

https://dspace.org/

The Role of Philanthropy in Women Development through Food Security

Makhubele, Thandi

2022

University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

https://hdl.handle.net/10539/41130

Makhubele, Thandi. (2021). The Role of Philanthropy in Women Development through Food Security [Master's dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg]. WireDSpace.

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

November 2021

Master of Management – Security (WSG)

Module: PADM 7213A – Research Report

Student Number: 584557 (Thandi Makhubele)

Supervisor: Prof Mzukisi Qobo

Title: The Role of Philanthropy in Women Development through Food Security

Declaration

I declare that this report is my own, unaided work. It is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Management in the field of Security in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other university.



Thandi W Makhubele

November 2021
Revised May 2022

Abstract

Food insecurity remains one of the critical issues for countries in the African continent. According to Pérez-Escamilla, (2017, p. 1), "food insecurity occurs when people do not have access to nutritious food and where food production is inadequate." Most of the world's rural population relies on agriculture for its livelihoods and to bolster their local economies (The World Bank Group, 2020). Small-scale farmers are the backbone of the agricultural sector in most rural areas. They (Small-scale farmers) provide access to food for vulnerable groups, including women and children (Misselhorn & Hendriks, 2017). Meanwhile women are the most affected by food insecurity, even though they are the main contributors to food production in most Sub-Saharan countries (Doss, 2018). Women in rural areas, in particular, rely on agriculture to fight food insecurity and to participate in local economies. In South Africa, small-scale women farmers ranked lowest in income accumulation, equal access to food production resources such as land and markets and financing (Sishuba, 2019). For this reason, government subsidies and philanthropic support are crucial for engaging women and assisting them with resources that can allow them to have equal access to land, resources, skills, and finances as their male counterparts.

This research investigated the intersection between and among philanthropy, food security and women-owned initiatives in the agricultural sector in Limpopo. The study focuses on small-scale women farmers in the Vhembe and Capricorn districts in Limpopo, the two regions that are popular for large scale farming in South Africa. The research sought to answer the question; 'what is the contribution of philanthropy to women development in the agriculture sector?' A qualitative research approach was employed to explore the role of philanthropic organisations in women development, particularly in the agricultural sector in Limpopo. Two questionnaires through an online survey were used as the main methods to collect primary data . Forty seven (47) respondents were targeted. Of these, twenty four (24) were small scale farmers while twenty three (23) were drawn from philanthropic organisations operating in South Africa. The feminist theory was adopted to discuss the findings. The main findings of the study are:

1. Most philanthropic foundations did not have gender specific funding in general and in particular few funded small scale women farmers in the Vhembe and Capricorn regions. There were exceptions however where a few foundations were conscious to fund women projects.

2. Philanthropic foundations provided other forms of support other than finances. These included networks, resource mobilisation strategies, training and equipment. Coincidentally these were the same needs that were identified by small scale women farmers as necessary.
3. Funding to small scale farmers in the last five years remained very low and as a result most small scale farmers ended up using their own capital to finance their operations. Their operational budgets were thus very small.
4. Most of the philanthropic foundations did not have a feminist policy to anchor their grant making. The exceptions were mainly international foundations or international organisations that operated in the philanthropy space.

Dedication

This research report is dedicated to my late father, Hlengani T Makhubele (Bra Khukza). You have always encouraged me to go to school. Thank you for laying a great foundation. This research report is also dedicated to my mother Tsakani Makhubele. Thank you for modelling education. You made it look easy. Now I know that you made it look easy because you wanted me to embrace education and persevere, no matter the circumstance. *A ku nga ri nyuku wa mbyana.*

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge my supervisor, Professor Mzukisi Qobo. Thank you for your patience and guidance through this journey. Your continuous feedback of numerous revisions helped to shape my report. I would like to also thank the Director at the Centre on African Philanthropy and Social Investments (CAPSI) and manager, Professor Bhekinkosi Moyo for the support and his inspiration.

Table of Contents

DECLARATION I
ABSTRACT II
DEDICATION IV
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS V
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS IX
CHAPTER 1 1
1. INTRODUCTION 1
1.1 INTRODUCTION 1
1.2 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY 5
1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT 9
1.4 RESEARCH PURPOSE 11
1.5 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES 11
1.6 RESEARCH QUESTION(S) 12
1.6.1 THE MAIN RESEARCH QUESTION FOR THIS STUDY IS: 12
1.6.2 THE SUB-QUESTION IS: 12
1.6.3 WHAT ARE THE GAPS IN FUNDING SUPPORT FOR SMALL SCALE WOMEN FARMERS? 12
CHAPTER 2 13
2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK 13
2.1 LITERATURE REVIEW 13
2.1.1 INTRODUCTION 13
2.1.2 OVERVIEW AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF THE STUDY: THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT 14
2.1.2.1 THE LIMPOPO FARMING TYPOLOGY 16
2.1.2.2 CAPRICORN DISTRICT 19
2.1.2.3 VHEMBE DISTRICT 20
2.1.2.4 PHILANTHROPIC ORGANISATIONS AND AGRICULTURE IN SOUTH AFRICA 21
2.1.2.5 SOUTH AFRICA POLICY AND STRATEGIES FOR THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR 24
2.1.3 FOOD (IN)SECURITY AND THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR 26
2.1.4 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND PHILANTHROPY THROUGH AGRICULTURE 29
2.1.5 FEMINIST PHILANTHROPY AND FOOD SECURITY 33
2.1.5.1 WOMEN AND DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA 36
2.2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK 40
2.2.1 INTRODUCTION 40
2.2.2 FEMINIST THEORY PERSPECTIVE (LIBERAL) 41
2.3 CHAPTER SUMMARY 43
CHAPTER 3 46

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 46
3.1 INTRODUCTION 46
3.1.1 RESEARCH APPROACH 46
3.1.2 RESEARCH TOOLS AND APPLICATIONS 48
3.1.3 SAMPLING PROCEDURE 49
3.1.3.1 PRIMARY DATA (SAMPLE A): PHILANTHROPIC ORGANISATIONS SAMPLE 49
3.1.3.2 PRIMARY DATA (SAMPLE B): SMALL-SCALE FARMERS' SAMPLE 50
3.1.4 PROCESS OF ANALYSIS 50
TABLE 2: SAMPLE A – CODES 53
TABLE 3: SAMPLE B – CODES 54
TABLE 4: SAMPLE A – THEMES 55
TABLE 5: SAMPLE B – THEMES 55
3.1.5 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY 56
3.1.6 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS 56
3.2 CHAPTER SUMMARY 57
4. RESEARCH FINDINGS 58
4.1 INTRODUCTION 58
4.2 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS 59
FIGURE 1: TYPES OF PHILANTHROPIC ORGANISATIONS 60
SEE ANNEXURE 1(B). 60
FIGURE 2: SMALL-SCALE FARMERS VS OTHER ORGANISATIONAL TYPES 60
4.3 RESEARCH FINDINGS 61
4.3.1 PHILANTHROPIC CONTRIBUTIONS TO FOOD SECURITY THROUGH WOMEN-LED INITIATIVES 61
FIGURE 4: PHILANTHROPIC SUPPORT TYPE VS GENDER FOCUS 62
FIGURE 5: PHILANTHROPY FOCUS ON SUPPORTING WOMEN-LED 63
TABLE 8: NUMBER OF ORGANISATIONS MOTIVATED BY FEMINIST APPROACH OR POLICY 64
FIGURE 6: MOTIVATIONS FOR SUPPORTING SMALL-SCALE WOMEN FARMERS IN LIMPOPO 64
FIGURE 7: AVERAGE AMOUNTS CONTRIBUTED BY PHILANTHROPY TO SMALL- SCALE WOMEN FARMERS IN THE PAST 5 YEARS (IN LIMPOPO) 65
FIGURE 8: NON-MONETARY SUPPORT FROM PHILANTHROPIC ORGANISATIONS 66
4.3.2 WAYS IN WHICH SMALL SCALE FARMERS ARE WORKING WITH PHILANTHROPIC ORGANISATIONS 66
FIGURE 9: TYPES OF SUPPORT RECEIVED BY SMALL-SCALE FARMERS FROM PHILANTHROPIC ORGANISATIONS 67
FIGURE 10: FINANCING MECHANISMS FOR SMALL-SCALE FARMERS IN LIMPOPO 68
FIGURE 11: SMALL-SCALE FARMERS' ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET 68
FIGURE: 12: SOURCES OF SUPPORT FOR SMALL-SCALE FARMERS. 69
FIGURE 13: WAYS IN WHICH SMALL-SCALE (WOMEN) FARMERS ACCESS SUPPORT FROM PHILANTHROPIC ORGANISATIONS. 70

FIGURE 15: PHILANTHROPIC ORGANISATIONS' INTENTION TO SUPPORT WOMEN DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES 71

TABLE 9: FACTORS LIMITING SMALL-SCALE (WOMEN) FARMERS PROGRESS 72

4.4 DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS 72

4.4.1 PHILANTHROPIC CONTRIBUTIONS TO FOOD SECURITY THROUGH WOMEN-LED INITIATIVES 73

4.4.2 WAYS IN WHICH SMALL SCALE FARMERS ARE WORKING WITH PHILANTHROPIC ORGANISATIONS AND GOVERNMENT. 77

4.5 CHAPTER SUMMARY 80

5. CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER AREAS FOR RESEARCH 82

5.1 INTRODUCTION 82

5.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS 82

5.3 FUTURE AREAS OF STUDY 85

5.3.1 RECOMMENDATIONS 86

REFERENCE: 87

ANNEXURE 1(A): SAMPLE A, PHILANTHROPIC ORGANISATIONS 105

ANNEXURE 1(B): SAMPLE B, SMALL-SCALE FARMERS 107

APPENDIX 1: SAMPLE A – PHILANTHROPIC ORGANISATIONS ..... A

APPENDIX 2: SAMPLE B – SMALL-SCALE FARMERS I

APPENDIX 3: ETHICS CLEARANCE LETTER ..... R

APPENDIX 4: SAMPLE A, PHILANTHROPIC ORGANIZATIONS ..... S

APPENDIX 5: SAMPLE B, SMALL-SCALE FARMERS ..... TT

List of Abbreviations

AUDA-NEPAD	African Union Development Agency - NEPAD
CARE	Cooperative For Assistance and Relief Everywhere
DGMT	
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
FANTA	Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GBV	Gender Based Violence
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
HFIAS	Household Food Insecurity Access Scale
HNWI	High Net Worth Individuals
IFSS	Integrated Food Security Strategy
IPASA	Independent Philanthropy Association of South Africa
LRAD	Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development Programme
MDG	Millennium development goals
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
SAB	South African Breweries
SAWIF	South African Women in Farming
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SIOC	
SOFA	State of Food and Agriculture
SSR	Sub-Saharan Region
StatsSA	Statistics South Africa
UN	United Nations

Chapter 1

1. Introduction

1.1 Introduction

Food insecurity remains one of the critical issues in Africa. Poverty and lack of access to nutritious food remain the key most causes of food insecurity for families and communities in the region (FAO, 2015). Food insecurity predominantly occurs in African countries where food demand exceeds the quantity and quality of food available to sustain the population (Hlophe-Ginindza & Mpandeli, 2020). According to the Global Food Security Index, South Africa is one of the most food-secure countries on the African continent (Mail and Guardian, 2018), yet, statistics show that many households remain food insecure (De Cock et al., 2013; Pérez-Escamilla, 2017). Even though women contribute significantly to food production in most Sub-Saharan countries, they remain by far the more affected group by food insecurity than men (Doss, 2018). Banik (2019) argued that food insecurity is associated with gender, income, and access to food production inequality. Poverty and food insecurity challenges can best be resolved through agriculture. Most rural communities in sub-Saharan Africa rely on small-scale farming to fight hunger and improve their local economies (Hlophe-Ginindza & Mpandeli, 2020). Rametsteiner (2016) stated that transforming agriculture for sustainable development was crucial. Furthermore, government institutions and other agencies need to rethink agriculture to include small-scale farming in order to end hunger and reduce poverty. There is also a need for collaborations across government institutions and the private sector through policy coherence to address food security sustainability (Rametsteiner, 2016)

Small-scale women farmers play a crucial role in rural economic development. According to the United Nations report on gender and agriculture, women farmers produce up to 80 per cent of food for households in sub-Saharan Africa (Ben-Ari, 2014). However, women in the agricultural and food production sector remain powerless and vulnerable to cultural and unfair labour practices, particularly in rural areas. Women face barriers to access and availability on all dimensions of food security (Oxfam, 2019). Ben-Ari (2014) further stated that disparities that women face in agriculture are unsettling. Male farmers remain in key farm management positions, while women farmers hold subservient roles. There is need to remove obstacles that prevent women from participating fully in the agricultural and food production sector. It is also important to support women in small-scale farming so that they can participate fully in the

production through financing schemes (Misselhorn & Hendriks, 2017; Rusare & Tsegay, 2014). These schemes include government interventions and financial strategies from philanthropic organisations to tackle food insecurity issues in South Africa (Hendriks, 2014). Philanthropic organisations are important given their role in marshalling resources that support innovations and the much-needed collaboration in the sector (Sulek, 2010, p. 199).

According to human security scholars, the concept of food security is nested under the paradigm of human security, which draws a humanistic perspective and the adoption of policies to promote agricultural development to combat food insecurity in the Sub-Saharan Region (SSR) (UN Food and Agriculture Organization, 2016). The main aim of the development initiatives is to renew the interest of agriculture in the development agenda and transform poor small-scale farming to thrive and alter marginalised communities (Rajaonarison, 2014). Support from governments for small-scale farmers has taken centre stage in South Africa, according to Thamaga-Chitja and Morojele (2014). The South African government has also implemented the 'New Growth Plan initiative' to position agriculture and support small-scale farmers in development areas. These efforts from the government are meant to position small-scale farmers where they can fight food insecurity and participate in the economy. Current challenges faced by small-scale farmers in South Africa ranges from access to markets, institutional dynamics related to the farmers' socio-economic conditions, poverty and inequality, and the historical marginalisation of small-scale women farmers in the country, Thamaga-Chitja and Morojele (2014) argued. According to the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), small-scale farmers produce about 80 per cent of the developing world's food, this is fundamental to fighting food insecurity (Saarinen, 2020; SEEPNetwork, n.d.).

Women are perceived to be the backbone of the rural economy. Empowering them (women) in the food security sector is crucial. This is important given that women contribute over 40 per cent to the agricultural workforce in developing countries, and their involvement has resulted in noteworthy developments in rural businesses (Committee in World Food Security, 2016). FOA further states that gender is also key to food insecurity because women are disproportionally dis-empowered through current processes and politics of food production, consumption, and distribution. SOFA Team and Doss (2011) argued that agriculture is critical for growing rural economy and reducing poverty reduction. Women often drive the agricultural workforce, and women's contribution and participation in agriculture are noteworthy. Women's contribution to agriculture and rural economy amounts to roughly 43 per cent on a global scale.

However, in sub-Saharan Africa, the general trend is that women are underpaid and overlooked for skilled work. Their contribution to agriculture is reduced to menial work such as tending animals, preparing food for other labourers, producing crops, and fetching water. In contrast, men take up roles in management, skilled labour, and land ownership. The State of Food and Agriculture team and Doss (2011) demonstrated that constraints imposed on women in the agricultural sector in many developing countries contribute to the lack of development for the rural economy and underperformance in the sector. As such, "millions of women are going hungry because of gender inequality" (SBS Food, 2018, p. 1).

Women farmers and entrepreneurs in the agricultural sector also face severe constrictions more than men. Men quickly access resources for food production (SOFA Team & Doss, 2011). Available data shows that almost 80 per cent of economically active women in developing countries spend their working hours producing food through agriculture. As a result, there is a need for transformative approaches that seek to transform gender roles and promote gender-equitable relationships between men and women. Gender equality is about men and women having equal participation in decision-making; having the same access and control over productive resources, services and technologies; having equal benefits from project results and the same opportunities to access decent employment and livelihood systems (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations & CARE Inc, 2019).

Gender transformative approaches such as the feminist perspective seek to promote gender equality by encouraging equal participation for both men and women. Feminist theory focuses on deconstructing gender norms by highlighting the politics of gender to challenge women's marginalisation and seek to bridge inequality gaps between men and women created by social, cultural, and political norms and beliefs (Kiguwa, 2019). Tsheola (2012) noted that the feminist perspective supports women's participation in development processes by advocating for women's liberation from traditional roles in the labour market. The feminist perspective further infers that men and women should both have the same access, control and equal benefits over productive resources and the same access to opportunities (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations & CARE Inc, 2019). Feminisation processes and interventions that empower and allow women access to critical resources for their livelihoods are crucial for sustainable rural development, Tsheola (2012) concluded. Government institutions and other private organisations need to intervene and assist struggling small-scale women farmers to combat food insecurity. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) Agenda 2030 presented

a feminist opportunity for all states to implement and provide policies aimed at protecting women, enhancing their participation, providing universal access to quality service and social infrastructure, diversification of policies and providing funding opportunities (Struckmann, 2018). Whether political, economic, or social, power inequalities contribute to unequal access to productive resources, discriminatory norms (cultural), and laws. Inequities that hinder women's decision-making participation need to be addressed to align with new SDGs development plans, especially in South Africa (Struckmann, 2018). According to Hendriks (2014), government interventions and financial strategies from philanthropic organisations are critical in tackling food insecurity issues in South Africa. Ideally, government interventions should be sufficient and inclusive to every individual as outlined in section 27 of the South Africa Constitution, which obligates the state to take responsible legislative measures suitable for a progressive realisation of sufficient food, water, and social security for all individuals. However, this is not the case, and hence the need for philanthropic interventions.

This study examines the intersection between philanthropy, food security and women-owned enterprises in the agricultural sector in Limpopo. The study focuses on small-scale women farmers in the Vhembe and Capricorn districts in Limpopo. The study assesses the role of philanthropic organisations in food security, particularly how philanthropy supports women development in the agriculture sector in the Limpopo province. A qualitative research approach was employed to explore the role of philanthropic organisations in women development. The study uses the conceptual lenses of security, development, and the feminist (liberal) theory to provide the rationale for examining the research question.

The report is structured as follows: the first chapter focuses on the context and the background of the study. It also addresses the research problem, research statement, research purpose, research objectives and research questions. Chapter two (2) examines the literature in the South African context. This will include government policies and strategies, background information on Limpopo and an overview of Capricorn and Vhembe district, zooming into small-scale women farmers. The chapter will further focus specifically on food security in the agricultural sector, small-scale women farmers, and the role of philanthropic organisations. The second section of the chapter discusses the theoretical framework. Chapter three (3) discusses the research methodology considerations for identifying, selecting, processing, and analysing information collected for the study and discusses study limitations and ethical considerations.

Chapter four (4) presents research results and the general analysis of the research study. The final chapter five (5) consists of conclusions and further areas for research.

1.2 Background of the Study

> *"Food security is related to all of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Improved food security governance based on sound, equitable, and sustainable food systems that benefit from current information and sustainable and equitable agricultural technologies is essential for countries to meet the SDGs."* (Pérez-Escamilla, 2017, p. 1)

Food security is always crucial for realising human security for all people, especially for vulnerable groups. The idea of linking human security and food security relates to the full realisation of human rights, prescribing that every person should always have physical and economic access to adequate and nutritious food (Rajaonarison, 2014).

According to Pérez-Escamilla, (2017, p. 1) "food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food which meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life". The FAO defines *food security* as the presence of physical, economic, and social assessments to nutritious, safe and sufficient food to all people at all times (Committee in World Food Security, 2016). The United Nations (UN) Food, FAO and the Trust Fund for Human Security defined *Human Security* as "the right of all people to live in freedom and dignity, free from poverty and despair", that "all individuals, in particularly vulnerable people, are entitled to freedom from fear and freedom from want, with an equal opportunity to enjoy all their rights and fully develop their human potential" (FAO & UN Trust Fund for Human Security, 2016, p. 1).

The human security approach seeks to promote people's livelihoods and dignities (FAO & UN Trust Fund for Human Security, 2016). Achieving food security is vital. Food security is achieved through agriculture by increasing food production, increasing support from governments and private donors, including favourable conditions inclusive to all (OECD, 2012).

FAO and UN Trust Fund for Human Security (2016) further stated that agriculture remains a primary livelihood source for the world's rural population. Over 80 per cent of the world's rural population relies on agriculture that small-scale farmers provide to get access to food. (Pérez-Escamilla, 2017) further stated that food insecurity occurs when people do not have access to

nutritious food and where food production is inadequate". Food insecurity is also interlinked with political, economic, social and health insecurities that negatively affect physical, social, cognitive, and emotional development. Social injustice, social exclusion, wealth inequality, cultural policies, and politics are some of the most significant barriers to food security for vulnerable groups (FAO & UN Trust Fund for Human Security, 2016; Pérez-Escamilla, 2017). Pérez-Escamilla (2017) further emphasises that unsustainable agriculture, poor gender equality policies, empowerment opportunities for women, and social and environmental challenges are major social disruptors that cause food insecurity.

Over 1.8 billion cases of people who are affected by food insecurity are reported worldwide (Doss, 2018). Women and children remain the most vulnerable. Although women in most Sub-Saharan countries contribute over 90 per cent to food production, they are the most affected by food insecurity (Doss, 2018). Banik (2019) argued that food insecurity is linked to gender, income, and access to food production inequality. Women are more than two times likely to face these challenges and constraints along with disparities of income and limited access to (food) production resources compared to males (Oxfam, 2019). Additionally, women in agriculture and food security are powerless and vulnerable to cultural and unfair labour practices, particularly in rural settings. Thus, it is essential to remove obstacles that prevent women from participating fully in the sector. Misselhorn and Hendriks (2017) and Rusare and Tsegay (2014) argued for an urgent need to support women's full participation in small-scale farming, mainly production and financing.

South Africa is among the largest economies on the African continent. Over 2 million small-scale farmers in the agricultural sector contribute to over $2 billion of the South Africa GDP. Although South Africa has a sophisticated agricultural sector, approximately 11 per cent of the population suffered from hunger in 2018. Significant challenges were caused by poor governance in the agricultural value chain, predominantly for small-scale farmers (African Development Bank, 2021). Historically, South Africans living in rural areas have engaged in agricultural production and running small and micro-enterprises. A substantial portion of rural South Africans' livelihoods contributions is dominated by land-based activities such as crop farming (Tsheola, 2012).

The Limpopo province is known as the "*country's breadbasket* and one of South Africa's most important agricultural regions as a significant producer of livestock, fruit and vegetables" (Molele, 2016, p. 1). The Limpopo province is also known for its rich and diverse cultural

heritage, agriculture, and incredible wildlife. Furthermore, Limpopo produces over 50 per cent of all vegetables, fruits, maize and other fresh produce for the country (Limpopo Info, 2016; Molele, 2016; Mzolo, 2018). Limpopo also has an increased record of social development growth in the agriculture, mining, and tourism sectors. It has an abundance of agricultural resources. However, the province is characterised by rural poverty, especially in the most underdeveloped parts of the province (Musyoki, 2011). The rural province faces numerous challenges in the agricultural sector. More than 50 per cent of rural households were declared food insecure (De Cock et al., 2013) because of the decreasing agricultural activities (Tsheola, 2012). Mpandeli and Maponya (2014) inferred that constraints and challenges affecting small-scale farmers in the province included finance, land ownership, and market access.

In addition to constraints that affect small-scale farmers, women in agricultural development face further compounded socio-cultural and economic barriers. They continue to face challenges accessing finance, land, training, and information (International Development Research Centre, 2020). Struckmann (2018) argued that these challenges continue in South Africa because of persisting gender inequality and women's rights abuses. Further, the 2019 Rural and Agricultural Finance State of the Sector report outlined that small-scale women farmers' progression in the sector was constrained by harmful traditional social norms and limited financial resources (International Development Research Centre, 2020). Women in the agricultural sector continue to face challenges caused by persisting gender inequalities—access to recourses such as financial assistance, markers, land, and productive recourses. Hence there is a need for philanthropic organisations and other institutions (private and governmental) to play a role development initiative for women development.

Philanthropic organisations consider philanthropy as synonymous with "*goodness and affecting the wealth of men*" (Sulek, 2010, p.195). Hence, there is an expectation for philanthropic organisations to support wherever there is a need. In African terms, philanthropy is associated with the notion of Ubuntu, which translates to '*I am because of you*' (Murisa & Trust Africa, 2015). Additionally, philanthropy in the African context applies to giving in solidarity for the well-being of others (Murisa & Trust Africa, 2015). In contrast, *modern philanthropy* is defined as the love of humankind or good nature (Sulek, 2010). The definition further expanded in the 19th century to include charity donations to alleviate the suffering of the poor. During this time, philanthropists such as Frederick Gates focused on giving to resolve previously challenging social problems. While Andrew Carnegie emphasised self-reliance

among his beneficiaries (Sulek, 2010), most of Carnegie's philanthropic initiatives occurred in African countries with severe under-development and socio-economic deprivation. Philanthropic foundations are understood as financial institutions separate from governments and enjoy a meaningful degree of autonomy (Sulek, 2010) further stated.

Under the SDG agenda 2030, philanthropic organisations are encouraged to partner with government institutions to plan and implement sustainable development goals. This partnership will also provide a common framework to address social ills, including social, economic and environmental challenges (Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors, 2019). Most philanthropic foundations are known to adopt policies that work with underdeveloped and disadvantaged communities. Their efforts are instrumental in promoting radial policy change, empowering marginalised groups and funding projects for development, mainly small-scale local projects. The Ford Foundation is one example of a philanthropic foundation that has influenced public policy, including focusing on the political marginalisation of women since the 1950s (Mottiar, 2015). Efforts from philanthropic organisations are also critical because of philanthropy's role in providing financial and other resources that support innovations and much-needed collaborations. *Philanthropy* is defined as an act of "goodwill to fellowmen and active efforts to promote human welfare, such as charitable gifts, and organisations supported by or distributing such philanthropic funds" (Sulek, 2010, p. 199). Wong et al. (2016) define philanthropy as generous behaviour in the form of charity. Contributing to this context involves giving by wealthy residents or philanthropists' money, assets, and volunteering time to the beneficiaries or the needy. Philanthropic organisations have in the past actively supported women-led initiatives as part of their commitment to development and gender equality by creating a space for education and skills development. Philanthropy is increasingly perceived as an alternative source of development finance worldwide, especially for rural development in developing countries. Initiatives that promote gender equality as well as empower women have also gained traction among philanthropic organisations. These initiatives gained more traction after the agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development Goals, in particular the SDGs on gender equality and women's empowerment that were adopted in 2015 (OECD, 2021).

Sustainable Development Goal 17 calls for philanthropic institutions to offer partnerships and resources to resolve issues such as gender inequality. Further, philanthropic institutions have a vital role given their significant resources that allow them to take more risks, fund new projects and offer new solutions than other stakeholders such as government institutions (Rockefeller

Philanthropy Advisors, 2019). According to Ogden, Prasad, and Thomson (2018), most funders target education, health, environmental issues and gender equality under the banner of SDGs. Donors such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and Susan Thompson Buffett Foundation have donated over 3 billion dollars towards gender equality programs in the past few years. Although known for its commitments to poverty reduction programs, the Ford Foundation has also contributed significantly to gender equality. It has mainly worked with policy dialogues and funding global advocacy work (Ogden et al., 2018).

The Development Centre of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development concluded that gender-based giving for gender equality rose among philanthropists. The OECD survey in 2018 for Private Philanthropy for Development showed that (philanthropic) foundations provided a total of over $3 billion to support gender equality in developing countries. South Africa, Kenya, Uganda, Nigeria, and Ethiopia were among the top five African countries that received philanthropists' gender-related giving. Gender-based giving is mainly concentrated in the health sector and reproductive health. Gender-based giving in the agriculture sector was very limited, recording only at 3 per cent at the time of the survey time (OECD netFWD, 2019). Women are disadvantaged when it comes to food security and agriculture. This is true of small-scale women farmers. At the same time, women are the backbone of food production through their provision of the agricultural labour force. Government interventions are not adequate, creating a gap that is then filled by philanthropy. Some of the features of philanthropy are that it is flexible, risk-taking, and adaptable. Philanthropy has a role to play in assisting women in development, yet philanthropic contributions to gender are less promising, and very little goes to women in agriculture.

1.3 Problem statement

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and its Social Institutions and Gender Index claimed, “South Africa is making significant strides in improving gender equality” (OECD, 2021, p. 32). However, restricted access to productive and financial resources and discriminative norms and practices continue to mitigate women’s societal barriers (OECD, 2021). Women’s participation in rural labour markers are represented by unpaid work and being paid less than men for the same work (SOFA Team & Doss, 2011). Additionally, women are historically subject to social and economic insecurity emerging from decades of social, political, economic inequality and gender disparities. As stated above, small-scale women farmers contribute up to 40 per cent of the agriculture workforce in South Africa.

However, they rank lowest in income accumulation, equal access to food production resources, land, markets, and financing (SOFA Team & Doss, 2011).

While high inequality and food insecurity levels remain a significant challenge for rural areas in South Africa, women remain the most affected (Denison et al., 2016). Despite efforts made by the feminist community and other human rights groups, agriculture continues to be male-dominated. Patriarchy disproportionately excludes women from farming resources such as land, farming equipment and financial resources. According to SOFA Team & Doss (2011), government institutions and philanthropic organisations have resources to empower women and strengthen their initiatives to achieve food security and economic development goals. Miranda (2019) argues that most funders have acknowledged that not enough resources are directed to women's organisations. The result is the high level of food insecurity among women due to unequal resources across different sectors (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations & CARE Inc, 2019; OECD, 2021). Table 1 illustrate the distribution of philanthropic funds across different sectors.

Table 1: Sector allocation of philanthropy funding, 2013-18 (OECD, 2021)

Sector	**USD millions**
Education	65
Health and reproductive health	16
Government and civil society	14
Multisector	10
Other social infrastructure	5
Total classified SIGI 2013-18	112

The OECD study mentioned above found inadequate research material and data in philanthropy and its contribution to small-scale women farmers, particularly in South Africa. While women and other activists have attempted to solve women's challenges in the agriculture sector with little success, literature suggests that philanthropy and government can change the status quo if they adopted a feminist analytical framework. The study explored philanthropy's role in supporting women led initiatives in the agricultural sector. It is essential to explore the significant contribution by philanthropists towards improving the conditions of small-scale women farmers in South Africa. This exploration will help fast-track women development initiatives through food security measures within the agriculture space, especially in rural areas.

1.4 Research purpose

This research aims to assess the role of philanthropic organisations and their influence on women development through food security in rural areas. Examining the significance of contributions and support for small-scale women farmers in Limpopo from philanthropic organisations is crucial. The study focuses on philanthropic development initiatives since the inception of the SDGs in 2015 to date. It studies women in the agriculture sector in the Vhembe and Capricorn districts in Limpopo. The study will specifically look at women who own and or manage farms and women who are part of the farming cooperatives.

According to the United Nations' Issue Note on Economic Empowerment, "Economic empowerment of women is widely seen as an effective mechanism to help break the cycle of discrimination and vulnerability" (United Nations, 2020, p. 2). Therefore, it is vital to strengthen rural women's participation and access to (agricultural) production, economic and financial recourses. It is also essential to assess the challenges faced by these women in terms of government support, hence the call for external actors to get involved. Other forms of participation can be in the form of building public and private partnerships. Philanthropic organisations are thus encouraged to support women's initiatives and provide assistance for strategies that support women empowerment (The Economic and Social Council, 2010).

1.5 Research Objectives

Research objectives in qualitative research generally refer to the purpose of the research. Formulating objectives is vital for the study because objectives determine the research's scope and comprehensive focus (Denscombe, 2012). Hodges and Thomas (2010) argue that research objectives give specific and precise details of the research topic linked to the study's main purpose.

The following research objectives are explored in the study:

- **Objective 1:** exploring how philanthropic organisations support small-scale female farmers and increase their visibility in Capricorn and Vhembe district in Limpopo.
- **Objective 2:** examining whether small-scale farmers in Capricorn and Vhembe districts in Limpopo have access to philanthropic support. The support includes

monetary assistance, skills training and access to equipment, agricultural land, information and access to markets.

- **Objective 3:** examining the gaps in funding support for small-scale women farmers from philanthropic organisations.

1.6 Research Question(s)

Qualitative research questions seek to uncover the perspectives and experiences of those involved in the study. Clearly stated questions thus give direction for the study (Agee, 2009).

1.6.1 The main research question for this study is:

How is philanthropy contributing to food security in the rural agriculture sector, mainly through supporting women-led initiatives?

1.6.2 The sub-question is:

In what way can small-scale women farmers work with philanthropic organisations to improve their farming enterprises?

1.6.3 What are the gaps in funding support for small scale women farmers?

Chapter 2

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.1 Literature Review

2.1.1 Introduction

The purpose of a literature review is to examine literature that covers the themes for the study. According to Allen (2017), a literature review aims to construct arguments that generate particular research questions. This section discusses food (in)security in a South African context as well global context to identify gaps in the literature concerning how governments institutions in general and philanthropic organisations in particular directly influence food security through women's involvement in agricultural development. The chapter further discusses South Africa's agriculture sector policies, programmes, and strategies developed to assist previously disadvantaged farmers to give an overview of the Limpopo agricultural sector and looks sharply into small-scale farmers in the Capricorn and Vhembe districts. The literature further focuses on the dynamics of food security in Limpopo province, particularly challenges facing women in small-scale farming.

Under the nexus of food security and human security, Rajaonarison (2014) argued that the concept of food security is encapsulated under the human security paradigm. He further argued that the concept is new and is shaping the history of agricultural development in Sub-Saharan Africa in fighting food insecurity in the region. For De Boeck, Jacxsens and Uyttendaele, challenges in food safety ought to be accomplished through food security. Achieving food security includes all points of food production, food availability and access to safe and nutritious food (De Boeck et a., 2016). According to the Global Food Security Index, food security can be further archived by improving access to nutritious food and reduced dependency on food imports (The Economist Intelligence Unit, 2021). The core themes discussed in this session are food (in)security and the agricultural sector, sustainable development, philanthropic foundations, feminist approaches and food security. The following sub-section discusses the notion of food insecurity in agriculture.

2.1.2 Overview and Historical Context of the Study: the South African Context

The agricultural sector plays a significant role in economic development, especially in developing countries. The agricultural sector's strategic role is to further improve food availability and access to all people at all times to achieve food security and poverty reduction (Pawlak & Kołodziejczak, 2020). The world's rural population relies on agriculture for their primary livelihood. Agriculture is vital and can help raise income and improve food security for over 80 per cent of the world's poor who live in rural areas (The World Bank Group, 2020). The agricultural sector in South Africa includes enterprises engaged in crop cultivation, fisheries, forestry, growing fruit and vegetables, and raising animals (UN Food and Agriculture Organization, 2016). According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the agricultural sector is also the backbone of the rural economy. The sector is driven mainly by small-scale farmers (Rapsomanikis, 2015).

While small-scale farmers rely predominantly on family labour, they account for almost half of the world's small farms and produce a significant amount of their food supply (Ricciardi et al., 2018). The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations further reiterates that "the world's smallholder farmers produce around a third of the world's food, nine out of 10 of the world's 570 million farms were family farms and produced around 80 per cent of the world's food" (FAO, 2021, p. 1). Additionally, most small-scale farmers, roughly 475 million, are in sub-Saharan Africa, Europe, South Asia, and the United States. Small-scale farmers allocate a large portion of their land to the production of food crops. Thus, small-scale farmers play a vital role in food security, environmental sustainability and conservation (Sustainable Food Production and Food Security, 2020).

The Sustainable Food Production and Food Security (2020) stated that small-scale women farmers in underdeveloped and developing countries play a significant role. Although women own fewer assets such as land, equal livestock, access to resources and capital, small-scale women farmers provide over 40 per cent of agricultural labour in developing countries (The World Bank, 2017). Women in Sub-Saharan Africa provide substantial labour on small-scale farms than men. Most women working in small scale farms engage in the production of maize, tending to small animals and cultivating crops (Rapsomanikis, 2015). Women in agriculture significantly contribute to food security and nutrition at the household and community level. Therefore, governments and financial institutions need to support and create programs that

encourage women to invest in the agricultural sector, particularly women in small-scale farming (The World Bank, 2016).

South Africa has a vast community of scale-scale farmers. Women farmers account for one-third of the country's farmers' labour, according to the 2018 Statistics South Africa report (Solidaridad Network, 2019). According to World Wide Fund for Nature, there are over 2 million small-scale farmers in South Africa. Rural small-scale farmers rely predominantly on available agricultural land for domestic trade and supplement food for their households (WWF, 2017). South Africa is said to be a food secure country at the national level. However, statistics suggest that many households within the county are food insecure, and almost 6 million South Africans experience hunger (Davida et al., 2018; Statistics South Africa, 2019a). By the end of 2017, Statistics South Africa reported that almost 20 per cent of households had inadequate access to food (Statistics South Africa, 2019a).

The primary cause of individual and household food insecurity for South Africans is inadequate access to food (Rusare & Tsegay, 2014). Hence, individuals and households in rural communities need to get involved in agricultural activities to reduce vulnerability to hunger and food insecurity. Notwithstanding challenges facing many South African households, there is noteworthy progress toward fighting food insecurity and hunger (Statistics South Africa, 2019a). The South African agricultural sector contributes significantly to household food security (International Trade Administration, 2021). In 2019, statistics South Africa reported that Limpopo and Gauteng had the highest number of households with adequate access to food (Statistics South Africa, 2019a). South Africa's agricultural sector is one of the world's most diverse sectors. The country's agricultural sector produces all major grains, livestock production and other food production. According to the International Trade Administration, the commercial farming sector is the backbone of the country's agricultural economy (International Trade Administration, 2021). Moreover, the agricultural sector exports its agricultural produce. Thus, South Africa's total agriculture exports were valued at $10.2 billion in the 2020 financial year, about 10 per cent of South Africa's total exports earnings (International Trade Administration, 2021).

2.1.2.1 The Limpopo Farming Typology

Since 1994, the Limpopo Province, formally known as the Northern Province under the apartheid government, continues to experience high poverty levels, poor infrastructure, and weak institutions (Hall, Shirinda, Wisborg, Zamchiya, 2013). The Limpopo province is one of South Africa's regions that contribute about 7.6 per cent to national agriculture (Scholtz, 2020). Limpopo is in the North, and it shares international borders across the Limpopo River with Zimbabwe, Mozambique, and Botswana. The province is known as the 'Africa's Eden' or South Africa 'Bread and Fruit Basket due to its green landscapes and rich agricultural land. There are five districts in the province, namely, Capricorn, Sekhukhune, Mopani, Vhembe and Waterberg (Ayisi, MacLeod, Mcdonald, et al., 2011). Limpopo province covers a land area of about 12.4 million hectares, with a population of over five million. It is also the only province in South Africa with more than two ethnic groups dwelling together. The most dominant ethnic groups are the BaPedi, MaTsonga and VhaVhenda (SAHO, 2021). According to Statistics South Africa (StatsSA), approximately 41 per cent of people are involved in agricultural production in one form or the other. The Limpopo province has the highest number of households that are involved in agriculture nationwide. (Olofsson, 2020).

Although the province is one of the poorest regions in the country, (Masiwa (2021) there are claims that the province is the most food-secure province in South Africa. What makes the poor province more food secure than other provinces is that most people in the rural communities take advantage of the available fertile land, especially those who are not formally employed (Masiwa, 2021). The Limpopo province is one of the most affluent agricultural areas in South Africa, producing over 60 per cent of fruit, vegetables, tea, maise meal, wheat, and livestock production. Limpopo agriculture produces 60 per cent of mangoes, avocadoes and tomatoes, and over 25 per cent of bananas, tea, oranges and citrus for South Africa (Ayisi et al., 2011; Limpopo Info, 2016; Vuk'uzenzele, 2007).

The Limpopo province also hosts one of the largest producers of tomatoes in the world. ZZ2 supplies 40 per cent of South Africa's tomatoes (Limpopo Info, 2016; Vuk'uzenzele, 2007). Both commercial and small-scale enterprises characterise agricultural activities in the province. Since the dawn of democracy in 1994, the democratic government centres its growth and development strategies on promoting agriculture, tourism and mining in the province (Ayisi et al., 2011). The province's agricultural sector offers significant jobs, income and export opportunities to poverty and dependence while enhancing food security for the region. More

than 85 per cent of the population in Limpopo is categorised as rural, and agriculture in this province accounts for 15 per cent of the provincial Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Thus, agriculture, particularly at the domestic level, plays a significant role in the (rural) economic growth and development of the province (Molele, 2016).

A significant number of agricultural activities in the province are practised by almost 300,000 small-scale farmers, mainly in their former homelands. In the past ten years, farmers in this area were known to practise mixed farming, including keeping livestock, growing crops, and producing fresh fruits and vegetables (Ayisi et al., 2011; Hall et al., 2013). Current data shows that farmers in some of the biggest farming areas, such as Levubu, Tshakhuma, Tshiomba and Rabali, still practice mixed farming. Seventy per cent of farmers in this area produce subtropical and tropical crops, while the rest focus on the production of livestock (Maponya, 2021). Notably, the Limpopo province hosts the highest number of households involved in agriculture in the country, and small-scale farmers account for the majority of agricultural production in the province (Olofsson, 2020).

Photo: small-scale farmers selling fresh produce in the Tshakhuma marker. Photo by Ndalomo




Photo credit: @mulepest – (*Instagram)*

While Limpopo boasts of a thriving agricultural sector, most informal or small-scale farmers do not have farming background knowledge or necessary skills to operate a successful farming enterprise (Ayisi et al., 2011). The province's agricultural sector is also affected by frequent droughts, poor soil fertility, and climate change, which interrupts farming progress, particularly for small-scale farmers who do not have the resources to continue working during drought periods (Molele, 2016). Small-scale farmers continue to use low levels of production technology which leads to little marketable surplus. Some of the challenges facing small-scale farmers in Limpopo are linked to lack of access to finances, ownership of land and assets, access to marketing information and market access (Mpandeli & Maponya, 2014). Women farmers tend to face more challenges compared to men. In 2017, the World Bank reported that only a handful of women farmers own assets such as land and livestock. Women also have less access to seeds, financial services, and skills training than men (The World Bank, 2017). As discussed in the next chapters, this is one of the key findings of this study.

Women in agriculture play a vital role in the province's economic development, specifically in the rural areas of the province. According to Statistics South Africa, women constitute 80 per cent of small-scale farmers in the province (Ayisi et al., 2011; Limpopo Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2020). Women play multiple roles in the agricultural sector. Women farmers contribute generously to food production at the household level and for commercial purposes (E. n. Raidimi, 2014). Murugani and Thamaga-Chitja (2019) argue that women also turn to agriculture to produce enough food to trade and support their households. Sihlobo (2018) further affirmed that not only do small-scale women farmers contribute substantially to agricultural production, women's income also makes a significant impact on food security (Sihlobo, 2018). Sadiki (2021) contends that the government, in collaboration with the agricultural sector, are working together to support and address challenges facing small-scale women in the farming industry.

Photo: Map of Limpopo with municipalities and districts - Limpopo Map of South Africa by Ofomaps



2.1.2.2 Capricorn District

The Capricorn District covers up to 21.705 square kilometres of the Limpopo province. It consists of five municipalities, including the Capital of Limpopo, Polokwane (Chauke & Oluwatayo, 2019). Capricorn agricultural sector accounts for 2.8 per cent of the total district economy. The district is home to more than 100 agriculture development projects, focusing on poultry, vegetable production and dairy farming (Capricorn District Municipality, 2014). Capricorn district municipality had the highest number of farms in 2017.

The Capricorn district is by far the biggest producer of potatoes in South Africa. It was reported to have produced over 70 per cent of potatoes in 2017, followed by its production of onions and cattle sales at 55.4 per cent of the whole province (Statistics South Africa, 2020). Additionally, Capricorn tomatoes and egg production are considerably high. The district is also home to two of the largest farms in South Africa. The Zebediela Citrus Estate supplies the local market and exports to the international market in the Lepelle-Nkumpi municipality (The South African Government, n.d.), while The ZZ2 farm mainly produces tomatoes and grows mangoes, avocados, onions, and other fruits and vegetables (ZZ2, n.d.). According to the ZZ2 information page, "the ZZ2 brand is a well-known icon in South Africa with a proud history backed by a great customer value offering and superior economic value for all our stakeholders" (ZZ2, n.d.,p1). Small-scale farmers in Limpopo are beneficiaries of the Zebediela farm through the South African government land restitution programme (Nkombisa, 2020).

2.1.2.3 Vhembe District

The Vhembe district municipality is in the far North of the Limpopo province, next to the Zimbabwe border, connecting via the Limpopo River (Dagada et al., 2002). Vhembe agriculture is one of the main drivers of the province's economy. According to studies done in the region, about 90 per cent of the Vhembe rural community rely on agriculture to generate income and sustain their livelihoods (Maponya, 2021). As a prolific fresh produce grower, Vhembe also exports quality fresh produce across the country (Vhembe District Municipality - Overview, n.d.). The district is divided into two distinctive agricultural systems, namely, large-scale commercial farmers and small-scale farmers. According to the Limpopo Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, there are over 1.100 small-scale farmers in the Vhembe district (Olofsson, 2020). Olofsson (2020) further asserted that the most prominent commodity amongst small-scale farmers in the Vhembe district is macadamia nuts and avocados. Notably, small-scale farmers in this region are historically known to grow sub-tropical tree crops such as mangoes, bananas, avocados, etcetera. According to StatsSA, the Vhembe district was one of the two leading districts in avocado production. The district was also responsible for producing over 80 per cent of Bananas in the province in 2017 (Statistics South Africa, 2020).

Maponya (2021) further asserted that agriculture is key to livelihoods in the district. Seventy per cent of the farmers in the Levubu, Tshakhuma, Rabali and Tshiombo areas produce sub-tropical and tropical crops, which contribute generously to the rural economy. However, it is still problematic that women's role and contribution in agricultural production is doing menial labour such as planting, weeding, and harvesting. Most men in the districts manage farms, are involved in off-farm activities or migrate to other provinces (Maponya, 2021). Despite considerable investments in Agriculture from the government, the Vhembe district was reported to have failed to achieve food security. Most government initiatives failed before preliminary stages because of socio-economic contrasting such as lack of water, use of poor quality seeds, declining soil fertility and (land) conflicts, to a few (Oni et al., 2010). Oni et al. (2010) further stated that several farmers could not access credit to start their enterprises. This is further demonstrated by findings of this study. Chauke and Oluwatayo (2019), apart from farmers low education levels and poor access to markets, access to credit facilities and information about financial assistance are the main socio-economic challenges affecting farmers efficiency.

2.1.2.4 Philanthropic Organisations and Agriculture in South Africa

Philanthropy in Africa and South Africa expresses itself in forms of individual giving and institutional giving. Philanthropic practices at a local level include stokvels, cooperatives, and lending of livestock, among others. In '*The Poor Philanthropist: How and why the poor help each other*, Wilkinson-Maposa and colleagues infer that philanthropy in Africa is not something that needs to be introduced by anyone because philanthropy is embedded in strong African traditions of self-help and self-support, voluntary institutions, community rotational credit and associations such as South African stokvels (Wilkinson-Maposa, Fowler, Oliver-Evans & Mulenga, 2015). According to Independent Philanthropy Association, South Africa 2019 annual review, the African definition of philanthropy should include acts performed at the community level and acts by the private sector and non-profit organisations geared towards the public good (IPASA, 2020). Murisa and Trust Africa (2015, p1) stated, "African philanthropy is best summed up as 'ubuntu', which is translated as: 'I am because you are'…the primary focus of ubuntu-based giving and solidarity is on ensuring the well-being of the neighbour, rather than being based on one person having more resources to spare than a neighbour does."

African philanthropy is embedded in the notion of Ubuntu, which is the highest expression of the African philosophies of solidarity, empathy and collaborative partnership and giving (Moyo, 2015). African communities have always found a way to mobilise resources necessary to meet their needs and the public good. African Philanthropic scholars suggest that Ubuntu drives generous giving. According to MacLeod (2010), wealthy South Africans are the most generous after North Americans, and South Africa is also ranked fourth in the world for volunteerism. MacLeod (2010) further added that inequality is one of the driving forces behind philanthropic giving in South Africa. Philanthropy giving is no longer defined in monetary terms. It now consists of giving time or volunteerism, skills transfer, a community-based initiatives, philanthropic foundations, corporates, private philanthropy/high net worth individuals or ordinary individual givers (Moyo, 2015). Bellegy (2019) further stated that philanthropy is involved in development by reaching spaces that government institutions cannot occupy. Philanthropy for development include empowering people in society to help close the SDG funding gap.

According to Everatt and Solanki (2005, p. 5), "South Africa appears to be a nation of givers." In early 2000s, over 50 per cent of South Africans who give donated money to charity, while

about 30 per cent gave food and volunteered time to charity (Everatt & Solanki, 2005). According to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (EOCD), domestic philanthropy in South Africa is predominantly corporate. Philanthropy has become a source for funding for public healthcare, education, environmental challenges, agriculture, and gender equality in middle to low-income countries. There is also a large number of individual and family giving. Most organisations give their funds and resources primarily to education, and over $260 million was donated between 2013 to 2018 to finance the education space. Some of the interventions include programs that seek to improve women's skills and education and assist women to gain access to financial resources (OECD, 2021). Additionally, giving behaviour in South Africa includes contributions from High-Net-Worth Individuals (HNWIs).According to the Nedbank Giving Reports, one-fifth of HNWIs giving is motivated by family giving, social and community development initiatives. HNWIs prioritise their giving (in time and money) to social causes to aid the challenging economic environment in South Africa. The Report further states that, one of the social and community development initiatives included giving significantly to food security and agriculture programmes (Nedbank Private Wealth, 2019). HNWI earning over R5 million per annum gave over R50 000 of their earnings in 2018 (Nedbank Private Wealth, 2019). Between 2013-2018, top domestic philanthropic funders in South Africa included SIOC Community Development Trust, DGMT, Sanlam Foundation, South African Breweries Foundation, Discovery Foundation and The Harry & Doris Crossley Foundations (OECD, 2021).

Data shows that philanthropic organisations are moving toward supporting more sustainable food and agriculture projects (Nallainathan, 2015). The OECD's report states that various philanthropic interventions and funding improve women's economic opportunities. The South African philanthropy for gender equality focuses on increasing women's access to financial and production resources. Organisations such as the Discovery Foundation, Claude Leon Foundation, Nelson Mandela Foundation and Lefa La Rona Trust support women initiatives for economic development (OECD, 2021). Moyo & Sowa (2015) added that philanthropic efforts in agriculture could potentially enhance economic prospects for rural African women. Most philanthropic organisation collaborate with Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs) and Community Based Organisations (CBOs) for sustainable development initiatives. Government institutions and philanthropies partnering with NGOs and CBOs in South Africa aim to strengthen government systems in the country by creating opportunities for skills development (Van der Elst & Volmink, 2019). Choto, Iwu and Tengeh (2020) further stated

that more government institutions are working with NGOs to provide resources for their citizens through partnerships with the private sector and philanthropy. Few non-governmental programs and organisations are supporting the agricultural sector in South Africa. The P.E.A.C.E Foundation, Lima and the Future Farmers Foundation support agriculture and recognise that agriculture is critical for development, particularly for boosting the rural economy. These foundations work in collaboration with other organisations to consult and implement agriculturally based projects. Lima was founded to support disadvantaged small-scale farmers in rural areas. Lima has implemented a program that comprehensively supports and targets isolated farmers in rural areas by assisting them to gain access to key markets and services (LIMA Rural Development Foundation, n.d.; The P.E.A.C.E. Foundation, 2009). The Future Farmers Foundation provides a platform for women and men who are interested in agriculture. The initiative was formed in 2007 to create opportunities for those who need to gain practical experience in the agricultural sector (Future Farmers Foundation, 2021). The P.E.A.C.E Foundation, Lima and the Future Farmers Foundation are work with disadvantage communities. The three organisations focus on all community development projects that empower all people in the communities. They offer agricultural support to both small-scale and commercial farmers in efforts to transform the agricultural sector.

Several philanthropic foundations involved in the agricultural sector in South Africa, particularly in Limpopo, include the Motsepe Foundation. The Motsepe Foundation is one of the philanthropic organisations which continue to support agriculture for sustainable development and reform in South Africa. The Foundation partnered with local traditional leaders, rural and urban communities. The Motsepe Foundation is also in partnership with AgriSA to provide technical skills, farming expertise, and knowledge to the farming communities. The Foundation has already spent over R600 million contributing to the development and growth of agriculture and farming projects in South Africa, including Limpopo province. The funding was used to procure tractors, seeds and fertilisers, irrigation systems, farming equipment and the construction of boreholes. The project commenced in 2019 at the African Farmers' Association of South Africa's Agribusiness transformation conference. The Motsepe Foundation pledged to work with traditional leaders and other stakeholders in urban and rural communities to commence this project to benefit sustainable agriculture, land development, and reform (Macaskill, 2021).

The SAB Foundation has an innovative programme aimed at promoting entrepreneurship for rural women in South Africa. The Foundation works in conjunction with SaveAct to assist small-scale farmers to set up their businesses in rural areas. SaveAct facilitates programmes to break the cycle of poverty in communities and assist these communities in playing an active role in social and economic development (SAB Foundation, n.d.; SaveAct, n.d.). The Coca-Cola Mintirho Foundation specifically funds and supports black farmers who were historically disadvantaged. Mintirho Foundation looks for black ownership more than 60 per cent. The Foundation funds primary agriculture, including all food crops targeted for growth capital for sustainable development. One of the recent projects from the Foundation is recognising women leadership and the significant role they play in agriculture as small-scale farmers to fight food insecurities while maintaining their homes (Mintirho Foundation, 2020). The Women Farmers Programme, through the Vodacom Foundation, assists South African women farmers. The Vodacom Foundation delivers the programme in partnership with UN Women and South African Women in Farming (SAWIF). The programme focuses on providing basic digital literacy training for small-scale women farmers in rural areas to help them transform their productivity and fight poverty through food security (Vodacom, 2021).

2.1.2.5 South Africa Policy and Strategies for the Agricultural Sector

This section presents South African policies and strategies post-1994. Since 1994, South Africa has been on a mission to change the economic, political, and social structures created by the apartheid system. The consequence of the former system created yielding poverty, which was attributed to former apartheid policies of (racial) inequality, segregation, and unsustainable settlement patterns. According to Dagada et al. (2002, p. 2290), "food insecurity and poverty in South Africa have prevailed for several centuries as a result of apartheid policies that were designed specifically to create conditions that were unfavourable to the well-being of black people. These historical legacies created the present situation where most black farmers are vulnerable to food insecurity despite the good food security situation at a national level." Maluleke (2019) further inferred that according to the South African National Development Plan, poverty is both a cause and consequence of food insecurity and vis-à-vis. Therefore, the government needs to adopt policies and strategies that will create opportunities for farmers to tackle poverty and food insecurity.

Notwithstanding the challenges of old South African policies, democratic South Africa continues to propose and implement policy interventions to tackle food security challenges. One of the significant shifts from post-democracy policies was the land reform policy which centres on "the advancement of both fairness and effectiveness through a shared agrarian and industrial plan in which land is recognised as a boost and stimulus to agricultural and economic growth" (Agholor & Bongiwe, 2020, p. 217). South Africa's strategies for land reform include land restitution, whereby the dispossessed person or community are to give back their land and be compensated (Agholor & Bongiwe, 2020). In addition to the land reform policy, the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development strategy "aimed at providing financial redress to black South African citizens to access land mainly for agricultural purposes" (Agholor & Bongiwe, 2020, p. 218). Other examples include the Integrated Food Security Strategy (IFSS), aimed at increasing access to productive assets and access to food production, and the Comprehensive Agriculture Support Programme, which aims to provide support to targeted beneficiaries of land reform (Hosu & Qamata, 2019). Hosu and Qamata (2019) further state that these programmes are essential for developing food security measures for household food producers and farmers working at agricultural micro and macro systems.

These strategies are not without challenges. Agholor and Bongiwe (2020) argued that the South African government was not fully prepared to implement land reform policies. Informal farmers are faced with challenges as they do not have the skills needed to manage a successful farming enterprise or have sufficient capital to invest in a profitable farming business (Agholor & Bongiwe, 2020). Khwidzhili and Worth (2017) further argued that while land reform policies aim to assist poor communities to acquire agricultural land and form small farming enterprises, the policies are not inclusive for the black majority. Consequently, only a few individuals could afford and maintain the farmland they have benefited. Sadiki (2021) stated that the South African government has put initiatives and policies to support and address challenges that women face in the agricultural sector. One of the policies adopted by the government was the Beneficiary Selection and Land policy which focuses on the allocation of agricultural land to women. The policy was adopted to rethink the direction of the land reform policy in South Africa. The Beneficiary Selection and Land policy was proposed to "ensure equitable access to land for all the previously disadvantaged citizens" (PLAAS, 2020, p. 1) and to ensure that the South African government land allocation reaches out to women in the agricultural sector (PLAAS, 2020).

Another policy proposed by the South African government is the Integrated Food Security Strategy. It calls for a rights-based approach (which includes gender equality) to food security. This policy was written from a human rights perspective which recognised fundamental rights for all (E. n. Raidimi, 2014). Raidimi (2014) further stated that gender inequality could limit agricultural productivity and cause challenges to women who want to access critical productive assets and services such as land, infrastructure, and financial services. Gender disparities are more prevalent where government investment programs overlook the role of women and the significant contribution in the development processes (Raidimi, 2014). Additionally, small-scale farmers, particularly women, are not fully included in policies and strategies; and they also lack access to funding and support networks. According to the World Bank, women account for half the agricultural workforce. However, gendered agricultural inequalities remain strong because of continuous discrimination and exclusion from policies (Botreau, 2019).

South Africa's Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development Programme (LRAD) mentions creating access to agricultural land for men and women. The LRAD aims to assist previously disadvantaged South African citizens in getting access to funds to buy land specifically for agricultural purposes. The LRAD is one of the few policy interventions in South Africa that focus on women development (Agholor & Lubisi, 2020; South African Government, n.d.). There is an urgent need to remove obstacles that prevent women from participating fully in the agricultural sector. Increasing women's access to financial resources, land and skills training is crucial to overcome women's social exclusion. Further, there is a need to introduce innovative practices and strategies targeted at women development (FAO & CARE, 2019; SOFA Team & Doss, 2011).

2.1.3 Food (In)Security and the Agricultural Sector

Small-scale farmers dominate the agriculture sector in Africa. Over 33 million small-scale farmers contribute to the production of food crops in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) to increase domestic food security (Dobie. Finlayson, Gassner et al., 2019). Dobie et al. (2019) further argue that agriculture is a tool that can be used to help people escape poverty. Although most farms cannot generate sufficient agricultural income due to their small size, Dobie et al. (2019) maintained that small-scale farmers' contribution to the rural economy is vital, especially for food security and as an income source. Pawlak and Kołodziejczak (2020) argue that agriculture has a significant impact on improving food security. The agricultural sector is significant for improving food security and reducing poverty. The sector can produce and distribute products

across countries by playing strategic roles in improving food productivity and food availability. In "*Food security and optimal government intervention level in agriculture*", Aliyeva, Babayeva, Hasanzade et al. (2019) look at government intervention in the agricultural sector for food security. They (Aliyeva et al. (2019) argue that the government's interventions in the agricultural sector often translate into subsidies, which means that the sector relies on government interventions for its optimal success. Consequently, agricultural interventions that are less than the country's optimal size can weaken the agricultural sector, which can threaten the country's food security. Moreover, the allocation of subsidies is dependent on the economy's profitability for the government (Aliyeva et al., 2019).

South Africa is considered a food secure country at a national level. However, available household data implies high levels of food insecurity, owing to income poverty and lack of access to food (de Cock, D'Haese, D'Haese et al., 2013). The government committed to halving poverty by 2014 to achieve food security at the household level (de Cock et al., 2013). Although the South African government committed to halving hunger by 2014, Masipa (2017) stated that climate change had an impact on food security in South Africa. Climate change is a major concern for food security because of its negative impact on agricultural land. Increasing and unstable temperatures can cause a destruction of crops, lower crops productivity and increase heat stress to livestock (Masipa, 2017). Further, the StatsSA also reported that millions of households across South Africans experienced hunger in 2017. Poor households lack money to buy adequate food due to inability to secure jobs to generate income (Statistics South Africa, 2019).

According to Rusare and Tsegay (2014), 1 in 4 people in South Africa still suffer from hunger. At the same time, more than half of the population are at risk of going hungry due to their precarious circumstances. The underlying causes of hunger and food insecurity in South Africa include significant unemployment levels at 34.6 per cent nationally at the time of writing this report, limited access to adequate and nutritious food, and limited access to food production (Statistics South Africa, 2019a). Women and children are affected by food insecurity because of lack of employment and inadequate access to water and farming equipment for small-scale farmers (Rusare & Tsegay, 2014). According to StatsSA, approximately 20 per cent of households did not have adequate access to food in South Africa in 2017. As Stats SA pointed out, black Africans and coloured headed households were most affected by food insecurity compared to households headed by whites and Asians (Indian). Lack of money caused food

inadequacy for these poor households to access food and the inability to access resources to produce their own food (Statistics South Africa, 2019b).

Rusare and Tsegay (2014) argued that women tended to suffer the most compared to men because of different forms of inequality, including income disparities, limited access to opportunities and means of production. Despite constituting most of the farming workforce, women continue to be discriminated against regarding access and control of resources. They are deprived of opportunities to improve food production activities (Rusare & Tsegay, 2014). According to an Oxfam report on *Gender Inequalities and Food Insecurity,* gender inequalities remain a challenge in agricultural food production. Women farmers are at risk of hunger. Rural women farmers suffer labour market discrimination, pay inequity, and difficulty in attaining (land) ownership and access to recourses and financial support (Botreau, 2019). Furthermore, women in agriculture continue to be confined to informal and casual farm work because patriarchal norms disadvantage them. Women have weaker bargaining power, are excluded from decision making and do not have the power to control resources (Botreau, 2019).

In South Africa, food security, which always involves access to adequate nutritious food, is a constitutional right. According to Mbajiorgu (2019, p331), "food security strategies are consistent with section 27(1)(b) of the Constitution of South Africa, which provides that everyone has the right of access to sufficient food." The government has an obligation to ensure that all measures and strategies are considered to achieve the right to access food for all. For instance, the South African government has put remedial policies such as social grants as a source of income for poor and low-income households (Mbajiorgu, 2019). Mbajiorgu (2019) further argued that the right to access food is at the core of human development. The South African government is also a signatory to international treaties and human rights conventions. South Africa ratified the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights. The country also signed the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. Additionally, South Africa is committed to the 2030 SDG goals 1 and 2 to eradicate poverty, hunger and food insecurity by 2030 (Mbajiorgu, 2019). To reduce food insecurity, South Africa implemented legislative frameworks and policies. For instance under the Reconstruction and Development Programme, the government committed to ensure the quality of life for all South Africans and the National Development Plan aimed to eliminate and reduce poverty and inequality by 2030 (Mbajiorgu, 2019). Mbajiorgu (2019) further stated that agricultural reform would be a fundamental instrument for food security strategy. Additionally, the reform strategy included promoting

small-scale farmers, which is a significant investment in rural development. Thus, it is imperative to confront current inequality and income poverty challenges, which negatively impact the realisation of food security in South Africa. In 2002, the South African government adopted the 'Integrated Food Security Strategy (IFSS) to halve poverty by 2014. This initiative was to reduce food insecurity further to achieve physical, social, and economic access to sufficient and safe nutritious food for all South Africans. The crucial objective of the IFSS strategy was "to attain universal physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food by all South Africans at all times to meet their dietary and food preferences for an active and healthy life" (de Cock et al., 2013, p. 4). The critical elements of the IFSS strategy comprised zero hunger which focused on access to food and food production to achieve food security, sustainable agricultural reform to improve food affordability and create rural jobs for sustainable and inclusive growth for all South Africans (de Cock et al., 2013).

In '*Food security in rural areas of Limpopo province, South Africa*', De Cock, D'Haese and colleagues looked at food security challenges in the region. The authors argued that accurate measurements and policies that target the multidimensional food security nexus need to be carefully accessed (de Cock et al., 2013). Policy targeting could reduce poverty, inequality, and food insecurity. Using the Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS), which the Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance (FANTA) project of US-AID was developed, De Cock et al (2013) inferred that over 50 per cent of households in rural Limpopo were food insecure. The Mopani district was presented with the highest poverty rate of 50 per cent, while the Vhembe district was presented with the lowest poverty rate at 19 per cent (D'Haese et al., 2013). Although the South African government has recognised key elements of these policies and strategies, the strategies are not fully realised. The challenges South Africa faces are due to the lack of a regulated way of monitoring the food (in)security status of the population and methods to effectively measure the current status of food (in)security (de Cock et al., 2013).

2.1.4 Sustainable Development and Philanthropy through Agriculture

In "*Does sub-Saharan Africa need capitalist philanthropy to reduce poverty and achieve food security?*", Morvaridi (2016) argued that traditionally, African philanthropic activities are underpinned by the idea of '*Ubuntu*'. Giving, especially at the community level, is driven by moral values, collective consciousness, and the spirit of humaneness. However, the new form of philanthropy, also known as 'capitalist philanthropy', emerged globally to support all activities, including social justice and other neoliberal economic activities. Globally, capitalist

philanthropists such as the Bill and Melinda Gates, Aliko Dangote, Warren Buffett, and Patrice Motsepe have in the past years pledged a portion of their wealth towards various poverty reduction programs and projects across Africa. The Gates Foundation is one of the philanthropic organisations that support food security projects in SSA. Morvaridi (2016) took a closer look into the Gates foundation's food security strategy. Morvaridi argued that the Gates capitalist philanthropy was both political and ideological. The Foundation committed to the modernisation of agriculture through market-led forces of production, which means that Gates is committed to promoting food security through agriculture while also promoting the market economy. The Gates Foundation contributed almost $2 billion to small-scale farmers in SSA in the early 2000s to support food security objectives (Morvaridi, 2016).

Asuru (2015) agreed with Morvaridi on the significant contributions from the Gates Foundation to the agricultural sector. Asuru (2015) stated that the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation made a noteworthy contribution to small-scale farmers in Ghana. The Foundation aimed to address poverty and hunger by helping small-scale farmers with resources to help rural development and poverty reduction. Asuru (2015) further emphasises the significant contributions by the 'new' philanthropy toward improving conditions of small-scale farmers in SSA. The author argued that philanthropy was fundamental to addressing social problems such as hunger and poverty for rural transformation. Because most philanthropic organisations are not based in rural areas, philanthropy needs to connect with community organisations in big cities to access rural and non-metropolitan communities to make a case for rural development needs. The gap between philanthropy and rural communities poses challenges for small enterprises to access institutions (Asuru, 2015). Asuru (2015) thus recommends that philanthropic institutions should create a strategy to increase access to a rural community to resolve critical rural development issues.

In '*Philanthropy and Sovereignty: A Critical Feminist Exploration of the Gates Foundation's Approach to Gender and Agricultural Development*', Fent (2012) assessed the Gates Foundation 'Gender Impact Strategy for Agricultural Development. Fent claimed that the Foundation has been under scrutiny for funding institutions that deal with agricultural research instead of supporting and funding small-holders and women's agricultural programs as they claimed. Fent criticised their approach to gender and development, claiming that although the Gates Foundation is the second-largest Foundation globally, its strategy on development has social and economic limitations for women. Therefore, women continue to face challenges

regarding access to opportunities that will help them gain access to farming products, farming techniques and markers. Although the Gates Foundation's conception of gender is sensible in a social, political, and economic contest, its opportunities have not been integrated successfully for women and societies in the Third World (Fent, 2012). Fent further argued,

> "*The Gates Foundation's philanthropic approach sees gender as a means of realising and improving development. As the Gates Foundation's Gender Impact Strategy states, "Agricultural Development must address gender in order to achieve significant impact in the reduction of hunger and poverty"* (Fent, 2012, p. 9).

The Gates Foundation acknowledges women's work. However, it understands women's participation as needing intervention (charity) and inputs to succeed fully (Fent, 2012). This approach undermined the long history of women's success in all levels of food production and marketing of products, Fent (2012) further argued. Furthermore, this view is problematic because it further emphasises the structural conditions that hinder women's equal access to land and rights (Fent, 2012). Nally (2016) further argued that the Gates Foundation's support for small-scale farmers is that sustainable agriculture is evolving. Thus, small-scale farmers need to consider shifting to a more natural free-market system. However, Nally (2016) argues against the Gates Foundation position, stating that small-scale farmers are an important component for elevating both hunger and poverty. Further, supporting small-scale is imperative to break vicious cycles of rural poverty. Thus, the Gates Foundation's position that implies small-scale farmers progression is burdensome is inconvenient with other development institutes such as the UN's International Fund for Agricultural Development (Nally, 2016). Several studies echo inferences that small-scale farmers are crucial to pioneer innovative ways of fighting global hunger through food security. Therefore, small-scale farmers should be seen as experts in their agricultural sector and deserving beneficiaries of aid (Nally, 2016).

Grey and Patel (2015) linked food insecurity to gender. The authors argued that despite women contributing to 43 per cent of the agriculture workforce, 60 per cent of women and girls suffer from food insecurity. Power and access within the food (production) system are concentrated in few corporations, with gendered consequences. Processes and (patriarchal) politics further disempower women from food production, distribution, and consumption. Patel (2012) viewed this injustice as 'capitalism's gendered division of labour. This injustice is because the system prohibited women from actively participating in the labour force equally as men. Although these barriers are being dismantled, he argued that much work is still needed to achieve equality

(Grey & Patel, 2015). Additionally, Grey and Patel argued that gender inequality in the food production system is systematic. It is not only about women working in the fields. According to the scholars, the Worlds Bank's influence on agriculture has produced a biased system that codes women tasks as unskilled and labour-intensive. In contrast, men are tasked to work on machinery and given supervisory roles. Although the World Bank supports agriculture, this system has resulted in systematic discrimination and women's exploitation linked to policies imposed by the World Bank (Grey & Patel, 2015; Patel, 2009, 2012).

In '*Advancing the Sustainable Development Goals: An Analysis of the Potential Role of Philanthropy in Ghana'*, Kumi (2019) focused on the role of philanthropy in advancing sustainable development. He argued that government and philanthropic institutions and the private sector require collaborative efforts to strengthen and unlock financing for the SGDs. Philanthropic institutions are perceived to be financially independent and able to take more risks than government institutions. Kumi further gave an example of philanthropic foundation giving in Ghana between 2002 and 2021. According to his findings, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the Conrad N Hilton Foundation contributed approximately $670 million to the Millennium development goals (MDGs). He further argued that the philanthropic sector is vital for financing development under the banner of SGDs. Giloth (2019) argued that philanthropy is also vital for economic development. It is associated with social equity and gives access to flexible resources for diverse interventions to change economic conditions, promote economic opportunities, and encourage inclusive economic development. Since the early 2000s, philanthropic giving for economic development has surged, particularly in community development support.

Pérez-Escamilla (2017) focused on food security under the banner of 2015–2030 Sustainable Development Goals. He argued that the key to food security for all is a sound food security governance that is enforceable. He further argued that food insecurities were caused by social injustice, inequality, and social exclusion, which prevent individuals and societies from developing. In order to address these challenges, the promotion of sustainable agriculture through minimising food waste, reducing income inequality, and promoting sustainable agriculture is necessary. Thus, in the context of goal 7 in the UN SDG agenda, sustaining a healthily supply of affordable and healthy food is paramount for achieving household food security at both national and global levels (Pérez-Escamilla, 2017).

Pérez-Escamilla further argued that women in farming played a crucial role in tackling food insecurity and reversing poverty. Women in small-scale farming make up to 43 per cent of agriculture production in developing countries. However, barriers such as access to products and markets, financial exclusion, and technical assistance make them produce over 25 per cent less than men farmers. Not much has been done to ensure that women farmers have enough resources to tackle food insecurity and improve their livelihood despite the rhetoric given to the international community, Pearl-Martinez (2017) further argued.

Philanthropic organisations are crucial for sustainable development. Capitalist philanthropists like Bill and Melinda Gates of the Gates Foundation are committed to modernising agriculture through market-led forces of production to promoting food security through agriculture. Although the Gates Foundation supports the agricultural sector, there is still a lack of evidence supporting small-scale farmers. Government and philanthropic institutions and the private sector require collaborative efforts to strengthen and unlock financing to achieve sustainable development goals for zero hunger and food security. Women in farming played a crucial role in tackling food insecurity and reversing poverty. Therefore, giving women financial assistance and access to resources is necessary to tackle food insecurity and improve their livelihood.

2.1.5 Feminist Philanthropy and Food Security

According to Bofu-Tawamba and Bosch (2019) 'philanthropy is a feminist issue. Thus, humanity's progression depends on philanthropic resources that allow for women's progression and participation in their community. There is a growing number of philanthropic foundations focusing on neglected women's issues. They are perceived as feminist philanthropists whose passions and motives are deeply rooted in correcting systematic oppression and marginalisation of women. "Feminist philanthropy is a political act; it is an act that seeks to challenge and transform notions of power, privilege and resources" (Bofu-Tawamba & Bosch, 2019, p. 2). Accordingly, feminist philanthropy is an act of power and not only about funding women's issues or a charitable act. The approach seeks to challenge and transform the notion of power and privilege, contributing to access to resources. Feminist philanthropic activists further promote women's voices in politics and communities and equip them with tools to fight against oppressive systems of power (patriarchy) that marginalised them.

The State of Food and Agriculture (SOFA) team and Doss (2011) argued that women are crucial for food production and poverty reduction. Their contribution to agriculture is noteworthy and critical for rural economies in developing countries. Nevertheless, they face constraints in the agriculture sector, and thus, the sector is underperforming in many countries. SOFA team and Doss further claimed that women's participation in agricultural, rural labour markets across sub-Saharan Africa is estimated at over 50%. However, they are paid less than men for doing the same work. These wage inequalities are due to a contractual arrangement, owning that woman are usually subjected to worse working conditions. Wage conditions in urban labour markets are typically higher, and there are better working conditions than in rural labour markets (SOFA Team & Doss, 2011). Additionally, women in rural areas are paid lower wages for the same work because of occupational segregation, discrimination and exploitation in rural labour markets. In '*Women and agricultural productivity: Reframing the Issues'*, Doss (2018) further argued that overall agricultural productivity would increase when women are empowered, and their participation in poverty reduction increases. This can be achieved by targeting investment to women, increasing agricultural production, and offering higher income for women. Agricultural development investment, agriculture technologies are essential for providing better opportunities for women (development) in farming and food production.

According to feminist scholars, knowledge based primarily on male, culturally specific experience represents a skewed perception of reality and is only partial knowledge. To address this, women's daily experiences and informal theorising must be considered, and feminist approaches to theory and knowledge must be adopted as a result. Concerns about gender relations in development have strengthened the belief that equality in the status of men and women is fundamental to all societies. Evidently, there is room for programme expansion and development that includes women and gender. Such programmes have the potential to reach a large number of people, to institutionalise gender scholarship, and to supplement other means of disseminating gender debate and advancing gender equality (Barriteau et al., 2000). According to Biana (2020), the third-world women's experience of oppression is laced with poverty. Because of the lack of policies and infrastructure in these developing countries, overcoming poverty is more difficult. More than empowerment or equality, women in the developing world, a significant proportion of whom live in poverty, may struggle to achieve a certain level of consciousness due to the burden of an additional layer of oppression, such as national oppression (due to culture or patriarchal norms). To end oppression, feminists propose

fostering a critical consciousness through a method of critical evaluation that begins with an interrogation of sex, race, and class factors through a paradigm shift.

According to food security research, gender inequality in communities and society as a whole is a major contributor to food insecurity. According to these studies, women are the most vulnerable group when it comes to food insecurity. Throughout history, women have been systematically oppressed through various laws and norms in their respective societies. Women remain vulnerable to food insecurity globally due to a lack of access to and control over household assets such as land and farming resources (Garutsa & Masuku, 2021). As a result, food security interventions are primarily led by women who rely on subsistence farming as their primary source of income. The gender and development approach, as well as the post-development approach, imply that women's empowerment and emancipation are an effective tool that can be used to reduce gender inequalities in all food security interventions (Garutsa & Masuku, 2021) further maintained. In the South African context, Patriarchies (male-dominated social systems) prevail, and women are subordinated despite their contributions to economic and social life. Despite the South African Constitution's emphasis on gender equality and a non-sexist society, inequality and sexual exploitation of women persist and are often difficult to address through constitutional safeguards. This is due to a lack of or limited access to training, as well as unequal pay for men and women performing similar tasks. These women also have limited access to productive assets, organisations and social networks, credit, legal rights, and political representation. South Africa, for example, was recently ranked 20th in the World Economic Forum's Gender Gap Index. Furthermore, South African women, particularly those in rural areas, are disproportionately affected by food insecurity. This is because female-headed households and the elderly have higher rates of food insecurity in South Africa (Reddy & Moletsane, 2015). Reddy and Moletsane (2015) concluded that the issue of food security, as well as the impact of the gender dimension on food insecurity, had not been thoroughly investigated, both in terms of policy framework and critical literature. As a result, understanding gender as a factor in food security demonstrates that food insecurity is a multifaceted issue shaped by poverty, resources, the environment, disease, natural disasters, and political context.

2.1.5.1 Women and Development in South Africa

Bahta, Owusu-Sekyere and Tlalang (2019) assess whether 'women's empowerment through policy intervention reduce food insecurity in South Africa'. The government of South Africa introduced the homestead food garden programme in response to poverty and food insecurity. The South African government introduced the programme in 1997 for women, the youth, and other vulnerable groups to respond to poverty and food insecurity challenges. Beneficiaries received training, farming material, and further support to implement the programme (Bahta et al., 2019). Women farmers were required to participate in the programme entirely to receive maximum benefits. Bahta and colleagues found that the women who participated had access to markets, credit, and other services, thus significantly reducing food insecurity. The authors further inferred that the government intervention through the homestead gardens programmes significantly reduced food insecurity and empowered women through policy intervention (Bahta et al., 2019).

In '*A systematic review of sub-national food insecurity research in South Africa: Missed opportunities for policy insights*', Misselhorn and Hendriks argued, "food insecurity is embedded in the unequal power women in South Africa have over resources, despite their frequently playing the most active role in providing for household food security; the role of women in agriculture and food security, and their particular powerlessness and vulnerability is widely researched and reported" (Misselhorn & Hendriks, 2017, p. 32). Thus, structural inequality causes food insecurity. Unequal power between men and women have left South African women more vulnerable to food insecurities. Despite their active role in providing for household food security and agricultural production, women remain powerless in the agriculture and food security sector. Misselhorn and Hendriks further stated that formal and informal institutions practices excluded women's participation in the agriculture sector, although they are drivers of agriculture production. Accordingly, women are excluded in decision making, socio-economic institutions, access, and control of farm assets. Thus, there is a call for urgent government support and recognition of women in agriculture. Vercillo (2020) critiques development policy narratives of gender in the African agricultural context. The author stated that although gender is an important aspect of social inequality and food insecurity, the narrative that suggests that women are not recognised for their significant contributions to food security is flawed. Further, the policy accentuates women's role in farming more for survival. In contrast, men's work is emphasised as farming for cash (Vercillo, 2020).

Raidimi (2014) argued that women's role in agriculture ought to be understood to implement agricultural programmes that include women successfully. Gender inequalities persist because of socially constructed gender differences between men and women. Additionally, women's challenges in the sector are not tied to recognition but equal access to recourses. Although women remain at the fore of food production, they face many disparities in developing countries (E. N. Raidimi, 2014). Raidimi (2014) further stated that women's contribution was significant. Therefore, "understanding women's roles in agriculture and planning programs relevant to their roles and needs is a prerequisite for the success of agricultural development programs" (E. N. Raidimi, 2014, p. 10).

Murugani and Thamaga-Chitja (2019) assessed how women's empowerment in agriculture affects household food security and dietary diversity, particularly for small-scale women farmers in rural Limpopo. Murugani and Thamaga-Chitja (2019) argued that interventions favour farmers who own land and women farmers who have access to productive resources. Consequently, most women do not own or have access to productive resources. Small-scale women farmers typically reside in rural communities defined by cultural norms that are more favourable to men. Therefore, access to land and productive resources are controlled mainly by male relatives. Unfortunately, the gender disparity means men will have access to opportunities, accumulate more assertions, and control productive resources while disempowering women and reducing women's bargaining power in the process (Murugani & Thamaga-Chitja, 2019). The authors further argued that patriarchal cultural norms continue to exist to avoid upsetting gender dynamics in households, leading to gender-based violence (Murugani & Thamaga-Chitja, 2019).

Hart and Makhetha (2018) used a gender lens to explore the unevenness of land redistribution policies in South Africa. Hart and Makhetha (2018) argued that women face challenges accessing land, financial support, and productive resources due to the prevalent patriarchal systems in South Africa. According to scholars, the relationship between women's land rights and land (access/ownership) often translates to violence because of a gendered division of labour. Although women remain challenged, they use various mechanisms to access land, gain tenure rights and access markets. They can access land, and effective recourse is to work through a trusted male relative while their role remains anonymous. Women-to-woman marriages and mother and son partnerships further assist women in accessing land and

resources (Hart & Makhetha, 2018). The situation whereby women have to hide their identity to access resources is concerning, especially given that the South African constitution is inclusive and promotes equal rights for all, despite gender, race, social class and sexual orientation (SAHRCommission, n.d.). Most small-scale farmers are women. Nevertheless, women remain marginalised. Patriarchal norms contribute to gender inequality and ongoing policies that allow cultural beliefs to perceived women as subservient to men. Scholars argue that 'philanthropy is a feminist issue. Thus, some philanthropic foundations are now focusing on neglected women's issues, including women in rural agriculture. Interventions for women development from government institutions is also crucial to challenge food insecurity. Interventions can include empowered women through gender-inclusive policy interventions. Women's roles in agriculture remain as general farmworkers without equal access to land and resources as men due to socially constructed gender norms. Women must remain anonymous and find creative ways such as working through a male relative or working with their male son to access land and resources as a result.

Women play an essential role in future of food production and food production. According to FAO, women represent 43 per cent of the global farming workforce. Women spend most of their time producing food through agriculture to fight food insecurity within their households and communities (FAO & CARE, 2019). Inhetveen (1998, p. 226) described women farmers as “the silent heroes of everyday life.” Research shows that women have played a significant role in agriculture since 10 000 BC. Researchers began to see a surge of female farmers during the 1940s when most men went off to fight in World War II. Women remained home to help maintain the fields and crops to sustain their households with food. However, women were not seen as owners of the farms or land but only workers or as a support system for their husbands (Folk, 2020). Traditionally, most women were employed as part-time general farm workers, while men enjoyed full-time employment as owners, managers, and supervisors. The gender disparities were justified by stating that physical strength was a significant barrier for women in the sector, ignoring that women or men did not need physical strength to own land or occupy managerial positions (Loubser, 2020). As shown by the responses to the survey, the status quo has not changed. Men still occupy management and ownership positions more than women in the sector.

According to the African Union Development Agency (NEPAD), "the Africa Union's Agenda 2063 and United Nation's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) aspire for food security and gender equality in Africa's agriculture" (AUDA-NEPAD, 2021, p. 1). Women in the Eastern and Southern African countries account for 50 per cent of the agricultural workforce, and they contribute to poverty elevation efforts in the region (AUDA-NEPAD, 2021). Although the South African government approved a 'women empowerment policy in 2020, South Africa's agriculture industry faces challenges, including women in the sector, despite the fact that transformation and gender equality are at the top for policy discussions. The government has proposed that 50 per cent of agricultural farming land should be allocated to women (Sihlobo, 2021). According to Sihlobo (2018), women constitute above 70 per cent of small-scale farmers, and however, less than 20 per cent of the women are landowners. Women farmers continue to face barriers to attain land rights and land ownership due to patriarchal norms that discriminate and disadvantage women (Botreau, 2019).

Women in the agricultural and food production sector are powerless and vulnerable to cultural and unfair labour practices, particularly in rural areas (SOFA Team & Doss, 2011). For example, women farmers face discriminatory inheritance rights because men are still considered heirs in many cultures (Botreau, 2019). FAO and CARE (2019) claim that only men have the right to cultivate certain crops or access markets in some communities, while women farmers are given duties as labourers or caregivers. South African women have been involved in agriculture for centuries. Women typically access agricultural land and resources through their husbands or male family members. The problem is that they require permission from men to access assets and use farming land (Hart & Makhetha, 2018). According to Raidim (2014), it is imperative to include the role of women in agriculture to successfully implement agricultural programs successfully. Lindeque (2019) recognised that women in Limpopo set a precedent for women in the agricultural sector. For many years, agriculture was perceived as a male industry or a 'boys club'. However, over 130 women in some parts of Limpopo came together and formed a strategic partnership to help them stand on their own (Lindeque, 2019). Apart from working together, women involved in small scale farming are partnering with philanthropic organisations. According to Sishuba (2019), in 2018, the Vodacom Foundation, in partnership with UN Women and South African Women in Farming (SAWIF), commenced a programme called the 'women farmers program'. Under the programme, over 600 small-scale women farmers from rural areas, including Limpopo, received training to empower women and create equal opportunities.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

2.2.1 Introduction

The theoretical framework in qualitative research underscores the importance of understanding beliefs and presents a specific theory for the study. It informs the research questions, which address social problems of individual and groups (Bahta et al., 2019). According to Collins and Stockton (2018), the theoretical framework in qualitative research provides a clear focus and connects the study to existing knowledge about complex phenomena. Additionally, a theoretical framework is essential to building a foundation, assessing research design and demonstrating how a study advances knowledge (Rocco & Plakhotnik, 2009). The study examined how philanthropic organisations play a role in women development in areas where government support is inadequate. Thus, government failure theory would have been most suitable. However, the study also examined the role of philanthropic organisations in women development. Therefore, it considered a theory that challenges patriarchal norms while highlighting challenges women face due to gender inequality.

Grand (1991) inferred that government failure theory parallels that of market failure, meaning that government institutions may fail just as the market fails. This failure is caused by certain conditions such as (government) self-interest, distribution of inequality of goods and services and economic inefficiencies that cause a disjuncture between governments interventions and the inefficiencies that would exist in an actual free-market system. Liu (2017) argued that government failure theory suggests that non-profit organisations activities are most prevalent where there are gaps in the supply of public services. Liu (2017) further added that the government failure theory contends that non-profit organisations supplement government services. Anheier (2014) reiterates Liu's argument, suggesting that non-profit organisations fill the gaps and offer public goods when the government fails to provide products and services efficiently. However, based on the above literature review, the government failure theory does not fully explain women's participation or lack thereof in the economy. The theory further failed to explain government interventions to women development projects.

Thus, this study is centred on the liberal feminist approach. This approach explores and describes the support philanthropic organisations and government institutions give to women in agriculture to further their socio-economic development. Historically, agriculture was perceived as a dominant male sector, despite the significant efforts of women. On a global

scale, female farmers are generally invisible, although they contribute to 40 per cent of all food production (Martin, 2019). Thus, feminist theory is suitable to explore how 'conventional rural masculinity' can be dismantled to elevate women's contribution to food production. This theory considers strategies, approaches and processes that philanthropic organisations can adopt to change women's lives sustainably. Under the lens of liberal feminist theory, food security through agriculture is associated with women small-scale farmers. It further explains how philanthropic interventions that focus on women can help fight food insecurities.

In contrast, the market-based perspective, philanthropy is based on political and ideological approach which is market based (Morvaridi, 2012). Morvaridi (2012) further stated that this idea of philanthropy was capitalist because philanthropic activities were meant to assist others create wealth. In terms of agriculture, production is to be implemented through market led forces and strategies (Morvaridi, 2012). An example of the market-based approach initiative is the Green Revolution for food security project. During the era of state-led development, philanthropists and state institutions partnered to expand and capitalise farming and promote agriculture business for the market. Further, Morvaridi (2012) argued that under the nexus of neo-liberalism, philanthropy is embedded in a concept of governance through partnerships with the private sector and other non-state actors. Although the market-orientated agricultural sector promotes substantiable agriculture and partnership between government institutions and philanthropy, the theory does not focus specifically on women development in the sector. This study therefore does not depend on this theory to explain women's challenges and opportunities in the agricultural sector. The more appropriate theory is the feminist analytical lens.

2.2.2 Feminist Theory Perspective (liberal)

Lay and Daley (2007, p.49) point out that, the "feminist theory has developed as a small part of a huge feminist movement striving to challenge traditions, methodologies, and priorities in all aspects." The theory emerged in the 1970s from a workshop that sought to understand and confront the complexities of women's subordination. The word gender, like development, had a specific usage before feminist theorists extended its meaning. Feminist scholars argued that women's subordination was not biologically determined but was socially constructed (Barriteau, Connelly & Parpart, 2000). Feminist theorists understand that political, social, and cultural systematic injustices are based on gender inequality. Thus, feminist theorists attempt to deconstruct and redefine skewed perspectives about the male and female roles through building knowledge and theory (Barriteau et al., 2000; Lay & Daley, 2007). The feminist

theory approach addresses and highlights diverse challenges women face within institutions that frame these challenges. Feminist scholars view gender as a lens that focuses on their issues and shapes their livelihood conditions (Creswell, 2013). The feminist ideology aims to "correct" both the invisibility and distortion of female experience in ways relevant to ending women's unequal social position (Creswell, 2013, p. 29). The liberal conception of feminist theory emphasises equal opportunity for both men and women. Liberal feminism viewed that biological sex was not the reason for women's subordination, instead it was due to social norms. Feminist theorists such as Mary Wollstonecraft similarly argued that women were equally capable as men. She further argued that women appear to be intellectually inferior not because of biological factors but due to a lack of educational opportunities, a consequence of inequality (Barriteau et al., 2000.; Wollstonecraft, 1729). This research study explored how women experience philanthropic organisations; hence, the feminist perspective is critical. Unequal access to resources and socio-economic barriers women faces regarding equal participation as men are better explained by liberal feminism theory. The theory focuses on the rights for women to access resources, economic independence and equality (Lay & Daley, 2007). Although other development theories could be considered seeing that the study focuses on the development of women in agriculture, the reality is that current gendered approaches to development are influenced mainly by liberal and socialist feminists. Approaches such as the modernisation theory do not discuss women issues in depth. Within this perspective, women's development and economic activities are ignored, assuming women to be caretakers in their households (Barriteau et al., 2000; Sarker, 2006).

Feminist theory is not without its limitations, as Lay and Daley (2007) argued that the main critique of the theory assumes that focusing on gender to address social issues is simplistic and reductionist. Modernisation theory focused primarily on industrialisation, technology, and modern values rather than the emancipation of women for equal access and participation in economic resources. Feminist scholars argued that there is a need to evaluate development and modernisation (Sarker, 2006). They further critique the theory by asserting, "development plans and projects would not succeed unless women's potential and actual productive roles were recognised" (Sarker, 2006, p. 57). Lay and Daley (2007) further claimed, "a central purpose of feminist theory is a "commitment to change oppressive structures..." (p. 50), meaning that the theory did not take into account private issues such as poverty and childcare (Lay & Daley, 2007).

The Feminist theory was employed in this study to provide a clear focus in analysing power relations and other forms of exclusion for women. Liberal feminist theory is suitable for the study because the approach broadly encompasses the roles of government institutions and philanthropic foundations to describe challenges women face in the agricultural sector. Feminist theorists also understand that political, social, and cultural systematic injustices are based on gender inequality. These are some of the concepts found in the literature that exacerbated gender disparities, inequality and discrimination based on gender. The theory further considers rights for women to access resources, economic independence, and equality.

2.3 Chapter Summary

The literature review has shown that small-scale farmers significantly contribute to food security through the agricultural sector. Women constitute the majority of the agricultural workforce—mainly small-scale women farmers in rural communities. Over 33 million small-scale farmers contribute to the production of food crops in Sub-Saharan Africa to increase domestic food security. Small-scale farmers rely mainly on intervention and support from government institutions for sustainability. The agricultural sector plays a significant role in economic development for achieving food security and reducing poverty. Small-scale farmers produce 80 per cent of the world's food supply. The Limpopo province is considered the fruit and breadbasket of South Africa. The province has many agricultural opportunities for small-scale farmers, particularly for women who constitute most small-scale women in the province and Sub-Saharan Africa. The two districts, Capricorn, and Vhembe are home to two large farms that support both the local economy and enterprises across South Africa. The ZZ2 is the largest producer of tomatoes globally, while the Zebediela Citrus Estate is the local market and exports to the international market. Women contribution to agricultural production is critical for food security. Traditionally, most women were employed as part-time general farm workers, while men enjoyed full-time employment as owners, managers, and supervisors. Women continue to face gender discrimination and barriers that prevent them from accessing equal opportunities. Although many women in the sector continue to face barriers, women are starting to form partnerships to stand on their own to acquire resources needed for farming. The initiative demonstrates that women are philanthropic and can create their own opportunities outside the support of the government and donors.

The South African government is also working on policies and strategies to close gaps created by the unequal system while excluding women's role in the agricultural sector. South Africa post-1994 agricultural sector strategies, interventions, and policies such as land reform policy, the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development strategy, and the Integrated Food Security Strategy aim to tackle food security challenges. The Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development programme is one of the few policy interventions in South Africa that focus on women development. Although there are still challenges implementing some of these policies, the South African government finds other innovative ways to tackle food insecurity and promote the agricultural sector for economic development—to further the land reform programme. Land restitution strategy and Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development strategy facilitate the dispossessed people or community giving back their land and being compensated and help provide financial redress to black South African citizens. The strategy assists farmers to access land mainly for agricultural purposes. Although land reform policies aimed to assist poor communities to acquire agricultural land and form small farming enterprises, the policies were not implemented successfully. Only a few individuals can afford, access, and maintain the farmland.

South African philanthropy is embedded in the nexus of Ubuntu. Most South Africans give based on the notion of caring for each other's well-being and showing humility. There is a lot of giving in South Africa. While the domestic philanthropy in South Africa is predominantly corporate, giving behaviour in South Africa also includes contributions from High-Net-Worth Individuals, foundations and the general population. Ordinary South Africans give their time and financial resources to individuals, family members and communities in times of need. Women also benefit from philanthropic organisations that fund and support women based enterprises. When government programs fail to meet basic needs, philanthropy becomes a source of funding for different sectors in the middle to low-income countries. The P.E.A.C.E Foundation, Lima and the Future Farmers Foundation support agriculture and recognise that agriculture is critical for development. In addition, the Motsepe Foundation, SAB Foundation, Coca-Cola Mintirho foundation and the Vodacom foundation also offer various support and programmes to the agricultural sector in Limpopo. The foundations focus particularly on the development of women in agriculture in rural communities. Additionally, the foundations' partner with community leaders and other non-governmental support structures such as SaveAct to provide the communities with the programmes and support to fight poverty through food security.

Interventions from government institutions and philanthropic organisations remain crucial for women's development and tackling poverty, fighting hunger, and promoting food security. The government's interventions in the agricultural sector often translates to subsidies. However, government interventions are rarely sufficient or easy to access. Challenges of access to resources tend to affect women more than men. Although women are the backbone of rural agriculture, men still dominate access to farming opportunities, land, and productive resources and have more bargaining power to control resources. Women's roles in agriculture remain as general farmworkers without equal access to land and resources as men due to socially constructed gender norms. Women must remain anonymous and find creative ways such as working through a male relative or working with their male son to access land and resources as a result. The liberal feminist theory shows how patriarchal norms have helped shape the marginalisation of women. Gender inequality has thus enabled society to continue to normalise marginalising women by gender. This marginalisation has created limitations for women to access resources, own land, and access markers without asking men for assistance. The study found that political, social, and cultural systems further contribute to the marginalisation of women in the agricultural sector. The next chapter focuses on a holistic overview of the agricultural sector in South Africa, particularly in the Capricorn and Vhembe districts in the Limpopo province.

Chapter 3

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This section focuses on the research methodology and methods employed in this study. The study was conducted in the Capricorn and Vhembe districts of Limpopo Province. Agricultural activities in these two districts constitute a significant contribution to the local and regional economy (Dagada et al., 2012). The research methodology included a description of the research approach, research tools, sampling procedures, the process of analysis, limitations, and ethical considerations of the study. The study adopted a qualitative research approach, which employs an interpretivism paradigm. The Interpretivism paradigm is suitable because its epistemological proposition helped the researcher interpret information and understand the text's meaning (Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017). A qualitative research approach is suitable for exploring how food security can be achieved by promoting women's development through agriculture. It also assesses how philanthropic organisations influence women development in the agricultural sector. Qualitative research methods generally involve a systematic collection and organisation of data about a specific phenomenon. Creswell (2009) defined qualitative research as a method for exploring and understanding the meaning of social and human challenges by gaining a holistic insight through informal contact with subjects.

3.1.1 Research Approach

The qualitative research approach involved collecting, interpreting, and analysing nonnumerical data to understand concepts and ideas from a selected group. This approach is commonly used to respond to questions related to personal experience and the perspective of the participant viewpoint (Hammarberg, Kirkman & de Lacey, 2016). According to Creswell, the research approach refers to "plans and the procedures for research that span the steps from broad assumptions to detailed methods of data collection, analysis, and interpretation" (Creswell, 2014, p. 3). The qualitative research approach was preferred because it is based on epistemological assumptions that clearly explained the social phenomenon, drawing from human knowledge, realities, and comprehension. Thus, applying this approach in the study established and uncovered the participant's knowledge in this social context (Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017; Yilmaz, 2013). Additionally, the qualitative research method allowed for an interpretation and understanding of the role of philanthropy within the food security sphere,

particularly for women development in the rural agricultural sector. According to Yilmaz (2013), the qualitative research method is interpretive, naturalistic and allows the researcher to develop a holistic overview of the subject matter.

Qualitative research assisted the researcher to explore and describe the experiences of small-scale women farmers working in the Capricorn and Vhembe districts in Limpopo. The method assisted the researcher to assess the role philanthropic organisations play in women development in the agricultural sector in the two districts. Creswell (2014) argued that qualitative research aims to uncover people's perceptions about their lives, how they interact with others through their social environment. Qualitative research is most suitable for this study because it provides a flexible way of collecting data from farmers and philanthropic organisations, thus allowing the researcher to collect information that provided an in-depth understanding of respondents' experiences. The method is also suitable because it does not rely on statistical or numerical data analysis. Further, the strength of a qualitative research study is that it can allow for new evidence and raise more issues for research through in-depth analysis. Additionally, this approach uses research tools such as open-ended questionnaires, textual material, and journals. However, the approach can be subjective, a disadvantage as it often relies on the researcher's discretion and interpretation (Mohajan, 2018).

The study further employed a qualitative research approach to primary and secondary data to understand and assess the role of philanthropy and women development through food security. Primary data was collected using a survey/questionnaire instrument, while secondary data was collected through secondary sources such as documents and literature review. The researcher used primary and secondary data to gather first-hand information from the relevant sample and existing literature to strengthen the study. Primary data was collected to assess the research problem specific to small-scale women farmers in the Capricorn and Vhembe districts and the role of the philanthropic organisation in this area. Secondary data was helpful in this study because it presented the researcher with a range of information from numerous sources that are vital for the study. Data was sourced from official government documents, journals and publications, books, newspapers and website documents from organisations (Hox & Boeije, 2005).

3.1.2 Research Tools and Applications

Data collection is a technique used to collect information. Data collection in qualitative methods enables the researcher to answer stated research questions (Creswell, 2014; Kabir, 2016). The study adopted an interpretive approach to understanding the world and subjective individual experiences better. This approach helped to make sense of complex situations and explain the meanings behind social phenomena. It is the most suitable approach for contextualising in-depth interpretation of the subjects under study (Chowdhury, 2014). The primary method used to collect data is a questionnaire that was disseminated through an online survey instrument. An online survey instrument was suitable for the study because it is a less structured research methodology. It allowed for in-depth information from both the farmers and philanthropic organisations. According to Creswell (2014), collecting qualitative data via an online instrument has an advantage because it reduces costs and the method is less time-consuming. Jansen (2010) stated that qualitative surveys are most suitable for qualitative research because they allow respondents to give profound, in-depth, and diverse feedback about their unique experiences without constraints.

The primary data was collected via a survey instrument from philanthropic organisations working specifically in South Africa. Primary data was also collected from small-scale farmers working in Vhembe and Capricorn district in Limpopo. The main objective for collecting data from philanthropic organisations and small-scale farmers was to establish the role philanthropic organisations play in the development of small-scale farmers—particularly female farmers in the Capricorn and the Vhembe districts in Limpopo. Additional information from publications, reports, newspaper articles and statistical reports from government and non-government organisations were assessed. The following criteria for inclusion were considered for secondary data. At least 40 documents and journal articles from 2015 to 2021 were considered for literature review. This period was selected because it covers information and literature that is still relevant to current challenges faced by small-scale farmers. Data was sourced from books, scholarly journals and government and non-government records accessed through the Wits University online library and other online library searches such as Google Scholar, Research Gate, and other journal publications. The advantage of sampling secondary data is that most sources are accessible online. Secondary data can be re-evaluated to gain new insights.

3.1.3 Sampling Procedure

Sampling in qualitative research refers to the process of selecting a specific group of people from a defined population to participate in the research study (Guest, Mitchell & Namey, 2013). It is not practical to include the whole population relevant for the study, and therefore a sample is selected. The purposive sampling technique was selected for this study. Duan et al. (2015, p. 533) stated, "purposeful sampling is widely used in qualitative research for the identification and selection of information-rich cases related to the phenomenon of interest." Additionally, purposive sampling identifies and attains data from individuals and groups that are well-informed and have insightful, in-depth understanding and experience of a phenomenon of interest (Alkassim, Etikan & Musa, 2016; Duan et al. 2015). Thus, the technique was appropriate because it allowed the researcher to sample participants with the necessary data suitable to answer the research questions for this study. Purposive sampling in qualitative research allows the researcher to focus on a small part of the population relevant for the study (Campbell et al., 2020; Creswell, 2014). The small and purposively selected sample is suitable for a qualitative study that seeks sample-specific and information-rich cases for in-depth research (Campbell et al., 2020). The study internationally selected specific individuals of interest in a targeted population to gather relevant information for the study, thus, purposive sampling technique is useful for remaining focused on the research goal.

3.1.3.1 Primary data (Sample A): Philanthropic Organisations Sample

The targeted population are philanthropic organisations working within South Africa. Philanthropic organisations include the private sector, corporates, NGOs, foundations (community, national and international), Trusts and other institutions that support development through the agricultural sector. The sample targeted philanthropic organisations working specifically in South Africa to answer the research questions. The researcher 's sample target was between fifteen (15) to twenty-five (25) philanthropic organisations. Focusing on organisations that work specifically within South Africa helped the researcher identify gaps in funding for small-scale farmers and identify where there is fund saturation from donors. A questionnaire was shared with philanthropic organisations through an online survey instrument. A questionnaire is suitable for this study because it allowed to effectively collect massive data at low costs and in a short time. Further, most organisations' staff are working from home to minimise the spread of Covid19. Therefore, an online instrument was most suitable to reach many people who are not easily accessible in person during this period.

3.1.3.2 Primary Data (Sample B): Small-scale Farmers' Sample

The criteria for selecting the target sample in the Capricorn and Vhembe district was informed by the research problem. The study sought to identify gaps in funding and challenges facing small-scale farmers in the two districts. The study targeted small-scale female farmers in the Vhembe and Capricorn districts. The sample size was between twenty to twenty-five (20-25) respondents. It fitted to assess both groups because most of the literature suggests that women continue to work as general workers in the agricultural sector. Therefore, considering women's challenges despite their position on the farms was necessary. Although the study is aimed at examining small-scale women farmers in Capricorn and Vhembe districts, the research also received responses from male small-scale farmers. Due to the nature of the agricultural sector in the two districts understudy, male small-scale farmers indicated that they work with women in their enterprises. Therefore, the male farmers' perspective was critical for assessing challenges women face because of remaining in the margins, while male farmers have access to information and institutions.

Participants from this district were targeted because agricultural activities are the primary source of income, predominantly carried out by small-scale female farmers. Samples were collected using a questionnaire sent to the participants in the form of an online survey. Most small-scale farmers did not have formal work email addresses. Thus, the questionnaires were sent to their mobile phone through instant messaging. This method was helpful because most participants were able to complete the survey promptly using minimal data costs.

3.1.4 Process of Analysis

This section discusses the process of data analysis. Primary data was collected from philanthropic organisations working in South Africa and from small-scale farmers in the Capricorn and Vhembe districts in Limpopo. The data was collected using a questionnaire through an online survey. According to Wong (2008, p. 14), "data analysis in qualitative research is defined as the process of systematically searching and arranging the interview transcripts, observation notes, or other non-textual materials that the researcher accumulates to increase the understanding of the phenomenon." The process of data analysis involves categorising, thematising, and interpreting data. Phenomenological analysis is ideal for the

study because it aims to understand social reality (Addington-Hall, Long-Sutehall & Sque, 2011). Therefore, it applies to this study because it seeks to understand the challenges of funding small-scale farmers, particularly women in rural Limpopo. Analysing qualitative research involves coding and categorising data to make sense and formulating meaning from the vast data (Wong, 2008). The study considered this approach because the thematic analysis can produce insightful findings, and it can help summarise crucial features from an extensive database. Swart (2019, p. 2) stated, "thematic analysis has been described as a useful method of analysing qualitative data for researchers, facilitating the organisation of data, and capturing valuable information."

The thematic analysis involves six distinct steps for data analysis. The first phase involves familiarisation with the data. Therefore, relevant data that has been set aside will require thorough engagement to establish relevant codes and themes, which will lead to generating initial codes in phase two. Phases three and four deal with searching and reviewing themes. Codes relevant to the study are attained by selecting the most repetitive concepts from the coded data. For example, a theme in this context could be funding based on merit, as illustrated in phase five. Lastly, a report will be produced outlining the process of coding and analysis in detail (Nowell et al., 2017). Thematic analysis of data is ideal for the study because the method examines data to gain meaningful insight into participants perspectives. The method further allows the researcher to identify patterns that will assist the researcher to understand the content of responses from data collected from survey questions (Swart, 2019). Swart (2019) further stated that open-ended and close-ended survey questions are used in research to collect information from a sample of participants. Open-ended questions provide participants with the freedom and flexibility to respond to questions as they think appropriate. At the same time, closed-ended questions are quick and easy to answer and improve the consistency of responses. The thematic analysis process is useful for this study owning that the research study involved going through an extensive database to answer the research question.

The data was collected from philanthropic organisations consisting of **twenty-three (23) participants**. Data was collected using an online survey instrument—the sample comprised of participants from philanthropic organisations working within South Africa. The identity of the respondents was protected by giving them coded names starting with the letters **PO**. The data was collected also from small-scale farmers consisting of **twenty-four (24) participants**. Data was collected using an online survey instrument—the sample comprised participants from

small-scale farmers in the Capricorn and Vhembe districts in Limpopo, South Africa. The identity of the respondents was protected by giving them coded names starting with the letters **SF**. The data analysis process involved categorising, thematising, and interpreting primary data collected using an online survey questionnaire. A survey instrument in the thematic analysis is valuable for eliciting knowledge about the respondents by asking specific questions directed at a specific situation they face (Swart, 2019). Thus, the study chose this approach because the thematic analysis can produce insightful findings and summarise crucial features from the two sets of questionnaires.

To begin the analysis process, the researcher started the process of coding after familiarising herself with the data. The coding process was conducted manually. Codes were selected after reviewing the answers from the questionnaires, and common texts were highlighted. Coding is necessary because it involves sub-diving a considerable amount of raw data subsequently assigning them into categories. Codes are also useful to identify allocated themes (Wong, 2008). The selected codes aimed to identify common themes from farmers and philanthropic organisations. These codes are necessary because they highlight essential text frequently used by participants. Words and phrases that sample respondents frequently used include gender, development, focus/support. These words and phrases are frequently used by ***Sample A***, respondents include funder/funding/ grant/incentives/subsidy, monetary, skills, support, and government/ philanthropic/donor organisations. The following are important codes for ***Sample A*** highlighting the respondents' ideas and knowledge to answer the main research question, which is, how is philanthropy contributing to food security in the rural agriculture sector, particularly through supporting women-led initiatives.

Table 2: Sample A – Codes

See Appendix A

Sample A	Questions	Code	Code colour
	Does your organisation work directly with small-scale women farmers in Limpopo? Does your organisation focus specifically on supporting women-led initiatives in the agriculture sector?	Gender	
	What is the main motivation to support small-scale women farmers in Limpopo? Which development initiative(s) does your organisation support projects or enterprise in Limpopo? Would you please select all relevant?	Development	
	How would you classify the organisations you fund? / Would you please elaborate on how and why you support women initiatives programmes?	Focus/ Support	

The following are important codes for ***Sample B*** highlighting the respondents' ideas to answer the sub-question which is, in what way can small-scale women farmers work with government institutions and philanthropic organisations to improve their farming enterprises?

Table 3: Sample B – Codes

See Appendix B

	Questions	Code	Code colour
Sample B	How do you get to receive funds from philanthropic organisations?	Funder/ funding/ grant/incentives/subsidy	
	What support does your organisation need? How would you classify contributions from philanthropic organisations?	Monetary	
	What support does your organisation need? How would you classify contributions from philanthropic organisations? What can be done to improve your work?	Skills/training	
	What support does your organisation need?	Support	
	From which institution have you received the support?	Government/ Philanthropic/donor organisations	

After creating codes, the next step was to identify patterns and themes. Generally, themes are more specific codes. According to Swart (2019), themes consist of main ideas that encompass clear and essential phrases that clearly explain the focus of the ideas under study. The researcher isolated four themes from each sample. These themes give a deeper meaning to the data. Data isolation allows the researcher to categorise respondents' similar experiences (O'Connor & Gibson, 2003). One of the themes that emerged from ***sample A*** is that most organisations did not support based on gender. Instead, they supported all initiatives and the theme that emerged from ***sample B*** was limited funding and access to funding opportunities.

Table 4: Sample A – Themes

	Code	Theme
Sample A	Gender	We support women in the context of community development. - take a holistic view; we support both genders; Not gender-specific
	Development	focus on economic inclusion; To combat hunger through food security programmes; Economic transformation
	Focus / Support	focus on economic inclusion; focus on youth development; Training and skills; Resource mobilisation; We support all annotations projects

Table 5: Sample B – Themes

	Code	Theme
Sample B	Funder /funding/ grant/incentives/subsidy	Limited funding and access to funding opportunities; No contact or knowledge of such organisations
	Monetary	No funding/support from organisations; own capital
	Skills/training	Lack of skills and training for women in farming
	Support	Farming machinery and equipment; Facilitate the marketing of agricultural products; Monetary subsidy; Poor market for agricultural products.
	Government/ Philanthropic/donor organisations	Government endorsement

3.1.5 Limitation of the Study

Limitations in a research study are generally constraints that impact or influence the study's interpretation of findings (Murnan & Price, 2004). Although all studies have limitations, limitations create an opportunity for further research. Limitations can be in the form of sample size, lack of reliable data, and access to organisations, people and documents (Bibler Zaidi & Ross, 2019). The study was conducted using a survey targeting philanthropic organisations and small-scale farmers in Capricorn and Vhembe district in Limpopo. Concerning philanthropic organisations, most organisations, donors, NGOs and (HNWIs) stressed that they were willing to participate in the survey. However, they did not have the mandate to divulge financial information for this study. Some organisations opted out of the study. They did not think they could participate in the survey because their organisations did not fund agricultural projects. Even though the purpose of the study is to highlight gaps in funding small-scale farmers, farmers felt their contribution would not make any difference. Additionally, several emails were no longer active due to changes in job portfolios and the database was not updated. The sample was impacted immensely as a result.

The distribution of questionnaires was a challenge for small-scale farmers. The delivery of many emails sent to farmers was unsuccessful because most farmers could not maintain their web pages due to financial constraints. Distribution of the questionnaire via cell phone instant messaging was also a challenge because most farmers could no longer afford to buy data. Most small-scale farmers had lost their business because of restrictions imposed by the government due to the spread of Covid19.

3.1.6 Ethical Considerations

Ethical issues may also arise while conducting non-experimental research, such as survey research. The researcher has a moral obligation to protect participants in their study. Thus, the researcher must ensure that the participants' information is kept anonymous and confidential. Furthermore, the researcher must obtain consent and fully inform the participants what their information will be used (Drew, Hardman & Hosp, 2008). Ethical consideration is vital for university research where human participants are involved. Such considerations are important to ensure that participants are protected by being anonymous and their identity and personal information. The participants were respected and treated with integrity. Although there are minimal ethical risks to consider, it was crucial to follow the ethics guidelines provided by the

Wits University ethics committee. Information provided by the participants using a questionnaire through an online survey remained anonymous and confidential. To respect and protect the participants ' identity, personal information from organisations and individuals was removed from the data sets and replaced by an alphabet or numbers. Participants were made aware that taking part in the survey was voluntary and free to opt out at any given time.

3.2 Chapter Summary

The chapter further focused on sampling and provided details of data collection and data analysis methods followed in the study. The purposive sampling technique was used to select a small sample of individuals and groups that were well informed, insightful, and in-depth understanding of the subject matter. Primary data from 23 philanthropic organisations and 24 small-scale farmers were coded, thematised, and analysed using a thematic data analysis process. The process was conducted manually using colour codes. Lastly, the chapter discussed the limitations and ethical considerations of the research study.

Chapter 4

4. Research Findings

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research findings on the assessment of the role that philanthropic organisations play in influencing women development particularly in the food security sector. The study is based in two rural districts that fall under the Limpopo province. There are three main findings and several sub findings emanating from the study. These are drawn from two samples; mainly sample A which comprises philanthropic organisations; and sample B which is made up of small-scale farmers from Vhembe and Capricorn regions. In the main the findings are;

1) Philanthropic organisations have not contributed adequately to or prioritised funding small scale (women) farmers in general and; in particular there has not been much support to the small scale farmers located in Limpopo;
2) The majority of small scale women farmers do not have adequate knowledge and access to both government and philanthropic support for their enterprises;
3) As a result of the lack of knowledge and access to philanthropies and government institutions, most small scale women farmers would like to be supported financially, through skills training and provision of equipment and machinery. In addition, small scale farmers would want philanthropic organisations to be visible during women specific events like women's month.

These findings are presented below and thereafter discussed in light of existing literature and the feminist theory. The findings are a result of a qualitative research methodology that was discussed in Chapter 1. This approach allowed for an in-depth understanding of the experiences of small-scale farmers in the Capricorn and Vhembe districts in Limpopo, the trends and funding interests of philanthropic organisations. In addition, the research benefited from male respondents who originally were not part of the sample, however when the questionnaires were sent out to respective organisations, a sizable number of men responded on behalf of their organisations. While this was not originally envisaged and planned, it turned out to be helpful in confirming the main thrust of this study, that women are still relegated to general and non-managerial positions even in organisations that have a large women workforce. Another feature

of the sample is that some of the philanthropic organisations that were identified for the study described themselves as NGOs. This does not skew the findings because NGOs, trusts and some corporates units that are doing voluntary work for public good are also treated as philanthropies by writers (Payton & Moody, 2008).


The chapter is structured as follows: the first section discusses the demographic profile of respondents, followed by a presentation of key findings. The last section discusses findings and concludes the chapter.

4.2 Demographic Profile of Respondents

There are forty-seven (47) respondents to the two questionnaires that were circulated. Of these, twenty-three (23) are from *sample A* and twenty-four (24) are from *sample B*. A summary of each respondent is provided below in ***Tables 6 and 7***. *Sample A* respondents are anonymised using the descriptive label **PO** while *sample B* respondents are identified as **SF**. A very important feature for this study is that most POs did not fund gender specific programmes, which by implication means that their programmes are not influenced by a feminist approach. Of the 22 POs that responded, only 9 funded in the Limpopo region. Of those that funded in the Limpopo region, 8 funded projects in Vhembe and Capricorn. Of these six (6) said they worked directly with small scale women farmers in Limpopo.

Additionally, as noted above, some of the SFs are men who indicated that they were working with at least one or more women. For this reason, their contribution was included in the study as it helped to identify gaps in funding of small-scale women farmers and the limitations that women have in accessing key information when compared to men. From the respondents, all the men that answered the questionnaire were either a founder or a manager while women were either a founder, manager, or general worker. The power dynamics and the distribution of resources is already apparent and skewed towards men. The researcher deduced that men can either facilitate the growth of women farmers or limit it. **See annexure 1(a).**


Figure 1: types of philanthropic organisations



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Corporate foundation	30.43%	7
Community foundation	13.04%	3
Operating foundation	4.35%	1
Other (please specify)	52.17%	12
TOTAL		23

See annexure 1(b).

Figure 2: Small-scale farmers vs other organisational types



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Corporation	8.33%	2
Social/community organisation	16.67%	4
Small-scale / Smallholder	66.67%	16
Other (please specify)	8.33%	2
TOTAL		24


4.3 Research Findings

The findings from the research study are presented individually below and expanded by discussing related issues around the types of support given or should be granted to small scale farmers, access to markets for small scale women farmers and the various ways through which government and philanthropy should work with small scale women farmers.

4.3.1 Philanthropic Contributions to Food Security through Women-led Initiatives

The primary finding to the question, 'how is philanthropy contributing to food security in the rural agriculture sector by supporting women led initiatives?', is that most philanthropic organisations studied did not have gender specific funding in general. As a result, they did not fund adequately or prioritise agriculture and food security projects for women development. Thus, the philanthropic contributions were minimal when measured in monitory terms. Instead, philanthropic organisations preferred funding other issues such as health, education, children, and youth development among others as depicted in ***figure 3 below***. Only two of the twenty organisations that responded to the questionnaire funded women specific projects in agriculture compared to thirteen (13) that funded other areas. Although education and health in the figure below have less support, responses to open ended questions and the addition of areas lumped under the 'other' show that philanthropic organisations prefer funding education and health. As discussed later, this is consistent with philanthropic funding trends globally and locally. Beyond financial contributions, philanthropic organisations provided other forms of support such as skills training and resource mobilisation strategies.


Figure 3: Development initiatives supported by philanthropic organisations in Limpopo



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Agricultural projects for women development	10.00%	2
Children and youth development	5.00%	1
Innovation and technology	5.00%	1
Education	10.00%	2
Health	5.00%	1
Other (please specify)	65.00%	13
TOTAL		20

Figure 4 below further buttresses the finding above. It shows that of the 22 that responded, half did not have gender specific funding, only four (4) said they supported women development initiatives and the rest said they focused on children, youth development and health care access among others. In instances where POs supported gender, the focus was primarily on Gender Based Violence (GBV) issues, women's rights, and women who bear the brunt of marginalisation, oppression, and dispossession. PO20 (10 October 2021) for example said, "we *advocate for philanthropy to be a tool that allows those affected by injustice to play a central role in the decisions that affect their lives*".

Figure 4: Philanthropic support type vs gender focus




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Focus on women development	18.18%	4
Not gender specific	50.00%	11
Other (please specify)	31.82%	7
TOTAL		22

The same finding emerged when POs were directly asked, 'does your organisation focus specifically on supporting women led initiatives in the agricultural sector? Seventy-seven (77) per cent of the respondents said they did not while eighteen (18) per cent said they did. PO14 for example said;

> *We do not support initiatives aimed at women but rather nudge our partners to mainstream gender and set equity targets, the one exception being a small grant to AWARD (African Women in Agricultural Research and Development) in support of early-career researchers" (06 October 2021).*

Figure 5: philanthropy focus on supporting women-led



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	18.18%	4
No	77.27%	17
If Yes (please specify)	18.18%	4
Total Respondents: 22		

However, there were exceptions to the finding that philanthropic organisations did not prefer agriculture and women led initiatives, partly because they did not have gender or women specific funding and also because they did not a feminist or gender strategy to guide their work. The exception was that there were few foundations such as PO12 that consciously funded women led initiatives in general and small-scale women farmers in particular. PO12 is a national foundation that aimed for 50 per cent gender split in all its programming. The foundation had a large macadamia farming initiative in Limpopo that is made up of mostly women farmers. In addition, the foundation had a second initiative in Limpopo, Keiskammahoek and Jozini. The Tholoana Programme targeted few communities for large-scale farming. Although the focus is not women specific, the call for applications is sent out once a year and is open to women farmers. In addition to the fact that most POs did not have gender specific funding, it was interesting to understand how the same POs engaged with their beneficiaries. Did they approach them for proposals, or did they accept unsolicited approaches? When asked if they (philanthropic organisations) approached or were approached by small scale women farmers, four (4) of the 19 who responded said they approached women farmers and they were also approached, while two (2) worked through partners, another 2 issued calls for proposals and three (3) accepted unsolicited approaches only. The rest (seven) said this question was not applicable to them. This could be because they provided other forms of support other than funding.


Another area of enquiry was 'whether philanthropic organisations anchored their programming and support for women initiatives on a feminist or gender strategy or philosophy'. Asked whether their support for women initiatives was motivated by an organisational feminist approach or policy?' twenty-nine (29) per cent said they were motivated while the rest (71 per cent) said they were not (see Table 8). This was an important question to probe because the study sought to use the feminist theory to explain the phenomena under study. It asked the question, why are women still not given significant attention by philanthropies or development institutions? Is it due to patriarchal and cultural norms; power dynamics or socialisation of women and men? The feminist lens helps by asking questions of systemic and structural nature.

Table 8: number of organisations motivated by feminist approach or policy

Answer choices	Number of responses	Percentage
Yes	6	29%
No	15	71%
Total	21	100%

In the absence of a gender or feminist strategy, the question is, what then motivated or drove the POs' philanthropic giving when supporting small scale women farmers in the Limpopo region? From their responses, there seemed to be two factors: economic transformation (22 per cent) and combating hunger through food security programmes (22 per cent).


Figure 6: Motivations for supporting small-scale women farmers in Limpopo



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Women development	5.56%	1
Supporting previously disadvantaged communities	0.00%	0
To combat hunger through food security programmes	22.22%	4
Economic transformation	22.22%	4
Other (please specify)	50.00%	9
TOTAL		18

Given the low numbers of POs that provided women or gender specific funding in general and funding to small scale women farmers in the two districts in Limpopo, it was important to find out the levels of amounts that have been spent in the area. Looking at a five-year period, forty two (42) per cent of the respondents said they had spent an average of R500 000, while 32 per cent said they had spent between R500 000 and R1000 000; and 26 per cent had spent over R5 000 000 as in ***figure 7***).

Figure 7: Average amounts contributed by philanthropy to small- scale women farmers in the past 5 years (in Limpopo)



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Less than R500 000	42.11%	8
R500 001 to R1 000 0000	31.58%	6
R1 000 001 to R5 000 000	0.00%	0
0ver 5 000 000	26.32%	5
TOTAL		19


When asked about their future funding plans, the majority (17 respondents out of 19) of the POs said they were not planning to increase their support to small scale women farmers in Limpopo. As stated above, POs also provided other forms of support. They offered more than financial support. They provided training and skills development (57 per cent), resource mobilisation (38 per cent) and volunteering (29 per cent) as illustrated in ***figure 8 below***. This was supported for example by PO16 who said:,

"We provide food, training and education".

The need for training and skills development was also echoed by small scale women farmers who highlighted that women who are leading agricultural initiatives ought to be supported to

acquire the necessary skills. Of the twenty-four (24) respondents, 13 said they needed skills training, while 9 required monetary support.

Figure 8: Non-monetary support from philanthropic organisations




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Training and skills development	57.14%	12
Resource mobilisation	38.10%	8
Supply seeds and farming equipment	19.05%	4
Volunteering time and services	28.57%	6
Other (please specify)	42.86%	9
Total Respondents: 21		

4.3.2 Ways in which Small Scale Farmers are Working with Philanthropic Organisations.

The second area of enquiry for this study sought to investigate the ways in which small scale women farmers work with philanthropy organisations. Respondents were of the view that there was very little knowledge of or contact with philanthropic organisations that could be used to improve or support their work. When asked to describe the ways through which they worked with philanthropic organisations, nine (9) out of the 22 that responded said they did not have contact or knowledge of philanthropic organisations. Five said they received monetary and skills support, while 13.6 per cent said they received skills and training only.


Figure 9: Types of support received by small-scale farmers from philanthropic organisations



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Fully supportive and visible (monetary and skills support)	22.73%	5
Only involved through government endorsements	13.64%	3
Visible during key celebrations (e.g. women's day/women's month)	0.00%	0
Monetary support only	9.09%	2
Skills and training only	13.64%	3
No contact or knowledge of such organisations	40.91%	9
TOTAL		22

Due to limited access and knowledge of POs, small scale (women) farmers had fewer funding opportunities and received limited funding from philanthropic organisations and government institutions. Of the twenty-two respondents from SFs, over 72 per cent of the small-scale farmers in the Capricorn and Vhembe districts did not receive any funding support in the last five years from either government institutions or philanthropic organisations. Of the 24 that responded, 20 said they had funded themselves using their own capital while only three said they received funding from philanthropic sources and only one from government (see **figure 10** below). There seems to be some discrepancies in the number of POs funding small scale women farmers in Limpopo. According to responses from POs presented earlier, eight (8) POs funded small scale women farmers in the two districts, however data from SFs suggests that only three (3) small scale farmers received funding from POs. This is discussed later.


Figure 10: Financing mechanisms for small-scale farmers in Limpopo



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Own capital	83.33%	20
Government subsidy/support	4.17%	1
Bank loan	0.00%	0
Philanthropic/donor giving	12.50%	3
Other (please specify)	0.00%	0
TOTAL		24

Given that most of the small scale (women) farmers said they funded their initiatives from their own capital, it is probably not surprising that of the 24 respondents, 17 had an annual operating budget of less than R100 000 and only three (3) had an annual operational budget of over R500 000. This finding is in many ways reflective also of the amounts that POs spent over the last five years on small scale women farmers.


Figure 11: Small-scale farmers' annual operating budget



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Less than R100 000	70.83%	17
R100 001 to R300 000	12.50%	3
R300 001 to R500 000	4.17%	1
Over R500 000	12.50%	3
TOTAL		24

The above finding that says only three small scale farmers were funded by POs in the last five years seems contradictory to what POs said, but when the question was framed broadly to include all forms of support, seven (7) of the 20 small scale farmers that responded said they had been supported by philanthropy. This is close to the eight (8) that POs mentioned. In addition, five (5) small scale farmers said they had received support from government. The remaining eight (8) mentioned other sources (see ***figure 12*** below). Although their support is not gender-specific, government institutions supported small-scale farmers in Capricorn and Vhembe districts in the Limpopo province through monetary subsidies and feedstock from the agricultural department.


Figure: 12: Sources of support for small-scale farmers.



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Government institutions	35.00%	7
Philanthropic/donor organisations	25.00%	5
Both	0.00%	0
Other (please specify)	40.00%	8
TOTAL		20

Of those that received support from philanthropic organisations, four (4) of the 21 respondents said they accessed support because they had been endorsed by government; another 4 said they had submitted a proposal while the other 4 said they were approached by the funder. The remaining nine (9) had not received any support as of the time of the research (see ***figure 13***).


Figure 13: Ways in which Small-scale (women) Farmers Access Support from Philanthropic Organisations.



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Government endorsement	19.05%	4
Written proposal to the funder	19.05%	4
Approached by the funder	19.05%	4
Other (please specify)	42.86%	9
TOTAL		21

Given the overall finding that showed little knowledge or contact with POs for farmers, it was important to find out how farmers wanted to work with philanthropic organisations. Nine (9) of the 24 respondents said support should be in the form of money while seven (7) said training is the kind of support they require. Five (5) wanted equipment. However, when responding to overall support required from both government and philanthropy, the majority of small-scale farmers said they needed equipment and machinery (15/24) and skills training (13/24). In addition, some stated that they have challenges accessing markers and marketing their agricultural products (33.33 per cent of farmers indicated that they needed support to market their agricultural products).


Figure 14: Support required by small-scale farmers



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
None of the above	4.17%	1
Skills/training	54.17%	13
Monetary subsidy	37.50%	9
Farming machinery and equipment	62.50%	15
Facilitate the marketing of agricultural products	33.33%	8
Land	37.50%	9
Other (please specify)	0.00%	0
Total Respondents: 24		

Related to the question on whether philanthropic organisations had a feminist approach to programming, small scale farmers were asked a similar question, whether they thought donors that gave them support were intentional about supporting women development initiatives, the majority (13/22) were not sure, while six (6) thought donors were intentional. The remaining three (3) thought donors were not intentional (***figure 15***).

Figure 15: Philanthropic organisations' intention to support women development initiatives



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	27.27%	6
No	13.64%	3
Not sure	59.09%	13
TOTAL		22

In addition to donors not being intentional in supporting women led initiatives, small scale farmers were asked to outline factors that limited their progress in farming. A significant number of respondents cited lack of skills and training for women in farming (66 per cent); limited funding and access to funding opportunities (48 per cent); and to some extent poor markets for agricultural products (23 per cent). The support required by small-scale women farmers included financial support, (farming) skills development and training, technical support for machinery and equipment, and marketing skills. Farmers also required support to acquire farming land and equipment like grading machines (for poultry farmers) to ensure that there would be no product or production limitations (see ***table 9***). Landownership remains a challenge for small-scale women farmers. Therefore, utilising unoccupied state land conducive for farming would be beneficial and affordable for small-scale farming enterprises.

Table 9: Factors limiting small-scale (women) farmers progress

Factors	Lack of skills and training for women in farming	Limited access to land	Lack of support from government institutions	Limited funding and access to funding opportunities	Gender based discrimination (lack of equal opportunities for women farmers)	Poor market for agricultural products
Number of respondents	15	12	15	15	12	13
Percentage	66%	31%	23%	48%	11%	23%

Interestingly, gender-based discrimination or lack equal opportunities seemed not to be a limiting factor (*11 per cent*). This is an interesting finding as we discuss later.

4.4 Discussion of Research Findings

This section discusses the key findings of the study. The discussion considers literature from similar studies elsewhere and demonstrates the applicability or none thereof of the feminist theory to the research findings. The study assessed the role played philanthropic institutions in women development through food security, particularly in the agricultural sector.

4.4.1 Philanthropic Contributions to Food Security through Women-led Initiatives

The finding on philanthropic contributions to food security through women-led enterprises is that philanthropic organisations generally did not have gender specific programming and as a result they did not adequately fund small-scale women farmers in the Capricorn and Vhembe districts in the Limpopo province. Instead, they provided other forms of support to women farmers in the region. However, a few exceptions were found where some foundations funded or supported projects in the two districts in Limpopo or had specific women focused support, for example PO20 and P12. As noted, most philanthropies preferred funding health, education, and several other areas. This finding is consistent with trends in philanthropic funding. Miranda (2019) argued that most funders do not direct enough resources to women organisations, and as a result, the levels of food insecurity have gone high (FAO and CARE 2019; OECD 2021). Further as was demonstrated earlier, the OECD report of 2021 showed that the distribution of philanthropic resources in South Africa favoured education, followed by health and reproductive health; government and civil society. Ogden et al. (2018) stated that most funders target education, health, and environmental issues under the UN Sustainable Development Goals banner. Thus, very little has been directed towards initiatives led by women in farming.

Literature shows that small-scale women farmers still face barriers to access financial support. Pearl-Martinez (2017) found that small-scale women farmers did not have access to financial institutions due to barriers they face. Asuru (2015) also argued that small-scale farmers had challenges accessing financial institutions and were not receiving support from philanthropic organisations because of the gap between philanthropy and rural communities. in addition,

the trend to prefer particular sectors was also illustrated by Paula Johnson (2018) where she showed that African foundations (in Kenya, South Africa, and Nigeria) preferred education (55 per cent); health (31 per cent), human services and social welfare (28 per cent), etc. A study of the High Net-Worth individuals also found that most of their giving is directed to formal registered Non-Profit Organisations (89 per cent), directly to individuals (53 per cent) and religious groups (50 per cent). Gender and agriculture do not feature highly in HNWIs giving according to this study (Trust Africa/UBS 2014). The Giving Report by Nedbank also confirmed this trend when reporting on HNWIs in South Africa. According to the report (2019), most of the HNWIs gave in 2019 to social and community development (66 per cent);

religious institutions and causes (41 per cent), education (32 per cent), animal welfare (25 per cent) and health (24 per cent).

The lack of specific focus on gender or women funding is an indication that while gender and feminism have been central in tackling issues of power relations and structure, the results of this study showed that very few philanthropies studied utilised a feminist lens in programming. Feminist approaches advocate for women to be considered in strategies, approaches, and processes that philanthropic organisations adopt to change women's lives. However as was demonstrated, very few had intentional strategies that utilised a feminist approach. Secondly as was also demonstrated by responses, men still occupied higher and influential positions within most of the organisations that were studied. This point was made by Murugani and Thamaga-Chitja (2019) who argued that gender disparities mean that men have access to opportunities, accumulate and control productive resources at the expense of women's bargaining power. In other words, this study still finds the dominance of patriarchal cultural norms and behaviours that continue to exist leading to unequal gender dynamics and gender-based violence among others (Wood, 2019). As was argued by Hart and Makhetha (2018) women face challenges accessing land, financial support, and productive resources due to patriarchal systems in South Africa. In other words, if philanthropies used a feminist lens in designing their funding, they would alter the power relations and redistribute more resources to women. This however is not what the study found. What the study found is that women's agricultural work remains unrecognised even though women in agriculture play an important role in the economy. This is why feminist scholars emphasise the need to change global systems that marginalise women's work (Verschuur, 2019). Verschuur (2019) acknowledged that agricultural systems treated women as peasant workers or wage workers. This was demonstrated by the profile of respondents to the study. The men that responded were founders or managers of the organisations under study while women were either founders or general workers, very few were managers.

This study confirms that women often lack significant recognition, endure unequal division of labour and unequal access to agricultural resources, workforce, land and credit or financial institutions. Martin (2019) argued that while female farmers contribute 40 per cent of all food production, they remained invisible. Using a feminist theoretical lens would highlight the sexual division of labour work in the agricultural sector where women remain marginalised and push for their recognition. The feminist theory would challenge the notion that male

farmers are substantive producers and wage earners in the sector while women farmers are associated with domestic and subsistence farming, which has no impact on development or economic growth. This is what Alston (1990) attempted to address. Alston (1990) maintained that feminists defined women's work in agriculture using the concept of patriarchy to illuminate how their contributions are ignored. As a result, the need for feminists to continue advocating for women's inclusion and recognition while emphasising the challenges women face within institutions that frame these challenges is urgent. This requires a few organisations and in the case of this study, a few philanthropies to lead the way.

Although most founders have acknowledged that not enough resources are directed to women's organisations, literature shows that donors such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and Susan Thompson Buffett Foundation support gender equality programs (Miranda, 2019; Ogden, Prasad & Thompson, 2018). The funds' support is not necessarily directed towards agriculture or specific to small-scale women farmers. This is consistent with previous studies that have tracked the performance of philanthropic organisations in funding gender programmes. Morvaridi (2016) for example looked at the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and argued that the Foundation Melinda is one of the outliers funding the agricultural sector. Although the Foundation does not support small-scale women farmers in Limpopo, it is one of the biggest foundations that support food security projects in Sub-Saharan Africa. Furthermore, the Gates Foundation has a food security strategy committed to modernising agriculture through market-led forces of production (Morvaridi, 2016). However as was shown earlier in Chapter 2, Fent (2012) assessed the Foundation's Gender Impact Strategy for Agricultural Development and found that the Foundation funded institutions that dealt with agricultural research instead of supporting a funding smallholder and women's agricultural programmes as it had claimed. In essence, Fent argued that even though the Foundation is the biggest in the world, its strategy on development still had social and economic limitations for women.
Other philanthropic organisations such as the Rockefeller and Ford Foundation contributed to food security by funding the Green Revolution initiative to increase agricultural production in developing countries (Bellegy, 2019).

In South Africa, there are examples of foundations that support development initiatives through agriculture. Still, these do not directly support women small scale farmers. The Motsepe Foundation, the SAB Foundation, and the Coca-Cola Mintirho Foundation are such examples. These Foundations do not focus specifically on small-scale women farmers; instead, they take

a holistic approach that is inclusive of all genders, big and small enterprises, and in all provinces of South Africa SAB Foundation, n.d.; Macaskill, 2021; Mintirho Foundation, 2020). SOFA Team and Doss (2011) have argued that effort from philanthropic organisations shows that philanthropic organisations are strengthening their resources to empower women initiatives.

According to Farhall and Rickards (2021), gender inequality remains a barrier to inclusive and sustainable agricultural systems. Although women are part of development interventions, there is little progress in fully integrating their efforts into development policies. Women in agriculture need access to institutions, land, and productive resources to gain the total capacity to produce and achieve sustainable enterprises. However as was found, most in the two districts used their own capital to fund their initiatives. In 2019, Lindeque found that women in Limpopo had set a precedent for women in agriculture. Over 130 women in some parts of Limpopo came together and formed a strategic partnership to stand on their own. They also formed collaborations with philanthropic organisations. In 2018, the Vodacom Foundation partnered with UN Women and South Africa Women in Farming (SAWIF) on a programme that had over 600 small-scale women farmers from rural areas in South Africa where they got empowerment training and created equal opportunities (Sishuba, 2019). There is additional literature that shows how powerful women are when they create their own spaces. “Women appreciate women spaces where they socialise, learn new knowledge and skills, appreciate the safe environment for learning to speak in public and for sharing problems” (Jackson & Wallace, 2015, p. 3). Women benefit from their created spaces and these spaces improve their conditions. Governments must create enabling legal and operational environments for consultative processes with women around resource allocations (Moyo, 2020).

The above recommendation for women to be supported to create their own spaces is linked to a few findings that implied that small scale women farmers while they required money; they also needed other forms of support such as resource mobilisation, networks, marketing of their products and the provision of training and equipment. There are several studies in philanthropy that demonstrate the importance of other forms of giving besides money (Everatt & Solanki, 2005; OECD, 2003; Wilkinson-Maposa et al., 2015). The study showed that the majority of organisations supported enterprises, regardless of the size, with training and skills development, resource mobilisation, and they volunteered their time and services. In doing this, they were motivated by the need to fast track economic transformation. Economic

transformation for some philanthropic organisations entailed contributions towards small-scale farmers to address social problems such as hunger and poverty for rural transformation (Asuru, 2015). The main aim of philanthropic support seems to have been to combat hunger through food security programmes—supporting small-scale women farmers as part of a broader community development initiatives. Further, philanthropic organisations focused on forming long term relationships to encourage development initiatives while empowering women through farming projects.

Moreover, most philanthropic organisations funded development projects through their partner organisations that worked directedly with women in the agricultural sector. The results suggest that most philanthropic organisations rely on those who seek help to either contact them or send proposals to request funding and support. Few philanthropic organisations cater only for specific areas. Further, most philanthropic organisations relied on third parties such as NGOs and CBOs to disseminate their funds to grant seekers.

4.4.2 Ways in which Small Scale Farmers are Working with Philanthropic Organisations and Government.

There was a small number of farmers who received support from philanthropic organisations. Those that did, had written a proposal or had been endorsed by government. Given the fact that small-scale farmers do not have access or ownership to land (Sihlobo, 2018, 2021), their growth, development, and market participation were hindered. Women farmers continued to be affected because the majority of them worked under male founders or managers.

As the study found, there was very little contact and knowledge of POs by small scale women farmers. This impacted on farmers' ability to raise funding for their projects. This finding may not be far-fetched given that most philanthropies are located in urban areas or major cities. (Moyo & Imafidon (2021) argued in *Barriers to African Civil Society: Building the Capacity and Potential to Scale Up* that there is a disconnect between urban based donors and local organisations resulting in the weakening of local groups. In this regard studies show that women farmers are the backbone of agriculture in the sub-Saharan Africa region, yet they lack knowledge and access to funders. One of the farmers contended that the "*government should invest in making sure that women are also prioritised*" (SF2). The Southern Africa Trust maintained that women remained marginalised and faced many barriers that prevent them from accessing financial institutions (funding or credit), land, markets, and agricultural inputs (Southern Africa Trust, 2020). Pearl-Martinez (2017) argued that very little was done to

improve women's access to resources to fight food insecurity and improve their livelihood. According to the World Bank Group, only a small percentage of small-scale farmers have access to finances (World Bank Group, 2014).

In addition to lack of knowledge and access to POs, small scale farmers received limited funding and funding opportunities. As a result, the majority of them funded their own enterprises. Women also receive funding from families or borrow from village savings loans (Southern Africa Trust, 2020). More often literature on entrepreneurship shows that when one is convinced about their mission, they take risks and finance with their own money. (Duplat, Theeuwen, Tjemkes and Wickert (2021) give an example of women who formed small scale cooperatives in Uganda to address challenges of gender disparities, exclusion, lack of government or NGO support, among others.

Financial institutions also add to women's lack of funding opportunities. They consider women as high-risk applicants because their sources of income are unstable. Women do not possess financial or material security for collateral. These challenges occur because women own fewer assets such as land, human capital, and livestock, and the right to such assets are resources are still in the hands of their male counterparts (Southern Africa Trust, 2020; World Bank, 2017). As the feminist lens shows, women find themselves in this situation because of patriarchal norms and several disparities. Rusare and Tsegay (2014) argue that women suffer the most compared to men because of inequality, income disparities and limited access to opportunities and means of production. Further Botreau (2019) maintained that rural women farmer suffer labour market discrimination, pay inequality and difficulty in attaining land ownership. Pearl-Martinez (2017) further found that resources meant to support small-scale farmers are being diverted to other projects due to governments lack of capacity to deliver to small-scale farmers.

To remedy this, small scale farmers recommended a working arrangement with philanthropies that will involve financing, training, provision of equipment and machinery as well as marketing of their products. This is in recognition that small-scale farmers in South Africa, particularly women, remain marginalised and face challenges of access to institutions (Thamaga-Chitja & Morojele, 2014), yet as Nally (2016) confirmed, supporting small-scale is imperative to break vicious cycles of rural poverty. Small-scale farmers should be seen as experts in the agricultural sector and deserve aid beneficiaries (Nally, 2016). Small-scale women farmers should be visible with access or knowledge of available support and funding opportunities.

The preference by women farmers for other forms of support such as training, and the provision of equipment speaks to the need to be sustainable and transformational. Rametsteiner (2016) for example argued for the transformation of agriculture and making it sustainable through the inclusion of small-scale farmers. The writer further calls for collaborations across government institutions and the private through policy coherence to address food security sustainability. Policy coherence cannot be achieved only through the provision of finances, but through such support as training, and skills development among others. In addition, there is adequate literature around other forms of giving such as giving of time, networks, collaborations and giving in kind (Kilmurray & Hodgson, 2015; Wilkinson-Maposa et al., 2015). An example of collaboration as a form of giving is demonstrated by small-scale women farmers in the Limpopo province who have formed a strategic partnership with each other to close funding gaps created by a patriarchal system that is not recognising their efforts in agriculture. Instead of working in isolation, these women are working together to seek partnerships and support from philanthropic organisations (Lindeque, 2019). One of the respondents highlighted that "teamwork and cooperation farming" is essential for improving their work.

In addition to challenges related to lack of funding and equal opportunities, small-scale farmers identified several factors that limited their enterprises. These included lack of skills and training for women in farming, limited funding lack of support from government institutions, limited access to land and poor market for products. These requirements are consistent with a lot of literature on capacity building (FAO & CARE, 2019; SOFA Team & Doss, 2011), resourcing, partnerships (Choto, Iwu and Tenger, 2020) and marketing. Farmers further stated that there was a poor market for agricultural products for small-scale farmers. As a result, small-scale women farmers rely on informal markets such as Tshakhuma marker in the Vhembe district to sell their produce.

As the findings demonstrated, gender discrimination and lack of equal opportunities was not seen as a highly limiting factor for small scale farmers. This is an unexpected finding and seems to go against the grain. The possible explanation is that this could have been the views of male respondents who made more than 50 per cent of the respondents to the questionnaire. As already discussed, literature supports the view that gender discrimination and unequal access to opportunities hinder women's progress.

Photo: woman selling fresh produce in Tshakhuma market – Venda, Limpopo



Photo credit: @mulepest (Instagram)

4.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter investigated the role that is played by philanthropic organisations in supporting women led initiatives in Limpopo, in particular in the Vhembe and Capricorn districts. Furthermore, the chapter explored how philanthropic organisations work with small scale women farmers. In addition, the study examined challenges faced by small-scale farmers in accessing finance institutions and productive resources. Key findings that emerged from the research include 1. Philanthropic organisations studied generally did not fund gender specific initiatives and in particular did not fund adequately small-scale women farmers in Limpopo. Secondly there were few philanthropic organisations that had feminist or gender strategies to anchor their programming. In the main these were international foundations. Among the local ones, there were exceptional ones that made conscious decisions to support women specific initiatives and women farmers in the region. Beyond financial support, philanthropic organisations offered other forms of support such as training, resource mobilisation and other in-kind goods. This was also recommended by small scale women farmers when responding to ways through which they can work with donors. There was also very little financial support in terms of amounts given to women farmers. This was demonstrated by looking at a five year period. As a result, most small-scale farmers financed their enterprises from their own pockets.

Small scale farmers did not have adequate knowledge and access to funding opportunities. As a result, they had limited funding. This affected their growth and led to some financing their operations from their own capital. Small-scale women farmers faced the most prominent obstacles. Women's contributions in the agricultural sector are still overlooked. Small-scale farmers also face barriers because they continue to be seen as 'help'. To remedy this, some women in rural Limpopo areas are working together to change the narrative by forming partnerships that help them build resources. Women farmers have also identified barriers such as lack of training, access to funding, land, and equal opportunities. The funding community can reverse this by adopting a feminist approach to its provision of funding to women led initiatives such as small-scale women farmers in the Limpopo region. As the next chapter shows, key lessons emanating from this study have implications for further research, policy development and donor behaviours especially as they relate to the agricultural sector in particular and women farmers in particular.

Chapter 5

5. Conclusions and Further Areas for Research

5.1 Introduction

The chapter concludes the study by restating the main findings of the research. It further reflects on the research and provides recommendations for future research, policy, and practice. The chapter also outlines its contribution to knowledge.

5.2 Summary of Findings

The study's main question aimed to investigate the role played by philanthropic organisations in supporting women led initiatives in agricultural sector in the two districts in Limpopo, namely Vhembe and Capricorn. Framed differently, the main question of the study is, 'what are the contributions made by philanthropy in supporting women led initiatives in food security'? The sub- research question examined the ways in which small scale women farmers work with philanthropies. By implication, this question also examined the challenges faced by small-scale women farmers in Limpopo. A qualitative research methodology was chosen for this study given the need to ask deeper questions about the phenomenon as well as explain the research constructs. An extensive review of the literature was also undertaken to provide a context of the relationship between small-scale (women) farmers and philanthropic organisations.

Ideally, the interview method was an appropriate technique for a study of this nature. Due to COVID 19 restrictions and the fatigue that resulted as a result of online meetings and working virtually, the researcher opted for an open-ended questionnaire which was administered virtually (online). This was an effective way to gather data but still give the respondents adequate room and flexibility to expand on their responses at their own time without the pressure of a time bound interview schedule. Further an open-ended online questionnaire allowed for respondents to feel safe and not vulnerable to COVID 19. The responses received are as relevant as one would get from an interview with some limitations of course such as the inability to make body observation, make follow up questions and use the environment to contextualise responses. Twenty-three (23) responses from philanthropic organisations and twenty-four (24) responses from small-scale farmers in Limpopo were consulted. Thematic data analysis was used to search and select themes that helped answer the research questions.

The study found that philanthropic organisations are not contributing adequately to small-scale women farmers. Particularly small-scale women farmers in Capricorn and Vhembe districts in Limpopo. The study further found that there is a disconnect between small-scale farmers and philanthropic organisations in the district. Thus, creating funding gaps, access to information about funding and opportunities and skill that philanthropic organisations may offer to small-scale farmers.

The following research objectives were achieved:

- The study's first objective was to explore how philanthropic organisations can assist small-scale female farmers and increase visibility in Capricorn and Vhembe district in Limpopo.
- The study's second objective was to examine whether small-scale farmers in Capricorn and Vhembe districts in Limpopo have access to philanthropic support. The support included monetary assistance, skills training and access to equipment, agricultural land, and access to markets. A related objective is to examine the gaps in funding small-scale women farmers from philanthropic organisations.

The main research findings that emerged from the study are, firstly that the majority of philanthropic organisations did not have women or gender specific funding in general and in particular with reference to the two districts in Limpopo, these philanthropic organisations did not fund small scale women farmers. This was partly because most of these did not have a feminist or gender strategy or policy. A few philanthropic institutions, mainly international ones had gender strategies and as a result they had funding earmarked for gender and women initiatives. They also funded small scale women farmers in the region and in the two districts.

In addition, there were few local philanthropic foundations that made a conscious decision to support gender programmes and women led initiatives such as small-scale women farmers. These findings are consistent with previous literature and also confirm that the feminist theory or approach advocates for. If power relations are not restructured and patriarchal cultures are not dismantled, which is what the feminist approach seeks to do, then women farmers will continue to be subjected to unequal opportunities and various forms of disparities. The findings were also consistent with trends in global and domestic philanthropy where priority is given to education and health initiatives.

Philanthropic organisations also worked directly with small-scale women farmers through non-governmental organisations and community-based organisations. As outlined above, NGOs and CBOs are vehicles for service delivery for development institutions. They also represent the voiceless in society and are preferred by development partners as 'magic bullets' for development. It is thus no surprise that philanthropic organisations worked through these structures to reach some communities; and provided other forms of support beyond money. These include training, provision of equipment and resource mobilisation strategies. These in-kind gifts resonated with small scale women farmers who have historically coalesced around cooperatives, stokvels in South Africa, savings and rotation clubs and giving of time.

The second set of findings revolved around the different ways with which small scale women farmers worked with philanthropies. In the main, small-scale women farmers had no adequate access and knowledge about philanthropic organisations. As a result, they had limited funding and funding opportunities. The result was that most ended up financing their own operations and some formed cooperatives to sustain their interventions. Additionally small-scale women farmers identified some barriers to their growth. These included lack of capacity and skills; limited funding, lack of access to land, lack of equal opportunities and to some extent gender discrimination. The literature confirmed that most small-scale farmers, regardless of gender, were beneficiaries of government subsidies. Women farmers, even beyond the two districts understudy, remained marginalised. Male farmers remain the main beneficiaries with access to resources, information, and financial institutions.

There are several reflections and key points that arise out of this study. The first is that philanthropic organisations are well positioned to drive change in restructuring power relations especially in the agriculture sector between men and women. This can be done through several ways that include an aggressive adoption of feminist approaches in their provision of funding and by taking risks in underwriting women specific agriculture initiatives. Philanthropies such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Ford Foundation, SAB Foundation, Patrice Motsepe Foundation, and international NGOs like ActionAid already do this and can lead a movement of the utilisation of a feminist lens in supporting women farmers in the South. The second point from this study is that philanthropies need to increase their funding towards gender and women led initiatives and assist women create only women spaces.

The third is that men will continue using the privilege of patriarchy to benefit from economic and social norms to access resources ahead of women. Men can forge transformative collaborations with women especially in the agriculture sector by transferring skills, sharing networks and knowledge as well as shifting power and ownership of assets and organisations. The fourth point is that small scale women farmers need to be provided with adequate knowledge in ways that are accessible, empowering and also be provided with resources to finance their operations. A gender specific Fund can be established in the region and contributions can be collected from individuals, community, philanthropies, private sector, and government. The fifth is that even though government support to small scale farmers was not part of the study, there were references to government by small scale farmers and the environment that needs to be created for farmers to thrive. Government needs to put in place adequate resources and a conducive policy environment for small scale women farmers.

The agricultural sector remains crucial for economic development for achieving food security and reducing poverty in developing countries. Small-scale farmers, particularly women farming in rural communities, are the backbone of rural economies. Barriers limiting women need to be eliminated. The feminist lens is one way to achieve this.

5.3 Future Areas of Study

The study focused on the role that philanthropy plays in women development through food security in rural Limpopo. There was a big gap in literature on the role of philanthropy towards the development of small-scale women. This study has attempted to close that gap, but this was only in relation to two small districts in South Africa. There is still no literature on other provinces and districts in South Africa. Future research could be extended to other provinces in South Africa either through a case study approach or through a comparative study. By implication further studies can be conducted on other countries in Africa. Another area of study is hoe government in South Africa provides support financially and otherwise with small scale women farmers. While there are policies in place that were developed by government, future research could deepen the analysis on government relations with small scale women farmers. Another area of interest are the different ways through which both philanthropy and government can use a feminist approach to restructure power relations between men and women in the agriculture sector. Although the study included corporate foundations, there is still little known around the support and financing provided by the private sector given to small scale women farmers. A study of new innovative ways of financing by the private sector

towards women in agriculture is another area of study. A follow-up study to determine whether this study impacted philanthropic organisations and small-scale farmers who participated would be ideal.

5.3.1 Recommendations

Considering the key findings, the study showed that small-scale women farmers require substantial support from both government institutions and philanthropic organisations. The following recommendations are given to the South African government and philanthropic institutions to address the marginalisation of small-scale women farmers in rural areas.

- Government should develop and improve policies and strategies to make them inclusive, particularly to women in the agricultural sector. These policies should include land distribution policies that favours women, particularly small-scale women farmers in rural areas. Government institutions and philanthropic organisations must work together to implement policies and strategies that are favourable to small-scale women farmers in rural areas.
- The government needs to intervene and help small-scale women farmers who are deprived of access to financial institutions and productive resources because they do not have access to land.
- Philanthropy should have direct interventions with small-scale women farmers rather than rely on government institutions, NGOs, and CBO to improve access to financial support and skills training.
- There is also needed to encourage small-scale women farmers to partner with other non-governmental institutions to access information. Both government and philanthropy can assist farmers to create an environment that allows farmers to access information.
- Apart from monetary support, small-scale farmers indicated that they required skills training and access to machinery and productive resources. Thus, philanthropy can booster their efforts in this regard.
- Given the gaps in funding small-scale women farmers, the study further recommends that philanthropy should pay special attention to informal projects to ensure that women farmers in rural areas have access to and knowledge of opportunities offered by philanthropic organisations. To do so, philanthropic organisations could encourage them to set up agencies closer to these marginalised communities.

Reference:

Agee, J. (2009). Developing Qualitative Research Questions: A Reflective Process. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *22*(4), 431–447. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390902736512

Agholor, I., & Bongiwe, L. (2020). Agriculture Policy: Challenges, Expropriation and Implication for Agricultural Extension in South Africa. *Il Ponte*, *76*, 211–226. https://doi.org/10.21506/j.ponte.2020.9.16

Agholor, I., & Lubisi, B. (2020). Agriculture Policy: Challenges, Expropriation and Implication for Agricultural Extension in South Africa. *Il Ponte*, *76*, 211–226. https://doi.org/10.21506/j.ponte.2020.9.16

Aliyeva, L. Z., Babayeva, S. J., Hasanzade, F., Huseynova, S. A., Huseynova, V. A., & Nasirova, O. A. (2019). Food Security and Optimal Government Intervention Level in Agriculture (comparative Analysis). *Bulgarian Journal of Agricultural Science*, *25*, 12–20.

Alkassim, R. S., Etikan, I., & Musa, S. A. (2016). Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, *5*(1), 5. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11

Allen, M. (2017). *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods*. SAGE Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483381411

Alston, M. (1990). Feminism and Farm Women. *Australian Social Work*, *43*(1), 23–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/03124079008550052

Anheier, H. K. (2014). *Nonprofit Organizations: Theory, Management, Policy* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315851044

Asuru, S. I. (2015). The New Philanthropy, Poverty Reduction and Rural Development: A Case Study of Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA) in Ghana. *Jurnal Studi Pemerintahan*, *6*(1), 18–30. https://doi.org/10.18196/jgp.2015.0003

AUDA-NEPAD. (2021). *Gendering Agriculture: Empowering African Women Farmers Using Modern Technologies*. https://www.nepad.org/blog/gendering-agriculture-empowering-african-women-farmers-using-modern-technologies

Ayisi, K., MacLeod, N., Mcdonald, C., Mkhari, J., Pengelly, B. C., & Whitbread, A. (2011). *Farming Systems, Emerging Farmers and Land Reform in the Limpopo Province of South Africa* (pp. 433–449). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9132-2_17

Bahta, Y. T., Owusu-Sekyere, E., & Tlalang, B. (2019). Does Women's Empowerment Through Policy Intervention Reduce Food Insecurity in South Africa? *Development in Practice*, *29*(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2018.1512952

Banik, D. (2019). Achieving Food Security in a Sustainable Development Era. *Food Ethics*, *4*(2), 117–121. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41055-019-00057-1

Barriteau, E., Connelly, M. P., & Parpart, J. L. (2000). *Theoretical Perspectives on Gender and Development*. International Development Research Centre. https://www.idrc.ca/sites/default/files/openebooks/272-4/index.html

Barriteau, E. V., Connelly, P. M., & Parpart, J. L. (n.d.). *Theoretical Perspectives on Gender and Development*. Retrieved March 21, 2021, from https://www.idrc.ca/sites/default/files/openebooks/272-4/

Bellegy, B. (2019, February 5). *The Role of Philanthropy for the Sdgs Is Not What You Expect*. Development Matters. https://oecd-development-matters.org/2019/02/05/the-role-of-philanthropy-for-the-sdgs-is-not-what-you-expect/

Ben-Ari, N. (2014, February 19). *Gendering Agriculture*. Africa Renewal. https://www.un.org/africarenewal/magazine/special-edition-agriculture-2014/gendering-agriculture

Biana, H. T. (2020). *Extending bell hooks' Feminist Theory*. *21*(1), 18.

Bibler Zaidi, N. L., & Ross, P. T. (2019). Limited by Our Limitations. *Perspectives on Medical Education*, *8*(4), 261–264. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40037-019-00530-x

Bofu-Tawamba, N., & Bosch, I. (2019). Philanthropy Is a Feminist Issue. *Alliance Magazine*, *24*(4), 8.

Botreau, H. (2019). *Gender Inequalities and Food Insecurity: Ten Years After the Food Price Crisis, Why Are Women Farmers Still Food-Insecure?* (p. 60). Oxfam International. https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/bp-gender-inequalities-food-insecurity-150719-en.pdf

Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive Sampling: Complex or Simple? Research Case Examples. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, *25*(8), 652–661. https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206

Capricorn District Municipality. (2014, June 23). *Agriculture: Capricorn District Municipality*. https://cdm.org.za/led-tourism/agriculture

Chauke, S. V., & Oluwatayo, I. B. (2019). Determinants of Economic Efficiency Among Smallholder Cowpea Farmers: A Case Study of Capricorn and Waterberg Districts, Limpopo Province, South Africa. *Asia Life Sciences*, *28*(2), 231–253.

Choto, P., Iwu, C., & Tengeh, R. (2020). Non-Profit Organisations and Socio-Economic Development in South Africa: A Literature Analysis. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, *8*, 689–600. https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2020.8267

Chowdhury, M. (2014). Interpretivism in Aiding Our Understanding of the Contemporary Social World. *Open Journal of Philosophy*, *04*, 432–438. https://doi.org/10.4236/ojpp.2014.43047

Collins, C. S., & Stockton, C. M. (2018). The Central Role of Theory in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *17*(1), 1609406918797475. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406918797475

Committee in World Food Security. (2016). *Why Are Women so Important to Agriculture? | Fao*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. http://www.fao.org/cfs/home/blog/blog-articles/article/en/c/447783/

Creswell, J. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed-Method Approaches*.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (3rd ed). SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2014a). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE.

Creswell, J. W. (2014b). The Selection of a Research Approach. In *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th edition). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Dagada, M., Nesamvuni, A., Odhiambo, J., & Oni, S. A. (2002). Executive Summary of a Study of Agricultural Industry of Limpopo Province. *Center of Rural Development*, 57.

Dagada, M., Nesamvuni, A., Odhiambo, J., & Oni, S. A. (2012). *The Study of Agricultural Industry in the Limpopo Province (Executive Summary)*. Agriculture, Rural Development and Forestry. http://policyresearch.limpopo.gov.za/handle/123456789/636

Davida, O. O., Jonathan, I. E., Olusola, O. A., & Temitope, A. P. (2018). Food Security Situation among South African Urban Agricultural Households: Evidence from Limpopo Province. *Acta Universitatis Danubius: Oeconomica*, *14*(1), 60–74.

De Boeck, E., Jacxsens, L., & Uyttendaele, M. (2016). Challenges in Food Safety as Part of Food Security: Lessons Learnt on Food Safety in a Globalized World. *Procedia Food Science*, *6*, 16–22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.profoo.2016.02.003

De Cock, N., D'Haese, L., D'Haese, M., Rooyen, C., Schonfeldt, H., Staelens, L., & Vink, N. (2013). Food Security in Rural Areas of Limpopo Province, South Africa. *Food Security*, *5*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-013-0247-y

Denison, J., Dube, S., Masiya, T. C., Moyo, T., Murata, C., Mpyana, J., Van Averbeke, L. L., & Van Averbeke, W. (2016). *Smallholder Irrigation Entrepreneurial Development Pathways and Livelihoods in Two Districts in Limpopo Province* (pp. 1–9). Agriculture Forestty and Fisheries: Water Research Commission.

Denscombe, M. (2012). *Research Proposals: A Practical Guide*. https://www.academia.edu/3149503/Research_Proposals_a_practical_guide

D'Haese, L., De Cock, N., D'Haese, M., van Rooyen, C. J., Schönfeldt, H. C., Staelens, L., & Vink, N. (2013). Food Security in Rural Areas of Limpopo Province, South Africa. *Food Security*, *5*(2), 269–282. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-013-0247-y

Dobie, P., Finlayson, R. F., Gassner, A., Harris, D., Lopes, C., Mausch, K., & Terheggen, A. (2019). Poverty Eradication and Food Security Through Agriculture in Africa: Rethinking Objectives and Entry Points: *Outlook on Agriculture*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0030727019888513

Doss, C. R. (2018). Women and Agricultural Productivity: Reframing the Issues. *Development Policy Review*, *36*(1), 35–50. https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12243

Drew, C., Hardman, M., & Hosp, J. (2008). *Designing and Conducting Research in Education*. SAGE Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483385648

Duan, N., Green, C. A., Hoagwood, K., Horwitz, S. M., Palinkas, L. A., & Wisdom, J. P. (2015). Purposeful Sampling for Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis in Mixed Method Implementation Research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health*, *42*(5), 533–544. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y

Duplat, V., Theeuwen, A., Tjemkes, B., & Wickert, C. (2021). How Do Women Overcome Gender Inequality by Forming Small-Scale Cooperatives? The Case of the Agricultural Sector in Uganda. *Sustainability*, *13*(4), 1–25.

Everatt, D., & Solanki, G. (2005). *A Nation of Givers? Social Giving Among South Africans: Findings from a National Survey—Researched and Written for the CCS, SAGA and NDA* (p. 49). Strategy and Tactics.

https://trialogueknowledgehub.co.za/index.php/research-and-reports-philanthropy/418-a-nation-of-givers-social-giving-among-south-africans

FAO. (2015). *Regional Overview of Food Insecurity Africa*. 37.

FAO. (2021, April 23). *Small Family Farmers Produce a Third of the World's Food*. http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/1395127/icode/

FAO, & CARE. (2019). *Good Practices for Integrating Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in Climate-Smart Agriculture Programs*. http://seepnetwork.org/Resource-Post/Good-Practices-for-Integrating-Gender-Equality-and-Women-s-Empowerment-in-Climate-Smart-Agriculture-Programs

FAO, & UN Trust Fund for Human Security. (2016). *Human Security & Food Security Hunger, Food Insecurity and Malnutrition* (p. 10). Food and Agriculture Organazation of the United Nations.

Farhall, K., & Rickards, L. (2021). The "Gender Agenda" in Agriculture for Development and Its (Lack of) Alignment With Feminist Scholarship. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, *5*, 20. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2021.573424

Fent, A. (2012). Philanthropy and Sovereignty: A Critical Feminist Exploration of the Gates Foundation's Approach to Gender and Agricultural Development. *Association of Concerned Africa Scholars (ACAS) Bulletin*, *88*, 78–114.

Folk, E. (2020, January 30). *The Rise of Women in Agriculture*. Resilience. https://www.resilience.org/stories/2020-01-30/the-rise-of-women-in-agriculture/

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations & CARE Inc. (2019). *Good practices for integrating gender equality and women's empowerment in climate-smart agriculture programmes.*

Future Farmers Foundation. (2021, March 23). *Future Farmers Member – Future Farmers*. https://futurefarmersfoundation.com/sinethemba-mtangayi-future-farmers-member/

Garutsa, T., & Masuku, M., M. (2021). Enhancing Food Security Through Systematic African Women Empowerment in South Africa | Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *12*(6). https://www.richtmann.org/journal/index.php/mjss/article/view/12705

Giloth, R. (2019). Philanthropy and Economic Development: New Roles and Strategies. *Economic Development Quarterly*, *33*(3), 159–169. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891242419839464

Grey, S., & Patel, R. (2015). Food Sovereignty as Decolonization: Some Contributions From Indigenous Movements to Food System and Development Politics. *Agriculture and Human Values*, *32*(3), 431–444. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-014-9548-9

Guest, G., Mitchell, M. L., & Namey, E. E. (2013). *Collecting Qualitative Data: A Field Manual for Applied Research*. SAGE Publications, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781506374680

Hall, R., Shirinda, S., Wisborg, P., & Zamchiya, P. (2013). *Farm Workers and Farm Dwellers in Limpopo, South Africa: Struggles Over Tenure, Livelihoods and Justice*. Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies, School of Government, Faculty of Economic and Management Sciences, University of the Western Cape.

Hammarberg, K., Kirkman, M., & de Lacey, S. (2016). Qualitative Research Methods: When to Use Them and How to Judge Them. *Human Reproduction*, *31*(3), 498–501. https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/dev334

Hart, T., & Makhetha, E. (2018). Hunger for Farmland Among Female Farmers in Limpopo Province: Bodies, Violence and Land. *Agenda*, *32*(4), 65–77. https://doi.org/10.1080/10130950.2018.1535042

Hendriks, S. (2014). Food Security in South Africa: Status Quo and Policy Imperatives. *Agrekon*, *53*(2), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/03031853.2014.915468

Hlophe-Ginindza, S., & Mpandeli, N. (2020). The Role of Small-Scale Farmers in Ensuring Food Security in Africa | IntechOpen. *Food Security in Africa*. https://www.intechopen.com/chapters/72086

Hodges, I., & Thomas, D. (2010). *Designing and Managing Your Research Project: Core Skills for Social and Health Research* (p. 253).

Hosu, S. Y., & Qamata, L. (2019). Regime Switch and Effect on Per Capita Food Security Issues in South Africa. In *Food Security in Africa*. IntechOpen. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.86931

Hox, J. J., & Boeije, H. R. (2005). *Data Collection, Primary Versus Secondary*.

Inhetveen, H. (1998). Women Pioneers in Farming: A Gendered History of Agricultural Progress. *Sociologia Ruralis*, *38*(3), 265–284. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9523.00078

International Development Research Centre. (2020). *Lessons from Farming Households: Agricultural Decision Making and Shifting Social Norms for Women's Economic Empowerment* (p. 21). International Development Research Centre. http://seepnetwork.org/Resource-Post/Lessons-from-Farming-Households-

Agricultural-Decision-Making-and-Shifting-Social-Norms-for-Women-s-Economic-Empowerment

International Trade Administration. (2021, September 11). *South Africa—Agricultural Sector*. https://www.trade.gov/country-commercial-guides/south-africa-agricultural-sector

IPASA. (2020). *Annual Review of Philanthropy 2019: Perspectives and Stories of South African Philanthropy*. IPASA. https://ipa-sa.org.za/annual-review-of-sa-philanthropy/annual-review-of-philanthropy-2019/

Jackson, : Elanor, & Wallace, T. (2015). *Creating new spaces Women's experiences of political participation in communities*. Womankind. https://www.iknowpolitics.org/sites/default/files/newspaces.pdf

Jansen, H. (2010). The Logic of Qualitative Survey Research and Its Position in the Field of Social Research Methods. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *11*(2), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-11.2.1450

Kabir, S. M. (2016). *Methods of Data Collection* (pp. 201–275).

Khwidzhili, R. H., & Worth, S. H. (2017). Evaluation of Policies Promoting Sustainable Agriculture in South Africa. *South African Journal of Agricultural Extension*, *45*(2), 73–85. https://doi.org/10.17159/2413-3221/2017/v45n2a443

Kiguwa, P. (2019). Feminist Approaches: An Exploration of Women's Gendered Experiences. In S. Laher, A. Fynn, & S. Kramer (Eds.), *Transforming Research Methods in the Social Sciences* (pp. 220–235). Wits University Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.18772/22019032750.19

Kilmurray, A., & Hodgson, J. (2015). *Community Philanthropy the Context, Concepts and Challenges: A Literature Review*. Global Fund for Community Foundations and Global Alliance for Community Philanthropy. https://globalfundcommunityfoundations.org/resources/community-philanthropy-the-context-concepts-and-challenges-a-html

Kivunja, C., & Kuyini, A. B. (2017). Understanding and Applying Research Paradigms in Educational Contexts. *International Journal of Higher Education*, *6*, 26. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v6n5p26

Kumi, E. (2019). Advancing the Sustainable Development Goals: An Analysis of the Potential Role of Philanthropy in Ghana. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, *54*(7), 1084–1104. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021909619862591

Lay, K., & Daley, J. G. (2007). A Critique of Feminist Theory. *Advances in Social Work*, *8*(1), 49–61.

LIMA Rural Development Foundation. (n.d.). Abalimi Phambili Farmer Support Programme. *Lima - Rural Development Foundation*. Retrieved September 4, 2021, from https://lima.org.za/our-work/agriculture/abalimi-phambili-farmer-support-programme/

Limpopo Department of Agriculture and Rural Development. (2020). *Annual Report: 2019/2020 Financial Year* (No. 4; p. 326). Limpopo Department of Agriculture and Rural Development. http://www.ldard.gov.za/About%20Us/Background/Pages/default.aspx

Limpopo Info. (2016). *Limpopo Province, South Africa's Food Basket* (p. 4). https://www.limpopo-info.co.za/provinces/article/1019/limpopo-province-south-africa-s-food-basket

Lindeque, B. (2019, August 21). Women in Limpopo Are Setting a Precedent for Women in Agriculture. *Good Things Guy*. https://www.goodthingsguy.com/people/women-limpopo-agriculture/

Liu, G. (2017). Government Decentralization and the Size of the Nonprofit Sector: Revisiting the Government Failure Theory. *The American Review of Public Administration*, *47*(6), 619–633. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074016631643

Loubser, M. (2020). *Women in Agriculture: An Exploratory Study on Women and Gender Equality in South African Agriculture.* (p. 29). The Sustainability Initiative of South Africa and the Western Cape Department of Agriculture. https://siza.co.za/siza-presents-a-study-on-the-representation-of-women-in-agriculture-with-a-focus-on-agricultural-careers/

Macaskill, C. (2021, March 15). Motsepe Foundation's Sustainable Agriculture, Land Development and Reform Philanthropic Projects and Partnerships. *Agribook Digital*. https://agribook.co.za/blog/motsepe-foundation-sustainable-agriculture-land-development-and-reform-philanthropic-projects-and-partnerships/

MacLeod, F. (2010, December 23). Ubuntu Drives South Africa's Generous "Go-Givers." *The Mail & Guardian*. https://mg.co.za/article/2010-12-23-ubuntu-drives-south-africas-generous-gogivers/

Mail and Guardian. (2018, October 26). The Complex Insecurity of Hunger in South Africa. *The Mail & Guardian*. https://mg.co.za/article/2018-10-26-00-the-complex-insecurity-of-hunger-in-south-africa/

Maluleke, R. (2019). *Towards Measuring the Extent of Food Security in South Africa: An Examination of Hunger and Food Inadequacy* (Government Publications No. 03-00–14). Stats SA. http://www.governmentpublications.lib.uct.ac.za/news/towards-measuring-extent-food-security-south-africa-examination-hunger-and-food-inadequacy

Maponya, P. (2021). Opportunities and Constraints Faced by Smallholder Farmers in the Vhembe District, Limpopo Province in South Africa; Special Issue: Sustainability in an Agro-Based Bioeconomi: Prospects and Challenges in a Post-Covid Era; Circular Economy & Sustainability (Springer); https://doi.org/10.1007/s43615-021-00028-x. *Circular Economy and Sustainability*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43615-021-00028-x

Martin, M. A. (2019). Digging Through Urban Agriculture with Feminist Theoretical Implements. *Canadian Food Studies / La Revue Canadienne Des Études Sur l'alimentation*, *6*(3), 88–107. https://doi.org/10.15353/cfs-rcea.v6i3.356

Masipa, T. S. (2017). The Impact of Climate Change on Food Security in South Africa: Current Realities and Challenges Ahead. *Jàmbá : Journal of Disaster Risk Studies*, *9*(1), 411. https://doi.org/10.4102/jamba.v9i1.411

Masiwa, D. (2021, September 8). *Limpopo Is Mzansi's Most Food-Secure Province*. https://www.foodformzansi.co.za/limpopo-is-mzansis-most-food-secure-province/

Mbajiorgu, G. (2019). Human Development and Food Sovereignty: A Step Closer to Achieving Food Security in South Africa's Rural Households: *Journal of Asian and African Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021909619875757

Mintirho Foundation. (2020, August 3). Leadership: Growing the Future with Mintirho. *Mintirho Foundation*. https://www.ccbsamintirhofoundation.co.za/news-1/2020/8/6/leadership-growing-the-future-with-mintirho

Miranda, A. (2019). *A Leap of Faith: Conversations with Funders of Women's Organizations* (p. 26). Oxfam. https://policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/a-leap-of-faith-conversations-with-funders-of-womens-organizations-620823/

Misselhorn, A., & Hendriks, S. L. (2017). A Systematic Review of Sub-National Food Insecurity Research in South Africa: Missed Opportunities for Policy Insights. *PLOS ONE*, *12*(8), e0182399. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0182399

Mohajan, H. (2018). Qualitative Research Methodology in Social Sciences and Related Subjects. *Journal of Economic Development, Environment and People*, *7*(1), 23–48.

Molele, C. (2016, November 25). Cultivating Agri-Business in Limpopo. *The Mail & Guardian*. https://mg.co.za/article/2016-11-25-00-cultivating-agri-business-in-limpopo/

Morvaridi, B. (2012). Capitalist philanthropy and the new green revolution for food security. *The International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food*, *19*(2), 243–256.

Morvaridi, B. (2016). Does Sub-Saharan Africa Need Capitalist Philanthropy to Reduce Poverty and Achieve Food Security? *Review of African Political Economy*, *43*(147), 151–159. https://doi.org/10.1080/03056244.2016.1149807

Mottiar, S. (2015). *Philanthropy and Development in Southern Africa: Philanthropy and Resource Governance* (p. 12). Southern Africa Trust. https://www.africaportal.org/publications/philanthropy-and-development-in-southern-africa-philanthropy-and-resource-governance/

Moyo, B. (2015). *Philanthropy and Legislative Environment Report* (p. 94). African Grantmakers Network. https://www.google.com/search?q=Philanthropy+and+legislative+environment+report&rlz=1C5CHFA_enZA889ZW890&sxsrf=AOaemvLWSSz9yRPuDCrITjJ5tQ2OhRBwPw%3A1630770373656&ei=xZQzYbTCJ4eA8gLrwI2YCQ&oq=Philanthropy+and+legislative+environment+report&gs_lcp=Cgdnd3Mtd2l6EAMyBAgjECc6BwgAEEcQsAM6BwgjELACECdKBAhBGABQ_25YocIBYOjNAWgBcAJ4AYABnwOIAfAfkgEHMi05LjQuMZgBAKABAcgBA8ABAQ&sclient=gws-wiz&ved=0ahUKEwj0uNOG1eXyAhUHgFwKHWtgA5MQ4dUDCA4&uact=5

Moyo, B. (2020). *African Women and Gilrs in a Shrinking Civic Space: Policy Brief*.

Moyo, B., & Imafidon, A.-M. (2021). *Barriers to African Civil Society: Building the Sector's Capacity and Potential to Scale Up'*. Safaricom, Vodacom and Vodafone Foundation. https://impactphilanthropyafrica.org/resource/barriers-to-african-civil-society-building-the-sectors-capacity-and-potential-to-scale-up/

Moyo, B., & Sowa, T. (2015). *Constructing a Developmental and Transformational Philanthropy in Africa: Towards a New Regulatory Common Sense* (p. 94). African Grantmakers Network. https://media.africaportal.org/documents/philanthropy-and-legislative-environment-report.pdf

Mpandeli, S., & Maponya, P. (2014). Constraints and Challenges Facing the Small Scale Farmers in Limpopo Province, South Africa. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, *6*. https://doi.org/10.5539/jas.v6n4p135

Murisa, T., & Trust Africa. (2015). A Watershed Moment for African Philanthropy. *Alliance Magazine*. https://www.alliancemagazine.org/analysis/a-watershed-moment-for-african-philanthropy/

Murnan, J., & Price, J. H. (2004). Research Limitations and the Necessity of Reporting Them. *American Journal of Health Education*, *35*(2), 66–67. https://doi.org/10.1080/19325037.2004.10603611

Murugani, V. G., & Thamaga-Chitja, J. M. (2019). How Does Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Affect Household Food Security and Dietary Diversity? The Case of Rural Irrigation Schemes in Limpopo Province, South Africa. *Agrekon*, *58*(3), 308–323. https://doi.org/10.1080/03031853.2019.1610976

Musyoki, A. (2011). Emerging Policy, Plans and Programs Towards a Green Economy and Social Development in Limpopo, South Africa. *United Nations Research Institute for Social Development*, *10–11*, 20.

Mzolo, S. (2018, May 11). In the Heart of Africa's Eden. *The Mail & Guardian*. https://mg.co.za/article/2018-05-11-00-in-the-heart-of-africas-eden/

Nallainathan, M. (2015, July 13). Global Sustainable Food and Agriculture: A Philanthropic Landscape Assessment. *Alliance Magazine*. https://www.alliancemagazine.org/blog/global-sustainable-food-and-agriculture-a-philanthropic-landscape-assessment/

Nally, D. (2016). Against Food Security: On Forms of Care and Fields of Violence. *Global Society*, *30*(4), 558–582. https://doi.org/10.1080/13600826.2016.1158700

Nedbank Private Wealth. (2019). *Giving Report IV: A SURVEY ON THE GIVING PRACTICES OF HIGH-NET-WORTH INDIVIDUALS IN SOUTH AFRICA* (p. 36). Nedbank. https://www.nedbankprivatewealth.co.za/content/private-wealth-sa/south-africa/en/info/GivingReportIV.html

Nkombisa, L. (2020). *The Citrus Growers Association will maximise the long-term p*. CGA. http://cga.co.za/page.aspx?ID=3208

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic Analysis: Striving to Meet the Trustworthiness Criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *16*(1), 1609406917733847. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847

O'Connor, H., & Gibson, N. (2003). *A Step-by-Step Guide to Qualitative Data Analysis*. 29.

OECD. (2003). Philanthropic Foundations and Development Co-operation. *OECD Journal on Development*, *4*(3), 73–148. https://doi.org/10.1787/journal_dev-v4-art23-en

OECD. (2012). Improving Food Security Emerging Evaluation Lessons. *Policy and Operations Evaluation*, *5*, 12.

OECD. (2021). *Philanthropy and Gender Equality: Domestic Philanthropy for Development and Gender Equality in South Africa*. OECD Development Centre. https://www.oecd.org/development/philanthropy-centre/researchprojects/countrystudies/OECD_CoP_DomesticPhilanthropySouthAfrica.pdf

OECD netFWD. (2019). *Philanthropy and Gender Equality—Insights on Philanthropy for Gender Equality*. OECD Development Centre. https://www.oecd.org/development/networks/Final_Gender_WG_Policy_Note_7319.pdf

Ogden, K., Prasad, S., & Thompson, R. (2018). Philanthropy Bets Big on Sustainable Development Goals. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 9.

Olofsson, M. (2020). Socio-Economic Differentiation from a Class-Analytic Perspective: The Case of Smallholder Tree-Crop Farmers in Limpopo, South Africa. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, *20*(1), 37–59. https://doi.org/10.1111/joac.12335

Oni, S. A., Maliwichi, L. L., & Obadire, O. S. (2010). Socio-Economic Factors Affecting Smallholder Farming and Household Food Security: A Case of Thulamela Local Municipality in Vhembe District of Limpopo Province, South Africa. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, *5*(17), 2289–2296. https://doi.org/10.5897/AJAR.9000638

Oxfam. (2019, July 15). *Gender Inequalities and Food Insecurity: Ten Years After the Food Price Crisis, Why Are Women Farmers Still Food-Insecure? - World*. ReliefWeb. https://reliefweb.int/report/world/gender-inequalities-and-food-insecurity-ten-years-after-food-price-crisis-why-are-women

Patel, R. (2009). Food Sovereignty. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, *36*(3), 663–706. https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150903143079

Patel, R. (2012). Food Sovereignty: Power, Gender, and the Right to Food. *PLoS Medicine*, *9*(6), e1001223. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001223

Pawlak, K., & Kołodziejczak, M. (2020). The Role of Agriculture in Ensuring Food Security in Developing Countries: Considerations in the Context of the Problem of Sustainable Food Production. *Sustainability*, *12*(13), 5488. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12135488

Payton, R. L., & Moody, M. P. (2008). *Understanding Philanthropy: Its Meaning and Mission* (p. 205).

Pearl-Martinez, R. (2017). *Financing Women Farmers: The Need to Increase and Redirect Agriculture and Climate Adaptation Resources* [Publication]. Oxfam International. https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/financing-women-farmers

Pérez-Escamilla, R. (2017). Food Security and the 2015–2030 Sustainable Development Goals: From Human to Planetary Health: Perspectives and Opinions. *Current Developments in Nutrition*, *1*(7), e000513. https://doi.org/10.3945/cdn.117.000513

PLAAS. (2020, August 10). Draft National Policy on Beneficiary Selection and Land Allocation: Prospects for a pro-poor land reform? *Plaas*. https://www.plaas.org.za/prospects-for-a-pro-poor-land-reform/

Raidimi, E. n. (2014). The Roles and Activities of Women in the Six Selected Agricultural Projects in Thulamela Local Municipality of Vhembe District Municipality in the Limpopo Province. *South African Journal of Agricultural Extension*, *42*, 23–23.

Raidimi, E. N. (2014). The Roles and Activities of Women in the Six Selected Agricultural Projects in Thulamela Local Municipality of Vhembe District Municipality in the Limpopo Province. *South African Journal of Agricultural Extension*, *42*(2), 10–23.

Rajaonarison, H. M. (2014a). Food and Human Security in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Procedia Environmental Sciences*, *20*, 377–385. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proenv.2014.03.048

Rajaonarison, H. M. (2014b). Food and Human Security in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Procedia Environmental Sciences*, *20*, 377–385. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proenv.2014.03.048

Rametsteiner, E. (2016, November 8). Transforming Agriculture for Sustainable Development. *Impakter*. https://impakter.com/transforming-agriculture-sustainable-development/

Rapsomanikis, G. (2015). *The Economic Lives of Smallholder Farmers :an Analysis Based on Household Data from Nine Countries* (p. 48). Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Reddy, V., & Moletsane, R. (2015). *The Gendered Dimensions of Food Security in South Africa: A Review of the Literature*. https://doi.org/10/4887

Ricciardi, V., Ramankutty, N., Mehrabi, Z., Jarvis, L., & Chookolingo, B. (2018). How Much of the World's Food Do Smallholders Produce? *Global Food Security*, *17*, 64–72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2018.05.002

Rocco, T. S., & Plakhotnik, M. S. (2009). Literature Reviews, Conceptual Frameworks, and Theoretical Frameworks: Terms, Functions, and Distinctions. *Human Resource Development Review*, 120–130.

Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors. (2019). *Philanthropy and the SDGs | Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors* (pp. 1–44). Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors. https://www.rockpa.org/project/sdg/

Rusare, M., & Tsegay, Y. T. (2014). *Hidden Hunger in South Africa*. Oxfam International. https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/hidden-hunger-south-africa

Saarinen, H. (2020, July 13). The Fight Against Hunger Must Top the Eu Agenda for a Fair and Green Recovery. *EU Policy Advisor on Food, Agriculture and Land*. https://www.oxfam.org/en/blogs/fight-against-hunger-must-top-eu-agenda-fair-and-green-recovery

Sadiki, R. (2021). *Government Boosts Role of Women in Agriculture- South Africa*. Farming Portal. https://www.farmingportal.co.za/index.php/farminglifestyle/agri-women/6710-government-boosts-role-of-women-in-agriculture-south-africa

SAHO. (2021). *Limpopo Province | South African History Online*. https://www.sahistory.org.za/place/limpopo-province

SAHRCommission. (n.d.). *Equality*. Retrieved October 16, 2021, from https://www.sahrc.org.za/index.php/focus-areas/immigration-equality/equality

Sarker, D. (2006). Development Theory and Gendered Approach to Development: A Review in the Third World Perspective. *Sociological Bulletin*, *55*(1), 45–66.

SaveAct. (n.d.). *SaveAct—Who We Are*. SaveAct. Retrieved September 24, 2021, from http://saveact.org.za/

SBS Food. (2018, March 8). *The Mother Is the Last to Eat in Developing Countries*. Food. https://www.sbs.com.au/food/health/article/2018/03/08/mother-last-eat-developing-countries

Scholtz, C. (2020). *A 2020 Vision of the Agricultural Sector in Limpopo | Global Africa Network*. https://www.globalafricanetwork.com/company-news/a-2020-vision-of-the-agricultural-sector-in-limpopo/

SEEPNetwork. (n.d.). *Thematic Areas: Agriculture & Food Security*. Retrieved April 18, 2021, from https://seepnetwork.org/Thematic-Areas-Agriculture-Food-Security

Sihlobo, W. (2018, October 5). *Role of Women in Agriculture- South Africa*. Farming Portal. https://www.farmingportal.co.za/index.php/farminglifestyle/agri-women/438-role-of-women-in-agriculture-south-africa

Sihlobo, W. (2021). *South Africa's Land Policy Seeks to Boost Women in Redistribution Delivery*. Farming Portal.

https://www.farmingportal.co.za/index.php/farminglifestyle/agri-women/6711-south-africa-s-land-policy-seeks-to-boost-women-in-redistribution-delivery

Sishuba, S. (2019). Empowering Small-Scale Women Farmers in SA. *Farmer's Weekly*. https://www.farmersweekly.co.za/agri-news/south-africa/empowering-small-scale-women-farmers-in-sa/

SOFA Team, & Doss, C. (2011). *The Role of Women in Agriculture*. *11*(2), 48.

Solidaridad Network. (2019, August 22). *Linking Women Farmers to High-Value Markets in South Africa*. Solidaridad Network. https://www.solidaridadnetwork.org/story/linking-women-farmers-to-high-value-markets-in-south-africa/

South African Government. (n.d.). *Land and Agriculture | South African Government*. Retrieved September 23, 2021, from https://www.gov.za/issues/govt-programmes-economic-opportunities/land-agriculture

Southern Africa Trust. (2020). *Closing the Gender Gap: How Women Farmers in Southern Africa Can Be Empowered*. https://southernafricatrust.org/closing-the-gender-gap-how-women-farmers-in-southern-africa-can-be-empowered/

Statistics South Africa. (2019a). *The Extent of Food Security in South Africa | Statistics South Africa*. http://www.statssa.gov.za/?p=12135

Statistics South Africa. (2019b, May). *The Extent of Food Security in South Africa | Statistics South Africa*. http://www.statssa.gov.za/?p=12135

Statistics South Africa. (2020). *Census of Agriculture Provincial Statistics: Financial and production statistics: Limpopo, 2017*. Stats SA. http://www.statssa.gov.za/?page_id=1854

Struckmann, C. (2018). A Postcolonial Feminist Critique of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: A South African Application. *Agenda*, *32*(1), 12–24.

Sulek, M. (2010). On the Modern Meaning of Philanthropy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *39*(2), 193–212. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764009333052

Sustainable Food Production and Fod Security. (2020, June 7). What Are Smallholder Farms? *Sustainable, Secure Food Blog*. https://sustainable-secure-food-blog.com/2020/06/07/what-are-smallholder-farms/

Swart, R. (2019a). *Thematic Analysis of Survey Responses From Undergraduate Students*. SAGE Publications, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526468666

Swart, R. (2019b). *Thematic Analysis of Survey Responses From Undergraduate Students*. SAGE Publications, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526468666

Thamaga-Chitja, J. M., & Morojele, P. (2014a). The context of smallholder farming in South Africa: Towards a livelihood asset building framework. *Journal of Human Ecology*, *45*(2), 147–155.

Thamaga-Chitja, J. M., & Morojele, P. (2014b). The Context of Smallholder Farming in South Africa: Towards a Livelihood Asset Building Framework. *Journal of Human Ecology*, *45*(2), 147–155. https://doi.org/10.1080/09709274.2014.11906688

The Economic and Social Council. (2010). *Engaging Philanthropy to Promote Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment | VUFO - NGO Resource Centre Vietnam*. https://www.ngocentre.org.vn/content/engaging-philanthropy-promote-gender-equality-and-women%E2%80%99s-empowerment

The Economist Intelligence Unit. (2021). *Global Food Security Index 2020: Addressing Structural Inequalities to Build Strong and Sustainable Food Systems*. GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY INDEX. https://foodsecurityindex.eiu.com/Resources

The P.E.A.C.E. Foundation. (2009). *Agriculture: Transforming Subsistence Farming into Commercially Sustainable Cooperatives and Industrializing the Agricultural Sector*. The P.E.A.C.E. Foundation. https://peacefoundation.org.za/agriculture/

The South African Government. (n.d.). *Capricorn District Municipality*. Retrieved September 4, 2021, from https://cdm.org.za/

The World Bank. (2016, March 6). *Breaking the "Grass Ceiling": Empowering Women Farmers* [Text/HTML]. World Bank. https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2018/03/06/breaking-the-grass-ceiling-empowering-women-farmers

The World Bank. (2017). *Help Women Farmers "Get to Equal"* [Text/HTML]. The World Bank. https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/agriculture/brief/women-farmers-getting-to-equal

The World Bank Group. (2020, September 30). *Agriculture Overview*. https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/agriculture/overview

Tsheola, J. (2012). Rural Women's Survivalist Livelihoods and State Interventions in Ga-Ramogale Village, Limpopo Province. *African Development Review*, *24*(3), 221–232. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8268.2012.00319.x

UN Food and Agriculture Organization. (2016). Human Security & Food Security: Hunger, Food Insecurity and Malnutrition. *United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security*, 10.

United Nations. (2020). Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. *United Nations Sustainable Development*. https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/gender-equality/

Van der Elst, L., & Volmink, J. (2019). *The Evolving Role of 21st Century Education NGOs in South Africa*. Seriti Institute. https://seriti.org.za/publications/the-evolving-role-of-twenty-first-century-education-npos-in-south-africa/

Vercillo, S. (2020). The Complicated Gendering of Farming and Household Food Responsibilities in Northern Ghana. *Journal of Rural Studies*, *79*, 235–245. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2020.08.020

Verschuur, C. (2019). From the Centre to the Margins and Back Again: Women in Agriculture at the ILO. *International Development Policy | Revue Internationale de Politique de Développement*, *11*, 152–176. https://doi.org/10.4000/poldev.3068

Vhembe District Municipality—Overview. (n.d.). Retrieved August 30, 2021, from https://municipalities.co.za/overview/129/vhembe-district-municipality

Vodacom. (2021, January 14). *Women Farmers: Using Tech to Boost Their Farm Businesses in Africa*. Vodafone.Com. https://www.vodafone.com/news/technology/women-farmers-tech-africa

Vuk'uzenzele. (2007, May). Our Beautiful Country Limpopo...Africa's Jewel. *Vuk'uzenzele*. https://www.vukuzenzele.gov.za/our-beautiful-country-limpopoafricas-jewel

Wilkinson-Maposa, S., Fowler, A., Oliver-Evans, C., & Mulenga, C. F. N. (2015). *The Poor Philanthropist: How and Why the Poor Help Each Other*. Southern Africa-United States Centre for Leadership and Public Values. Graduate School of Business, University of Cape Town.

Wollstonecraft, M. (1729). *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. British Library. https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/mary-wollstonecraft-a-vindication-of-the-rights-of-woman

Wong, K., Ong, P., & Zheng, W. (2016). American Philanthropy Literature Review. *UCLA Center for Neighborhood Knowledge*, 52.

Wong, L. (2008). Data Analysis in Qualitative Research: A Brief Guide to Using Nvivo. *Health Research Development Unit*, *3*(1), 7.

Wood, H. J. (2019). Gender Inequality: The Problem of Harmful, Patriarchal, Traditional and Cultural Gender Practices in the Church. *HTS Theological Studies*, *75*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v75i1.5177

World Bank Group. (2014). *Access to Finance for Smallholder Farmers: Learning from the Experiences of Microfinance Institutions in Latin America* (No. 94905; p. 84). The World Bank Group - International Finance Corporation. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/21679

WWF. (2017). *Climate Smart Smallholder Farming*. https://www.wwf.org.za/our_work/initiatives/climate_smart_smallholder_farming.cfm

Yilmaz, K. (2013). Comparison of Quantitative and Qualitative Research Traditions: Epistemological, Theoretical, and Methodological Differences. *European Journal of Education*, *48*(2), 311–325.

ZZ2. (n.d.). *ZZ2 l Home*. Retrieved August 30, 2021, from https://www.zz2.co.za/

Annexure 1(a): Sample A, philanthropic organisations

Respondent	Type of organisation	Districts (Vhembe/Capricorn)	Funding focus areas	Support small-scale women farmers
PO1	Corporate foundation	South Africa (broadly)	Health	No
PO2	Trust	Capricorn and Vhembe	Children and youth development	No
PO3	NGO	South Africa (broadly)	Agricultural projects for women development	Yes
PO4	Corporate foundation	All the five districts in Limpopo (Waterberg, Capricorn, Vhembe, Mopani, and Sekhukhune	Education, Health, Youth and women skills development and small business support, Innovation, Art & Culture, and technology	Yes
PO5	Corporate foundation	South Africa (broadly)	Children and youth development	No
PO6	Community foundation	South Africa broadly including all five districts in Limpopo	Education	No
PO7	NGO	Capricorn and Vhembe	Various communities' development project	Yes
PO8	Community foundation	Capricorn and Vhembe	Innovation and technology	Yes
PO9	Corporate foundation	South Africa	-	No
PO10	NGO	Venda (Vhembe)	Education	both genders

PO11	NGO	Mokopane (Waterberg) Thohoyandou (Vhembe)	Focus on women development	Yes
PO12	Corporate foundation	South Africa/not sure	Agricultural, general entrepreneurship, social innovation	Yes
PO13	Corporate foundation	South Africa (broadly)	Agricultural Farming Cooperatives	Not gender-specific
PO14	Independent (endowed) foundation	-	Higher education and research institutions	No
PO15	Corporate foundation	Ga-Mphahlele (Capricorn)	Agricultural projects for women development	No
PO16	Operating foundation	South Africa (broadly)	Focus on women development	No
PO17	Private foundation	South Africa (broadly)	-	No
PO18	Global political foundation	South Africa (broadly)	Health and agriculture projects in South Africa	No
PO19	Community foundation	South Africa (broadly)	Psychosocial support	No
PO20	Development finance institution	SADC region	Large scale infrastructure	No
PO21	Trust	-	Tax reform and anticorruption	No
PO22	Consultancy	South Africa (broadly)	Research and strategic advisory services on philanthropy	No
PO23	Private foundation, Grantmaker	South Africa (broadly)	Education	No

Annexure 1(b): Sample B, small-scale farmers

Respondent	Gender	Number of female workers	Position	Type of organisation	District
SF1	Male	1-5	Founder	Social/community organisation	Waterberg
SF2	Male	1-5	Founder	Small-scale / Smallholder	Capricorn
SF3	Male	1-5	Founder	Real Estate Agriculture	Waterberg
SF4	**Female**	1-5	General worker	Small-scale / Smallholder	Vhembe
SF5	**Female**	1-5	Founder	Social/community organisation	Waterberg
SF6	**Female**	1-5	General worker	Small-scale / Smallholder	Capricorn
SF7	Male	1-5	Founder	Small-scale / Smallholder	Vhembe
SF8	**Female**	1-5	Founder	Small-scale / Smallholder	Mopani
SF9	Male	1-5	Founder	Small-scale / Smallholder	Vhembe
SF10	Male	1-5	Manager	Small-scale / Smallholder	Vhembe
SF11	Male	1-5	Manager	Small-scale / Smallholder	Vhembe
SF12	**Female**	20	Manager	Corporation	Theme
SF13	Male	1-5	Founder	Small-scale / Smallholder	Vhembe
SF14	**Female**	20	Founder	Small-scale / Smallholder	Capricorn

SF15	**Female**	10-20	Founder	Social/community organisation	Mopani
SF16	Male	5-10	Manager	Small-scale / Smallholder	Mopani
SF17	**Female**	10-20	Manager	Social/community organisation	Vhembe
SF18	Male	-	Founder	Small-scale / Smallholder	Capricorn
SF19	Male	1-5	Founder	Small-scale / Smallholder	Capricorn
SF20	-	1-5	Founder	Small-scale / Smallholder	Vhembe
SF21	**Female**	1-5	Founder	Small-scale / Smallholder	Vhembe
SF22	Male	10-20	Manager	NPO	Vhembe
SF23	**Female**	1-5	General worker	Small-scale / Smallholder	Vhembe
2F24	**Female**	5-10	Founder	Small-scale / Smallholder	Capricorn

Appendix 1: Sample A – Philanthropic Organisations

Open-ended questionnaire responses

Questions	Codes	Key themes	Responses	Respondent
Q9: Does your organisation work directly with small-scale women farmers in Limpopo? Q10: Does your organisation focus specifically on supporting women-led initiatives in the agriculture sector? Q18: Do small-scale women farmers reach out to your organisation, or do you approach them for support?	**Gender**	We support women in the context of community development. - take a holistic view; we support both genders; Not gender-specific/small-scale women farmers/women/female	- Both genders - As part of our social and economic rights cluster, we focus on economic inclusion for women through the agriculture sector. - We fund small scale women farmers through partner organisations that work at the grassroots level. Partners apply for grants, and in some instances, we approach partners to apply. - We have not had any funding requests from small scale women farmers.	- PO3; PO6; PO10; PO20 - PO1 - PO18 - PO17 - PO14

			- The only support we provide explicitly to women in agriculture is a small grant to AWARD (African Women in Agricultural Research and Development), consistent with the priority we place on early-career researchers.	- PO12
			- We approach them as we have long term relationships. Their support of small-scale female farmers is part of a broader community development initiative.	- PO15
			- The projects we are working with are too small to be defined as farmers. They are community-based food	
Q7: Which development initiative(s) does your organisation support projects or enterprise in Limpopo? Would you please select all relevant?	**Development**	To combat hunger through food security programmes; Economic transformation	- Agricultural projects for women development	- PO3; PO15
			- We support health and agriculture projects in South Africa but not specifically in Limpopo	- PO12
			- Agricultural, general entrepreneurship, social innovation	- PO12

Q17: What is the main motivation to support small-scale women farmers in Limpopo?	- We help communities with various development project	- PO7
	- Education, Health, Youth and women skills development and small business support, Innovation, Art & Culture, and technology	- P4
	- I can only select one - we support Health, Education, Children, and youth development	- PO2
	- Women development	- PO1
	- To combat hunger through food security programmes and Economic transformation	- PO4
	- All of the above, however we do not only fund in Limpopo but across South Africa	- PO2
	- 1.Economic transformation 2. Inequality.3 Psych Social 4. GBV	- PO

			- Children and youth development	- PO5
			- Education	- PO6; 10
			- Innovation and technology	
			- 1.Child Sponsorship 2. Women's Rights, Gender 3. LGBTQ+ 4. Mining & Extractive	- PO8
				- PO11
Q10: Does your organisation focus specifically on supporting women-led initiatives in the agriculture sector?	**Focus/Support**	Focus on economic inclusion; focus on youth development; Training and skills; Resource mobilisation; We support all annotations projects	- As part of our social and economic rights cluster, we focus on economic inclusion for women through the agriculture sector.	- PO18
			- RWF mainly supports Agricultural Farming Cooperatives	- PO2
			- We support both genders	- PO3
Q11: How would you classify the organisations you fund?			- We provide education and skills and	- PO4
			- Not gender-specific	- PO11
			- Focus on women and youth	- PO15; PO16
			- Higher education and research institutions that offer opportunities to both men and women	- PO14
Q13: Apart from monetary funding, does				- PO6
			- We focus on youth development	- PO5

your organisation offer other services?	- Children	- PO11; PO18
Q15: Would you please elaborate on how and why you support women initiatives programmes?	- Focus on women development	- PO1
	- Health care needs access to services for specific projects; Health care access	- PO3
	- Training and skills development, Resource mobilisation, Supply seeds and farming equipment	- PO4
Q19 Does your organisation have a plan to increase its philanthropic support for small-scale women farmers in Limpopo in the future?	- Our CSI policy focusses on women and youth skills development	- PO5
	- Empower children	- PO6; 20
	- Training and skills development	- PO7; PO9;
	-	PO11;
	- Training and skills development, Volunteering time and services	PO12; PO13
	- Training and skills development, resource mobilisation	- PO8; PO16
	- Training and skills development, Supply seeds and farming equipment, Farmer support	- PO10
	- Volunteering time and services	
	- We support youth initiatives, including young women	- PO19; 22 - PO6

- We support all annotations projects
- we support both genders by training them in the business of farming - PO8 - PO10
- We use Human Rights-Based Approach policy, and we are guided by ActionAid top Ten feminist's principles which is part of policy - PO11
- We aim for 50% women on all our programmes, and we have a national focus. We also have quite a large macadamia farming initiative in Limpopo which is mostly women farmers. We support women because why wouldn't we! It is also part of the Foundations mandate as written in the Trust Deed - PO12
- For empowerment purposes.
- We don't support initiatives aimed at women but rather nudge our partners to mainstream gender and set equity targets, the one exception being a small grant to AWARD (African Women in Agricultural Research and Development) in support of early-career researchers. - PO13 - PO14

- We support women in the context of community development. We take a holistic view - PO15
- Primary focus on women's rights
- We support them through our partner organisations. These are NGOs or CBO's that work directly with women initiatives. We aim to provide opportunities and economic inclusion for women since they have been historically disadvantaged. Supporting women's economic inclusion also improves the standards of living for households. - PO16 - PO18
- Support women on GBV issues
- We do not focus on women-specific programmes. - PO19
- Women bear the brunt of marginalisation, oppression, and dispossession - our work seeks to advocate for philanthropy to be a tool that allows those affected by injustice to play a central role in the decisions that affect their lives that - PO20 - PO22
- We are always available to support all project that we have identified - PO7

- We plan to increase support for all technology innovation projects - PO8
- Not only in Limpopo, but we also want to be abroad and support women and man in SA - PO10
- We financial constraints due to lack of funding from the donors which impact continuity support. - PO11
- Not necessarily as we already do a lot. We will continue to run the Tholoana programme every year and hope to get applications from women in this province as they meet two of our criteria namely, women and rural - PO12
- Not certain at the moment as we are going through a transformation. But we will remain committed to improve the livelihoods of women through the agriculture. - PO18
- Not applicable to our programmes, we focus on large scale infrastructure projects within the private and public sector. Our primary sectors are water, energy, transport, and ICT. We do not finance within the agriculture sector. - PO20

Appendix 2: Sample B – Small-scale Farmers

Open-ended questionnaire responses

Questions	Codes	Key themes	Responses	Respondents
Q6: How is your organisation funded?	**Monetary**	No funding/support from organisations; own capital	- Own capital - Government subsidy/support	- SF1; SF2; SF3; SF5; SF6; SF7; SF8; SF9; SF10; SF11; SF13; SF14; SF15; SF16; SF18; SF19; SF20; SF21; SF23; S24

Q17: Please list the names of philanthropic organisations or donors who are supporting your work in farming	-	- SF4
	- Philanthropic/donor giving	- SF12; SF17; SF22
	- No funding from organisations	- SF1
	- None	- SF4, SF6; SF7; SF9; SF17; SF21; SF22
	- So far, we haven't received any support from philanthropic organisation	- SF20
Q18: Please list the names of government programmes that support your work in farming.	- None	- SF1; SF3; SF6; SF7; SF9; SF10; SF13; SF22
		- SF2
	- No government supports	
		- SF8
	- None for now we're still waiting to get support.	

Q8: What support does your organization need?			- Skills/training, Facilitate the marketing of agricultural products	- SF1; SF7
			- Monetary subsidy	- SF2; SF7; SF10; SF11; SF22; SF23
			- Skills/training	
			- Skills/training and land	- SF3; SF7; SF9; SF10; SF12; SF13; SF15; SF17; SF19; SF21; SF23
				- SF5; SF7; SF10
Q10: From which institution have you received the support?	**Government/ Philanthropic/donor organisations**	Government endorsement	- Government institutions	- SF1; SF4; SF6; SF7; SF20; SF21; SF23
			- Philanthropic/donor organisations	- SF11; SF12; SF14; SF17; SF22

Q11: How do you get to receive funds from philanthropic organisations?	**Funder/ funding/ grant/incentives/subsidy/endorsements**	Limited funding and access to funding opportunities; No contact or knowledge of such organisations.	- Government endorsement - - Monetary subsidy - - Approached by the funder - Some funding grants to expand production - Approached by the funder - I need funds	- SF1; SF4; SF6; SF14; SF20 - SF2 - SF5; SF17 - SF7 - SF11 - SF19
S				
Q12: How would you classify contributions from philanthropic organisations?	**Skills/training**	Lack of skills and training for women in farming; No knowledge of philanthropic organisations	- Skills and training only - - No contact or knowledge of such organisations - - Fully supportive and visible (monetary and skills support) - Monetary support only - Only involved through government endorsements	- SF1; SF5; SF14 - SF2; SF3; SF8; SF9; SF10; SF19; SF21; SF23 - SF7; SF11; SF12; SF16; SF22 - SF15; SF17 - SF20


Q14: What factors would limit your progress in farming?	- Limited funding and access to funding opportunities and Lack of skills and training for women in farming.	- SF1; SF3; SF6; SF7
	- Limited funding and access to funding opportunities	- SF4; SF9; SF10; SF18
	- Lack of skills and training for women in farming and Gender-based discrimination (lack of equal opportunities for women farmers)	- SF5
	- Lack of skills and training for women in farming	- SF11; SF16; SF17; SF19
	- Lack of skills and training for women in farming and Limited access to land	- SF12
	- Lack of support from government institutions and Gender-based discrimination (lack of equal opportunities for women farmers)	- SF14

Q15: What can be done to improve your work?	- Lack of support from government institutions and Limited funding and access to funding opportunities	- SF15
	- Lack of support from government institutions and Limited access to land	- SF20; SF21
	- Lack of skills and training for women in farming and Lack of support from government institutions	- SF22; SF23
	- Government should invest in making sure that women are also prioritised. Corporative with woman leading the pack should get all the necessary support and skill.	- SF2
	- Skills and productivity training.	- SF3
	- Governmental incentives.	
	- Funding opportunities.	

- Utilisation of current state-owned land to it maximum possibility.
- Sub-division permitted on agricultural land to give more people access to affordable small scale farming enterprises.
- Less use of land questions by political parties to get more votes and focussed on existing land to develop and create skills. Acknowledgement of security of privately owned properties to secure future investment and secure food and product supply.
- We need farming equipment like grading machine so we can be able to grade our eggs into different sizes
- More funding and government support
- Training and equipment

- SF4
- SF12
- SF13
- SF14

			- Funding or government grant for equipment and infrastructure. - Monetary funding and training - Skills development, machinery, and equipment	- SF15 - SF17
Q16: In what way can philanthropic organisations or donors support your work? **And** **Q19: What support does your organisation need?**	Support	Farming machinery and equipment; Facilitate the marketing of agricultural products; Monetary subsidy; Poor market for agricultural products.	- Funding and skills training without political interference. - Farming machinery and equipment and by giving us skills and ideas to grow our business - Farming machinery and equipment - it will supplement the funding and skills required to expand production - Skills, farming machinery and borehole - Subsidy, machinery support, seeds, etc.	- SF3 - SF4 - SF3; SF7; SF9; SF10; SF12; SF13 - SF7 - SF9



- Being supported by the government and Monetary subsidy	- SF10
- Skills/training, Monetary subsidy, Farming machinery and equipment, and Land	- SF11
- Skills training	- SF12; SF15; SF19; SF24
- By providing training and financial funding	- SF14
- Skills/training, Farming machinery and equipment, and Land	- SF15
- By offering both funds and skill development	- SF16; SF17; SF18; SF21; SF23
- through training and farmer support and Monetary subsidy.	- SF17
	- SF22

Appendix 3: Ethics Clearance Letter

Research Office:
Sithembile Xaba
Tel: 011 717 3133
Email: Sithembile.Xaba@wits.ac.za

Research Ethics Chair:
Rekgotsofetse Chikane
Tel: 0117173869
Email: rekgotsofetse.chikane@wits.ac.za

23 September 2021

Dear Thandi Makhubele,

Title: The Role of Philanthropy for Women Development through Food Security
Student Number: 584557
Degree: Master in Management in the field of Governance
Ethics Clearance Number: *WSG-2021-40*

All candidates must satisfy the University's ethical standards for research. Your ethics application has been received and reviewed by the Wits School of Governance Human Research Ethics Committee.

Your ethical clearance has been approved subject to you getting permission to conduct research from all sites where research is conducted. The letter(s) of permission to undertake research must be submitted to the WSG Research Office and kept on file with your final proposal and other ethics documents.

You may commence your data collection under the guidance of your supervisor. In the event that the scope, methodology or nature of the research changes, you are required to submit another ethics application reflecting the changes.

The onus is on you as the candidate, with support from your supervisor, to ensure your research complies with university human research ethics policies and protocols at all stages of the research process.

It is recommended that you keep this letter in a safe place as you are responsible for ensuring you have proof of ethics clearance and have lodged the ethics clearance / protocol number with Faculty before final submission of your research report. If you do not have an ethics clearance number, you are not permitted to graduate.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries.

Yours sincerely

Rekgotsofetse Chikane


Rekgotsofetse Chikane
Research Ethics Chair

Appendix 4: Sample A, Philanthropic Organizations

The Role of Philanthropy in Women Development through Food Security: Philanthropic Organisations — SurveyMonkey

Q1 How would you classify your organization? (please select the most relevant)

Answered: 22 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Corporate foundation	31.82%	7
Community foundation	13.64%	3
Operating foundation	4.55%	1
Other (please specify)	50.00%	11
TOTAL		22

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	consultancy/ advisory	10/13/2021 11:26 AM
2	Trust	10/10/2021 10:22 AM
3	Development finance institution	10/10/2021 9:43 AM
4	Global Political foundation	10/8/2021 9:18 AM
5	Private Foundation	10/8/2021 9:16 AM
6	Independent (endowed) foundation	10/6/2021 9:33 PM
7	NGO	10/4/2021 12:25 PM
8	NGO	10/4/2021 12:23 PM
9	NGO	10/2/2021 7:54 AM
10	NGO	9/28/2021 8:30 PM
11	Trust	9/28/2021 9:12 AM

Q2 What is the name of the organization?

Answered: 20 Skipped: 2

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Thiqa Consulting	10/13/2021 11:26 AM
2	Joffe Charitable Trust	10/10/2021 10:22 AM
3	DBSA	10/10/2021 9:43 AM
4	Life Savers Foundation	10/8/2021 10:41 AM
5	Open Society Foundation South Africa	10/8/2021 9:18 AM
6	Mott Foundation	10/8/2021 9:16 AM
7	The Graça Machel Trust	10/8/2021 9:11 AM
8	Barloworld Empowerment Foundation (BWEF)	10/8/2021 7:41 AM
9	Carnegie Corporation of New York	10/6/2021 9:33 PM
10	Rand Water Foundation	10/4/2021 2:16 PM
11	SAB Foundation	10/4/2021 1:36 PM
12	ActionAid South Africa	10/4/2021 12:25 PM
13	Buhle Farmers Academy	10/4/2021 12:23 PM
14	Vision of Hope Foundation	10/2/2021 7:54 AM
15	Tutuwa community foundation	10/2/2021 7:33 AM
16	The LEGO foundation	10/1/2021 8:56 PM
17	MTN SA Foundation)(Please note each MTN Country operation has a Foundation or CSI unit in smaller operations)n	9/28/2021 8:49 PM
18	FOOD AND TREES FOR AFRICA	9/28/2021 8:30 PM
19	DG Murray Trust	9/28/2021 9:12 AM
20	Netcare Foundation	9/27/2021 3:35 PM


Q3 In which country are you based? Please specify

Answered: 22 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	South Africa	10/13/2021 11:26 AM
2	UK	10/10/2021 10:22 AM
3	South Africa/SADC	10/10/2021 9:43 AM
4	Vhembe District Thulamela Municipality,Ha -Makuya Police Station.	10/8/2021 10:41 AM
5	South Africa	10/8/2021 9:18 AM
6	US, with offices in South Africa	10/8/2021 9:16 AM
7	South Africa, Johannesburg	10/8/2021 9:11 AM
8	RSA	10/8/2021 7:41 AM
9	United States	10/6/2021 9:33 PM
10	South Africa	10/4/2021 2:16 PM
11	South Africa	10/4/2021 1:36 PM
12	South Africa	10/4/2021 12:25 PM
13	South Africa	10/4/2021 12:23 PM
14	South Africa	10/4/2021 9:42 AM
15	South Africa	10/2/2021 8:06 AM
16	South African	10/2/2021 7:54 AM
17	South Africa	10/2/2021 7:33 AM
18	South Africa	10/1/2021 8:56 PM
19	South Africa	9/28/2021 8:49 PM
20	SOUTH AFRICA	9/28/2021 8:30 PM
21	South Africa	9/28/2021 9:12 AM
22	South Africa	9/27/2021 3:35 PM

Q4 Do you have operations offices in South Africa?


Answered: 21 Skipped: 1



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	90.48%	19
No	9.52%	2
TOTAL		21

Q5 If you have offices in South Africa, do you fund projects or enterprises in the Limpopo province?


Answered: 21 Skipped: 1



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	42.86%	9
No	57.14%	12
TOTAL		21

Q6 Would you please select the district you support in Limpopo?

Answered: 18 Skipped: 4




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Capricorn	22.22%	4
Vhembe	22.22%	4
Not sure	22.22%	4
Other (please specify)	72.22%	13
Total Respondents: 18		

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Not applicable	10/10/2021 10:22 AM
2	We focus on the SADC region	10/10/2021 9:43 AM
3	Currently we do not have projects in Limpopo, but we fund across South Africa. Therefore if NPOs in Limpopo apply for funding they have an opportunity to receive funding.	10/8/2021 9:18 AM
4	Does not apply	10/8/2021 9:16 AM
5	countries outside South Africa	10/8/2021 9:11 AM
6	Ga-Mphahlele	10/8/2021 7:41 AM
7	None	10/6/2021 9:33 PM
8	Mokopane and Thohoyandou	10/4/2021 12:25 PM
9	Venda	10/4/2021 12:23 PM
10	All districts	10/2/2021 7:33 AM
11	Not applicable	10/1/2021 8:56 PM

	The Role of Philanthropy in Women Development through Food Security: Philanthropic Organisations	SurveyMonkey
12	All the five districts (Waterberg, Capricorn, Vhembe, Mopani and Sekhukhune	9/28/2021 8:49 PM
13	MAJORITY	9/28/2021 8:30 PM

Q7 Which development initiative(s) does your organization support projects or enterprise in Limpopo? Would you please select all relevant?

Answered: 20 Skipped: 2




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Agricultural projects for women development	10.00%	2
Children and youth development	5.00%	1
Innovation and technology	5.00%	1
Education	10.00%	2
Health	5.00%	1
Other (please specify)	65.00%	13
TOTAL		20

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Tax reform and anticorruption	10/10/2021 10:22 AM
2	Large scale infrastructure	10/10/2021 9:43 AM
3	Psychosocial support	10/8/2021 10:41 AM
4	We support, health and agriculture projects in South Africa but not specifically in Limpopo	10/8/2021 9:18 AM
5	Not applicable	10/8/2021 9:16 AM
6	countries outside South Africa	10/8/2021 9:11 AM
7	None	10/6/2021 9:33 PM

	The Role of Philanthropy in Women Development through Food Security: Philanthropic Organisations	SurveyMonkey
8	None	10/4/2021 2:16 PM
9	Agricultural, general entrepreneurship, social innovation	10/4/2021 1:36 PM
10	1.Child Sponsorship 2. Women's Rights, Gender 3.LGBTQ+ 4.Mining & Extractives	10/4/2021 12:25 PM
11	We help communities with various development project	10/2/2021 7:54 AM
12	Education, Health, Youth and women skills development and Small business support, Innovation, Art & Culture and technology	9/28/2021 8:49 PM
13	I can only select one - we support Health, Education, Children and youth dev	9/28/2021 9:12 AM

Q8 Does your organization collaborate with the South African government to support development initiatives for small-scale women farmers?

Answered: 21 Skipped: 1



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	19.05%	4
No	76.19%	16
If yes, please specify the development initiative(s) you support.	0.00%	0
If yes (please specify)	4.76%	1
Total Respondents: 21		

#	IF YES (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Not yet we have just begun our operations. Our strategy values partnerships so yes we will be approaching other donors and government	10/8/2021 7:41 AM

Q9 Does your organization work directly with small-scale women farmers in Limpopo?


Answered: 21 Skipped: 1

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	28.57%	6
No	71.43%	15
If yes, what types of initiatives do you support?	4.76%	1

#	YES	DATE
1	yes	10/4/2021 1:36 PM
2	Yes	10/4/2021 12:25 PM
3	both genders	10/4/2021 12:23 PM
4	Yes	10/2/2021 8:06 AM
5	Yes	10/2/2021 7:54 AM
6	YES	9/28/2021 8:30 PM
#	**NO**	**DATE**
1	No	10/10/2021 10:22 AM
2	No	10/10/2021 9:43 AM
3	No	10/8/2021 10:41 AM
4	NO	10/8/2021 9:18 AM
5	No	10/8/2021 9:16 AM
6	No	10/8/2021 9:11 AM
7	The projects we are working with are too small to be defined as farmers they are community based food security	10/8/2021 7:41 AM
8	No	10/6/2021 9:33 PM
9	No	10/4/2021 2:16 PM
10	X	10/4/2021 9:42 AM
11	No	10/2/2021 7:33 AM
12	No	10/1/2021 8:56 PM
13	We do work with small communtity businesses not speciafically in farming	9/28/2021 8:49 PM
14	x	9/28/2021 9:12 AM
15	no	9/27/2021 3:35 PM
#	**IF YES, WHAT TYPES OF INITIATIVES DO YOU SUPPORT?**	**DATE**
1	TRAINING IN AGROECOLOGY	9/28/2021 8:30 PM

Q10 Does your organization focus specifically on supporting women-led initiatives in the agriculture sector?

Answered: 21 Skipped: 1




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	19.05%	4
No	76.19%	16
If Yes (please specify)	19.05%	4
Total Respondents: 21		

#	IF YES (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	As part of our social and economic rights cluster, we focus on economic inclusion for women through the agriculture sector.	10/8/2021 9:18 AM
2	RWF mianly supports Agricultural Farming Cooperatives	10/4/2021 2:16 PM
3	we support both genders	10/4/2021 12:23 PM
4	We provide education and skills	10/2/2021 7:54 AM

Q11 How would you classify the organizations you fund? (please select)

Answered: 21 Skipped: 1




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Focus on women development	19.05%	4
Not gender specific	52.38%	11
Other (please specify)	28.57%	6
TOTAL		21

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	N/A	10/8/2021 10:41 AM
2	Focus on women and youth	10/8/2021 7:41 AM
3	Higher education and research institutions that offer opportunities to both men and women	10/6/2021 9:33 PM
4	We focus on youth development	10/2/2021 7:33 AM
5	Children	10/1/2021 8:56 PM
6	Health care needs access to services for specific projects	9/27/2021 3:35 PM

Q12 What is the average amount your organization contributed to small-scale women farmers in the past 5 years?


Answered: 19 Skipped: 3



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Less than R500 000	42.11%	8
R500 001 to R1 000 0000	31.58%	6
R1 000 001 to R5 000 000	0.00%	0
0ver 5 000 000	26.32%	5
TOTAL		19

Q13 Apart from monetary funding, does your organization offer other services? Please select all relevant.

Answered: 21 Skipped: 1



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Training and skills development	57.14%	12
Resource mobilisation	38.10%	8
Supply seeds and farming equipment	19.05%	4
Volunteering time and services	28.57%	6
Other (please specify)	42.86%	9
Total Respondents: 21		

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	research and strategic advisory services on philanthropy. No funding	10/13/2021 11:26 AM
2	Fighting corruption	10/10/2021 10:22 AM
3	A wide network and collaboration opportunities	10/8/2021 9:18 AM
4	None of the above	10/8/2021 9:16 AM
5	Depends on what an organization require	10/8/2021 7:41 AM
6	None in this area.	10/6/2021 9:33 PM
7	Farmer support	10/4/2021 12:23 PM
8	Empower children	10/1/2021 8:56 PM
9	Health care access	9/27/2021 3:35 PM

Q14 Is your support for women initiatives motivated by an organizational feminist approach or policy?

Answered: 21 Skipped: 1

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	28.57%	6
No	71.43%	15
If yes, please elaborate how and why you support these programmes	4.76%	1

#	YES	DATE
1	yes	10/13/2021 11:26 AM
2	Yes	10/8/2021 10:41 AM
3	Yes	10/8/2021 9:18 AM
4	Yes	10/8/2021 9:11 AM
5	Yes	10/4/2021 12:25 PM
6	Yes	9/28/2021 8:49 PM
#	**NO**	**DATE**
1	No	10/10/2021 10:22 AM
2	No	10/10/2021 9:43 AM
3	Not applicable	10/8/2021 9:16 AM
4	Not sure I understand what you mean. We see the marginalization of women as a limitation to for a community to build its resilience	10/8/2021 7:41 AM
5	No, but DEI is becoming more of a focus	10/6/2021 9:33 PM
6	No	10/4/2021 2:16 PM
7	no	10/4/2021 1:36 PM
8	not sure	10/4/2021 12:23 PM
9	X	10/4/2021 9:42 AM
10	No	10/2/2021 8:06 AM
11	No	10/2/2021 7:54 AM
12	No	10/2/2021 7:33 AM
13	no	10/1/2021 8:56 PM
14	NO	9/28/2021 8:30 PM
15	x	9/28/2021 9:12 AM
#	**IF YES, PLEASE ELABORATE HOW AND WHY YOU SUPPORT THESE PROGRAMMES**	**DATE**
1	Our CSI policy focusses on women and youth skills development	9/28/2021 8:49 PM

Q15 Would you please elaborate on how and why you support women initiatives programmes?

Answered: 17 Skipped: 5

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Women bear the brunt of marginalization, oppression and dispossession - our work seeks to advocate for philanthropy to be a tool that allows those affected by injustice to play a central role in the decisions that affect their lives that	10/13/2021 11:26 AM
2	Not applicable to our organization	10/10/2021 10:22 AM
3	We do not focus on women specific programmes	10/10/2021 9:43 AM
4	Support women on GBV issues	10/8/2021 10:41 AM
5	We support them through our partner organizations. These are NGOs or CBO's that work directly with women initiatives. We aim to provide opportunities and economic inclusion for women since they have been historically disadvantaged. Supporting women's economic inclusion also improves the standards of living for households.	10/8/2021 9:18 AM
6	This is not an area of focus for the Mott Foundation	10/8/2021 9:16 AM
7	Primary focus on women's rights	10/8/2021 9:11 AM
8	We support women in context of community development. We take a holistic view	10/8/2021 7:41 AM
9	We don't support initiatives aimed at women but rather nudge our partners to mainstream gender and set equity targets, the one exception being a small grant to AWARD (African Women in Agricultural Research and Development) in support of early-career researchers.	10/6/2021 9:33 PM
10	For empowerment purposes.	10/4/2021 2:16 PM
11	We aim for 50% women on all our programmes and we have a national focus. We also have quite a large macadamia farming initiative in Limpopo which is mostly women farmers. We support women because why wouldnt we! It is also part of the Foundations mandate as written in the Trust Deed	10/4/2021 1:36 PM
12	We use Human Rights Based Approach policy and we are guided by ActionAid top Ten feminist's principles which is part of policy	10/4/2021 12:25 PM
13	we support both genders by training them in the business of farming	10/4/2021 12:23 PM
14	We work with community projects in KZN and Eastern Cape both of which focus on small scale farming and empowering women to enter farming.	10/4/2021 9:42 AM
15	We support all annotations projects	10/2/2021 8:06 AM
16	We provide food, train and education	10/2/2021 7:54 AM
17	We support youth initiatives, including young women	10/2/2021 7:33 AM

Q16 Is your support for women initiatives motivated by an organizational feminist approach or policy?

Answered: 15 Skipped: 7

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	26.67%	4
No	73.33%	11
If yes, please elaborate how and why you support these programmes	0.00%	0

#	YES	DATE
1	yes	10/13/2021 11:26 AM
2	Yes	10/8/2021 10:41 AM
3	Yes	10/8/2021 9:18 AM
4	Yes	10/4/2021 12:25 PM


#	NO	DATE
1	No	10/10/2021 10:22 AM
2	No	10/10/2021 9:43 AM
3	Not applicable	10/8/2021 9:16 AM
4	No, but DEI is becoming more of a focus	10/6/2021 9:33 PM
5	No	10/4/2021 2:16 PM
6	no	10/4/2021 1:36 PM
7	not sure	10/4/2021 12:23 PM
8	X	10/4/2021 9:42 AM
9	No	10/2/2021 8:06 AM
10	No	10/2/2021 7:54 AM
11	No	10/2/2021 7:33 AM

#	IF YES, PLEASE ELABORATE HOW AND WHY YOU SUPPORT THESE PROGRAMMES	DATE
	There are no responses.	

The Role of Philanthropy in Women Development through Food Security: Philanthropic Organisations SurveyMonkey

Q17 What is the main motivation to support small-scale women farmers in Limpopo?

Answered: 18 Skipped: 4



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Women development	5.56%	1
Supporting previously disadvantaged communities	0.00%	0
To combat hunger through food security programmes	22.22%	4
Economic transformation	22.22%	4
Other (please specify)	50.00%	9
TOTAL		18

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Fight corruption and promote tax justice	10/10/2021 10:22 AM
2	All of the above, however we do not only fund in Limpopo but across South Africa	10/8/2021 9:18 AM
3	N/A	10/8/2021 9:16 AM
4	Build resilience	10/8/2021 7:41 AM
5	We do not fund in this area.	10/6/2021 9:33 PM
6	1.Economic transformation 2.Inequality.3 Psych Social 4. GBV	10/4/2021 12:25 PM
7	Not focused on limpopo	10/4/2021 9:42 AM
8	Not applicable	10/2/2021 7:33 AM
9	Not applicable	10/1/2021 8:56 PM

Q18 Do small-scale women farmers reach out to your organization or do you approach them for support? Please elaborate?

Answered: 19 Skipped: 3

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Not applicable	10/10/2021 10:22 AM
2	Not applicable to our programmes	10/10/2021 9:43 AM
3	No	10/8/2021 10:41 AM
4	We fund small scale women farmers through partner organizations' that work at the grassroot level. Partners apply for grants and in some instances we approach partners to apply.	10/8/2021 9:18 AM
5	We've not had any funding requests from small scale women farmers	10/8/2021 9:16 AM
6	Both	10/8/2021 7:41 AM
7	The only support we provide explicitly to women in agriculture is a small grant to AWARD (African Women in Agricultural Research and Development), consistent with the priority we place on early-career researchers.	10/6/2021 9:33 PM
8	We receive proposals based on their needs.	10/4/2021 2:16 PM
9	Both. We run calls for applications for our Tholoana Programme once a year where we get farmers from across the country. We have also targeted a few communities for larger scale farming projects, namely Keiskammahoek, Limpopo and Jozini	10/4/2021 1:36 PM
10	Assessment are conduct by ActionAid South Africa and we approach	10/4/2021 12:25 PM
11	Both ways	10/4/2021 12:23 PM
12	We approach them as we have long term relationships. Their support of small scale female farmers is part of a broader community development initiative	10/4/2021 9:42 AM
13	Our support is not specific to agriculture	10/2/2021 8:06 AM
14	We work within communities and we support whenever there is a need	10/2/2021 7:54 AM
15	NA	10/2/2021 7:33 AM
16	NA	10/1/2021 8:56 PM
17	REACH OUT TO US. APPLICATION FOR SUPPORT IS RECEIVED	9/28/2021 8:30 PM
18	We respond to all applications submitted through our portal. We have not yet approached small-scale women farmers directly.	9/28/2021 9:12 AM
19	Neither	9/27/2021 3:35 PM

Q18 Do small-scale women farmers reach out to your organization or do you approach them for support? Please elaborate?

Answered: 19 Skipped: 3

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Not applicable	10/10/2021 10:22 AM
2	Not applicable to our programmes	10/10/2021 9:43 AM
3	No	10/8/2021 10:41 AM
4	We fund small scale women farmers through partner organizations' that work at the grassroot level. Partners apply for grants and in some instances we approach partners to apply.	10/8/2021 9:18 AM
5	We've not had any funding requests from small scale women farmers	10/8/2021 9:16 AM
6	Both	10/8/2021 7:41 AM
7	The only support we provide explicitly to women in agriculture is a small grant to AWARD (African Women in Agricultural Research and Development), consistent with the priority we place on early-career researchers.	10/6/2021 9:33 PM
8	We receive proposals based on their needs.	10/4/2021 2:16 PM
9	Both. We run calls for applications for our Tholoana Programme once a year where we get farmers from across the country. We have also targeted a few communities for larger scale farming projects, namely Keiskammahoek, Limpopo and Jozini	10/4/2021 1:36 PM
10	Assessment are conduct by ActionAid South Africa and we approach	10/4/2021 12:25 PM
11	Both ways	10/4/2021 12:23 PM
12	We approach them as we have long term relationships. Their support of small scale female farmers is part of a broader community development initiative	10/4/2021 9:42 AM
13	Our support is not specific to agriculture	10/2/2021 8:06 AM
14	We work within communities and we support whenever there is a need	10/2/2021 7:54 AM
15	NA	10/2/2021 7:33 AM
16	NA	10/1/2021 8:56 PM
17	REACH OUT TO US. APPLICATION FOR SUPPORT IS RECEIVED	9/28/2021 8:30 PM
18	We respond to all applications submitted through our portal. We have not yet approached small-scale women farmers directly.	9/28/2021 9:12 AM
19	Neither	9/27/2021 3:35 PM

Q19 Does your organization have a plan to increase its philanthropic support for small-scale women farmers in Limpopo in the future? Please elaborate

Answered: 19 Skipped: 3


#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Not applicable	10/10/2021 10:22 AM
2	Not applicable to our programmes, we focus on large scale infrastructure projects within the private and public sector. Our primary sectors are water, energy, transport and ICT. We do not finance within the agriculture sector.	10/10/2021 9:43 AM
3	No	10/8/2021 10:41 AM
4	Not certain at the moment as we are going through a transformation. But we will remain committed to improve the livelihoods of women through the agriculture.	10/8/2021 9:18 AM
5	Not within the current program plan	10/8/2021 9:16 AM
6	It will depend on the results of our initial engagements	10/8/2021 7:41 AM
7	No.	10/6/2021 9:33 PM
8	Yes. Currently we are operating within Rand Water's footprints, but looking at expanding to non-footprints.	10/4/2021 2:16 PM
9	Not necessarily as we already do a lot. We will continue to run the Tholoana programme every year and hope to get applications from women in this province as they meet two of our criteria namely, women and rural	10/4/2021 1:36 PM
10	We financial constraints due to lack of funding from the donors which impact continuity support.	10/4/2021 12:25 PM
11	Not only in Limpopo, we want to be abroad and support women and man in SA	10/4/2021 12:23 PM
12	Not at present	10/4/2021 9:42 AM
13	We plan to increase support for all technology innovation projects	10/2/2021 8:06 AM
14	We are always available to support all project that we have identified	10/2/2021 7:54 AM
15	NA	10/2/2021 7:33 AM
16	NA	10/1/2021 8:56 PM
17	SUPPORT IS FUNDING DEPENDENT	9/28/2021 8:30 PM
18	This is possible but has not yet been formalised.	9/28/2021 9:12 AM
19	No	9/27/2021 3:35 PM

Appendix 5: Sample B, Small-scale Farmers

The Role of Philanthropy in Women Development through Food Security: Small-scale farmers SurveyMonkey

Q1 What is your gender?


Answered: 23 Skipped: 1



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Female	47.83%	11
Male	52.17%	12
TOTAL		23

Q2 How many female workers are in your organization?

Answered: 23 Skipped: 1




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
1 to 5	69.57%	16
5 to 10	8.70%	2
10 to 20	13.04%	3
over 20	8.70%	2
TOTAL		23

The Role of Philanthropy in Women Development through Food Security: Small-scale farmers SurveyMonkey

Q3 What is your position in your organization?

Answered: 24 Skipped: 0




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Founder	62.50%	15
Manager	25.00%	6
General worker	12.50%	3
Other (please specify)	0.00%	0
TOTAL		24

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
	There are no responses.	

Q4 Which district in Limpopo do you work in?

Answered: 24 Skipped: 0




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Capricorn district	25.00%	6
Vhembe District	50.00%	12
Other (please specify)	25.00%	6
TOTAL		24

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Mopane	10/1/2021 3:37 PM
2	Mopani district	10/1/2021 2:45 PM
3	Mopani	9/29/2021 6:39 AM
4	Waterburg	9/27/2021 5:59 PM
5	Waterberg	9/27/2021 1:39 PM
6	Waterberg	9/27/2021 12:53 PM

Q5 How would you classify your organization? (please select the most relevant)

Answered: 24 Skipped: 0




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Corporation	8.33%	2
Social/community organisation	16.67%	4
Small-scale / Smallholder	66.67%	16
Other (please specify)	8.33%	2
TOTAL		24

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	NPO	10/6/2021 12:58 PM
2	Real Estate Agriculture	9/27/2021 1:39 PM

Q6 How is your organization funded?

Answered: 24 Skipped: 0




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Own capital	83.33%	20
Government subsidy/support	4.17%	1
Bank loan	0.00%	0
Philanthropic/donor giving	12.50%	3
Other (please specify)	0.00%	0
TOTAL		24

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
	There are no responses.	

The Role of Philanthropy in Women Development through Food Security: Small-scale farmers SurveyMonkey

Q7 What is your annual operating budget?


Answered: 24 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Less than R100 000	70.83%	17
R100 001 to R300 000	12.50%	3
R300 001 to R500 000	4.17%	1
Over R500 000	12.50%	3
TOTAL		24

Q8 What support does your organization need?

Answered: 24 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
None of the above	4.17%	1
Skills/training	54.17%	13
Monetary subsidy	37.50%	9
Farming machinery and equipment	62.50%	15
Facilitate the marketing of agricultural products	33.33%	8
Land	37.50%	9
Other (please specify)	0.00%	0
Total Respondents: 24		

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
	There are no responses.	

Q9 Have you received the support you need for your business in the past 5 years?

Answered: 22 Skipped: 2

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	27.27%	6
No	72.73%	16
If yes, please specify the type of support you have received	4.55%	1


#	YES	DATE
1	Yes	10/10/2021 10:00 AM
2	monetary	10/6/2021 12:58 PM
3	Community support	10/1/2021 2:45 PM
4	small grant	9/28/2021 8:03 AM
5	Yes	9/27/2021 4:08 PM
6	No	9/27/2021 1:31 PM

#	NO	DATE
1	no	10/10/2021 9:50 AM
2	No	10/2/2021 7:18 AM
3	No	10/1/2021 6:32 PM
4	NO	10/1/2021 5:30 PM
5	No we have not.	10/1/2021 5:25 PM
6	No	10/1/2021 3:37 PM
7	No	10/1/2021 1:25 PM
8	NO	10/1/2021 11:58 AM
9	No	10/1/2021 11:10 AM
10	No	10/1/2021 8:20 AM
11	no	9/30/2021 3:44 PM
12	Don't need string tied support, in the form of interfering and non-productive officials.	9/29/2021 6:39 AM
13	No	9/27/2021 6:52 PM
14	N0	9/27/2021 5:59 PM
15	No	9/27/2021 1:39 PM
16	No	9/27/2021 12:53 PM

#	IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY THE TYPE OF SUPPORT YOU HAVE RECEIVED	DATE
1	We received feedstock from agricultural department	9/27/2021 4:08 PM

Q10 From which institution have you received the support?

Answered: 20 Skipped: 4




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Government institutions	35.00%	7
Philanthropic/donor organisations	25.00%	5
Both	0.00%	0
Other (please specify)	40.00%	8
TOTAL		20

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	non of the above	10/10/2021 9:50 AM
2	None	10/1/2021 6:32 PM
3	None	10/1/2021 3:37 PM
4	Community	10/1/2021 2:45 PM
5	None	9/29/2021 6:39 AM
6	Future of tomorrow	9/27/2021 5:59 PM
7	None	9/27/2021 1:39 PM
8	None	9/27/2021 1:31 PM

Q11 How do you get to receive funds from philanthropic organizations?

Answered: 21 Skipped: 3




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Government endorsement	19.05%	4
Written proposal to the funder	19.05%	4
Approached by the funder	19.05%	4
Other (please specify)	42.86%	9
TOTAL		21

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Not yet	10/10/2021 10:00 AM
2	I have not received funding	10/10/2021 9:50 AM
3	I have not received philanthropy funding	10/2/2021 7:18 AM
4	Never applied	10/1/2021 6:32 PM
5	do not have funding	9/30/2021 3:44 PM
6	.....	9/30/2021 11:15 AM
7	I said no, two questions at. Not sure where this is going?	9/29/2021 6:39 AM
8	N/A	9/27/2021 1:39 PM
9	Never received any funding	9/27/2021 1:31 PM

Q12 How would you classify contributions from philanthropic organisations?


Answered: 22 Skipped: 2



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Fully supportive and visible (monetary and skills support)	22.73%	5
Only involved through government endorsements	13.64%	3
Visible during key celebrations (e.g. women's day/women's month)	0.00%	0
Monetary support only	9.09%	2
Skills and training only	13.64%	3
No contact or knowledge of such organisations	40.91%	9
TOTAL		22

Q13 Are philanthropic organizations or donors which support your organisation intentional and clear about supporting women development initiatives?


Answered: 22 Skipped: 2



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	27.27%	6
No	13.64%	3
Not sure	59.09%	13
TOTAL		22


Q14 What factors would limit your progress in farming? Please respond to each question using the scale below.

Answered: 23 Skipped: 1



The Role of Philanthropy in Women Development through Food Security: Small-scale farmers

SurveyMonkey



The Role of Philanthropy in Women Development through Food Security: Small-scale farmers

SurveyMonkey

	LACK OF SKILLS AND TRAINING FOR WOMEN IN FARMING	LIMITED ACCESS TO LAND	LACK OF SUPPORT FROM GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS	LIMITED FUNDING AND ACCESS TO FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES	GENDER BASED DISCRIMINATION (LACK OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN FARMERS)	POOR MARKET FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS	TOTAL	WEIGHT AVERAG
Strongly agree	30.43% 7	8.70% 2	17.39% 4	26.09% 6	0.00% 0	17.39% 4	23	3
Agree	33.33% 6	22.22% 4	5.56% 1	22.22% 4	11.11% 2	5.56% 1	18	2
Neither agree nor disagree	0.00% 0	14.29% 2	50.00% 7	14.29% 2	7.14% 1	14.29% 2	14	3
Disagree	6.67% 1	20.00% 3	13.33% 2	13.33% 2	20.00% 3	26.67% 4	15	4
Strongly disagree	8.33% 1	8.33% 1	8.33% 1	8.33% 1	50.00% 6	16.67% 2	12	4

Q15 What can be done to improve your work? (please elaborate)

Answered: 24 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	More land, training, money and equipment	10/10/2021 10:00 AM
2	money and straining	10/10/2021 9:50 AM
3	More funding	10/6/2021 12:58 PM
4	Skills training and funding	10/2/2021 7:18 AM
5	Funding with capital	10/1/2021 7:56 PM
6	I need funds	10/1/2021 6:32 PM
7	Semi Automated machinery for feeding my birds, and processing machinery for processing and packaging meat for market	10/1/2021 5:30 PM
8	Skills development, machinery and equipment	10/1/2021 5:25 PM
9	By having a bigger land where I know production of my product will not have limit	10/1/2021 3:37 PM
10	Monetary funding and training	10/1/2021 2:45 PM
11	Funding or government grant for equipment and infrastructure.	10/1/2021 1:25 PM
12	TRAINING AND EQUIPMENT	10/1/2021 11:58 AM
13	More funding and government support	10/1/2021 11:10 AM
14	Being supported by the government	10/1/2021 8:20 AM
15	Subsidy, machinery support, seeds,etec	9/30/2021 3:44 PM
16	Clean water and feeds	9/30/2021 11:15 AM
17	Resilience.	9/29/2021 6:39 AM
18	some funding grants to expand production	9/28/2021 8:03 AM
19	To have equipment like pipes n tanks	9/27/2021 6:52 PM
20	Land cooperation and marketing skills	9/27/2021 5:59 PM
21	We need farming equipment like grading machine so we can be able to grade our eggs into different sizes and we also need plucker machine so we can sell chickens that are well prepared.	9/27/2021 4:08 PM
22	Skills and productivity training. Governmental incentives. Funding opportunities. Utilisation of current state owned land to it maximum possibility. Sub division permitted on agricultural land to give more people access to affordable small scale farming enterprises. Less use of land questions by political parties to get more votes and focussed on existing land to develop and create skills. Acknowledgement of security of privately owned properties to secure future investment and secure food and product supply.	9/27/2021 1:39 PM
23	Government should invest in making sure that woman are also prioritized . Corporatives with woman leading the pack should get all the necessary support and skill	9/27/2021 1:31 PM
24	Team work and co operation farming	9/27/2021 12:53 PM

Q16 In what way can philanthropic organisations or donors support your work? (please elaborate)

Answered: 24 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Not yet	10/10/2021 10:00 AM
2	assist with money and education in farming	10/10/2021 9:50 AM
3	through training and farmer support	10/6/2021 12:58 PM
4	Proving training and donate money	10/2/2021 7:18 AM
5	advices	10/1/2021 7:56 PM
6	Financial support and equipment	10/1/2021 6:32 PM
7	Semi Automated machinery for feeding my birds, and processing machinery for processing and packaging meat for market	10/1/2021 5:30 PM
8	By offering both funds and skill development	10/1/2021 5:25 PM
9	If I can have a bigger land it will be simple for me to have more production. And also have transport to move around and collect food	10/1/2021 3:37 PM
10	By providing training and financial funding	10/1/2021 2:45 PM
11	Skills and training	10/1/2021 1:25 PM
12	N/A	10/1/2021 11:58 AM
13	Funding	10/1/2021 11:10 AM
14	By money	10/1/2021 8:20 AM
15	Subsidy, machinery support, seeds,etec	9/30/2021 3:44 PM
16	Skills,farming machinery and borehole	9/30/2021 11:15 AM
17	Not applicable	9/29/2021 6:39 AM
18	it will supplement the funding and skills required to expand production.	9/28/2021 8:03 AM
19	By founding with material	9/27/2021 6:52 PM
20	Land, input Production	9/27/2021 5:59 PM
21	By giving us skills and ideas to grow our business	9/27/2021 4:08 PM
22	Funding and skills training without political interference.	9/27/2021 1:39 PM
23	Not supported	9/27/2021 1:31 PM
24	Input production	9/27/2021 12:53 PM

Q17 Please list the names of philanthropic organisations or donors who are supporting your work in farming

Answered: 23 Skipped: 1

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	No fundind from organizations	10/10/2021 10:00 AM
2	I dont have any	10/10/2021 9:50 AM
3	nedbank	10/6/2021 12:58 PM
4	Non so far	10/2/2021 7:18 AM
5	service center	10/1/2021 7:56 PM
6	None	10/1/2021 6:32 PM
7	None	10/1/2021 5:30 PM
8	Open society and private donors	10/1/2021 5:25 PM
9	None	10/1/2021 3:37 PM
10	Community	10/1/2021 2:45 PM
11	Gordon's institute of business management	10/1/2021 1:25 PM
12	N/A	10/1/2021 11:58 AM
13	None	10/1/2021 11:10 AM
14	Vhutavhatsindi youth development agency	10/1/2021 8:20 AM
15	N/A	9/30/2021 3:44 PM
16	Not applicable	9/29/2021 6:39 AM
17	None for now	9/28/2021 8:03 AM
18	N/A	9/27/2021 6:52 PM
19	Future of tomorrow	9/27/2021 5:59 PM
20	So far we haven't received any support from philanthropic organisation	9/27/2021 4:08 PM
21	None currently	9/27/2021 1:39 PM
22	None	9/27/2021 1:31 PM
23	Future of tomorrow	9/27/2021 12:53 PM

Q18 Please list the names of government programmes that support your work in farming.


Answered: 23 Skipped: 1

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Non	10/10/2021 10:00 AM
2	no government support	10/10/2021 9:50 AM
3	none	10/6/2021 12:58 PM
4	SEFA	10/2/2021 7:18 AM
5	rural development	10/1/2021 7:56 PM
6	None	10/1/2021 6:32 PM
7	None	10/1/2021 5:30 PM
8	None for now we're still waiting to get support.	10/1/2021 5:25 PM
9	None	10/1/2021 3:37 PM
10	None	10/1/2021 2:45 PM
11	Seda	10/1/2021 1:25 PM
12	N/A	10/1/2021 11:58 AM
13	None	10/1/2021 11:10 AM
14	Secondary school	10/1/2021 8:20 AM
15	There was a relief fund for covid 19, but did not get, others did get	9/30/2021 3:44 PM
16	No applicable	9/29/2021 6:39 AM
17	ARC	9/28/2021 8:03 AM
18	N/A	9/27/2021 6:52 PM
19	Department of agriculture	9/27/2021 5:59 PM
20	Department of agriculture	9/27/2021 4:08 PM
21	Dept of Agriculture	9/27/2021 1:39 PM
22	None	9/27/2021 1:31 PM
23	Department of Agriculture	9/27/2021 12:53 PM

The Role of Philanthropy in Women Development through Food Security: Small-scale farmers SurveyMonkey

Q19 What support does your organization need? Please select all relevent.

Answered: 24 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
None of the above	4.17%	1
Skills/training	70.83%	17
Monetary subsidy	54.17%	13
Farming machinery and equipment	66.67%	16
Facilitate the marketing of agricultural products	29.17%	7
Land	33.33%	8
Other (please specify)	0.00%	0
Total Respondents: 24		

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
	There are no responses.	