
UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN

CENTRE FOR

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

# Social Protection, Intergenerational Relationships and Conflict in South Africa

Elena Moore and Jeremy Seekings

CSSR Working Paper No. 419

September 2018


Research jointly supported by the ESRC and DFID

Published by the Centre for Social Science Research

University of Cape Town

2018

http://www.cssr.uct.ac.za/

This Working Paper can be downloaded from:

http://www.cssr.uct.ac.za/cssr/pub/wp/419

ISBN: 978-1-77011-406-7



About the authors:

Dr Elena Moore is an Associate Professor in the Sociology Department and the Director of FaSRU. Email: elena.moore@uct.ac.za

Jeremy Seekings is Professor of Political Studies and Sociology. Email: jeremy.seekings@uct.ac.za.

Acknowledgements:

Jeremy Seekings' research was facilitated by an award from the British Economic and Social Research Council and Department for International Development, for the "Legislating and Implementing Welfare Policy Reforms" research programme. Elena Moore acknowledges the support of the DST-NRF Centre of Excellence in Human Development. Opinions expressed, and conclusions arrived at are those of the authors and are not necessarily to be attributed to the CoE in Human Development.

# Social Protection, Intergenerational Relationships and Conflict in South Africa


## Abstract

*It has long been acknowledged that social protection contributes to patterns of stratification but there is little attention paid to the ways in which it creates conflict and inequalities in intergenerational relationships at the micro level. Where social protection has uneven generational coverage, relationships between generations are reshaped. South Africa is an important site for the study of such effects. It has a long history of social protection as well as multi-generational kinship practices. The provision of grants to some but not all family members recasts patterns of dependency and conflict within families. Expanding state intervention through the welfare state has led to refamilialisation rather than defamilialisation, with effects varying by class, race, gender and generation.*



**Key words**: social protection; South Africa; defamilialisation; intergenerational relationships; social grants, care


## Introduction

This paper introduces the theme of a project on the question of social protection, intergenerational relationships and conflict. The project examines how, in one country in the global South, inequalities in public provision combine with familial norms to transform families and generate new patterns of conflict within them. The findings from the project suggest that the predominant literature from the global North underestimates the conflicts that arise from expanded public provision.

Because welfare states – or 'social protection' – redistribute resources, they generate new patterns of inequality, stratification, solidarity and, at least potentially, conflict. The egalitarian visions of T.H. Marshall and social democratic reformers notwithstanding, most welfare states redistribute resources unequally, do little more than mitigate inter-household inequality, fail to have much of an effect on the inter-generational reproduction of advantage and disadvantage, and reproduce much of the status hierarchy. Poverty (and 'social exclusion') persist despite the welfare state. Esping-Andersen (1990) identified three models of stratification and solidarity in the advanced capitalist societies of

the global North, each associated with one of his three 'worlds' of 'welfare capitalism'. The liberal and conservative worlds of welfare capitalism most obviously entailed economic and social inequality, but even socialist workers' movements and parties were prone to reforms that privileged unionised workers over other and often poorer social groups. Only rarely – in the social democratic Scandinavian cases – did egalitarian and generous universalism become the defining ideology of the welfare state.

Provision might be unequal, but most welfare states in the global North in the second half of the twentieth century did protect most citizens against a wide range of 'risks' from cradle to grave: deprivation during childhood, motherhood, poor health or disability, involuntary unemployment and finally old age. The breadth of direct protection against risks means that much of the ensuing inequality and stratification occurred *between* families: some families received far less than others (whether through inegalitarian social insurance or minimalist social assistance) or were stigmatised for being dependent on the state (through social assistance). Some inequality persisted *within* families, however. Many welfare states did not treat family members equally. As feminist critics of Esping-Andersen argued, public provision was gendered, in different ways under different welfare regimes (Lewis, 1992; Orloff, 1993). Conservative welfare regimes, especially, treated women primarily as the dependents of male breadwinners. Some welfare states directly protected men against a range of risks, whilst protecting (dependent) women indirectly (or not at all) against the risks facing their (breadwinning) husbands. The family itself was thus a site of struggle and conflict (Delphy and Leonard, 1993). In response, Esping-Andersen (1999) distinguished between 'familialistic' and 'de-familialistic' welfare regimes, according (in practice) to the extent to which the burden on women of unpaid care for children and the elderly was shifted to either the welfare state (as in the social democratic regimes, through public daycare for children and home-help for the elderly) or the market (as in the USA).

The literature on the global North paid some, but less, attention to inter-generational conflicts. As populations aged, scholars debated the state's allocation of resources to older and younger people, and whether countries could afford generous pensions and healthcare for the elderly (Arber and Attias-Donfut, 2000; Vanhuysse and Goerres, 2012). Scholars examined why some states in the global North spent relatively more or less on the elderly (e.g. Lynch, 2006). Despite some variation in the generational allocation of resources, 'European societies … do not show signs of generational conflict', concluded Attias-Donfut and Arber (2000: 19) in their edited volume on the myth of intergenerational conflict. The welfare system nurtured collective solidarity within which private contracts between family generations are renegotiated (Attias and Wolff, 2000: 49). The evidence in the edited collection highlighted how, despite financial

inequalities between generations in Norway (Gulbrandsen & Langsether, 2000) or in East and West Germany (Kohli, et al. 2000), there was little evidence of intergenerational conflict. Of course, this could change. Even before the 2008 global economic crisis, Attias and Wolff worried that the 'rolling back of welfare systems' combined with slowing economic growth and demographic aging to threaten the European social model and create new conflict over resources between the young and old (2000a: 23). But there has been little evidence of this in North-West Europe or its diaspora.

The absence of evident inter-generational conflict across much of the global North in the second half of the twentieth century reflected at least three factors. First, the welfare states of north-west Europe and its diaspora (in North America and Australasia) were built on nuclear family norms (notwithstanding falling marriage and rising divorce rates): Young adults left their parental homes to establish independent households, whilst few elderly people lived with adult children. Esping-Andersen provided data from the mid-1980s showing that the proportion of elderly people living with their children varied from 4 percent in Denmark to 20 percent in France. Even unemployed youth tended to live apart from their parents (Esping-Andersen, 1999: 63). Secondly, these countries generally maintained a high level of employment, reducing inter-generational dependence. Thirdly, welfare states tended to protect all generations against many risks. Whilst decommodification remained gendered, in practice, it was rarely generational.

The factors underlying inter-generational solidarity in North-West Europe and its diaspora were much weaker or non-existent in countries on the periphery of the global North. Welfare regimes in Southern Europe and Japan remained deeply familialist, continuing to impose responsibilities of support and care on kin through extended, multi-generational households (Leitner, 2003). Esping-Andersen (1999) chose to categorize these regimes as extreme cases of his conservative type. Across much of the global South, kin remain crucial. Not only do traditional norms impose responsibilities to a wide range of kin, but public provision is almost everywhere highly selective and un- (and under-) employment ensures that many adults are dependent on others. Inter-generational dependency is likely to have increased in Southern Europe: The old-age dependency ratio rose from 28 (i.e. people aged 65 and older per 100 people of working age) to 34 in Greece, 30 to 35 in Italy and 24 to 29 in Spain, between 2006 and 2017.[1] Meanwhile, economic crisis pushed youth unemployment rates up to about 50 percent in both Greece and Spain and 40 percent in Italy (in 2015).[2] When welfare states provide uneven or indirect protection against different risks, it is more likely that there will also be conflict *within* families, including between generations. While there is little evidence on conflict in Southern Europe, there are some examples emerging, such as in Spain, where the transition to dual parent

employment in a context of weak family policy has forced mothers to rely on grandparents to provide childcare and there are some indications of the unwillingness of grandparents to continue to provide intensive care for grandchildren in Spain (Tobio Solar, 2012).

Much of the global South differs even more from the North-West European cases, for all three of the reasons identified above. First, whilst kinship norms are widely in flux, there is little or no normative commitment to nuclear family households in which the only adults are partners of the same generation. Normative commitments to support and care for extended kin remain far much more powerful than in north-west Europe, and a high proportion of households continue to comprise multiple generations of adults as well as distant kin and even non-kin. Secondly, whilst public provision ('social protection') has expanded, it remains very uneven and selective. The result is that in many societies some poor individuals receive public support, but others do not. Thirdly, the rise of un- and under-employment poses growing challenges of dependency among working-age adults. The blocked economic development of the younger generation across much of Africa prevents young men and women from becoming social adults and independent (less reliant on support) from their parents or grandparents (Durham, 2017). For all of these reasons, families and households often comprise a mix of individuals who support themselves, individuals who are dependent on the state and individuals who are dependent on kin. There is often little consensus as to who has obligations to whom, and for what, and the potential grows for conflict between kin.

This collection of working papers concentrates on these tensions and conflicts within families – between generations as well as along gender lines – and how these are shaped by the uneven expansion of public welfare provision. We focus on one country in the global South – South Africa – but view this as a (currently) extreme case of what seems to be a widespread phenomenon across Africa and the rest of the global South. Viewed from the global South, the welfare regimes of North-West Europe appear to be more the exception rather than the rule in terms of the solidarities around public provision against social risks.

Social protection expanded across much of the global South in the 2000s, especially for the poor through forms of social assistance (ILO, 2014, 2017; World Bank, 2015, 2018). Across Africa – and across the global South more broadly – states are ever more involved in the provision of public services, including not only public education and health care but also direct financial support to selected groups of people. Garcia and Moore (2012, for the World Bank) identified more than 120 cash transfer programmes in sub-Saharan Africa as of about 2009. 'Just giving money to the poor' through social assistance programmes is becoming more and more widespread, especially to support

children and the elderly (Hanlon et al., 2010; von Gliszczynski and Leisering, 2016). This expansion can be illustrated with respect to non-contributory old-age pensions for the elderly in Africa. 'Social' pensions for the elderly, funded out of general taxation, have long existed in South Africa, its former colony, Namibia, and Mauritius. More recently, social pensions have been introduced in Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, and Zanzibar, and selective programmes are being rolled out in Zambia, Uganda and Kenya.

The expansion has been driven in part by international organisations, most of which have their favoured programmes and target groups. Thus, UNICEF and the World Bank focus (in different ways) on families with children, HelpAge International focuses on the elderly, and the World Food Programme on food-insecure households. Within countries, domestic politics typically favours the expansion of some programmes but not others. The result is a very uneven patchwork of programmes, with deep and wide 'coverage gaps'. Whilst there are growing literatures on the design and economic impact of social protection programmes, and the politics of policy-making, the social and political consequences of the uneven expansion of public programmes has received little scholarly attention. The existing literature on inter-generational relations points in diverse directions, in different contexts. Golaz et al. (2017), for example, suggest with reference to Uganda that inter-generational relations and support may be contested when there are not enough resources available in the support networks to cover the needs of all, substantial responsibilities continue to sit on the family, and the needs of the young come into competition with the needs of the middle or older generation within families. Attias Donfut and Wolff (2000b) argued that, in the case of Guadeloupe, the introduction of family allowances (which funded schooling and education) and social protection for the elderly did not create conflict, despite changing the direction of family solidarity from the older person who is 'provided for' to the older person 'who provides'. Solidarity persisted based on the norm that everyone contributes to collective welfare in some way (whether through a pension, wages or carework) (Attias Donfut and Wolff, 2000b: 66). The existing literature thus provides snapshots that are difficult to collate into a fuller picture.

South Africa is an especially useful site for studying the social consequences of social protection because the challenges are unusually pronounced. Both familial change and 'modern' state-building occurred earlier and more extensively in South Africa than elsewhere in Africa (or in most of the global South). South African society has been transformed by economic changes (including landlessness, unemployment, urbanisation) and social and cultural change (including declining fertility and marriage rates, the decline of kinship obligation, the increase in women-headed households, and the rise of individualist consumerism), both before and after the end of apartheid in the early 1990s. The

welfare state has expanded further (in terms of both coverage of the poor and the expense of this) than almost all other countries across the global South. This expansion has had a notable impact on families and households and on specific individuals within these. On the one hand, the reach and amount of the various cash grants has helped raise many individuals and households out of poverty and has empowered specific individuals (notably pensioners and the disabled) – as many studies have shown. On the other hand, welfare state expansion has occurred as levels of unemployment have increased and the burden of care due to the AIDS endemic have increased. The process of empowering state beneficiaries with a grant has thus come at the same time as pensioners and other state cash grant beneficiaries carry a larger responsibility for care (both financial and physical care). For all of these reasons, the interactions between public provision, private provision and intra-familial relationships (and solidarities) are starker in the South African context than in most other societies across the global South.

In the global North, the expansion of public provision was widely interpreted in terms of defamilialisation. By definition, the state's assumption of responsibilities previously undertaken by kin, in the global South or North, entails an element of defamilialisation. In the global South, however, the uneven and selective expansion of public provision has often entailed also a process of refamilialisation, as relationships between kin are reconstituted. The South African case allows us to see how the combination of shifting public and private solidarities gives rise to a process of conflicted refamilialisation.

## Concepts in Context

Before the main points of the project are discussed, it is important to engage critically with some of the key concepts that the collection of these papers draw upon. Firstly, despite the ideological misuse of the term 'family', we use this term to include any person within a wider set of kin relations, particularly across generations, who may be involved in the organisation or receipt of care. In this regard we refer specifically to 'families' and recognise the diversity of forms that families can take. We also draw on the concept of households as much of the statistical information we know about families is based on co-residential households. We recognise 'the household' is not an 'unproblematic universal phenomenon' (Russell, 2003: 6). We define a household as a social unit comprised of individuals who may or may not be related by blood or marriage, who stay together for at least some nights of the week and to some extent (but rarely fully) share resources and expenditure (whilst sometimes also sharing resources with kin and non-kin outside of the household). We recognise the differences between families and households and we do not use these concepts interchangeably.

Secondly, the concepts of intergenerational solidarity, conflict and ambivalence must also be used with caution. The various theoretical perspectives central to understanding inter-generational family relations (Bengston et al. 2002; Luescher and Pillemer, 1998; Arber and Attias-Donfut, 2000) were developed in and for the global North and focus on relationships between older parents and their adult children. The dominant understanding and application of the concept focuses on parent-child dyads rather than the more complex multi-generational and skip-generational relationships that are widespread in the global South. Relative to an extensive literature on intergenerational transfers from adult children to ageing parents or vice versa, the body of literature on the supports that uncle and aunts, grandparents and adult grandchildren provide to each other is much smaller. Across the global South (and in South Africa in particular), flows of support extend across vertical multi-generational family ties and are not restricted to the nuclear family. Moreover, these concepts have not always been investigated in contexts and cultures (with the exception of Ikels 2004 in the East Asian context) that place a high value and expectation on interdependence and reciprocity across generations, such as in South Africa.

Furthermore, the terms care and intergenerational relations are often used together as family members are frequently heavily involved in patterns of care. In terms of care, the collection of papers is interested in what actually takes place, who provides care, for whom and of what kind? The papers are also concerned with values and norms concerning the role of the family and the state in meeting caring responsibilities. Overall, the project engages with the ideological construction of the family and norms around obligations as much as actual practices of support and care.

The papers in this project draw on a critical theory of care by providing an analysis of the South African care regime and practices of care as forms of power within families and society. Through links to the economy and social policy, care has been coupled with welfare, but this project attempts to separate issues of welfare and care by examining not only the strained social conditions where care is given and received but also analysing how welfare provision is experienced in the local context. For example, the authors draw on local everyday notions of care (sometimes labelled as ‘Ubuntu’ in South Africa) to unpack the ways in which communal bonds and a relational notion of the self is foregrounded and understood. We follow Gouws and van Zyl (2014) who argue that a southern lens for a feminist ethic of care analysis allows for contextualising relationships of interdependence and needs, while simultaneously highlighting the gendered dimensions of care. It also provides a perspective for analysing South African state policies framed in the language of both rights and Ubuntu. We uncover how rights talk often conceals features of the care situation, namely the structural

conditions that produce the dependency of poor people on others or the state in the first place.

## The state and the family in South Africa

Most of South Africa's social assistance programmes originated in racist anxieties in the 1920s or 1930s, which were partly deracialised in the 1940s and completely deracialised in the 1980s and 1990s. 'Liberal' means-tested social assistance programmes were originally introduced for selected categories of 'deserving' poor white individuals and families: the elderly, disabled, and poor mothers and their children. Able-bodied adults were supported through job creation and workfare programmes. The African majority population was not only subject to discriminatory economic policies, which kept most in poverty, but was also largely excluded from the welfare state on the grounds that support and care were sufficiently and appropriately provided by kin within the 'traditional' or 'tribal' system. Public programmes were slowly expanded to and for the African population. In 1993, parity was reached in terms of the value of the old-age pensions paid to white and African men and women. Discrimination continued, however, in other parts of the welfare state. Almost no African women were eligible for the grants paid to single mothers, whilst institutional care remained largely segregated and deeply discriminatory (Button et al. 2018; Seekings and Moore, 2014).

The post-apartheid state inherited deep inequality and poverty in 1994. Failing to tackle the root causes of inequality and poverty, especially with respect to employment and unemployment, post-apartheid governments expanded the welfare state, especially through the reform of social assistance for poor mothers and children. The expansion of public provision mitigated only partially poverty (Seekings and Nattrass 2005; Seekings 2015b). By 2017, South Africa's social grant system paid out more than 17 million grants every month (South African Social Security Agency, 2017a), i.e. for one in three South Africans. Very few poor households receive no grants, although there are many poor individuals who remain dependent on other households or family members. The households that remain very poor typically have no members who are eligible for – or are actually receiving – a social grant. The largest programme is the Child Support Grant programme, with 12.1 million beneficiaries, which is by far the largest social assistance programme in Africa in terms of coverage. About 1 million people received Disability Grants and 3.3 million people receive Old Age Grants (formerly called pensions) (*ibid*). Foster Care Grants, which (unlike the three larger programmes) are not means-tested and are paid for just under half a million orphans and other children placed in care by the courts. As of April 2018, the value of the Disability Grant and Old Age Grant was R1690 (or approximately

US$135) per month, whilst the Foster Care and Child Support Grants were worth R960 (about $75) and R400 (about $30 per month respectively). The value of these grants may not be large in comparison to high-income countries of the global North, but they are high in relation to most countries across the global South. The total cost of these social assistance programmes – at about 3,5 percent of GDP – is higher than any other major country in the global South.

South Africa might have an extensive welfare state in terms of coverage, but there remain glaring coverage gaps. With an unemployment rate of close to 40 percent (using the more appropriate definition of unemployment), there are very many adults of working-age who are not themselves eligible for any of the social grants. Unemployment rates are especially high among young adults. A very small proportion of the unemployed benefit from 'work opportunities' through workfare programmes. Many unemployed young women receive child support grants on behalf of their children, but many others do not, and unemployed young men remain entirely dependent on kin (Seekings 2005; Klasen and Woolard, 2005; Hassim, 2008). Many poor people depend on the state; many others depend on kin.

Moreover, the expansion of social citizenship and rights through the welfare state has not taken into account the predominant norms and values among the country's African majority. Interdependence has long been fundamental to the norms as well as the practices of kinship in Southern Africa, but the grant programmes confer rights on individuals without any acknowledgement of their broader social responsibilities or obligations. Providing resources to individual young women subverts not only patriarchal family relations – to the horror of defenders of the patriarchy – but also potentially subverts norms around both the social responsibilities associated with interdependency and the value of work, including carework (with many women as well as men, of diverse ages, articulating concern over the payment of 'something for nothing'). Through both providing grants to some individuals within households and families and denying them to others, the state has recast relations of dependency within households and families as much as between its citizens and the state itself.

Posel (2010: 131) writes that households in South Africa are 'more complex formations than households typically found in developed countries'. She argues that the reasons for this are twofold. Firstly, individuals can be members of more than one household, and secondly, they may be considered to be a part of a household even if they are not resident in the household for much of the year. Such patterns have led many South African households to be characterised as 'porous' and 'fluid' in that household composition and individuals' relations to household units can change over time (Spiegel *et al.*, 1996). This does not mean, however, that porosity and fluidity are unbounded (Seekings, 2008). Households

are also porous and fluid in the sense that resources (money and unpaid labour) can move between individuals in different households. Therefore, individuals may provide practical, personal or financial care to or receive care from individuals outside the household.

Many children in South Africa live separately from one or both of their biological parents for a variety of reasons, including orphaning, high rates of extra marital childbirth, low rates of co-residence between parents and cultural reasons. Approximately one in three children live in a nuclear family. Compared with other countries, rates of paternal absence in South Africa are high (Posel and Devey 2006). Less than half of rural children have co-resident fathers when they are born, and only a third of all children nationally have their father co-resident in the household (Hosegood and Madhavan 2012; Seekings and Moore, 2014). Although maternal co-residence rates are higher, about one in four children live without their mothers. Many children live in extended households. Extended households can take the form of 'skip-generational' or three or even four-generational households. Only one in five African people over the age of 60 lives alone or with one other elderly person (Statistics South Africa, 2013: 96). Most live with younger kin. Data from the 2015 General Household Survey indicated that almost one half of all households headed by elderly African people contained three or more generations (Statistics South Africa, 2017b: 32). While elderly-headed households are most likely to be characterised by female headship (*ibid:* 17), older women are also more likely to head multi-generational households than elderly men (Dungumaro, 2008). The proportion of households headed by a woman had risen to almost 40 percent by 2006, reflecting women's longer life expectancy, increased economic independence and the decline in marriage rates (Posel and Rogan, 2009; Zulu and Sibanda, 2005).

Marriage rates are unusually low in South Africa, even relative to the rest of Africa. Marriage rates dropped dramatically under apartheid and continued thereafter. By 2001, the percentage of African women who had never married nor were living together as unmarried partners had increased to 54 per cent. By 2011, 61 percent of women were recorded as never married or living together (Mhongo and Budlender, 2013). Changes in marriage rates, living arrangements and household headship all shape inter-generational relationships of care in these households.

At the same time, inter-generational relations have been challenged and shaped by persistent poverty, unemployment, illness and death (including due to AIDS) and the high cost of living. For example, whilst caring for grandchildren is not new, the level of care required due to AIDS-related illnesses and the missing support from the middle generation added a new layer of stress to grandparents' lives and altered reciprocal relationships of care (Chazan, 2008). Rising

unemployment imposed similar strains. South Africa has an exceptionally high poverty rate given its overall level of development (i.e. GDP per capita), with half of the population considered poor using the favoured official poverty line (Statistics South Africa, 2017a). The poverty rate was slow to fall after the end of apartheid, only dropping well in the 2000s with the rollout of the child support grant (Posel and Rogan, 2012; Seekings 2015). Poverty is higher among women and within woman-headed households. Social grants are more important for poverty reduction among women and woman-headed households (Posel and Rogan, 2012).

A further challenge experienced by families in South Africa is labour migration. Under apartheid, African men were forced to migrate, leaving families in rural areas when they worked in urban and industrial areas, framing family life (Budlender and Lund, 2011; Ramphele, 1993; Murray, 1981). After apartheid, as across much of Africa, labour migration remains an important livelihood strategy (Posel, 2006), with rising numbers of women migrating between rural and urban areas also (Casale and Posel, 2006; Posel, 2010). The practice of moving children between kin and households also persists, for cultural as well as economic reasons (Russell, 2003).

Public provision and family dynamics therefore affect each other in many ways. Working-aged adults may have little choice but to reside with kin who have stable sources of income. Studies in various parts of the country have indicated that many older women use their pension grants to support their unemployed adult children as well as their grandchildren, and care for their grandchildren when their adult children seek employment elsewhere (Kimuna and Makiwane, 2007; Mosoetsa, 2011; Schatz, 2007; Button, 2017). Indeed, adult women are more likely to migrate for work if they are members of a household where someone receives a pension: income from a social grant provides the means for other family members to look for work as well as for a pensioner to look after her grandchildren (Ardington et al., 2009). Disability grants provide some financial independence to some people incapacitated by AIDS or other illnesses, but they often remain dependent on other kin – especially mothers and grandmothers – for care (Urdang, 2006; Schatz, 2007; Schatz and Ogunmefun, 2007; Chazan, 2008; Fakier and Cock, 2009; Mosoetsa, 2011; Richter, 2011). Receipt of child grants has a range of welfare benefits for dependent children as well as their mothers (Patel, 2012; Wright et al., 2015; Zembe-Mkabile et al., 2015). The child support grant is sometimes a key and the only source of income in a household and is redistributed within the family (Goldblatt, 2005; Patel, 2012; Fakier and Cock, 2009). A large body of evidence exists on how older black African women have used their pension grants and other resources to address the needs for financial and practical care in their families (Kimuna and Makiwane, 2007; Schatz, 2007;

Schatz and Ogunmefun, 2007; Chazan, 2008; Ogunmefun and Schatz, 2009; Schatz and Madhavan, 2011; Mosoetsa, 2011; Button, 2017).

Grants have widespread direct and indirect benefits within poor households and families, but the payment of grants to some individuals (and not others) exposes them to demands, to fulfil others' expectations, and hence conflict arises. This project examines the ways in which poor, mostly African men and women in South Africa experience and negotiate the use of their grants to support others, sometimes alongside and at other times in return for care, and the consequences of this for the reconstitution of families and households.

Contestation over grants in South Africa had prompted a growing literature. A series of studies have pointed, generally in passing, to inter-generational conflict and tension between household members around the use of social grants (Dubbeld, 2013; Mathis, 2011; Mosoetsa, 2011; van Dongen, 2008). In particular there is evidence that younger kin are not always forthcoming with support and have contested the traditional expectations for caregiving placed on them by their older household members (Sagner and Mtati, 1999; Mathis, 2011; Mosoetsa, 2011; Button, 2017). Furthermore, there is evidence that points to the gendered inequalities of inter-generational support, in that the expectation that young women would contribute financially to their households when they had the means to do so was not matched by a similar expectation of (or practice by) young men (Mosoetsa, 2011: 67). In a study of the roles of younger women in their rural households in KwaZulu-Natal, Mathis (2011) reported that employed younger women tried to limit the financial obligations towards their parents by speaking of themselves as rights-bearing individuals. This project builds on these foundations through a direct focus on the ways in which public provision and familial conflict shape each other.

# Overview of the Project

The papers in this project draw on a mix of methodologies, approaches and data sources to probe the social and distributional effects of public provision as well as legal regulation on inter-generational relationships. Sources include data from courts, sample surveys, in-depth interviews, focus groups and archival research (including content analysis of parliamentary debates on welfare reform).

The first working paper, 'The Price of the Grant: the Social Cost of Child Support Grants for Female Caregivers and their Extended Networks' (no. 412), shows how the emotional stress (and public scrutiny of being a grant recipient) of receiving a child welfare grant may outweigh its financial benefit. By examining the powerful moral discourse surrounding the most accessed of all the grants, the

Child Support Grant, the article identifies how the receipt of these grants increase the precariousness of already strained relationships between female kin by creating expectations about how grants ought to function that are extremely difficult to uphold

The second working paper (no. 414) 'The influence of disability-related cash transfers on family practices in South Africa', examines the position and conceptualisation of the disability grant, which is often neglected in social policy analysis. Disability is a significant area for state intervention in South Africa. The article explores how the grant places the disabled grant beneficiary in an ambivalent position. On the one hand the grant provides a stable income to the household giving disabled people the opportunity to exercise agency, be seen as valuable and secure care and support from household members. On the other hand, the grant also creates conflicts over how income is shared and may lead to the extortion, abuse and neglect of disabled people, particularly in cases of severe disablement.

The third working paper (no. 413), 'Intergenerational care, negotiation and conflict: female state pensioners' experiences of financial caregiving in low-income, multigenerational households', illuminates how the state pension positions grandmothers as key breadwinners and, in many cases, adult (grand) children as dependents on grandmothers. In many ways, the state has redrawn the boundaries of grandmother's responsibility in multigenerational households whereby adult children are increasingly dependent on grandmother's pension. Negotiations around the provision of resources for caregiving reflects unequal power relationships with the households and added to the emotional and financial vulnerabilities the female pensioners experience in their capacities as caregivers

The forth working paper (no. 415), 'Intergenerational family dependence: Contradictions in family policy and law', examines how current social and legal structures do not always support diffuse patterns of kin dependency across generations. An analysis of court cases reveals that the state through the framework of the law attempts to accommodate demands of diffuse patterns of kin dependency but other state institutions, notably a social insurance system (Road Accident Fund) has different practices and does not reflect the same understanding of kin dependency. Although the state, through the Courts, are actively promoting intergenerational interactions and living by supporting the complexity of family life for many in South Africa, the findings show that another state institution bases policies on certain assumptions about how families are structured and operate and tries to reinforce these assumptions even when they are not deemed legitimate by the groups affected.

The penultimate working paper (no. 416), 'The legitimacy of claims made on kin and state in South Africa', uses quantitative data to probe how young South Africans distinguish between deserving and undeserving claimants on both the state and kin. Through an innovative methodological quantitative approach, the paper explores hierarchies of desert with respect to both public and private welfare and the relationship between the two. The findings show that there is a clear and generally intuitive hierarchy of desert with respect to public welfare. Deservingness with respect to different categories of kin – i.e. the 'radius' of responsibility for kin – varies less markedly, but with some variation between racial or cultural groups. The author argues that public and private support appear to be complements not substitutes for each other, in that people who believe that the state should support people in need are also more likely to believe that kin should do so also.

The final working paper (no. 418) 'Rethinking Welfare Regimes: Challenges from the South', provides some reflections on how the South African case compares and contrasts with other countries in the Global South and North. The author not only locates the South African case study within the wider global context and theoretical debates surrounding welfare regimes and intergenerational solidarities within the public and private sphere, but it also fills a gap in the existing literature on comparative welfare and care regimes in the global context and the relationships between intergenerational relations and the state by exploring the topic from the perspective of a Global South context. The comparison identifies the idiosyncrasies of the South African national context.

Overall, these working papers provide a more nuanced understanding of the relationships between social protection, intergenerational relationships, conflict and the consequences of welfare expansion on defamilialisation. We argue that inequalities in public provision combine with familial norms to transform families and generate new patterns of conflict within them. Expanding state intervention through the welfare state has led to refamilialisation rather than defamilialisation, a process imbued with conflict and with effects varying by class, race, gender and generation. Together, the collection of the papers suggests that the predominant literature from the global North underestimates the conflicts that arise from expanded public provision. In particular, the papers offer an important contribution to understandings of this relationship from the perspective of the South.

# References


Arber S and Attias-Donfut C (2000) *The Myth of Generational Conflict: the family and state in ageing societies*. London: Routledge.

Attias-Donfut C and Arber S (2000) Equity and solidarity across the generation. In Arber, S and Attias-Donfut, C., eds., 1-22. *The Myth of Generational Conflict: the family and state in ageing societies*. London: Routledge.

Attias-Donfut C and Wolff F (2000a) The redistributive effects of generational transfers. In Arber, S and Attias-Donfut, C., eds., 22-47. *The Myth of Generational Conflict: the family and state in ageing societies*. London: Routledge.

Attias-Donfut C and Wolff F (2000b) Complementarity between private and public transfers. In Arber, S and Attias-Donfut, C, eds., 47-69. *The Myth of Generational Conflict: the family and state in ageing societies*. London: Routledge.

Ardington C, Case A, and Hosegood V (2009) Labor Supply Responses to Large Social Transfers: Longitudinal evidence from South Africa. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 1(1): 22–48.

Bengston V, Giarrusso R, Mabry JB. and Silverstein M (2002) Solidarity, Conflict, and Ambivalence: Complementary or Competing Perspectives on Intergenerational Relationships? *Journal of Marriage and Family* 64: 568-576.

Bozalek V (2014) Integrating difference and care into social justice: Towards a normative framework for care, welfare and social cohesion. In Vasu Reddy, Stephan Meyer, Tamara Shefer, Thenjiwe Meyiwa, eds., *Care in Context: Transnational gender perspectives*. Johannesburg. HSRC Press.

Budlender D and Lund F (2011). South Africa: A Legacy of Family Disruption. *Development and Change* 42(4): 925-946.

Button, K 2017. The impact of intergenerational negotiations and power dynamics on the burden of care experienced by low-income grandmothers. *CSSR Working Paper* no. 400. The Centre for Social Science Research, University of Cape Town.

Button, K, Moore, E & Seekings J (2018) South Africa's Hybrid Care Regime: The changing and contested roles of individuals, families and the state after apartheid. *Current Sociology* 66(4): 602-616.

Case A, Hosegood V, and Lund F (2005) The reach and impact of Child Support Grants: evidence from KwaZulu-Natal. *Development Southern Africa,* 22(4): 467-482.

Casale D and Posel D (2006) Migration and Remittances in South Africa: Background document on migration and first set of draft questions for inclusion in the National Income Dynamics Study. Cape Town: SALDRU, University of Cape Town.

Chazan M (2008) Seven "deadly" assumptions: unravelling the implications of HIV/AIDS among grandmothers in South Africa and beyond. *Ageing & Society* 28: 935- 958.

Delphy C and Leonard D (1992) *Familiar Exploitation: A New Analysis of Marriage in Contemporary Western Societies*. Cambridge, Mass: Polity Press.

Dubbeld B (2013) How social security becomes social insecurity: fluid households, crisis talk and the value of grants in a KwaZulu-Natal village. *Acta Juridica* 13: 197-218.

Dungumaro E.W. (2008) Gender differentials in household structure and socioeconomic characteristics in South Africa. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 39(4): 429-451.

Durham D (2017) Elusive adulthoods: An introduction. In Durham and Jacqueline Solway, eds. *Elusive Adulthoods: The Anthropology of New Maturities,* Indiana University Press.

Esping-Andersen G (1999) *Social Foundation of Postindustrial Economies*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fakier, K and Cock J (2009) A gendered analysis of the crisis of social reproduction in contemporary South Africa. *International Journal of Feminist Politics* 11(3): 353-371.

Ferguson J (2015). *Give a Man a Fish: Reflections on the New Politics of Distribution*. Duke University Press.

Gulbrandsen L and Langsethre A (2000) Wealth distribution between generations: A source of conflict or cohesion? In Arber, S and Attias-Donfut, C, eds., 69-88. *The Myth of Generational Conflict: the family and state in ageing societies*. London: Routledge.

Garcia M and Moore C (2012) *The Cash Dividend: The Rise of Cash Transfer Programs in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Washington D.C.: World Bank. 1-10.

Golaz V, Wandera S O, and Rutaremwa G (2017). Understanding the vulnerability of older adults: extent of and breaches in support systems in Uganda. *Ageing and Society* 37(1): 63-89.

Goldblatt B (2005) Gender and social assistance in the first decade of democracy: a case study of South Africa's Child Support Grant. *Politikon: South African Journal of Political Studies* 32(2): 239-257.

Goldblatt B (2009) Gender, rights and the disability grant in South Africa. *Development Southern Africa* 26(3): 369-382.

Gough, I. (2013) Social policy regimes in the developing world. In Kennett, Patricia, ed., 205-224. *A Handbook of comparative social policy*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.

Gouws A and van Zyl M (2014) Feminist ethics of care through a Southern lens. In Vasu Reddy, Stephan Meyer, Tamara Shefer, Thenjiwe Meyiwa eds., 99-125. *Care in Context: Transnational gender perspectives*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Gray M, Edwards B, Hayes A, and Baxter J (2009) The impacts of recessions on families. *Family Matters: Australian Institute of Family Studies* 83: 7-14.

Harper, S. & Seekings, J. (2010) Claims and obligations to kin in Cape Town, South Africa. *CSSR Working Paper* no. 272. Centre for Social Science Research, University of Cape Town.

Hassim, S (2008) Social justice, care and developmental welfare in South Africa: A capabilities perspective. *Social Dynamics* 34 (2): 104-118.

Hanlon J, Barrientos A, and Hulme D (2010) *Just Give Money To The Poor: The Development Revolution from the Global South.* Sterling, VA: Kumarian Press.

Hochfeld T (2015) *Cash, Care and Social Justice: A study of the Child Support Grant*. PhD thesis. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand.

Hochfeld T and Plagerson S (2011) Dignity and stigma among South African female cash transfer recipients. *IDS Bulletin* 42(6): 53-9.

Hosegood V and Madhavan S (2012) Understanding Fatherhood and Father Involvement in South Africa: Insights from surveys and population cohorts. *Fathering* 10(3): 257–273.

Ikels C (2004) Filial Piety: Practice and discourse in contemporary East Asia, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Klasen S and Woolard I (2005) Surviving unemployment without state support: unemployment and household formation in South Africa. *CSSR Working Paper* No. 129. Centre for Social Science Research, University of Cape Town: Cape Town.

Kohli M, Kunemund H, Motel A and Szydlik M. (2000) Families apart? Intergenerational transfers in East and West Germany. In Arber, S and Attias-Donfut, C, eds., 88-100. *The Myth of Generational Conflict: the family and state in ageing societies*. London: Routledge.

Kimuna S and Makiwane M (2007) Older people as resources in South Africa: Mpumalanga households. *Journal of Aging & Social Policy* 19(1): 97-114.

Lewis J (1992) Gender and the development of welfare regimes. *Journal of European Social Policy* 2: 31-48.

Leitner S (2003) Varieties of familialism: The caring function of the family in comparative perspective. *European Societies* 5(4): 353-375.

Lüscher K and Pillemer K (1998). Intergenerational ambivalence: A new approach to the study of parent-child relations in later life. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 60: 413-425.

MacLean A, Harden J and Backett-Milburn K (2010) Financial trajectories: how parents and children discussed the impact of the recession. *Twenty-First Century Society* 5(2): 159-17.

Mathis S (2011) Disobedient Daughters? Changing Women's Role in Rural Households in KwaZulu-Natal. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 37 (4): 831–48.

Mhongo C and Budlender D (2013) Declining Rates of Marriage in South Africa: What do the numbers and analysts say? In A. Claasens and D. Smythe, eds, 181-196. *Marriage, Land and Custom: Essays on law and social change in South Africa*. Cape Town: Juta.

Mosoetsa S (2011) *Eating from One Pot: The Dynamics of Survival in Poor South African Households*. Johannesburg, Wits University Press.

Murray C (1981) Families Divided: The impact of migrant labour in Lesotho. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ogunmefun C and Schatz E (2009) Caregivers' sacrifices: The opportunity costs of adult morbidity and mortality for female pensioners in rural South Africa. *Development Southern Africa* 26(1): 95-109.

Orloff A (1993) Gender and the social rights of citizenship: the comparative analysis of gender relations and welfare states. *American Sociological Review* 58: 303028.

Patel L (2012) Poverty, Gender and Social Protection: Child Support Grants in Soweto, South Africa. *Journal of Policy Practice* 11(1-2): 106-120.

Patel L and Hochfeld T (2011) It buys food but does it change gender relations? Child Support Grants in Soweto, South Africa. *Gender & Development* 19(2): 229-240.

Plagerson S, Harpham T, and Kielmann K (2012) Cash transfers and citizenship: Evidence from South Africa. *Journal of Development Studies* 48(7): 969-982.

Posel D (2006) Moving On: Patterns of labour migration in post-apartheid South Africa. In M. Tienda, S. Findley, S. Tollman and E. Preston-Whyte, eds, 217–231. *Africa on the Move: African migration and urbanisation in comparative perspective*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Posel D (2010) Households and Labour Migration in Post-Apartheid South Africa. *Studies in Economics and Econometrics* 32(3):129–141.

Posel D and Devey R (2006) The Demographics of Fathers in South Africa: An analysis of survey data, 1993–2002. In Richter and Morrell, eds., 38–52.

Posel D and Rogan M (2009) Women, income and poverty: Gendered access to resources in post-apartheid South Africa. *Agenda* 81(23): 25-34.

Posel D and Rogan M (2012) Gendered trends in poverty in the post-apartheid period, 1997-2006. *Development Southern Africa,* 29(1): 97-113.

Ramphele M (1993). *A Bed Called Home: Life in the Migrant Labour Hostels of Cape Town.* Ohio: Ohio University Press.

Reddy V, Meyer S, Shefer T, and Meyiwa T (2013) *Care in Context: Transnational gender perspectives*. Johannesburg: HSRC Press.

Richter L (2010) Social cash transfers to support children and families affected by HIV/AIDS. *Vulnerable Children and Youth Studies* 5(Suppl 1): 81-91.

Russell M (2003) Understanding Black Households: The problem. *Social Dynamics* 29(Special Issue 2): 5–47.

Sagner A and Mtati R (1999) Politics of pension sharing in urban South Africa. *Ageing and Society* 19(4): 393-416.

Schatz E (2007) 'Taking care of my own blood': Older women's relationships to their households in rural South Africa. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health* 35: 147-157.

Schatz E and Madhavan S (2011) Headship of older persons in the context of HIV/AIDS in rural South Africa. *African Population Studies* 25(2): 440-456.

Schatz E and Ogunmefun C (2007) Caring and contributing: the role of older women in rural South African multi-generational households in the HIV/AIDS era. *World Development* 35(8): 1390-1403.

Seekings J (2017) The discourse of dependency and the agrarian roots of welfare doctrines in Africa: The case of Botswana. In Michael Nollert and Daniel Kuenzler, eds., *Sozialpolitik.*

Seekings J and Nattrass N (2015) *Policy, Politics and Poverty in South Africa*. London: Palgrave.

Seekings J & Moore, E (2014) Kinship, market and state in the provision of care in South Africa. *Soziale Welt.* Sonderband 20, Nomos: Baden-Baden. 435-451.

Seekings J (2011) Measuring the Gendered Consequences of AIDS. Householding and Poverty in South Africa. In Jennifer Klot & Vinh-Kim Nguyen, eds., 423–4. *The Fourth Wave. An Assault on Women. Gender, Culture and HIV in the 21st Century*. New York: UNESCO.

Seekings J (2008) Beyond Fluidity: Kinship and Households as Social Projects. *CSSR Working Paper* no.237. Cape Town: Centre for Social Science Research, University of Cape Town, 2008.

Seekings J & Nattrass N (2005) *Class, Race and Inequality in South Africa,* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Spiegel A, Watson V and Wilkinson P (1996) Domestic Diversity and Fluidity among Some African Households in Greater Cape Town. *Social Dynamics* 22(1): 7–30.

Statistics South Africa (2017a) Poverty trends in South Africa: An examination of absolute poverty between 2006 and 2015 / Statistics South Africa. Pretoria.

Statistics South Africa (2017b) *Quarterly Labour Force Survey, Quarter 4: 2016. (Statistical Release P0211)*. Statistics South Africa: Pretoria.

Statistics South Africa (2013) *Social profile of vulnerable groups: 2002- 2012. (Report No. 03-19-00)*. Statistics South Africa: Pretoria.

Tobio Solar C (2012) Reciprocity and solidarity in intergenerational relationships: Spain, France and Norway in comparative perspective. *Papers* 97 (4): 849-873.

Urdang S (2006) The Care Economy: Gender and the Silent AIDS Crisis in Southern Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 32(1): 165-177.

Van Dongen E (2008) "That was out time…this is ours!" Memories and intergenerational conflicts in South Africa. In Alber E, van der Geest S, and Reynolds Whyte S, eds., 183-202. *Generations in Africa: Connections and Conflicts.* London: Global Book Marketing.

Vanhuysse P, Goerres A (eds) (2012) *Ageing populations in postindustrial democracies: comparative studies of policies and politics*. Abingdon, Oxon, New York: Routledge.

Von Gliszczynski M, and Leisering L (2016) Constructing new global models of social security: How international organizations defined the field of social cash transfers in the 2000s. *Journal of Social Policy* 45(2): 325-343.

West A and Lewis J (2018) *Helicopter Parenting and Boomerang Children: How Parents Support and Relate to Their Student and Co-Resident Graduate Children.* London: Routledge.

Wright G, Neves D, Ntshongwana P and Noble M (2015) Social assistance and dignity: South African women's experiences of the child support grant. *Development Southern Africa* 32(4): 443-457.

Zembe-Mkabile W, Surrender R, Sanders D, Jackson D, and Doherty T (2015) The experience of cash transfers in alleviating childhood poverty in South Africa: Mothers' experiences of the Child Support Grant. *Global Public Health*, 1-18.

Zulu E.M and Sibanda A (2005) Racial differences in household structure. In T. Zuberi, A. Sibanda & E. Udjo, eds., 218-252. *The Demography of South Africa.* New York: M.E. Sharp Publishers.

[1] http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&language=en&pcode=tps00198&plugin=1
[2] http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Unemployment_statistics#Youth_unemployment