

Theлма Trench, Rauri Alcock, Masondo, Fana, Brigid Letty*, Sibusiso Gumede*

* Farming Systems Research Section
Technology Development and Training

REPORT ON SURVEY CONDUCTED WITH CATTLE OWNERS AT MSINGA DURING 2002

INTRODUCTION

CAP is a non-government organisation that is based in Msinga. Originally it was concerned mainly with land reform but is now moving towards addressing land-use issues. A number of staff of the Farming Systems Research Section are working in cooperation with CAP, with the purpose of addressing issues that pertain in general to small-scale livestock owners in KwaZulu-Natal.

Since a large number of cattle owners reside on the farms where CAP is working, efforts are being made to identify opportunities and address constraints which these farmers encounter. CAP is looking at livestock issues and thus needs to understand what drives livestock owners, in terms of why they keep cattle and the manner in which they manage them. The survey was conducted as a starting point from which further activities will develop.

Cattle owners have a “social legend” regarding the reasons why they keep cattle. The study allowed people to express the “social legend” and then tested this by recording the benefits actually obtained relative to a time-frame.

The second means of testing the existing “social legend” was to look at the inputs and input costs associated with the livestock enterprises. The assumption being that if livestock is important then surely this should be reflected in the level of inputs recorded.

Another purpose of the study was to challenge the views, perceptions of government and NGOs and their methods of working with people. For example, much work around livestock in communal areas focusses on commercialisation of the cattle enterprise and involves working with groups rather than individuals. The purpose of the study is to challenge these beliefs in order to create a more enabling institutional environment.

The problems and constraints identified during the study, together with the cattle owners’ visions for the future and preferred method of approach (individuals versus groups) will shape CAP’s work in Msinga.

METHODOLOGY

Before conducting the survey, the questionnaire was circulated to both livestock people and “process people” for comment and input. It was also tested with three farmers at one of the farms at Msinga, Nomoya. After each of these activities, the questionnaire was revised. See attached questionnaire (Appendix 1).

- On each of the three farms, a meeting was called and 5 to 7 people were chosen at

random to be part of the survey group. This included both livestock owners and people owning no livestock.

- The sites selected are the five land reform projects that Mdukatshani, a sector of CAP, works with.

The survey was conducted by people who have a deep understanding of the communities, are themselves livestock owners, and who are also familiar with using questionnaires. The interviews took place at meeting sites and not at individual homesteads. The answers were written down in Zulu and although they were sometimes scant, the people who asked the questions were part of the summarising process, so the information was not lost.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The herd sizes of the livestock owners interviewed are summarised in Table 1. The dots indicate the number of owners interviewed owning cattle, goats or both livestock types. The numbers in black indicate the herd sizes of households that had either cattle or goats, while the numbers in red indicate the number of goats or cattle in households having both livestock types. The information in the table is arranged so that it indicates the relative numbers of cattle and goats in households owning both.

Table 1 Livestock numbers for the households interviewed

FARM NAME	NO. OF OWNERS INTERVIEWED			FLOCK/HERD SIZE	
	GOATS	CATTLE	GOATS & CATTLE	CATTLE	GOATS
NKASENI	●	●	●●●	41,9,5,5	20,5,11,10
NCUNJANA	●●	●●	●	20, 25, 30	15, 10, 30
MAHLABATINI	●		●●●	10, 5,6	6, 8, 16, unknown
NHLAWE	●●●		●●	15, 30	40, 1, 9, 60, 36
NOMOYA	●●	●	●●	5, 2, 13	23, 6, 9, 10

A description of the farms and the communities where the study was conducted is presented in Table 2.

Assertion - Peoples' history on the land shapes their social outlook around livestock as well as their current wealth in livestock. For example, people who have lost their livestock through eviction or other social incidents in the past, are seeking to increase their livestock numbers to benefit their *isithunzi* (status).

Table 2 Description of the farms and communities where the study was conducted

Farm name	Tenure history	Farm size HA	No. of families	No. of families interviewed	Ecological description of farm	Current issues around livestock
Nkasini	Labour tenant community dating back over 80 years- became first labour tenant project in the country	350	33	6	small- well watered fields- access to furrow and river-no water in upper parts of farm were residents are-overgrazing a problem-largish herds of cattle	Department of Agriculture has implemented a project here to deal with overgrazing concerns dams being planned
Nhlawe	(Act 126)Redistribution project for ex labour tenants - people were moved 100 klms away to a resettlement village a few families stayed and were resource wealthy by the time the project came through- many of the resettlement families are more interested in jobs than agriculture. about half of the beneficiaries have returned- very difficult group to work with	1500	120	7	large and ,made up of three farms initially in the Weenen game reserve- mixed veld condition from bad to good - farm has Blaawkrantz river running through it but not much water beyond that- good fields next to river but largely unused	poaching grazing from Weenen biosphere
Nomoya	(Act 126) evicted and pushed over the river in the 60s redistribution project families moved back	800	55	7	small river frontage on the Tugela some fields on so-so soil then rest of farm steep and dry- some dry cropping on the plateau	grazing seems good as landbank farms neighbour them so they spread to here
Mahlabathini	Small piece of land with large tugela river frontage squashed between the biosphere and the river -small group with good ties to each other and relatively motivated	200	16	5	strip of overgrazed land between river and biosphere - cliffs are the border between them and biosphere very steep parts to it and inaccessible in flooding	small herds poaching biosphere grazing very bad veld condition but farmers seem committed
Ncunjana	Labour tenants evicted in 1992 from a farm bordering CAP they got land back through (Act 126)in 1996 - a stable community - very tradition rural group large cattle herds and many generational families	120	14	5	Very dry - water dug from river bed in winter- veld condition relatively good - poach grazing from CAP with whom they share a boundary as well as a community link	no open issues around stock but a lot of power held because of ownership of large herds

1 Perceived benefits of livestock

The livestock owners were asked what benefits they derived from their livestock (separate lists were made for cattle and goats). Without being prompted, a number of benefits emerged. These are summarised in Table 3. The assumption is that the number of livestock owners that mentioned a particular benefit without being prompted, is an indication of how near that benefit is to the top of peoples' minds. A number of benefits were only acknowledged after prompting (Table 4).

Table 3 The benefits derived from livestock that were mentioned without prompting

Cattle (17 owners interviewed)	Goats (19 owners interviewed)	Assumption:
cultural slaughter (14)	cultural slaughter (18)	<div style="display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> <div style="border-left: 1px solid black; border-right: 1px solid black; height: 100%; width: 20px;"></div> <div style="margin-left: 10px;"> <p>most important</p> <p>least important</p> </div> </div>
ploughing (13)	selling (16)	
lobola (11)	<i>hlawula</i> / paying damages (7)	
milking (9)	swapping (4)	
selling (8)	status (1)	
status (3)		

Table 4 Benefits of livestock that were only acknowledged after prompting

Cattle	Goats
swap	status
hlawula (pay damages)	lobola
slaughter for meat	slaughter for meat
bank	

There was some disagreement as to whether or not status (*isithunzi*) is a benefit. The majority of goat owners (16/19) saw it as being not a benefit, but rather a burden.

2 Active ranking of benefits

The people were asked to rank all the possible benefits of owning livestock (including those benefits which they acknowledged only after prompting). All the possible benefits were listed on cards. The cards were placed in a row on the ground and the person being interviewed was asked to place stones on the cards such that the number of stones indicated the importance of

that particular benefit to him/herself. Since people used different numbers of stones in total, it is not possible to compare across interviewees, but only within each person's own ranking. The results are given in Tables 5 and 6. Benefits were categorised as more important, medium importance, low importance or no importance. More important means that they were seen as being more important than other benefits, but not necessarily most important.

Discussion of results of active ranking exercise for benefits derived from cattle:

- The obvious highs were for **ploughing** (11), **bank** (10) and **cultural slaughter** (13).
- The obvious low was **swap**
- **Status** was actively named as being of no benefit.
- This pattern was similar for owners of cattle only and owners of mixed herds (cattle & goats).

- The understanding of what it meant to use cattle as a **bank** differed significantly between ourselves setting the question and the people answering it. We meant 'do people sell cattle when they need money' and thus use their herd as a means for cash flow. The people responding thought we meant 'do people sell cattle to put money in the bank'. They saw our 'bank' as 'cash flow'.
- According to those that ranked **bank** highly, this benefit is an aspiration (*iphupho*) that they would like to do, so they see it as important but it is not actually happening currently.

Discussion of results of active ranking exercise for benefits derived from goats:

- The obvious high was **cultural slaughter**.
- There were no obvious lows
- **Status** was named as being of no importance.

Selling for cash is a benefit of livestock which many programmes focus on. Selling was said to be very important by 10 out of 18 goat owners but was only said to be very important by 6 out of 14 cattle owners. This sort of response should be carefully considered by outsiders wishing to become involved in livestock-related work programmes..

Table 5 Results of the activity where the benefits derived from cattle were actively ranked by cattle owners. (Four cattle-only owners (C); 10 mixed herd owners (CG))

BENEFIT	MORE IMPORTANT			MEDIUM IMPORTANCE			LOW IMPORTANCE			NO IMPORTANCE		
	C	CG	TOT	C	CG	TOT	C	CG	TOT	C	CG	TOT
SWAP	●	●	2	●	●	2	●●	●●●●● ●●●	10			0
PLOUGH	●●●	●●●●● ●●●	11		●	1	●	●	2			0
<i>HLAWULA</i> (PAY DAMAGES)	●●●	●●	5		●●●● ●	5	●	●●	3		●	1
SELL	●●●	●●●	6	●	●●●	4		●●●●	4			0
MILK	●●●	●●●●●	8		●	1	●	●●●●	5			0
<i>LOBOLA</i>	●●	●●●●● ●●	9	●●	●●	4		●	1			0
SLAUGHTER FOR MEAT	●●	●●	4		●●●●	4	●●	●●●●	6			0
STATUS 3 said it doesn't exist	●●	●	3			0		●●	2		●●●● ●●	6
BANK	●●●	●●●●● ●●	10		●	1	●	●●	3			0
CULTURAL SLAUGHTER	●●●●	●●●●● ●●●●	13		●	1			0			0

Table 6 Results of the activity where the benefits derived from goats were actively ranked by goat owners. (8 goat-only owners (G); 10 mixed herd owners (CG))

BENEFIT	MORE IMPORTANT			MEDIUM IMPORTANCE			LOW IMPORTANCE			NO IMPORTANCE		
	G	CG	TOT	G	CG	TOT	G	CG	TOT	G	CG	TOT
CULTURAL SLAUGHTER	●●●●● ●●●●	●●●●● ●●●●	14	●	●●	3		●	1			0
STATUS	●●	●	3			0	●	●●	3	●●●●● ●	●●●●● ●●●●	12
SWAP	●●	●●●●●	6	●●●●	●●●●	6	●●●●	●●	5		●	1
HLAWULA	●●●●	●●●●● ●●	9	●●●●●	●●	6	●	●●	3			0
BANK	●●●●	●●●●● ●	8	●		1	●●	●●●●● ●	7	●●		2
SLAUGHTER FOR MEAT		●●	2	●●●●	●●●●	6	●●●●●	●●●●● ●	9	●		1
SELL	●●●●● ●	●●●●● ●	10	●●	●●	4	●	●●●●	4			0
LOBOLA			0			0	●		1			0

3 Actual realisation of benefits

The nature of the benefit will determine whether it is likely to take place on a regular or irregular basis. *Lobola*, for instance is likely to happen far less frequently than slaughtering of animals for the ancestors. This is because “*lobola*’ring” is related to marriage which for the majority of people is not highly repeated. The nature of the benefit will also determine whether something can be said to never take place. For instance, if a person has not slaughtered for the last 12 years, then one can assume that he does not, however, if he has not *lobola*’d for the last 12 years, this does not mean the same thing. Time frame is thus related to the nature of the benefit. *Lobola* and *hlawula* have not been included in the comparison of level of utilisation since *hlawula* only takes place when someone has committed a misdemeanour and *lobola* is a benefit not frequently derived from livestock.

To define whether or not a benefit has been realised “recently” or not, is also dependent on the nature of the benefit. Time frames thus need to be defined for each particular benefit. *Lobola* always starts with an initial down-payment of at least 4 cattle or the equivalent and the remainder can be payed off over years or even carried over to the next generation, where the children finish the debt for the man in question. Cattle are generally only slaughtered for ancestors in the case of death. Similarly, cattle are only used to *hlawula* when a serious misdemeanour has been committed.

3.1 Utilisation of cattle

The benefits/ uses that were ranked as highly important were cultural slaughter, plough and bank.

- **Slaughter for the ancestors**

In this case, the primary reason for slaughtering is to communicate with the ancestors - “open a channel”.

10/15 have slaughtered for the ancestors during the period 2000 - 2002

3/15 have never slaughtered for the ancestors.

Even when the primary reason for slaughtering is for meat, the ancestors (*amadlozi*) are acknowledged. Cattle are slaughtered mainly to *kugezwa* someone who has died - this means to “wash” this person so that their spirit is able to move on.

- **Ploughing**

15/15 have used cattle to plough during 2001/2002. (Cross-reference confirms importance). People make up spans with other cattle owners when there own numbers are too short.

Next question: whose cattle are you using to make a complete span?

- **Bank**

Only one cattle owner has sold an animal and put money in the bank from cattle sales. One other says he would do that this in the future.

- **Selling**

9/15 cattle owners sold animals during 2001/2002

4/15 have never sold cattle.

If people do not sell, is it because its something which they just do not do, or is it just because their herd sizes are too small.

- All the owners of large herds were found to sell cattle (6 owners with herds > 15).
- The herd sizes of the 4 who have never sold were as follows:
5, 9 (doesn't remember whether he has ever sold), 6, 2.
- Those whose herds are small and still growing, "*bayaphemba*". *Phemba* means to kindle.

When the relationship between herd size and importance given to selling as a benefit of having cattle was investigated, no pattern emerged.

- **Slaughter for meat**

As apposed to the commonly held belief, slaughter for meat does happen but it is of fairly minor importance and it should be remembered that even when this is the primary reason for slaughtering the animal, the ancestors are acknowledged when blood is spilt.

6/15 slaughtered for meat during 2002/2002

4 slaughtered for meat during the period 1990 - 1999

3 had never slaughtered for meat.

2 do not remember.

- **Swapping**

12/15 have swapped their cattle at some stage, 6 of these within the last two years.

An example of swapping cattle for goats: A cattle owner would swap a beast for a number of goats and then sell a goat - he does not need as much money as he'd get for a beast and cattle are more difficult/time-consuming to sell. Another example of swapping could be if a cattle owner sold 2 good animals and bought 3 smaller ones to use for lobola.

Swapping widens peoples' options. A person can sell a goat although he only owns cattle, he can get cattle even if he only has goats and can swap an unproductive animal (one with no udder) for a productive one or for goats. It is thus a means of building herds without using

cash.

- **Status**

More important	3/14
Low importance	2/14
No importance	6/14
doesn't exist	3/14

All owners having herds of more than 15 animals denied that status is a benefit which they obtain from their cattle. A commonly held misconception is that cattle are kept for status, however only 3/14 said that it was an important benefit.

3.2 Utilisation of goats

Cultural slaughter was an obvious high and status an obvious low.

- **Cultural slaughter**

3/18 have never slaughtered for ancestors. This agrees with the ranking(that it is important). It is unlikely that anyone has never slaughtered for ancestors, it may be the manner in which the question has been interpreted. If the person is young, then it may be such that in the past it was his/her father who slaughtered for them., or in the case of a women being questioned, she may have answered for herself as apposed to her family.

The question needs to be revised: Has your family, not just you, slaughtered for the ancestors.?

- **Status**

Status was stated as not being important by 12 of the 18 goat owners.

- **Selling**

10/18 goat owners said that selling was a very important benefit gained from goats. In fact, 11/18 have sold goats in the last two years. Prices ranged from R250 to R600 per goat. Two goat owners "*bayaphemba*".

- **Hlawula**

9/18 said that this is very important. 12/18 have never used their goats for this purpose, but this does not mean that their families have not committed offences leading to fines, it may mean that there was no tribal authority to enforce the laws.

- **Lobola**

More than half of the people interviewed have contributed to the lobola system. Several goats can represent a beast.

- **Bank**

Although 8/18 said that this is a very important benefit, nobody has actually ever sold goats to put money in the bank.

4 Inputs/costs associated with livestock enterprises

The four inputs investigated in the study were: dipping, feeding, injections and grazing. The question being, do people spend money on their livestock. Although none of the respondents reported that they buy grazing, this is practiced by some livestock owners who wish to market their animals and thus need to have them in good condition. None of the livestock owners interviewed spends money on feed or grazing.

4.1 Injections

The question did not differentiate between treatment of sick animals and prevention of disease (use of vaccines).

Table 7 Injections used by goat owners

Herd size	Use injection?	Cost
40	yes	-
1	yes	R55 himself
6	yes	doesn't remember
15	yes (vaccinates kids + injections)	R200
9	yes	different costs for different drugs for different diseases
6	no	-
10	no	-
23	yes	R22.96

Only 2 goat owners did not spend money on injections.

Table 8 Injections used by cattle owners

Herd size	Use injections?	Cost
40	yes	R100
20	yes	R100
25	yes	R30 - R100
5	yes	> R60

Table 9 Injections used by mixed livestock owners (cattle & goats)

Herd size	Use injections?	Cost
30 cattle 60 goats	yes	R100
15 cattle 36 goats	yes	buy for themselves
31cattle 30 goats	yes	buy for themselves
9 cattle 20 goats	yes	R100
6 cattle unknown goats	yes	-
3 cattle 10 goats	yes	-
5cattle 8 goats	yes	-
10 cattle 16 goats	yes	R40 - R60
5 cattle 5 goats	yes	R36
13 cattle 9 goats	yes	R200 for himself

4.2 Dipping

13/14 cattle owners indicated that they do dip their stock. 1 did not give a response, thus it would appear that generally all cattle owners do dip. More cattle owners buy dip as individuals than in groups (5 owners buy in groups). Costs mentioned ranged from R10 to R250.

Is this is an annual amount spent on dipping?

4.3 Conclusion

Inputs are to reduce the risk of death rather than to improve productivity.

Questions to check: In order to make interventions, one needs to know cash flows around livestock. Thus one needs more detail about cash spent (annually).

5 Constraints/problems related to livestock

The question was asked openly, but a checklist (ticks, theft, sickness) was given. Additional problems listed were predation of goats by jackals, the need to herd livestock and keep them out of peoples' fields due to the lack of fences.

Table 10 Goat problems

Problem	Causes	Outcomes	Solutions
Ticks	* thick bush * lots of grass	* Goats get sick * Ticks are bad in summer	* dip * smear
Sickness		* <i>Nyongo</i> (Gall sickness) * loss of hair * thin goats	* Epsom salts and <i>Mathithibali</i> (type of lily) for <i>Nyongo</i> * traditional medicine * shop medicine * smear (against hair loss)

Comment made: I inject my goats, but it doesn't heal them.

Table 11 Cattle problems

Problem	Causes	Solutions
Sickness	* diseases I don't know * ticks * worms * animals mixing with others that are not injected * poisonous plants (<i>indlolothe</i>)	* inject * dip * vaccinate * traditional medicines (eg. <i>Umqoqonga</i>)
Ticks	* no dip * thick bush (<i>isikhotha</i> - rank growth) * lots of grass * livestock do not sleep in the kraal	* dipping * smearing

Table 12 Theft - a problem affecting owners of both cattle and goats

Cause	Solutions
* hunger * born thieves * the youth are stealing * people like money * jealousy and people having fewer than others (<i>umhawu</i> - people steal from those who have money) * unemployment * <i>ukuganga</i> - stealing not for their own needs * unemployment * steal to pay <i>lobola</i>	* report to police (but they do nothing) * brand * go and look for them yourself * community agrees to either kill stock - thieves or take them to the police

Comments:

- stock theft was traditionally a capital offence, but murder was not.
- the STU has been disbanded as a specialist unit and they had the highest conviction rate.

IS IT BETTER TO WORK IN GROUPS OR AS INDIVIDUALS?

From the discussions around inputs, it was found that people do work together to buy things (dips, medicines, etc). A general comment from all respondents was that they should pool dips and medicines.

The discussion needs to be taken back to the feedback meeting with the community because it was not handled satisfactorily.

VISIONS FOR THE FUTURE

- One individual commented that he would like to graze his cattle separately.
- Nine livestock owners said that they would like to increase their cattle numbers to a point where they feel comfortable selling.
- Two livestock owners would like to have access to a sale yard.
- 6/8 would like their goat numbers to increase so that they can swap them for cattle.

Our understanding of the situation regarding the development of livestock owners is as follows: *livestock owners move from goats cattle and then obtain more cattle.*