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ABSTRACT

Capacity building is a process of building capabilities in individuals, groups, institutions, organisations, and societies at the local, national and international levels, to be more effectively prepared for and respond to public health threats of a crisis in a sustainable manner. This process is designed to reinforce or create strengths upon which communities can mitigate vulnerabilities as a result of emergencies and disasters.

The main aim of the study was to assess capacity building in Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP) funded projects in Capricorn District of Limpopo Province. The CASP programme was initiated to provide post-settlement support for farmers who have benefitted from the Land Reform programmes. Since the inception of this programme, there has not been any assessment of capacity building as one of the pillars of CASP. The objective of the study was to assess capacity building on productivity and to determine the impact of capacity building on the CASP funded projects. The study hypothesised that an increase in the level of productivity of CASP funded projects depends on the level of capacity building.

The term training refers to the acquisition of knowledge, skills and competencies as a result of the teaching of vocational or practical skills. In land reform projects, training is provided as the planned and organised activity of a consultant to impart skills, techniques and methodologies to employers and their employees, to assist them in establishing and maintaining employment and a place of employment that is safe and healthy.

The Farmer training is offered in two different methods, viz., on-farm and off-farm training. The on-farm training involves a service-provider visiting the farmer and rendering the training at the farm, whereas the off-farm training requires a farmer to go to the planned venue or institution of training to receive the planned training.
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CHAPTER ONE (1)

1. Background to the study

1.1. Background of CASP funded Projects

The South African land reform policy is based on three pillars, namely, the restitution of land rights, the redistribution of land, and the reform of traditional land tenure system to improve security of tenure. The focus of this study is on the land redistribution pillar. Land redistribution constitutes two programmes, viz., Settlement Land Acquisition Grant (SLAG), which was launched in 1997, and the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD), launched in 2001 to complement the SLAG. The LRAD programme has the post settlement support package (CASP Report, 2003-2005).

In 2003, the national Department of Agriculture and the nine provincial Departments of Agriculture, supported by the national and provincial treasuries, conducted a fiscal review of the agricultural sector. The purpose of the review was to identify the cost drivers and the spending pressures within the agricultural sector. Through this Intergovernmental Fiscal Review Process (IFRP), assessment of the agricultural budget and key deliverables, such as training and capacity building; on -and -off farm infrastructure development; technical advice assistance and marketing; and business development, were identified, as well as some of the constraints that hindered service delivery (CASP Report, 2003-2005).

On further analysis, the IFRP made a key observation; that there was insufficient provision made for farmer support within the agriculture budget. In addressing this shortfall within the limited budget, a number of strategies were identified. This included the Comprehensive Agriculture Support Programme (CASP), which was prioritised by the joint committee for implementation during 2004 (CASP Report, 2003-2005).
1.2. Motivation for the study (Problem Statement)

The Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP) was initiated in 2004 as a strategy by the South African government to provide post-settlement support for the farmers who have benefitted from land reform programmes and those acquired through private means. This programme has focused in the six pillars, namely, market access, financial access, capacity building and training, on and off-farm infrastructure development. However, much has been done by the state to accomplish its goal on post settlement support towards high productivity of the farms. During this period, farmers were assisted to ensure that farms are used to their optimum. Since the inception of this programme, there has not been any assessment of capacity building as one of the pillars of CASP, hence the need to put this subject matter under scientific investigation.

1.3. Research questions

a) Primary research problem

• Does capacity building affect the productivity of the CASP funded projects?

• Does the level of skills gain in capacity building increase the level of productivity of CASP funded projects?

• Are farmers following the training and capacity building guides?

b) Secondary research problem

• Why do CASP funded projects fail to produce to their full capacity after receiving the support?

• To what extent does capacity building improve the production of CASP funded projects, and what are the challenges facing CASP funded projects?
1.4. Aim of the Study

The main aim of the envisaged study is to assess capacity building in CASP funded projects in the Capricorn District of Limpopo Province, South Africa.

1.5. Objectives of the Study

• To assess the impact of capacity building on the productivity of CASP funded projects.

• To assess the impact of capacity building on the beneficiaries of CASP funded projects.

1.6. Hypotheses

• Capacity building affects the optimum usage of the CASP funded projects.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

Land reform is a national priority and is further entrenched in Section 25 (4) of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 (Act No. 108 of 1996). A three-pronged land reform programme aiming at tenure reform, restitution and land redistribution, was launched in 1994. In relation to the Comprehensive Rural Development Plan (CRDP), it is not sufficient to only provide prospective farmers with land and capital but they must be empowered to manage their businesses effectively and profitably in a competitive and often hostile environment.

The Department of Agriculture (DOA) and provincial Departments of Agriculture in the country have made many efforts, through participative workshops, questionnaires and various other means, to obtain a comprehensive picture of the support needs of the targeted beneficiaries. Six areas of support have been identified, these are, namely: Information and Knowledge Management; Technical and Advisory Assistance, and Regulatory Services; Training and capacity building; Marketing and Business Development; On-farm and Off-farm Infrastructure and Production inputs; and Financial Assistance.

2.2. Capacity building definitions and policies

Capacity building is about development of human resources for the purpose of developing and managing certain areas in society. Capacity building may be defined as "the development of knowledge, skills and attitudes in individuals and groups of people relevant in the design, development and maintenance of institutional and operational infrastructures and processes that are locally meaningful" (Groot and Molen, 2001: 179). This issue is crucial in most developing countries with regard to management of land as a resource both from an environmental and from an economic perspective.

Capacity refers "the ability of people, institutions and societies to perform functions, solve problems, and set and achieve objectives" (UNDP, 2002). Capacity
development is the process whereby individuals, groups, and organisations enhance their abilities to mobilise and use resources in order to achieve their objectives on a sustainable basis. Efforts to strengthen abilities of individuals, groups, and organisations can comprise a combination of (i) human skills development; (ii) changes in organisations and networks; and (iii) changes in governance or institutional context (ADB, 2004).

Capacity building is a complex notion that involves individual and organisational learning which builds social capital and trust. Develops knowledge, skills and attitudes and when successful creates an organisational culture which enables organisations to set objectives, achieve results, solve problems and create adaptive procedures which enable it to survive in the long term.

An influential group of papers has emerged from research commissioned in 2002 by the OECD which asked ECDPM (European Centre for Development Policy Management) to study the capacity of organisations, mainly in low income countries, its development over time and its relationship to improved performance’. One useful paper is entitled ‘The Concept of Capacity’, (Morgan, 2006). The 2005 Commission for Africa Report and the G8 summit focussed on the crisis in higher education in Africa, putting the issue firmly on the agenda.

Meanwhile, DFID and other donors have commissioned several research and technical reports on Capacity Development in the last few years. They include ‘Building Capacity in Southern Research: A Study to Map Existing Initiatives”. (ODI, 2001). Capacity was also a major part of ODI’s Report entitled “Setting the Scene: Situating DFID’s Research Funding Policy and Practice in an International Comparative Perspective”, (ODI, 2007).

The research funding policy was up-dated in November 2007 DFID/CRD funded a lesson learning study ‘developing the Capacity of research Systems in Developing Countries: Lessons learnt and Guidelines for Future Initiatives’. (NRI, 2005).

DFID also funded (with other donors) a Capacity Collective workshop. The workshop report, Capacity for a Change; Documents based on outcomes of the Capacity Collective Workshop, (NRI. 2008), IDS, Sussex pulled together current views on
definitions, range of activities and extend and size of donor involvement. As a prelude to the development of the research Strategy CRD held a 2 day workshop/learning event (Sept. 2007) which sought the ideas and experiences of researchers involved in DFID research funded activities. Other United Kingdom bodies have looked at UK for International research funding. The Association of Commonwealth Universities issued a report ‘Frameworks for Africa-UK Research Collaboration in the Social Sciences and Humanities: African Universities Perspective’ (May. 2007).

Similar work has been commissioned in the physical sciences and engineering. The UNCTAD Least Developed Countries Report (LDC) contains a 60 page background annex on Science and Innovation which summarises science development issues and comments on differing donor approaches to research and capacity building. A World Bank Forum around the topic Building Science, Technology and Innovation Capacity for Sustainable Growth and Poverty Reduction was held in Washington in early 2007.

Other donors have also looked at their programmes or undertaken more strategic evaluations. An Australian report “Capacity Building Evaluation” (Oct. 2006) notes that the development community spends 15 billion US dollars on capacity development but is unsure of the return on the investment. The Dutch have attempted to deal with this question in a Report filled “Comparative Study of the Impacts of Donor-initiated Programmes on research capacity in the South” DGIS, (2001: 149). The report has little on Africa because they could find no non-donor funded research to act as a ‘control’.

The World Bank has recently funded a research report on agricultural education on Africa ‘Cultivating Knowledge and Skills to Grow African Agriculture’, W Saint (May. 2007). The report shows a continuing decline in the quantity and quality of those entering agriculture as students, teachers and researchers. Net losses caused by retirement, migration and HIV/AIDS show a rapid decline in numbers such that people in key teaching and research positions are not being replaced because there is no-one to fill the post. This problem is repeated in other sectors, especially in Africa. The US Social Science Research Council (USSRC) commissioned, in 2002, a report on ‘Social Science Research Capacity in South Asia’. Its sub-title is ‘Decline
and Crisis’ although not as precipitate as the decline in Africa the trend lines are downwards (DFID and R4D, 2001).

2.3. The importance of community involvement and local solutions

Rural community members of all ages should be part of creating and maintaining capacity building programme for youth development (Korten, 1980:479). To accomplish this, community-wide engagement and organisations should concentrate on members of the rural community “[making] more of the programming decisions for themselves”(Korten,1980:487). This involvement accesses community understanding that is “crucial to any effort by outsiders... but easily overlooked by planners who have not had or do not seek the opportunity to ask” (Korten, 1980:498). Community members provide an understanding of community beliefs and developmental desires (Wendel et al., 2009). Use of this local knowledge helps develop a clear vision of the community, its resources, and its process to communicate and grow (Gruidl & Hustedde, 2003: 92). Relying on solutions outside of the community can undercut community capacity building (Wendel et al., 2009). Growth occurs when rural communities work out problems without heavily relying on outside sources, although some initial resources such as funding and training may be necessary. This independence creates “community agency,” or the capacity for a community to effect change. Community agency can develop through accessing potential capacity and empowering residents to create an outcome that benefits the rural community (Brademans & Weber, 1999: 45; Brennan, Barnett, & Baugh, 2007: 67). Empowerment enables residents to recognise challenges and develop solutions which assist the community in developing “a sense of self-determination and capacity” (Gibbon, Labonte & Laverack, 2002: 487).

Building capacity may require changes in approaches to programme development and community engagement (Gruidl & Hustedde, 2003:105). Organisations designing programme in rural areas might need to take a “blueprint approach,” using a design from another programme without making adjustments to address the changed context of the programme (Korten, 1980: 490). However, capacity building in rural areas is best accomplished by taking a “learning process approach,” taking
context into account. These programmes are responsive to community needs, and community members are involved in establishing the programme (Korten, 1980: 492). Programme designed using the blueprint approaches are not as effective in rural communities as the creatively formed, contextually-based programmes developed from the learning process approach (Backer, 2000: 35). Successful rural development programme deal with mistakes in a positive manner (Korten, 1980:493). The learning process approach allows programmes to evolve through freedom to admit failure and make adaptations. Capacity development is a long-term commitment, which often requires programme modifications (Backer, 2000: 38).

Agriculture is Africa’s greatest industry with important potential for expansion, diversification, and generating incomes and employment. For several decades, the capacity of African agricultural universities and colleges has shown poor capacity to address the needs of the social and economic stakeholders, starting with small farmers but also including commercial and business sectors.

At present there are important deficiencies in African agricultural capacities which, if not addressed will prevent the achievement of the African Vision of 6% per annum growth in agricultural production. This is far higher than the continent has ever achieved and yet is the minimum for meeting the needs of the expanding populations while making real inroads into relieving extreme poverty and hunger.

In these circumstances, there is urgent need to re-orient and re-invigorate African agricultural universities and other higher education institutions so that they will produce graduates who are not only at the cutting edge of their specialisations but who are also problem solvers, job creators and entrepreneurs who are capable of taking full advantage of the vast opportunities that Africa’s greatest and most diverse industry offers.

2.4. International perspective on capacity building

DFID provides £20 million per year to the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). Some of the funding is provided to specialist centres, and some is spent on central administration. Since the funding is not generally earmarked, a significant percentage will be used for the training and
development of researchers and for ensuring that the institutes are effectively managed.

DFID has supported the WHO Special Programmes for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases (TDR) and Human Reproduction (HRP) for many years. Current funding for each programme is £5.5 million over years. TDR provides grants to support developing country researchers in their Masters, PhD and post-doctoral studies. It also provides re-entry grants to help reverse the brain drain. It supports institution building in southern research institutions. Grants are awarded directly to institutions and principal researchers in developing countries. HRP supports national research capacity strengthening as well as research that responds to country reproductive health priorities. It also supports training in research methods in reproductive health and administers capacity strengthening grants.

DFID contributes £5 million to a five-year period, £1 million ICT4D programme of work that is hosted by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC). The programme aims to ensure that information and communication technologies (ICTs) play a key and integrated role in accelerating progress towards achievement of the millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Strengthening the capacity of researchers, research institutions and research networks already working on these topics is a key thread of the programme; with 80% of support channelled through southern research networks or institutions with which IDRC already have some relationship, capacity and trust. Approaches include providing support to partners in policy research and communication skills, as well as disseminating research results.

2.5. Directly managed and joint programmes on capacity building and development

The SEACAP (South East Asia Community Access Programme – £7.5 million over 5 years) is building capacity and strengthening institutions to ensure that local infrastructural investments are carefully researched and developed in a way that is sustainable. The programme, based in Hanoi, operates at various levels. It facilitates
practical action-oriented research in rural communities, ensures that lessons learned about, for example, low cost technologies to maintain rural roads, are integrated into professional engineering development programmes at universities. The programme also ensures that government officials are involved at all levels so that research findings influence future policy and practice.

The Climate Change Adaptation in Africa programmes (CCAAP), managed by IDRC, and has a budget of £24 million over 5 years. Around 40% of the overall budget (more in the early years) was allocated for capacity development to help African researchers, policy makers and institutions, including NGOs, and those representing at-risk groups, to address the expected impacts of climate change in Africa. The funds will support action research programmes, training and mentoring initiatives and higher education opportunities for specialists. Participatory action research methods will be used to ensure that all concerned stakeholders are involved.

DFID supports a number of programmes that aim to strengthen the ‘enabling environment’ for research uptake. Some of these specifically address the needs of southern journalists to improve the way that science is reported. These include the Science and Development Network (Scidev.net) worth £1.6 million over seven years; Panos RELAY programme £800,000 over three years; and World Federation of Science Journalists worth £100,000 over three years. The Programme for the Enhancement of Research Information (ERI) provides support to southern partners to enable them to negotiate for access to academic journals. The Global Development Network Electronic Service (GDNet) supports capacity building to information management staff and researchers in developing country research institutes. They have developed a programme of skills-building and knowledge-sharing in information management to build southern capacity in research communication.

In 2008 DFID launched a £10 million programme in association with IDRC and the Welcome Trust to develop research capacity in Kenya and Malawi. The focus was to work with the apex institutions (the National Research Council of Malawi, Kenya Medical Research Institute and Kenya Consortium for National Health Research) to rebuild their capacity to facilitate and disseminate health research in their respective
countries. The programme was also work to improve the regulation and co-ordination of the research environment to encourage local scientists to stay within the region.

2.6. Research programme consortia which include capacity building

Most of the CRD’s directly-funded research takes place through Research Programme Consortia (RPCs), which together account for 15% of CRD annual spends. The first generation of RPCs (commissioned in the current Research Funding Framework 2005-2007 which built on the Development Research Centres, (DRCs) did not have Capacity building as an explicit objective, but capacity strengthening was nonetheless expected to be an important by-product of the research process.

Within RPCs, the level of engagement and resources spent on capacity issues vary enormously. It depends on location, need, previous investment, and nature of the research. It also depends on whether the consortia members wish to move beyond the ‘basic’ capacity building level through which a number of scholarships (for Masters or PhDs) or a series of workshops and training events for example, on research methods and academic writing are provided. Some combination of training, mentoring, and higher education would be a feature of every current RPC – not least because it is a requirement of the tendering process.

For those RPCs which provide basic capacity assistance, the level of expenditure is relatively modest below 5%. For the majority, who work with southern colleagues to assist in the building of organisational capacity and who are attempting to build sustainable institutions and an international profile the figure is between 7-12 %. The average for the Health RPCs (which were 14 in 2008) is 7%. Since health research has been relatively well funded over the last decades this amounts to a not unreasonable figure. The percentage allocated to capacity issues has been rising in recently-awarded RPC contracts as the importance of long-term and more equal partnerships and the need to avoid extractive relationships is recognised.

The figures for RPCs which work mainly in Africa are higher because the capacity problem is more profound. The RPC entitled Power, Politics and the State in Africa has budgeted to spend 25% of its funding (£.75 million over five years) on capacity
building. The ‘Disability, Development and Policy in the Southern African Region’ RPC (£1.8 million) is developing a southern-led research programme on issues of disability and poverty with Disabled Peoples Organisations (DPOs) in southern Africa. The programme will focus on building local capacity to direct and undertake research according to the priorities of disabled people and to ensure that the research results are used to influence policy. The programme will facilitate a shift from supply to demand-led research of a kind which is useful to disabled people. Capacity building is an early priority for this programme (60% of the budget) as is the collection of data on disability issues.

2.7. Communication and capacity building

DFID believes that communication is central to the capacity building ‘mix’ and is an instrumental catalyst in getting research taken up and used to create better development. There are three separate aspects to the overall task, which DFID pursues with distinct but inter-related sets of activities.

• The first is helping individuals and institutions to more effectively communicate research. This requires that those generating new knowledge consider from the outset how best to engage with others so that the research will be useful and used. Specific skill sets, mind-sets, and institutional environments are required to make this happen. The policy of embedding communication into the work of DFID’s RPCs was introduced by the Research Funding Framework 2005-2007. It required that a minimum 10% of the overall budget be spent on helping researchers communicate more effectively, strengthening the enabling environment for uptake and strengthening southern research through better access to information.

• The second aspect is making easily accessible global public goods so that southern researchers are not disqualified from achieving research excellence because of lack of access to cutting-edge research, or southern policymakers removed from research that could inform their better decision-making. Some of the assistance given in this area includes providing better access to research information.
2.8. Future direction on capacity building

DFID and R4D (2001) sought to engage with relevant national and regional partners. They continue to fund capacity development in areas in which they are currently active and will develop a broader portfolio of capacity strengthening initiatives. These include:

- Working as part of a broader community to develop a capacity development programme in the non-economic social sciences in a number of African countries. This works alongside a “Think Tanks” programme which is being developed by IDRC and the Hewlett Foundation. Funding from other parts of DFID for the African Economics Research Consortium continues.

- Further funding in the Agriculture sector through CGIAR, the SCARDA programme and other initiatives to help with the development of regional bodies such as Agricultural Research in East and Central Africa (ASERECA) and Council for Agricultural Research and Development (CORAF).

- A network to build the capacity of intermediary organisations to help communicate research, and help build skills of generators to disseminate and users to access and put into use research evidence.

There will be better at articulating of capacity building principles, which includes:

- Recognising the value and importance of southern leadership;

- A consideration of both systemic and instrumental approaches to capacity building;

- Adopting a broad definition of capacity building that includes both the generation and communication of new knowledge, and recognises that a variety of stakeholders outside of the academic community need to be involved;

- Recognising that the complexity of the situation does not lend itself to quick or linear solutions; and
• Ensuring that funding for capacity building is sufficient to have a sustainable impact, particularly when encouraging research in fragile and poorly funded research environments.

2.9. Empirical evidence of land reform support

Uganda has an Agricultural Sector Programme Support (ASPS), which has its focus on poverty reduction and household food security targets the agricultural sector in a broader sense to provide livelihoods of small scale farmers with increased production levels in the rural areas as well as gender mainstreaming, livestock research, support farmers organisations and also provide financial assistance to those farmers (World Bank Appraisal report, 2004).

Venezuela promoted conditions for holistic rural development, with the purpose of generating employment and guaranteeing the peasant population an adequate level of well-being, as well as their incorporation into national development. Similarly, it supported agricultural activity and the optimal use of land, by means of the provision of infrastructure works, credit, training services, and technical assistance (World Bank Appraisal report, 2004).

The Agricultural Land Preservation Programme was introduced in Southern Maryland in the United States of America (USA), as an incentive for tobacco farmers to place land in agricultural preservation, for enhancing the existing Southern Maryland Agricultural Land Preservation Programmes, assisting in the acquisition of land and for the general support for farmers’ markets. In 2004 alone, 1,454 acres were directly preserved by the programme in five districts of Southern Maryland, thus increasing the total to 5,763 acres over the three years period of the programme. The programme provided incentives for local agricultural land preservation and thus supported the country's agricultural land preservation programmes, and assisted in the acquisition of land and the establishment of local farmers’ markets (Southern Maryland Agricultural Development Commission Report, 2004).

Capacity building was sought to be necessary in the implementation of land policy in Malawi, to deal with the complex issues of building efficient land information systems
and sustainable institutional infrastructures. Capacity building in land management is not only a question of establishing a sufficient technological level or sufficient economic resources. It is mainly a question of understanding the interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral nature of land administration systems, and understanding the need for human resource development in this area. Furthermore, capacity building should ensure that the focus is on building sound institutions and good governance rather than just high-level IT-infrastructures. (Groot & Molen, 2001)

2.10. Challenges facing capacity building and development

DFID and R4D, (2001:37) indicate some significant challenges facing capacity building in Africa:

- Although attempts have been made to develop more planned and strategic capacity building and development efforts which are multi-directional (North-South and South-South) and have a strong learning focus, a variety of capacity development approaches are still used among the research centres, with the majority of them viewing capacity development as instrumental rather than from a systemic perspective;

- Assessment of capacity needs is limited. Baselines for evaluating the success of capacity building and development strategies have not been set up, and it is unclear as to the extent to which the Centres have contributed directly to increasing capacity since studies on this have not been carried out;

- Time is seen as a limiting factor when it comes to understanding and conceptualising capacity building and development, with pressure on partners to undertake research activities within specific timelines set out within the broader programme;

- There is considerable overlap of research partners between different consortia. This should facilitate more joint and collaborative capacity development efforts which bridge across the work of different centres and consortia. However, research programmes are founded on what appear to be particular sets of principles and
values not necessarily shared by others, which makes co-ordination difficult. Not surprisingly they believe that a significant re-think of the approach to capacity development is required. Among the points they make are the following:

- Capacity building and development must be carried out purposefully. Its purpose is often not stated at all, or there may be differing perceptions on the purpose (implicit, hidden and even negative) among different stakeholders.

- Capacity building and development initiatives need to draw on valuable knowledge associated with different disciplines (for example adult education, psychology, information systems) even in an era where interdisciplinary approaches are seen as beneficial. There is a tendency towards simplification when moving to implementation stages, failing to take into account complexity, non-linearity and the uncertainty of change in human systems.

- Capacity building and development interventions need to address development from a systematic perspective, where the relationships between capacity at the individual, organisational and institutional (wider societal) levels are acknowledged. Attempts to evaluate capacity development also tend to take an instrumental view, looking at outcomes and impacts from a project or programme intervention view.

- Time frames for support to capacity building and development must go beyond the short-term. It is rare to find long-term commitment to capacity development that allows patterns of support to emerge in a responsive fashion. Insufficient attention is given to the nature and evolution of partnerships within which capacity building and development takes place, and in which there is a common strategic vision, shared ownership, and effective and accountable forms of governance. Resource allocation is seen to be bound to strict timelines and limited areas of support, disconnected from other parts of the system. The range of stakeholders is often limited to governmental organisations, failing to take account of the roles of NGOs and civil society organisations, as well as the private sector.

- Mutual capacity gaps need to be recognised. Southern research institutions comment frequently on the perception by external agents that they have a capacity deficit, whereas they often feel their northern partners and/ or donors have their own
capacity gaps that prevent them from working co-operatively towards common development goals. This lack of capacity for equitable co-operation can lead to:

- brain-drain from southern institutions;
- challenges for the wider spread (scaling-up and scaling-out) of capacity beyond individuals to organisations, and more widely in society;
- inequitable control over resources that support Capacity development, with northern institutions usually holding the reins;
- and the continuation of the paradigm of the North “developing capacity” in the South, rather than making a shift to approaches that emphasise the valued perspective of the outsider.

2.11. Conclusion

Developing capacity in rural areas can benefit from increased community involvement. Research on increasing the involvement of stakeholders specifically parents would be beneficial. Research on ways to provide rural areas with more efficient and cost-effective transportation could increase involvement in programmes, therefore building capacity. Effective training methods that require less time and money would also be beneficial. Shorter and less expensive training opportunities may allow working adults to get more involved in capacity development within their communities.

In thinking about capacity building, the research council noted that “there is also a need to recognise different elements of capacity that together form a capacity system” made up of Institutions and organisations with buildings and core infrastructure (such as ICT and libraries).

A range of submissions focused on the way research is funded and managed, pointing to a number of strengths in DFID’s current RPC research model with respect to capacity development (CD). These are: “experiences of capacity assessments that can be shared with others, innovative training design and implementation models, Strategies for human resource development that support CD.”
Lastly, the strategy for capacity building should recognise the fact that effective research involves both the researchers themselves and a far wider community of actors including governments, information intermediaries, ICT professionals, field workers, trainers, librarians, funders, publishers, journalists, and many other research communicators.
CHAPTER 3

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

A qualitative research design was adopted for the study. The primary goal for using this approach is defined as describing the actions of the research participants in great detail and attempting to understand their actions in terms of the actors’ own beliefs, history and context (Babbie and Mouton, 2006:271). The advantage of using a qualitative research design is that it generates rich, detailed data that leaves the participants’ perspectives intact and provides a context for healthy behaviour (Weinreich, 2006: 2).

A research design is the plan according to which we obtain participants (subjects) and collect information from them (Welman & Kruger, 2002: 46). In it we describe what we are going to do with the participants, with a view to reaching conclusions about the research problem (Welman & Kruger, 2002:46).

According to Babbie and Mouton (2006:72), research design addresses the planning of scientific inquiry and strategy for investigation. There are two major aspects of research design: firstly, the researcher must specify as clearly as possible what they want to find out, and secondly, they must determine the best way to do it (Babbie and Mouton, 2006:72). According to Babbie and Mouton (2006: 72), as mathematicians say, a proper-framed question contains an answer.

Babbie and Mouton (2006:72) further elaborate that in a scientific inquiry the researcher needs to make observations and interpret what he/she have observed, and before they can observe and analyse, they need to plan. They need to determine what they are going to observe and analyse, why and how (Babbie & Mouton, 2006:72).

Verschuren and Doorewaard (1999:16), distinguished between two types of research designs, namely; a conceptual research design and a technical research design. A
conceptual research design determines what, why, and how much are we going to study, where we mainly use concepts and the relationship between concepts, and is the design chosen for this study.

3.2. Area of Study

The area of the study was the Capricorn District Municipality of Limpopo Province in South Africa. The district is situated at the core of economic development in the Limpopo Province and includes the capital of the province, Polokwane. One national and various major provincial roads pass through the district municipal area, linking Gauteng to Zimbabwe and the rest of Africa.

Capricorn District Municipality comprises five local municipalities, namely: Aganang, Blouberg, Lepelle-Nkumpi, Molemole and Polokwane, with 547 settlements. The Capricorn District Municipality boasts 31 SLAG projects from the provincial total of 71 projects, apart from Restitution and LRAD projects.
Figure 1: The map shows the Capricorn District Municipality and its local municipalities

### 3.3. Population

The CASP funded projects that have received training within the Capricorn District between the year 2008 and 2012 are thirteen (13). The projects fall under three different Land Reform Programmes. The first and the largest group are LRAD projects, which are composed of eleven (11) farms, the second and the third groups are the SLAG and restitution projects, which have one (1) farm each. The total number of beneficiaries trained was 156 and these were trained on different modules such as, ABET, production (according to Commodity), record keeping, finance management and others depending on the project’s needs assessment.

The projects are spread throughout all municipalities of the Capricorn District, with Polokwane having a large number of eight projects(four in Leeukuil and four in Palmitfontein), Blouberg with two (one in Andermark and one in Ga-Malebogo). Aganang (Ga-Ramosoane), Molemole (Solomondale) and Lepelle-Nkumpi
(Zebediela) had one project each. The project sizes varied from the minimum of 8,5ha to a maximum of 6000ha.

3.4. Sampling methods

Random sampling method was used to select the beneficiaries by names from the selected projects as they were scattered around the Capricorn District Municipality. About forty per cent (40%) of beneficiaries were sampled.

3.5. Data collection and methods

Data were collected from the selected participants in the community development projects through interviews and observations so as to ensure that all the relevant information was captured. The researcher made use of observations as well as structured and unstructured interviews.

3.5.1. Observation

Participant observation was used by the researcher as a data collecting technique in this study. Strydom et al. (2002: 289) discussed participant observation as a valuable procedure for data collection in qualitative studies as it has an exploratory character. Babbie (2004:285) and Strydom et al. (2002:280) support the notion that participatory observation implicates a continuum from complete observer to complete participant with a variety of degrees of involvement in between.

The challenge associated with the method was to make regular notes on observations and experiences in the research field and to convert it into field notes as soon as possible in order to reduce errors. Observation was followed up with informal one-on-one interviews.

3.5.2. Interviewing

According to Strydom et al. (2002: 292), interviewing is the method of data collection most often used in qualitative research. Babbie (2004: 299) describes this technique as qualitative field interviewing. Strydom et al. (2002: 292) depict the interview in the
qualitative research sense as a conversation that presents a two-sidedness. Babbie (2004: 300) explains that qualitative interviewing implicates the interaction between the interviewer and the respondent. As Babbie (2004: 300) advises, the interviewer had a general idea about questions to be posed and guided the interview accordingly. A closer relationship between the interviewer and the respondent was possible. The interviewer could show his human side when asking questions and noting down responses. He could show feelings. Oakley (1884:49) describes this as the reciprocal character of interviewing. Such interviews provided a greater range of information and deep insight about the respondents. The respondents became participants in this nature (Frey, 1994: 370).

Different types of interviews were conducted in this research. Unstructured and structured interview methods were implemented. One-on-one interviews were used to obtain information from the project members in the municipality. The informal interview (unstructured) resulted in respondents on occasions forgetting that they were being interviewed, as questions followed from the immediate context.

The structured interview schedule was also used as one of the methods of collecting data. The structured interview schedule is the data collection technique most common used in social survey (Miller & Brewer, 2003: 253). A structured interview is when the interviewers are present, asking questions and helping the respondent, examples include face-to-face interviews and a telephone survey (Miller & Brewer, 2003: 253).

Miller and Brewer (2003: 255) also highlighted the criticisms that the respondents may not always be honest in answering a particular question, and such gaps may easily be identified and addressed in the in-depth approaches to data collection methods such as the unstructured interview.

3.6. Data analysis

Data were analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS), with basic commands to use when performing statistical analysis such as univariate analysis, bivariate analysis (tabulations and cross tabulations), and regression analysis (Babbie & Mouton, 2006:583). A qualitative analysis (non-numerical
examination and interpretation of observation, for the purpose of discovering underlying meanings and patterns of relationships) and quantitative analysis (numerical representation and the manipulation of observations for the purpose of describing and explaining the phenomena that those observations reflect) were used (Babbie & Mouton, 2006:446). The analysis of qualitative data involved the concretisation of identified categories and the incorporation of pre-existing knowledge into one theory that is being confirmed, created or added (Nkatini, 2005:40).

There were two basic approaches to follow when addressing the data analyses of recurring themes in qualitative research, that is, the content analyses and ethnographic summary (Welman & Kruger, 2002:194). Content analyses involved a systematic observation of personal documents and mass media material. This was executed in order to make qualitative analyses of such an interview (Welman and Kruger, 2002: 195).

3.7. Ethical considerations

The researcher considered ethical issues (such as anonymity of respondents and non-disclosure of information) and therefore the respondents were informed of their right to choose whether to participate in the envisaged research study project or not. The respondents were informed of the right to stop the interview whenever they felt uncomfortable to continue. They were informed that there was no danger or risk the study could bring to participating members, non-participating members or the management of the project.

The respondents were informed of the confidentiality of the information they provided. The respondents were informed that they would not be identified by name or address in any of the reports that are planned to be written on the findings of the study. They were also advised that they were not obliged to provide their names, and in no way could their names be revealed to anyone. The above information appeared as the researcher's introduction to remind him of the provision to declare
that he advised each respondent on all of the above. This would serve to inform anyone who would participate in the study.

3.8. Conclusion

A qualitative research design was adopted for the study because it generates rich, detailed data and provides a context for healthy behaviour. About forty per cent (40%) of beneficiaries were sampled. Different types of interviews were conducted in this research. Unstructured and structured interviews methods were implemented. One-on-one interviews were used to obtain information from the project members in the municipality. Data were analysed using the statistical package for social science (SPSS), with basic commands to use when performing statistical analysis such as univariate analysis, bivariate analysis (tabulations and cross tabulations), and regression analysis. The respondents were informed of the confidentiality of the information they would provide and their right to choose whether to participate in the research study project or not. The respondents were fully supportive and patient during the collection of data. No problems were encountered during the process.
CHAPTER 4

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1. Introduction

The main objective of this chapter is to present and analyse data collected on the experiences of the respondents. A total of 64 respondents participated in the study. The researcher used Moonstats package for windows, descriptive analysis and explanations. The analysis is divided into sections following the introduction.

4.2. General information

4.2.1 Gender

Table 1: Frequency table for GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>57.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 64 100.00

Missing cases: 0

About 57.81% (37) of the respondents were male, while 42.19% (27) were female; representing 37 and 27 cases respectively.

4.2.2 Age of the respondents

About 26.56% of the respondents were aged between 46 and 55 years, 23.44% of them 56-65 years, 20.31% were 36-45 years, 14.06% were over 66 years, 10.94% were 26-35 years and 4.69% were below 25 years of age. This represented 17, 15, 13, 9, 7, and 3 cases from the study respectively.
4.2.3 Marital status of the respondents

Table 2: Frequency table for marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cum. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54.69</td>
<td>54.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>56.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>59.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40.63</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 64 100.00

Missing cases: 0

The study revealed that 54.69% of the respondents were married, while 40.63% of them were unmarried, and this represented 35 and 26 cases from the study. Those who were divorced were 3.13% of the respondents, widows were 1.56%; this represented 2 cases and 1 case respectively.
4.2.4 Respondents’ experience in farming

Table 3: Frequency table for respondents’ experience in farming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cum. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-3 Years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,56</td>
<td>1,56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 Years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10,94</td>
<td>12,50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7 Years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17,19</td>
<td>29,69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9 Years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10,94</td>
<td>40,63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 Years</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>59,38</td>
<td>100,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL  64  100.00

Missing cases: 0

The majority of the respondents (59.38) had more than 10 years of experience in farming, representing 38 respondents from the study, while the values “4-5 years” and “8-9 years” both achieved 7 cases each. The value “6-7 years” of farming experience achieved 11 cases from the study, and the category 2-3 years of experience was 1 respondent, and it represented 1.56% of the cases. Table 2 represents the results of this variable.

4.2.5. Respondents’ educational qualifications

Figure 3: Respondents’ educational qualifications
The study found that 42.19% (27) of the respondents had gone to school up to primary level, while 31.25% (20) of the respondents attended school up to secondary level. About 14.06% (9) of the respondents attended school up to matric level and 7.81% (5) had diplomas; only 1.56% (1) of the respondents had a degree qualification, while those who did not have any formal school education were 3.13% (2) of the respondents.

4.2.6 Respondents’ employment background

Figure 4: Respondents’ employment background

Figure 4 indicates that 46.88% (30) of the respondents were unemployed, 34.38% (22) respondents were farm workers. About 10.94% (7) of the respondents were self-employed and 7.81% (5) respondents were pensioners.

4.2.7 Type of land reform projects

The study noted that about 39.06% of the respondents were under Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD), and represented 25 cases from the study. Twenty eight point one three per cent (28.13%) of the respondents were under “other” projects such as communal projects as captured in the study. The value “Settlement Land and Acquisition Grant” (SLAG) achieved 17.19% of the
cases and represented 11 cases from the study while the value “Restitution” achieved 15.63% (10) of the cases. Figure 5 indicates the results on this variable.

Figure 5: Type of land reform project

4.2.8 Forms of land ownership

Figure 6: Forms of ownership
The study found that 43.75% of the respondents were under a “Trust”, while 26.56% of the respondents were under the value “None”, and this result represented 28 and 17 respondents respectively. Those who were under Communal Property Association (CPA) were 9.38% (6) respondents, whereas those who fell under Close cooperation (CP) were 20.31% (13) of the respondents.

### 4.2.9 Number of beneficiaries in the projects

Table 3: Frequency table for number of beneficiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cum. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20,31</td>
<td>20,31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21,88</td>
<td>42,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20,31</td>
<td>62,50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,56</td>
<td>64,06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35,94</td>
<td>100,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 64 100.00

Missing cases: 0

The majority (35.94%) of the project’s respondents indicated that they were more than 20 beneficiaries in each project, and it represented 23 respondents from the study. Those who indicated that there were 6-10 beneficiaries in each project represented 21.88% (14) of the respondents. Those who had less than 5 members, and those with 11-15 members both achieved 20.31% (13) of the cases each; and only 1 (1, 56%) was achieved for the value “16-20".
4.2.10. Cross-tabulations/chi-square

4.2.10.1 Gender by Age

Table 4: Cross tabulation of Sex by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 25 Years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35 Years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45 Years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55 Years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65 Years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 66 Years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 3 male respondents were aged below 25 years with 0 for females, 5 males were between 26-35 years against 2 of their female counterparts, 6 were between 36-45 years against 7 of their female counterparts. Eight (8) males were between 46-55 years males against 9 females, Seven (7) females were between 56-65 years against 8 females; and those over 66 years were 8 males against 1 female. Generally males were found to be more than their female counterparts in number.

4.2.10.2 Gender and marital status

Table 5: Cross tabulation of gender by marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About 23 males against 12 females respondents were married, 0 male to 1 female respondent was widowed, the value “Divorced” achieved 1 case on each gender counterpart; and “Unmarried” achieved 13 cases on each gender counterparts. The study found that the dominance by both married males and females reflected a negatively skewed data in terms of unemployed people among the communities and these had to find alternative ways of feeding their families through participating in the projects. Unmarried people with no families to feed always had excuses for not participating in the projects.

4.2.10.3. Gender by education

Table 6: Cross tabulation of gender by education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matric</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study noted that 1 male and 1 female had no education with regard to their educational qualifications, 15 male and 12 female respondents went up to primary level, 11 males and 9 females had secondary education, 6 males and 3 females only had matric qualifications. Those with diplomas were 3 males and 2 females. One (1) male to zero (0) female had a degree qualification. Table 6 shows the results of this variable.
4.2.11. Correlation of variables

Table 7: Correlation of variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>r-value</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender and age</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Weak correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and farming experience</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>Relatively Weak correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and education</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Weak correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and occupational background</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Weak correlation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An r of -1 is a perfect negative correlation, an r of 1 is a perfect positive correlation, and an r of 0 means there is no correlation.

A Pearson product-moment correlation shows the strength of the relationship between two continuous variables. It is suitable for use if it can be assumed that the variables are approximately normally distributed.

The P value indicates if the correlation is statistically significant. Given a large enough sample size (n), even a very weak correlation can be statistically significant, and given a small enough sample size even a very strong correlation may not be statistically significant.

In this cases "GENDER and AGE are not statistically significantly correlated (r=0,01; p=0,961)." ; "SEX and FARMING EXPERIENCE are not statistically significantly correlated (r=0,13; p=0,300)."; "GENDER and EDUCATION are not statistically significantly correlated (r=-0,10; p=0,452)."; "GENDER and OCCUPBACKG are not statistically significantly correlated (r=0,06; p=0,613)."

4.2.12. T-test for independent variables

Table 8: T-test for independent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and age</td>
<td>3.963</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>No statistical difference between the means of the two groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and education</td>
<td>2.741</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>-0.758</td>
<td>No statistical difference between the means of the two groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender and occupational background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sdtDev</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The p-value of 0.05= statistically significant. The p-value above 0.05 indicates non significance.

The t-test for independent groups shows if there is a significant difference between the means of two groups. Looking at the P value of the relevant t -test above to see if the difference between the two means is statistically significant. Here all the p-values are larger than 0.05. This suggests that there is no statistically significant difference between the means of the two groups.

4.2.13. Descriptive statistics

Table 9: descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sdtDev</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>Positively skewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>Negatively skewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>Positively skewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming experience</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>Negatively skewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>Positively skewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational background</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>Positively skewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of land reform Project</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Positively skewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms of Project ownership</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Positively skewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of beneficiaries</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>Positively skewed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Skewness >0=positively skewed. Skewness<0=negatively skewed

If skewness is larger than 0, the distribution is positively skewed, that is there are fewer cases above the mean than below the mean. If skewness is smaller than 0, the distribution is negatively skewed, that is there are more cases above the mean than below. Table 9 indicates the findings of the study.
4.3. Economic aspects

4.3.1. Respondents’ benefit from the projects

Figure 7: Respondents’ benefits from the projects

About 95.31% of the respondents indicated that they observed some benefits as a result of the existence of the projects, whereas only 4.69% of the respondents did not; this represented 61 and 3 cases from the study respectively.

4.3.2. Type of benefit.

Figure 8: Type of benefit
The study noted that 64.06% of the respondents indicated they benefited through employment got from the projects, 18.75% indicated that they earned income since the establishment of the projects, and this represented 41 and 12 cases respectively. 9.38% of the respondents indicated poverty reduction as the benefit they achieved, the values “food security” and “other/specify” achieved 3.13% each and represented 6, 2, and 2 cases respectively, while the value “All above” achieved 1.56% (1) of the cases. Figure 8 represents the findings of the study.

4.4. Capacity building in the projects

4.4.1. Respondents who received some form of training in the projects

About 96.88% of the respondents indicated that they did receive some form of training in their projects. Only 3.12% of the respondents indicated that they did not receive any training; this represented 62 and 2 respondents respectively. The figure below indicates the findings from the study.

Figure 9: Training received by beneficiaries

The training received always capacitate beneficiaries with a lot of skills which enables them to transfer that knowledge to other colleagues and to better their understanding in terms of managing their projects, finances and their employees.
4.4.2. Institutions provided the training

The study noted that the Department of Agriculture was the main provider for capacity building of beneficiaries in the projects, recording 87.5% (56) response in that regard. Universities/Colleges received 3.13% (2), LEDA did 1.56% (1) of the training, while 7.81% (5) of respondents indicated that they received training from other institutions including farmer to farmer training.

4.4.3. Number of years after receiving of training

Figure 10: Institution which provided training

Figure 11: Number of years after receiving training
Respondents who received training less than a year ago represented 12.5% (8) of the cases, 1-2 years represented 35.94% (23) cases, 3-4 years represented 10.94% (7) of the cases, 5-6 years 28.13% (18) cases and the value “None” received 12.5% (8) of the cases.

### 4.4.4. Type of training

Table 10: Frequency table for type of training received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cum. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>43.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record keeping</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>57.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial ma</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>65.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All above</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.13</td>
<td>93.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>95.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 64     100.00

Missing cases: 0

The majority of respondents (43.75%) indicated that the type of training received was related to production management, this represented 28 respondents from the study. About 28.13% (18) of the respondents indicated that they received all the above mentioned training, while those who received record keeping and financial management training courses represented 14.06% (9) and 7.81% (5) cases respectively. Those who received other forms of training or none were represented by 1.56% (1) and 4.69% (3) respectively.

### 4.4.5. The type of manuals received

37.5% (24) respondents indicated that they received all training with manuals, 29.69% (19) of the respondents indicating that they received production management manuals, record keeping and financial management. 9.38% (6) of the respondents did not receive manuals; whereas 4.69% (3) of the respondents received other training manuals.
4.4.6. Usefulness of the training manuals

Table 11: Frequency table for usefulness of the training manuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cum. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60.94</td>
<td>60.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39.06</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 64 100.00

Missing cases: 0

60.94% of the respondents found the training manuals provided to be very useful whereas 39.06% of the respondents did not find them useful. This represented 39 and 25 cases respectively. If training manuals were provided, it would have been easy for the beneficiaries to catch up on the information that they would have forgotten or wanted to refer to regarding important information.
4.5. Impact of capacity building on beneficiaries

4.5.1. Impact of the training provided

57.81% (37) of the respondents indicated that they agree that the training provided had made an impact on beneficiaries. 31.25% (20) strongly agreed to the idea that the training had made a positive impact on beneficiaries; those who said “don’t know” and “disagreed” constituted 7.81% (5) and 3.13% (2) of the respondents respectively as indicated on the likert scale. Figure 14 indicates the findings of the study. The training enabled the beneficiaries to do farm by themselves without the assistance of the extension officials. They were able to better manage their projects and other resources and also transfer the skills to the needy.

Although the main challenges of some beneficiaries were associated with their literacy level, it is always important to use a better method of training which accommodates those with a challenge of reading and writing.

Figure 14: Impact of training
4.5.2. How capacity building impacted on beneficiaries?

34.38% (22) of the respondents indicated that they were able to do production records than before, 18.75% (12) indicated that they were able to record their financials, 1.56% (1) indicated ability to do HR records, whereas 17.19% indicated general management skills. A percentage count of 18.75% (12) respondents indicated “All the above”; whereas 9.38% (6) indicated “other/specify” represented 9.38% (6) as their response.

Figure 15: How capacity building impacted on beneficiaries?
4.5.3. Challenges faced by beneficiaries in their projects

Table 12: Frequency about table for Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cum. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26,56</td>
<td>26,56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,56</td>
<td>28,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No training manuals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18,75</td>
<td>46,88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No trainers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40,63</td>
<td>87,50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of above</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12,50</td>
<td>100,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing cases: 0

40.63% (26) of the respondents indicated that the shortage of trainers was their main challenge which created a stumbling block in maximising production in the projects because of the shortage of knowledge and skills. 26.56% (17) of the respondents indicated that illiteracy among some of the beneficiaries made it difficult for the trainers to transfer their knowledge to them. 18.75% (12) indicated they did not receive training manuals for reference, 1.56% (1) indicated that absenteeism by beneficiaries during the training process resulted in a fallacy in the projects and 12.50% (8) respondents indicated all of the above in their responses.

4.5.4. Possible ways of resolving the challenges

Table 13: Frequency table for Resolving Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cum. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18,75</td>
<td>18,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,69</td>
<td>23,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More training manuals</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20,31</td>
<td>43,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21,88</td>
<td>65,63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of above</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29,69</td>
<td>95,31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/specify</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,69</td>
<td>100,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing cases: 0
The majority of respondents (29.69%) responded with “All of above” as indicated in the table above and this represented what they thought could best resolve their challenges. If that was addressed, it would be possible to maximise their production, income and job creation, and this represented 19 respondents on the table.

The respondents also indicated that there was need to increase the number of trainers in order to reach the needy in a broader sense. 20.31% of the respondents indicated that there should be more training manuals provided in order for every beneficiary to have a mini-library at home to refer to when need arise.

18.75% (12) of the respondents indicated that training should go hand-in-glove with some demonstrations because most of the beneficiaries were illiterate.

4.69% (3) of the respondents indicated that the availability of the agricultural colleges should be visible and should play a major role in the training of the beneficiaries. Those who indicated “Other/specify” were represented by 4.60% (3) of the respondents who had a different view with regard to the capacity building of the beneficiaries. Twelve (18.75%) of the respondents indicated that a lot of demonstrations would help them as most beneficiaries were illiterate; whereas 20.31% of the respondents indicated that more repeated trainings could help with the increase in a number of trainers, noted the study. The majority of the respondents indicated that “All above” would be enough to help the respondents with the capacity they required.

4.6. Discussion

4.6.1. General information

A study noted that male respondents were in dominance as compared to their female counterparts. The female respondents seemed to have shifted their focus to other enterprises such as the big malls which were opened recently for retail employment and other forms of employment.
A study by Nziane (2009:30) observed that female respondents were in dominance in projects related to agriculture because their male counterparts in Lepelle-Nkumpi municipality mainly focused on other forms of employment such as the newly opened mines in the area.

Another study which also noted male dominance on the project was conducted by Fabiyi et al. (1991: 234) in the Southwest Nigeria, where females rarely allocated land and had their rights to land use coming from men.

The study by FAO (1985: 241), has noted that females play an important role in agriculture and should be motivated to participate largely in such projects.

The study also found that the majority of respondents were aged between 46-55 years, followed by those who were aged 56-65 years with a sharp decline among young people in the community participating in the projects.

This created a fear that young people and women were reluctant to participate in agricultural related activities. The income generated by the projects is too little to attract the attention of the youth’s involvement in agricultural activities. The department should play a major role in encouraging youth participation in the projects by giving support on the resources required to kick-start the projects. Some bursaries for the youth should be supported by all spheres of the government in order to shift their focus into agriculture.

The study also observed that male respondents who were married were in a majority when compared to their women counterparts. This study shows that more married men were not employed while they had families to feed, and could find alternative means of survival through agriculture.

Married female counterparts may have found alternative jobs on the nearby malls which had open recently.

The male respondents were a bit more educated as compared to their female counterparts. This could have eased their understanding in terms of finding alternative way of feeding their families through participating in the projects.
4.6.2. Economic aspects

The majority of respondents were positive about the benefits they gained by participating in the projects. They indicated that the type of benefits they gained were employment, poverty reduction, income generation as well as food security through the establishment of the projects.

The study also noted that the educated section of the community were reluctant to participate in the projects. With reference to that one would conclude that the project did not accommodate the educated members of the community; or that those who were educated were not prone to poverty and as a result, they did see the need to participate in these projects.

Absenteism during the training was an impediment to the sustainability of the projects as participants would not have the required skills needed in the projects. Attitude towards the projects was one of the main challenges which led to the downfall of many project.

4.6.3. Capacity building of beneficiaries

The respondents indicated that they received some form of training in their projects. The institutions which trained the beneficiaries included the Department of Agriculture, Universities/Colleges, LEDA, and other structures such as farmer to farmer training.

The type of training provided was production management, record keeping, and financial management. The training manuals were also made available to the respondents should they wish to refer in the future. The respondents found the manuals very useful.

4.6.4. Impact of capacity building on beneficiaries

The majority of respondents indicated that the training provided made a positive impact on beneficiaries because they were now able to manage their production records, financial records and human resource records. There was a slight decline of respondents who were negative about the capacity building provided for farmers.
The major challenges faced during the training process were that some of the respondents were illiterate, and some mechanisms had to be tailored to make them understand what the training was all about, for example demonstrations that involved during training, and some exposure visits to other farmers involved in the same production system, thereby encouraging farmer-to-famer training.
CHAPTER 5

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1. Introduction

A dissertation of a limited scope cannot adequately address the challenges related to capacity building to beneficiaries on CASP funded projects in Capricorn district. There are also limitations to achieve the primary aims, that is, to capacitate the beneficiaries in order to enhance their productivity and record keeping on their enterprises.

The findings of the study also provide a guideline on how the beneficiaries appreciated the training provided by different stakeholders including the Department of Agriculture. However, there were challenges which were raised by DFID and R4D (2001) as indicated in the literature review.

5.2. Conclusion

The researcher understands that assessment of capacity needs is limited since baselines for evaluating the success of capacity development strategies have not been set up, it is also unclear as to the extent to which the centres have contributed directly to increasing capacity since studies on this area have not been carried out, hence more effort has to be put on it for the beneficiaries.

The study observed that, on the general information, there is still a need to encourage more women to take part in the projects since this has a direct economic effect on the lives of the needy in rural communities.

The study also noted reluctance in participation by the educated section of the community in the projects. A majority of the respondents who were participating in the projects either did not attend any formal education or attend only until primary level.

The study also found out that beneficiaries, who had more experience working in the projects, were still faced with the challenge of being dependent on financial
assistance from the government and other stakeholders. This was also observed on the field during data collection although it was not captured as one of the challenges. However, some participants indicated that they had a challenge of accessing credit facilities.

The study also revealed that the respondents were satisfied and happy with the intervention by the government and other stakeholders on capacity building. There were few respondents who indicated that they did not receive training and they hoped that stakeholders would make follow-up training sessions to enable them to catch up.

The challenges faced by respondents varied from market access, credit facilities, transport and support with regard to production inputs. They felt that if this challenge could be addressed, they would be able to increase their production potential. The study has noted that a dependency syndrome had affected the beneficiary’s ability to be self-reliant and this tendency is likely to take long to correct.

5.3. Recommendation

Based on the literature and the research findings, the researcher recommends that more intervention be offered to beneficiaries by different stakeholders. A participatory approach to rural development is needed to ensure that beneficiaries own their projects, understand that agricultural projects are their business for employment generation, income generation, and have a trickle-down effect in terms of economic development.

Different stakeholders involved in capacity building should enhance their training strategies and production methodologies such as hydroponics, to increase their production levels. The Departments of Agriculture and Rural development should be available to give out their expertise to the beneficiaries who need such assistance.

The government, researchers and non-governmental organisations involved in community development should critically consider the factors that deter community development and come up with strategies and recommendations to ensure that everybody in the community participates.
The study recommends the involvement of as much stakeholders as possible for capacity building in order to enhance the productivity potential of the beneficiaries. More research activities regarding community development and capacity building should be conducted on a broader scope.

In as much as projects seemed sustainable, there were challenges which had to be addressed to ensure that the essence of projects was realised. The project indicated participants highlighted the challenges mentioned above, and if these are not addressed otherwise the existence of the projects will be meaningless.

Developing capacity in rural areas do benefit from increased community involvement. Research on increasing the involvement of stakeholders specifically youth would be beneficial. Transportation also can be an issue in rural areas. Research on ways to provide rural areas with more efficient and cost-effective transportation could increase involvement in programme, thereby enhancing building capacity.

Effective training methods that require less time and money would also be beneficial. Shorter and less expensive training opportunities may allow working adults to get more involved in capacity development within their communities. Workforce training and development programme should take particular cognisance of the fact that their learners are adults (quite often illiterate or semi-illiterate), who also require different teaching methods.
6. REFERENCES


51


Journals


ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE OF FARMERS IN THIRTEEN CASP FUNDED PROJECTS IN CAPRICORN DISTRICT ON CAPACITY BUILDING

Good morning/afternoon/evening

My name is……………………………………. I am a student at the University of Limpopo (Edupark Campus). The questionnaire intends to collect information that will be used to assess the Capacity building on CASP funded projects In the Capricorn District. Such information will assist the researcher in policy recommendation.

You are in no way forced to participate in the interview process and you are at liberty to stop me at any time. Your input will however be extremely valuable. Participation is voluntary and anonymity will be maintained.

I thank you.

Enumerator: …………………………………………
Date: …………………
1. Type of Land Reform Project

- Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) 1
- Settlement Land Acquisition Grant (SLAG) 2
- Restitution 3
- Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy (PLAS) 4
- Other (specify): ______________________ 5

2. Forms of ownership

- Communal Property Association 1
- Trust 2
- Close Corporation 3
- Cooperative 4
- None 5

3. Total number of beneficiaries in your project: __________________

A. Personal Information

4. Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Married</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widower</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. What is your age?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 25 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Experience, No of years in farming on a project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Range</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1yr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 &amp; above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Educational qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Indicate your occupational background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensioner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formally employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Economic aspects

10. Do you benefit from the project?

Yes | No
---|---

11. If yes, how do you benefit?

Employment
Poverty reduction
Food security
Income
Other (specify): ______________

C. Capacity building in the project

12. Have you received training in the project?

Yes | No
---|---

13. If yes, from which institution?

Department Of agriculture
Limpopo Economic Development Agency
Self-Enterprise Development Agency
University/College:
Name__________________
Other (specify) ____________________

14. How many years after receiving training?

>01
01-02
02-03
03-04
None
15. What type of training did you receive?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record keeping</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify) _____</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Type of training manuals did you receive?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record keeping</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify): ______</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Do you find the material useful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
D. Impact of Capacity Building on beneficiaries

18. Is there any impact on the training provided?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Strongly agree</th>
<th>2. Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

19. How has capacity building impacted on beneficiaries?

Ability to keep production records

Ability to keep financial record

Ability to keep HR record

Ability to keep production skills

Other (Specify): ………………………
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20. Have you benefited from the training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Strongly agree</th>
<th>2. Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

21. What challenges has CASP beneficiaries experienced in their projects?

- Literacy
- Absenteeism
- No Training manuals
- No Trainers
- All of Above
22. How best can the challenges be resolved?

Demonstrations

Colleges

More training manuals

Trainers

All of Above

Other (specify): ___________________

Thank you