

**ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE MENTORSHIP PROGRAMME
IN LAND REFORM: A CASE OF LAND RESTITUTION IN SEKHUKHUNE
DISTRICT, LIMPOPO PROVINCE**

by

NYIKO SHADRACK GOLELE

Mini-dissertation

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of

MASTER OF DEVELOPMENT

In the

FACULTY OF MANAGEMENT AND LAW

(Graduate School of Leadership)

at the

University of Limpopo

Supervisor: **Professor G. Makombe**

2016

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my father, Mashila, Mother, Sasavona Golele, brothers and sisters Piet, Nkhesani, Hlamalani, Xikombiso, Tlangelani, Dzunisani and Langutela for their moral support throughout my life. Sincere gratitude to my in laws Phahlela and Phephu Chauke. Not forgetting my late uncle, Daniel Gabeni and my cousin Edwin Ntsan'wisi, and my late grandmothers N'wa Mdungwazi and N'wa Machavi. May their souls rest in peace.

DECLARATION

I declare that the mini-dissertation hereby submitted to the University of Limpopo for the degree of Master in Development and Management Sciences has not previously been submitted by me for a degree at this or any other university, that it is my work in design and in execution, and that all materials contained therein has been duly acknowledged.

.....
Mr. Golele Nyiko Shadrack

.....
DATE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost I want to thank God. Had it not been for His intervention in my life I might not have achieved what I have achieved thus far. He has helped me to overcome impediments, sicknesses and the impasse of this long walk.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Makombe, for sacrificing his time and providing me with his support, constructive suggestions and guidance during this research.

I would also like to express my appreciation to all the land reform beneficiaries that were interviewed, mentors, officials from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform for sharing their time; giving me essential information and providing their support during my field work. Without their cooperation, patience and understanding, this work would not have been successful. Ms. Mamaila Mothiba you are a star, your contribution in this paper is much appreciated and may God richly bless you my sister.

I extend words of gratitude to my brothers and sisters for their moral support throughout the duration of the study. Not only did they make it possible for me to do my Master's degree but through supporting me financially, emotionally and through much prayer, they have given me the most wonderful present.

To my sons Ntokoto, Ndzalo (Kuhlula) and my daughter Rivoningo, you are the reason for me to enrol for the Master's degree. You are so special to me.

To my wife, Tinyiko Golele, for your support, love, patience and understanding during my studies, thank you very much my beautiful angel.

ABSTRACT

In South Africa, the Land Reform Programme is a priority programme aimed to address land ownership through land redistribution and restitution programmes. The aim of this study was to assess the effectiveness of the mentorship programme in land reform programme. The study adopted a qualitative approach in which one mentor, three executive committee members, 20 protégé's (new farmers) and a manager from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform were interviewed.

The findings show that there are essential qualities and characteristics that a mentor and Protégé should possess to ensure a successful mentorship programme. The qualities linked to a mentor include a good commended, traceable track record; he/she must be people's person (that is, he/she must be able to get along with people); a motivator to other people; he/she must be able to make people productive and take firm decisions; and must be a knowledgeable, respectful and trustworthy person. The 'ideal' protégé should be honest, committed, respectful and hard working. The characteristics of a mentee include honesty, passionate with farming and reliability. All these qualities must be undergirded by a good mentorship relationship between a mentor and mentee, a condition which is crucial for success. The study also found out that a lack of respect from either the mentor or mentee, a lack of willingness to cooperate, a lack of commitment have the potential to lead to negative impact on the mentorship programme and affects farm production. Due to the fact that the mentorship programme applies a participatory approach, beneficiaries are at liberty to select their own mentor. They also have the opportunity to make input when a land use plan and a business plan are developed.

Key words: Mentorship; beneficiary, land reform; agriculture; business plan; sustainability and recapitalisation.

Table of contents

	Page
DEDICATION	i
DECLARATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES	v
LIST OF ACRONYMS	vi
CHAPTER ONE: ORIENTATION OF THE STUDY	1
1. Introduction and background	1
1.1. Food security in South Africa.....	3
1.2. Relationship between mentorship and food security	4
1.3. Sustainable livelihood	5
1.4. Sustainable livelihood concept.....	6
1.5. Sustainable livelihood approach	6
1.6. The mentorship programme a solution to land reform farmers	7
1.7. Land reform concept in South Africa	9
1.8. National development plan and challenges faced by land reform farmers in	11
South Africa.....	11
1.9. Problem statement	14
1.10. Aim of the study	15
1.11. Objectives of the study	15
1.12. Significance of the study	16
1.13. Research question	16
1.14. Definition of concepts	16
1.14. Ethical considerations.....	17
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	18
2. Introduction	18
2.1. Government determination to alleviate poverty through agriculture.....	18
2.2. Land Reform Policies in South Africa.....	20
2.3. Agriculture, land redistribution and access to markets by land reform beneficiaries	21

2.4. Rural livelihood strategies	22
2.5. Extension service	24
2.6. The mentorship	24
2.7. Strategies implemented by government to address food security in South Africa	29
2.8. Conclusion	32
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	33
3. Introduction	33
3.1. Research Design and Rationale	34
3.2. Study Area	35
3.3. Population	37
3.4. Sample	38
3.5. Data Collection Method	39
3.6. Data Analysis	39
3.7. Limitations of the study	39
3.8. Conclusion	40
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND ANALYSIS	41
4. Introduction	41
4.1 Project funding	42
4.2 FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS FOR 20 FARMERS WITH A MENTOR	42
4.3 Insights from the interview with the mentor	54
4.4 Interview with executive committee members of Ba Bina Noko CPA	60
4.5 RESPONSE BY KEY INFORMANT (LIMPOPO DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND LAND REFORM)	69
4.6 Discussion and synthesis	73
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	76
5. Introduction	76
5.1 Unemployment	76
5.2 Stakeholder collaboration	77
5.3. Skills transfer	77
5.4 Mentorship legal contracts	77
5.5. RECOMMENDATIONS	78
5.5.1. Unemployment	78
5.5.2. Stakeholders	78

5.5.3. Skills advancement	78
5.5.4. Mentorship legal contracts.....	79
5.5.5. Remuneration for a mentor and employees.....	79
5.5.6. Mentorship funding	79
REFERENCES	80
ANNEXURE 1: RESEARCH QUESTIONS	92
ANNEXURE 2: PERMISSION LETTER.....	98

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1.1: Land ownership in South Africa

Table 3.1: Land Use Patterns in the Greater Sekhukhune District Municipality

Table 4.1: Profit margins per commodity on Ba Bina Noko Farm

Figure 3.1: Map for Sekhukhune District Municipality

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CASP: Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme

CPA: Communal Property Association

DFI: Development Finance Institution

DFID: Department for International Development

DRDLR: Department of Rural Development and Land Reform

ESTA: Extension of Security Tenure Act

ERP: Extension Recovery Programme

FAO: Food Agricultural Organisation

GDP: Gross Domestic Product

GSDM: Greater Sekhukhune District Municipality

HDI: Human Development Index

HSRC: Human Science Research Council

IDS: Institute for Development Studies

IFSS: Integrated Food Security Strategy

INP: Integrated Nutrition Programme

LPG: Limpopo Provincial Government

LRA: Land Reform Act

LRAD: Land Redistribution For Agricultural Development

MAFISA: Micro Agricultural Finance Initiative of South Africa

MDG: Millennium Development Goal

NDA: National Development Plan

NGO: Non-Governmental Organisation:

PAETA: Primary Agriculture Education and Training Authority

PLAS: Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy

PSC: Public Service Commission

RADP: Recapitalisation and Development Programme

RSA: South Africa

R &T: Road and Transport

SACGA: South African Cane Growers' Association

StatsSA: Statistics South Africa

SL: Sustainable Livelihoods

SLA: Sustainable Livelihood Approach

SMME: Small, Micro and Medium Enterprises

UNDP: United Nations Development Programme

CHAPTER ONE: ORIENTATION OF THE STUDY

1. Introduction and background

The majority of rural households in South Africa live under severe poverty. Agriculture is the predominant economic activity for rural households in the country, with about 8.5 million people depending directly or indirectly on agriculture for their livelihood (StatsSA, 2011). This indicates that agriculture remains at the core of rural development, and has a positive influence in the country's economic growth.

The Sekhukhune district municipality has 740 villages, mushrooming urban areas as well (StatsSA, 2011). The district has a mixture of commercial and subsistence agriculture, with subsistence farming being predominant in rural areas. Despite agriculture being the vital contributor to employment within the district, it remains a relatively marginal contributor (approximately 9.7%) to the aggregate GDP of the district (StatsSA, 2011). Rural farmers are struggling to access markets for their produce.

According to Maponya and Moja (2012), 63% of households within the district are food insecure and levels of hunger are on the increase. More than 50% of the district population reside in rural areas, thus there is a need for development of local agriculture, with skills and access to markets. Facilitating the establishment of viable markets is a vital part of rural development and agricultural development in the district. Land restitution in South African is to address the needs of individuals and communities who were forcibly removed from settled land in terms of the Land Acts of 1913 and 1936. The Land Restitution Act no 22 of 1994 provides the legal framework and procedure for affected communities to submit claims for the restoration of lost right (The Land Restitution Act no 22 of 1994 as amended).

In this regard, more than 80 000 urban and rural land claims were submitted (The Land Restitution Act no 22 of 1994 as amended). The statistics from rural development land in South Africa (2014/15) shows that to date more that 90% of the claims are settled through willing sellers. However, the majority of the agricultural

restitution projects fail production, investments is lost and dreams of improved quality of life have proved to be a nightmare. The major problem is that beneficiaries lack agricultural and management skills. The Department of Rural Development and Land Reform introduced a mentorship programme to assist farmers with skills in order to improve production and create jobs.

The performance of restituted agricultural land projects, however, shows that the economic objectives are not attained. The economic focus of the restitution of agricultural land to dispossessed rural people must be to alleviate rural poverty, through increased and sustained agricultural production in order to ensure food security. Improved agricultural productivity can provide surplus production for the market to improve household incomes.

Table1.1 shows that the total area of land ownership in South Africa is 122 million hactares, with 100 million hacteres of farm land. The white owned commercial farms account for 82 million hactares and the land targeted for land reform is 24.5 million hactares, while land owned by blacks mainly in former homelands is 3 million hactares. There is 26 million hactares owned by state.

TABLE 1.1 Land ownership in South Africa

OWNERSHIP	HACTARES
Total area	122 million ha
Farm land	100 million ha
White-owned commercial agricultural land	82 million ha
Target for land reform	24.5 million ha (30% of the 82 million ha)
Only 13.7% of total land area	
Land owned by blacks mainly in former homelands	3 million ha of high quality agricultural land.
State Land	26 million hectares (22%)
Arable land	13.7% of the land area (16,7 million hectares).

Source: CDE, 2005; Nkwinti, 2013

1.1. Food security in South Africa

FAO (2006) reports that the South African government adopted a healthy approach to the society by encouraging people to consume healthy food and do extra mural activities for healthy lifestyle which seeks to ensure that the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) that aims to eradicate hunger, malnutrition and food insecurity is achieved by 2015.

A 2006 survey by the Development Bank of South Africa (DBSA) highlights the complicated relationships between food security and land in an era where the land reform programme is battling to meet its targets of redistribution, satisfactorily providing post settlement support and present win-win solutions for private land owners with constitutional property rights and land reform beneficiaries who may not share the same agribusiness interests (Mclachlan and Thorne, 2009). Of the 1.3 million black South Africans who have access to farming land, of which 97% are engaged in farming activities, most are located in districts which have been identified as presidential poverty nodes (Mclachlan and Thorne, 2009).

This means that people in such districts live in extreme poverty. Findings from the General Household Survey conducted in 2006 by the DBSA explain that these districts are geographically mainly found in dry parts of the country, thus forcing the people who live in these communities to engage in dry-land agriculture which produces low yields. These yields are naturally only enough to their basic food needs (Mclachlan and Thorne, 2009).

The main reason why farmers engage in crop production activities is predominantly as a source of extra supplementary food (74%). Only a few see it as the main source of income (3%) and food (9%) respectively. This figure may seem insignificant yet on the other hand re-amplifies the constant argument of the landless and poor, that land is a valuable asset in rural livelihood strategies. Even though 64.5% of South African households have access to at least some land (less than 0.5 hectare) and those with land up to the 20 hectares were only 2.7% there has been a dramatic drop in subsistence/supplementary production in the past ten years (Mclachlan and Thorne, 2009). Various reasons have been cited to explain this downward trend, amongst

which are, insecure tenure rights, lack of extension services and research on subsistence farming systems as well the adverse climatic conditions, factors which have increased the risk of farming (Mclachlan and Thorne, 2009).

Food security is a national and international discourse for politicians, academics, and civil society. Global summits that resulted in the signing of declarations and construction of institutional bodies to see to it that food security is made a human right for all have not gone unnoticed. However, the impact of South African government interventions aimed at addressing malnutrition and hunger amongst other economic and social plights have often gone unnoticed by the public because there is no delivery to be noticed (FAO, 2012).

There is therefore dire need to ensure that programs such as the Integrated Food Security Strategy (IFSS) and Integrated Nutrition Programme (INP) do not end up as superfluous government programs but as plans that deliver measurable sustainable outcomes that augment rural people's livelihoods. Though it is clear that some government departments are experiencing budgetary and institutional capacity constraints, these delivery setbacks need interrogation and remedy. Other alternatives to these national plans need to be introduced, with the help of external partners so as to combat hunger. It is in the government's interest to attempt to learn more, develop its capacity and renew its commitment to serve the people (FOA, 2012).

1.2. Relationship between mentorship and food security

In the South African agricultural sector, the categorisation of business enterprises into size and volume is usually done in terms of subsistence, semi-commercial (also called emerging) and commercial enterprises. These categories do not clearly distinguish small, micro and medium enterprises (SMME) as defined by the National Small Business Act 102 of 1996. Therefore, the SMME definition in agricultural enterprises or the agricultural sector in South Africa differs from the common definition of the SMME's in other sectors. On this basis, farming SMMEs in the South African context are formed through individual, groups and government initiatives such as Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD). These initiatives

were started in 1994 by the first democratically elected government of South Africa (Ortmann and King, 2007). The objective of these aforesaid initiatives was to ensure that the previously disadvantaged South Africans are provided with the opportunity to own and utilise productive land for agricultural purposes.

Farming SMMEs arising from Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) and Land Restitution face a lot of challenges during both pre- and post-settlement phases; such challenges relate to lack of access to production inputs, credit, marketing information, value addition and value chains (Ortmann and King, 2007). In addition, these enterprises lack proper business mentorship from their designated extension officers leading to a lack of well-defined shareholding status (in the case of the business entities other than sole proprietorship) and contribution to farming activities.

Despite these challenges, farming SMMEs are considered a cornerstone to development, job creation and food security (Fete, 2010). Management, marketing, training and infrastructure capacity are amongst the factors that play an important role in achieving the competitive advantage of any individual or any business entity, including a farming enterprise, irrespective of its size or the number of people involved (Ortmann and King, 2007). These skills categories are needed also by emerging farmers, and should ideally be imparted to them by extension services. In order to impart such skills, extension workers should themselves be well versed in these fields.

1.3. Sustainable livelihood

The section starts by explaining the sustainable livelihood concept, and then it explains the sustainable livelihood approach (SLA) and the sustainable livelihood framework. Mentorship can promote livelihood of farmers where management, marketing, training and infrastructure capacity are amongst the factors that play a role in achieving the competitive advantage of any individual or any business entity, including a farming enterprise, irrespective of its size or the number of people involved (Ortmann and King, 2007, Nell and Napier, 2006).

Ortmann and King (2007), Nell and Napier (2006) stress that these skills categories are needed also by emerging farmers, and should ideally be imparted to them by extension services. In order to impart such skills, extension workers should themselves be well versed in these fields.

1.4. Sustainable livelihood concept

The sustainable livelihoods idea was discussed by the Brundtland Commission on Environment and Development, and the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development expanded the concept, advocating for the achievement of sustainable livelihoods as a broad goal for poverty eradication (Krantz, 2001). In 1992 Robert Chambers and Gordon Conway introduced a combined definition of the sustainable rural livelihood, which is most used at the household level. A livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (stores, resources, claims and access) and activities required as a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stress and shocks, maintain or enhance its capabilities and asset (Scoones, 1998). A livelihood is only sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stress and shocks, maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets, and provide sustainable livelihood opportunities for the next generation; and which contributes net benefits to other livelihoods at the local and global levels and in the long and short term (Majale, 2002).

1.5. Sustainable livelihood approach

Majale (2002) describes the sustainable livelihoods approach as a multi-disciplinary approach that tries to capture, and provide understanding of the fundamental causes and dimensions of poverty without collapsing the focus onto just a few factors for example, economic issues, food security and others. The term livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets and activities required as a means of living. Households are the main focus rather than the resources that government is giving them. SLA is used to discover opportunities available to poor people. The Limpopo people are mainly practising farming as a source of food and a source of income. Approximately

92 per cent of rural households practice agriculture as a source of food, and about 10 per cent are employed in agriculture (Cousins, 2013).

Black smallholders in the provinces are categorised as, the Eastern Cape 675, Free State 799, KwaZulu-Natal 690, Limpopo 291, Mpumalanga 444, Northern Cape 271, North West 300 and Western Cape 223 (Greenberg,2010). In all these provinces, the percentage of black households engaged in agriculture is between 57 and 72 (Cousins, 2013).

Summaries of available national data with regard to small-scale agriculture in South Africa show that in 2006 the average per capita income per annum was approximately R4,600 for households that depend on farming as their main source of food, and farmers who undertook farming as their main source of income earned approximately R9,000 (Cousins, 2013). This may be because households that are richer are more likely to produce more and earn more from farming since they have more access to production resources than poor households. The summary of the study presented by Cousins (2013) also shows that agriculture contributes a relatively small share of total household income.

The Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) defines agricultural extension and mentoring as a service or system, which assists farmers, through educational procedures, in improving farming methods and techniques, increasing production efficiency and income, improving their standard of living, and increasing the social and educational standards of rural life (Swanson and Claar, 1984). Training is one of the most essential skills of farming, which implies an assumption that the beneficiaries either already possess such skills or that they will acquire the necessary training themselves. Such training needs are sure to be extensive (Swanson and Claar, 1984).

1.6. The mentorship programme a solution to land reform farmers

In business today coaching and mentorship are buzzwords, the trends of the moment (Stout-Roston, 2007) and more and more organizations/institutions are busy developing and structuring mentorship programmes. Mentorship however can differ

depending on the profession involved and workplace practices where it is implemented. The concept, mentorship, can be taken back many years to the Greek mythology, when Odysseus, the Greek poet, took his son Telemachus to his friend Mentor and requested him to guide, coach and raise him in life skills while he was away from home for a long time (Adams and Scott, 1997). In the agricultural sector in South Africa and more specifically with regard to land reform, there is an outcry by land reform beneficiaries that they need mentors to support them. There are a number of examples of mentorship successes, but unfortunately also failures.

The mentorship model endeavours to maintain or resuscitate the production capacity of restituted and redistributed farms. This is intended to save jobs, reduce poverty and confer food security amongst beneficiary communities. The principal form of natural capital and basic livelihood asset in a rural area is land from which people produce food to solve the problem of food insecurity. Poverty eradication in rural areas may be overcome by access to land and security of land rights. Farming can reduce unemployment from families having access to land which increases labour and production (Quan, 2000).

Since the mentorship model aims to improve the quality of life of land reform beneficiaries, to what extent are the beneficiaries' socio-economic needs met? This question needs to be addressed so as to inform future policy attempting to improve the productivity of emerging farmers in land reform.

The government appoint mentors to work with the Land Reform beneficiaries and mentors are expected to:

- (i) Develop business plans in consultation with the beneficiaries, Department of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development and Land Reform and any other interested parties, including markets.
- (ii) Transfer skills to the land reform beneficiaries, which must include: financial skills, marketing, business skills, cooperate governance and general farm management.
- (iii) Have the relevant skills including basic book keeping and asset management.

The mentor signs contracts with government, which is a five-year contract of working with the beneficiaries. It is the responsibility of government to pay/remunerate the mentor on the first year of mentoring and from the second year onwards it is expected that the business will be making profits and mentors' salary will be determined by the directors of the company and will depend on profits. Successful outcomes of mentorship programmes depend heavily on the successful development of mentoring relationships between mentors and the protégés. There is, however, no single formula for good mentoring. Mentorship can be regarded as a career development option for individuals in an organisation. One could also structure mentored learning for staff members or even other individuals in a community.

1.7. Land reform concept in South Africa

South Africa suffered a long history of colonization, racial domination and land dispossession that resulted in the bulk of the agricultural land being owned by a white minority (Rugege, 2004). The promulgation of the 1913 and 1936 Land Acts, the Group Areas Act of 1950 and the various land-based acts resulted in black people being landless. The acts constrained access for Africans as owners of the country's economy, thus reducing them to cheap labourers (Rugege, 2004).

The high hopes of land restoration and redistribution to blacks were strengthened by the reconstruction and development programme which was committed to redistributing 30% of agricultural land to black people within five years (Twala, 2010) and thus alleviate poverty. According to Twala (2010), the first step by the newly democratically elected South African government of 1994 was to remove the Black Land Act 27 of 1913. In spite of the operation of the land reform programmes, there are many unanswered questions around socio-economic factors targeting beneficiaries of these programmes, and the extent to which the projects have led to the improvement of the beneficiaries' livelihoods.

Turning the acquired land into productive and sustainable forms of land use that benefit the masses of the rural poor and landless still remains to be seen (Ntsebeza, 2007). The majority of the beneficiaries remain voiceless because of a lack of

resources (Kahn, 2007). The social redress made by the land reform programmes has failed the poor people of South Africa (Kahn, 2007).

According to Deininger and Binswanger (1999), there is a wide range of objectives in addressing land reform. Some regimes aimed to augment productivity and lessen poverty, while others aimed at quickening social turmoil and allaying political pressure from peasant organisations. In particular, land reform aims at changing agrarian structure (De Janvry, 1981). Currently, the main drive for land reform in South Africa is to increase the number of small and medium-scale farmers, to intensify land use as well as enlarge the scope for enhancing rural incomes (Quan, 2000). Restitution provides for the restoring of land rights to a person who was or communities who were disposed of rights to land after 19 June 1913 from racially-based laws or practices (Lahiff, 2001).

Restitution is part of redressing the injustice of the past and at the same time it is considered to be a process of change in rural societies. Disappointing performances of land reform projects may be attributed partly to the weaknesses identified in the market based approach which slowed down the progress of land restitution, redistribution and tenure processes (Ntsebeza, 2007). During the apartheid era, different South African ethnic groups had livelihoods that were almost all land based.

The parts of land allocated to African (black) people were known as Native Areas and represented only seven percent of the total land area. From 1910 white farmers turned commercial, but after 1960 they became even more commercial due to the transformation of the farming techniques (animal draught replaced by tractors). But this particular development was not implemented in the native areas (Cokwana, 1988). According to StatSA (2009), approximately 70 percent of rural people are poor due to the inability of the rural economies to provide them with formal or informal employment opportunities.

However, since the beginning of the 21st century the importance of farming to rural livelihoods has decreased due to a number of factors (social, economic and political). The limited overall importance of farming in rural livelihoods in South Africa was adequately illustrated by Van Averbeke (2008), and Orkin (2000). Using the 1996 census data and the 1997 rural survey data, they counted 1 449 000 homesteads in the former homelands that held arable land (about 50 per cent had

less than 1 ha) (Van Averbek, 2008). As a result of this, those rural areas contribute very little to the economy of the country. In spite of the various projects initiated over the years, there is no significant change in rural livelihoods.

According to Jacobs (2009), the livelihoods strategies of the rural poor are off-farm and on-farm activities. Most of these livelihoods combine their off-farm and on-farm income to sustain their living. A large number of these poor households depend on agriculture. In South Africa, most of the poor households depend on farming activities (livestock and cropping). In these farms, land productivity is threatened by various factors such as the shortage of land, and land degradation (Jacobs (2009)). Rural households employ various food-coping strategies to alleviate food stress or poor food availability.

According to Lahiff (2008), critical land reform should address issues of poverty alleviation through alternative economic opportunities. Abalu (1999) and May (2000) argue that agriculture is one of the main sources contributing to livelihood strategies and underpinning food security in rural areas in South Africa.

1.8. National development plan and challenges faced by land reform farmers in South Africa

According to Sasol (2006), one of the biggest challenges faced by emerging farmers in setting up sustainable and competitive farms is the application of old cultural farming knowledge in an industry that has become technologically advanced. For example, "The mentorship programme was designed to provide emerging farmers with the support and practical experience to navigate the modern dairy industry landscape and ensure sustainable and long-term productivity" (Sasol, 2006:6). Emerging farmers do not have the necessary skills and training to cope with the complex agricultural situation of today. Many are illiterate and have little access to information on the technical and other aspects of agricultural production.

According to Sasol (2006), the National Development Plan asserts that various models of land acquisition and redistribution should be considered to resolve the slow pace of land reform and the lack of successful implementation of policy at the

local level. With this in mind, the NDP contends that land reform should be based on the following principles:

- (i) Make space for more rapid transfer of agricultural land to black land reform beneficiaries without diminishing private sector confidence in agribusiness or causing distortion of land markets;
- (ii) Provide essential opportunities for education and skills transfer to land reform beneficiaries to promote sustainable and productive land use;
- (iii) Ensure that cases of opportunism, speculation and corruption in land markets are prevented through effective monitoring institutions;
- (iv) Change land-transfer targets to better match economic realities so that land is transferred rapidly and efficiently, and
- (v) Provide opportunities for white commercial farmers and the private sector to participate in land reform initiatives so that they can contribute to emergent black farmers' success (Sasol, 2006).

The NDP proposes the establishment of District Land and Agriculture Committees (DLACs) to:

- i) Integrate rural areas in the economy so that rural people share in its growth and prosperity; establish sufficient numbers of new black farmers in agriculture through accelerated land reform; ensure that agricultural development and inclusive rural economic growth are central outcomes of land reform; ensure that farm dwellers work with landowners to resolve the problem of tenure insecurity;
- ii) Give a voice to land reform beneficiaries and small farmers; enable landowners to play an active role in land reform, agricultural growth and rural economy transformation;
- iii) Encourage all stakeholders to forge a common approach to land reform and agriculture support; bring into production under-utilized land in commercial farming and communal areas; address household food security; improve the performance of agriculture on job creation, growth, land and income distribution; address climate change, and
- iv) Enhance the capacity across the spheres and sectors of government to coordinate planning and implement land reform, agricultural and rural

development; factor provincial, district and local municipality IDPs and Spatial Development Frameworks (Sasol, 2006).

According to Silungwe (2009), the land restitution model has been championed in South Africa and it is entrenched under the Constitution of South Africa with the purpose to address land dispossession that occurred during the apartheid period under the racially discriminatory Native Land Act of 1913. It is further indicated that the model is regulated through 'an expedited' extra-judicial method where claimants negotiate with the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights, and the remedies include, restoration of land, provision of alternative land, financial compensation and alternative relief, priority access to housing and land development programmes. The restitution model has suffered from institutional fragmentation, unnecessary litigation and lack of leadership (Silungwe, 2009).

According to the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (2013), the land reform managed to fund 281 farmers of the targeted 182 farms during the 2013/2014 financial year. These recapitalised farms were managed by the accredited mentors in order to improve production, access to market and skills transfer. Mr. M. Shabane Director-General for the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform indicated in the Annual Report for 2013/2014 that rural development managed to assist in capacity building to farmers and 6302 farmers were assisted on skills development and sustainable economic opportunities created by 2014 out of the targeted 3400 farmers. With regard to skills development and sustainable economic opportunities created by 2014, the department managed to transfer skills to 6302. Additional stakeholders were brought on board to assist with rural enterprise and industrial development projects and the spin-off was that these stakeholders provided training that was planned for. This includes training for council of stakeholders (Department of Rural Development and Land Reform, 2013).

1.9. Problem statement

Producing for the market calls for production resources, including production means such as land, water, on-farm and off-farm infrastructure, labour force, capital, and good management of the resources. In terms of external assistance, people existing in a situation of absolute poverty need immediate relief in order to survive, while those existing in relative poverty can hopefully benefit from development assistance which, ideally, should help them to become independent of such assistance.

Farms that were obtained through restitution programmes are not functioning at all, while others are merely operating at a subsistence level. Moreover, the cost of this approach to welfare and development is so high that no government in any low-income country can reasonably expect to meet the needs of all its people in the near future. According to Quan, (2000) the intended beneficiaries of rural development do not necessarily share the perception that programme planners have of their priority needs. As a result, services offered to the people were often rejected and or underutilised because they did not meet the needs, respect the sensitivities of the people concerned or respond to local realities (Quan, 2000).

The majority of the people who acquired farms through restitution programmes are previously dispossessed communal landowners, most of whom live in absolute poor conditions, do not have an agricultural background, and are illiterate and too poor to manage a farm at a commercial level. As for the restitution farms, the problems are exacerbated by the fact that many people from different backgrounds with diverse interests are compelled to work together on their restituted land. Moreover, they are expected to utilise the land productively.

According to Perret (2002), Ndleve (2012) and Obi (2011), even after a series of policy shifts designed to spur development in rural areas, poverty still persists in the former homelands of South Africa. The vast majority of smallholder farmers are still using outdated technology and they have constraints preventing them from becoming productive and profitable farmers. Smallholder farmers have limited access to resources such as water and land.

Aliber (2009) states that there is an observable decrease in the number of households engaged in subsistence farming as the main source of income.

Furthermore, the number of households diversifying out of farming is increasing. The decrease in the population engaged in primary production is associated with agricultural development, so this would have been a positive development if it were accompanied by enhanced livelihoods. Aliber (2005) indicates that there is evidence of deteriorating livelihoods and a rise in prices, which is positively driven by food shortages, among other factors. In many places, malnutrition has been observed. Protests over wages have become rife in recent years, suggesting that people are finding it difficult to make ends meet (Aliber, 2005).

Experience shows that most farms that are obtained through restitution programme do not perform as desired. Most people who obtain farms through restitution programme are previously dispossessed communal land owners, most of whom do not have previous farming experience and sufficient capital to run the farms on a sustainable basis. As for the restitution farms, the problems are compounded by the fact that many people with diverse interests are brought together due to a shared interest in the land being claimed. Other than the fact that these people have common interest in that they have lost their land rights on the same pieces of land, their other interests are often so dissimilar that it is unlikely that they may arrive at a common ground on how to utilise the land. (Quan, 2000 and Zimmerman, 2000).

1.10. Aim of the study

The aim of the study is to assess the effectiveness of the mentorship programme in land reform programme.

1.11. Objectives of the study

The objective of the study is to get an in-depth understanding of the effectiveness of mentorship programme.

1.12. Significance of the study

The study will assist government in assessing the effectiveness of a mentorship programme. The government is assisting the beneficiaries with recapitalisation grant funding. The outcome of the study will inform policy on whether the mentorship programme is assisting the beneficiaries in terms of skills transfer, job creation and improvement in livelihood.

1.13. Research question

How effective has the mentorship programme been in improving the livelihood of the beneficiaries?

1.14. Definition of concepts

The following are the definitions of concepts:

1.14.1. Land reform

Martin (1995) states that the concept of land reform is widely accepted to mean the redistribution of property or rights in land for the profit of the landless, tenants, and agricultural labourers. It is further stated that land reform is the process of assessing and modifying laws, regulations and customs relating to land ownership and land tenure (Stibbe and Dunkley, 1997).

1.14.2. Mentorship

Goosen (2004:21) states that a more simplified but descriptive definition of mentoring is simply someone who helps someone else to learn something the learner would otherwise have learned less well, more slowly, or not at all. Cluttebuck (1991) states that mentorship is “a formal relationship”. Goosen (2004), Meyer and Fourie (2004) note that mentorship is ‘the relationship between the experienced

person and a person with less experience in a specific field of expertise'. Mentorship can therefore be described as a formal intervention in a process of transferring skills, knowledge and wisdom from a more experienced person to a less experienced in a specific field of expertise.

Mentoring is “a method of teaching and learning that occurs amongst all types of individuals across all kinds of knowledge bases and settings.” In the workplace, mentoring normally consists of teaching, giving feedback, coaching on the job, counselling through change, and structuring on going contact over a designated period (Young & Wright, 2001). Finally, mentorship is career guidance and an individual development process in which competencies (professionalism) and insights are transferred by chosen people (mentors) to other people (protégés).

1.14.3. Emerging farmers

The National Department of Agriculture (NDA) defines emerging farmers as farmers who are the beneficiaries of one of government's land reform programmes e.g. Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) and Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP). Emerging farmers who are mainly dependent on state and semi-state organisations for support and finance including those farmers who consume and sell some portion of their harvest (NDA, 2006).

1.14. Ethical considerations

Welman, Kruger and Michell (2005) indicate that ethical considerations are important when participants are sourced for a study and participants must be involved when results are released. Ethical considerations must be taken into consideration, irrespective of the method used to gather data. The researcher arranged a meeting with the executive committee of the Communal Property Association (CPA) which is Ba Bina Noko CPA to request permission prior to the interviews with the beneficiaries. There were no promises for incentives for participating. The participants were not be forced to participate in the research if they felt uncomfortable.

Strydom and Venter (2002) also adds that the ethical privacy refers to individual rights to decide when, where, to whom, and to what extent his/her beliefs and behaviour will be revealed, and confidentiality refers to agreement between persons that limit others access to information. Anonymity means that when data are analysed they will not be associated with individuals but will be identified by codes. The researcher assured the respondents that there would be no information that would be identified by their names.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2. Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature on current livelihood strategies employed in rural areas globally and in South Africa. The chapter narrows down the discussion on the South African government's efforts to reduce poverty through agriculture, the government's contribution and the outcomes of government initiatives. Further, the chapter discusses the mentorship programme, the mentoring relationships, post land redistribution/restitution support and finally it discusses the sustainable livelihoods concept, the sustainable livelihoods approach. The specific focus of the study is on mentorship and the literature review assesses the key issues in mentoring.

2.1. Government determination to alleviate poverty through agriculture

The UNDP (2007) points out that poverty is all about a lack of power. Poverty alleviation should therefore address situations in which people are empowered to appreciate their rights and their responsible use of resources. Rather than thinking of the poor as needy persons waiting for hand-outs, their basic rights to common resources should be recognised and enforced. South Africa's democracy brought equal rights, but not everyone is accessing them. In terms of the Human Development Report of 2013, South Africa falls under the Medium Human Developed countries and is ranked number 121 with a human development index of 0.674, the same as that of Vanuatu (UNDP, 2013).

The South African education index of 2013 indicates that the country has 0.806% index, adult literacy index of 82.4%, and life expectancy index of 0.430%, GDP index of 0.786% (UNDP, 2013). Historical inequalities remain largely unaddressed by current economic policy, including black empowerment strategies. Unemployment figures are higher among women, and female-headed households are more likely to suffer from poverty (UNDP, 2007). Given the multi-dimensional nature of poverty, it is logical that South Africa has sought to address poverty from different dimensions.

The South African multi-dimensional poverty index in 2013 in terms of intensity of deprivation is 42.3%, the population vulnerable to poverty is 22.2%, the population in severe poverty is 2.4% and contribution of deprivation to overall poverty of education is 7.5%, health is 50.5% and standard of living is at 42.0% (UNDP, 2013).

The South African government's commitment to poverty reduction has been articulated in recent years through various national, provincial and local policy interventions (Ntsebeza, 2007). Since 1994, the South African government has introduced a large number of interventions to address poverty in its various manifestations. The most prominent interventions have focused on poverty (lack of income), human capital poverty (lack of education and skills), service poverty (lack of access to services and amenities), and asset poverty (lack of ownership of land and housing). These government interventions vary from child support and disability grants, subsidised water and electricity, housing, land redistribution and restitution, and various inter-departmental programmes such as the Expanded Public Works Programme.

In 2005 the Public Service Commission commenced a research process, where all government projects were compiled into a single database. This provided the statistical overview of most of the poverty reduction initiatives that make up the Poverty Reduction Programme. A definition was proposed for government to consider describing projects that focus on poverty reduction. The PSC established that there is little capacity in government to implement poverty reduction projects (Kariuki (2003) and (National Department of Agriculture) (2005). The projects are targeted at very poor people who need continued support to make a success of the projects. An example is the land redistribution projects, which are seen as completed as soon as the land is transferred to the beneficiaries. These projects are in some

instances not properly handed over to provincial agriculture departments. Where they are, these departments lack the capacity to support the projects properly (Kariuki, 2003). The lack of capacity is reflected in poor entrepreneurial skills; the lack of basic financial skills; the lack of technical skills in the area of business of the project, and the lack of skills to conceptualise and execute poverty reduction programmes that address the multi-dimensional nature of development.

South Africa needs an economy that is more inclusive, more dynamic and in which the fruits of growth are shared more equitably (National Development Plan, 2013). An economy that serves the needs of all South Africans, rich and poor, skilled and unskilled, those with capital and those without, urban and rural, women and men is what is needed. In 2030, the economy should be close to full employment; equip people with the skills they need; ensure that ownership of production is less concentrated and more diverse and be able to grow rapidly, providing the resources to pay for investment in human and physical capital (National Development Plan, 2013).

2.2. Land Reform Policies in South Africa

This section will discuss Land Reform Policies in South Africa:

2.2.1. Land Tenure: Land tenure reform policies are aimed at providing more secure access to land in communal areas and commercial farms.

2.2.2. Extension of Security of Tenure Act (ESTA): The Act provides for security of tenure for people living on farmland belonging to others and regulates the eviction of such people. The aim of the legislation is to protect farm dwellers, referred to as occupiers in ESTA, from illegal eviction and to ensure that evictions occur in a lawful and constitutional manner (Hall, 2004).

2.2.3. Land Reform (Labour Tenants) Act (LTA), 1996: The Land Reform Act provides security of tenure for labour tenants and those who occupy or use land as a result of their association with labour tenants. The Act provides labour tenants the same procedural rights as other occupiers are granted in terms of ESTA. The Act

differs from ESTA in that in addition to regulating evictions, it also provides a limited opportunity for labour tenants and their associates to acquire land and they can therefore claim ownership of land that they occupy and use (Hall, 2004).

2.2.4. Communal Property Association Act 28 of 1996: Enables groups of people to hold and manage their land jointly through a legal entity registered with the Department of Land Affairs (Hall, 2004).

2.2.5. Transformation of Certain Rural Areas Act 94 of 1998: Repeals the Rural Areas Act 9 of 1987 ('Act 9') and establishes procedures for upgrading the tenure rights of residents to commonage and residential land in the 23 former "coloured" reserves (formerly Act 9 areas) (Hall, 2004).

2.2.6. The Provision of Land and Assistance Act, Act No. 126 of 1993 Section 10(1) (a): Gives legal effect to the proactive acquisition of land: The Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy (PLAS) was officially launched in 2006 after which LRAD was phased out. PLAS aims to support local government to develop area-based planning and improve coordination among the institutions responsible for land reform. The objectives of PLAS are to contribute to growth, employment creation and equity (DLA 2006).

2.2.7. Restitution of Land Rights Act 22 of 1994: To provide for the restitution of rights in land to persons or communities dispossessed of such rights after 19 June 1913 as a result of past racially discriminatory laws or practices; to establish a Commission on Restitution of Land Rights and a Land Claims Court; and to provide for matters connected therewith (RSA, 1997a).

2.3. Agriculture, land redistribution and access to markets by land reform beneficiaries

Agriculture plays a significant role in the developing countries to improve food security. According to FAO (2012), agriculture accounts for not less than 30 percent of most economic activities. The significance of agriculture in the economy also depends on land availability, land use rights and opportunities. According to FAO (2003), new markets or improvements to existing markets in rural areas can help overcome many of the marketing problems faced by rural farmers. Formal markets in

rural areas play a significant role in improving agricultural marketing. They can increase retail competition by providing a convenient place where farmers can meet with consumers, reduce post-harvest losses by providing overhead protection for produce, provide a focal point for rural activities and make marketing a more pleasurable activity (FAO, 2012). Agriculture in the Greater Sekhukhune District Municipality is a mixture of both commercial and subsistence farming. The south-western corner of the District (Greater Marble Hall and Elias Motsoaledi LMs) specifically, contains one of the largest clusters of commercial agricultural production in South Africa. However, in spite of being an important contributor to employment within the district, agriculture remains a relatively marginal contributor (approximately 9,7%) to the aggregate GDP of the District. Water scarcity, and the uncertainty created by land claims is unfortunately discouraging the expansion of commercial agricultural activities (LPG, RSA, R and T 2009).

According to Anim (2008) and FAO (2006), property rights support the potential to invest and this could also mean investing for improved production. D’Haese and Kirsten (2003) scrutinised the significance of agriculture and food security in the rural development spectrum. They indicated that agricultural development has a significant relationship with economic growth. An increase in agricultural output relates well to increase in GDP and overall increase in countries economic outlook.

In order for agriculture to continue playing its role in the economy, land allocation and availability becomes critical because land is a key source of income, livelihood, food security, cultural identity, and shelter (FAO, 2006). Land, therefore, becomes a major resource for development.

2.4. Rural livelihood strategies

Livelihoods are defined as the various ways in which households obtain the necessities of life both in good and bad years. The necessities comprise food, water, shelter, clothing, health care and education (FAO, 2009). Two characteristics define the livelihoods of rural dwellers: one group stays in sparsely populated areas in which people depend on farming and natural resources, with small towns dispersed

in these areas, and another group is made up of large settlements in former homelands and is dependent on migratory labour and social grants and, has traditional land tenure systems (FAO, 2009).

The South African National Department of Agriculture (2002) identified 240,000 smallholder farmers who derive their livelihood from agriculture and have 1 million beneficiaries and provide occasional employment to another 50,000. Skewed apartheid policies are thought to be some of the major contributors to the poor standards of living and high poverty levels among rural households, especially those living in the former homelands of South Africa.

During the Apartheid era, the high levels of poverty among the indigenous black population forced rural dwellers, particularly able-bodied males, to leave their rural homes for employment in the mines and factories to raise income to pay hut tax and tax on livestock. In addition, they had to meet the living expenses of the family, while the women had to take over and become the household producers and day by day livelihood providers (Panin, 2001).

Most of the rural areas have three sources of income namely, on-farm income, off-farm income and transfers (Panin, 2001). Even though a wide range of activities are associated with these three sources of income, rural households transitions into high return, non-farm activities are constrained. Not all rural households enjoy equal access to high return and non-farm activities.

Households often practise more than one livelihood strategy: different non-agricultural activities concurrently or at different points throughout the year (Bryceson, 2000). Most of the activities have high prospects in nature and faster responses to market demands and supply (Bryceson, 2000). South African households employ several dynamic livelihood strategies. These livelihood strategies differ according to the daily, monthly and annual variations in terms of timing and numerous factors such as rainfall, labour availability, input costs, access to public services, markets and credit, migration opportunities, remittance income and transport costs (SLSA Team, 2003). Other determinants of livelihood strategies are also categorised by age, gender, wealth and ethnicity, as people are able to draw on differing material and social assets, political connections, experience and expertise (SLSA Team, 2003). The mentorship programme has a positive impact on the

livelihood of people, especially smallholder farmers, since it promotes the communities from primitive farming to commercial farming through skill transferred by mentors.

2.5. Extension service

The extension and advisory service of the Department of Agriculture continues to play a critical role in land reform. Limpopo Province alone has more than 700 officials who can be classified as extension workers. These workers provide extension and advisory service to farmers including the recipients of land through government programmes. In the year 2007/08 financial year, an Extension Recovery Programme (ERP) was initiated with a total budget of R15 million in the province. The main aim of the programme was to address the challenges of skills gaps and to respond to the needs of farmers (including the beneficiaries of land reform).

According to Hall (2004), provincial departments of agriculture were found to be under-capacitated and short-staffed, making it difficult for them to play a meaningful role and provide support to land reform beneficiaries. The Department of Agriculture has contributed much in mentoring emergent farmers through their extension services and training (Lahiff, 2008; Turner, 2001).

It is noted with concern that the performance of land reform in South Africa is mostly measured by the total number of hectares either restituted or redistributed through government land reform programmes (Lahiff, 2008; Turner, 2001). However, some land reform activists will also look into the policy performance of land reform and less attention is given to the socio-economic performance of the land reform programmes. Land reform in South Africa is a reality despite challenges identified by scholars, land reform activists and opposition parties (Anseeuw and Mathebula, 2008).

2.6. The mentorship

The concept “mentor” is derived from the Greek mythology, where Mentor was a trusted friend of Odysseus and tutor of Odysseus’s son, Telemachus. The relationship between Mentor and Telemachus has been described as nurturing, educative and protective. Mentor ensured that Telemachus developed personally, socially and professionally (Watson, 1999).

The foundation of the mentorship programme is the relationship between the experts or accompaniers and the novices (Ryan and Brewer, 1997). This notion is supported by Brown (1999) who maintains that mentoring is a relationship between two people in which one with greater rank, experience, and/or expertise teaches, counsels, guides and helps the other to develop both professionally and personally.

Mentoring depends on the profession and the workplace practices where it is implemented. For instance, according to Murray (1991:5) Mentoring is a structure and series of processes designed to create effective mentoring relationships, guide the desired behaviour change of those involved, and evaluate the results for the protégés, the mentors and the organisation with the primary purpose of systematically developing the skills and leadership abilities of the less experienced members of the organisation’. Mentoring brings individuals together on a one to one basis, bypassing bureaucracy and institutions. It brings people together (Murray, 1991).

According to research by Murray (1991), Adams (1998), Holliday (2001), Edwards and Keane (2001), Young and Wright (2001), Primary Agriculture Education and Training Authority (2003), de Beer (2005), South African Cane Grower’s Association, (2005) and Ueckermann (2005) the successful outcomes of a mentorship programme depends heavily on the development of a mentoring relationship between the mentor and protégé.

Van der Elst (2007) indicates that within the context of land reform, sustainable development entails that in order to be successful beneficiaries quality of life must improve substantially, and acquired land must be utilised to its full commercial potential after resettlement on claimed land has occurred.

According to Young and Wright (2001) the mentor is a person who guides another to avenues of success; will meet the protégé's needs is; knowledgeable and respected; a person who listens and is a problem solver.

Abbott, Goosen and Coetzee (2010) advocate that there is a high degree of interest in mentoring in South Africa, where there is a great need for accelerated individual development as well as for various types of societal and community development, especially with the high incidence of unemployment in the country. Since mentoring is a form of human development, it is taking on employment challenges (Kingdon and Knight, 2007). Currently, a major concern in South Africa is the unemployment (Statistics SA, 2010).

According to Kingdon and Knight (2007), focused skills development is most beneficial to human development. Consequently, it is of importance for economic growth in South Africa to be proactive in addressing unemployment by means of human development initiatives, such as mentoring programmes.

Truter (2008) suggests that examples of great historical mentors include Socrates, who mentored Plato, who later mentored Aristotle, who later mentored Alexander the Great. In describing himself, Socrates uses the analogy of being a mid-wife assisting the labour of the mind in bringing knowledge and wisdom to birth (Truter, 2008). Keating (2012) concludes by stating it is clear that great leaders would not have achieved their full potential without effective mentoring. Govender and Parumasur (2010) add by stating that the competencies in the mentor role entail understanding self and others, communicating effectively and developing employees.

2.6.1. Qualities essential in an active mentor

A mentor has the following attributes:

- i) a desire to help
- ii) positive experiences
- iii) good reputation to develop others
- iv) sufficient time and energy
- v) up-to-date knowledge

- vi) positive learning attitude
- vii) effective managerial skills
- viii) constructively critical
- ix) is an active listener
- x) encouraging and persistent
- xi) an open door and is approachable.

2.6.2. The new farmer (protege)

According to Young and Wright (2001) the protégé is the person who is being mentored. The protégé must respect and trust the mentor, be willing to enter into a relationship and must be committed and willing to learn.

2.6.3. Characteristics of a protégé

The characteristics of a protégé include:

- i) eagerness to learn
- ii) keen to acquire new skills and knowledge
- iii) keen to develop existing skills and abilities
- iv) ability to work as a team player
- v) patient and must be willing to put time and effort into the relationship
- vi) risk taker
- vii) willing to travel from a “safe harbour” into the sea of uncertainty
- viii) positive attitude
- ix) bright and hopeful attitude
- x) commitment and self-confidence

According to De Beer (2005), Edwards and Keane (2001), Young and Wright (2001) and PAETA (2003), the above qualities and characteristics of the mentors and protégés are the building blocks of successful mentoring relationships.

2.6.4 Advantages of mentorship

Advantages of mentorship are:

The construction of the self and of mentoring relationships is interdependent and created through individuals, interactions and dialogue with others (Hayes & Koro-Ljungberg, 2011). Hayes & Koro-Ljungberg (2011) suggest that when mentors and mentees enter into a relationship, they bring with them multiple, though not always identical, relational histories that represent a unique combination of communities and voices.

Baguley (2010:10) describes mentoring as a transformative relationship in which individuals reconstruct possible selves in adopting the ways of the other individual in the relationship that simplifies their current way of thinking. The University of Birmingham (2013) accedes that one of the greatest discoveries is that mentoring is a two-way learning process where mentoring is not only beneficial to the mentee, but also a learning experience for the mentor. The mentor, through friendship, counselling, and acceptance, also helps the mentee in developing the sense of professional competence and self-esteem needed to achieve career success (Van der Pol, 2011; Dunn, 2012).

Gilmore (2005) presupposes that the benefits of mentoring for the mentee can include faster career progress, increased confidence, assistance with working through difficult issues when dealing with other people, having a sounding board for trying out ideas, and being able to draw on someone else's experience. Therefore, mentoring opens up the mentee to new issues and adds layers of thinking by developing new insights. The main advantage of mentoring is the positive contribution to the development of the mentee, specifically applicable to growth in the ability to perform optimally in the workplace (Walsh, 2010). Psychological growth, where self-confidence will enable the mentee to be assured when difficult decisions in the work arena are faced, is also included (Spence and Oades, 2011).

2.6.5. The disadvantages of mentorship

Taherian and Shekarchian (2008) point out that many of the disadvantages attributed to mentoring in the literature are in fact not so much disadvantages of mentoring itself but rather problems associated with the mentoring process being incorrectly conducted. They believe that a dysfunctional mentoring relationship could also result from possession of certain personality traits that are not compatible with the mentoring process. Other difficulties that may at times be encountered during the mentoring process include frustration due to lack of progress, and strains and conflicts, which can occur in any caring relationship and, improperly conducted mentoring can result in individual stress, role confusion and disillusionment with the task (Taherian and Shekarchian, 2008).

Taljaard (2010) recognises that misconduct and gross unethical behaviour of either member in the mentoring relationship can, in the worst-case scenario, lead to legal action and, according to him, the most common occurrence is sexual or racial discrimination and/or harassment. Livingston (2010) follows up by saying that respondents in formal mentoring programmes either feel that the match is not what is needed and consequently becomes ineffective, or the arrangement can even detract from the learning experience.

2.7. Strategies implemented by government to address food security in South Africa

The following are strategies followed by government to address food security in South Africa:

a) The integrated nutrition programme

The Integrated Nutrition Program was one of the key strategic health programs to decrease morbidity and mortality rates as well as to prevent and manage malnutrition. The programme was formed from the recommendation of the Nutrition Committee, appointed by the Health Minister in 1995, Dr NC Zuma (Dept. Health, 2005).

b) The integrated food security strategy

The worldwide food and security summit held in Rome in 1996 saw the amalgamation of 185 countries in the expedition of halving poverty by the year 2015, one of the eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Since then the South African government facilitated the Integrated Food Security Strategy (IFSS) making use of a partnership of existing experienced members of the national, provincial and local government; universities, NGOs and community based structures.

c) The objectives of the IFSS

The objectives of the IFSS are:

- i. Increase household production and trading
- ii. Improve income generation and job creation opportunities
- iii. Improve nutrition and food security
- iv. Provide capacity building

d) The comprehensive agricultural support programme of 2005

- The Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP) was an initiative involving a range of government departments and incorporates the Household Food Production programme, which was targeted at those households that fail to access surplus food. The programme spent R22 million of the R30 million budgeted for the 2005-6 financial year on 273 projects with just over 17 000 beneficiaries receiving surplus food aid. CASP also focused on skills and knowledge transfer and financial and marketing advice with the aim to promote wealth through agriculture and improve national and household food security, amongst others.

The Micro Agricultural Finance Initiative of South Africa (MAFISA) of 2006. MAFISA was launched in 2005 by the National Department of Agriculture (NDA) and the Development Finance Institution of South Africa (DFI) and was operationalized in the following year with a budget of R150- R200 million in the period of 2005-6 to 2006-7 respectively, as a pilot in KwaZulu-Natal, Eastern Cape and Limpopo provinces. By providing credit to aspiring black farmers and the working poor, it was hoped that the

effect would be evident in improved livelihoods, reduced poverty and viable business ventures.

e) Recapitalisation and development programme

The Recapitalization and Development Programme is one of the new strategic interventions aimed primarily at ensuring that land acquired through the Land Reform Programme since 1994 is productive and produces food for the country and improves the lot of not only those who benefited as new land owners, but also those who are employed on those farms. Production discipline becomes the bedrock of the programme. The programme is also to be used as a key lever towards accelerating the rural economy since land form the integral part of production asset at the disposal of rural communities (Department of Rural Development and Land Reform 2013).

f). Post transfer of land support

According to Tuner (1997), May and Roberts (2000), no project can survive without proper planning and subsequent support. This assertion can be said to be true and applicable to the programme of land reform distribution. The focus on land transfer and the lack of support for the productive use of land were widely recognised as key failings of the programme, which is considered to have made limited contributions to beneficiaries' livelihoods (Turner 1997; May & Roberts, 2000). There is also no clearly defined land use model, the government focuses on meeting targets at the expense of the program (Greenberg, 2009). And according to Greenberg (2009), the remedy lies in answering questions such as:

1. What is the model of a productive farm?
2. What is the government's role in ensuring that land is used productively in post redistribution or restitution era?

In its submission to the committee for Agriculture and Land Affairs, the South African Human Sciences Research Council (2004) points out that some of the causes of the failures of the projects on restituted land can be said to be the lack of adequate post-

transfer support and an inadequate mechanism of monitoring and evaluation of the system.

2.8. Conclusion

The chapter has provided an overview of land reform from different perspectives. Several land reform policies were put to test by researchers using literature references. After long deliberations on land reform, it is clear that mentorship of land reform beneficiaries has a role to play in asserting the socio-economic status of the beneficiaries. The evolution of land reform pursuant to a political and economic change is essential in determining the scope of land reform.

Abbott, Goosen and Coetzee (2010) support the idea that there is a high degree of interest in mentoring in South Africa, where there is great need for accelerated individual development as well as for various types of societal and community development, especially with the high incidence of unemployment in the country. Since mentoring is a form of human development, it is taking on employment challenges (Kingdon and Knight, 2007). Currently, a major concern in South Africa is the availability of employment (Statistics SA, 2010).

This is also supported by Kingdon and Knight (2007), where they indicate that focused skills development is most beneficial to human development. Thus, it is of importance for economic growth in South Africa to be proactive in taking on unemployment by means of human development initiatives, such as mentoring programmes.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3. Introduction

The previous chapter dealt with an in-depth literature review of the challenges in South Africa to create employment through farming as well as the use of mentoring as one way to address the current skills shortages, eradication of poverty and for job creation. The researcher explores the participants' opinions to determine to which extent the mentors transfer skills to beneficiaries and to assess the effectiveness of the mentorship programme. This chapter presents the research design, study area, the population, sampling, data collection, and analysis methods.

Mouton (2001) defines a research design as a plan or blueprint of how a researcher intends conducting research. He further points out that a research design focuses on the end product, formulate a research problem as a point of departure and focuses on logic of the research. Neuman (2003) distinguishes between quantitative and qualitative research designs.

According to these authors the qualitative category includes ethnography, biography, case studies, phenomenology and grounded theory. The qualitative approach aims to construct detailed description of social reality and the quantitative approach aims to test predictive and cause effect hypotheses about social reality (De Vos, Strydom, Fouche and Delport, 2005).

Babbie (2007) indicates that there are three common and useful purposes of social research which are exploratory, descriptive and explanation. He also indicates that exploratory studies are mostly done to satisfy the researcher's curiosity and desire for better understanding, to test the feasibility of undertaking a more extensive study and develop the methods to be employed in a subsequent study. This study employed the qualitative research method because the focus of the study is based on reality that the land reform beneficiaries experience in the mentorship programme.

3.1. Research Design and Rationale

Research design as defined by Mouton (2010) is a plan or blueprint of how a researcher intends to conduct the research. This suggests that a research design is a framework to be used in order to achieve the final product. Qualitative research is typically used to answer questions about complex nature of phenomena, often with the purpose of describing and understanding the phenomena.

This study used the descriptive research design. A descriptive approach will reveal the relationship between mentors and mentees. Descriptive research studies can reveal the nature of certain situations, settings, processes, relationships, systems or people (Peshkin, 1993). The study applies the interpretivist paradigm.

3.1.1. Qualitative Research Design

Cooper and Schindler (2006:282) describe qualitative research as “interpretive techniques that seek to describe, decode, translate and come to terms with the meaning not the frequency of certain phenomena. It is a fundamental approach of inquiry and exploration, including individual in-depth interviews, group interviews, participant observation, videotaping of participants, projective techniques, psychological testing, case studies, elite interviewing, document analysis and kinesics”.

According to Zikmund (2003), qualitative research usually provides a better understanding of a problem instead of exact measurement. For this study data collection was undertaken by means of voice recorded interview using an interview guide. The focus group approach was used. One focus group comprised the executive committee. A simple random sample selection of 20 members was the second focus group. A mentor was interviewed for the restitution programme for Ba Bina Noko community which is under mentorship. Key informants were identified from Department of Rural Development and Land Reform since they are funding the programme. Qualitative research is normally carried out where the sample size is small.

3.2. Study Area

The study area is Greater Greater Sekhukhune District Municipality, Elias Motsoaledi Local Municipality. The District is made up of 5 local municipalities (LMs) - Elias Motsoaledi Local Municipality (formerly the Groblersdal Local Municipality), Fetakgomo Local Municipality, Greater Marble Hall Local Municipality, Greater Tubatse Local Municipality and Makhuduthamaga Local Municipality.

The Ba Bina Noko farms consist of portion 2 and 3 of the Wintpenskloof 40 JS with the extent of 34.2613 and 38.5438 respectively. There are 5 chicken pens with the estimated carrying capacity of about 4500 chickens, 20 hectares of land demarcated for crops like spinach, watermelon, tomatoes, pumpkins and pepper. The farm management has demarcated 20 hectares for maize production and 32.8051 hectares is allocated for citrus fruits. Before the appointment of a mentor the farm was not operating well, and this was also due financial constraints. After the appointment of a mentor and funding by the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform the farm is now operating sufficiently well and the mentor replaced grapes with other crops. In terms of farm operations, the mentor indicated that the Ba Bina Noko farm is operating at 40% of its capacity, which is bad for the farm to sustain itself.

The map below shows how the Sekhukhune District is positioned.

The study area is shown in figure 3.1 below



Figure 3.1: Sekhukhune District Municipality boarders
Source: Drimie *et al.*, 2009

Greater Sekhukhune District Municipality report (2011) points out that the district was a cross-border municipality, straddling the Limpopo and Mpumalanga provinces until early 2006. The entire district now falls in Limpopo Province found in the northern part of South Africa. The district which lies in the south-eastern part of the province covers an area of approximately 13 264 square kilometres, most of which is rural with almost 605 villages, which are generally sparsely populated and dispersed throughout the district. It is estimated that only 5% of the Sekhukhune population live in urban areas. The area of Greater Sekhukhune District is endowed with some of the most lucrative mineral deposits in South Africa, including enormous reserves of platinum group metals. The area is mineral-rich but exceptionally dry, such that it experiences significant water shortages and is dependent on irrigation for farming

The south-west part of the district contains one of the largest clusters of commercial agricultural production in the country. The critical water deficit affects households and is a major constraint to the growth of the agriculture and mining sectors - approximately 65 000ha of prime land cannot be farmed due to lack of water for irrigation (Limpopo Provincial Government, Republic of South Africa, Road and Transport 2009).

Sekhukhune is located in Limpopo Province, the northern-most part of South Africa. It covers an area of approximately 13 264 square meters, most of which is rural. The main urban centres are Groblersdal, Marble Hall, Burgersfort, Jane Furse, Ohrigstad, Steelpoort and Driekop. Outside these major towns, one finds almost 605 villages, which are generally sparsely populated and dispersed throughout the district. The area's towns and villages are serviced by its major rivers - the Olifants River, Tubatse (Steelpoort) River and the Elands River, all of which supply a number of large dams. The Sekhukhune economy is driven largely by agriculture, mining and tourism (Limpopo Provincial Government, Republic of South Africa, Road and Transport 2009).

Sekhukhune is an area with a long and proud history. It is also a place of majestic beauty, mountainous, lush valleys and meandering rivers. Under its soil, lie vast deposits of precious metals - so vast that they today contain the largest reserves of platinum group metals in the world. Above its soil, sprout more than 2200 indigenous species of vascular plants, making it an area of exceptionally high biodiversity that is globally recognised. It is a land blessed by natural beauty, unusual resource endowments and a compelling history dating back to the 16th century (Limpopo Provincial Government, Republic of South Africa, Road and Transport 2009). Greater Sekhukhune Municipality comprises 5 local municipalities with 116 wards and 605 villages in total. Elias Motsoaledi comprises 29 wards with 104 villages, Fetakgomo with 13 wards and 87 villages,; Greater Marble Hall with 14 wards and 69 villages, Greater Tubatse 29 wards and 202 villages and Makhuduthamaga with 31 wards and 143 villages.

3.3. Population

Grinnel (1993) defines a population as the totality of persons or objects with which a study is concerned. Population is described by Babbie (2007) as a group (usually of people) that we want to draw conclusion on. The population of this study is limited to beneficiaries of Land Reform Programme in Elias Motsoaledi Local Municipality, Sekhukhune District in Limpopo Province. Currently there are 14 communities that

were restored of their claimed farms in the Elias Motsoledi Local Municipality each with more than 300 beneficiaries.

The beneficiaries of land reform projects in Elias Motsoledi Local Municipality mostly reside in areas of Motetema, Stofburg, Middleburg, Witbank, Marble Hall, Groblersdal, Burgersfort and Tafelkop. Interviews were conducted with the mentor at Ba Bina Noko CPA, the executive committee and a group of beneficiaries. Interview guides and a voice recorder were used. The latter two took the form of focus group discussions.

Table 3.1 below indicates that in Sekhukhune District an area of 3.484 sq.km is for conservation, representing 23.5%.of the total area. Commercial agricultural land is at 1.135 sq.km representing 7.7%. Agricultural subsistence farming at 2.683 sq.km represents 18.1%, while the area under active mining is 37 in sq.km or 0.2%.

Table 3.1: Land Use Patterns in the Greater Sekhukhune District Municipality

Land use type	Area in sq.km	% of total
Agricultural: commercial	1.135	7.7
Agricultural: subsistence	2.683	18.1
Potential conservation	3.484	23.5
Active mining	37	0.2
Other	7.030	47.4
Total	14.832	47.4

Source: Department of Land Affairs (2006). Land Cover Map cited in Maila (2006)

Greater Sekhukhune Municipality comprises 5 local municipalities: Ellias Motsoledi, Fetakgomo, Ephraim Mogale, Greater Tubatse and Makhuduthamaga.

3.4. Sample

According to Strydom and Venter (2002), sampling means taking a portion of a population and sample means a small portion of the total set of objects, events or persons that together comprise the subject of the study. Babbie and Mouton (2001)

indicate that there are two types of sampling methods namely, probability sampling and non-probability sampling.

According to Seaberg (1988:43) cited in De Vos (1998:195) probability sampling is the sample in which each potential respondent in the population has the same known probability of being selected. The present study used convenience sampling where one project was selected due to its accessibility: The Ba Bina Noko Communal Property Association. One focus group comprised the executive committee and the other comprised 20 beneficiaries.

3.5. Data Collection Method

Data to be gathered were used useful for diagnosis of the existing situation for beneficiaries of the programme and provided policy guidelines related to land reform. Creswell (2009) indicates that data collection procedure in qualitative research involved four basic types: (1) observation, (2) interviews, (3) documents and (4) audio-visual materials. Data were collected to enable assessment of the effectiveness of the mentorship programme. In this study, data collection was by means of voice recorded interview using an interview guide. Data were collected from two focus groups, the mentor, and a key informant from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform.

3.6. Data Analysis

The recorded interviews were transcribed and NVIVO was used to identify common and recurrent themes.

3.7. Limitations of the study

Mentorship is a very broad concept, and it is found in all disciplines whether it be in community, church, family and business. To have regards to all of these disciplines of such a nature that the study of each and every aspect of mentorship focus beyond

the scope of this study. The purpose of this study is therefore not to give a comprehensive report on all aspects of mentorship and aspects ancillary thereto.

Only one community, the Ba Bina Noko CPA in Elias Motsoaledi Local Municipality, Sekhukhune District Municipality, Limpopo Province will be studied, thus the results may not be generalisable.

3.8. Conclusion

The chapter described the area under study, providing the population demographics and economic opportunities. The chapter indicated that the study used qualitative descriptive research design whereby the effectiveness of the mentorship were explored. Data collection was done by means of voice recorded interview using an interview guide. The focus group approach was used. One focus group was the executive committee and another was of 20 beneficiaries. A mentor was interviewed, and for the key informant a manager from Department of Rural Development and Land Reform was also interviewed. The agricultural sector is important in providing both employment and in dealing with issues of poverty through mentorship. The chapter further indicated the history of land reform in the district. This chapter also discussed the data analysis model and data collection methods. NVIVO was deemed to be the appropriate software for the study.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

4. Introduction

This section covers the analysis of the effectiveness of the mentorship programme. The vision of the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform in Mentorship Programme is to achieve a united and prosperous agricultural sector and to eliminate skewed participation by means of a formalised and outcomes/output directed programme in which experienced stakeholders (example, commercial farmers, retired farmers and others) are used to mentor, guide and assist inexperienced newcomers (e.g. emerging farmers). The programme therefore encourages the continued participation of those who are already part of the sector and promotes the development of an inclusive and diverse agriculture that will cover the entire spectrum of enterprises and farm sizes. Mentorship is viewed as a key mechanism towards developing a solid partnership between the commercial sector (both farmers and other agribusinesses within the agricultural value).

Table 4.1 shows the total gross margins per commodity in the Ba Bina Noko farm during the 2014 financial year.

Table: 4.1 the project profit margins per commodity

Product	Hectares allocation per Commodity	Yield per ha	Production (per kg/ha)	Average Price / unit (R)	Gross Income (R)/ha	Variable cost (R)/ha	Gross Margins(R)/ha	Total Gross Margins
Pumpkins	4	20 000	kg	3,80	76 000	33 422	42 578	170 312,00
Maize	20	4 000	kg	2,20	8 800	7 500	1 300	26 000,00
Tomatoes	4	40 000	kg	4,50	180 000	78 110	101 890	407 560,00
Pepper	4	15 000	kg	3,50	52 500	27 911	24 589	98 356,00
Spinach	4	18 000	kg	2,50	45 000	24 775	20 225	80 900,00
Watermelon	4	28 000	kg	2,60	72 800	63 523	9 277	37 108,00
Citrus	32	15 000	kg	4,60	69 000	43 400	25 600	819 200,00
TOTAL								1 639 436,00

4.1 Project funding

With regard to funding, the mentor said that Ba Bina Noko CPA was awarded a total amount of R6, 516,500.00 by the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform through the programme of Recapitalisation and Development Programme. The mentor said that the funding allocated was very little since the business plan requested projected a total amount of R18 000 000.00 for the optimal utilisation of the land. However, due to budget constraints, the department only funded the project with an amount of R6, 516,500.00. The mentor also pointed out that he was concerned with the adjustment of funding since he knew the farm could not operate at its full capacity and develop under the prevailing circumstances.

4.2 FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS FOR 20 FARMERS WITH A MENTOR

4.2.1. Introduction

This focus group was conducted with 20 farmers from Ba Bina Noko CPA. The discussion was undertaken with a mixed group comprising eight males and 12 females.

4.2.2 The project

According to the participants, the project's name is Ba Bina Noko Communal Property Association and the project started in 2011 after restoration. According to a male participant aged 68, all documentation of the CPA project including for the mentorship and recapitalisation programme is the responsibility of the executive committee and management; he also said that the beneficiaries and employees on the farm did not have access to such documentation. Therefore, even the number of beneficiaries and how they are selected is the responsibility of the executive committee.

4.2.3 Appointment of mentor and the mentorship programme

A participant mentioned that the mentor was officially appointed in 2011. He became aware of the mentorship programme during that time; however the decision to get a mentor was done by management since they realised there were challenges on farm production and the situation was deteriorating. Regarding the mentor, a respondent had this to say:

The mentor is good because he is doing the right job on the farm. (Male respondent aged 38 years old).

The above words also reflect their appreciation of the mentor and the work he is doing.

A female participant said the process of getting a mentor was handled by the executive committee; they got a mentor they wanted since there was great improvement on the farm since his arrival in 2012.

A male participant aged 34 years old mentioned that according to protocol, it was the executive responsibility to appoint a mentor not the entire beneficiaries. The participants showed much appreciation to the mentor since they could witness improvements on farm production and employee satisfaction. Their positive attitude towards mentorship is reflected in this excerpt:

When I compare the farm now and before the intervention by the mentor, there is great improvement on the farm. Employees are now paid their salaries without any problem and the farm is producing its cash crops, maize and citrus without problem. The farm has regular customers who support our business. (Male participant aged 39 years old).

4.2.4 Farm production

A female participant aged 35 said that the condition was bad on the farm before the arrival of the mentor; the farm was operating without proper farm implements such as tractors, and pick up vehicles and employees were not getting their salaries and many times they would work for three months without salaries. She further said that

from 2010 until 2011, the farm was struggling because of lack of sufficient operating resources. She also mentioned that after the appointment of a mentor through the government mentorship programme, the farm started functioning well with better production and employees getting their salaries consistently.

With regard to farm production, the participants mentioned that their farm was at the brink of collapse before the appointment of a mentor. The participants further mentioned that the recapitalisation grant funding and appointment of a mentor has turned the farm around, because before government intervention, there were no farm equipment.

4.2.5 Farming activities before the mentor

The participants mentioned that, before the appointment of a mentor they had a grapevine, orange orchard and they planted maize, but after the appointment of the mentor they diverted to planting water melon, butternut, cabbage and are still continuing with maize and oranges. Maize is grown under irrigation. They further mentioned that the mentor replaced grapes with crops after realising that they would cost the farm to revive them.

4.2.6 Beneficiary perception on the mentorship programme and how it impacted on their livelihoods

In addressing the above questions the participants were expected to explain their situation before the mentor and after the intervention by the mentor. They were specifically asked about food they used to eat before and food they could afford afterwards, access to education, access to medication before and after the mentorship.

A female participant aged 46 responded that the mentorship programme assisted her family a lot because now she could take care and feed her family. She could also pay school fees for her daughter at studying at a college. She also said that before the appointment of the mentor life was very difficult since they were not getting salaries consistently.

The participants mentioned that they could now pay school fees for their children, and buy new furniture for their households.

Through mentorship, I got employment; I bought cement building bricks since I intend to build a decent house for my family. Before the arrival of a mentor in 2011 the farm was not operating well and my living conditions at home were bad (A 42 years old age man).

The participants emphasised that the mentorship programme had lifted them out of poverty. They also said that before the mentor, they could not even afford to buy meat and nutritious food, but now they could buy meat for their families. They further said that the appointment of a mentor on their farm assisted a lot in terms of job creation. People could now take care of their families.

After the government assisted the project with funding and the appointment of a mentor, the farm has better farming implements and production inputs and the farm produce have a stable market than before. This feeling is encapsulated in this excerpt:

I can now afford to buy casual clothes, school uniform and school fees for my children while before the mentor it was a crisis. My life was dependent on borrowing money to take care of my family and now I can afford to pay a doctor in case a member of my family is sick (Female participant aged 35 years old).

Another echoed:

Mentorship helped me to build a proper house. Before the mentor came, my life was miserable; without proper shelter. I did not have money to buy nutritious food for my family. (A 39 year old man).

A female participant said that the mentorship programme helped her a lot and now she was extending her house.

It was very difficult before a mentor, I once spent 3 months without a salary and for Christmas I had no money to buy clothes and food for my family. With a mentor my life is better and I am getting my salary every month. (Male participant aged 49 years old).

The participants were showing a lot of appreciation on the mentorship programme and the manner that it impacted on their lives; they reiterated that before the appointment of a mentor it was very difficult because the farm was not fully operational, but now with a mentor, employees on the project are managing to take care of their families. They said that they were working well with the mentor on the farm.

According to a male participant aged 31 years old, when he got employed at the farm the mentor was already there and he managed to acquire a driver's licence for himself, and he is also taking care of his child and parents. The participants expressed their appreciation on the mentorship programme and how it impacted on their lives in terms of access to school fees, medication, shelter and food. The participants' appreciation of the good work of the mentor and how it impacted on their lives are reflected in the following excerpt:

Before the appointment of a mentor it was very difficult for me and my family, I could not afford medical attention from practitioners when a member of my family got sick, this was because I was not having a stable salary. With the help of a mentor on the farm I can access nutritious food like meat, bread and cornflakes for my family. (Female participant aged 37 years old).

After the appointment of the mentor there was better production and sales on the farm, this is due to the fact that the farm is now operating better than before and this sentiment is encapsulated in this excerpt:

My life was very difficult before the mentor, I was struggling to feed my family, but now I can afford clothes, bag of rice, bread, margarine, peanut butter, meat and vegetables. I can also buy medication at pharmacies in case a member of my family gets sick. (Male participant aged 39 years old).

A female participant aged 48 said that her situation was very bad before she got employed at Ba Bina Noko farming project, she could not afford anything since she was not working. She further said that because she is employed now, she can manage to buy food like spinach, meat, cabbage, rice, tomato sauce and

mayonnaise to feed her family. She also mentioned that before her appointment she was not able to buy bread and butter.

Before the mentor came, it was difficult since I was not affording anything, I could not afford to pay burial society, no money for food but after appointment of a mentor, I can now access maize meal, meat, vegetables, bread and butter to feed my family. (A female participant aged 39 years old)

One participant reported that before the appointment of a mentor, breakfast comprised soft porridge every day without any choice, but after the mentor things changed and he can now afford to buy bread, cornflakes and peanut butter with the salary.

Life was very difficult before the appointment of a mentor; I could not afford food for my family and my dogs. However, mentorship assisted better farm production and I can now afford to buy bread, Rama, milk and meat to feed my family. (Male participant aged 29 years old).

Another echoed:

My life was very difficult before a mentor on the farm since I was not honouring my debit orders and payments of monthly instalments, but now I bought myself furniture, and my family has access to nutritious food and I am getting paid every month. (A 37 years old age female participant).

Another 39 year old participant mentioned that the mentorship programme helped him a lot since he was in the process of extending his house.

Another echoed:

Before the mentor I was not employed since the farm was not functioning well, but now because of the mentor I am employed and taking care of my family well. (A 41 years old male).

4.2.7 Challenges of the mentorship programme

Regarding challenges that beneficiaries experience with the mentorship programme, the participants said that there was poor planning from management in terms of giving employees job descriptions. They further mentioned that they were just

working without clear job descriptions from management and they suggest that management must give them clear roles on their work.

A male participant aged 61 said that workers were not having proper uniform; they worked in their own clothes. He further proposed that farm management must make provision for uniform. The participants expressed their frustrations with regard to the mentor and farm managers. However, their positive attitude towards mentorship is reflected in these excerpts:

There is a challenge of safety clothes to employees. Employees are working with chemicals for spraying without protective clothes. Management must buy us protective clothes and also give us an opportunity for medical check-ups regularly since we are working with dangerous chemicals. (A male respondent aged 39 years old).

A female participant aged 35 highlighted that their management did not have meetings with the employees and that it was a challenge for employees because they were not certain if they were doing right or wrong. She further suggested that management must invite employees to monthly meetings and discuss monthly plans and monthly reports/ progress reports on the farm.

This is supported by Taherian and Shekarchian (2008) who argue that a dysfunctional mentoring relationship could also result from possession of certain personality traits that are not compatible with the mentoring process.

4.2.8 Post-settlement support provided by government

Lahiff (2007) indicates also that one of the challenges of the land reform programme is the lack of post settlement support. Post settlement support failure is also the result of the conceptualisation of some land reform projects, which makes any post support system ineffective (Lahiff, 2007). The importance of post settlement support for land reform beneficiaries is critical for any attainment of land reform goals and objectives.

According to Deininger (2003), post settlement support is a process of enhancing and broadening post settlement support services to land reform projects. There is a need to strengthen post settlement support to ensure cohesion function of government institutions (Elst, 2007). On the other hand, post settlement services should not remain the responsibility of government only. Several agents and organs of government are critical in providing meaningful post settlement support. The main aim of this support is to ensure that beneficiaries are empowered to turn the land to use for poverty eradication and improvement of livelihood.

Participants said that their farm is operating well like other farms, and that the farm now has farm resources like tractors, delivery vehicles and centre pivot. They further said that appointment of a mentor also assisted a lot since government provided the farm with money and there is production, plus markets for produce and employees are paid well.

4.2.9 Skills acquired from the mentor

With regard to skills acquired from the mentor, the participants mentioned that they acquired more skills on the application of fertilisers on cabbages; they have an understanding of water irrigation system on the farm, and they can now maintain the irrigation system and are now experts with the farm irrigation drip lines.

When I got employed on the farm I did not know how to plant cash crops, but now I gained more knowledge on planting of crops and application of fertilisers. I was trained on citrus crops and application of fertilisers and chemicals. (Female participant aged 30 years old).

Before the appointment of a mentor, the farm was functioning without guidance, beneficiaries lacked skills in running the farm at a commercial level.

The above words reflect beneficiaries' appreciation of the mentor through the skills he transferred to them. This aligns with Gilmore's (2005) view that the benefits of mentoring for the mentee can include faster career progress, increased confidence, assistance with working through difficult issues when dealing with other people, having a sounding board for trying out ideas, and being able to draw on someone

else's experience; therefore, mentoring opens up the mentee to new issues and adds layers of thinking by developing new insights.

4.2.10 Access to markets

The participants mentioned that their produce are marketed properly and have regular customers. They further said that their farm produce are marketed through formal and formal markets. The participants emphasised, however, that their farming business is making better sales through informal markets where their customers come with their own transport, making the transaction less costly. The participants further stressed that formal marketing is costly since it puts demands on proper packaging and transportation costs. They further said that if their produce is of poor quality and they are already at the market in Johannesburg, it means they must be returned to the farm which is an expensive exercise. The participants are in favour of the informal marketing they are practising on the farm.

Our business uses informal marketing and this is working very well for the business. Many of our customers come and buy our produce here on the farm. It is my responsibility to ensure that regular customers are informed when a particular produce is ready for sale and they will come and buy. (A female participant aged 35 years old).

The above words reflect their appreciation of the informal marketing their farm practices.

4.2.11 Challenges of informal marketing

The participants mentioned that they did not experience major challenges on informal marketing, except minor complaints from customers that other customers were receiving preferential treatment in terms of their orders. The participants however indicated that these were minor challenges and that they were able to handle such cases. The participants also said that they did not have contracts with their customers but they had a reliable client base.

The concept of market is in line with FAO's (2003) view that new markets or improvements to existing markets in rural areas can help overcome many of the marketing problems faced by rural farmers. FAO (2003) further emphasises that formal markets in rural areas play a significant role in improving agricultural marketing. In their view markets can increase retail competition by providing a convenient place where farmers can meet with consumers, reduce post-harvest losses by providing overhead protection for produce, provide a focal point for rural activities and make marketing a more pleasurable activity.

4.2.12 Contribution on food security and poverty alleviation in the area

With regard to food security, the participants mentioned that their project is so helpful since people can buy cabbages, water melons, maize and citrus fruits. They further said that their project has created employment opportunities to people from the surrounding villages and are earning better salaries to support their families. A female respondent aged 36 indicated that their farm is contributing a lot to people in the area because of the availability of food. Their farm products are also purchased by people from Gauteng and Free State provinces.

According to a male participant aged 44, the mentorship programme assisted a lot in terms of reducing poverty in the area, because now he is employed on the farm, getting a reasonable salary and can also buy cabbages and other cash crops from their own farm. He further said that people in the surrounding villages get food in close proximity at farm gate price.

The concept of food security and poverty alleviation is supported by FAO (2012). Their view is that agriculture can play a significant role in the developing countries to improve food security. They further emphasise that agriculture accounts for not less than 30 percent of most economic activities and the significance of agriculture in the economy also depends on land availability, land use rights and opportunities.

4.2.13 Profit sharing

With regard to profit sharing, the beneficiaries are of the view that their farm is making profit. According to a female participant, “I think the project is making profit because if the farm was running a loss, management was going to change to other enterprise or commodity”. In terms of profit sharing our management is using the profit to properly manage the farm operations by buying fertilisers and seedlings. These words from beneficiaries are a clear indication that the beneficiaries are not sharing profit on the farm.

4.2.14 Social networking

The participants mentioned that working on the farm assisted them to meet with other beneficiaries and farm workers from other farms during training and workshops. They further said that being part of the project helps them and are learning a lot on customer care have good working relationship with the customers.

4.2.15 Objectives of mentorship programme

With regard to mentorship programme the participants said that the government has achieved its objective of mentorship in Ba Bina Noko Project. They further mentioned that the programme is very good since the farm is now operating productively. One member had this to say: “I can recommend to other projects to go for mentorship programme since it helped our farm to stand on its own”.

According to a male participant aged 47 a mentor is a good guide to them and they are working well with him. The programme is good and the farm is functioning well under the supervision of the mentor. He further said that he can recommend the mentorship programme to other communities.

4.2.16 Rational for diverting from grapes to cash crops

According to the participants grapes were removed and replaced by the mentor. They said that on his arrival the mentor realised that the grapes were dying and it

would be more costly to revive them. The participants further mentioned that their mentor was planting crops that can give them money after every three months and crops that are not costly. They also said that the decision to replace grapes was a management decision between the mentor and the CPA Executive Committee.

4.2.17 Appointment of employees determinations

In terms of appointment of employees on the farm, the participants said that it is the responsibility of the Executive Committee to appoint. They further said that first preference is given to beneficiaries during appointments of employees. The participants also mentioned that during peak periods, farm management encourage more employees to be seasonal workers.

4.2.19 Conclusion

The general expression from the beneficiaries regarding the recapitalisation grant funding and the mentorship programme, clearly exposes that the programmes has the potential to reduce unemployment. Mentorship can improve/transform the livelihoods of people. Mentorship can facilitate acquisition of new skills (for example; the practical application of fertilisers and insecticides). Lack of mentorship can render farms to be unable to operate optimally. Mentorship has the potential to bring about profound change and great improvement in terms of farm productivity as individual performance in terms of soft skill and knowledge (for example, decision making, management and marketing practices) and hard skills (pruning, land preparation, spraying and so forth). The ages of the participants show that there are no young people involved in farming. These questions the long term sustainability of the programme.

4.3 Insights from the interview with the mentor

4.3.1 Introduction

The discussion was conducted with a mentor of Ba Bina Noko CPA regarding his experiences on the mentorship programme.

4.3.2 Role as mentor

The mentor mentioned that he started mentoring from 2011. He was already working with the community of Ba Bina Noko CPA as their manager. He further indicated that he was also an experienced farmer, with 27 years practical experience in farming. He thereafter approached the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform for financial assistance. It was during this engagement that he got the information regarding the recapitalisation and development programme of the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform which promote the mentorship of the land reform beneficiaries.

4.3.3 The significance of the mentorship model

Regarding the issues of the mentorship model having an impact on livelihoods of land reform beneficiaries/farmers he said the mentorship programme was making a significant positive impact on the lives of people since the programme enabled the community to acquire farm implements, created job opportunities of 50-60 employees with 25 permanent workers and seasonal employees.

4.3.4 Salary determinations for mentor and employees

According to the mentor, the mentor's salary is determined by the CPA Executive Committee through a contractual agreement between both parties (Mentor and CPA)

while employees' salaries are effected in accordance with the government policy regulating minimum wages in South Africa.

4.3.5 Equitable distribution of revenues and benefits among beneficiaries

The mentor was of the view that since they started with the project of Ba Bina Noko Community, they never reached a point of distributing dividends to beneficiaries. This is due to the fact that the farm is not operating at its optimal potential and this sentiment is encapsulated in this excerpt from the mentor:

'We are just struggling'.

4.3.6 Involvement of beneficiaries in the board of directors and the criteria of selecting board members

The mentor mentioned that the beneficiaries are part of the board of directors and the selection of board members is based on merit, which includes skills, education and dedication.

4.3.7 Term of mentorship and the fixed 5 year mentorship programme

The mentor said that the mentorship is a five year programme and it is informed by the policy on recapitalisation and development programme of the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform. The mentor expressed his concern regarding the 5 year term of mentorship which he considers is not affording enough time for learning. He claims that this is also exacerbated by the fact that the trainee manager is 60 years of age and difficult to train. His frustrations are reflected in this excerpt:

The trainee managers are not yet fully capacitated and unfortunately they are also not passionate and dedicated to do farm work. Furthermore, other members/beneficiaries get passionate in farming at a later stage when the term is left with a few months to be concluded.

4.3.8 The ideal time for mentorship

The mentor indicated that 8-10 years is an ideal time for a mentor to enhance skills and knowledge to benefit the beneficiaries. He also claimed that it is crucial for

beneficiaries to be afforded enough time with practical farm work and skills transfer. There are many enterprises at Ba Bina Noko CPA comprising various commodities, and time is needed to know and understand all crops on the farm.

4.3.9 Skills transfer to beneficiaries

The mentor said there is no direct contact with the entire beneficiaries except those working on the farm. He indicated that he is not confident that by the time his contract ends, the beneficiaries will be skilled enough to take the farm forward. However, he demonstrated his willingness to continue assisting the beneficiaries at any time they need his professional advice.

4.3.10 Rental determination paid to the CPA

The mentor and the CPA are expected to establish an operating company, and the operating company must pay rentals to the CPA since it owns the land. An annual rentals is determined by the mentor and the CPA executive committee. The rentals are paid to the CPA's account and it is the community's responsibility on how the rentals are used. According to the mentor, it is the responsibility of the Executive Committee, Board of Directors and the bookkeeper of the project to determine the rental amount to the Ba Bina Noko CPA. The operating company also has the responsibility to pay rentals to the CPA and money is disclosed in the annual general meeting in the presence of all the beneficiaries.

4.3.11 Employment strategy

The mentor said that the employment strategy is a competency given to the CPA Executive Committee and Board of Directors. The CPA has to come up with the strategy on employment on the farm, and their strategy is that preference is given to their beneficiaries when there are vacancies on the farm. The strategy is aimed at ensuring that their restored farms benefit their beneficiaries in terms of reducing unemployment. The business plan is a guiding tool in the application of the employment strategy. He indicated that the farm has managed to appoint 25

employees permanently since the mentorship programme started. “Initially I was involved in the recruitment of employees; however, such responsibility is now a competency of the supervisors and the farm manager”. The mentor further pointed out that with regard to appointment of seasonal workers, first preference is given to the family members of the beneficiaries of Ba Bina Noko from the 182 verified households and then to the communities around.

4.3.12 Stakeholder’s involvement

The mentor mentioned that Ba Bina Noko CPA is working with different stakeholders, including the Department of Agriculture in Elias Motsoaledi Local Municipality through their Agricultural Economists and Extension Officers, and the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform who are the main funders for the project using the recapitalisation grants. The agricultural economists assisted the project with the development of a business plan. The mentor further highlighted that the Limpopo Department of Agriculture assisted their beneficiaries who were sent for training in tractor driving and insecticides and pesticides use. The mentor also indicated that he is also expected to submit monthly reports on financial spending and all farm activities to the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform.

4.3.13 Rational for diverting from grapes to cash crops

The mentor indicated that when he was appointed as a farm manager in 2010, grapes were already in very bad condition with no chemicals, not properly irrigated and the grapes were infected with worms. Moreover, he took a decision to replace grapes with crops after soliciting for professional advice from qualified specialists on grapes. The specialist is a retired professor and he advised farmers that their farm was not suitable for grapes considering their soil types and climatic condition. He therefore said that the decision to divert to crops was also for economic reasons and cash flows on the farm.

4.3.14 Other potential investors on the farm operations

The mentor said that he was not aware of any other investor on the project except that there was a certain strategic partner called Group Africa who previously partnered with the community and their partnership did not last due to lack of funding. However, the mentor was clear that he did not have records for any previous and other investors except funding from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform.

4.3.15 Characteristics of a mentor

The mentor said that a mentor must be someone who has good qualities and must be serious about work. He expressed his views on the characteristics of a mentor as reflected in this excerpt:

A mentor must have a good commended track record that is traceable, He/she must be a people's man (he must be able to get along with people) and motivator to other people. He must be able to make people productive and take firm decisions. A mentor must be prepared to be at work an hour early and leave work an hour later. It helps him with adequate time to measure and evaluate the performance of the project.

4.3.16 Characteristics of a beneficiary/mentee

The mentor said that in order for the relationship between mentor and mentee to work, a beneficiary needs to have certain good qualities and must be serious about work as a trainee. His views on the characteristics of a beneficiary are reflected below:

A beneficiary must be honest. Someone passionate with farming. Someone with certain farming equipment and willing to put the interest of the farm first.

This is in line with Baguley's (2010:10) notion of mentoring as he regards it as being a transformative relationship in which individuals reconstruct possible selves in adopting the ways of the other individuals in a relationship which simplifies their

current way of thinking in putting their work first. This view is also supported by Young and Wright (2001) as cited in de Beer (2005: 30) when they say the protégé is the person who is being mentored. The protégé must respect and trust the mentor; be willing to enter into a relationship and must be committed and willing to learn.

4.3.17 Mentors recommendations on mentorship programme

Regarding advice on the mentorship programme, the mentor said that government policy gives a mentorship salary of only one year, and this brings a challenge since the farms are not yet making any profits. For example, in livestock farming, it is always not practical to realise profits in a year, while government expects a business to cater for the mentor's remuneration in the second year of business operation.

The mentor further recommended that, government must pay the mentor's salary for at least 3 years because farming enterprises will be able to realise a profit by then and therefore be able to make a determination on the mentor's salary. He further said that if the business was marketing its produce through informal markets, this presented a huge challenge in terms of monitoring sales and realising profits due to theft by members of the project during sales.

4.3.18. Meetings by mentor and the executive of the department of rural development and land reform

With regards to meetings between mentors and the Minister of Department of Rural Development and Land Reform, the mentor said that the minister invited all mentors in South Africa in 2014 and 2015. The mentor complained that meeting with the Minister cannot address challenges faced by mentors since mentors are many and they cannot express themselves in that forum. His frustrations are reflected below:

Yes I attended two meetings with the Minister where mentors were invited by the senior management of the department. However, discussions with the Minister were not robust and inclusive of all participants since mentors were many. His suggestion is that the Minister must delegate officials in discussion regarding challenges faced by mentors and each province must be visited.

4.3.19 Conclusion

The mentor indicated that mentorship has the potential to inculcate friendships and acceptance. Mentorship encompasses counselling. Mentorship nurtures and fosters talent and individual potential. Mentorship entails coaching and the transfer of knowledge. Mentorship allows the development of cooperation and commitment among beneficiaries. A mentor should ideally possess the following characteristics: experience, respect, competence, knowledge, reliability, understanding, and empathy and be a guide. A mentor must be able to earn the trust of stakeholders, communities, government and beneficiaries. The mentor also raised the issue of the age of mentees. Training a 60 year old man to be a manager does not contribute much to project long term sustainability. Again the absence of youth is clearly noticed.

4.4 Interview with executive committee members of Ba Bina Noko CPA

4.4.1 Introduction

This interview was conducted with 2 male executive committee members and 1 female member of the committee. Ba Bina Noko CPA comprises seven committee members which includes the chairperson, deputy chairperson, secretary, deputy secretary, treasure and two additional members. The role of committee members is to facilitate the affairs of the CPA, liaising with different stakeholders and governments departments for the project funding. The committee is elected by the verified members of Ba Bina Noko in an annual general meeting. Elections are conducted when the term of office of the office bearers has lapsed. The term lasts three years. The interview was conducted with two male and one female members of the CPA.

4.4.2 The project

According to the Executive Committee members, the project name is Ba Bina Noko Communal Property Association and the project started in 2011. The committee

indicated that they have a copy of a title deed. They also claimed that they are still waiting for the original copy from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform.

According to the members, the Ba Bina Noko CPA comprises about 182 households with 650 beneficiaries.

4.4.3 The role of executive committee

According to the committee members the role of executive committee members is to work with the entire members of the CPA. The committee has also the responsibility of liaising with other stakeholders on behalf of the entire community members. The communication between the executive committee and the entire community is through community meetings and annual general meetings. Community meetings are held every quarter.

4.4.4 The role of the executive committee members in the appointment of a mentor

The Executive Committee Members mentioned that in the case of Ba Bina Noko CPA the mentorship programme found their mentor working with them as their farm manager. They emphasised that in their situation it was a matter of signing the mentorship contracts with the mentor formalising their relationship.

4.4.5 Annual general meetings and elections of new members

According to the members, their CPA conducts their Annual General Meeting with the entire community once a year to discuss and give progress reports and to present financial reports to the community. It is during these meetings where the community elects new committee members of the executive committee when their term in office has expired.

4.4.6 Awareness of the business plan of the project

According to one executive committee member, the community is involved in the development of the business plan. Community members are invited on community meetings to share ideas and bring their own inputs on the business plan. The process is facilitated by the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform together with the Department of Agriculture, the appointed mentor and the executive committee of the CPA.

4.4.7 Perception on mentorship programme regarding farm productivity, farm profitability, beneficiaries livelihoods and profit sharing

According to the CPA executive committee members, community members see great improvement on their farm when they compare farm production by 2009 without a mentor with production from 2011 after the mentor was appointed. Members expressed their frustrations that delays on funding from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform had a negative impact on planting seasons, and profit sharing by the beneficiaries. Lack of funds and maximisation of profits is a major challenge. If there are no crops on the market for three months, they struggle to run the farm. Moreover, the salary of R2 200 per month for employees recommended by government is also costly to the business. However, since the CPA received recapitalisation funding and a mentor in 2011, the livelihoods of people are now better off than before.

The Ba Bina Noko farm was struggling before getting a mentor, but after the appointment of a mentor, there are many changes taking place on the farm. The farm is productive now and employees are paid salaries monthly. (Male Executive Committee Member aged 45).

4.4.8 Board of directors in the operating company

According to executive committee members the community is represented by two executive committee members in the board of directors' meetings. Committee members serving as board of directors are also signatories in the bank joint account for the operating company for the project.

4.4.9 Role of the executive committee on member's beneficiation

According to the member, the committee is trying by all means to ensure that the farm is productive and employees are receiving their salaries well. However, the farm did not reach that stage of beneficiation for profit sharing; it is still struggling. Government grant funding was very little compared to what was requested in the business plan.

4.4.10 Total number of beneficiaries of Ba Bina Noko CPA

According to the female executive committee member, it is not easy to know the exact number of beneficiaries since members are many. The member further said that the executive committee has a register of the beneficiaries or claimant verification and updates of the register are conducted annually during their annual general meetings. The last claimant verification update was conducted in 2013 and the total number of the households was 182 with 790 beneficiaries. The male executive committee member further pointed out that other beneficiaries reside locally while others live in far places like Gauteng.

4.4.11 Objectives of mentorship programme

With regard to the objectives of the mentorship programme, the executive committee member said that the programme is there to help emergent farmers with the farming skills and be able to farm at a commercial level. The members pointed out that the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform proposed the programme after realising that land reform beneficiaries are struggling on their farms in terms of skills, production and marketing of their produce. Members further said that government intention is to uplift emergent farmers to commercial farming as reflected below:

The objective of the mentorship programme is being achieved because in the Ba Bina Noko farm there are great improvements on the farm since the start of the mentorship programme. (A 45 years Male Executive Committee Member).

The objective is in line with Goosen (2004) and Meyer and Fourie (2004) who regard mentorship as the relationship between the experienced person and a person with less experience in a specific field of expertise. They also regard mentorship as a formal intervention in a process of transferring skills, knowledge and wisdom from a more experienced person to a less experienced in a specific field of expertise.

The idea was also supported by Kingdon and Knight (2007), since they are of a view that focused skills development is most beneficial to human development. Consequently, it is of importance for economic growth in South Africa to be proactive in taking on unemployment by means of human development initiatives, such as mentoring programmes.

The objective also is in line with Gelderblom's (2003) view that an emerging farmer is person who aspires to farm successfully within his or her given physical, mental and socio-economic constraints and needs the assistance of an external facilitator to realise this aspiration.

4.4.12 Fixed 5 year term of mentorship programme and skills transfer

With regard to the 5-year term of the mentorship programme, a male Executive Committee Member indicated that the Ba Bina Noko community will be ready to take forward the farm operations. Executive committee member indicated that CPA members are afforded opportunities for skills through employment on the farm and training, however the challenge is that most of the beneficiaries are not interested in farm work. The members of the executive committee shared their frustrations with lack of youth participation on the farm. According to a male executive committee member mentorship always ensures that beneficiaries get exposure to farming, the members are also taken to workshops and training, however their challenge is that many of the youth beneficiaries are not interested on farm work. In 2013 CPA members of Ba Bina Noko were trained on CPA regularisation by the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform. In 2014 the CPA members were trained on corporate governance by Agri-Sita. The CPA accomplishes this training through the assistance by the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform.

4.4.13 Employment opportunities

With regard to work opportunities, executive committee member indicated that when there are vacancies on the farm, first preference is given to the beneficiaries. The participant further indicated that many of their members including the youth are not interested in farm work. These views are in line with Quan, (2000) and Zimmerman, (2000) as they maintain that farming can reduce unemployment from families having access to land which increases labour and production.

4.4.14 Salary determination of employees

With regard to salaries of employment on the farm, executive committee member indicated that salaries are guided by the sectorial determination policy. They further indicated that employees are paid in accordance with the government directive of minimum wages to employees including farm employees.

4.4.15 Perception by beneficiaries on mentorship programme

Since the CPA received recapitalisation funding and a mentor in 2011, the livelihoods of people is now better off than before. This is expressed in the following extract:

The community will like the mentor to continue mentoring since from his arrival there is now better production on the farm and the livelihoods of people have improved for the better and beneficiaries are now employed on the farm.

4.4.16 Partnership with Group Africa and the mentor

The Ba Bina Noko CPA executive committee members mentioned that with regards to the CPA's partnership with Group Africa, the participants said that the partner was appointed by the CPA and a community resolution was made to appoint them as strategic partners. The participants said that their relationship with Group Africa did not work since the partners were dependent on community money they received from lease for payments of salaries. The participants further said that Ba Bina Noko

CPA signed a 5-year Service Level Agreement with Group Africa but their relationship did not last even for 6 months.

A male executive committee member said that the mentor is doing a great job for the community because their farm now is productive and creating job opportunities for their beneficiaries, therefore their mentor is more competent than those from Group Africa.

4.4.17 Leasing out the farm

With regard to the idea of leasing the farm, a male executive committee member said that the community of Ba Bina Noko will not agree with renting their farms, they will rather prefer to work on their own. He further said that CPA beneficiaries have realised that working on the land themselves is more beneficial than depending on a monthly rental from leases. The male executive committee member further indicated that working the land is benefiting community members through employment, poverty eradication and skills transfer.

4.4.18 Challenges of a mentorship programme

Executive committee members mentioned that in certain instances their mentor has a tendency of dominating the executive committee by taking decisions without their involvement, and this can result in him taking decisions that the committee is not comfortable with. They further said that it is very difficult to pay their mentor since the recapitalisation grant was finished after the second year of the contract, and he recoups his salary on farm profit. The farm is currently paying the mentor a monthly salary R 12 000.00. This is in line with Govender and Parumasur (2010) who note that competencies in the mentor role entail understanding self and others, communicating effectively and developing employees.

4.4.19 Project funding

The members of executive committee further said that the funding allocated was not enough. Their business plan requested an amount of R18 000 000.00. The participants said that the amount R6, 516,500.00 granted to the community of Ba Bina Noko was used for the development of their orchards. With regard to the farm operations, the male participants indicated that the Ba Bina Noko farm is operating at 45% of potential.

4.4.20 Other business opportunities on the farm

With regard to other business on the farm, the executive committee member mentioned that their farm has some broiler structures but they are currently not using them. They further said that since the mentor arrived he never paid attention on the broiler business. Executive committee member also said that their mentor is ignoring the broiler business and even when they persuade him he does not support the business saying that it is a risky business since they can always experience high mortality rate of chicks. Committee members revealed that through the mentors' advice the farm cannot venture into broiler production and his view is that the business is risky due to high mortality and they do not have formal markets. He further said that for now the farm is concentrating on crops which are labour intensive and they can realise profit with minimum and manageable risks.

4.4.21 Characteristics of a beneficiary

According to the CPA executive committee members, a beneficiary is someone with a passion and love for farming. They further described a beneficiary as a person passionate about farm work not someone who is solely after money. However, the committee indicated that many of their beneficiaries do not meet the criteria, specifically the youth since they are not passionate about farming and they prefer industrial jobs in cities.

4.4.22 Advice to other emergent farmers regarding the mentorship programme

The executive committee members mentioned that the mentorship programme is beneficial to emerging farmers. They further expressed their positive attitude on the programme by saying that, even other farmers can get better production if they can work with mentors.

I can advise communities on farming, to work with mentors since it is so helpful to the black society who are still lacking in terms of technical skills including management skills required in farming. Therefore the mentorship can help them grow in the farming sector. Mentorship is a good programme by government since our people are historically disadvantaged with little knowledge of farming.

The mentor transferred a lot of knowledge and skills to Ba Bina Noko beneficiaries. It can also recommended that communities embrace the mentorship programme since they will benefit a lot (Male executive committee member aged 63 years old).

The outcomes of the mentoring relationship and therefore, the mentorship programme are best summarized in the words of a new farmer/beneficiary:

We understand one another and work together to achieve one goal - I the new farmer must be successful. I have developed a new value system - proud of who I am and what I have achieved. The secret is we made time available for one another.

The above words reflect their appreciation of the mentor and the work he is doing on their farm. This resonates with Walsh's (2010) notion of mentoring which furthers the positive development of the mentee, specifically allowing growth in the ability to perform optimally in the workplace.

4.4.23 Conclusion

The Ba Bana Noko committee expressed that in the absence of mentorship, frustrations may set in among beneficiaries. Mentorship enhances management and business skills of the beneficiaries. Mentorship affords beneficiaries with an opportunity to learn farming at a commercial level including basic book keeping, marketing, asset management and networking. Mentorship generates innovated skills in farmers (for example application of fertilisers, packaging, customer retention

and the knowledge of the business cash flows). Mentorship capacitates beneficiaries with financial management, record keeping and socio-economic dynamic skills. Mentorship develops beneficiaries to be able to manage themselves successfully and independently. Mentors should preferably be knowledgeable, have leadership abilities and have training skills to transform beneficiaries to be better farmers. The committee also expressed their frustration on the limited funding they receive in the mentorship programme through recapitalisation funding and thus affect farm performance.

4.5 RESPONSE BY KEY INFORMANT (LIMPOPO DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND LAND REFORM

4.5.1 Introduction

Interviews were held with the Deputy Director of the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform responsible for Sekhukhune District. This was done in order to obtain information within the department regarding the mentorship programme and the direct thought the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform is achieving its goal on the programme.

4.5.2 Objectives of the mentorship programme

The key informant said that the mentorship programme was started by the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform in 2011 through the Recapitalisation and Development Programme. He further said the programme was meant to assist distressed farmers with financial assistance, therefore competent and accredited mentors are the ones expected to help in the development and implementation of the business plan. Emergent farmers are expected to graduate from subsistence farming into commercial farming.

The key informant pointed out that the main reason for appointment of mentors is to assist land reform beneficiaries in uplifting them from subsistence into commercial farming. He further said that mentors are expected to transfer skills to the beneficiaries through a period of five years of the mentorship programme.

The above opinions are supported by Gilmore (2005) when he expresses that the benefits of mentoring for the mentee can include faster career progress, increased confidence, assistance with working through difficult issues when dealing with other people, having a sounding board for trying out ideas, and being able to draw on someone else's experience; therefore, mentoring opens up the mentee to new issues and adds layers of thinking by developing new insights.

4.5.3 Appointment of mentors

According to the key informant the department uses a selection process where candidate mentors submit their curriculum vitae and those who meet the necessary requirements regarding farming are selected and called for interviews. Candidates for mentorship are expected to be experienced in farming, and to have qualifications in agriculture. He also indicated the department needs retired farmers, extension officers to become mentors but that government employees do not qualify for mentorship.

With regard to the process of appointment of mentors he said that mentors can be identified by Department of Agriculture, Department of Rural Development and Land Reform or the beneficiaries.

Mentors are accredited and placed in the departmental data base for future reference and interviews are facilitated by Department of Rural Development and Land Reform and Department of Agriculture to appoint competent mentors. The Department of Water Affairs is invited to assist in water rights on farms to be granted funding through the mentorship programme.

He further said that local municipalities are invited through their Local Economic Development Units. These are very important stakeholders for the department since they assist with funding from the municipality and also other business opportunities for the farms.

4.5.4 Government perception on mentorship

The key informant expressed his concern that the mentorship programme cannot be currently perceived as a success since the department is having budget constraints for the recapitalisation of land reform farms and the mentorship projects. His frustrations of poor performance of mentoring is encapsulated in this excerpt:

“Ba Bina Noko CPA applied R18 000 000.00 in their business plan and due to limited budget only approved an amount of R 6, 516,500.00 for the project which is far very little in terms of the optimal performance of the farm”. Mentors do not finish the term of the mentorship programme and it affects the performance of the funded farms and lastly there is lot of maladministration of funds and mentors and beneficiaries are failing to report financial reports and not implementing the business plan in accordance with the implementation plan.

The key informant said that the Department is facing challenges with conflicts between farmers fighting among themselves and not respecting the mentor; this affects the performance of the farm negatively since the mentor and management spend more time on conflict resolutions than working the land.

This is supported by Taljaard (2010) as he recognises that misconduct and gross unethical behaviour of either member in the mentoring relationship can, in the worst-case scenario, lead to legal action and, according to him, the most common occurrence is sexual harassment or racial discrimination.

4.5.5 Government funding of mentorship programme

According the key informant, the government transfers the recapitalisation grant funding in a joint account opened by the mentor and the beneficiaries. He further said that a joint account can be opened from any South African bank. The mentor is the one expected to account for the funds, therefore mentors are expected to report to government on financial spending.

4.5.6 Accountability on funding

The key informant said that government expects the mentor and farmers to report their financial spending on a monthly basis. He further said that a government official responsible for the project is expected to reconcile all invoices from mentors and monitor the spending if they are in accordance with the approved implementation plan.

4.5.7 Mentorship contractual agreements

The key informant said that mentors and beneficiaries are expected to sign some legal contracts as follows:

- ✓ The Service Level Agreement is signed between the mentor and the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform.
- ✓ The Tripartite Agreement is signed between the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform, Department of Agriculture and the Beneficiaries.

The key informant indicated that the contracts are binding legal contracts that are expected to encourage mentors and the beneficiaries to use recapitalisation money allocated to projects responsibly.

4.5.8 Conclusion

The government's intention in having a mentorship programme is to transfer skills to the beneficiaries through a period of five years of mentorship programme. Mentorship programme need emergent farmers to advance from subsistence farming into commercial farming. Conflicts among farmers hamper productivity and affect good working relations with the mentor. The government promotes accountability in the disbursements of public funds allocated to the mentorship programme; so mentors and beneficiaries are required to sign contractual agreements with the government.

4.6 Discussion and synthesis

Based on these findings, it is evident that the mentorship model and recapitalisation funding from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform is having a positive impact on the livelihoods of the land reform beneficiaries. Some of the positive impacts include: the empowerment of communities through the acquisition of farm implements and job creation including downstream employment. This implies that the programme should be rolled out to other beneficiaries.

The findings from this study portray a mentor as someone who should have a good traceable track record; a reputable; a motivator to other people; someone capable of making 'people productive' and having the capacity to take firm decisions when it is opportune; and importantly, he/she must be prepared to work long hours. This implies that mentors must be hard workers with empathy and determination while exuding leadership qualities.

Based on the findings of the study the five-year term of mentorship programme appears to be not enough to ensure that the mentees are deemed capable to work on their own. The mentor suggested that the five-year term of the mentorship programme could be extended to eight (8) to ten (10) years to afford beneficiaries enough time to learn and the mentor to fulfill his/her role of skills transfer.

The findings of the study reflect that a one-year salary paid by the government for mentoring may not be enough since the farm will not be in a position to generate revenue and to pay of salaries without the government's grant assistance. This suggests that extending employees' salaries and that of the mentor could be more effective to two or three years, or even, budget allowing, over the first five years.

The results from this study reveal that the mentorship programme empowers and respects beneficiaries since they are involved in the crafting of the business plan. In this case the mentor did not impose a business plan on the community instead a participatory approach was applied by the mentor. This signifies mentors must be good listeners and team builders. Based on the results, it is possible for the

government to achieve its objectives of the mentorship programme of improving production, market and skills transfer to the beneficiaries. The other benefit that the community can receive is their advancement from subsistence farming into commercial farming.

On the basis of the findings from this study, it is shown that beneficiaries are afforded opportunities with training and workshops for farming skills, fertiliser and chemical application but there is still a gap in management training to executive committee members. This implies that cooperative governance training might be needed to uplift the management skills of managers.

The finding exposes that there is still a gap between the mentor and the beneficiaries with regard to information at a project level. This can suggest that management must engage community members on financial reports that disclose loss and profits of the business during their annual general meetings.

After interviewing the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform management, it became evident that the Department is more committed to ensuring that land reform beneficiaries are assisted technically through capacity building from the appointed mentors. This implies that the an acceleration of its processes of recapitalisation funding by putting more budget on these distressed farms and also a consideration of better remuneration could be productive of mentors. By putting focus on mentorship of farmers the department might then better realise its objective of graduating more land reform farmers into commercial farmers.

Based on the findings it is evident that the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform is highly concerned with the skill shortage from farmers, thus an appointed mentor must be highly competent since their application is screened and assessed by different stakeholders including Department of Agriculture. This implies that the intergovernmental stakeholder relations must be consolidated for the sustainability of the mentorship programme.

The findings from this study show that the an ideal mentor from government must be a person who has a convincing farming experience, highly skilled and professional

qualification in agriculture, can put a candidate at advantage for selection, loyal and faithful on financial matters, no record of mismanagement of funds, a teacher with good report writing skills. A mentor must be reliable since the government keeps them on their departmental data base for future reference. This implies that mentors must be highly dedicated and prepared to work with different stakeholders.

Based on the findings from the study, it is evident that there is a challenge on mentors not finishing their 5-year contract on mentorship since they quit before the end of the term. This implies that the Department contractual agreements on mentorship must be strengthened.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5. Introduction

The term “mentor” is not a new term and was established in historical times where more experienced people had the opportunity of contributing to the lives of inexperienced individuals. Mentoring is largely found in medical institutions, school structures and the sport world, and recently the corporate world has entered this paradigm in order to better equip their workforce with skill and mental care. Mentoring is a process that occurs over a period of time. The individual is gradually sculpted, but also given the opportunity to add their own style to their own development as the new knowledge and wisdom is shared with them. Mentorship has advantages and disadvantages, but research findings shows that the advantages supersede the latter.

5.1 Unemployment

South Africa, as a developing nation, is emphasising care and growth of the work force where training, development, education and mentorship form an integral part of development process. It is evident that there is much room for improvement. It can be concluded that the mentorship model can raise the production capacity of restituted and redistributed farms, save jobs, reduce poverty and confer food security amongst beneficiary communities.

The study also concludes that South Africa has much of interest in mentoring, where there is great need for accelerated individual development as well as for various types of societal and community development, especially with the high incidence of unemployment in the country. Mentoring is a form of human development which it addresses unemployment challenges. It can therefore be concluded that focused skills development is most beneficial to human development. It is of importance for economic growth in South Africa to be proactive in taking on unemployment by means of human development initiatives, such as mentoring programmes.

5.2 Stakeholder collaboration

It is concluded that mentors should be able to work with different stakeholders. In this case, mentors were working with various departments, agricultural economists and extension officers, the local municipality through their Economic Development Directorate and the Department of Environment Affairs.

5.3. Skills transfer

The study observed that mentorship is the relationship between the experienced person and a person with less experience in a specific field of expertise. It can be concluded therefore that mentorship is a formal intervention process of transferring skills, knowledge and wisdom from a more experienced person to a less experienced in a specific field of expertise.

5.4 Mentorship legal contracts

It is concluded that the mentorship contracts are not working for the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform given that some mentors mismanage mentorship funds and abandon their work, some beneficiaries also disrespect mentors and no legal action is taken for any wrong doing. In terms of the findings of the study, it is shown that the mentorship programme is beneficial to the mentees who in this study are referred to as land reform beneficiaries. According to the research results, the objective of the mentorship programme in improving their livelihood, employment opportunities, access to market and skills transfer to the beneficiaries shows potential that it can be achieved. Land reform beneficiaries of Ba Bina Noko CPA were transformed from emergent farmers into commercial farmers.

5.5. RECOMMENDATIONS

5.5.1. Unemployment

In order for the country to address unemployment rate, the relationship between the mentor and mentee should be consolidated. The mentorship programme must be supported and funded.

5.5.2. Stakeholders

For effectiveness and efficiency in the mentorship programme, it should be recognized that collaboration between stakeholders is very critical and should be intensified.

5.5.3. Skills advancement

In terms of the Recapitalization and Development Programme of the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform, mentorship is one of the new strategic interventions aimed primarily at ensuring that land acquired through the Land Reform Programme since 1994 is productive and produces food for the country and improves the lot of not only those who benefited as new land owners, but also those who are employed on those farms. Mentorship will become a central element of the recapitalization programme considering the skills gap of land reform beneficiaries. The aim of the mentorship programme is to enhance the skills of land reform beneficiaries funded through the recapitalization and development programme. Mentors were expected to empower beneficiaries through training, project management, marketing, basic book keeping, asset management and networking skills on the business world.

The challenge with the mentorship programme is that their focus is only limited to the beneficiaries that are employed on the farm. It must be acknowledged that business on the restituted land cannot accommodate all the beneficiaries in terms of employment opportunities; therefore those who are not employed on the farm cannot enjoy the benefit of capacity building through mentorship skills transfer. Skill audits of

beneficiaries during their update of membership diary can assist in terms of skill development plan and also ensure that the process of beneficiation from their forefathers land is perpetuated positively without others being left out. The skills development programme can capacitate the beneficiaries not only to look for employment opportunities from farms, but also be employable in other sectors.

5.5.4. Mentorship legal contracts

With regard to mentorship contracts, the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform should ensure that contracts are binding and respected and should anyone violate the contract legal action should be taken.

5.5.5. Remuneration for a mentor and employees

For effective mentorship programme, government should extend mentorship remuneration to cover three years or even the first five years since it becomes difficult for beneficiaries to finance the salaries of employees and a mentor in the second year of mentorship.

5.5.6. Mentorship funding

The government should fund land reform farms' requested amount from the business plan since it is for the optimal utilisation of farms. The government must get more funding for the mentorship programme in order to achieve the objective of reducing poverty, unemployment and working with farmers in such a way that these become commercial farmers with better skills. This will certainly change their lives for the better and the country as a whole will benefit from such intervention.

REFERENCES

- Abbott ,P., Goosen, X & Coetzee, J. 2010. Developing and supporting coordinators of structured mentoring schemes in South Africa. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 8(1):1-10.
- Adams, M., Sibanda, S. & Turner, S. 2000. Land tenure reform and rural livelihoods in Southern Africa. In Toulmin & Quan (Eds). *Evolving land rights, policy and tenure in Africa*, pp . London: Department for International Development.
- Adams, H.G. 1998. *The mentorship briefing guide: Handbook for establishing and implementing a mentoring programme*. Notre dame, in: gem consortium.
- Adams, H.G. & Scott, S.K. 1997. *The fundamentals of effective mentoring*. Notre dame, in: gem consortium.
- Aliber, M. 2005. Overcoming underdevelopment in South Africa's second economy. Development report, Pretoria, United Nations Development Programme and Development Bank of Southern Africa.
- Aliber, M. & Hart, T. 2009. Should subsistence agriculture be supported as a strategy to address rural food insecurity? *Agrekon*, 48 (4):434–58.
- Allen, T.D., Eby, I.T. & lentz, E. 2006. Mentorship behaviours and mentorship quality associated with formal mentoring programmes: Closing the gap between research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(3):567-578.
- Anim, F.D.K. 2008. *On farm investment under open versus restricted access grazing: Case of small-scale farmers in Limpopo province of South Africa*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa.
- Anseeuw, W. & Mathebula, N. 2008. Land reform and development: Evaluating South Africa's restitution and redistribution programmes. University of Pretoria, Pretoria: Kellogg S Foundation, Research Paper No 2008/1.

Babbie, E. 2007. *The practice of social research*, 12th ed. United state of america.

Babbie, E. & Mouton, J. 2001. *The practice of social research*. oxford: oxford University Press.

Baguley, M. 2010. The role of transformative leadership between teacher and student in the context of the senior secondary art studio. In *Australian association for research in education annual conference*, Canberra, 29 Nov to 03 Dec 2009, Canberra, pp. 1-14.

Binswanger, H.P. & Elgin, M. 1992. What are the prospects for land reform? In eicher and Staatz (Eds.). *Agricultural development in the third world*, 2nd ed., pp. 342-344. London:NY:Longman Publishers.

Brown, H.N. 1999. Mentoring new faculty. *Nurse Educator*, 24(1):48-51.

Bryceson, D.F., Kay, C. & Mooij, J. 2000. *Disappearing peasantries? Rural labour in Africa, Asia and Latin America*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Cokwana, M. M. 1988. A Close Look at Tenure in Ciskei. In C.R. Cross & R. Haines (Eds.). *Towards freehold options in land and development in South Africa's Black rural areas*, pp. 305-313. Pretoria, South Africa. Juta.

Cooper, D. & Schindler, P. 2006. *Business research methods*. McGraw-Hill: New York.

Cousins, B. 2013. Smallholder irrigation schemes, Agrarian reform and accumulation from above and from below in South Africa. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 13 (1): 116 –139.

Creswell, J.W. 2009. *Research design qualitative, and mixed methods approaches*, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

De Beer, J. 2005. Mentoring skills: Course material, CE@UP. Pretoria, South Africa: University of Pretoria.

Deiniger, K. 1999. *Making negotiated land reform work: Initial experience from Colombia, Brazil and South Africa. World Development*, 27(4):651-672.

Deininger, K. & Binswanger, H. 1999. The Evolution of the World Bank's land policy: Principles, experience, and future challenges. *Research Observer*, 14(2). Washington, DC: World Bank.

Deininger, K. (2003). *Land policies for growth and poverty reduction*. New York: Oxford: Oxford University Press.

De Janvry, A. 1981. The role of land reform in economic development: Policies and politics. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 63:384-391.

Department of Health: Nutrition Directorate KwaZulu Natal. 2005. Implementation guidelines for nutrition interventions at health facilities to manage and prevent malnutrition.

Department of Rural Development and Land Reform. 2014/2015. Annual report, Vol 133, Pretoria, government printers.

Department of Land Affairs. 2007. Annual Report 1 April 2006–31 March 2007. Pretoria: Department of Land Affairs.

Devos, A.S. 2005a. Combined qualitative and quantitative approach. In A.S De vos, H. Strydom, C.N. FouChe & C.S.I Delpont (Eds.). *Research at grass roots: For the social sciences and human service professions*, 3rd ed. pp. 357-366. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

D'hease, I. & Kirsten, J. 2003. *Rural development focusing on small scale agriculture in Southern Africa*. Revised version: Pretoria: University of Pretoria.

Dunn, K. 2012. Mentoring within Clinical Education. *Radiologic Technology* 83(4):401-404.

- Edwards, C. and Keane, E., 2001. *The quality mentor*, a mentoring handbook. Northwest Missouri State University.
- Elst van der, H. J. 2007. Post–settlement support as key contribution to the success of the South African land reform programme (1994-2007). North West University.
- Fao. 2003. *World agriculture: towards 2015/2030*. A FAO Perspective: Economic and social development department. Rome: FAO.
- FAO. 2004. *The state of food and agriculture: A FAO perspective*, Rome: London.
- FAO. 2006. The state of food insecurity in the world. Eradicating world hunger-taking stock ten years after the world summit. Italy. Available: <http://www.fao.org/icalog/inter-e.htm>. [accessed 10 Novemebr 2014].
- FAO. 2009. A review of experiences of establishing emerging farmers in South Africa – case lessons and implications for farmer support within land reform programmes, Rome: FAO.
- Fao. 2012. *The state of food and agriculture: A FAO Perspective*, Rome: FAO.
- Gilmore, N. 2005. Experiences of the mentoring relationship: A study in mining company. *South African Journal of Human Resource Management*, 3 (3):27-32.
- Goosen, X. 2004. The Nature of Mentorship in an Industrial Goods and Services Company. Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg. (Dissertation – Ph.D.) p59.
- Gossen, Meyer, M. & Fourie, I. 2004. Mentoring and coaching: tools and techniques for implementation. Randburg: Knowres Publishing.
- Govender, P. & Parumasur, S.B. 2010. Evaluating the roles and competencies that are critical considerations for management development, *SA Journal of industrial psychology*.

Greater Sekhukhune District Municipality (GSDM). 2011. *2010/2011 IDP Review*. Retrieved January 15, 2012, from <http://www.sekhukhune.gov.za>.

Greenberg, S. 2010. *Status report on land and agricultural policy in South Africa 2010*. Institute for poverty land and agrarian studies, research report 40, University of Western Cape, Cape Town, South Africa.

Grinnel, R.M. 1993. *Social work research and evaluation*. USA: Peacock publishers.

Hall, R. 2004. A political economy of land reform in South Africa, land and agrarian studies. University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, South Africa.

Hall, R. 2004. *Land and agrarian reform in South Africa*. Unpublished research, University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, South Africa.

Hayes, S. and Koro-Ljungberg, M. 2011. Dialogic exchanges and the negotiation of differences: female graduate students, experiences of obstacles related to academic mentoring. *The Qualitative Report*, 16(3): 682-710.

Holiday, M. 2001. *Coaching, mentoring and managing*, 2nd ed. New Jersey: Career Press.

Hooglander, A. 2005. Land reform rests on post-settlement support. *Farmer's Weekly*, 8 July 2005. p. 53.

Human Science Research Council, 2004, annual report 2003/2004, available: <http://www.hsrc.ac.za>. [accessed on 14 April 2015]

Jacobs, P. T. 2009. The status of household food security targets in South Africa. *Agrekon*, 48:4.

Kahn, N. 2007. Land and agrarian reform in South Africa. Center for policy studies. Johannesburg. Available: http://www.cps.org.za/cps%20pdf/pia20_12.pdf. [accessed on 10 December 2014].

Kariuki, S. 2003. *Failing to learn from failed Programmes. South Africa's Communal Land Rights Bill*: www.univie.ac.at/ecco/stichproben/Nr7kariuki.pdf. [accessed 10 December 2014].

Keating, K. 2012. Mentorship of hospitality management students during work-integrated learning, *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, 13 (2):89-102.

Kingdon, G.G. & Knight, J. 2007. Community, comparisons and subjective well-being in a divided society. *Journal of economic behaviour and organisation*, 64: 69-90.

Krantz, I. 2001. *The sustainable livelihood approach to poverty reduction: An introduction*, Stockholm, Swedish International Development Agency.

Lahiff, E. 2001. *Land reform in South Africa. Is it meeting the challenge?* Cape Town, programme for land and agrarian studies, University of the Western Cape, policy Brief no. 1.

Lahiff, E. 2008. *Land redistribution in South Africa: progress to date*, paper presented to the workshop, land redistribution in Africa: towards a common vision, World Bank. . Regional Course, Southern Africa, July 9–13, 2008.

Limpopo Provincial Government. 2004. Limpopo growth and development strategy. Polokwane: Government printers.

Livingston, R.M. 2010. Reality vs. Myth: mentoring re-examined, available: <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/gettrdoc?ad=ada526585>. [accessed 14 April 2014].

Majale, M. 2002. Towards pro-poor regulatory guidelines for urban upgrading: A review of papers presented at the international workshop on regulatory guidelines for urban upgrading, bourtonon- dunsmore, pp. 17-18.

Maponya, P. & Moja, S. 2012. Asset portfolios and food accessibility in Sekhukhune District, Limpopo province, *journal of agricultural science*, 4 (12):144-153.

May, J. & Carter, M. R. 2000. Is poverty and inequality leading to poor growth? *South African Labour Bulletin*, 28(2): 18-20.

May, J. & Roberts, B. 2000. Monitoring and evaluating the quality of life of land reform beneficiaries: 1998/1999. Summary Report prepared for the Department of Land Affairs, Final Report.

Mclachlan, M. & Thorne, J. 2009. Development planning division working paper series, 16, Midrand: DBSA.

Ministry of Agriculture and Land Affairs (MALA). (2006). Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development. A sub-program of Land Redistribution Programme. Framework Document. National Department of Agriculture, Pretoria: DLA.

Mouton, J. 2001. *How to succeed in your masters and doctoral studies*. A South African guide and resource book, Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Mouton, J. 2010. *Research designs in the social sciences*, class notes: African Doctoral Academy summer school, University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch, January 2010

Murray, M. 1991. *Beyond the myths and magic of mentoring*. San Francisco: Jossey-bass.

National Department of Agriculture. 2002. The Integrated Food Security Strategy for South Africa. Pretoria: Department of Agriculture.

National Department of Agriculture. 2005. Economic Review of South African Agriculture: 2005/6. Online. [Available]: <http://www.nda.agric.za> (March 2013). [Accessed 11 December 2014]

Neuman, W. L. 2003. *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*, 5th ed. Place:Publisher.

Ntsebeza, I. & Hall, R. 2007. Land question in South Africa. In I. Ntsebeza, & R. Hall, (Eds.). *Challenges of transformation and redistribution*, Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Obi, A., Ndleve, A., and Musewa, I. 2011. *Institutional constraints to small farmer development in Southern Africa*. Isbn: 978-90-8686-132-3: e-isbn: 978-90-8686-704-2:doi: 10.3921/978-90-8686-704-2 Wageningen Academic Publishers: The Netherlands 2011: Department of Agricultural Economic, University of Fort Hare, Alice, South Africa.

Orkin, F.M. 2000. *Employment trends in agriculture in South Africa*, Statistics South Africa and National Department of Agriculture: https://www.statssa.gov.za/Publications/./Employ_TrendsAgri.pdf. [Accessed 10 December 2014].

Ortmann, G. F. & King, R. P. 2007. *Agricultural cooperatives ii*, can they facilitate access of small-scale farmers in South Africa to input and product markets? *Agrekon* 46: 219-244 .

Paeta (Primary Agriculture Education and Training Authority), 2003. Mentorship Review - towards a model for mentorship in agricultural development in South Africa. Draft Report.

Panin, A. 2001. *Hoe and ox farming systems in Southern Africa: A comparative socio-economic analysis*. Triops Verlag, Langen, Germany.

Perret, S. 2002. *Water policies and smallholding irrigation schemes in South Africa: a history and new institutional challenges*, Working Paper 2002 no. 19, University of Pretoria (Department of Agricultural Economics, Extension and Rural Development).

Peshkin, 1993. *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative methods*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Quan, J.J. 2000. Land tenure, economic growth and poverty in sub-Saharan Africa. In Toulmin & Quan (Eds). *Evolving land rights, policy and tenure in Africa*, pp. 282- London: Department for International Development.

Republic of South Africa. *Restitution of Land Rights Act 1994, chapter 22*, (1994)
Cape Town: Government Communication and Information System.

Republic of South Africa. 1997. Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108
of 1996. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Republic of South Africa. Statistics South Africa, 2011. *Community survey*. Pretoria:
Government Printers.

Rugege, S. 2004. Land reform in South Africa: an overview. Available:
<http://ccs.ukzn.ac.za/files/landreforminsouthafrica.pdf>. [accessed 30 November
2014].

Ryan, D. & Brewe, K. 1997. Mentorship and professional role development in
undergraduate nursing education. *Nurse Educator*, 22(6):20-24.

Sasol Report. 2006. Available at: <<http://www.sasol.co.za>>. [Accessed: 07 February
2015].

Scoones, I. 1998. Sustainable rural livelihoods: A framework for analysis. Working
paper 72, Brighton, UK: Institute for Development Studies.

Seaberg, J. R.1988. Utilising sampling procedure. In Grinnell (Ed.). *Social work
research and evaluation*. Itasca Il: Peacock.

Silungwe, C.M. 2009. The rhetoric and practice inland in Malawi: A contextualised
governmentality analysis, *Law Journal mlj*, 3(1):Page 1-27

SLSA Team. 2003. *Livelihood dynamics: Rural Mozambique, South Africa and
Zimbabwe*:[http://sanrem.cals.vt.edu/1048/Livelihood%20Dynamics%20Mozambique
%20South%20Africa%20and%20Zimbabwe.pdf](http://sanrem.cals.vt.edu/1048/Livelihood%20Dynamics%20Mozambique%20South%20Africa%20and%20Zimbabwe.pdf). [Accessed on the 15 February
2015]

Spence, G. B. & Oades, I. G. 2011. Coaching with self-determination theory in mind, using theory to advance evidence-based coaching practice. *International Journal of Evidence-based Coaching and Mentoring*, 9 (2): 37-55.

Statistics South Africa. 2009. Census of Commercial Agriculture. Available from: <http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P1102/P11022007.pdf>. [Accessed on 15 February 2015].

Statistics South Africa. 2010. Census 2010. Available from: <http://www.statssa.gov.za/Publications/P03014/P030142011.pdf>. [Accessed on 14 April 2015].

StatsSA. (Statistics South Africa). 2011. Community survey 2007. Statistics South Africa, Pretoria.

Stibbe, C.B. & Dunkley, G. 1997. Land reform and land policy: The progress report. Pretoria Van Schaik Publishers.

Stout-Roston,S. 2007. Article: Coaching and mentoring are the business buzz-words. The star workplace, updated march 2007.

Strydom, H., Fouché, C.B. & Delpont, C.S.I. 2002. *Research at grass roots for the social sciences and human service professions*, 2nd, Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Strydom, H. and Venter, I. 2002. Sampling and sampling methods. In De Vos, A.S., Strydom, H., Fouché, C.B., & Delpont, C.S.I. 2002. *Research at grass roots for the social sciences and human service professions*, 2nd ed., Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Swanson, B. E. & Claar, J. B., 1984. Defining extension Agricultural extension: A reference manual. Alternative models and recent trends in organizing agricultural Extension. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization.

Taherian, K. & Shekarchian, M. 2008. Mentoring for doctors, do its benefits outweigh its disadvantages? *Medical Teacher*, 30 (4):95-99.

Taljaard, A. 2010. *The identification of factors that contribute to the creation of a formal mentoring programme at Lumotech (pty)* Unpublished MBA dissertation, Port Elizabeth, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University.

Terblanché, S. E. 2007. Understanding mentorship and the development, implementation and management of a mentorship programme to support Extensionists towards professionalism. Proceedings of the 41st Congress of the SA Society for Agricultural Extension.

The University of Birmingham. 2013. University of Birmingham Mentoring Scheme. 5 p. <http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/generic/internships/documents/mentoring-guide.pdf> [Accessed on 06 January 2015].

Turner, S. 1997. Mid-term review of the land reform pilot programme. Pretoria: DLA in association with DANID, the European commission and UK-DFID. 24 September.

Turner, S. 2001. Sustainable development: What's land got to do with it? Available from: <http://www.plaas.org.za/sites/default/files/publications-pdf/PB%2002.pdf>. [Accessed on 15 December 2014].

Twala, W.D. 2010. The land question and sustainable development in South Africa: Issues and challenges, department of construction management and quantity surveying, university of Johannesburg. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, 5 (25):3553-3560.

Ueckermann, H. 2005. Vroue bemagtig met program van mentorskap, inspiration woman at work, *Rapport*.

UNDP. 2007. Country programme outline for South Africa 2007-2010, New York, executive board of the United Nations development programme and the United Nations Population Fund.

UNDP .1990. Human development Report 2013.

UNDP. 203. Human Development Report Office, New York.

Van Averbeke, W. M. 2008. *Best management practices for small-scale subsistence farming on selected irrigation schemes and surrounding areas through participatory adaptive research in Limpopo Province*. Pretoria: Water research Council.

Van der Elst, H.J. 2007. Post settlement support as a key contributor to the success of the south african land reform programme. *The Journal of School of Basic Sciences*, 26 (3):287-305.

Van der Pol, M. 2011. Learning motives of employees, the role of managers, and employee satisfaction with manager role as antecedents of learning activities of employees. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, Tilburg University, Tilburg.

Walsh, D. 2010. *The nurse mentor's handbook*, supporting students in clinical practice, NY: Mcgraw-hill, pp. 240.

Watson, N. A. 1999. Mentoring today – the students' views: An investigative case study of pre-registration nursing students' experiences and perceptions of mentoring in one theory/practice module of the common foundation programme on a project course. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 29 (1):254-262.

Welman, C., Kruger, F., & Mitchell, B. 2005. *Research methodology*. Cape Town, South Africa: Oxford University press.

www.daff.gov/greater Sekhukhune. Accessed 15/01/2015

Young, C.Y & Wright, J. 2001. Mentoring, the components for success. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, Volume 28, No 3, September 2001, Page: 202 - 206.

Zikmund, W. G. 2003. *Great circle learning: The practice of mentoring, business research methods*, 7th ed. United State of America, Thomson South-western.

Zimmerman, F.J. 2000. *Barriers to participation of the poor in South Africa's land redistribution*. *World Development*, 28:1454-1460.

ANNEXURE 1: RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS FOR 20 FARMERS WITH A MENTOR

GENERAL QUESTIONS

- A. What is the name of your project?
- B. When did your project start?
- C. Do you have documentation for mentorship and recapitalisation programme?
- D. How many beneficiaries are there in your project?
- E. How were beneficiaries selected?
- F. When did you get a mentor?
- G. How did you know about the mentorship programme?
- H. Why did you decide to get a mentor?
- I. How was the process of getting a mentor?
- J. Did you get the mentor you wanted?
- K. In what way has the mentorship programme assisted your project the most?
- L. Has mentorship affected your farm activities?

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS (beneficiary perception on how mentorship impacted their livelihood)

How has mentorship impacted the livelihood of beneficiaries?

- (I) Is there any improvement in in your household income as a result of mentorship?
- (II) Can you now afford school fees as a result of mentorship?
- (III) Can you now afford hospital fees as a result of mentorship ?
- (IV) Diversifying skills: Can you see improvement in your skills as a result of mentorship?
- (V) Does the mentorship programme have a positive impact on your household food security (access to food)?

- (VI) Did the mentorship programme have a positive impact on your household asset base for agricultural production?
- (VII) Were you able to buy/build the following as a result of the mentorship programme? - Please explain.
- a. A radio
 - b. A house
 - c. A TV
 - d. Nice clothes
 - e. Gifts for the family e.g. Christmas/Valentine
 - f. Nice shoes
 - g. Nice perfume
 - h. More beer

B) What are the challenges in the mentorship programme?

C) What are the challenges faced by land reform beneficiaries with regard to mentorship support?

D) What kind of post-settlement support has been provided to the community?

E) How can the challenges faced by land reform beneficiaries on mentorship be overcome?

F) How can the mentorship programme be improved so as to better support the needs of land reform beneficiaries?

G) Did you acquire **skills** from your mentor?

H) Did mentorship assist in improving your **farm production/yields**?

- How was your production before mentorship?
- How is production after getting a mentor?

I) Did mentorship assisted in terms of **markets**?

- (i) Do you have formal or informal markets?
- (ii) Do you have letters of intent with your markets?

J) Is your farm contributing to food security in the area?

K) Is your farm making profit?

L) How do you share profits in your project?

M) What do you need assistance with on your farm?

N) Did mentorship assist in **job creation**?

O) Did mentorship assist **poverty alleviation**?

- P) How did the mentorship programme affect social networking?
- Q) What are the objectives of the mentorship programme?
- R) Have the objectives of the mentorship programme been achieved?
- S) Would you recommend mentorship to another project?

2. QUESTIONS FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS WITH A MENTOR

GENERAL QUESTIONS

- A) What is the name of your project?
- B) When did your project start?
- C) Do you have documentation for the establishment of your project?
- D) How many beneficiaries are there in your project?
- E) How were beneficiaries selected?
- F) What is the role of the executive committee in general?
- G) What is the role of the executive committee members in the appointment of a mentor?
- H) Do you have Annual General Meetings and elections of new members?
- I) Are you aware of the business plan of the project?
- J) How do the executive committee members communicate with the entire community of beneficiaries?
- K) How does the committee perceive the mentorship programme?

In terms of:

- Farm productivity
- Farm profitability
- beneficiaries livelihoods
- Profit sharing

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

- A) Does government engage committee members during the appointment of a mentor?
- B) Does government involve executive committee members during the development of a business plan?

- C) Do committee members form part of the board of directors in the operating company?
- D) Are committee members allowed to be signatories in the bank joint account for the operating company for the project/farm?
- E) Do you have Annual General Meetings and elections of new members?
- F) Which role does the committee play in ensuring that there is equity in terms of profit sharing/beneficiation by all beneficiaries?
- G) What are the objectives of the mentorship programme?
- H) Have the objectives of the mentorship programme been achieved?

3. QUESTIONS FOR A MENTOR

- A) When did you become a mentor for this project?
- B) How were you selected?
- C) Why did you choose to be a mentor?
- D) How did you know about the mentorship programme?
- E) Does the Mentorship Model have an impact on livelihoods of land reform farmers/beneficiaries? If so, how?
- F) Who determines your salary and that of as a mentor and the employees? And, who provide that?
- G) How do you determine if there is equitable distribution of revenues and benefits among the beneficiaries?
- H) Do you involve beneficiaries in the board of directors, and what are the criteria of selecting board members?
- I) What is the term of mentorship, and who determines the period and what informed this?
- J) Who determines rental amount paid by the Operating Company to the Communal Property Association/beneficiaries?
- K) Who determines the employment strategy and what informed that?
- L) Do you involve government and other stakeholders on the running of the farm and to what extent?
- M) How did you make the business plan for this project?

4. QUESTIONS FOR KEY INFORMANT (DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND LAND REFORM: Deputy Director Sekhukhune)

GENERAL QUESTIONS

- A) What are the objectives of the mentorship programme?
- B) How are mentors appointed?
- C) Which process do you follow in insuring that high quality mentors are appointed?
- D) Do you perceive the mentorship model a success to the farmers/government?
- E) Which process does government use in transferring the recapitalization grant that will be managed by mentors for the development of the targeted farmers/beneficiaries?
- F) What are the reasons for government in appointing mentors to the land reform beneficiaries?
- G) What measures does the government have in insuring that funded farmers are disbursing money in accordance with the approved business plan and the implementation plan?

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

- A) Do you have accreditation/assessment process in appointing prospective mentors?
- B) Do you engage farmers in the allocation of a mentor, or you just impose without involving farmers?
- C) Do you need land use plans and business proposal on funded farms?
- D) Do you involve the Department of Agriculture in the process of appointing mentors?
- E) Do you involve/engage other relevant stakeholders while funding the farmers? (Example the municipality and department of agriculture.)
- F) What kind of contractual agreement does government enter into with the mentors?

- G) What kind of contractual agreement does government enter into with the mentors?
- H) Do you transfer recapitalization funding directly to the mentors' account or farmers' account?
- I) Does government demand audited statements for accountability from funded farmers?
- J) What are the general challenges the Department is confronted with in the mentorship programme?

ANNEXURE 2: PERMISSION LETTER

HOUSE NO: 41 SERALA VIEW
P.O. BOX 532
SASELAMANI, 0928
15 March 2015

Dear Sir\Madam

I, Nyiko Shadrack Golele, Master of Development student of University of Limpopo, am undertaking a research project to assess the effectiveness of the mentorship programme in your farm. Please be informed that this research interview guide is not going to be used to implicate you in any way. You are at liberty to withdraw at any time. The information that you are requested to provide will be used for only research purposes and for the fulfilment of my Masters of Administration in Development at University of Limpopo. Lastly, I kindly request that you participate in this interview by responding to the following general and direct questions on employment opportunities, skills transfer, food security, access to markets, farm production and material benefits that you derive from the mentorship programme. The interview guide will comprise interviews with the focused group, interview with the mentor and interview with the executive committee members separately.

Your response is of utmost importance. Please do not mention your name or contact details during the voice recordings. Responses will remain anonymous.

Summary results of this interview will be made available to you on request by contacting us on the above stated address or by using my email address: nyiko.golele@drdlr.gov.za or 082 302 4406.

Yours Sincerely

NS GOLELE

Student Number: 9707277