AZAPO were used also. This shows a clear agenda by most of the independent media to promote opposition ideology (particularly DA) more than other political parties including the ruling ANC. On the other hand *SABC News Online*'s reporting tends to be more inclined towards promoting mainly the government agenda. In a nutshell, in order to uphold objectivity, there is need for balance when sourcing out political opinion.

The media also opted to use sources from organised commercial agriculture and urban based commercial institutions such as banks and large-scale retail companies instead of farm workers or the landless rural voices. *Farmers Weekly* quoted five AgriSA staff member in six stories; two Standard Bank's Agribusiness Sector staff ,members in four stories, two Kwanalu staff members in seven stories, three TAU SA staff members in four stories, a Land Bank staff member in two stories as well a Pick n Pay staff member in a single story. The *Farmers Weekly* magazine did not quote any farm work, or landless land reform applicant. This trend is the same in other mediums apart from *SABC News Online*. This raises concerns the journalists' ability to seek and listen to grassroots voices, and their ability to engage and connect with the rural citizens as indicated in chapter 2 (2.3.3).

5.2.5. Journalistic Writing Standards

The nature of the news and the quality of journalism are important: they influence our thoughts, our experiences, our cultures (Nel 2005:3). Before making a critic of the varied journalistic quality and styles portrayed in the stories, it is critical to distinguish between hard news stories and feature articles. Hard news stories can be referred to as tidings, the report of recent events, new occurrences as a subject or report or talk. It is what is on a society's mind. Has a bill been passed? Has anyone benefited? Is the president visiting our village? News, therefore, whatever else it may be, is in the eyes of the beholder: reporters, editors and audiences (Nel: 2005:2, 64). On the other hand, a feature article is a piece of

deliberately structured writing for publication, usually running 600 to 2000 words which aims to inform, comment, persuade or entertain. These may not relate to the news of the day but they always have a topical peg of some kind (Hennessy: 1997:7). News has qualities of conflict, human interest, importance, prominence, proximity, timeliness and unusualness whilst a feature article reflects on these qualities. Most hard news stories has inverted pyramid shape, most important points coming first whilst most feature stories takes various shapes, dictated by their content, and a common shape is the pyramid right way up, with weight of the content at the end.

Daily media produced more hard news stories whilst weekly media produced more feature stores. All stories in *SABC News Online* in 2012 are hard news and *Business Day* carried 78.6% hard news stories during the same period. On the other hand, 55% of *Farmers Weekly's* 2012 stories are feature articles; 57.1% of *Mail and Guardian's* are feature articles as well and the same with all stories in *Daily Maverick*.

Another critical journalistic principle to consider is the anatomy of argument. Each medium seem to be following a certain writing style and story format. Some stories' thesis and purpose are not clear. Others' are poorly structured with points jumbled in the same paragraph. Some stories carry to many arguments which are not in any way related to the theme and headline of the story. For instance *SABC News Online's* story titled "Government's land reform programme criticised" (18 November 2011) starts with the criticism levelled against the Green Paper on land reform, then explains the Minister, Gugile Nkwinti's response. Suddenly the story shifts into regulations aimed at boosting the procurement of locally manufactured goods. The conclusion focuses on how the government should use the Broad Based Black Economic Empowerment codes for preferential procurement. This story shows lack of logic, chronology and con-cordial agreement in story writing. The body of the story is disjointed and do not agree with the title and the introduction. It could have helped to make sense of the story if subtitles had been used. Most stories in *Farmers Weekly*, follow a well organised and logical flow and structure. They have well set attractive title, then subtitles, or stand first which adds greatly to the title of an article. Hennesy (1997:62) argues that a good idea is not just a matter of catchy title. It must have the potential to be developed into a good article. This means a good title should be well fused together with the

introduction, body and conclusion which also must be carefully constructed. The use of striking facts and figures in addition makes the stories pleasant to the eye. Examples of these include *Farmers Weekly's* "Land reform budget cut" (8 November 2014); and "Focus on willing-buyer, willing seller" (25 May 2012). Most stories in *Business Day, Mail and Guardian* and *Daily Maverick* were well organised and logical, but the absence of subtitles makes some of the stories difficult to follow. *Mail and Guardian's* story, "Land policy not thought through" (17 April 2014), and *Daily Maverick's* "Land Reform – Cloud cuckoo or calculus of power?" (11 August 2014) are good examples. Also, *SABC News Online* and *Business Day* hard new stories in 2014 were written in inverted pyramid style. As much as this is a good approach to "tell" news quickly, the continual use of the same style will ultimately be monotonous to the read.

The *Daily Maverick* feature stories used varied, interesting and eye-catching writing styles. For a story by Richard Spoor on the effects of the new Property Valuation Act (7 July 2014), starts with a quotation of Robert Jordan (The Path of Daggers) which says: "the Law of Unintended Consequences, stronger than any written Law. Whether or not what you do have the effect you want, it will have at least that you never expected, and one of those is usually unpleasant." This then introduces the reader to the legal debate which follows.

Development journalistic writing, especially feature articles, must not merely tell a story but they must be descriptive and engaging. Nel (2005:192) said, "Dont tell me it is dry, show me the cracked mud in the park pond. Don't tell me the man is angry; show me his clenched jaw and the throbbing vein in his temple. I want to see the news..." Stories by Ivo Vegster and Greg Nicolson in Daily Maverick do justice on this topic. It is critical however, that the stories lacked development journalism components emphasised in chapter 2 (2.3).

Chapter 6

6. Conclusion

In any modern society, the media has power to influence knowledge, perspectives, beliefs, cultures, values, social relations and social identities. Media personnel - writers and editors, have the privilege to set agenda and decide what to include, what to exclude, what to background, which source to use and which in one to ignore, what words to use and who to serve most in their reporting. The South African media equally weighs the same power. However, the question is, how has this power been used and has the media been able to fulfil its intermediate role?

This study has gone through the available literature on land and agrarian reform in South Africa. From a global perspective, this research has analysed the different perspectives to the land question and the different routes which nation states can take in order to address this question. The South African case is highly sensitive and delicate. The need to redress the hideous history of dispossession made the land and agrarian reform one of the major challenges of the post-apartheid South Africa. Millions of black South Africans lost their native lands through colonial wars since 1650s and draconian laws since 1913. The 1913 Land Native Act marked the beginning of a more radical and racially unequal transition in the politics of land. Most black South Africans were forced into homelands whilst vast tracks of fertile agricultural land were allocated to the white minority. Blacks were ultimately forced by situations to return to their dispossessed land and work as mere wage farm workers. All these raised sundry challenges which the new democratic government has been reversing since independence. The government proclaimed its commitment to land reform in the RDP and White Paper on Land Reform explained a three pronged strategy for redressing the land question. The strategy was based on three pillars of land reform: land restitution, land tenure and land redistribution, which were implemented within the frameworks of willing seller willing buyer neoliberal principles. The literature on these three pillars has been explained in detail together with key normative issues which cropped up in the first decade of land reform. The greatest criticisms of these policies were that land reform was very slow and it failed to meet the 30%

redistribution target in five years and even when that target was extended to 2014, it could not be met. The National Land Summit in 2005 and the Polokwane Conference in 2007 marked a turn around on the rhetoric on land and agrarian reform. The summit called for more radical approaches which the conference sanctioned the then Department of Land Affairs to embark on. In 2009, the new government established the Department on Rural Development and Land Affairs which has developed several policy reform proposals and legal amendments including the green paper on land and agrarian reform (2011).

This study is more interested on how the media have responded to these new developments and how it has reported these developments. The research has also gone through the available literature on media reporting, focusing mainly on media theories, and development journalism in Africa. One critic role of (development) journalists and the media is to set agenda and determine what people will read, listen to and see. This is a critical role which should not be abused and should be done in the purview of public interest. Using Professor F. Banda's perspectives on development journalism in Africa, this study offer a critique on media reporting on land and agrarian reform since the publication of the green paper (2011)

The research focused on five media institutions, a weekly newspaper, *Mail and Guardian*; a daily online news media, *Daily Maverick*; a daily newspaper, *Business Day*; an online media receiving feeds from all SABC radio and television channels, *SABC News Online*; and a weekly farmers newspaper, *Farmers Weekly*. 192 stories were collected from these media institutions between the periods September 2011 to August 2014. Quantitative and qualitative content analysis has been used in this study. Quantitative content analysis includes the frequency of words, expressions, and themes which were used in the media; the sources used; and the writers. On the other hand qualitative content analysis focused on mainly on in-depth thematic and comparative analysis of the content.

The research identified some key areas of concern. These include the sources used, set agendas, story structures and the angles which the media chose. As has been established in this study, each media outlet had its own preferred sources who dominated the land reform discourse. In the political arena, the independent media tended to have more preference on the perspectives of the opposition parties, particularly DA and FF+. On the other hand, *SABC News Online* was more ardent towards the

government and ruling party (ANC)'s viewpoint. More inclined to this perspective is the continued use of organised commercial agricultural organisations such as AgriSA, Kwanalu and their provincial subsidiaries at the expense of the landless, and subjugated rural masses who are calling for land reform. As much as it is commendable that the media is seeking expert opinion on controversial land reform issues, most researchers and academics who were used as sources were frequently from the same institutes, especially the University of Western Cape's PLAAS Institute. This creates ideological monopoly in the public debate platforms. This also raises concerns on the media's ability to seek diverse connoisseur opinion considering there are several universities and research institutes which have land and agrarian reform units and/or departments. This is also contrary to development journalism's 'multiplicity' or 'another development' paradigm which advocates for the participation of diverse sources in the public development agendas (See 2.4.3).

Most themes discussed in this study did not reflect the interest of the majority landless. Most denigration especially from organised commercial agriculture and opposition parties had an emphasis on respecting the status and the threats more radical land reform policies may bring to food security. Other stories criticised any further land reform efforts. These gave evidence of land restitution, redistribution and land tenure projects which has failed dismally due to lack of post settlement support. On this, the media failed to bring forth the other side of the coin, which is rampant poverty and dire need for land for agricultural purposes especially in former homelands and among the farm workers. Some stories actually seem to justify that land reform was unnecessary and a waste of money. These quoted the statistics of those who opted for money instead of land during the first window of land restitution. This is a misplaced argument since most of the claims were urban based. The exclusion of the rural poverty and rural voice on media agenda has made land question an elitist debate with "urbanised" writers, editors and their sources on the steering wheel. This is typically a top – down modernisation theory approach to information dissemination where the "urbanised top elite" dominate the media fraternity and the broadcast (publish) their perspectives whilst the "down rural masses" are passive and voiceless recipients of the elite's dogma (See 2.4.1). This confirms Genis (2006:113)'s conclusion that, "newspapers are no longer the independent

activists of the past, fighting for what's right and good; they are businesses and part of a corporate culture where shareholder pressure for higher profits and dividends often indirectly dictate the agenda".

Of concern also is the quality of journalism in some of the media outlets. Some of the mediums such as *SABC News Online'*s journalistic standards and principles are questionable whilst others such as *Daily Maverick* are writing upper market elitist stories above the heads of the majority South Africans. Most stories in *Farmers Weekly; Mail and Guardian;* and *Business Day* esteemed journalistic standards and principles even though others were not balanced and lacked adequate diverse sources. In a nutshell, there is need for journalists and writers to fully understand the audience and study more on development journalism (See 2.2 and 2.3).

This study concludes that the media partially fulfilled its role as a disseminator of land reform information. This is seen in the wide coverage of major land reform events during the study period. These include the publication of the green paper on land and agrarian reform (2012); the debates on the green paper which followed (2011 and 2012); the 2013 centenary celebrations; the publication and passing of some crucial land reform bills (2013 and 2014). With these, one will argue that the media provided fairly sufficient information and space for an ordinary citizen to be aware of the land reform developments (See 2.3.1). However, the loopholes discussed above must be addressed for the media to play its satisfactory role and to ensure that the voice from below is part of the agenda in the public media debates. To sum it up in McQuail's words, (1987), there is need for 'multiplicity, smallness of scale, locality, de-institutionalisation, interchange of sender receiver roles and horizontality of communication links at all levels of society' (See 2.4.3).

This study only covered selected stories in five media institutions. For further research in this area, there is need to capture several media outlets from all key mediums. These include print media, new media and broadcast media. South Africa has 12 official languages and this study covered English mediums only. It is critical to explore the media from other languages. Also this study did not interview the writers, journalists and editors and future studies should explore this gateway in order to understand the reasons why those who hold the media power make the choices they make and their justification to the agenda

they set. An in-depth research on audience perception on how land reform is pictured in the media is critical. Such a research will need to cover both the perspectives of all races, commercial farmers, landless rural – urban population and middle-class urban population. Also such a research can be broken down into the three arms of land reform – land restitution, redistribution and tenure. There is also need for research on the teaching of journalists for specialised niche such as land and agrarian reform. This will include analysing the curriculum of journalism programs in general and development journalism in particular. Also this can include the available Continuous Professional Development (CPD) programs.

Bibliography:

1. Agri, S. A. "Agri SA comments on the green paper on land reform." (2012).

2. Baldwin A, (1975). *Mass Removals and Separate Development*, Journal of Southern African Studies, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 215-227, Taylor & Francis, Ltd.

3. Banda, F. (2007). An appraisal of the applicability of development journalism in the context of public service broadcasting (PSB) This paper was presented during the South African Broadcasting Corporation's 'News Content Planning'workshop on 21 October 2006, held at the Birchwood Executive Hotel, in Boksburg, South Africa. *Communicatio*, *33*(2), 154-170.

4. Berger A. (1991) *Media Research Techniques*. Sage Publications

5. Berger G (2005). *Current challenges, Changing the 4th Estate. Essay of South African Journalism*, Cape Town: HSRCC Press, South Africa

6. Bernstein H, (2003). *Land Reform in Southern Africa in World-Historical Perspective.* Review of African Political Economy, ROAPE Publications Ltd

7. Berqué P. and Khamphasith S (2010). Journalism and development *"Facing new challenges"*, Lao Journalists' Association, Institut Panos Paris, France

8. Binswanger H, Bourguignon C and Brink R (2009). *Agricultural Land Redistribution. Toward Greater Consesnsus.* The World Bank, Washington D C

9. Branston, Gill, and Roy Stafford. "The media student's handbook." *London and New York: Routledge* (1996).

10. Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods*. Oxford university press.

11. Bolton R (2005). *Habermas' Theory of Communicative Action and the Theory of Social Capital,* Department of Economics, Williams College, Williamstown, Massachusetts, United States.

12. Boynton, P. M. (2004). *The research companion: a practical guide for the social and health sciences*. Psychology Press.

13. Claassens, Aninka. *Land, power & custom: controversies generated by South Africa's communal land rights act*. Ed. Ben Cousins. Juta and Company Ltd, 2008.

14. Cousins Ben (2006). *Agrarian Reform and the Two Economies Transforming South Africa's Country Side* in Ntsebeza L, and Hall R, 2006. The Land Question in South Africa. Pretoria: Human Science Research Council

15. Cousins, Ben. "Smallholder irrigation schemes, agrarian reform and 'accumulation from above and from below'in South Africa." *Journal of Agrarian Change* 13.1 (2013): 116-139.

16. Daily Maverick (2014). About Us. Available: http://www.dailymaverick.co.za/page/about-us [Accessed 24.07.14]

17. Daily Sun Statistics 2013. Available: http://www.media24.com/en/newspapers/emerging-markets/daily-sun.html [Accessed 31.03.2014], Media 24

18. Dlamini, Thula S., Aart-Jan Verschoor, and Gavin CG Fraser. "Exploring options in reforming South African land ownership: Opportunities for sharing land, labour and expertise." *Agrekon* 52.sup1 (2013): 24-45.

19. Dlamini, T. S., Verschoor, A. J., & Fraser, G. C. (2013). Exploring options in reforming South African land ownership: Opportunities for sharing land, labour and expertise. *Agrekon*, *52*(sup1), 24-45.

20. Devlin, A. S. (2006). *Research methods: planning, conducting and presenting research*. Thomson/Wadsworth.

21. Doyle G. (2002); Understanding Media Economics; Sage Publications

22. Du Plessis, W., Pienaar, J., & Olivier, N. (2011). Land matters and rural development: 2010: journal. *SA Publiekreg= SA Public Law*, *26*(1), 292-318.

23. Du Plessis, W., Pienaar, J., & Olivier, N. (2012). Land matters and rural development: 2012. *SA Publiekreg= SA Public Law*, *27*(2), 587-626.

24. Edigheji, O. (2007). Rethinking South Africa's Development Path: Reflections on the ANC's Policy Conference Discussion Documents Special edition of Policy

25. Fairclough N. *(*1995), *Media Discourse.* Bloomsbury Academic

26. Financial Mail, About Us 2014, http://www.financialmail.co.za/about/ [Accessed 31.03.2014], Financial Mail

27. Geuss, R. (1981). *The idea of a critical theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School*. Cambridge University Press.

28. Genis, A. J. (2006). *Land Reform in the News* (Doctoral dissertation, School of Government, University of the Western Cape).

29. Gumede, Vusi. "Land reform in post-apartheid South Africa: Should South Africa follow Zimbabwe's footsteps?." *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies-Multi-, Inter-and Transdisciplinarity* 9.1 (2014): 50-68.

30. Gutto, Shadrack BO. "Re-theorising and re-conceptualising land, sovereignty, socio-economic rights and responsibility in the context of pan-Africanism and African renaissance in the 21st century." *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies-Multi-, Inter-and Transdisciplinarity* 9.1 (2014): 5-15.

31. Habermas, J. (1991). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. MIT press.

32. Hadland, A. (2007). State-media relations in post-apartheid South Africa: an application of comparative media systems theory. *Communicare: Journal for Communication Sciences in Southern Africa= Communicare: Tydskrif vir Kommunikasiewetenskappe in Suider-Afrika*, *26*(2), 1-17.

33. Hall, Ruth. "A political economy of land reform in South Africa." *Review of African Political Economy* 31.100 (2004): 213-227.

34. Hall, Ruth. *Land and agrarian reform in South Africa: A status report 2004*. Cape Town: Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape, 2004.

35. Hall, Ruth. "The next Great Trek? South African commercial farmers move north." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 39.3-4 (2012): 823-843.

36. Hall, Ruth. "Transforming rural South Africa? Taking stock of land reform." *The land question in South Africa: the challenge of transformation and redistribution*(2007): 87-106.

37. Heimann, D. (2006). Supporting communication for development with horizontal dialogue and a level playing field: The Communication Initiative. *Development in Practice*, *16*(6), 603-610.

38. Hendricks F, (2001). *Land Policies and Democracy in South Africa in Development, Theory, Policy and Practise.* Edited by J.K. Coetzee, J. Graaff, F. Hendricks, and G. Wood. Cape Town: Oxford University Press

39. Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. W. (2002). *Dialectic of enlightenment: Philosophical fragments*. Stanford University Press.

40. Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAAS) (2011). *Comments on the Green Paper on Land Reform 2011*. Available: http://www.plaas.org.za/sites/default/files/publications-pdf/PS%2001.pdf [Accessed 03.04.2014], University of the Western Cape

41. Jaichand V. (2014) Women's Land Rights and Customary Law Reform in South Africa: Towards a Gendered Perspective Available: https://www.conftool.com/landandpoverty2014/.../Jaichand-610_ppt.ppt [Accessed 09.02.2015], Witwatersrand University

42. Kariuki, Samuel M. *Creating the black commercial farmers in South Africa*. No. 56. African Studies Centre, 2004.

43. Kariuki, Samuel M. *Failing to Learn from Failed Programmes? South Africa's Communal Land Rights Act (CLRA 2004)*. No. 58. African Studies Centre, 2004.

44. Kariuki, Samuel. "Political compromise on land reform: A study of South Africa and Namibia." *South African Journal of International Affairs* 14.1 (2007): 99-114.

45. Lahiff, Edward, and Ben Cousins. "Smallholder agriculture and land reform in South Africa." *IDS Bulletin* 36.2 (2005): 127-131.

46. Letsoalo, E. M., and M. J. J. Thupana. "The repeal of the land acts: the challenge of land reform policies in South Africa." *Social Dynamics* 39.2 (2013): 298-307.

47. Mayher, A., & Mcdonald, D. A. (2007). The Print Media in South Africa: Paving the Way for 'Privatisation'. *Review of African Political Economy*, *34*(113), 443-460.

48. Mbedu, Nkosinathi. "Social cohesion for the unfinished business of land reform in South Africa." *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies-Multi-, Inter-and Transdisciplinarity* 9.1 (2014): 100-114.

49. McQuail D. (2005) *McQuail's Mass Communication Theory*. Sage Publications

50. Mcquail D (2002). *McQuail's Reader in Mass Communication Theory*, Sage Publications, UK

51. Media Club South Africa (2014). *The Press in South Africa.* Available: http://www.mediaclubsouthafrica.com/component/content/article?id=article#ixzz2xWFJxMYg [Accessed 31.03.2014],

52. Miller, G., & Dingwall, R. (Eds.). (1997). *Context and method in qualitative research*. Sage.

53. Mkamba L (2014) *Green light for re-opening of Land Claims* Available: http://www.ruraldevelopment.gov.za/news-room/news-flash/file/2421, [Accessed 25.12.2014], Department of Rural Development and Land Reform.

54. Morna, C. L. (2007). Making every voice count: a southern Africa case study.*Gender & Development*, *15*(3), 369-385.

55. Moyo, S. (2008). *African land questions, agrarian transitions and the state: contradictions of neo-liberal land reforms*. African Books Collective.

56. News24 http://www.news24.com/SiteElements/Footer/About-Us-20090703-4 [Accessed 24 May 2014]

57. Odhiambo, L. O. (1991). Development journalism in Africa: capitulation of the Fourth Estate?. *Africa Media Review*, *5*(2), 17-29.

58. Ott B. L and Mark R. L (2010). *Critical Media Studies: An Introduction*, Blackwell's publishing, UK

59. Ramutsindela, Maano, and Monene Mogashoa. "The people's choice: options for land ownership in South Africa's land reform." *Social Dynamics* 39.2 (2013): 308-316.

60. Pienaar, J., Olivier, N., & Du Plessis, W. (2011). Land matters and rural development: 2011: journal. *SA Publiekreg= SA Public Law*, *26*(2), 523-565.

61. Pienaar, J., Du Plessis, W., & Olivier, N. (2013). Land matters and rural development: 2013 (2): joernaal. *SA Publiekreg= SA Public Law*, *28*(2), 425-446.

62. Procter J (2013). *Routledge Critical Thinkers - Stuart Hall*. Routledge

63. Radio Netherland Worldwide Africa. (2010) New South Africa newspaper launches, denies ANC bias http://www.rnw.nl/africa/bulletin/new-safrica-newspaper-launches-denies-anc-bias [Accessed 15 May 2014)

64. Report of the National Land Summit , (2005), *A partnership to fast track land reform: a new trajectory towards 2014, D*raft Report of the National Land Summit, Nasrec, Johannesburg

65. Rudman, A. (2012). Re-defining national sovereignty: the key to avoid constitutional reform? Reflections on the 2011 Green Paper on Land Reform. *Stellenbosch Law Review= Stellenbosch Regstydskrif*, *23*(3), 417-437.

66. SABC News (2014). *About Us*. http://www.sabc.co.za/wps/portal/SABC/SABCHOME [Accessed 24 May 2014]

67. SALGA (2011). SALGA comments on the draft Green paper on Land Reform, South African Local Government Association

http://www.salga.org.za/app/webroot/assets/files/Municpal%20Focus/SALGA%20comments%20on%20the%20draft%20Green%20Paper%20on%20Land%20Reform%20September%202011.pdf [Accessed 07 May 2014]

68. Schonberger H. B (1989). *Aftermath of War: Americans and the Remaking of Japan, 1945-1952.* The Kent State University Press, Kent

69. South African Audience Research Foundation (2014). *Average Issue Readership of Newspapers and Magazines 2013.* Available: http://www.saarf.co.za/amps-readership/2013/AMPS%20JUN%202013-%20READERSHIP%20SUMMARY-with%20Non%20Pay-for%20SAARF.pdf . [Accessed 31.03.2014],

70. Swinnen J.F.M, (1999). *The political economy of land reform choices in Central and Eastern Europe,* Economics of Transition Volume 7 (3), Blackwell Publishers, UK

71. The Law Society of South Africa (LSSA) (2011). *Comments on the Green Paper on Land Reform 2011.* Available: http://www.lssa.org.za/upload/LSSA%20COMMENTS%20ON%20GREEN%20PAPER%20LAND%20REFORM%20February%202012_.pdf [Accessed 20.02..2014]

72. Thompson, J. B. (2013). *Media and modernity: A social theory of the media*. John Wiley & Sons.

73. Walker, Cherryl. "Piety in the sky? Gender policy and land reform in South Africa." *Journal of Agrarian change* 3.1-2 (2003): 113-148.

74. Walker, Cherryl. "The limits to land reform: Rethinking 'the land question'."*Journal of Southern African Studies* 31.4 (2005): 805-824

75. Wa Muiu A. M, Marti G (2009). *New Paradigm of the African State: Fundi Wa Afrika*, Palgrave Macmillan

76. Wiggershaus, R. (1995). *The Frankfurt school: Its history, theories, and political significance*. MIT Press.

77. Wasserman, H. (2005). Debating the media, shaping identity: Postcolonial discourse and public criticism.

78. Wasserman, H., & De Beer, A. (2005). Which public? Whose interest? The South African media and its role during the first ten years of democracy. *Critical arts*, *19*(1-2), 36-51.

Appendix

Apendix 1 – Farmers Weekly Most common sources used - September 2011 – August 2014

No //	Institution	Person	Position	2011	2012	2013	2014
1.	Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAS)	Prof. Ben Cousins	Professor	1		1	
2	Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAS)	Prof. Ruth Hall	Professor		1	2	
2	Democratic Alliance (DA)	Annette Steyn	Shadow Minister of Rural Development and Land Reform	1			
3	Democratic Alliance (DA)	Athol Trollip	Spokesperson of Rural Development and Land Reform	1	1		
4	Democratic Alliance (DA)	Kevin Mileham	Spokesperson of Rural Development and Land Reform			1	1
5	Democratic Alliance (DA)	Lindiwe Mazibuko	MP		1	1	
6	AgriSA	Hans van der Merwe	C.E.O				1

7	AgriSA	Livhu Ngwenkhulu	Transformation Manager	1			
8	AgriSA	Dr Theo de Jager	Vice President	2			
9	AgriSA	Dawie Maree	Economist	1			
10	AgriSA	Annelize Crosby	Legal and Policy Adviser			1	
11	SA Institute of Race Relations	Dr Anthea Jeffery	Head			2	2
12	Learamele le sa Tlhabile Trust	William Segola	North West Farmer				1
13	Pick n Pay	Gareth Ackerman	Chairperson	1			
14	Land Bank	Jerome Mthembu	Chief Legal Officer			1	1
15	Standard Bank	Dr John Purchase	CEO		1	2	
16	Standard Bank – Agribusiness	Willie du Plessis	Head			1	
17	Freedom Plus	Dr Pieter Mulder	President (Also the the Agriculture Deputy Minister)	1	1		

18	SA Institute of Race Relations	John Kane-Berman	C.E.O	1			
19	KZN Restitution Support	Advocate Bheki Mbili	Chief Director		1	1	
20	African Association of South Africa (AFASA)	Mandla Mthembu	KZN Chairperson			1	
21	National African Farmers' Union (NAFU)	Dr	Mandla Buthelezi		1		
22	Kwanalu	Robin Barsley	President	1			
23	Kwanalu	Sandy la Marque	C.E.O	1	1	3	1
24	TAU SA	Loius Meintjes	President	1			
25	TAU SA	Bennie van Zyl	General Manager	1			
26	TAU SA	Danie du Plessis	Manager – Eastern Region	1			1
27	AfriForum	Chris Fourie	Community Coordinator in KZN				1
28	Conference Speaker	Corwyn	Leadership Coach	1			

		Botha					
29	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Mtombeli Mxotwa	Spokesperson	1	1		
30	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Lamahlubi Lama	Legal Administration Officer		1		
31	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Gugile Nkwinti	Minister	1	2	2	1
32	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Nhlanhla Mndaweni	Chief Director			1	
33	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Mmuso Riba	Chief Surveyor – DRDLR			1	
34	ARC National	Moses Zengetwa	Emerging Farmer				1
35	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Pamela Tshwete	Deputy Minister			1	
36	Department of Rural Development and Land	Spho Dlamini	KZN Spokesperson			1	

	Reform						
37	Gledhow Farmers'Association	Anthony Goble	Vice Chairman				1
38	Rhys Evans Group	Anthony Evans	C.E.O				1
39	Marina Beach	Michael Yeadon	Director			1	
40	Association of Rural Advancement	Mike Crowling	Acting Director			1	1
41	Ongeluksnek Valley Leaseholder	Malefane Ramotsamai	Leaseholder	1			
42	Matatiele resident	Vivian Haviside	Development Specialist		1		
43	Inkhata Freedom Party (IFP)	Inkosi Cebekhulu	MP		1		
44	Zimbabwe Government	Morgan Tsvangirai	Prime Minister and MDC Leader	1			
45	Association for Rural Advancement (AFRA)	Thabo Manyathi	Rural Land and Citizenship Rights Programme Coordinator		1		
46	Land Reform Reference Group	Thokozane	Representative			1	

		Zondi					
47	SA Sugar Association	Anwhar Madhanpall	Land Reform Manager			1	
48	Landless Peoples' Movement (LPM)	Gcina Shabalala	Member		1		
49	Stellenbosch University	Prof Nick Vink	Professor				1
50	Cabinet	Pumla Williams	Acting Cabinet Spokesperson				1

Appendix 2 - Farmers Weekly - Table 7.2. Writers - September 2011 – August 2014

No//	**Name**	**Position**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**
1	Mike Burgess	Staff	1		1	
2	Robyn Jourbert	Staff	2		1	1
3	Lindi van Rooyen	Staff	3		1	1
4	Tshepo Diale	Opinion	1			
5	Athol Trollip	Opinion		1		
6	Lloyd Philips	Staff	1	1	1	1
7	Denene Erasmus	Staff	1	2	2	1
8	Jasco Visser	Staff	1			

9	Peter Mashala	Staff		1	3	3
10	Walter Redinger	Opinion			1	
11	Anthony Goble	Opinion				1
12	Luckeez Mfowethu	Opinion				1
13	Gugile Nkwinti	Opinion			1	
14	Mtombeli Mxotwa	Opinion		1		
15	Vivian Havide	Opinion		1		
16	Annelie Coleman	Staff				1
17	Daniel du Plessis	Opinion				1

Appendix 3 - Business Day - Most common sources used - September 2011 – August 2014

No//	**Institution**	**Person**	**Position**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**
1.	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Sunday Ogunrombi	Head of Policy Research and Legislation	1			
2	Democratic Alliance (DA)	Hellen Zille	President				1
3	Democratic Alliance (DA)	Kevin Mileham	Member of Parliament			1	3
4	Democratic Alliance	Christian Smit	Member of Parliament				1

	(DA)						
4	Democratic Alliance (DA)	Lindiwe Mazibuku	National Spokesperson	3			
5	Democratic Alliance (DA)	Athol Trollip	Spokesperson of Rural Development and Land Reform		1	1	
6	Democratic Alliance (DA)	Kevin Mileham	Deputy Spokesperson of Rural Development and Land Reform			1	
7	Treasury Department	Devan Naidoo	Head of Economic Services	1			
8	AgriSA	Johannes Moller	President			1	1
9	AgriSA	Dr Theo de Jager	Vice President	1			1
10	AgriSA`	Annelize Crosby	Legal and Policy Adviser			1	
11	Ministry in the Office of President	Trevor Manuel	Minister		1		
43	South African Sugar Association	Bongani Linda	Chairman		1		
13	Freedom Front Plus	Dr Pieter	President (Also the	1			1

		Mulder	Agriculture Deputy Minister)				
14	Freedom Front Plus	Pieter Groenewald	Spokesperson				2
15	Institute of Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (Plaas)	Ruth Hall	Professor		1	1	
16	Agricultural Business Chamber	John Purchase	C.E.O		1	1	
17	Centre for African Renaissance	Prof. Shadrack Gutto	Director	1			
18	Kalomshiyo Resident	Timothy Dlamini	Beneficiary		1		
19	African National Congress	Gwede Mantashe	Secretary Genreal				1
20	National Planning Commission	Mohammed Karaan	Commissioner				1
21	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Mtombeli Mxotwa	Spokesperson	1	1	2	
22	Department of Rural Development and Land	Lechesa Tsenoli	Deputy Minister		1		

	Reform						
23	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Gugile Nkwinti	Minister	5	4	5	6
24	Institute of Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (Plaas)	Ben Cousins	Professor		1		1
25	University of Pretoria	Johann Kirstern	Professor, Agriculture Economics Head		1		
26	Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Ministry	Tina Joemat-Pettersson	Minister		1		2
27	Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Ministry	Senzeni Zokwana	Minister				1
28	Ministry of Finance	Pravin Gordhan	Minister		1		1
29	African National Congress (ANC)	Discussion Documents	Discussion Documents		3		
30	ANC Youth League	Ronald Lamola	Deputy President		1		
31	COSATU	Policy document response			1		

32	Agri-sector Unity Forum	Ntombi Msimang	Chairwomen				1
33	South African Property Owner's Association (Sapao)	Neil Gopal	CEO				1
34	Sikhula Sonke	Sara Claasen	President				1
35	IEC	Advocate Pansy Tlakula	Chairman				1
36	Ministry of Economic Development	Ibrahim Patel	Minister			1	
37	Agang SA	Mamphela Ramphele	President			1	
38	Congress of the People	Willie Madisha	Member of Parliament			1	
39	Stellenbosch University	Nick Vick	Professor			1	
40	University of Cape Town	Francis Viruly	Property Economist				1
41	University of Cape Town	Nolundi Luwaya	Researcher				1
42	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Mmuso Riba	Chief Surveyor-general			2	

Appendix 4 - Business Day - Writers - September 2011 – August 2014

No//	Name	Position	2011	2012	2013	2014
1	Wyndham Hartley	Parliamentary editor	3	3	2	1
2	Linda Ensor	Political Correspondent	1		1	1
3	Hopewell Radebe	Land and Agriculture Editor	3	9	1	
4	Bezekela Phakathi	Political Staff		3		1
5	Carol Paton	Staff			4	
6	Michael Aliber	Opinion		1		
7	Paul Vecchiatto	Political Correspondent			2	4
8	Ernest Mabuza	Staff			1	
9	Doreen Atkinson	Opinion (Research, Free State University)				1
10	Nomalanga Mkhize	Opinion (Rhodes University Lecturer)				1
11	Alistair Anderson	Property Correspondent				1
12	Franny Robkin	Opinion				1
13	Willem Cronje	Opinion				1
14	Tshepo Diale	Opinion				1
15	John Kane- Berman	Opinion (CE of the South			1	

		African Institute of Race Relations)				
16	Dr Wilmont James	Opinion (DA Federal Chair)			1	
17	Setumo Stone	Political Correspondent				3
18	Sue Blaine	Development and Environment Editor			1	
19	Trudi Makhaya	Opinion (Economist)				1
20	Khulekani Magubane	Political Correspondent				3
21	Shannon Sherry	Agriculture and Food Correspondent			2	
22	Anthony Evans	Opinion (Grain Farmer)				1
23	Edward West	KwaZulu Natal Editor		1		
24	David Gleason	Opinion	1			

Appendix 5 - Mail and Guardian - Writers - September 2011 – August 2014

No//	**Name**	**Position**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**
1	Philip de Wet	Reporter		1		
2	Charles Molele	Reporter		1		
3	Kwanele Sosibo	Reporter		1		2

4	Prof. Ben Cousins	Opinion		1		
5	Lynley Donnelly	Opinion			2	2
6	Verashni Pillay	Reporter				1
7	Paul Vecchiatto	Reporter	1			
8	Katharine Child	Reporter	1			
9	Wendell Roelf	Reporters	1			
10	Faranaaz Parker	Reporters	1			
11	Manqoba Nxumalo	Reporters			1	
12	Andisiwe Makinana	Reporters				3
13	Miranda Raaf	Reporters				1
14	Staff Reporters	Reporters	1	1		
15	SAPA	Reporters		1		5

Appendix 6 - Mail and Guardian - Most common sources used - September 2011 – August 2014

No //	**Institution**	**Person**	**Position**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**
1	Freedom Front Plus	Dr Pieter Mulder	President (Also the		1		

			Agriculture Deputy Minister)				
2	Freedom Front Plus	Pieter Groeneward	Spokesperson				1
3	National Union of Metalworkers of South Africa	Irvin Jim	General Secretary		1		
4	Institute of Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (Plaas)	Ruth Hall	Professor	2		1	2
5	Institute of Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (Plaas)	Andries du Toit	Professor				1
6	Agricultural Business Chamber	John Purchase	C.E.O				1
7	African National Congress (ANC)	Moloto Mothapo	Parliamentary Spokesperson				1
8	African National Congress (ANC)	Jackson Mtembu	Member of Parliament				1
9	African National Congress (ANC)	Jerry Thebidi	Member of Parliament				1
10	African National	Gwede Mantashe	Secretary General				1

	Congress (ANC)						
11	African National Congress (ANC)	Julius Malema	Youth League President	1			
12	Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF)	Flyd Shivambu	Commissioner Responsible for Policy and Research				1
13	Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF)	Andile Mngxitama	MR				1
14	Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF)	Hlengiwe Maxom	MP				1
15	Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF)	Julius Malem	Commander in Chief				1
16	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Mtombeli Mxotwa	Spokesperson				1
17	Institute of Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (Plaas)	Ben Cousins	Professor		1		
18	University of Pretoria	Johann Kirstern	Professor, Agriculture Economics Head			1	
19	Stellenbosch University	Cherryl Walker	Professor	1			

20	South African Institute of Race Relations	Kerwin Lebone	Researcher			1	
21	Democratic Alliance	Lindiwe Mazibuko	Rural Development and Land Reform Shadow Minister	2			
22	Democratic Alliance	Annette Steyn	Rural Development and Land Reform Deputy Shadow Minister	1			
23	Democratic Alliance	Helen Zille	President				3
24	Democratic Alliance	Mpowele Swathe					1
25	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Gugile Nkwinti	Minister	5	3	3	7
26	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Mtombeli Mxotwa	Spokesperson	1			
27	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Lechesa Tsenoli	Deputy Minister		1		
28	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Nomfundo Gobodo	Chief Land Claims Commissioner				1

29	Government	Jacob Zuma	President	1		1	1
30	Human Sciences Research Council	Dr Peter Jacobs	Executive		1		
31	Government Documents	Green Paper on Land and Agrarian Reform		2			
32	Discussion Paper	Anika Claassens	Communal Land, Property Rights and Traditional Authority				1
33	Land and Agriculture Researcher	Stephen Greenberg	Researcher				1
34	Historian	Jeff Peires	Historian				1

Appendix 7 - SABC News Online - Writers - September 2011 – August 2014

No//	**Name**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**
1	SABC	4	11	5	8
2	SAPA		1		1
3	Mzandile Mbeje		1		
4	Busi Magudulela			1	
5	Lukhanyo Calata			1	

6	Chritelle du Toit			1	
7	Maluti Obseng/Mokete Radebe			1	
8	Mercedes Besent / Otsile Saku				1
9	Bulelani Philip				1
10	Tshepo Pagane				1

Appendix 8 - SABC News Online - Most common sources used - September 2011 – August 2014

No//	**Institution**	**Person**	**Position**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**
1	Governement	Jacob Zuma	President	2	3	1	1
2	Former President	F W De Klerk					1
3	United Democratic Party	Stanley Ntapane	Member			1	
4	Makholokoeng Villae	Qejwayo Moloi	Chief	1			
5	Barolong Boo Ratshidi	Kgosi Jeff Montshioa	Chief			1	
6	AgriSA	Dr Theo de Jager	Vice President		2		
7	Black Management Forum (BMF)	Unnamed		1			

8	Agric Wescape		Western Cape Agriculture business forum	1			
9	Agri North West (Agri NW)	Boeta du Toit	Chairperson			1	
10	Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF)	Julius Malema	Commander in Chief				1
11	Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF)	Mbuyiseni Ndlozi	Spokesperson				1
12	Azanian People's Organisation (AZAPO)	Gaontebale Nodoba	National Spokesperson		1		
13	Business News Johannersburg	John Motlogelwa		1			
14	African People's Convention (APC)	Themba Godi	Leader	1			
15	African National Congress	Baleka Mbete	National Chairperson		1		
16	African National Congress	Jackson Mthembu	ANC Spokesperson		1		
17	African National Congress	Zizi Kodwa	ANC Spokesperson				1
18	Northern Cape	Ali Diteme	Provincial Land	1			

	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform		Reform Spokesperson				
19	Western Cape Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Vuyani Nkasayi	Department's Provincial Head of Communications				1
20	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Mtombeli Mxotwa	Spokesperson	1			
21	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Lechesa Tsenoli	Deputy Minister		1	2	
22	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Mncebisi Skwatsha	Deputy Minister				1
23	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Avhashoni Magada	Communications Officer			1	
24	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Gugile Nkwinti	Minister		2	2	5
25	Northern Cape Land	Ruwayda					1

	Claims Commission	Baulackey					
26	Land Claims Commission	Nomfundo Gobondo	Chief Land Claims Commissioner				1
27	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Mdu Shabane	Director General			1	
28	City of Cape Town	J P Smith	Mayoral Committee Member for Safety and Security				1
29	City of Cape Town	Ian Neilson	Deputy Cape Town Mayor				1
30	Analysts	Nthambeleni Gabara					1
31	Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Ministry	Nelisiwe Sithole	Spokesperson	1			
32	Ministry of Public Works	Thulas Nxesi	Minister			1	
33	Government Policy Documents	Green Paper	Green Paper	1			
34	ANC Youth League	Ronald Lamola	Deputy President		1		
35	Council for the Advancement of South	Sipho Pityana	Chairperson		1		

	Africa's Constitution						
36	Zulu Kingdom	King Goodwill Zwelithini	King				1
37	Rural Development and Land Reform Portfolio Committee	Stone Sizani	Chairperson		1		
38	KwaGubeshe Community	Philip S'khakhane	Resident and claim applicant		1		
39	Vaal Area	Amos Njoro	Resident and beneficiary			1	
40	Xanthium Vegetable Farm	Oupa Morris	Farm Manager			1	
41	Agriculture Economist	Ernst Janowsky				1	
42	University of Cape Town	Hanri Mostert	Professor		1		

Appendix 9 - Daily Maverick - Writers - September 2011 – August 2014

No//	**Name**	**Position**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**
1	J Brooks Spector	Writer	1			
2	Carien Du Plessis	Columnist	1			
3	Ivo Vegster	Columnist	1		2	1

4	Osiame Molefe	Writer	1	1		
5	Greg Nicolson	Writer	1	1	4	2
6	Sipho Hlongwane	Writer	1	1		
7	Ranjeni Munusamy	Associate Editor		1		
8	Chriss Gibbons	Writer		1		
9	Pierre de Vos	opinion			1	
10	Rebecca Davis	Writer				2
11	Stephen Groots	Writer				1
12	Mmusi Maimane	Opinion				1
13	Johann Redelinghuys	Writer				1
14	Richard Poplak	Writer				1
15	Richard Spoor	Writer				1
16	Andris du Toit	Opinion				1

7.10. Daily Maverick - Most common sources used - September 2011 – August 2014

No //	**Institution**	**Person**	**Position**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**
1.	Department of Rural Development and Land	Sunday Ogunrombi	Head of Policy Research and	1			

	Reform		Legislation				
2	Democratic Alliance (DA)	Hellen Zille	President				2
3	Democratic Alliance (DA)	Zak Mbhele	Presidential Spokesperson				1
4	Democratic Alliance (DA)	Mmusi Maimane	National Spokesperson		1	1	1
5	Democratic Alliance (DA)	Athol Trollip	Spokesperson on rural development and land reform		1		
6	Democratic Alliance (DA)	Lindiwe Mazibuko	Parliamentary Leader			1	
7	Government	Jacob Zuma	President	2	2	1	
8	Free State Province	Ace Magashule	Premier			1	
9	AgriSA	Johannes Moller	President	1	2		
10	Institute for Liberty and Democracy	Hernando se Soto	Peruvian Economist and Institute President			1	
11	Freedom Front Plus	Dr Pieter Mulder	President (Also the Agriculture Deputy				1

			Minister)				
12	Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF) (Formerly ANC Youth Leage President)	Julius Malema	Commander in Chief (Formerly ANC Youth Leage President)	2	1	2	4
13	Institute of Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (Plaas)	Ben Cousins	Professor		2		
14	Stellenbosch University	Cherryl Walker	Professor		1		
15	African National Congress	Jackson Mthembu	ANC Spokesperson	1			
16	African National Congress	Gwede Mantashe	Secretary General				1
17	African National Congress	Mandla Mandela	Member of Parliament				1
18	National Union of Metal Workers of South	Irvin Jim	General Secretary		1		
19	Monitoring and Evaluation Ministry	Collins Chabane	Minister		1	2	2
20	Department of Rural Development and Land	Mtombeli Mxotwa	Spokesperson			1	

	Reform						
21	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Gugile Nkwinti	Minister	1			1
22	South African progressive Civic organisation (Sapco)	Stephen Katz	Deputy President		1		
23	AfriForum Youth	Charl Oberholzer	Chairmen		1		
24	Book: In the shadow of policy	Prof Ben Cousins and Paul Hebinck	Editors			1	
25	Book: Trajectories of Change in Northern Limpopo	Michael Aliber	Editor			1	
26	Free Market Foundation	Leon Louw	Executive Director			1	
27	Slate Magazine	John Gravois	Analyst			1	
28	Sunday Times	Mondli Makhanya	Columnist			1	
29	City Press	Carin du Plessis	Journalist				1
30	Sunday Independent	Shanti	Journalist				1

		Aboobaker					
31	Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU)	S'dumo Dlamini	President			1	
32	Communist Party	Blade Nzimande	General Secretary		1	1	
33	Government Policy Documents	Green Paper; constitution, bills	Green Paper	3	2	2	2
34	ANC Youth League	Ronald Lamola	Deputy President		1		
35	South African Institute of Race Relations	John Kane-Berman	CEO			1	
36	Inkhatha Freedom Party	Mangosutu Buthelezi	President				1
37	University of Western Cape	Lungisile Ntsebeza	Professor		1		
38	Wits University	Professor Jannie Roussouw	Head of the School of Economic and Business Sciences				1
39	South African Human Rights Research Council	Mpilo Pearl Sithole	Analyst		1		