

# AN ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE MENTORSHIP PROGRAMME IN LAND REFORM: THE CASE OF BA BINA NOKO COMMUNITY PROPERTY ASSOCIATION, SEKHUKHUNE DISTRICT, LIMPOPO PROVINCE, SOUTH AFRICA

Nyiko S Golele and Human Mautjana  
University of Limpopo

Godswill Makombe

Gordon Institute of Business Science, University of Pretoria and Stellenbosch University

---

## ABSTRACT

The South African land reform programme is implemented to redress land ownership patterns that resulted from Apartheid discriminatory laws. Whites expropriated land from Africans and, by so doing, usurped their livelihoods. The majority ANC government has been attempting to return not only the land, but also to restore the livelihoods from land ownership. The programme has been very slow to return land to the black majority, but some land has been returned. The programme has dismally failed to restore the livelihoods from land ownership, as most of the projects have failed to continue producing at all or at levels achieved by previous white landowners. The mentorship programme was created in order to increase the success of the land reform programme in delivering a livelihoods impact. We use a qualitative approach to evaluate the impact

of this programme. Although beneficiaries of the mentorship programme perceived the programme positively, production on the projects is still low. Even with the failure of the projects to deliver livelihoods impacts, the government is proposing expropriation without compensation to accelerate land reform. We propose a land reform process that incorporates the mentorship programme, averts expropriation without compensation, but achieves both political and economic imperatives of land reform.

**Keywords:** Land reform, Mentorship program, expropriation, compensation.

## INTRODUCTION

The White Paper on South African Land Policy clearly states that, "By helping to create conditions of stability and certainty – both nationally and at household level – land

reform is essential for sustainable growth and development in South Africa. It is a precondition for the success of government's growth, employment and redistribution strategy" (RSA, 1997:7). This succinct statement implies that land reform is both a *political* and *economic* programme. Political in the sense that it aims to redress the land ownership imbalances that were created by the Apartheid discriminatory laws, which resulted in the fact that by 1994, 82 million ha of agricultural land were owned by white farmers. The aim of the land reform programme was, therefore, to redistribute 24.5 million ha or 30 percent of this to Blacks by 2014 (Binswanger-Mkhize, 2014). It is an economic programme, because it also aims to achieve growth, employment and redistribution (of both land and wealth). Since it is possible to achieve the political imperatives without achieving the economic ones, it is the economic objectives of the land reform programme that make it critical that the land reform programme provides livelihoods to the beneficiaries in such a way that sustainable growth, employment creation and (wealth) redistribution can be achieved at national level.

In order to achieve these goals, the South African land reform programme is made up of three components, namely;

1. **Land restitution:** This programme redresses the imbalance in land ownership by returning (or compensating for) land that was lost since 19 June 1913 as a result of discriminatory laws.
2. **Land redistribution:** This programme makes it possible for poor people to purchase land through assistance by the government.
3. **Land tenure:** This programme aims to develop a unitary, legally validated landholding system for those occupying land, for instance farm labourers. It also seeks to resolve land tenure disputes and to find alternatives for those displaced in the process of land reform (RSA, 1997).

One of the problems associated with the South African land reform programme is the slow pace at which it has been implemented (Anseeuw & Mathebula, 2008; Cousins, 2013). There are several reasons that have been extended to explain the slow pace of land reform. The reason most cited is the willing seller, willing buyer principle on the basis of which the land reform programme has been implemented (Fraser, 2008; Logan *et al.*, 2012). Many of the white farmers are not willing to sell their farms, thus, slowing down the land reform programme.

The willing seller, willing buyer basis is not the only cause for the slow pace of the implementation of the land reform programme. The rate at which both the restitution and redistribution programmes are implemented has also been called into question. In the case of the Mothiba and the Mathapo clans of Limpopo, a meeting to resolve the disputed claims between the two clans was held nine years after the restitution claim was launched (Logan, Tengbeh & Petja, 2012). For the Kagiso land redistribution project, it took eight years from the time the farm was purchased to the formal transfer and use of the farm, because water rights had not been included in the purchase price (Hart, 2012). Golele (2016) laments that when the beneficiaries finally get to start using the restitution or redistribution farms, because of the time taken between gazetting and final

transfer, the farms are usually no longer going concerns. This led to involuntary enterprise adjustments at Ba Bina Noko Community Property Association. These are inefficiencies resulting from the poor implementation of the land reform programme. They are also partly a result of implementers who are insensitive to the direct impact of such inefficiencies on the livelihoods of the beneficiaries and growth, food security, employment creation and wealth distribution at national level. Most of the implementers have no farming experience (Makombe, 2018).

This situation has led to public expression of the need to accelerate the pace of land reform. Leading this clarion call is Julius Malema, leader of the Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF). In response to this call, the African National Congress (ANC), under President Cyril Rhamaphosa, has resolved to implement a policy of land expropriation without compensation (Citizen Reporter, 2018). The process requires an amendment of Section 25 of the *Constitution* in order to make it easy to expropriate property without compensation. Countrywide consultations were held on whether Section 25 of the *Constitution* should be amended and the result of the process was that, "...our people have unequivocally and overwhelmingly said Section 25 of the *Constitution* must be amended in order to fulfil the broad and fair land ownership" (Citizen Reporter, 2018). We have no doubt that the constitutional amendment will be effected and given its overwhelming support; we also agree that it should be implemented. It is a fact that expropriation without compensation can be implemented legally as suggested by Theresa May (Friedman, 2018). Even with May's support, there is strong opposition to land expropriation without

compensation, particularly from the white farmers who stand to lose the most. However, those opposed to land expropriation without compensation need only to revisit the results of the discriminatory laws by the Apartheid government, namely The Natives Land Act of 1913 and The Natives Land and Trust Act No. 18 of 1936 (Bradstock, 2005; Fraser, 2008), and assess the impacts of these two pieces of legislation on the livelihoods of the general African populace at that time. Therefore, there is a strong moral and political (even legal) justification for land expropriation without compensation. However, we posit that, even though the justification for land expropriation without compensation is strong, it does not mean that it has to be implemented.

Land expropriation without compensation is likely to accelerate the pace of land reform. In so doing, the government needs to take heed of the fact that, in most cases where land reform has been accelerated, only the political and not the economic imperatives have been delivered (Mufune, 2010). It is important to make sure that the South African land reform programme delivers better livelihoods to beneficiaries. Sikor and Müller (2009) argue that the purpose of land reform is to improve the livelihoods of disadvantaged groups. However, according to Pringle (2013), the failure rate of land reform projects is as high as 90 percent. Logan *et al.* (2012) support Pringle's observations. Binswanger-Mkhize (2014) makes reference to islands of success in a sea of partial or complete failure. Based on studies, we conclude that the land reform programme has performed poorly in improving the livelihoods of the previously disadvantaged. One of the mechanisms which the government implements in order to deliver improved livelihoods to beneficiaries is the mentorship programme.

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE MENTORSHIP PROGRAMME**

Golele (2016) describes the mentorship programme in detail. The term "mentor" was established in historical times when more experienced people had the opportunity of contributing to the lives of inexperienced ones. Mentoring is largely found in school structures, medical institutions and the sport world. Recently, the corporate world has endorsed this paradigm with the aim of better equipping their workforce with skills and mental care. Mentoring occurs over a period of time. An 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. However, research shows that there are more advantages compared to disadvantages.

In today's business world, coaching and mentorship are buzzwords; trends of the moment (Stout-Roston, 2007) and organizations/institutions are structuring and developing mentorship programmes. Mentorship, however, can differ depending on the profession involved and workplace practices where the implementation takes place. The concept, mentorship, can be taken back many years to 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 & 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 a 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 appoints mentors to work with the land reform beneficiaries and mentors are expected to:

- 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.
- Transfer skills to the land reform beneficiaries, which must include: financial skills, marketing, business skills, co-operative governance and general farm management.

**TABLE 1: Limpopo population**

District	Male	Female	Total
DC33: Mopani	539 574	619 612	1 159 186
DC34: Vhembe	643 758	750 191	1 393 949
DC35: Capricorn	625 260	705 176	1 330 436
DC36: Waterberg	381 493	364 265	745 758
DC47: Sekhukhune	548 463	621 299	1 169 762
<b>Limpopo</b>	<b>2 738 548</b>	<b>3 060 543</b>	<b>5 799 091</b>

Source: Statistics South Africa - Community Survey, 2016

- Have the relevant skills, including basic bookkeeping and asset management (Golele, 2016).

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 in the first years of mentoring and, from the second year onwards, it is expected that the business will be making profits and the mentor's salary will be determined by the directors of the company and will depend on profits. Successful outcomes of the 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. Terblanché (2011) argues that mentorship is a key success factor in sustainable land reform projects in South Africa.

## OBJECTIVE

The objective of this study was to assess the effectiveness of the mentorship programme in terms of whether it improves the performance

of the land reform programme by improving the livelihoods of the beneficiaries.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### Study Area

The study was conducted in Sekhukhune district in Limpopo Province. The province comprises five districts, namely the Mopani, Vhembe, Capricorn, Waterberg and Sekhukhune districts. The total population of the Limpopo province is 5 799 091, of which just under 53 percent is female (Table 1). This gender distribution of the population suggests that development interventions in Limpopo need to pay particular attention to being accessible by both males and females.

Table 2 on the following page shows that Sekhukhune district accounts for just over 20 percent of the Limpopo Province population, which is located in 117 wards. Both wards and villages are sometimes used as target units for development interventions.

Golele (2016) shows that, in the Sekhukhune District, just under 8 percent of the land is under commercial agriculture and just over 18 percent under subsistence agriculture. The land reform programme is being implemented in commercial agriculture.

**TABLE 2: Sekhukhune district population**

Local municipality	Number of wards	Population
LIM471: Ephraim Mogale	16	127 168
LIM472: Elias Motsoaledi	31	268 256
LIM473: Makhuduthamaga	31	284 435
LIM476: Fetakgomo-Tubatse	39	489 902
<b>Sekhukhune District</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>1 169 761</b>

Source: Statistics South Africa - Community Survey, 2016

## Data Collection Methods

Data was collected to enable the assessment of the effectiveness of the mentorship programme based on the perceptions of beneficiaries. Two focus group interviews were conducted, namely a focus group of 20 farmers and a focus group of the executive committee, which comprised seven committee members, namely the chairperson, deputy chairperson, secretary, deputy secretary, treasurer and two additional members. The mentor and a key informant were interviewed to triangulate the findings from the focus groups.

According to Donalek (2005:124), "The interview is by far the most common method of qualitative data collection...". Qualitative researchers study experiences through interviews. Different studies use different questions. In phenomenology, the questions asked are similar to, "What was it like to...?"; in ethnography, questions like, "What are the traditions of...?" are used, whereas case studies "... are used to answer specific kinds of research questions" (Donalek, 2005:124). In this case study, open ended, semi-structured questions were used to explore the experiences of the mentor, the key informant and focus group participants. Questions like, "How does mentorship impact the livelihoods of land reform beneficiaries?" were asked to the mentor and

questions like "What are the reasons given by government for appointing mentors to the land reform beneficiaries?" were asked to the key informant. In keeping with the recommendations of Donalek (2005) and Sakellariou, Boniface & Brown (2013), interviews were recorded and then transcribed.

## Analysis of Data and Research Findings

Thematic analysis, as was applied by Makombe (2018), was used to analyse the data.

According to Clarke and Braun (2017:297), "Thematic analysis... is a method for identifying, analyzing and interpreting patterns of meaning ('themes') within qualitative data". An organic approach to data coding and theme development was adopted. After patterns of meaning were identified, the coded data was grouped into themes. Seven themes were identified as follows:

**Theme 1:** Impact of mentorship programme on farm production.

**Theme 2:** How has the appointment of the mentor impacted beneficiaries' livelihoods?

**Theme 3:** Skills acquisition from the mentor.

**Theme 4:** Market access.

**Theme 5:** Contribution to food security and employment creation.

**Theme 6:** Profit level of the farm.

**Theme 7:** Social networking and accountability.

The analysis of each theme is summarised below.

### ***Impact of Mentorship Programme on Farm Production***

A focus group member mentioned that the mentor was officially appointed in 2011. According to the farmers, the decision to get a mentor was made by the executive committee, because they realised that there were challenges to farm production and the situation was deteriorating. Regarding the mentor, one respondent said, "The mentor is good, because he is doing the right job on the farm". This reflects the farmers' appreciation of the mentor and the work he was doing. It was observed that the farmers got the mentor they wanted, since there was a great improvement on the farm since his arrival in 2011. This shows that, from the farmers' perspective, the mentorship programme has a positive impact. Another farmer said, "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".

It was generally agreed that the condition was bad on the farm before the arrival of the mentor. The farm was operating without

proper farm implements, like tractors and pickup vehicles, and employees were not getting salaries on time and, sometimes, they would work for three months without salaries. Farmers reported that the farm was on the brink of collapse before the appointment of a mentor. The participants pointed out that, on the farm they had inherited, the previous farmer was planting grapes, oranges and maize. After the mentor was appointed, they diverted to watermelon, butternut and cabbage. They still continued with maize and oranges. It was mentioned that the mentor replaced grapes with other crops after realising that they will cost the farm too much to revive them after the deterioration that took place while the beneficiaries were waiting for the restoration process to unfold. The executive committee mentioned that the funds they got from the recapitalisation programme were far less than they had requested. They requested R18m, but got R6.5m. They were not yet clear why they got less; they had worked hard to justify the amount they needed in order to bring the farm to full production potential.

### ***How Has the Appointment of the Mentor Impacted Beneficiaries' Livelihoods?***

Participants were asked to explain their situation before the mentor and after the intervention by the mentor. They were asked to explain any way in which the intervention had affected their livelihoods whether it was through the food they ate, access to education, access to medication and/or any other possible impacts to their livelihoods before and after the appointment. The participants shared the opinion that the mentorship programme had had a positive impact on their livelihoods as illustrated by the quote, "I can now afford to buy casual

clothes, school uniforms and school fees for my children while before the mentor it was a crisis. My life was much 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". Some have been able to improve their living conditions as illustrated by the quote, "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". Participants generally agreed that the mentorship programme was liberating them from poverty. It was mentioned that beneficiaries could not afford to buy nutritious food like meat, but now they are able to do that as a direct result of the mentorship programme. It was mentioned that all this is possible as a result of the positive impact of the mentorship programme on farm production.

### ***Skills Acquisition from the Mentor***

Focus group participants mentioned that they acquired skills from the mentor including the planting of crops, as well as the use and application of fertilisers to crops, including citrus. They now understand how their water and irrigation system works. They can now fix some of the irrigation-related problems and they have some who are experts with the irrigation lines on the farm. This is illustrated by this quote, "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". It was mentioned that before the appointment of a mentor, the farm was

operating without guidance. Beneficiaries lacked the skills needed to run a commercial enterprise. This is also illustrated by the above quote.

This is a reflection of the beneficiaries' appreciation of the mentor through the skills he transferred to them. Even though the beneficiaries appreciated the skills transfer, the mentor mentioned that the five-year term was not enough to transfer all the skills to beneficiaries who have no farming background. He lamented that he was training a 60-year-old manager, yet he should be training someone much younger for the future of the farm. He mentioned that an 8-10 year term might serve the purpose better. This was echoed by the executive committee.

### ***Market Access***

Regarding marketing, it was mentioned that their farm produce is marketed properly and that there are regular customers. It was mentioned that farm produce is marketed through both formal and informal markets. They mentioned that their farming business makes better sales through informal markets. When they sell to informal markets, the customers come to the farm with their own transport. It was observed that this makes marketing produce less costly to the business. It was stressed that the formal market costs more, because of the need for proper packaging and that transportation costs are high. It was mentioned that, in some cases, formal markets present serious challenges. For instance, if, after taking produce to the Johannesburg market, it is judged to be of poor quality, it has to be transported back to the farm more than 300km away. This costs the business. Participants showed a clear



preference for informal marketing as shown by the quote, "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".

### ***Contribution to Food Security and Employment Creation***

Participants mentioned that the project is helpful, since local people can buy cabbages, watermelons, maize and citrus fruits from the farm. They mentioned that this is a direct contribution of their project to the food security of the local people, including those who are not direct beneficiaries of the project. They also mentioned that when they sell to formal markets in Johannesburg, they contribute to national food security. They also mentioned that the project created employment for beneficiaries and for people from the surrounding villages. They mentioned that these people are earning better salaries to feed their families and, therefore, the project contributes to poverty alleviation. They said that this is all as a result of the mentorship programme.

### ***Profit Level of the Farm***

Focus group participants mentioned that they believe that the farm is making a profit. They observed that, since employees are paid salaries without any problems, this must be from the farm profit. This is illustrated by the quote, "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". It was observed that, for the meantime, there will be no

profit-sharing among beneficiaries, since profits are being used to manage the farm operations and to buy inputs like fertilisers and seedlings. The mentor also lamented that they have not yet reached the full production potential of the farm. He noted, "We are struggling". The mentor also expressed concern over the 5-year mentorship term, which he said was not sufficient to bring the farm to full production potential. This was echoed by the executive committee.

### ***Social Networking and Accountability***

Participants mentioned that the mentorship programme has enabled them to meet other beneficiaries and farmworkers from other farms during workshops and training. They are learning about customer care through networking which is achieved by the mentorship programme. They now know that good customer care leads to good working relationships with customers.

In addition to echoing most of what was said by the other groups interviewed, the key informant specifically raised the issue of accountability. The mentor alluded to this when he said, "A beneficiary must be honest. Someone passionate with farming. Someone with certain farming equipment and willing to put the interest of the farm first". Accountability, in this case, requires that one puts the interest of the group before personal interests. The key informant said that it is a government expectation that the mentor and farmers will report their financial spending on a monthly basis, and that reconciliation of these reports is expected to be done by a government official who is responsible for the project in order to keep expenditure in accordance with the implementation plan that was approved.

## DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The beneficiaries observed that the mentorship programme had improved production on the farm. Makombe (2018) notes that there is a need to be cautious in making the comparison about production. There are three time periods that need to be taken into account, namely production during the time before the previous owner left, production from the time the previous owner leaves to the time when the beneficiaries can officially use the farm (usually after receiving recapitalisation funds) and then the period when the farmers have taken over production on the farm. During the first period, the farm is usually producing close to full potential; however, this usually deteriorates during the second period to the point where the farm is no longer a going concern when it's taken over by the beneficiaries in the third period. At Ba Bina Noko, the citrus and grapes enterprises deteriorated. The citrus could be revived, but not the grapes. The participants are comparing the second and third periods, yet the first and third periods should be compared as well in order to establish the real impact of both the land reform programme and the mentorship programme. Usually, the comparison of the first and third periods cannot be performed, because the previous owner leaves with the records of the first period as is mentioned by Makombe (2018). This renders it impossible to compute the *real* impact of the land reform programme.

The skills transfer referred to by the participants reverberates with Gilmore (2005) who argues that the benefits of mentoring 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. However, at the current level, the mentor at Ba Bina Noko is transferring basic low-level skills. The relationship has not yet developed to the point where management and farm development insights can be shared between the mentor and the beneficiaries.

The fact that the farm, even under mentorship, is not yet producing at full capacity, or even at the capacity achieved by the previous farmer, is shown by the fact that the beneficiaries use and even have a preference for informal marketing. Although informal markets can be used to alleviate some of the problems faced by rural farmers regarding formal markets (FAO, 2003), the volumes of informal markets can fluctuate and buyers can over negotiate prices (especially if they know the farm does not have an alternative). Also high reliance on informal markets indicates low levels of commercialisation, an inability to meet contracted supplies and an inability to meet the high-quality standards that are usually demanded by the formal markets.

The beneficiaries appreciate the positive impact of the mentorship programme on food security. However, this comparison needs to be done carefully. This is because the food security of the individual beneficiaries can improve, while national food security is deteriorating. National food security will deteriorate if the production in the first period is higher than that of the latter two periods; yet, under these conditions, individual food security for the beneficiaries

can still improve. The participants also appreciate the employment creation of the mentorship programme. However, a similar comparison to that for food security needs to be performed. As Makombe (2018) argues, if employment for the first period is higher than that of the subsequent periods, it means the land reform programme is destroying, not creating employment.

On the question of profit from the farm, the beneficiaries *think* that the farm is achieving a profit. However, they do not know for sure. This is an indication that the beneficiaries are not having access to documentation of the farm operations. They *believe* profits are being used to buy inputs, but this is the purpose of the money allocated for post-settlement support! Clearly, transparency and accountability are lacking at Ba Bina Noko. It must also be brought to attention that the benefits discussed in terms of livelihoods and employment only apply to the beneficiaries who have been able to secure employment on the farm as a result of the mentorship programme. The rest of the beneficiaries are waiting for a profit-sharing scheme in order to benefit from the land reform, in general, and the mentorship programme, in particular. However, it appears that the monthly financial reporting, as required by the recapitalisation programme, has not occurred at Ba Bina Noko.

A final niggling aspect is that the beneficiaries, based on advice from the mentor and the Department of Agriculture, requested R18m for recapitalisation, but got R6.5m. They are not clear why the amount was reduced, because no explanation was given. Makombe (2018) points out that this is problematic and may lead to the failure of beneficiaries

to reach full farm potential or even the potential achieved by the previous farmer.

The results of this study, therefore, show that it is necessary and important to design a land reform programme that takes care of the concerns encountered in the land reform projects, including those we raise in this study. These include:

- The ability to compare production, employment creation, livelihoods achievements and food security impacts in the three time periods earlier mentioned; thus, enabling the full assessment at national and household level of the impacts of land reform.
- The ability to assess whether both the political and economic objectives are being achieved.
- Accountability in financial reporting.
- Cumulative reporting of the vital statistics that show the progress of the land reform programme.
- A time frame for achieving both the political and economic objectives.

This leads us to our proposal.

## **A PROPOSAL FOR LAND REFORM**

Given the foregoing, this article proposes that:

**Land reform need not adopt expropriation without compensation:** The land reform programme in South Africa desperately needs to be guided by an approach that can achieve

both the political and economic objectives. In the thought process to come up with such an approach, it is essential to take a step back and process how events unfolded. We, therefore, present our perspective of what happened to take the country to where it is now. In 1913 and 1936, the Apartheid government approved the discriminatory laws. These laws were completely unacceptable to the black population. However, given that the Apartheid government was all-powerful, and the Blacks were helpless to do anything meaningful about it, the government went ahead and enforced the laws anyway. Land was forcibly taken away (expropriated without compensation) from the Blacks and given to Whites. Most notably, the livelihoods of the black population changed dramatically for the worst, creating large pockets of poverty and human suffering. This led to an unstable situation with highly skewed land ownership patterns that the current government is still trying to redress. Since 1994, the government has been trying to correct the land ownership imbalances. The willing seller, willing buyer basis has been used as an approach to acquire land, but the government has not received much cooperation from the white landowners in terms of selling land willingly. This has slowed down the land reform process. Given this, the government is considering accelerating land reform by using land expropriation without compensation. This appears almost as unacceptable to most of the white farmers as the discriminatory laws of 1913 and 1936 were to the black population. Given that the white farmers are helpless and can do nothing meaningful to avert land expropriation without compensation, the government can simply go ahead and implement the policy anyway. However, our analysis suggests

that this may create instability too, because the acceleration without proper planning is likely not to lead to an improvement in the livelihoods of the beneficiaries and may put economic growth and national food security in jeopardy. Furthermore, just going ahead and implementing expropriation without compensation would not be consistent with the government of a rainbow nation. This article's proposal does not involve expropriation without compensation.

**The *Constitution* be amended to make expropriation of land without compensation legal and easy:** As mentioned earlier, given the overwhelming support, the *Constitution* should be amended to make land expropriation without compensation both easy and legal. However, the amendment should only be used as a credible threat in the event that there is no cooperation from the white farmers.

**Clear and realistic time frames for land reform be determined and applied:** In our proposal, the first parameter to be decided upon is a time frame for both the land reform programme (it cannot take forever) and the time frame for transferring individual projects to the beneficiaries. Golele (2016) observed that five years is not sufficient time for the transfer of skills. This gives us a first benchmark. We, therefore, suggest that the process should take between 10 and 40 years. Ten years for small, simple projects (like a 200ha farm) and 40 years for large, complex operations like ZZ2. The land reform process should be completed within 40 years from the launch of this proposal. At the present moment, it is an indefinite process. The exact time frame for each project will be informed by the size and

complexity of the project and will be one of the first parameters to be decided. The larger and more complex a project is, the longer it takes to transfer.

**The land reform programme should explicitly recognise that knowledge about farming resides with the white farmers and needs to be transferred to beneficiaries:** Other reasons may be articulated, but the lack of farming knowledge among beneficiaries of land reform, and the fact that the farming knowledge resides with the white farmers, is one of the primary reasons why the land, which has been secured for transfer to black beneficiaries, is predominantly not delivering the economic objectives. Given this recognition, the approach should facilitate the transfer of both the land and the knowledge to use the land to earn a decent livelihood and to contribute towards national growth and development. Land can be forcibly taken from the white farmers, but the knowledge cannot. An acceptable process needs to be developed in order to transfer the farming knowledge and skills that the white farmers have to the black beneficiaries. This has to be the key to the success of land reform in South Africa.

Therefore, an effective process of farming knowledge transfer needs to be designed. Let's take the example of a small project of 200ha growing maize in summer and vegetables in winter. This is a relatively simple project, so it would be transferred in 10 years. During the 10 years, the beneficiaries and the farmer work together to transfer knowledge and skills from the farmer to the beneficiaries. Firstly, the operation should hire unskilled labour from the pool of beneficiaries, so that, gradually, the beneficiaries gain the

low-level skills. Secondly, the beneficiaries should select a number of young beneficiaries to train in colleges, like Tompi Seleka, and to go to university. Most of the study programmes are not longer than three years, so the trainees can come back to the farm and work with the farmer and beneficiaries to understand agricultural production. As is clear from some of the mistakes made by the current implementers of the land reform programme, agricultural training does not turn one into a farmer. Makombe (2018) discusses a similar beneficiary training plan that had been proposed by the farmers at Maitjene Trust. This will ensure that the transfer of land will occur after a critical mass of farming knowledge and training has been transferred to the beneficiaries.

**The mentorship programme be infused into the land and knowledge transfer programme:** Coupled with the proposed training programme, a mentor should be appointed to moderate the transfer of knowledge and skills from the farmer to the trainees and to the beneficiaries, in general, by facilitating training sessions for beneficiaries from the farmer or other relevant sources and institutions. The mentor should serve for the duration of the time frame proposed for each project, 10 years in the case of the example of a small project; thus, taking care of the concerns raised by Golele (2016) about the length of the mentorship programme. Instead of the money that is currently given to restitution, which has not been very productive, the government can inject funds into the knowledge and skills transfer programmes that can produce tangible outputs and impacts and ensure long-term economic growth and national food security, all as part of a recapitalisation programme.

**A profit-sharing scheme between the farmer and beneficiaries be designed and implemented:** A scheme for sharing profits (not gross revenue) needs to be designed. There are several ways of doing this. The simplest way, say in the example of the 10-year transfer project, is to have the beneficiaries receive nothing in the first year of the transfer programme, one-tenth in the second, two-tenths in the third until nine-tenths in the tenth year (the final year of land transfer). In the tenth year, title deeds are transferred to the beneficiaries and they will make decisions as to how the operation proceeds.

How the funds are used by the beneficiaries is an issue needing consideration. Given the number of beneficiaries, in many of the cases, it does not make sense to divide the proceeds among them, as this will result in beneficiaries getting very little, which does not make a difference to their livelihoods. Beneficiaries need to be creative and use the money, say, for development in their area (roads, clinics, schools, etc.). They can also create a revolving fund to finance local (economic) development projects that pay back at an interest rate that is lower than the bank rate. They can establish scholarship funds in agriculture to benefit the children of beneficiaries who can then work for the project for at least the same number of years as they have been trained. This way the money becomes truly developmental and will have a longer term impact than being used to buy Mercedes Benzes (unproductive, movable property).

**A fair market price be paid for movable property and immovable development/investments made by farmers on the land:** Existing equipment used for production should be depreciated over its lifetime or

over the land transfer period, whichever comes first. The depreciated values should be paid to the farmer (who owns the equipment). Replacements should be made if any equipment's lifespan is less than the land transfer period. This process should ensure that all equipment necessary for the operation of the farm is available and belongs to the beneficiaries by the end of the land transfer programme. The immovable investments made by the farmer will be inherited by the beneficiaries and a fair market price (determined through an independent valuation process) should be paid to the farmer. The payments should be imputed into the recapitalisation programme. Water rights, being neither movable equipment nor immovable investments, should not be paid for. It should be clearly stated in the land transfer programme that water rights are an explicit part of the land transfer programme.

## CONCLUSION

Given that it appears to be producing positive impacts, the mentorship programme can be incorporated into the proposed land transfer programme. The length of the mentorship needs to be extended and we recommend at least ten-year contracts, which are renewable for those projects where the land transfer periods are longer than ten years. We recommend that all future restitution and redistribution projects be implemented based on our proposal. For the distribution programme, the format will be the same, except there will be one beneficiary household.

There are many other aspects to be worked out in the land transfer programme; the

details of which cannot be presented in this article. However, this article presents a concept that can be adopted by the land reform programme, together with a programme, mentorship, that is already being implemented. This approach can avert the need for using expropriation without compensation as the primary approach while, at the same time, increasing the chances that the programme will deliver on both

the political and economic imperatives. The programme should be guided by clear targets and clear annual reporting formats for both new and existing projects. Such a programme should have high accountability and transparency. The credible threat of expropriation without compensation should be reserved for those farmers who choose not to cooperate with the proposed programme.

---

## REFERENCES

- Adams, H.G. & Scott, S.K. 1997. The Fundamentals of Effective Mentoring. Notre Dame, In: GEM Consortium.
- Anseeuw, W. & Mathebula, N. 2008. *Land reform and development: Evaluating South Africa's restitution and redistribution programmes*. (Research Paper No. 2008/1). Postgraduate School of Agriculture and Rural Development. Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences. University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa.
- Binswanger-Mkhize, H.P. 2014. From failure to success in South African land reform. *African Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, 9(4):253-269.
- Bradstock, A. 2005. Changing livelihoods and land reform: Evidence from the Northern Cape Province of South Africa. *World Development*, 33(11):1979-1992.
- Citizen Reporter. 2018. Big surprise for ANC about support for expropriation without compensation. The Citizen 12 August 2018.
- Clarke, V. & Braun, V. 2017. Thematic analysis. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(3):297-298. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2016.1262613.
- Cousins, B. 2013. Land redistribution, populism and elite capture: New land reform policy proposals under the microscope. *The Journal of the Helen Suzman Foundation*, 70:11-19.
- Donalek, J.G. 2005. The Interview in Qualitative Research. *Urologic Nursing*, 25(2):124-125.
- FAO. 2003. *World agriculture: Towards 2015/2030*. An FAO perspective: Economic and social development department.
- Fraser, A. 2008. White farmers' dealings with land reform in South Africa: Evidence from Northern Limpopo. *Journal of Economic and Social Geography*, 88(1):24-36.
- Friedman, D. 2018. Theresa backs Cyril on 'legal' land expropriation. Bloemfontein Courant. Available at: <https://www.bloemfonteinourant.co.za/theresa-backs-cyril-on-legal-land-expropriation/>. Accessed on 11 October 2018.
- Gilmore, N. 2005. Experiences of the mentoring relationship: a study in mining company. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 3(3):27-32.
- Golele, N.S. 2016. Assessment of the effectiveness of the mentorship programme in land reform: A case of land restitution in Skhukhune District, Limpopo Province. (Unpublished master's dissertation). University of Limpopo, Limpopo, South Africa.
- Hart, T.G.B. 2012. How rural land reform policy translates into benefits. *Development Southern Africa*, 29(4):563-573.
- Logan, B.I., Tengbeh, G. & Petja, B. 2012. Towards a reorientation in land reform: From a market led to locally-driven approach in South Africa's land restitution programme. *Progress in Development Studies*, 12(2&3): 173-191.
- Makombe, G. 2018. Land Reform in South Africa: The Conversation That Never Took Place. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(6):1401-1421.
- Mufune, P. 2010. Land Reform Management in Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe: A Comparative Perspective. *International Journal of Rural Management*, 6(1):2010:1-31. DOI: 10.1177/097300521100600101.

- Pringle, E. 2013. Land reform and white ownership of agricultural land in South Africa. *The Journal of the Helen Suzman Foundation*, 1(70):37-42.
- 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.
- RSA. 1997. White Paper on South African Land Policy. Department of Land Affairs, National Office, April 1997. Available at: <http://intranet.ruraldevelopment.gov.za/tenurereform/newpage7.htm>.
- RSA. 2018. Annual Performance Plan 2018/2019: Department of Rural Development and Land Reform. RSA.
- Sakellariou, D., Boniface, G. & Brown, P. 2013. Using Joint Interviews in a Narrative-Based Study on Illness Experiences. *Qualitative Health Research*, 23(11):1563-1570.
- Sikor, T. & Müller, D. 2009. The limits of state-led land reform: An introduction. *World Development*, 37(8):1307-1316.
- Statistics South Africa. 2016. Community Survey 2016. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa.
- Stout-Roston, S. 2007. Article: Coaching and mentoring are the business buzzwords. The star workplace, updated March 2007.
- Terblanché, S.E. 2011. Mentorship a Key Success Factor in Sustainable Land Reform Projects in South Africa. *S. Afr. J. Agric. Ext.*, 39:55-74.

---

**Nyiko Shadrack Golele** is an Assistant Director in the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform. He holds a Masters in Development Studies. He is currently studying for a PhD in the College of Human Sciences at the University of South Africa.

**Human Mautjana** is a Research Associate at the University of Limpopo. He holds a Masters in Development Studies.

**Godswill Makombe** is a Research Associate at the Gordon Institute of Business Science, the University of Pretoria and at the Stellenbosch University, Sustainable Agriculture Programme. He holds a PhD in Agricultural and Resource Economics.