

Socio-Economic And Job Characteristics Among Farm Workers In Mafikeng Municipality South Africa

Silolo MD and Oladele O.I.

Graduate School of Business and Leadership,
 Department of agricultural Economics and Extension
 North-West University, Mafikeng Campus, South Africa.
 E-mail: oladimeji.oladele@nwu.ac.za

Abstract: The study examined personal and job characteristics and the socio-economic status of farm workers in the Mafikeng area, North West province, South Africa. A simple random sampling technique was used to select 100 farm workers to be interviewed. A structured questionnaire was developed based on the study objectives and related literature to collect data which were analyzed using frequency count, percentages and multiple regression analysis. The results show that the majority of farm workers fall between 20-30 years age group with males dominating and most have gone through primary education. The mean salary of most of the farm workers per month was R1 250.00. Medical aids, sectoral determination and labour unions were non-existent in different farms. In terms of possession of materials, 79% of the farm workers have chickens while 64% have dogs. 92% have radio, 93% have beds, 89% have tables and 59% have electric stoves. Also, 82% have cell phones while 78% have boots and rain coats each. Significant determinants of job characteristics were age ($t = 4.66$), gender ($t = 2.66$), Marital status ($t = 3.46$), educational level ($t = 2.95$), job category ($t = -3.57$), types of employment ($t = -3.17$) and family size ($t = -3.32$); while significant determinants of socio-economic status were age ($t = 3.32$), gender ($t = 3.11$) and family size ($t = 4.88$). The findings have implications for the level of socio-economic status of the farm workers and the need to improve on their livelihoods.

[Silolo MD and Oladele O.I. **Socio-Economic And Job Characteristics Among Farm Workers In Mafikeng Municipality South Africa.** *Life Sci J* 2012;9(4):1453-1459] (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 222

Keywords: farm workers, personal and job characteristics, socio-economic status

Introduction

The historical background to the deplorable conditions endured by South African farm workers lies generally in South Africa's history of colonial conquest and dispossession of indigenous people, but more particularly in the 1913 Natives Land Act. This piece of legislation outlawed the ownership of land by blacks in areas which was designated for white ownership. Essentially, it solidified the distribution of land that emerged from the era of colonial wars against indigenous tribes and polities. It further sought to roll back black ownership of land in certain areas. The outcome was that 87 percent of land became white owned, whilst blacks were relegated to the remaining 13 percent (Kassier 2005).

Since the dawn of democracy in 1994, the South African agriculture industry has been characterized by both, profound economic and political changes as well as continuities with its past, rooted in slavery, apartheid and paternalism. In this context Black farm workers, whose labour built the foundation of a prosperous agricultural industry, still belong to the most marginalised groups in post-apartheid society. A number of state and non-state actors, however, attempt to improve the economic and social positions of farm workers in South Africa (Schweitzer, 2008). Schweitzer, (2008) argued that these so called Black

Empowerment projects are based on partnerships between White farmers, farm worker communities and complex networks of actors, ranging from state agencies to nongovernmental organisations, international organisations, businesses and private individuals. The mobilisation of these actors and their resources allows farm workers to become land and business owners and in the process to acquire other economic, educational and symbolic benefits. While these projects demonstrate how marginalised Black farm workers become farmers, they also show a series of shortcomings – first and foremost that the 'new Black farmers' do not obtain real autonomy. The same can be said about current living and working conditions of most Black farm workers. The latter still belong to the most marginalised social groups in post-apartheid society, as their income level show that they are even the poorest in the formal economy (SAWB 2003). Those who are permanently employed or whose relatives are permanently employed usually stay on the farm in housing provided by the farmer. The quality of housing largely depends on the attitude of the farmer and ranges from "decent" to "scarcely fit for human habitation" (Ewert and Hamman 1999). Similarly, the educational background of farm workers indicates their marginal position in society. According to (Kassier 2005). almost one-fifth had no access to

formal education and many are illiterate. Moreover, due to their working and living conditions, farm workers are two to three times more likely to get infected by tuberculosis than people living in urban areas (SAWB 2006).

Only half of South Africa's potential labour force is able to find employment in the formal economy. Women, the less skilled and those who live in rural areas are more likely to be poor, and less likely to find formal sector employment. In this regard, the farm labour force sits at the junction between the formal and informal economies. Farm workers earn more than those engaged in informal activities in urban and non-urban areas, yet they earn less than any other workers in the formal economy do. Their duties include inter alia applying pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizer to crops and livestock; plant, maintain, and harvest food crops; and tend livestock and poultry. Repair farm buildings and fences. Duties may include: operating milking machines and other dairy processing equipment; supervising seasonal help; irrigating crops; and hauling livestock products to market.

Most people in the North West are employed on farms, making the agricultural sector the biggest employer in the province. Farm workers are crucial due to their contribution to food production, however, farm workers are the worst-paid labourers and their working conditions are not always favourable. This study will focus on the socio-economic status and job characteristics of farm workers in the Mafikeng and Ramotshere-Moiloa District. Farm workers cited anecdotal experiences of their suffering at the hands of farm owners who they allege to have little or no regard for their well being. The objective of the study is to determine the socio-economic and job characteristics among farm workers in Mafikeng municipality South Africa. The study specifically identified personal characteristics of farm workers, determined job characteristics of farm workers, ascertained their socio-economic status of farm workers and determined relationship between socio-economic status and job characteristics of farm workers. Also, significant relationships between personal characteristics, job characteristics and socio-economic status of farm workers were explored

Materials And Methods

North West is a province of South Africa with capital in Mafikeng. The province is located to the west of the major population centre of Gauteng. North West was created after the end of Apartheid in 1994, and includes parts of the former Transvaal Province and Cape Province, as well as most of the former Bantustan of Bophuthatswana. North West borders Kgatleng and Kgalagadi districts of Botswana and provinces within south Africa such as Limpopo,

Gauteng, Free State and Northern Cape. North West Province is traversed by the northwesterly line of equal latitude and longitude. The North West province has 4 district municipalities and 21 local municipalities, listed below.

The population of study is farm workers in the Mafikeng and Ramotshere Moiloa Municipalities. According to Statistics South Africa (2002), there were 5 349 farming units (farms) in the North West province during the year 2002 and only 29 for Mafikeng. Eight farms consisting of three commercial farms and five communal farms were randomly selected. One Hundred farm workers were randomly selected and interviewed for this study. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire which was made of three sections namely: personal characteristics, socio-economic status and job characteristics. Personal characteristics section consisted of twelve (12) variables such as age, gender, marital status, nationality, educational level, job category, job positions, type of employment, salary grade, religion, source of information and family size. Job characteristics' section consisted of forty-seven (47) items with three scale type of Satisfactory (3), Moderately Satisfied (2) and Not Satisfied (1). The last section was for Socio-economic status with ninety-three (93) items and consists of three scale of Poses (Yes), and Poses (No), and Number of those items poses. Socio-economic status comprised on three sub-sections with one focused on socio-economic status on agricultural possession, the other on household possessions and the other focused on other utilities. This was adapted from Akinbile (2007). Data collected were sorted, coded and subjected to analysis using SPSS. The percentages, mean and standard deviation were used to describe data. The relationship between socio-economic status and personal characteristics were explored with multiple regression analysis.

Results

The results from the data analysis are summarized into six tables. Table 1 presents the percentage distribution of farm workers on the basis of personal characteristics; Table 2 shows the percentage distribution of farm workers on the basis of agricultural possessions, Table 3 depicts the percentage distribution of farm workers on the basis of household possessions. Table 4 shows percentage distribution of farm workers on the basis of other utilities possessions, while Table 5 presents job characteristics with mean and standard deviation and Table 6 shows multiple regression analysis of relationship between, socio-economic status and personal characteristics of farm workers.

Table 1: Percentage distribution of farm workers on the basis of personal characteristics

| Variables | Percentage |
|----------------------------|------------|
| Age | |
| Less than 20 Years | 2 |
| 20-30 years | 39 |
| 31-40 years | 26 |
| 41-50 years | 23 |
| 51-60 years | 10 |
| Gender | |
| Male | 74 |
| Female | 26 |
| Marital status | |
| Single | 54 |
| Married | 19 |
| Cohabiting | 27 |
| Nationality | |
| Republic of South Africa | 93 |
| Republic of Zimbabwe | 7 |
| Educational level | |
| Grade 1-6 | 91 |
| Grade 7-11 | 9 |
| Job category | |
| Technical Operators | 13 |
| General Labourer | 87 |
| Employment types | |
| Permanent | 87 |
| Temporary | 13 |
| Salary grade | |
| R10 000- R15 000 per annum | 63 |
| R16 000- R20 000 per annum | 37 |
| Information sources | |
| Radio | 91 |
| Television | 9 |
| Family size | |
| 1-3 | 61 |
| 4-6 | 36 |
| Above 6 | 3 |

Table 2: Percentage distribution of farm workers on the basis of agricultural possessions

| SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS (Agric. possession) | | | |
|---|-----|-----|---------|
| Items | 0 | 1-3 | Above 3 |
| Cattle | 92 | 3 | 5 |
| Horse | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Sheep | 97 | 2 | 1 |
| Goats | 84 | 0 | 16 |
| Pigs | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Dogs | 36 | 63 | 1 |
| Cats | 92 | 8 | 0 |
| Donkey | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Donkey-Cart | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Tractor | 99 | 1 | 0 |
| Chickens | 21 | 1 | 78 |
| Turkeys | 86 | 0 | 14 |
| Peacocks | 98 | 0 | 2 |
| Land | 99 | 1 | 0 |

Table 3: Percentage distribution of farm workers on the basis of household possessions

| Household materials | 0 | 1-3 | Above 3 |
|---------------------|-----|-----|---------|
| Radio | 8 | 92 | 0 |
| Television Set | 52 | 48 | 0 |
| DVD Player | 75 | 25 | 0 |
| Heater | 79 | 21 | 0 |
| Bed | 1 | 99 | 0 |
| Wardrobe | 50 | 50 | 0 |
| Kitchen unit | 36 | 64 | 0 |
| Table | 11 | 89 | 0 |
| Chairs | 3 | 57 | 40 |
| Fridge | 91 | 9 | 0 |
| Electric stove | 41 | 59 | 0 |
| Microwave | 99 | 1 | 0 |
| Kettle | 26 | 74 | 0 |
| Boiler | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Decoder | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Satellite dish | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Plates | 0 | 4 | 96 |
| Table spoon | 0 | 39 | 61 |
| Tea spoon | 3 | 63 | 34 |
| Knives | 0 | 96 | 4 |
| Fork | 16 | 77 | 7 |
| Computer | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Air-conditioner | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Blankets | 0 | 5 | 95 |
| Pillows | 0 | 79 | 21 |
| Curtains | 6 | 64 | 30 |
| Bath | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| Mug | 0 | 39 | 61 |
| Glasses | 7 | 51 | 42 |
| Window pane | 6 | 69 | 25 |
| Wooden door | 6 | 94 | 0 |
| Ironing board | 72 | 28 | 0 |
| Coffee table | 90 | 10 | 0 |
| Sofas | 96 | 4 | 0 |
| Water-buckets | 0 | 95 | 5 |
| Lawnmower | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Drill-machine | 99 | 1 | 0 |
| Welding-machine | 95 | 5 | 0 |
| Washing-machine | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Sewing-machine | 99 | 1 | 0 |
| Calendar | 4 | 96 | 0 |
| Spade | 49 | 51 | 0 |
| Rake | 54 | 46 | 0 |
| Spade-fork | 78 | 22 | 0 |
| Saw | 54 | 46 | 0 |

Table 4: Percentage distribution of farm workers on the basis of other utilities possessions

| Other Utilities | 0 | 1--3 | Above 3 |
|--------------------------|-----|------|---------|
| Car | 99 | 1 | 0 |
| Bicycle | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Wheelbarrow | 72 | 28 | 0 |
| Electricity | 21 | 79 | 0 |
| Protective clothing | 8 | 74 | 18 |
| Running portable water | 6 | 94 | 0 |
| Toilet/ablution facility | 11 | 89 | 0 |
| Cell phone | 18 | 82 | 0 |
| Camera | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Umbrella | 16 | 77 | 7 |
| Travelling bag/suitcase | 1 | 80 | 19 |
| Jackets | 0 | 70 | 30 |
| Trousers | 15 | 21 | 64 |
| Blouse | 75 | 7 | 18 |
| Shirts | 24 | 39 | 37 |
| T-Shirts | 0 | 37 | 63 |
| Denim jeans | 16 | 79 | 5 |
| Gown | 75 | 9 | 16 |
| Sunglasses | 58 | 42 | 0 |
| Raincoat | 22 | 78 | 0 |
| Boots | 10 | 78 | 12 |
| Shoes | 0 | 86 | 14 |
| Socks | 0 | 71 | 29 |
| Hats | 0 | 74 | 26 |
| Underwear | 4 | 54 | 42 |
| Tool-box | 88 | 12 | 0 |
| Yard | 96 | 4 | 0 |
| Gate | 96 | 4 | 0 |
| Pens | 21 | 79 | 0 |
| Notebook | 28 | 72 | 0 |
| Diary | 92 | 8 | 0 |
| Watch | 39 | 61 | 0 |
| Calculator | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Washing line | 100 | 0 | 0 |

Table 5: Job Characteristics with mean and standard deviation

| Job Characteristics Items | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|--|------|--------------------|
| Pressure on improved performance | 1.92 | 0.6 |
| Infrastructure for work | 2.03 | 0.69 |
| Working Hours | 2.28 | 0.93 |
| Vote during National, Provincial and Municipal election | 2.41 | 0.75 |
| Relationship with manager/foreman | 2.16 | 0.58 |
| Relationship with subordinates | 2.04 | 0.45 |
| Accommodation provided at the farm | 2.48 | 0.78 |
| Accommodation electricity | 2.43 | 0.89 |
| Accommodation ablution facilities | 2.38 | 0.79 |
| Accommodation running portable water | 2.6 | 0.53 |
| Salary | 1.59 | 0.53 |
| Farm policies | 1.62 | 0.55 |
| Morale within the farm | 1.62 | 0.49 |
| Authority within the farm | 1.98 | 0.51 |
| Job status | 1.58 | 0.49 |
| Promotion | 1.52 | 0.5 |
| Medical Aid | 1 | 0 |
| Loan Schemes | 1.13 | 0.34 |
| Working Conditions | 1.86 | 0.49 |
| Work Equipment (Resources) | 2.35 | 0.74 |
| Leave entitlement | 2.01 | 0.92 |
| Overtime Remunerations | 1.66 | 0.71 |
| Salary advice/Pay slip | 1.97 | 0.98 |
| Labour Union | 1 | 0 |
| Sectoral Determination | 1 | 0 |
| Job Description | 1.98 | 0.45 |
| Response to challenges | 1.8 | 0.4 |
| General operations | 2 | 0.25 |
| Bonuses | 1.63 | 0.52 |
| Documents and Contracts written in vernacular language | 1.01 | 0.1 |
| Night shift allowance | 1.45 | 0.67 |
| Compensation for Sunday and Public Holiday work | 1.66 | 0.63 |
| Pay/salary in South African Currency | 3 | 0 |
| Salary on every month-end | 2.77 | 0.55 |
| Pay-day on the agreed date between employer and employee | 2.74 | 0.58 |
| Foul language within the farm | 1.95 | 0.43 |
| Conflicting orders | 2 | 0.35 |
| Qualification for job | 1.94 | 0.44 |
| Job specialization | 2.07 | 0.38 |
| Job security | 1.98 | 0.81 |
| In-Job training | 2.36 | 0.69 |
| Deductions on your salary | 1.9 | 0.57 |
| Flexibility and initiative | 1.74 | 0.44 |
| Meal intervals during working hours | 2.61 | 0.75 |
| Provision of food within the farm | 2.55 | 2.04 |
| Does employer know your physical address of your next of kin in case of unforeseen circumstances | 2.48 | 0.87 |
| Burial rites within the farm | 1.2 | 0.4 |

Table 6: Multiple regression analysis of relationship between, socio-economic status and personal characteristics of farm workers

| | Job characteristics | | | | | Socio-economic status | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|------------|------|-------|------|-----------------------|------------|-------|-------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | Sig | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | Sig |
| (Constant) | 76.31 | 25.37 | | 3.00 | .003 | 138.29 | 44.9 | | 3.08 | .003 |
| Age | 6.75 | 1.45 | .48 | 4.66 | .000 | 8.53 | 2.56 | .289 | 3.32 | .001 |
| Gender | 8.48 | 3.18 | .25 | 2.66 | .009 | 17.54 | 5.63 | .249 | 3.11 | .002 |
| Marital status | 5.62 | 1.62 | .33 | 3.46 | .001 | -1.66 | 2.87 | -.046 | -.57 | .56 |
| Nationality | -1.90 | 9.13 | -.03 | -.20 | .835 | -10.62 | 16.16 | -.088 | -.65 | .51 |
| Educational level | 13.12 | 4.44 | .25 | 2.95 | .004 | -5.61 | 7.86 | -.052 | -.71 | .47 |
| Job category | -12.54 | 3.50 | -.28 | -3.57 | .001 | .18 | 6.21 | .002 | .03 | .97 |
| Type of employment | -10.68 | 3.36 | -.24 | -3.17 | .002 | -26.03 | 5.95 | -.283 | -4.37 | .00 |
| Information sources | 4.19 | 8.03 | .08 | .52 | .602 | -1.03 | 14.21 | -.010 | -.07 | .94 |
| Family size | -3.46 | 1.04 | -.34 | -3.32 | .001 | 8.99 | 1.84 | .424 | 4.88 | .00 |
| F | 10.53 | | | | | 19.3 | | | | |
| p | 0.00 | | | | | 0.00 | | | | |
| R | 0.72 | | | | | 0.81 | | | | |
| R square | 0.51 | | | | | 0.65 | | | | |

Discussion

In Table 1, the majority of farm workers fell between 20-30 years age group, this may be as a result of high unemployment rate that the country is currently experiencing. Kruger et al., (2006), concluded that employment is usually linked to men, while most women have access to casual jobs only. The male dominates the farming sector as farm workers as a result of the type of work associated with 'hard labour'. Males are known to take care of the families, as women are regarded as those who care for the house. About 70% of all agricultural workers are male. Farm workers are also relatively young, their average household size is relatively small, and the overwhelming majority is South African citizens and female farm workers are paid less than male. This gender disparity exists despite the fact that the female are better educated than male. Female are paid less because the tasks typically performed by female are viewed as less skilled, and because employers often choose to view male workers as 'permanent' while female are viewed as 'casual' workers whose employment is contracted via a male partner. Most of the respondents are not married, the figure of singles stands at 54%, and this may be of a fact that most farm workers fell on 20-30 years age group while 27% of them are cohabiting as a result of testing each other's compatibility or saving money for lobola; with only 19% being married.

Seven percent of farm workers are from the Republic of Zimbabwe, this may result from the collapse of agriculture in Zimbabwe has resulted in an influx of skilled farm workers to South Africa and 93% of farm workers are South African Citizen as a result of high rate of unemployment, most of South African citizen has no other option but to look for job elsewhere and working on the farm is no exception. Most farm workers (91%) had primary school level of education. This may emanates from the fact that the

type of work concern does not require any formal qualification. Only 9% of farm workers have surpassed the grade 6 and above. Vorster et al., (2000) concluded that farm workers have the lowest literacy rate in South Africa and the immense backlog in education services still persists on farms. About 87% of farm workers were permanent and mostly classified as general labourers, the interaction was that honesty can lead to one being registered as a permanent worker; and only 13% of them were temporary workers. Temporary workers present a heterogeneous assemblage of casual, seasonal and contract workers who have far less legal rights than their permanently employed counterparts (Schweitzer, 2008). The results on income show that 63% of farm workers earn R10 000—R15 000 per annum and the mere 37% were earning R16 000—R20 000, this may be as a result of compensation from public holidays and Sundays work. Kruger et al., (2006) found out that those women who were permanently employed in a farm had a mean cash income of R500.00 per month; the mean income of male workers on farms in the Ventersdorp district was R544.00 per month. Most farm workers in addition to their income received benefits from farm owners such as free access to accommodation and water, with the conditions of accommodation and also the type of sanitation varying greatly between farms.

According to Statistics South Africa (2007) ownership of a radio, television, computer, refrigerator and cell phone has increased considerably between 2001 and 2007, this concurred well as 91% of farm workers rely on radio as a source of information, this may be a result of the price tag on radio compared to other audio-visual equipments and only 9% utilize television. Farm workers had varying family size ranging from 1-3 was observed to be 61% and 4-6 with 36% and above 6 family size ought to be only 3%, this might resembles the outcome of cost of living; as more and more families tried in vain to reduce the size of the

family due to high costs of food prices, school fees, clothing, toiletries, transport. Husy and Samson, (2001) observed that as opposed to those employed on farms, consideration has to be given to the dependents of these workers who are resident on farms. In general, dependents constitute additional 4-5 members of the family unit, reflecting an approximate national number of employees and dependents permanently residing on farms.

From Table 2, prominent agricultural possessions among respondents in the study area were chicken (78%), goats (16%) and turkey (14%) as well as cattle (8%). The indicators of socio-economic status change with time in every community because of the dynamics of human existence. With the agrarian-based community made up of some disguisedly poor ruralite and a generally poverty ridden farming population (Olawoye, 2002). In terms of the possession of household materials by the farm workers prominent items include radio, bed, blankets, pillows, table, water-buckets, bath, calendar, window panes, wooden door and eating utensils are the most objects that almost every farmworker possess. These materials are the basic necessity for the farmer workers in order to enhance their existence due to the vagaries of weather and sustaining their work-life (Table 3). Ovwigho (2009) found similar results among farmers in Nigeria.

Table 4 shows that on other utilities, there are findings that only one farm worker from the rest owns a motor vehicle, and most household have electricity. A substantial portion of the farm-worker community in South Africa is comprised of the descendants of people who may have occupied and farmed white-owned land in a relatively independent manner. Those who are permanently employed or whose relatives are permanently employed usually stay on the farm in housing provided by the farmer. The quality of housing largely depends on the attitude of the farmer and ranges from "decent" to "scarcely fit for human habitation" (Ewert and Hamman 1999). Protective clothing and cell phones seemed to be the most common item they possess. There seems to be no interest on calculator, camera, toolbox and diaries. Ovwigho (2011) found similar results among farmers in Nigeria.

Table 5 shows a list of 47 indicators of job characteristics of farm workers. The respondents were asked to rate the statements using 3 point Likert-type scale as follows; 3 satisfactory, 2 moderately satisfied and 1 not satisfied. The actual mean is 2 due to the rating scale and a mean of greater than 2 denoted a satisfaction while a mean less than 2 denoted non-satisfaction with their job characteristics. Out of the 47 indicators 18 items had mean score higher than 2, which implies that farm workers were only satisfied

with 18 indicators. The 18 indicators are work related such that the farm workers were able to carry out their duties without interruption. The mean scores for non-work related indicators were less than 2, which is an indication of non-satisfaction. Prominent indicators farm workers were satisfied with include: Salary on every month-end (2.77); Pay-day on the agreed date between employer and employee (2.74); Meal intervals during working hours (2.61); Provision of food within the farm (2.55); Accommodation provided at the farm (2.48) and employer knowledge of workers' physical address of your next of kin in case of unforeseen circumstances (2.48). According to SAWB (2003) farm workers were the most marginalized social groups in post-apartheid society, as their income level show that they are even the poorest in the formal economy. Those who are permanently employed or whose relatives are permanently employed usually stay on the farm in housing provided by the farmer. The quality of housing largely depends on the attitude of the farmer and ranges from "decent" to "scarcely fit for human habitation" (Ewert and Hamman 1999). Moreover, due to their working and living conditions, farm workers are two to three times more likely to get infected by tuberculosis than people living in urban areas (SAWB 2006). Most farm workers in addition to their income received benefits from farm owners such as free access to accommodation and water, with the conditions of accommodation and also the type of sanitation varying greatly between farms. On some farms, however, farm workers had to pay for accommodation. On most of the farms, farm workers were able to buy subsidised food such as fresh milk, meat, maize meal, eggs, poultry or vegetables from the farm owner, depending on the type of farming (Kruger et al., 2006).

Farm workers indicated that they were not satisfied with pressure on improved performance; Salary; Farm policies; Morale within the farm Authority within the farm; Job status; Promotion; Medical Aid; Loan Schemes; Working Conditions; Overtime Remunerations; Salary advice/Pay slip; Labour Union; Sectoral Determination; Job Description; Response to challenges; Bonuses; Documents and Contracts written in vernacular language; Night shift allowance; Compensation for Sunday and Public Holiday work; Foul language within the farm; Qualification for job; Job security; Deductions on your salary; Flexibility and initiative, and Burial rites within the farm.

The result of multiple regression analysis of relationships between farm workers' personal characteristics and job characteristics were presented in Table 6. The independent variables were significantly related to job characteristics with F value of 10.53, $p < 0.05$. Also, R value of 0.72 showed that there was a strong correlation between independent

variables and job characteristics. The result further predicted 51 percent of the variation in job characteristics by farmer workers. Significant determinants were age ($t = 4.66$), gender ($t = 2.66$), Marital status ($t = 3.46$), educational level ($t = 2.95$), job category ($t = -3.57$), types of employment ($t = -3.17$) and family size ($t = -3.32$). It implies that as farmers age, gender, marital status, and educational level increases, the more satisfactory they become with job characteristics. In terms of farm workers' socio-economic status, independent variables were significantly related to socio-economic status with F value of 19.3, $p < 0.05$. Also the R value of 0.81 shows that there was a strong correlation between independent variables and socio-economic status. Table 6 further revealed that 65 percent of the variation in socio-economic status of farm workers were predicted by independent variables. Significant determinants were age ($t = 3.32$), gender ($t = 3.11$) and family size ($t = 4.88$). The results imply that as age and gender and family size increases, socio-economic status would increase.

The following conclusion can be drawn based on the findings that majority of farm workers are males. Most of the farm workers are illiterate with very few above primary education level. The majority earn between R10 000—R15 000 per annum. None of the farm workers possess medical aid. Agricultural possession can be observed in only few of farm workers. Significant determinants of job characteristics were age, gender, Marital status, educational level, job category, types of employment and family size, while Significant determinants of socio-economic status were age, gender and family size.

Corresponding Author

Oladele O. I.

Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension,
North-West University, Mafikeng Campus, South
Africa. E-mail: oladimeji.oladele@nwu.ac.za,

References

1. Akinbile, L.A. 2007. Standardization of Socio-economic Status (SES) Scale for Farm Families in South-west Nigeria. *Journal of Social Science*, 14(3): 221-227.
2. Ewert, J., and Hamman, J. 1999. Why Paternalism Survives: Globalization, Democratization and Labour on South African Wine Farms. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 39(2), 202–221.
3. Huss, D. U., Kohlweiss, C., and Schweitzer, E. 2008. Wein, Macht, Geschichte. In W. Zips (Ed.), *To BEE or not to be? Black Economic Empowerment im neuen Südafrika am Beispiel der Weinindustrie* (pp. 65–96). Wien: LIT.
4. Husy, D., and Samson, C., 2001. Promoting Development and Land Reform on South African Farms. Land Bank. Pretoria.
5. Kassier, E. 2005. Black Economic Empowerment in the Wine Grape Producer and Cooperative Wine Cellar Sectors: Baseline Study 2005. First Draft.
6. Kruger, A., Lemke, S., Phometsi, M., van't Riet, H., Pienaar, A.E., and Kotze G. 2006. Poverty and household food security of black South African farm workers: the legacy of social inequalities. *Public Health Nutrition*: 9(7). 830-836.
7. Ovwigho, B.O. 2011. Construction of a Socio-economic Status Scale for Heads of Rural Farm Families in the North Agricultural Zone of Delta State, Nigeria. *Journal of Hum. Ecol*, 33(2): 113-118.
8. Ovwigho, B.O. 2009. Validation of Socio-economic Status Indicators for Heads of Farm Families in Delta North Agricultural Zone, Delta State, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development*, 1(2):50–57.
9. Ovwigho, B.O. and Ifie, P.A. 2009. Principles of Youth Development in Africa. Benin-City: Ethiopie Publishing Corporation.
10. SAWB, 2003. The South African Wine Industry Strategy Plan (WIP): A Strategic Plan for a Vibrant, United, Non-racial and Prosperous South African Wine Industry. Stellenbosch: South African Wine and Brandy Company.
11. SAWB, 2006. The Effects of Deregulation on the South African Wine Industry. Stellenbosch: SAWB. Retrieved December 10, 2006, from http://www.sawb.co.za/news_articles.htm.
12. Schweitzer, E. 2008. How Black Farm Workers become land and business owners: Actors, Resources, Contexts and Outcomes of Black Empowerment Projects in the South African Wine Industry. *Wiener Zeitschrift für kritische Afrikastudien* Nr. 15/2008, 8. Jg., 31-53.

9/25/2012