# **AFRICAN INSTITUTE FOR AGRARIAN STUDIES**

Fast Track Land Reform Baseline Survey in Zimbabwe: Trends and Tendencies, 2005/06

Sam Moyo, Walter Chambati, Tendai Murisa, Dumisani Siziba, Charity Dangwa, Kingstone Mujeyi & Ndabezinhle Nyoni

December 2009

Table of Contents	
List of Tables	iv
List of Figures	vii
List of Acronyms	ix
Preface	xi
1.0 INTRODUCTION, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND STUDY APPROACHES .	1
1.1 Introduction and scope of study	1
1.2 The Key Research Questions	4
1.2.1 Land allocation and distribution issues	4
1.2.2 Land tenure issues	6
1.2.3 Land utilisation issues	6
1.2.4 Natural resource utilisation	7
1.2.5 Farm labour issues	7
1.2.6 Social differentiation and agrarian restructuring	7
1.3 Study area	8
1.4 The Study Population, Sources of Data and Collection Approaches	10
2.0 ACCESS TO AND DISTRIBUTION OF LAND	14
2.1 Access to and distribution of farming land and natural resources	14
2.1.1 Land sizes allocated and distribution (background policy guidelines)	14
2.1.2 Access to natural resources and their distribution	16
2.2 Land access approaches and patterns	17
2.2.1 Timing and periodisation of land access	17
2.2.2 Official land beneficiaries and methods used to gain access to land	18
2.2.3 The pattern of "illegal" occupations	20
2.3 Socio-economic characteristics of beneficiaries	21
2.3.1 Origins of land beneficiaries	21
2.3.2 Family structure (size and membership) of beneficiaries	24
2.3.3 Gender composition of land beneficiaries	26
2.3.4 Educational levels of land beneficiaries	27
2.3.5 Employment profiles of beneficiaries	28
2.4 Farm residency and homesteads	29
2.5 Farm labourers' access to residential and agricultural land	31
2.5.1 Farm worker residency	31
2.5.2 Former farm worker beneficiaries of farming land	32
2.6 Land access through sharing, rentals and "co-existence"	34 27
2.7 Concluding Statement	37 20
3.1 Forms of land tonum and tonum security, local parspective	30 20
3.1 1 Forms of land tenure in practice	30 38
3.1.2 Tenure security	30
3.1.2 1 Gender relations in land tenure	/// //
3.1.2.1 Ochoci relations in failu tenure.	40
3.2 L and displacements, existions and threats	41 /13
3.3 I and conflicts and sources	<b>۲۳</b> . ۸6
3.4 Land conflict resolution mechanisms and land administration issues	0 <del>1</del> 48
3.5 Concluding statement	0 <b></b> 10
4.0 AGRICULTURAL LAND USE AND PRODUCTION	
4.1 Farm establishment and farm nlans	
4.2 Agricultural production patterns	52

4.2.1 Overall net land utilisation levels and rates	54
4.2.2 Crop production patterns	56
4.2.3 Livestock production patterns	65
4.3 Agricultural Inputs	69
4.3.1 Inputs used in crop production	69
4.3.2 Inputs used in livestock production	70
4.3.3 Farm equipment and machinery resources distribution and utilization	72
4.3.4 Financial resources	75
4.3.5 Skills and knowledge distribution and utilization	77
4.4 Emerging Agricultural markets	80
4.4.1 Input markets	80
4.4.2 Output Markets	82
4.5 Forms of productive investment	87
4.6 Concluding remarks	87
5.0 NON-AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION STRATEGIES	89
5.1 Non-farm production strategies	89
5.2 Natural resources utilisation	89
5.3 Non-agricultural income generating strategies	92
5.4 Other alternative land uses	95
5.5 Concluding statement	97
6.0 AGRARIAN LABOUR PROCESSES AND SOCIAL RELATIONS	<b>98</b>
6.1 Forms of labour in New Resettlement Areas	<b>98</b>
6.1.1 Family labour utilised on own farm plots	98
6.1.2 Family labour hired out to farms and non farming activities	99
6.1.3 Hired in labour for farming and non farming activities	100
6.2 Mobilisation of agricultural labour	103
6.2.1 "Recruitment" of family labour	103
6.2.2 Nature of hired labour mobilised	104
6.2.3 Sources of labour	106
6.2.4 Farm labour supply and demand in newly redistributed areas	107
6.3 Farm wages and benefits	109
6.4 Rural labour structures and relations	114
6.4.1 Emergent structure of rural labour	114
6.4.2 Land sizes and labour use	117
6.4.3 Labour Intensities in New Resettlement Areas	119
6.5 Concluding statement	120
7.0 SOCIAL SERVICES AND REPRODUCTION STRATEGIES	121
7.1 Overview of social conditions in newly redistributed areas	121
7.1.1 Age structure	121
7.1.2 School enrolment	121
7.1.3 HIV and AIDS situation	122
7.1.4 Impact of drought on farming based social reproduction	123
7.2 Social security services and strategies	125
7.2.1 Access to social services within the newly redistributed areas	125
7.2.2 Access to social services through communal areas interactions	127
7.3 Social reproduction strategies/incomes	130
7.3.1 Sources of incomes in newly resettled areas	130
7.3.2 Household consumption patterns	137
7.4 Social assistance programmes	138

7.5 Concluding statement	. 140
8.0 LOCAL 'GRIEVANCES' AND SOCIAL ORGANISATION	. 141
8.1 Land and agrarian impacts: beneficiary discourses	. 141
8.1.1 Land grievances cited by the beneficiaries	. 141
8.1.2 Production constraints and grievances of the beneficiaries	. 143
8.1.3 Social grievances	. 146
8.2 Local state structures and societal relations	. 147
8.2.1 Local state structures	. 147
8.2.2 Traditional leaders	. 149
8.3 Land beneficiary organisation and advocacy	. 150
8.3.1 Farmer Organisations among land beneficiaries	. 151
8.4 Other forms of organisation	. 156
8.5 Organisations of new and former farm workers	. 157
8.5.1 Unionisation of farm workers	. 157
8.5.2 Collective bargaining: wage determination in newly resettled areas	. 159
8.5.3 Labour syndicalism, skills use and survival strategies.	. 160
8.6 Political parties	. 162
8.7 Formal civil society organisation and interventions	. 163
8.8 Concluding Statement	. 163
9.0 AGRARIAN STRUCTURE AND CLASS FORMATION	. 165
9.1 Social Differentiation in Newly Resettled Areas	. 165
9.1.1 Social differentiation as perceived by beneficiaries	. 165
9.1.2 Statistical classification of beneficiaries	. 168
9.2 Key differentiating factors: Production relations and accumulation	. 169
9.2.1 Group 1- Capital intensive farmers	. 170
9.2.2 Group 2-Unmarried (widowed) farmers	. 170
9.2.3 Group 3-Civil servants	. 170
0.2.4 Group 4. Latest optropts	
9.2.4 Oloup 4-Latest entrants	. 171
9.2.4 Group 4-Latest entrans	. 171 . 172
<ul><li>9.2.4 Group 4-Latest entrants</li><li>9.2.5 Group 5- "Ordinary majority"</li><li>9.3 Further analyses of the groups</li></ul>	. 171 . 172 <b>. 172</b>
<ul> <li>9.2.4 Group 4-Latest entrans</li></ul>	. 171 . 172 . <b>172</b> . <b>173</b>
<ul> <li>9.2.4 Group 4-Latest entrains</li></ul>	. 171 . 172 . 172 . 172 . 173 . 174
<ul> <li>9.2.4 Group 4-Latest entrains</li></ul>	. 171 . 172 . 172 . 173 . 173 . 174 . 179

## List of Tables

Table 1-1. Emerging Agrarian Structure in Zimbabwe	2
Table 1-2. Provincial Distribution of LSCF in Zimbabwe	2 1
Table 1-2: Key demographic features of land beneficiaries	11
Table 1-4: Sample size by model type and district	12
Table 1-4. Sample Size by model type and districtions	12
Table 1-5. Failin Worker Sample Characteristics	12
Table 2-1. Form size guidelines for resettlement	15
Table 2-1: Farm-size guidennes for resetuement	15
Table 2-2: Landholdings for A2 honofisionis	15
Table 2-5: Landnoidings for A2 beneficiaries	10
1 able 2-4: Year of formal land allocation by district         Table 2-5: Male a flux language for langu	18
Table 2-5: Mode of land access for beneficiaries	19
Table 2-6: Place of origin by model type	22
Table 2-7: Place of origin of land beneficiaries by district	23
Table 2-8: Family structures in newly resettled areas	25
Table: 2-9: Age range against gender (total population)	25
Table 2-10: Education levels attained by plot owner	27
Table 2-11: Previous employment of land beneficiaries	28
Table 2-12: Current profession of land beneficiaries	29
Table 2-13: Residency of plot owners in newly resettled areas	30
Table 2-14: Residency of plot owners in newly resettled areas by gender	30
Table 2-15: Former Farm Worker Preferences before the FTLRP	33
Table 2-16: Former Farm Worker Preferences during the FTLRP	33
Table 2-17: Land sharing in new resettlement areas by model	34
Table 2-18: Land sharing in new resettlement areas by district	35
Table 2-19: Non-farm owners with access to land by model	35
Table 2-20: Non-farm owners with access to land by district	36
Table 3-1: Possession of relevant land tenure documents by model	38
Table 3-2: Eviction threats received by beneficiaries by model	44
Table 3-3: Eviction threats received by beneficiaries by district	44
Table 3-4: Sources of eviction threats received by land beneficiaries	44
Table 3-5: Actual evictions of land beneficiaries by model	45
Table 3-6: Actual evictions of land beneficiaries by district	45
Table 3-7: Source of actual eviction of land beneficiaries	45
Table 3-8: Reason for maintaining a communal home	45
Table 3-9. Involvement of land beneficiaries in land conflicts by model	46
Table 3-10. I and conflicts among heneficiaries by district	46
Table 3-10. Land conflicts among benchclaries by district management of land conflicts by model	40 17
Table 3-11. Nature of land conflicts by district	47 17
Table 3-12. Source of land conflicts	4/ /Q
Table 3-14: Desolution of ovistion throats	40
Table 3-14: Resolution of eviction unreals	49
Table 4-1: Year when piece of land was allocated vs. year when farming commenced	5U 51
Table 4-2: Tear when piece of fand was anocated vs. year when farming commenced	51
1 able 4-5: x ear farming operations commenced by district         Table 4 4: A entire leave leave de tion trouble	51
Table 4-4: Agricultural production trends	53
1 able 4-5: Arable land utilization levels	55
Table 4-6: Major crops grown by agro-ecological region	57

Table 4-7: Major crops grown by district	58
Table 4-8: Total cropped areas by farm sizes in new resettlement areas	60
Table 4-9: Total cropped areas by district	61
Table 4-10: Major crops by cropped area ranges	62
Table 4-11: Crop outputs and yields in the new resettlement areas	63
Table 4-12: Average crop outputs per household (in tonnes) by district	63
Table 4-13: Land beneficiaries utilising irrigation for crop production	64
Table 4-14: Major crops being grown by households under irrigation	65
Table 4-15: Livestock ownership by district	66
Table 4-16: Numbers of livestock kept by newly resettled households	67
Table 4-17: Ownership of livestock by model	68
Table 4-18: Number of cattle kept by households by disticts	68
Table 4-19: Utilisation of agricultural inputs by model	69
Table 4-20: Utilisation of agricultural inputs by district	70
Table 4-21: Inputs used for livestock production by model	71
Table 4-22: Inputs used by livestock owners by district	72
Table 4-23: Access to productive tools – A1 model	73
Table 4-24: Access to productive tools – A2 model	74
Table 4-25: Utilisation of own financial resources for farming activities	75
Table 4-26: Access to external finance for specific crop production	76
Table 4-27: Access to external finance for livestock production by district	76
Table 4-28: Source of non-commodity specific finance	76
Table 4-29: Formal agricultural training obtained by land beneficiaries	79
Table 4-30: Sources of seed inputs in New Resettlement Areas	80
Table 4-31: Sources of fertilizer in New Resettlement Areas	81
Table 4-32: Sources of livestock inputs under input schemes	82
Table 4-33: Marketing channels of major food crops	83
Table 4-34: Marketing channels for oilseed and key export crops	83
Table 4-35: Marketing channels of plantation crops	84
Table 4-36: New Marketing Channels by District	86
Table 4-37: New Marketing Channels by Model	86
Table 4-38: Forms of productive investment in newly resettled areas	87
Table 5-1: Natural resources utilisation by land beneficiaries	89
Table 5-2: Natural resources utilisation by farm worker households	92
Table 5-3: Non-farm income generating activities by land beneficiaries	93
Table 5-4: Non-farm income generating activities by farm worker households	95
Table 5-5: Alternative land use options	96
Table 6-1: Family labour use on own farm plots	98
Table 6-2: Family labour hired out for farm jobs	99
Table 6-3: Hiring in of labour for farming	100
Table 6-4: Households Hiring in Labour for Farming Activities	101
Table 6-5: Skills of Household Members Mobilised	104
Table 6-6: Composition of Rural Employment in New Resettlement Areas	106
Table 6-7: Reasons for farm labour shortages	108
Table 6-8: Additional Benefits Provided to Wage labour	110
Table 6-9: Working Hours in New Resettlement Areas	114
Table 6-10: Overall Emergent Structure of Rural Labor in New Resettlement Areas	114
Table 6-11: Emergent Structures of Rural Labour in New Resettlement Areas by model	115
Table 6-12: Termination of Employment by Household Heads	116

Table 6-13: Labour Employed by size of land holding	117
Table 6-14: Labour Employed by Size of Arable Area in Newly Resettled Areas	118
Table 6-15: Labour Employed in Newly Resettled Areas by Cropped Area	118
Table 6-16: Labour Intensities by Farm Sizes	119
Table 6-17: Labour Intensity by Cropped Areas in Newly Resettled Areas	120
Table 7-1: Land beneficiaries Perceptions on HIV and AIDS impacts on agriculture	123
Table 7-2: Access to social infrastructure on the farm	126
Table 7-3: Number of household members in communal areas by land beneficiaries	127
Table 7-4: Social and economic benefits derived by newly resettled people from CA	129
Table 7-5: Social and economic benefits derived by people from CA from new RA	129
Table 7-6: Major crop sale patterns in newly resettled areas (2004/05 season)	133
Table 7-7: Major crop retention patterns in newly resettled areas (2004/05 season)	133
Table 7-8: Livestock sale patterns in newly resettled areas	134
Table 7-9: Duration of food stocks from own production	137
Table 7-10: HIV and AIDS social assistance programmes	139
Table 8-1: Land grievances	143
Table 8-2: Production grievances	145
Table 8-3: Social grievances in newly resettled area	147
Table 8-4: Contact with Government agencies in newly resettled areas	149
Table 8-5: Level of awareness of traditional leaders in new resettlement areas	150
Table 8-6: Cooperation among newly resettled households	152
Table 8-7: Knowledge of existence of farmer groups	153
Table 8-8: Major benefit derived from famer groups by members	154
Table 8-9: Social origins of farmer group members	155
Table 8-10: Gender of household member belonging to a farmer group	156
Table 8-11: Wage determination methods in new resettlement areas	160
Table 9-1: Perceptions of class structures within farming communities	165
Table 9-2: Class distribution by model	166
Table 9-3: Most important distinguishing factors for social classes	166
Table 9-4: Description of farmer classes according to the beneficiaries	167
Table 9-5: Variables used in classifying land beneficiaries	169
Table 9-6: Distribution of land beneficiary groups	170
Table 9-7: Characteristics of land beneficiary groups	171
Table 9-8: Further Characterization of Land Beneficiary Groups	173

List of Figu
--------------

-	
Fig 1-1: Map of Zimbabwe showing the survey districts	9
Fig 2-1: Year of land allocation by model type	17
Fig 2-2: Mode of land access by district	19
Fig 2-3: Intensity of land occupations in Newly Redistributed Areas	20
Fig 2-4: Household size by model	24
Fig 2-5: Gender by model type	26
Fig 2-6: Current location of former farm workers	32
Fig 4-1: Arable land utilisation levels	54
Fig 4-2: Arable land utilisation levels by model type	55
Fig 4-3: Major crops production patterns in newly resettled areas	56
Fig 4-4: Minor crops grown by model type	59
Fig 4-5: Total cropped areas in newly resettled areas	60
Fig 4-6: Types of livestock kent by model type	66
Fig 4-7: Sources of agricultural information in new resettlement areas	77
Fig 4-8: Level of Training attained by model type	78
Fig 4-9: Source of agro-chemicals in New Resettlement Areas by model type	81
Fig 5-1: Natural resource extraction by gender	90
Fig 5-2: Natural resource extraction activities as reported by key informants	91
Fig 5-2: Natural resource extraction activities as reported by Key mormants	93
Fig 5-3. Non-agricultural activities by resetticularmers	94
Fig 5-5: Alternative land use by model type	95
Fig 6-1: Hiring out of labour for farming activities by newly resettled households	99
Fig 6-7: Hiring in of farm labour by district	101
Fig 6-3. Hiring of permanent form labour by newly resettled households	101
Fig 6-4: Hiring in of escual form labour by newly resettled areas	102
Fig 6 5: Hiring in of child wage labour by newly resettled households	102
Fig 6.6: L and hanaficiarias experiencing form labour shortages	100
Fig 6-7. Form Worker Descentions of working conditions in comparison to I SCE	107
Fig 6-7: Farm worker Perceptions of working conditions in comparison to LSUF	113
Fig 7-1: Educational status of school going youths in newly redistributed areas	121
Fig 7-2: Land beneficiaries' crop production affected by drought	124
Fig 7-3: Interactions between communal and new resettlement areas	128
Fig 7-4: Number of meals consumed per day	138
Fig 8-1: Land grievances by model	142
Fig 8-2: Production grievances in new resettlement areas by model	144
Fig 8-3: Membership to farmer groups by district	154
Fig 8-4: Awareness of existence of agricultural labour union among farm workers	157
Fig 8-5: Membership of agricultural workers to labour unions	158
Fig 8-6: Existence of workers committee structures in newly resettled areas	159
Fig 8-7: Employment of former farm worker skills in newly resettled areas	161
Fig 8-8: Employment of former farm workers by district	161
Fig 8-9: Relevance of former farm worker skills to current employment	162
Annex 1-1: Chipinge District map	184
Annex 1-2: Chiredzi District map	185
Annex 1-3: Goromonzi District map	186
Annex 1-4: Kwekwe District map	187

Annex 1-5: Mangwe District map	188
Annex 1-6: Zvimba district map	189
Annex 4-1: Land utilization levels by district of study	190
Annex 4-2: Minor crops grown by district of study	190
Annex 4-3: Minor crops by cropped area and ranges by model type	191
Annex 4-4: Minor crops being grown by households under irrigation	192
Annex 4-5: Access to productive assets by district	192
Annex 4-6: Formal agricultural training obtained by land beneficiaries by district	193
Annex 9-1: Rotated Factor Loadings and unique variances for significant variables.	193
Annex 9-2: Distribution of land beneficiaries within groups by model type	194
Annex 9-3: Whether plot holder is married or not	194
Annex 9-4: Whether plot holder is widowed	195
Annex 9- 5: Whether plot holder is still in professional employment	195
Annex 9-6: Size of labour force employed	196
Annex 9-7: Whether plot holder is/was a civil servant	196
Annex 9-8: Plot size in hectares	197
Annex 9-9: Number of permanent workers employed	197
Annex 9-10: Available labour in natural logarithms (permanent and hired)	198
Annex 9-11: Cultivated land area in natural logs	198
Annex 9-12: Year farming was started by land beneficiaries	199
Annex 9-13: Ownership of capital intensive farm equipment (score)	199

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

AFDB	African Development Bank
AIAS	African Institute for Agrarian Studies
AIDS	Aquired Immuno Deficiency Syndrome
ALB	Agricultural Labour Bureau
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
ARDA	Agricultural and Rural Development Authority
AREX	Department of Agricultural Research and Extension
AUC	African Union Commission
BIPPA	Bilateral Investment Promotion and Protection Agreement
CA	Communal Area
CCZ	Consumer Council of Zimbabwe
CFU	Commercial Farmers Union
CFSAM	Collaborative Food Security and Agriculture Management Project
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CONEX	Department of Conservation and Extension
CSO	Central Statistical Office
CSOs	Civil Society Organisations
COTTCO	Cotton Company of Zimbabwe
CTDT	Community Technology Development Trust
DDF	District Development Council
DEVAG	Department of Agricultural Development
DLC	District Land Committee
DZL	Dairiboard Zimbabwe Limited
ECA	Economic Commission for Africa
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations
FCTZ	Farm Community Trust of Zimbabwe
FEWSNET	Famine Early Warning System Network
FPL	Food Poverty Line
FTLRP	Fast Track Land Reform Programme
GMB	Grain Marketing Board
GoZ	Government of Zimbabwe
GAPWUZ	General Agricultural and Plantation Workers Union of Zimbabwe
HIV	Human Immuno Virus
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IOM	International Organisation on Migration
LSCF	Large Scale Commercial Farm
MDC	Movement for Democratic Change
	Ministry of Lands and Rural Resettlement
MPSL&SW	Ministry of Public Service, Labour and Social Welfare
MWMAKI	National Social Security Authority
NSSA	National Social Security Authority
NECAIZ	National Employment Council of the Agricultural industry of Zinibadwe
NGUS	Non Governmental Organisations
	Natural Region
PDI	Poverty Datum Line
RB7	Reserve Bank of Zimbahwe
RDC	Rural District Council
RDDC	Rural District Development Committee
PLRC	Presidential Land Review Committee
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SAP	Structural Adjustment Policies
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
VIDCO	Village Development Committee
UN	United Nations
WB	World Bank
WLLG	Women Land Lobby Group
WLZ	Women and Land in Zimbabwe

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

ZANU-PF	Zimbabwe African National Union Patriotic Front
ZESA	Zimbabwe Electricity Supply Authority
ZCFU	Zimbabwe Commercial Farmers Union
ZFU	Zimbabwe Farmers Union
ZHDR	Zimbabwe Human Development Report
ZNA	Zimbabwe National Army
ZNLWVA	Zimbabwe Liberation War Veterans Association
ZRP	Zimbabwe Republic Police

#### PREFACE

One of the core research programmes of the African Institute for Agrarian Studies (AIAS) has been to track the impacts of land reform in the wider context of agrarian reform in Africa. The AIAS has examined land reform policies in Southern Africa and beyond. This baseline survey is one such an effort conducted in 2005 and 2006. The research instruments were also shaped through various inputs of research workshops and public consultations organised by AIAS in 2004 and 2005. Various empirical studies were initiated by the AIAS to assess the outcomes of Zimbabwe's Fast Track Land Reform Programme (FTLRP). The main questionnaire used in this study was designed in 2000, and modified after a series of pilot case studies in 20 districts between 2000 and 2004 (see AIAS monographs series on website and the Report of the Presidential Land Review Committee: Volume II).

The monograph reports the results of a baseline survey of Zimbabwe's FTLRP in six districts, focusing on the patterns of land allocations, land tenure, land use and production, and labour relations that obtained then, and explores the patterns of socio-economic differentiation, and social reproduction in the newly redistributed areas. It is part of an on-going research agenda including various related studies undertaken between 2005 and 2009 by numerous post-graduate students supported by AIAS, including its staff members and research associates<sup>1</sup>. The study does not cover in any detail the administrative and legal matters related to land acquisition nor does it address issues related to compensation claims by former farmers. These are the subject of separate AIAS studies.

The study would not have been possible without the support from our funding partners. The Royal Norwegian Embassy in Harare consistently and generously provided AIAS with core and programme funding since 2003, and this secured AIAS' underlying institutional capacity to do the various research and advocacy. In 2006, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation provided funds for the field surveys. Funding was also received from the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), Trust Africa and the Open Society Initiative for Southern Africa (OSISA) for numerous policy dialogue platforms which enabled the research outcomes to be shared and interrogated extensively.

As such, various components of the study findings are already in the public domain, including in journal articles, books, post-graduate students' thesis, AIAS monographs and other reports. The present publication provides the entire data set to the public and serves to stimulate thought on the currently proposed land audit, and land tenure and land use policy reforms. It will also inform a second round survey to be undertaken soon.

Numerous colleagues and research associates of the AIAS provided invaluable comments on earlier versions of this monograph. In this regard we sincerely thank Professor Paris Yeros of PUC Minas University, Bello Horizonte in Brazil, Professor Ian Scoones, Institute of Development Studies in the United Kingdom and Dr. Kirk Helliker of the Department of Sociology and Development Studies at Rhodes University in South Africa. Dr. Shephard Siziba and Mr. Godfrey Mahofa of the Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension at the University of Zimbabwe assisted us in the statistical classification of land beneficiaries into various social categories. Invaluable comments were also received from a group of Zimbabwean researchers and activists at a meeting convened by the AIAS in December 2009 at Bronte Hotel to discuss the draft report. Feedback was also received from participants in the regional Agrarian Studies Summer School (in 2009 and 2010) hosted by AIAS in collaboration with Universities of Dar es Salam (Tanzania), Cape Town and Rhodes (South Africa), Haki Ardhi (Tanzania) and the International Development Economics Associates (India) where some of the results were presented.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The AIAS include: Walter Chambati; Tendai Murisa; Eddah Jowa; Charity Dangwa; Kingstone Mujeyi and Ndabezinhle Nyoni. Associates include: Wilbert Sadomba; Erin McCandles; Mark Nyandoro; Bernard Manyena; Kuthula Masthazi and Nancy Andrews.

We would also like to acknowledge the contributions of the research assistants and enumerators who collected data for the study, and several undergraduate students from the University of Zimbabwe and Midlands State University who entered the data. The acknowledgements would be incomplete if we did not acknowledge the hundreds of land beneficiaries and local officials who took time to respond to the questionnaire and interviews. As usual, the views expressed in this study are only those of the authors and not institutions and people mentioned above, nor of AIAS as an institution.

Sam Moyo Harare, December 2009

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND STUDY APPROACHES

#### 1.1 Introduction and scope of study

This monograph reports on the results of a baseline survey of the outcomes of Zimbabwe's Fast Track Land Reform Programme (FTLRP) since 2000, in six districts. It focuses on the patterns of land allocations, land tenure, land use and production, and labour relations since 2000, and the emergent pattern of socio-economic differentiation and social reproduction in the newly redistributed areas. Its main purpose is to begin the process of building a baseline of data on the outcomes of the FTLRP, to define the social, economic and political tendencies that characterise the newly created farming areas, and to provide some empirical evidence for ongoing policy debates on land reform<sup>2</sup>.

The post-independence history of Zimbabwe's land reform until 1999, has been extensively documented (Moyo, 1995, 1999, 2000), and is not the focus of this study which examines the socioeconomic situation in the former "commercial framing" areas. The study does not address the land acquisition and compensation processes of the FTLRP<sup>3</sup>. This report represents the first in a planned series of surveys of the trajectory of social reproduction and accumulation in newly redistributed areas, and it accompanies other AIAS studies on the subject<sup>4</sup>.

The FTLRP transformed the agrarian structure from a bi-modal structure in which 4,500 farmers (approximately 5,000 farm units) held over 11 million hectares mostly on the basis of export-focused commercial agriculture, alongside one million communal area households on 16.4 million hectares mostly in the drier regions of the country. The FTLRP implemented by the Government of Zimbabwe redistributed about 80 percent of the former large scale commercial farms (LSCF) to a broad base of beneficiaries including, mostly peasants from across the political divide, as well as politicians, senior Government officials, private sector officials, employed and unemployed urbanites, farm workers, corporates and the former white farmers. This has altered the previous highly unequal bimodal agrarian structure and created relatively more broad based tri-modal agrarian structure comprising small, medium and large farms with an estimated 170,000 family farms created by the FTLRP (see Table 1-1; Moyo, forthcoming)<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>The broad structural and economic results of the land and agrarian programme and their effects on the agricultural sector have also been examined elsewhere (Moyo and Sukume, 2004; Chambati and Moyo, 2004; Richardson, 2005; World Bank, 2006; Chambati, 2009; Moyo, 2009). The role of civil society in Zimbabwe's land reforms has also been a focus of related research elsewhere (Helliker, 2008; Murisa, 2008; Moyo, 2006; CPS, 2006; Mavedzenge et.al, 2008; Scoones, 2008; Moyo et al, 2008; Yeros, 2002).Preliminary assessments of the nature of agrarian transformation in terms of the patterns of beneficiaries, the emergent agrarian structure relations, agricultural production patterns, and social relations in the Zimbabwean countryside, have also been explored in the other works and by others (Alexander, 2003; Moyo et al, 2003; Scoones and Chaumba, 2003; Sachikonye, 2005; Matondi and Sukume, 2005). Recent PhD theses have also engaged these issues (Selby 2006; Sadomba, 2008; Marongwe, 2008; Murisa, 2010).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>There are other studies have focused on aspects of human and political rights transgressions during the fast track land reform period (Hammar and Raftopoulos, 2003; Amnesty International, 2004; Hellum and Derman, 2005; Human Rights Watch, 2005), which we do not dwell on here.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Previous work of the African Institute for Agrarian Studies (AIAS) has examined in detail the origins and execution of the fast track land reform process, including assessment of the mobilisation of social demands through land occupations and the state's land acquisition processes, the role of the war veterans in the national land movements, and the wider role of the state and ruling party, Zimbabwe African National Union Patriotic Front (ZANU- PF) in the land reform programme (Moyo, 2001; Moyo and Yeros, 2005; Moyo, 2006; Sadomba, 2008).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>For earlier work on the emerging agrarian structure, see Moyo, (2004); Moyo and Yeros, (2005); Moyo, 2006; Moyo and Yeros (2007).

Farm	Farms	househo	ds (000's)				Area held (000 ha)						Average Farm size (ha)		
categories				T	1	1								1	
	1980		2000		2010		1980		2000		2010		1980	2000	2010
	No	%	No	%	No (000)	%	ha	%	ha	%	ha	%			
Smallholder															
Communal	700	98	1,050	92.3	1,100	81.4	16,400	49	16,400	47.8	16,400	49.8		16	15
Old	-	-	73	6.4	73	5.4	-	-	3,667.1	10.7	3,667.7	11.1	-	50	50
resettlement															
Al	-	-			146	10.8	-	-	-		4,137.1	12.6	-		28
Sub-total	700	98	1,123	98.7	1,319			49		58.4	24,205	73.4		22	18
Medium															
Old SSCF	8.5	1.2	8.5	0.7	8.5	0.6	1,400	4.2	1,400	4.1	1,400	4.2	165	165	165
Small A2	-				22.2	1.6	-				2,988.1	9.1			135
Sub-total	8.5	1.2	10	0.9	30.7			4.2		4.1	4,388	13.3			143
Large scale															
Large A2	-		-		0.209	0.02					509	1.5			2,435
Black LSCF			0.7	0.06	0.956	0.07			530.6	1.5	530.6	1.6		758	555
White LSCF			4	0.4	0.198	0.01			10,687	31.1	117.4	0.4		2,672	593
Sub-total	6	0.8	4.5	0.4	1.363		15,500	46.3	11,213	32.7	1,157	3.5		2,386	849
Estates															
Corporate					0.140	0.01					78.3	0.2			559
estates															
Parastatal					0.153	0.01					721.31	2.2			4,714
estates															
Conservancies	0		0.007	0.00	0.007	0.001	-		1,124	3.3	1,124	3.4		160,571	160,571
Institutions	0.113	0.02	0.117	0.01	0.117	0.001	145.7	0.4	532	1.5	532	1.6	1,289	4,547	1,289
Sub-total	0.113	0.02		0.01	0.413			0.4		4.8	2,069.31	7.4		19,803	5,010
Unsettled	-	-	-		0.517	0.04					757.6	2.3	-		1,465
gazetted land															
Total	714.6	100.0	1,137.8	100.0	1,352	100.0		100.0		100.0	32,577	100.0			

## Table 1-1: Emerging Agrarian Structure in Zimbabwe

Source: Compiled by Moyo and Nyoni cited in Moyo (forthcoming)

A more thorough assessment of the emerging agrarian structure, the new agrarian relations, and the wider social relations of production in the countryside has so far been constrained by the narrow base of available empirical data. There are a few independent social surveys of the newly resettled areas. The fluidity of the land allocation and settlement process until 2005, and the continuation of land disputes between former landowners and the new landholders and the state (as former landowners challenged the acquisition of land until 2005), also posed challenges to the reliability of land transfer data. New opportunities for survey work in resettled areas emerged following the Utete Review Committee's Report (2003), making it possible for some of the empirical facts to become more commonly accepted across scholarly and political divides. This baseline study builds on numerous empirical case studies undertaken by the AIAS since 2002, studies done for the Utete Commission in 2003, and for the European Commission in 2003/4.

The recent literature evaluating the impact of the FTLRP has tended to be based on short term, ad-hoc and anecdotal evidence of the nature of land acquisitions, land allocations, beneficiaries, land tenure and the use of land. Any meaningful and effective evaluation of the FTLRP has to be based on systematic surveys of the performance of the programme, examining the key attributes over at least five years since programme implementation, and such evidence needs to be tracked over a longer period. Although what formally became the FTLRP commenced in 1997, the effective official execution of the FTLRP started in 2000, and, in view of the political turbulence since then, became a social fact on the ground from around 2002.

Some of the attributes of land reform are more amenable to empirical observation and evaluation than others. In particular, evidence on the redistributed lands can reveal: who benefited (and who, implicitly, did not) from the land allocations; the demographic make-up of the beneficiaries; the forms of land tenure that obtain; the types of land conflicts that occur; the incipient forms of land use, the broad farming system that is emerging and natural resource utilisation patterns; the types of farming labour relations that obtain in relation to labour trends inherited from the legacy of past land owners; and the emerging local social relations (and to an extent the politics) of land in the newly redistributed areas. The empirical evidence can also indicate what type of resource flows obtain (financing, credit, inputs supplies and use), what outputs are currently realised and for what use (own consumption and/or markets), and what assets (social and physical) the beneficiaries are currently accumulating. From this, the emerging broad agrarian structure can be deduced, although the trajectory of agrarian class formation processes is too incipient to define conclusively.

It is mainly these types of facts that are amenable to validation in the short term that are pursued in the analyses of this report, and which are used to infer potential trends and effects. For instance, there has been ample time for the gestation of key empirical processes such as 'illegal' land occupations and land allocation by the state, in the study areas, and this allows assessing the land allocation patterns, bearing in mind that some land beneficiaries may later be "evicted". An assessment can also be made of how the core processes of land occupations may or may not have affected the current overall patterns of land allocation and land disputes, given that beneficiary informants were on the ground during the survey. The differential production opportunities posed by early or late land allocations among the beneficiaries can be deduced, as can access to and use of farming inputs (seeds, fertilizers and machinery), from the survey data, key informants views and observations by enumerators. Furthermore, the perceptions of the land beneficiaries and other actors concerning the adequacy of the access to land or the allocation process, the security of the current land tenure situation and land conflicts, can be readily assessed from the interviews. Such data does not provide all the answers to all the questions which are being posed in the public debates, many of which miss both the context and limitations of much the data in circulation.

It would be premature and even tautological to definitively deduce the trajectories of the land use system and accumulation patterns after land redistribution, given that there have been dynamic shifts in agricultural resource flows since 2000 and that the economic crisis experienced during the initial phase of the FTLRP, have provided unstable and/or uncertain macro-economic conditions for the micro-level (farming population) and meso-level service providers (e.g. inputs and credit suppliers and other agricultural merchants. Zimbabwe's local capital and agricultural inputs markets have shrunk, liquidity has been restrictive, inflation high and volatile, and interest rates exceedingly high, especially for agricultural production. The economic isolation of Zimbabwe from many global (capital and commodity) markets has constrained agricultural production (World Bank, 2006). This leaves widely open the nature of answers to questions on the potential and trajectory of the land use systems, let alone on the efficacy of the current forms of land tenure, as many are not to callously profess on. What is feasible now is to deduce that certain agricultural production patterns may hold, even when there is a change in the external environment (for the new farmers) in terms of the macro-economy and the apparently incipient process of re-integration into global markets.

The samples for the baseline survey were drawn from districts which had LSCF farming areas, focusing on the farms, that had been acquired and redistributed to new land beneficiaries (Table 1-2) by 2005 and 2006. The sample survey does not cover the LSCF farms which had not been acquired by the Government of Zimbabwe (GoZ) for redistribution, including the land tied to international Bilateral Investment Promotion and Protection Agreements (BIPPAs) and the large plantation estates owned by transnational companies such as the sugar estates in the lowveld owned by the Anglo-American Company, as well as some state- owned farms mostly operated by the parastatal Agricultural and Rural Development Authority (ARDA)<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>From around 2007/08 most of the lands linked to international agreements were also being acquired for resettlement by the GoZ.

Province	No. of LSCF	No. of districts	Districts with no LSCF	Names of districts with no LSCF
Manicaland	1534	7	1	Buhera
Mash Central	859	7	1	Rushinga
Mash East	1135	9	3	Mutoko, Mudzi, and UMP
Mash West	2,028	6	0	Kariba District had 2 farms
Masvingo	649	7	2	Chivi, Zaka
Mat North	670	7	2	Binga, Nkayi
Mat South	922	6	0	
Midlands	1347	8	2	Gokwe North, Gokwe South
Total	9144	57	11	

Table 1-2: Provincial Distribution of LSCF in Zimbabwe

Source: Utete (2003)

The acquisition of LSCF and subsequent redistribution was not one single uniform event that occurred across all the provinces and districts in Zimbabwe at the same time, as land acquisition, land occupations and land allocations was phased overtime, based on a variety of social, technical, legal and political circumstances that obtained in a geographically differentiated fashion. Some provinces, especially in the Mashonaland regions, which had higher concentrations of LSCF lands than others in the southern parts of the country (such as in Masvingo and the Matebeleland provinces) experienced greater agitation for land. As such, LSCF acquisition and redistribution was at the beginning and for sometime concentrated in the Mashonaland Provinces, while elsewhere land acquisition and redistribution was mostly a later process. Also important to note is that 11 out of Zimbabwe's 57 districts had no LSCFs and thus did not experience any land acquisition and redistribution, as they were solely composed of Communal Areas (Table 1-2). This differentiated pattern of land transfer and allocation shaped the sampling frame used, but has important implications on the interpretation of the facts on land utilisation patterns, given the staggered settlement and farm establishment process.

Given that numerous studies that had been done on the communal, old resettlement and LSCF areas by 1999, and that much is known about the socio-economic and farming structures and related processes, and the limited resources available for this work, it was decided to concentrate the baseline survey on the newly redistributed areas. This has meant that issues such as the so-called "decongestion" of Communal Areas cannot be fully addressed, although it is also notable that most of the public commentaries on "decongestion" are not based on systematic empirical surveys of the Communal Areas since 2000.

## 1.2 The Key Research Questions

This monograph also tests a variety of assertions that have defined recent land reform debates, including those concerning the equitability of land allocations, the (in)security of land tenure, the efficacy of land use and farm production, and the intensity of land conflicts within the newly redistributed areas. Other key assertions examined include whether employment and labour relations, access to social services and consumption have deteriorated, and if so, in what way. Some of the key issues and research questions which arise can be outlined as follows.

#### 1.2.1 Land allocation and distribution issues

Regarding land redistribution process and distributional outcomes, it has been argued by some that the FTLRP was not 'redistributive' suggesting that the proportion of the 'poor' who gained access to land were limited, and that Communal Areas were not 'decongested'. Instead it has been asserted that it is mostly a vaguely defined set of elite or 'cronies' that corruptly gained most of the land through A2

schemes. This assertion is not based on empirical evidence of the social facts on the ground in terms of landholding or access, and tends to gloss over the social (class, ethnic, age, regional and gender) and political (wider power relations, political party connection and influence) differentiation of access to land. Moreover, a facile debate on the distributional outcome of the land reform tends to conceal the reinforcement and emergence of new agrarian class formation processes and social differentiation processes in general and limits the assessment of new processes of accumulation, exploitation and social reproduction among the various categories of former and new poor people.

It is critical to adequately understand the empirical outcome of land distribution since the FTLRP, because this has shaped the wider debate about the legitimacy of the land reform process, including whether it is 'pro-poor', and the nature and extent to which inequalities have been retained or newly created. It also reveals the extent to which corruption may or may not have predominated land allocation processes, and helps to discern the 'social facts' that may shape future socio-economic development and socio-political conflicts. Instead such debates are influenced by the tendency of many writings to focus only on the "violation of landowners" rights during the land takeovers and on the "political motives" of Zimbabwe's government. While many studies have tended to focus on the "politicisation" of the land redistribution process and their research mainly use information from sources and perspectives of the "victims" of the land reform, they tend to overlook the perspectives of land seekers and beneficiaries, let alone of the Government officials involved in land reform. Such studies have tended to be based largely on anecdotal media reports based on such sources and are informed by and limited field studies, have gone on to suggest that "elite capture" dominated the land allocation process, in addition to the access to farm machinery and infrastructures. Ironically some rely mainly on official data sources on formal land allocations and on former land owners<sup>7</sup>, which they nonetheless cast aspersions on rather than undertaken primary research on these issues.

Past approaches to the study of the distributional outcome tend to miss the evolving numbers of those being formally allocated land over a number of years since 2000, including popular (unofficial) processes of land allocations which occur within the new settlements. The official land 'beneficiaries' tend to share "and lease" out land to family, friends, neighbours and "entrepreneurs" in "informal" land transactions including their accommodation of "squatters" (e.g. former farm workers, displaced and/or homeless urban and rural workers) and other unofficial land occupiers. The few empirical studies on such processes, (AIAS, 2002, 2003, 2004/5, 2006/7; Matondi et al, 2004/5; Scoones et al, 2006/8) have neither been adequately disseminated nor acknowledged in the mainstream literature.

As a result most of the existing research has failed to track the existence of a class (and social and ethnic) 'struggles' or confrontations over the allocation of land, due to the presumed effective dominance of ZANU-PF 'elite' over the process. It is often assumed that the control of the state, through its key instruments of policy and force, within an assumed centrist and predominantly 'elitist' mold, rather than a differentiated and contested state apparatus, alongside differentiated war veterans (in terms of their class and political orientation) shaped on homogenous land allocation outcome, without any contradictions arising in terms of the process and outcomes. Indeed, the debate about 'elite capture' of land allocations has tended to treat A2 scheme beneficiaries in aggregate and undifferentiated. That some of the beneficiaries are 'elites' is undisputed. What is in dispute is their character and the extent of their benefit. The tendency to generalize the notion of an 'elite' leaves unexplained the social content of the concept, and assumes that it lacks differentiation in a dynamic process of class formation. Thus, little attention has been paid to the complex class and social struggles, which shape the nature of the so-called "primitive accumulation" and marginalization processes. Thus, for example, a beneficiary who is an employee of the state, a war veteran and a member of the security forces, or who is assumed to 'belong' to the state and/or is a member of ZANU PF, tends invariably to be referred to as an elite, and thus to lump diverse groups into this category, despite their social differentiation, and political position in the hierarchy. All such elites are deemed to have accessed land through connection and/or corruptly, as well as access to state services (inputs, credit, etc.). The empirical evidence presented will show that there has been a more differentiated

pattern of access to land and other benefits<sup>8</sup>.

#### 1.2.2 Land tenure issues

The dominant literature asserts that Zimbabwe now has no defined land tenure or agricultural property rights system, since agricultural land has been 'nationalised', and that the beneficiaries of the land redistribution are tenurially insecure, because they do not have 'title' and/or allegedly because they are exposed to evictions by the state or élites. (See Moyo 2007). Some argue that, even if formal tenures (leases and freeholds) were being allocated by the state (which is considered impossible since the GoZ is alleged to be unwilling to do so), such state-derived landholding tenures (leases, permits and concessions) would be insecure, because of the state's tendency to use land to control or manipulate people. Such state-based tenures are considered by some (Richardson, 2005, etc.) as inferior to freehold title, which is claimed to define the success of the erstwhile large scale commercial farmers, because state-based tenures do not constitute bankable property rights that reflect asset value. Others argue that since in general 'farm disruptions' or 'invasions' continue to occur and are considered widespread, the current agricultural land tenure system is insecure and that uncertainty will remain since former landowners will continue to litigate over their land rights. Little empirical evidence on such tenure insecurity has been proffered. The emergence of a new land tenure regime in terms of the forms of access to land, the right to inclusion or exclusion, and the protecting mechanisms of such access and use tends to be disregarded. The nature and sources of land tenure insecurity and land disputes tends to be based on generalisations, rather than empirical evidence.

#### 1.2.3 Land utilisation issues

The GoZ, however, has maintained that the land reform was a success in so far as its evaluative focus has been largely on the scale of land reallocation, while taking the view that land tenure is less of a problem, because at any rate it is being 'sorted out' and is constrained only by the lack of resources. The GoZ has only begun to accept more openly since 2005 that the utilisation of land was poor and that it requires substantial improvement<sup>9</sup>. There is this dispute on extent and causes of land under utilisation. The GoZ has insisted that the root cause of poor performance in land use today has been the external sanctions imposed on Zimbabwe, combined with three droughts (in the 2001 to 2003 period) and 'sabotage' by various actors (remaining white farmers, commercial banks through their reluctance to fund farmers, some input suppliers with an interest in profiteering, etc). But while the aggregate decline in agricultural outputs and inputs levels has been acknowledged (Moyo et al., 2003 in Utete Report, 2003, Volume 2; World Bank, 2006), little systematic empirical work has been undertaken at the micro level to gauge the nature of constraints facing newly settled farmers and the ways in which land use performance has been limited. Indeed, few have assessed the relationship between patterns of access to land, the land tenure system and agricultural production processes. The land use debate is thus informed by inadequate data and social biases regarding the land users capabilities, to the exclusion of proper analysis of the macro and meso-level influences on land use.

Many claim that most, if not all, of the land allocated to new beneficiaries lies unused and idle, suggesting that there is hardly any farming taking place. The new beneficiaries are accused of being unable to adopt the production system and output levels established by the former LSCF producers,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>It is also asserted that all the white farmers were displaced because the FTLRP was racially and politically motivated, without recognition of the fact that over 30 agro-industrial farming estates (e.g. sugar, tea, coffee, horticulture), and over 400 white farmers remained by 2009. Farm workers, who have generally been over-estimated to comprise more than 400 000 fulltime workers are mostly treated as displaced from the large farms, although the evidence shows that a number were allocated land and many remain on the farms.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup>See President Mugabe, November 2005; Mutasa, 2006; and RBZ Monetary Policy Statements, 2004 to 2006. By 2006 the GoZ data on declining agriculture production (except maize outputs) tended to tally with figures from various other sources (see FAO/WFPCFSAM Reports 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009).

largely because it is presumed that most of the beneficiaries are unskilled in farming and their work or life experiences are not adaptable to high value farming, particularly of export crops. Farming techniques and agronomic practices are generally considered to be poor and land productivity low, reflecting deficient farming competence. It is generally claimed that hardly any useable farm machinery and equipment, infrastructure and irrigation facilities remain on the farms, or if they do, they are hardly being used effectively, hence the poor land utilisation levels. Moreover, most of the new farmers are deemed to be 'weekend', 'cell phone' or part time farmers, who are not committed to farming and also lack qualified farm managers, hence their pathologically low levels of land utilisation. In addition, it is argued that extension services (by the state, actors and farmers' organisations) have collapsed, such that there is no promotion of productive agronomic land use and natural resource use practices. The empirical data presented here examines these assertions.

#### 1.2.4 Natural resource utilisation

The impression gained from the literature is that there is rampant, ubiquitous and a total destruction of natural resources on the redistributed lands. A litany of environmental transgressions is usually given; including: tree felling, grass burning, hunting of wildlife, soil degradation and gold panning (Marongwe, 2008). This is claimed to be a result of the new beneficiaries' greed (selling off natural resources), their lack of natural resource management skills, and their disrespect for the land they received because it was free and that beneficiaries do not hold freehold title to it (Maguwu, 2008; Masiiwa, 2004). Implicitly it is suggested that there are no evolving local systems for the sustainable regulation of natural resources (such as gold, wood and wildlife) for commercial purposes, leading to widespread environmental destruction and substantial loss of natural resource stocks. The empirical basis of this narrative is also weak as will be shown

#### 1.2.5 Farm labour issues

The commonly used data on the situation of former farm workers is either outdated or narrow in its coverage (Sachikonye, 2003; GoZ/IOM, 2004). The tendency of the dominant discourse has been to identify their displacement and to argue that most former farm workers have not been gainfully employed by new farmers contrary to the more diverse situations in which former and new farm workers are observed to be living within. Where farm workers are employed their conditions of work are not adequately documented by most studies. Generally fewer former farm workers are considered to have been formally allocated the redistributed land than is found on the ground. These informal strategies they use for land access are not noticed. Thus farm labour is, in general, considered to have declined as a source of employment, although such studies provide little empirical evidence to support these claims. They fail to notice that a different agrarian labour regime (compared to that in former LSCFs and communal areas) has been emerging, that while this regime is also exploitative, it has been subjected to dynamic change in the fluid context since 2000.

#### 1.2.6 Social differentiation and agrarian restructuring

The discussions on social and class struggles over land and the emergence of a new agrarian base, are a critical aspect of the fast track land reforms which the recent literature has not grappled with (see Moyo and Yeros, 2005). Without conceptual clarity on key notions e.g. elites, cronies, and the neglect of class oriented and ethnographic analyses, the emerging social differentiation in newly redistributed areas and related communal areas, as well as nationally, has largely gone unnoticed. Some of the case studies (e.g. Scoones et. al., 2008) have undertaken some systematic assessment of the social basis of access to land, but little work on the wider political economy of this has been done (see Moyo, 2010).

Rather than over-simplify the nature of social stratification in the newly redistributed areas as most studies tend to do, this survey explores the emerging agrarian structure by identifying the social and economic factors, which 'classify' the beneficiaries in terms of their resource endowments (including land and natural resources and other assets and their production), and the accumulation and social reproduction strategies that they seem to adopt. The approaches used in classifying the beneficiaries combines the beneficiaries' own perceptions of their 'wealth' and performance rankings, multivariate statistical classification based on principal component and discriminant analytic tools, and the researchers' own hypotheses of the key variables which differentiate various groups of beneficiaries.

Given the differentiated nature of struggles for access to and conflict over land and other resources, and the profiles of agricultural and non-agricultural production that appear to characterise newly redistributed areas, this study opens up the framework required to examine empirical processes of social differentiation and agrarian restructuring. These results may also be useful for evidence-based policy analyses intended to promote agricultural and social development and poverty eradication.

#### 1.3 Study area

The field research for this AIAS baseline survey was carried out in six districts from six different provinces between November 2005 and June 2006. The districts are Chipinge in Manicaland Province, Chiredzi in Masvingo Province, Goromonzi in Mashonaland East, Kwekwe in Midlands, Mangwe in Matabeleland South and Zvimba in Mashonaland West (Fig 1-1), (see also annexed maps 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 1.4, 1-5, 1-6). The districts sampled cover Natural Region (NR) I-IV and some parts of  $V^{10}$ , in order to capture the diversity of farming systems, socio-economic and political context which characterise the country. The overriding objective was representativeness<sup>11</sup> of the sample and also the ease of access into the areas. The research team also deliberately targeted areas that had the most activity in terms of resettling people in each province.

The survey covered the two resettlement schemes promoted by the FTLRP. The A1 scheme was intended to expand the smallholder farming sector (commonly called the Communal Area sector), to cater for the landless, unemployed and disadvantaged peoples from communal, urban and other areas. On average, the A1 beneficiaries were given 5 to 6 hectares of arable land for farming and 7 to 15 hectares per household for grazing. There are two sub-schemes within the A1 model; the 'villagised' and 'self-contained'. The villagised is a close replica of earlier Model A resettlement where the planners settle land beneficiaries in a closed village and are allocated household arable land and land units in grazing land that are outside the village. The self-contained farms on the other hand are smaller versions of A2 models, whereby the resettled are given one piece of land in which they are meant to build the homestead, apportion some land for crop cultivation and also some to provide pasture for livestock production. There are 147 000 A1 household land allocations in the country (see MLRR, 2009).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup>Zimbabwe is divided into five agro-ecological zones, according to rainfall patterns, soil types and consequently land use patterns. Natural regions (NR) I and II are suitable for intensive agriculture, III and IV are suitable for extensive agriculture (such as livestock rearing) whilst V is mainly very arid and there is little agricultural activity.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup>The criteria of ensuring representativeness entails ensuring that the total number of cases investigated closely resemble the population.

#### Fig 1-1: Map of Zimbabwe showing the survey districts



#### Source: Department of General Surveyor (1998)

The A2 model comprises individually held farm units ranging in size from the small, 50 hectares to large scale A2 units (at around 400 to 1,500 hectares). Their average size was about 330 hectares in 2003 (Utete Report, 2003). Farm sizes vary according to natural regions<sup>12</sup>. The model was by 2009 made up of small, medium and large scale commercial farms and there are approximately 20 000 A2 farms nationwide, meaning that the former 4 500 large scale commercial farms have been subdivided into approximately 167,000 farm units (a thirty fold increase).

Chipinge District is situated in the South Eastern part of Manicaland Province, on the border with Mozambique. It shares borders with Buhera and Chimanimani districts in Manicaland Province and Bikita and Chiredzi districts of Masvingo Province. The greater part of Chipinge falls within NR I

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup>Plots in NR IV and V tend to be larger than those occurring in NR I and II and some parts of NR III. The rationale behind the variation lies in the fact that NR I and II are normally suitable for intensive crop production whilst NR IV and V are suitable for livestock and game ranching activities and require substantial amounts of grazing land.

while other parts are in NR II. It experiences a hot climate and high annual average rainfall (above 1,000 mm) making it suitable for intensive (specialized and diversified) farming including fruit, forest and livestock. It is one of the areas in Zimbabwe suitable for tea, coffee, citrus as well as pine and wattle plantations owing to the mountainous slopes. Amongst the diverse commercial farming activities, it also used to produce milk. The district was one of the top producers of milk prior to the FTLRP. As a result of this high milk production the district hosts the sole sterilized milk processing plant owned by Dairiboard Zimbabwe Limited (DZL).

Chiredzi is situated in the South Eastern Lowveld region of Masvingo, bordered by the districts of Beitbridge, Mwenezi, Chivi, Masvingo, Zaka, Bikita and Chipinge. Chiredzi rural district has a total population of 208 171 (National Census Report, 2002). The district lies within NR III. Major land use patterns include cattle and game ranching, wild life conservancy, sugar cane, cotton and citrus production as well as subsistence dry land farming.

Goromonzi is one of the nine districts in Mashonaland East Province and is about 50km east of Harare. It borders Ruwa Township to the west and Marondera District to the south. The district falls within NR II, and average rainfall is between 900 and 1 200mm per annum. The district is suitable for intensive farming and because of proximity to major markets (Harare and Marondera) horticulture production has become the major land use pattern. In addition to horticulture, most farmers are engaged in maize, tobacco, paprika and soya bean production.

Kwekwe District is one of the eight districts centrally located in the Midlands province. Most of the district falls within NR III (78.8 percent) and a small margin of 21.2 percent is in NR IV. The district is suitable for livestock production supported by the production of fodder crops. Mangwe District was created in 2003 after the Bulilima Mangwe Rural District Council was split into three local authorities. It is situated in the western part of Matabeleland South and shares its borders with Plumtree and Bulilima districts and Botswana to the west. The district lies in NR IV and V and is suitable for growing drought resistant fodder crops, livestock rearing and game ranching. The district experiences erratic rainfall averaging between 450-650mm per annum. It is one of seven administrative districts in Matabeleland South and is made up of 12 wards. Most of the 'fast track farms' are found in one ward. Small scale farms or former purchase areas allocated to black commercial farmers during the colonial period are in another ward and the rest of the wards are communal area wards.

Zvimba District is one of the six districts that make up Mashonaland West Province. The district falls within NR II and is characterized by high and reliable rainfall patterns (700 to 1050mm), lush vegetation and rich soils which properties are most suitable for intensive agriculture production. The district is generally divided into two, north and south. Prior to the FTLRP, the northern part was characterized by white large scale commercial farming whilst the south was predominantly communal farming. The district shares boundaries with Chegutu, Makonde and Chinhoyi.

#### 1.4 The Study Population, Sources of Data and Collection Approaches

The formal data on the estimated population in the sampled areas composed about 13,159 households, including "squatters" (11.1 percent); farm workers (28.6 percent) and retired farm workers (7.0 percent) (see Table 1-3). This is contrary to the common perception that the newly redistributed lands accommodated only the official beneficiaries, and the survey data will show there were many more families allocated land by the official beneficiaries, making the total numbers of settlers even higher.

People in	Chip	oinge	Chir	edzi	Goro	Goromonzi		Kwekwe		ngwe	Zvimba		Total	
NRAs	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total No. of farms	5	0	5	0	7	5	4	2	2	1	7	8	31	6
Households settled on farm	4950	66.4	606	20.9	2952	49.9	1925	82.0	263	87.7	2463	42.4	13159	53.2
Squatters	690	9.3	255	8.8	818	13.8	182	7.8	8	2.7	804	13.8	2757	11.1
Farm workers	1347	18.1	1994	68.7	1656	28.0	187	8.0	25	8.3	1864	32.1	7073	28.6
Retired farm workers	467	6.3	47	1.6	494	8.3	54	2.3	4	1.3	677	11.7	1743	7.0
Total	7454	100.0	2902	100.0	5920	100.0	2348	100.0	300	100.0	5808	100.0	24732	100.0

Table 1-3: Key demographic features of land beneficiaries

Source: AIAS Original Farm Survey (2005/06)

Data was collected from four levels and units of enquiry; namely farm level, newly resettled households and farm workers were used. The bulk of the data for the baseline survey was collected from individual farming households or land beneficiaries of the A1 and A2 schemes and farm workers, while original farm units were a source of some of the background information utilised. A separate questionnaire survey was undertaken among the farm workers including the former and new farm workers. Finally data was also collected from key informants such as local leaders of various organisations, extension workers, teachers and others.

The initial stage of selecting the farm level study units involved stratification of the study area into non-overlapping strata according to the agro-ecological zones. An imaginary perimeter was then drawn in each of the strata. The perimeter covered an area of not more than 30 wholesome farms in each district. The wholesome farms for the study were then selected randomly from the perimeter. The aforementioned procedure was only limited to the A1 and A2 study units, while the sampling procedure for selecting farm workers was purposive due to absence of population parameters on location of farm workers. The farm worker sampling frame was thus constructed during the process of collecting household data using key informants opinions on the farm workers' residences.

There were various types of households that were found in newly redistributed areas. On the one hand, there are household beneficiaries of the land reform or household land "owners" i.e. those, which were officially allocated either under A1 or A2 models. On the other hand, there are also farm worker households who are either employed in the new farms, in the remaining LSCFs not acquired by the Government or unemployed, but still reside in the farm compounds. In this survey report, the individual household survey refers to households which were land beneficiaries, while others are referred to as farm worker or squatter households.

Two separate types of household questionnaires were administered, one targeting farmers settled on the A1 model and the other targeting the A2 farmers<sup>13</sup>. The questionnaires covered similar data on the farmers' socio-economic characteristics, land access, health status, agricultural productivity, asset ownership, agricultural markets and other broader information. The survey also sought information on the history of the new settlers including their household members remaining in the communal lands, their current social status, migration and employment patterns, their landholdings and, their agricultural production activities, assets and inputs utilisation. Their situation in terms of food security, local agricultural markets, incomes, and environmental management practices, and locally available social and agricultural services was also tracked. The survey also explores the past, current and future agricultural production patterns of the families and the factors influencing this, while

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup>For consistency with the GoZ terminology and common usage of terms 'settlers' (for A1) and (new) 'farmers' for A2 beneficiaries, we use the same terms, even though conceptually we differ with the implication of the distinction, that the A2 beneficiaries are commercially oriented, while the A1 beneficiaries are 'subsistence' farmers or merely 'socially' oriented beneficiaries.

tracing links and comparing practices to those in their communal lands. The specific analysis derived land use patterns based on the types of crops and outputs realised, farming and production methods used, inputs utilisation and market patterns, labour utilisation processes, livestock ownership patterns, types of infrastructure available and used on the farms and the constraints to agricultural production.

Model	Chip	pinge	Chiı	edzi	Goro	monzi	Kwe	ekwe	Mar	ngwe	Zvi	mba	То	tal
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A1	201	60.2	167	71.1	608	87.5	356	95.7	108	74.5	211	68.5	1651	79.0
A2	133	39.8	68	28.9	87	12.5	16	4.3	37	25.5	97	31.5	438	21.0
Total	334	100	235	100	695	100	372	100	145	100	308	100	2089	100.0

Table 1-4: Sample size by model type and district

Source: AIAS Baseline Survey 2005/06, Household questionnaire. N=2089

A total number of 2,089 households were interviewed during the AIAS (2005-2006) national survey of the outcomes of 'fast track'; of these 1,651 were A1 and 438 were A2. Goromonzi had the highest number of respondents with 634 whilst the least was Mangwe District with 145. A variety of factors were considered in choosing the sample districts. Sample size for every sampled district averaged 15 percent of the total district, which is considered statistically representative of the sampled area. The distribution of model types by district is shown in Table 1-4. More A1 farmers were interviewed due to the fact that earlier studies (Buka 2002, Utete Report, 2003) have already shown that the A1 scheme is 10 times larger than the A2 in terms of number of plots nationwide. For every A2 plot household, 3.6A1 farmers were interviewed.

The survey also found different classes of farm workers in the newly redistributed areas, including those who were 'former' farm workers loosely defined as those who worked in the previous large-scale commercial farming sector and 'new' farm workers. The new land 'owners'/beneficiaries, especially in the A1 model also include former large scale commercial farming area workers with their own plots. Another group of farm workers comprises those that can be termed as the "new" farm workers, as these had not previously worked in the former LSCF sector and have been employed by the new land 'owners'/beneficiaries. The farm worker survey targeted both new and former farm workers in the new resettlement areas, while the land beneficiary survey investigated labour services hired in or out by the beneficiaries.

A separate questionnaire was also conducted for both "new" and former farm workers. The farm worker survey solicited information on their socio-economic conditions, history in the former LSCF farms, beneficiation under the FTLRP, agricultural labour market conditions and other survival strategies currently being adopted.

D'-4	Former Fa	rm Workers	New Farr	n Workers	Total			
District	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Chipinge	73	66.4	37	33.6	110	100.0		
Goromonzi	113	65.3	60	34.7	173	100.0		
Chiredzi	91	41.2	130	58.8	221	100.0		
Kwekwe	45	40.9	65	59.1	110	100.0		
Mangwe	27	39.7	41	60.3	68	100.0		
Zvimba	65	82.3	14	17.7	79	100.0		
Total	414	54.4	347	45.6	761	100.0		

Table 1-5: Farm Worker Sample Characteristics

Source: AIAS Inter-district Farm Worker Survey (2005-2006)

In the farm worker survey, a total of 760 households were interviewed across the survey districts (Table 1-5). The farm worker household survey comprised of 368 (or 48.4 percent) former farm workers and 392 (or 51.6 percent) new farm workers.

Model type	No. of farms s	surveyed and pe	ercent in parenth	ieses			
on farm	Chipinge	Chiredzi	Goromonzi	Kwekwe	Mangwe	Zvimba	Total
A1 model	22	9	26	35	15	43	150
	(44.0)	(18.0)	(34.7)	(83.3)	(71.4)	(55.1)	(47.5)
A2 model	22	27	37	7	6	33	132
	(44.0)	(54.0)	(49.3)	(16.7)	(28.6)	(42.3)	(41.8)
Both A1 and A2 model	6	14	12	0	0	2	34
	(12.0)	(28.0)	(16.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(2.6)	(10.7)
Total	50	50	75	42	21	78	316
	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)

#### Table 1-6: Original Farms' Sample Characteristics

Source: AIAS Original Farm Survey (2005/06)

Data on the original whole farms, which entailed 316 farms was collected using the snowball technique, in which key informants referred researchers to other informants knowledgeable about the issues being investigated (see Table 1-6). The key informants who provided information to the wholesome farm survey included war veterans, village heads, committee of seven members<sup>14</sup>, former farm workers, Department of Agricultural Research and Extension (AREX) officials; Government lands officers, remaining white large-scale commercial farmers and new land beneficiaries. The snowball technique was preferred as it allowed the researchers to track "before" and "after" situation in newly resettled areas. For instance, former farm workers were targeted for labour related issues, while AREX officials were useful on the agricultural production aspects.

Enumerators who administered the various questionnaires included AIAS staff, temporary researchers and some locally based government officials including extension and lands officers. The enumerators underwent a training course on the data collection procedures and issues. This AIAS course covered the three sets of questionnaires.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup>These are committees set up by the state on all A1 farms during the FTLRP period to mostly manage the security situation on these farms (see also section 8.4).

## 2.0 ACCESS TO AND DISTRIBUTION OF LAND

This section discusses the resultant access and distribution of land created by the FTLRP under the A1 and A2 resettlement models taking into account the farm sizes redistributed and socio-economic backgrounds of land beneficiaries. The section also examines related access to natural resources resulting from land beneficiation, as well as exclusion from land access and informal land access under the FTLRP. The different approaches used by beneficiaries to gain access to land under the FTLRP are also assessed.

### 2.1 Access to and distribution of farming land and natural resources

### 2.1.1 Land sizes allocated and distribution (background policy guidelines)

One of the major objectives of 'fast track' was to ensure that there was equity in the resettlement process, and a critical criterion used was an egalitarian redistribution of land in terms of farm sizes. Land planners developed guidelines of viable farm sizes on the basis of agro-ecological zones and model type. Prior to 'fast track', resistance to land reform was based on the fact that any redistribution exercise would affect productivity within the large scale farms which were largely perceived to be very efficient and central to national food security and generation of foreign currency. However, a large body of research worldwide has adequately demonstrated the negative relationship between farm size and production costs in capitalist farming specifically due to supervision costs associated with hired labour<sup>15</sup> (Sukume et al., 2004). Globally, average farm sizes range from 12 hectares (China), 38 hectares (France), 50 hectares (Germany) and 65 hectares (United Kingdom). Studies in Zimbabwe (Bruce, 1990; Roth, 1990; Chasi et al., 1994) have demonstrated that there was significant under-utilisation of land in the large scale commercial farming areas.

Farm size determination was guided by considerations of viability of farm size and these included the adequacy of land to enable a competent person to derive a livelihood from working the land, or an income adequate to ensure a reasonable standard of living for the person and his/her entire household. However, the weakness with this consideration is that it leaves open the determination of what a 'reasonable standard of living' requires. In this chapter we argue that a reasonable standard of living should be one that enables the entire household to provide for its own consumption needs, keep some of the produce in store in case of production stress, be able to trade a portion of the produce to access cash in order to buy other food and non-food items that are not locally produced, and also be able to afford reasonable healthcare, pay school fees for children and afford transportation costs.

Planning guidelines state that A1 households were to be allocated farm sizes ranging from 5 to 7 arable hectares in wetter regions (NRI-III) and 10 arable hectares and at least 30 grazing hectares in the drier regions (Sukume et al., 2004). The farm sizes proposed for the A1 model under the planning guidelines appear adequate in line with the policy goal of ensuring food security at the household level for the small farmers. Furthermore, the planning guidelines have taken into account the social and political dimension which required more beneficiaries to be accommodated under the FTLRP so as to ease the congestion in the communal areas.

The prescribed farm sizes for A2 land allocations provide for four categories of farm sizes, small, medium scale, large scale and peri-urban plots (Ibid). Like the A1 scheme, the amount of land allocated varies with the agro-ecological zone. The guidelines for planning are presented below (Table 2-1).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup>Co-operative/collectives have a different size-costs relationship

Natural	A	I Farm Size	(ha)		A2 Farm	Size (ha)		Access Difference		
Region	Arable	Grazing	Total	Small Scale	Medium Scale	Large scale	Peri-Urban	(ha)	Acc	
1	5	7	12	20	100	250	2-30	238	20	
2a	5	10	15	30	200	330	2-30	335	23	
2b	5	15	20	40	250	400	2-30	380	19	
3	10	20	30	60	300	500	2-30	470	16	
4	10	30	40	120	700	1500	2-30	1450	29	
5	10	60	70	240	1000	2000	2-30	1930	25+	

### Table 2-1: Farm-size guidelines for resettlement

Source: Department of Lands, 2001

In practice, land allocations have not strictly adhered to the planning guidelines. In an earlier study, Sukume et al. (2004) noted the wide variation between the official farm size prescription and the sizes of land demarcated for allocation across the natural regions in both A1 and A2. They noted the diversity of farm sizes within provinces, and how various districts located in similar agro-ecological regions demarcated varied sizes of farms for allocation to beneficiaries. Land allocations tended to fall below the prescribed thresholds.

#### Land sizes allocated and distribution

The findings of the AIAS inter-district survey show that land sizes and distribution tend to vary within the same agro-ecological region (see Table 2-2), with more plots allocated below the prescribed farm size. For instance, Chipinge (NR II) has nine A1 farms which are more than 20 hectares and Chiredzi (NR III) has forty eight A1 plots that are less than the prescribed minimum of 30 hectares (arable plus grazing). The majority (50.3 percent) of the A1 plots are within the 1-10 hectares which suggests that in many instances planners accommodated more beneficiaries than the guidelines provided for. However, even though there is evidence of allocating plots that are lesser than the guidelines established prior to embarking on the land redistribution, the average hectarage per household is still larger than that prevailing in communal areas. These findings noted similar farm size variations as reported by Sukume et al. (2004).

Plot size	Chip	oinge	Chiredzi		Goromonzi		Kwekwe		Mangwe		Zvimba		Total	
(ha)	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-5	70	36.8	20	16.3	58	11.3	1	0.3	-	-	-	-	149	10.3
5.1-10	47	24.7	28	22.8	436	84.7	67	21.1	-	-	-	-	578	40.0
10.1-20	64	33.7	3	2.4	12	2.3	27	8.5	-	-	189	95.5	295	20.4
20.1+	9	4.7	72	58.5	9	1.8	222	70	101	100	9	4.5	422	29.2
Total	190	100.0	123	100.0	515	100.0	317	100.0	101	100.0	198	100.0	1444	100.0

 Table 2-2: Landholdings for A1 beneficiaries

Source: AIAS Household Baseline questionnaire, N=2089

It is difficult to determine the level of variation within the A2 scheme, given the fact that the model accommodates various farm sizes in each natural region either as small scale, medium scale, large scale or peri-urban farms. The scale of the A2 farms is relative and depends on the natural region in which the farm is located as provided for by the farm size guidelines (Table 2-1). Kwekwe and Mangwe predominantly in NR III do not have any small scale A2 farms. The majority of the plots are within the 60-120 hectares range (Table 2-3). These are mostly small scale A2 plots in NR III and IV

and those with 100-120 hectares are considered to be medium scale in NR I. Beneficiaries in Chipinge were allocated small scale A2 plots.

In Chipinge (NR IIa and IIb) the majority of beneficiaries were allocated small scale A2 plots of up to 40 hectares. The discrepancy is with those who were allocated plots ranging between 40 and 1000 hectares – according to planning guidelines these are neither small scale nor medium scale. Goromonzi, a largely peri-urban area, does not seem to have designated a large number of plots as peri-urban as the majority of the plots are above 30 hectares.

Range (ha)	Dist	rict											Total	
_	Chip	inge	Chir	edzi	Gord	omonzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	nba		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0.1-20	35	26.5	24	35.3	8	9.6	0	-	0	-	1	1.1	68	16.1
20.1-30	17	12.9	33	48.5	4	4.8	0	-	0	-	6	6.5	60	14.1
30.1-40	24	18.2	2	2.9	4	4.8	0	-	0	-	27	29.0	57	13.4
40.1-50	25	18.9	8	11.8	3	3.6	0	-	0	-	9	9.7	45	10.6
50.1-60	7	5.3	0	-	12	14.5	0	-	0	-	3	3.2	22	5.2
60.1-120	18	13.6	1	1.5	26	31.3	2	13.3	1	2.9	30	32.3	78	18.4
120.1-250	6	4.5	0	-	11	13.3	8	53.3	26	76.5	11	11.8	62	14.6
250.1+	0	-	0	-	15	18.1	5	33.3	7	20.6	6	6.5	33	7.8
Total	132	100.0	68	100	83	100.0	15	100	34	100.0	93	100.0	425	100

 Table 2-3: Landholdings for A2 beneficiaries

Source: AIAS Household Baseline questionnaire

### 2.1.2 Access to natural resources and their distribution

Besides access to land allocated officially, or land illegally controlled for farming and residential uses, the "beneficiaries" of the FTLRP also include those who have access to and control of natural resources on the resettled areas, either as official land beneficiaries (allocated) or as ""squatters"" and natural resource "poachers". The issue of access to and control of natural resources by official land beneficiaries and others, also bears on the nature and efficacy of the land tenure security, as we discuss later, and on the effective and sustainable management of the natural resources and land.

About 21 percent of the land beneficiaries reported that various people had access to the natural resources found on their plots. Farm workers (30.7 percent) and neighbours (from the same resettlement scheme and adjacent communal areas) (43.6 percent) were cited as those responsible for such access, and "illegal" settlers comprised 4.4 percent of this group. Gold panners and wildlife poachers transgressed on (respectively) only 0.4 percent and 17.3 percent of the total number of beneficiaries affected by such natural resource 'poachers'. This trend represents a substantial degree of land tenure insecurity and constraints to the effective management of natural resources for a significant number of the land beneficiaries. The different range of non-farm activities occurring in newly resettled areas are discussed in detail in section 5.0.

In general, the land tenure problems faced over the access to the use of natural resources by those alleged or deemed to be non-plot holders by the putative land beneficiaries, fall into three types of disputes. The more common type being what could be considered a basic form of competition for access to the natural resources available on the plots in redistributed lands by various socially deprived categories of people, such as former farm workers and neighbouring small farmers, as well as some remaining LSCF farmers who require the said natural resources. This type of problem represents a general belief by poor people that available natural resources should be shared. This type of natural resource user (or poacher) appears to have some sympathy from the plot owners, who perceive them as being needy.

The second type of land tenure problem relates to the contest over the 'legal' (or presumed) right of access to and control of the redistributed land and its appended natural resources between those who claim to (and indeed may) have been allocated plots, those who believe that they were unfairly (or unjustly) excluded from the land allocation process (e.g. farm workers and others deemed to be ""squatters"" living within the redistributed farms) and those who believe that their land was unfairly or unjustly acquired for redistribution (the former LSCF – mainly white – owners). Unlike the first type of natural resource "poachers", the latter category of natural resource contestants tend to be viewed by those who were allocated plots by the GoZ as antagonistic claimants, who threaten their ultimate control or ownership of the redistributed plots quite directly.

The third category of natural resource user disputes, which is the least common, is perpetrated by people whose actions are considered by land beneficiaries to be illegal. These actors have neither a legitimate social nor potentially legal standing from which to claim rights to use the available natural resources. They are classified as wildlife poachers, ""squatters"" and illegal gold panners.

Furthermore, up to 24.1 percent of the beneficiaries of official land allocation reported that they shared the natural resources on their land with other users, including on a voluntary basis (75.5 percent of them) and against their wish (24.5 percent of them). This suggests that while land sharing against their wish (at 4.4 percent of the sample) is relatively low, the sharing of natural resources was a more significant issue of concern. Illegal and unaccepted natural resources sharing (with for instance, gold panners, wildlife poachers and those deemed to be ""squatters"") accounted for the least incidences (22.1 percent) of the natural resource sharing disputes. The sharing also arose because of disputed rights of access to, or use of land and natural resources (between the land beneficiaries and former LSCF farmers and "squatters", or competing claims of rights to land access between beneficiaries and neighbours and former or current farm workers). The latter accounted for about 30.7 percent of the disputes which emerged over natural resources, while the former accounted for 43.6 percent of such disputes

#### 2.2 Land access approaches and patterns

#### 2.2.1 Timing and periodisation of land access

The process of formal land allocations indeed was staggered over time, place and between the two land allocation schemes (A1 and A2). During the first year or so (February 2000 to May 2001) land access was mainly through land occupations beginning with A1 schemes. The formal Government land acquisition process only picked up at the end of 2000 when 3 000 farms were gazetted, as reflected in the GoZ law of May 2001 prohibiting further land occupations<sup>16</sup>.





<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup>Rural Land Occupiers Act Chapter 20:26 protects people who occupied land on or before the 1st March 2001 from eviction, whilst occupations occurring after this date are deemed illegal and occupiers should be evicted by the state.

Indeed a number of "self-contained" A1 land plots were allocated during this period and some beneficiaries got hold of these in anticipation of the A2 scheme. Some of the A1 self-contained plots and other A1 schemes were later converted into A2 schemes. This began in earnest from 2001 through to 2003, when 8 000 A2 plots were allocated (see also Utete Report, 2003). Allocations of A1 plots continued, but in decreasing proportions from 2004 onwards; a lesser proportion of A1 plots were allocated gradually, especially under the A2 scheme. It is also important to note that during the FTLRP period four elections were held and affected the land allocations as state resources were channelled for these exercises in the different election years.

In our sample survey, the bulk of the land beneficiaries had been formally allocated land by the GoZ by 2002 (Fig 2-1). The number of beneficiaries who were formally allocated land between 2000 and 2002 was higher in the A1 scheme, compared to the A2 scheme. The majority of the beneficiaries in both the A1 and A2 schemes were formally allocated land in 2001 (Fig 2-1). Formal land allocations were continuing even during the time the field surveys were conducted in 2005 and 2006 but at a slower pace than the earlier periods, such that a few of the beneficiaries in our sample received formal land allocations between 2005 and 2006.

Year	Chip	inge	Chired	lzi	Goro	nonzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvim	ba	Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2000	56	17.6	25	11.9	71	11.2	56	16.7	38	26.6	34	11.8	280	14.5
2001	58	18.2	70	33.3	197	31.1	189	56.3	63	44.1	81	28.2	658	34.1
2002	82	25.8	46	21.9	205	32.4	47	14.0	23	16.1	62	21.6	465	24.1
2003	55	17.3	32	15.2	72	11.4	17	5.1	10	7.0	46	16.0	232	12.0
2004	31	9.7	30	14.3	45	7.1	11	3.3	3	2.1	37	12.9	157	8.1
2005	32	10.1	5	2.4	29	4.6	10	3.0	5	3.5	27	9.4	108	5.6
2006	4	1.3	2	1	14	2.2	6	1.8	1	0.7	-		27	1.4
Total	318	100	210	100	633	100	336	100.0	143	100.0	287	100.0	1927	100.0

Table 2-4: Year of formal land allocation by district

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire

The pace of land allocation was almost similar across all the survey districts as the bulk of the land beneficiaries had been formally allocated land by the GoZ by 2002 (Table 2-4). The pace of formal land allocations between 2000 and 2002, was relatively faster in the Kwekwe and Mangwe districts which managed to formally allocate land to over 80.0 percent of the beneficiaries during this period in comparison to an average of 60.0 percent in the other districts.

#### 2.2.2 Official land beneficiaries and methods used to gain access to land

Over 82 percent of the beneficiaries declared that they had been formally allocated land by Government through the relevant land offering agents and system (Table 2-5). There were also some beneficiaries (2.9 percent) who claimed to have purchased the land gained during the FTLRP period. Only 14.5 percent declared gaining access to land either by 'land occupation' without being formalised (9.7 percent), or by occupying land and then having it formally allocated by the Government (4.8 percent). Thus between 9.7 and 14.5 percent of the beneficiaries bordered on being 'illegal' land occupiers, with half (9.7%) of them having had their land 'formalised' after the occupations.

Mode of land access	A1		A2		Total		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Formally allocated	1285	83.0	336	81.2	1621	82.6	
Occupation	158	10.1	33	8.0	191	9.7	
Both formal & occupation	69	4.5	25	6.0	94	4.8	
Purchasing	37	2.4	20	4.8	57	2.9	
Total	1549	100.0	414	100.0	1963	100.0	

Table 2-5: Mode of land access for beneficiaries

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire

This scale of land access through 'occupations' is in line with the CFU finding that, at the peak of 'invasions', only 1 000 farms were occupied illegally, suggesting that below 20 percent of the LSCF land was never 'invaded'<sup>17</sup>. This repudiates the commonplace assertion in the literature and media that the entire land redistribution was based on self-allocations by land occupiers. Most land occupiers were rural based peasants, small capitalists, bureaucrats and traditional authorities. Urbanites and farm workers were also involved in the land occupation movement. Indeed out of 269 survey households reported to have participated in the land occupations, 177 were from the communal areas, 41 were from the urban areas, 19 from the LSCF (that is, farm workers) and the remainder were from other areas which included growth points, mining areas and the old resettlement schemes. These findings are in contrast to widely held views in studies (e.g. Sachikonye, 2003) evaluating the impact of the FTLRP, which has tended to view farm workers as passive victims of the land occupation movement led by war veterans, yet in actual fact some of them participated in the processes, albeit a relatively small number.



#### Fig 2-2: Mode of land access by district

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup>The tendency has been to make blanket statements on the legality of land access methods. Land allocations in which the state might have been involved in through formalising settlement by land occupiers are generally combined with those where the state did not necessarily have a direct or indirect hand in condoning illegal land occupiers.

The mode of land allocation also varied across the districts. Most of the land occupations before the implementation of the FTLRP occurred in districts within the Mashonaland provinces, which had the greatest number of former large scale commercial farms. As such, Goromonzi (18.5 percent) and Zvimba districts (18.3 percent) (Mashonaland East and West respectively) had the highest proportion of households who gained land through occupations, with some occupations later confirmed during the official FTLRP process as highlighted earlier (Fig 2-2). Land occupations were limited in the Matebeleland provinces, with only 1.4 percent of the households in Mangwe District reporting gaining land access through occupations (Fig 2-2).

### 2.2.3 The pattern of "illegal" occupations

The scale of clear-cut 'illegal' land occupiers, as declared by the beneficiaries themselves in the field survey sample, was limited to 9.7 percent of the beneficiaries. This is the best case interpretation of events that occurred. However, up to 14.5 percent of the beneficiaries (the worst case scenario) may have initially been 'illegal' land occupiers, if one deduces from responses to questions that cross-checked the manner in which land had been allocated to the beneficiary<sup>18</sup>. The whole farm survey suggested that about 15 percent of the land allocations had arisen from land 'occupations', a figure that tallied with the household survey results.

The period during which the 'illegal' land occupations occurred was staggered. The wholesome farm survey indicated that most of the farm occupations (87.9 percent) occurred between 2000 and 2002. About 46 percent of the land occupations occurred in 2000. Occupations gradually decreased over the subsequent years. None were recorded in the surveyed farms in 2003. In 2004, 7.3 percent of them occurred, while in 1999 and 2005 only 2.4 percent occurred on the farms covered by the survey (Fig 2-3).



#### Fig 2-3: Intensity of land occupations in Newly Redistributed Areas

Source: AIAS Baseline Survey 2005/06, Household questionnaire. N=2089

The origins of the 'illegal' land occupiers also varied. About 73 percent of them were from rural areas (with the communal areas represented by 65.8 percent); 7.1 percent were farm workers; and 6.0 percent by people from growth points and other areas (old resettlement, mining areas, diaspora). While the pure urban based occupiers amounted to only 21.2 percent of the illegal occupiers, contrary to the view that 'land invasions' were urban dominated, this proportion tallies with the relatively lower

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup>The questionnaires sought to assess the pattern of 'illegal' occupations at various points in time by asking a number of questions, focusing directly on land invasions or occupation, on whether Government permission was given and on the nature of tenure held.

representation of urban beneficiaries among the overall number of land beneficiaries. Of course, for the rural population it was easier logistically to occupy lands for a long period, especially for those from communal areas with neighbouring LSCFs. As other studies show (e.g. Sadomba, 2006), rural-based land occupiers were the epicentre of the land occupation movement, even if they were led by urban-based war veterans accompanied by other urbanities.

This pattern also reflects the fact that urban-based efforts to bid for land or to catch up in the land access process were slow to take off. While a few urbanities sought A1 land, most sought land through the A2 scheme, which only started in earnest during late 2001 and into 2002, after the bulk of the A1 land allocation had been undertaken, and which by the end of 2003 had only formally allocated land to 8 000 beneficiaries. The A1 scheme had formally commenced in late 2000. This pattern also reflects the fact that it was only after the national presidential elections of 2002, when political tranquillity had returned, that there was more confidence built among urbanities and potential indigenous farmers seeking A2 farms in the land redistribution programme. By 2003 the general public mood was dominated by 'avoiding being left out from access to land'.

#### 2.3 Socio-economic characteristics of beneficiaries

In this section the discussion focuses on the geographic, social and economic origins of the land beneficiaries within the study sample. Generally, most Zimbabweans perceive their point of origin as a communal area home, even though they might have migrated into urban areas. A 1991 study (Peta et al, 1991) showed that the majority of Zimbabwean workers living in urban centres maintain a home or strong home links with a communal area. In this section the discussion also analyses socio-economic backgrounds prior to 'fast track' and the levels of inclusion as beneficiaries of special interest groups such as war veterans and women.

## 2.3.1 Origins of land beneficiaries

In most instances the geographic location of a household before the land reform determined the social setting of households. Communal areas were and are mostly inhabited by black smallholder households, whereas commercial farms were made up of white commercial farmers and farm workers who were mostly black and in many instances were a mixture of Zimbabweans, Zambians, Malawians and Mozambicans (see for instance Moyo, 1995; Moyo et al, 2000; Kinsey, 2003).

Table 2-6 shows the nature of land beneficiaries by area of origin. In general, most (62.1 percent) of the land beneficiaries interviewed came from the communal areas. If we disaggregate this group was the biggest number of land beneficiaries coming from communal areas within the district (32.8 percent), followed by those from within the province (18.0 percent), while those from other provinces constituted 12.0 percent of land beneficiaries within this group.

The second largest group of land beneficiaries is made of people who came from urban areas. Indeed, analyses of processes leading to 'fast track' have explained the composition of the land movement as inclusive of urban elements or members of households seeking to diversify their social reproduction strategies through subsistence farming. Furthermore, as the land redistribution began to gather momentum – especially after the official announcement of 'fast track' as a legitimate Government programme – some elites (middle class elements from the private sector) also joined the process of submitting applications for land.

Place of origin	A1		A2		Total		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
CA this district	483	33.7	119	28.5	602	32.5	
CA this province	275	19.2	58	13.9	333	18.0	
CA other provinces	187	13.0	36	8.6	223	12.0	
LSCF this district	106	7.4	11	2.6	117	6.3	
LSCF this province	16	1.1	6	1.4	22	1.2	
LSCF other provinces	9	0.6	2	0.5	11	0.6	
Diaspora	6	0.4	1	0.2	7	0.4	
Urban area	279	19.5	145	34.8	424	22.9	
Employment in another area	47	3.3	34	8.2	81	4.4	
SSCF this district	14	1.0	3	0.7	17	0.9	
Growth point	1	0.1	1	0.2	2	0.1	
Mining area	11	0.8	1	0.2	12	0.6	
Total	1434	100.0	417	100.0	1851	100.0	

#### Table 2-6: Place of origin by model type

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire

Table 2-6 above shows that the highest (34.8 percent) number of A2 beneficiaries is from the urban areas. Two factors help to explain the reason for such a large number of beneficiaries from the urban areas. Firstly, the process for applying for land under A2 was different from A1 where chiefs played a very important role. Applicants for A2 land were required to submit a business development plan and proof of capacity to finance farm operations. Most of the beneficiaries were able to use some of their property title deeds in the urban areas as collateral to mobilize credit to finance farm operations. The conditions and procedures of applying were a barrier to many aspiring A2 farmers from the rural areas. Secondly, most of the A2 allocations were done by Government bureaucrats who were in certain instances susceptible to pressure from elites in terms of beneficiary selection. In many debates the A2 remains contested due to the perceived bias in beneficiary selection (some argue that only ruling party elites were allocated) and instances of multiple-farm ownership.

Table 2-7 shows that Goromonzi had the highest proportion of land beneficiaries from the urban areas. This could be due to the fact that the district is very close to the city of Harare. The third largest category of beneficiaries was made up of people from communal areas within the same province. There is a very low number (8.1 percent) of land beneficiaries from the LSCF both in the district and in the province. It is assumed that those originating from the LSCF would be former farm workers. Table 2-9 therefore suggests that very few farm workers benefited from the land distribution process, mainly those that participated in the land occupations.
Place of origin	Chip	inge	Chir	edzi	Goro	omonzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	ıba	Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
CA this district	125	37.4	82	34.9	132	22.2	122	32.8	71	49.0	116	39.3	648	32.8
CA this province	15	4.5	68	28.9	116	19.5	75	20.2	29	20.0	41	13.9	344	17.4
CA other provinces	4	1.2	15	6.4	109	18.3	60	16.1	5	3.4	42	14.2	235	11.9
LSCF in this district	53	15.9	2	0.9	23	3.9	17	4.6	16	11.0	14	4.7	125	6.3
LSCF this province	6	1.8	-	-	8	1.3	5	1.3	2	1.4	2	0.7	23	1.2
LSCF other	1	0.3	-	-	4	0.7	3	0.8	-	-	3	1.0	11	0.6
provinces														
Diaspora	1	0.3	1	0.4	4	0.7	1	0.3	-	-	-	-	7	0.4
Urban area	73	21.9	48	20.4	182	30.6	68	18.3	22	15.2	59	20.0	452	22.9
Employment in	45	13.5	17	7.2	14	2.4	11	3.0	-	-	10	3.4	97	4.9
another area														
SSCF this district	8	2.4	2	0.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	2.7	18	0.9
Growth point	2	0.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0.1
Old resettlement area	1	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.1
Mining area	-	-	-	-	3	0.5	10	2.7	-	-	-	-	13	0.7
Total	334	100.0	235	100.0	595	100.0	372	100.0	145	100.0	295	100.0	1976	100.0

Table 2-7: Place of origin of land beneficiaries by district

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, 2005/06, Household questionnaire

Table 2-7 indicates the distribution of land according to the areas of origin of the newly resettled land beneficiaries according to the districts sampled. The table shows the varying patterns of selection of beneficiaries. In Mangwe and Chipinge districts, beneficiary selection exhibited exclusionary tendencies as most land beneficiaries (69 percent and 55.7 percent respectively) came from within the district. Although the trend is exhibited in some of the sampled districts, the Mangwe case suggests high levels of a very exclusionary process of self selection. Such high levels of beneficiaries from the same areas suggest implications for social organization which will be discussed later.

Interestingly, Mangwe also has the second highest number of beneficiaries from the LSCF sector (17.7 percent) from within the district and within the province, which suggests an inclusion of former farm labour in the resettlement exercise. It is noteworthy that 3 districts (Goromonzi, Kwekwe and Zvimba) had more than 10 percent of land beneficiaries from other provinces. Also, of interest is the fairly high percentage of urbanites who benefited from land allocations across all provinces. This highlights the route (based on kith and kin) used to access land by those not resident in rural areas of origin. Most urbanites used their rural links to gain access to land and that this group of beneficiaries, to some degree, could be considered as "beneficiaries within this district".

Chipinge had the highest number (17.7percent) of beneficiaries from the LSCF, which used to employ local labour and at the time of resettlement these labourers were able to make a demand for land on the basis of belonging to the community. The emerging varying pattern of land allocation to former farm workers from district to district challenges some of the more dismissive arguments amongst scholars (Sachikonye, 2003; Alexander, 2003) that 'fast track' actually disregarded farm workers as an important category of land beneficiaries. Indeed, Chambati and Moyo (2004) have argued that GoZ policy in practice included farm workers as beneficiaries and those who wished to be allocated land were expected to apply through their provincial and district land committees. In some provinces a number of farms were specifically set aside for former farm workers and in others they were not. Furthermore, a preference survey carried out before the FTLRP showed that 53percent of the former farm workers wanted access to land if they were to benefit from the land reform (MPSL&SW, 2001).

Our study's findings show that there is a diverse set of beneficiaries from the communal areas, LSCFs, urban areas and mining areas. In many instances 'strangers' have been resettled together. The criteria for selection varied from area to area depending on local organization and social forces on the ground. In instances of high intensity land occupations, the land occupiers generally allocated plots amongst

themselves. However, during the more organized period of 'fast track' (just after 'jambanja')<sup>19</sup>, chiefs were assigned the role of identifying land beneficiaries and forwarding the list to the district land committees (made up of ZANU PF, district chairman, District Administrator's office, intelligence, war veteran district chairman and the chief). It is worth noting that others managed to lobby the committee or to muscle-in, based on their position in relation to the ruling party and the state. The variation in terms of the level of inclusion of certain special groups such as former farm workers is indicative of the extent to which these committees and the chiefs were sensitive to their plight.

### 2.3.2 Family structure (size and membership) of beneficiaries

A household size is defined as a set of family members living together and sharing the same hearth. Moyo's (1995) study found that the most common household in communal areas is made up of 3-5 members followed by ones with 6-7 members. This suggests highly nucleated households with an average number of three children. Findings from the AIAS survey show a similar picture (Figure 2-4), as the most common household size is 3-5 across both resettlement models. There are very few (83) households or 4.2 percent with ten and more members; these are more common in A1 areas. In addition there are more one-member households in the sample from fast track areas (15.5 percent) than in the communal areas (refer to Moyo, 1995). There are also more households with one member within the A2 model (22.8 percent) than in A1 areas.





#### Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

Newly resettled households were organized as both nuclear and extended family structures. A nuclear household includes adults of both sexes, at least two of whom maintain a socially approved sexual relationship, and one or more children, born or adopted, of the sexually cohabitant adults (Murdock, 1949). This basic unit, referred to as the nuclear family, may have other relatives such as brother or sister of the spouses, an uncle, an aunt, grandfather or other kinsmen. The presence of such kinfolk within the family extends the core and transforms the nuclear family into what is called the extended family (Medina and De Guzman, 1994).

The newly resettled areas were dominated by nucleated households, which accounted for 77.9 percent of the sample population (Table 2-8), whilst the remainder were extended family households. Evidence from the survey showed that extended family households were more common in the A2

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup>The land occupations are popularly referred to as jambanja in the local Shona language as they entailed confrontations with former white farmers and the sporadic violence that sometimes accompanied the process.

sector (30.4 percent) than the A1 sector (19.9 percent). Key informant interviews showed that the transformation of the nuclear households into extended households in newly resettled areas was motivated by the need to boost the supply of labour. The dominance of extended households in the A2 sector could be partly explained by the fact that they have larger farm sizes that ordinarily demand more farm labour and thus beneficiaries co-opted relatives from the extended family to assist in productive areas.

Family	A1 model		A2 model		Total		
structure							
	No. of HH	% of HH	No. of HH	% of HH	No. of HH	% of HH	
Nucleated	1322	80.1	305	69.6	1627	77.9	
Extended	329	19.9	133	30.4	462	22.2	
Total	1651	100.0	438	100	2089	100.0	

Table 2-8: Family structures in newly resettled areas

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

Another common form of organisation is polygamous nature of marital relationships between men and women that result in the emergence of a family unit. In polygamous relationship, a man has socially approved sexual relationships with at least two women with children from both relationships. Polygamous relationships are common in Zimbabwe, especially in the rural areas. With specific reference to the newly resettled areas, polygamous relationships have been highlighted as complicating the registration of tenure documents and their inheritance (see Utete, 2003). The extent of this phenomenon was not adequately studied in newly resettled areas. This type of family organisation was confirmed by 19.8 percent of the households who indicated that the existence of polygamous relationships in newly resettled areas exposed the communities to the HIV and AIDS pandemic.

Analysis of the entire sample population (see Table 2-9) shows that there are slightly more males (55.3 percent) than females (44.7 percent). The most common (13.4 percent) age group is that of school going youths who are between 15-19 years. Most household heads were aged between 25-59 years, where 40 percent of the sample population was found. There are two categories of economically dependent people – those that are too young to work (0-14 years) and those too old to work (60+ years). In the sample these categories make up 35 percent of the entire sample (30.8 percent below 15 years and 4.2 percent above 60 years).

Age range (years)	Male		Fema	le	Total	
0-4	326	3.7	278	3.2	604	6.9
5-9	475	5.4	465	5.3	940	10.7
10-14	585	6.6	579	6.6	1164	13.2
15-19	652	7.4	526	6.0	1178	13.4
20-24	605	6.9	430	4.9	1035	11.8
25-29	346	3.9	331	3.8	677	7.7
30-34	285	3.2	285	3.2	570	6.5
35-39	284	3.2	251	2.9	535	6.1
40-44	287	3.3	240	2.7	527	6.0
45-49	320	3.6	201	2.3	521	5.9
50-54	285	3.2	152	1.7	437	5.0
55-59	168	1.9	77	0.9	245	2.8
60-64	110	1.2	55	0.6	165	1.9
65-69	71	0.8	27	0.3	98	1.1
70+	68	0.8	41	0.5	109	1.2
Total	4867	55.3	3938	44.7	8805	100.0

 Table: 2-9: Age range against gender (total population)

Source: AIAS Baseline Survey 2005/06, Household questionnaire

The population size of 8 805 in 2 089 sample households suggests an average of four members per household. Table 2-9 has already shown the variations in terms of the distribution of the population. Unlike communal area data, these findings suggest availability of land access of equal proportions to males and females within fast track areas. More importantly, the average size of the household suggests a potential limitation in the maximum utilization of land based on family labour. The section below discusses the gender composition of land beneficiaries.

## 2.3.3 Gender composition of land beneficiaries

One of the major critiques that has emerged over customary tenure is the male chauvinism within the patriarchal system which marginalises women in terms of land access and decision-making over land use and utilization of proceeds from the land. Prior to 'fast track', a number of effective efforts were made by the Women Land Lobby Group (WLLG) (Chari 1999) to ensure that a specific quota of resettled land was set aside for women. The discussion in this section is set on analyzing how women benefited from 'fast track' in terms of distribution of land.

Overall, there were 339 (19 percent) women who received land in their own right. There were more women land beneficiaries within the A1 (20.72 percent) than those within the A2 (14.72 percent). Fig 2-5 provides a summary of the distribution of land access according to gender. However, the discussion on gender relations and access to land has to go beyond an analysis of what women got in their own right. The land rights being bestowed in the newly resettled areas are qualitatively different from the prevailing tenure system in communal areas. The GoZ has since 2006 been introducing the permit system for A1 farms and leasehold tenure for A2 farms. These confer significantly more rights for women in A1 and A2 than in the communal areas. In the first instance, as a result of lobbying from civil society organisations (CSOs), the permit and lease are to be registered in the names of both spouses (in the case of married couples). As well, in the event of permit disposal, the husband or wife is required by law to seek written consent of the other party before the disposal can be legally recognized.



# Fig 2-5: Gender by model type

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

There, however, remains some sticking issues such as the rights of spouses at the time of divorce or at the time of death of the male spouse. The lease document states clearly, that the lease should be administered within the prevailing inheritance laws of Zimbabwe, which generally do not favour women. Another possible area of conflict that has been raised is on the distribution of land in polygamous marriage. These outstanding gender issues are residues of the 'fast track' nature in which

the land reforms were implemented and also the desire on the part of the Government to introduce new laws governing these areas. A number of policy dialogues have been held between Government and CSOs over some of these issues and recommendations crafted are being considered by Government. Some have commented that There, however, remains some sticking issues such as the rights of spouses at the time of divorce or at the time of death of the male spouse. The lease document states clearly, that the lease should be administered within the prevailing inheritance laws of Zimbabwe, which generally do not favour women. Another possible area of conflict that has been raised is on the distribution of land in polygamous marriage. These outstanding gender issues are residues of the 'fast track' nature in which the land reforms were implemented and also the desire on the part of the Government to introduce new laws governing these areas. A number of policy dialogues have been held between Government and CSOs over some of these issues and recommendations crafted are being considered by Government. Some have commented that what might be needed is a more comprehensive overhauling of laws related to gender relations such as the inheritance and customary laws (Ndoro 2006).

Furthermore, the processes of land allocation were perceived to be biased against women, especially the role of the chief in identifying potential beneficiaries to be forwarded to the district land committee. Women lobbyists such as Women and Land in Zimbabwe (WLZ) noted that the chiefs operate within a framework of customary laws which do not accord/recognize women's rights to access land in their individual status. Such attitudes, they argued, could lead to the sidelining of women beneficiaries. At the initial stages GoZ had set an informal target of 20 percent of women beneficiaries and studies (AIAS, Utete Report 2003) indicate that the actual average is 18 percent.

## 2.3.4 Educational levels of land beneficiaries

The discussion in this subsection is closely related to the above. When studying social organization, it is imperative to understand the educational levels of the beneficiaries and to analyse how this relates to the forms of emerging organization. Formal education has a bearing on the kind of information accessed, and on the nature of planning at household level and community level. In certain instances, having acquired education can be a status symbol which might also have implications for processes of inclusion and exclusion within communities.

Education	Chip	inge	Chir	edzi	Gord	monzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	ıba	Total	
level of plot	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
owner														
No formal	27	9.1	18	8.5	26	4.2	8	2.9	14	10.3	-	-	93	5.1
education														
Pre-school	1	0.3	-	-	6	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	0.4
Primary	47	15.8	37	17.5	106	17.3	59	21.2	60	44.1	81	26.4	390	21.2
education														
Junior	26	8.8	20	9.5	92	15.0	55	19.8	9	6.6	44	14.3	246	13.4
Certificate														
Standard six	27	9.1	19	9.0	81	13.2	33	11.9	19	14.0	23	7.5	202	11.0
O' level	83	27.9	70	33.2	213	34.8	91	32.7	16	11.8	129	42.0	602	32.7
A' level	25	8.4	21	10.0	24	3.9	11	4.0	3	2.2	14	4.6	98	5.3
Tertiary	61	20.5	26	12.3	64	10.5	21	7.6	15	11.0	16	5.2	203	11.0
Total	297	100.0	211	100.0	612	100.0	278	100.0	136	100.0	307	100.0	1841	100.0

## Table 2-10: Education levels attained by plot owner

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Study findings (see Table 2-10) indicate that the majority of beneficiaries have studied up to Ordinary level<sup>20</sup>. Approximately 16percent of the sample has Advanced Level or tertiary education qualifications.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup>Up until 2000, Zimbabwe's secondary education system was regulated by the University of Cambridge.

In Mangwe, however, the biggest sub-group are those with primary education whilst those with Ordinary Level and above are only 25 percent (other areas average 45 percent in this latter sub-group). There are very few (5.1 percent) land beneficiaries with no formal education. These figures suggest that basic literacy skills are available in these areas and this enables ease of communication especially in written form.

The levels of education of people resident in the newly resettled areas and the professional experience that these people bring are qualitatively different from that prevailing in communal areas and even older resettled areas. These traits are very critical in analyzing the emerging forms of social organization and agency. Potentially, the new calibre of farmers has had exposure to different cultures, forms of organization and agency.

## 2.3.5 Employment profiles of beneficiaries

In an effort to develop a deeper understanding of the identity of the land beneficiaries the discussion in this subsection will analyse the socio-economic background of the newly resettled households. An analysis of socio-economic backgrounds entails analyses of the previous and current professions of newly resettled households. Such an approach is influenced by the realization that the workplace is not only an economic zone, but is also a place of social interactions where habits and relations have a bearing on the development of the individual and also that these attributes can be replicated in other settings.

Previous employment	A1		A2		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Not in professional employment	656	39.7	159	36.3	815	39.0
Currently employed	226	13.7	113	25.8	339	16.2
Pvt sector managerial/skilled	54	3.3	22	5.0	76	3.6
Pvt sector semi-skilled	229	13.9	32	7.3	261	12.5
Pvt sector unskilled	118	7.1	21	4.8	139	6.7
Self employed	81	4.9	10	2.3	91	4.4
Civil servant managerial/skilled	28	1.7	12	2.7	40	1.9
Civil servant semi-skilled	42	2.5	21	4.8	63	3.0
Civil servant unskilled	15	0.9	2	0.5	17	0.8
Civil servant uniformed	179	10.8	39	8.9	218	10.4
Domestic worker	6	0.4	2	0.5	8	0.4
Other	6	0.4	2	0.5	8	0.4
Total	1651	100.0	438	100.0	2089	100.0

Table 2-11: Previous employment of land beneficiaries

#### Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Approximately 45.0 percent of the land recipients had been previously employed within the formal wage economy, whilst 27.0 percent were in current employment (Tables 2-11 and 2-12). The previous occupations of the newly resettled land beneficiaries vary and they cover the whole organisational ladder from management positions to shop floor levels. Tables 2-14 and 2-16 show the previous and current occupations of the recipients. The majority of the beneficiaries (337 or 16.1 percent) previously engaged in private sector skilled and semi-skilled positions. The second highest (218 or 10.4 percent) category of land beneficiaries are those who were in the uniformed services (army/police).

Current profession	A1		A2		Total		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Not in professional employment	1282	77.6	242	55.3	1524	73.0	
Pvt sector managerial/skilled	34	2.1	52	11.9	86	4.1	
Pvt sector semi-skilled	121	7.3	43	9.8	164	7.9	
Pvt sector unskilled	30	1.8	6	1.4	36	1.7	
Self employed	41	2.5	12	2.7	53	2.5	
Civil servant managerial/skilled	29	1.8	36	8.2	65	3.1	
Civil servant semi-skilled	22	1.3	11	2.5	33	1.6	
Civil servant unskilled	6	0.4	2	0.5	8	0.4	
Civil servant uniformed	78	4.7	26	5.9	104	5.0	
Farm worker	2	0.1	2	0.5	4	0.2	
Works in the diaspora	4	0.2	2	0.5	6	0.3	
Other (student, traditional healer)	2	0.1	4	0.9	6	0.3	
Total	1651	100.0	438	100.0	2089	100.0	

Table 2-12: Current profession of land beneficiaries

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, 2005/06, Household questionnaire, N=2089

There are more beneficiaries (626) from the private sector than those from the public sector (435). Approximately 50 percent of land recipients within the A2 have either managerial or semi-skilled backgrounds from the private sector and the public sector. The biggest category of land beneficiaries in the A1 are those with private sector semi-skilled experience (22.2 percent). These findings suggest the availability of different skills and management capacities that could influence the form of social organization and agency that emerge. The individuals that have been resettled seem to have some levels of knowledge of processes of trade and hierarchical organization (i.e. an understanding of how bureaucracies work).

## 2.4 Farm residency and homesteads

One of the enduring legacies shaping rural social organization in Zimbabwe has been the tendency of most households to operate simultaneously with the urban and rural economies. Through changes in the structure of the political economy from around 1903, the indigenous population was increasingly becoming partially integrated into the wage economy due to diminishing access to land, increasing taxation and an increasingly Government protected and competitive agriculture sector (Van Onselenn, 1980). The process was partial due to the fact that, despite the diminishing access to land, migration into wage economy sectors was controlled through pass laws that restricted urban or mine compound residence for workers only. Furthermore, the situation was worsened by the low wages paid to mine and farm workers which necessitated the need to supplement the wages with subsistence farming. Bush and Cliffe (1984) apply observe that there is vagueness when it comes to class identity on the wage working class and the peasantry, as the system perpetuated by the settler regime, encouraged migrant labour which was maintained in the wage economy but reproduced in peasant economy. These processes led to a perpetual contradiction between proletarianisation and a politically enduring functional dualism by which petty commodity production in the communal areas and especially female unwaged labour would subsidise the social reproduction of male labour on mines and farms (Moyo and Yeros, 2005).

Indeed, the practice has continued into post-colonial Zimbabwe. In the early 1990's it was estimated through an organizational survey of trade unions that 75 percent of households maintained dual homes in town and country, suggesting that the dominant phenomenon is neither the middle peasant ideal type for full proletarianisation, but semi-proletarianisation whereby petty commodity production and wage labour together sustain the household.

Residency of plot	By mo	lel type	By district of study (% parentheses)									
owner	A1	A2	Chipinge	Chiredzi	Goromonzi	Kwekwe	Mangwe	Zvimba	Total			
Resident on farm	1072	228	185	143	436	180	100	256	1300			
	(76.6)	(60.0)	(64.2)	(73.0)	(74.4)	(66.2)	(71.9)	(85.9)	(73.1)			
Communal area	67	12	10	1	32	11	5	20	79			
	(4.8)	(3.2)	(3.5)	(0.5)	(5.5)	(4.0)	(3.6)	(6.7)	(4.4)			
Diaspora	16	5	2	0	5	2	12	0	21			
	(1.1)	(1.3)	(0.7)	(0.0)	(0.9)	(0.7)	(8.6)	(0.0)	(1.2)			
LSCF	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	4			
	(0.1)	(0.8)	(1.4)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.2)			
Urban area	234	131	87	52	113	69	22	22	365			
	(16.7)	(34.5)	(30.2)	(26.5)	(19.3)	(25.4)	(15.8)	(7.4)	(20.5)			
Prison farms	9	1	0	0	0	10	0	0	10			
	(0.6)	(0.3)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(3.7)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.6)			
Total	1399	380	288	196	586	272	139	298	1779			
	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)			

 Table 2-13: Residency of plot owners in newly resettled areas

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

The AIAS inter-district study found out that, 73.1 percent of land beneficiaries were resident on their plots in the newly resettled areas (Table 2-13). Across the model types, the A1 sector had a higher percentage (76.6 percent) of beneficiaries resident on the farms in comparison to the A2 sector (60.0 percent). Even peri-urban areas such as Goromonzi (74.4 percent) and Zvimba (85.9 percent) have high numbers of households that are permanently resident on the farm (Table 2-13).

On the surface these trends suggest a reversal of the division of the household between the wage economy and the peasant economy. The majority of the plot owners (20.5 percent) not resident in the newly resettled areas lived in the urban areas. The A2 sector had the higher percentage of plot owners resident in the urban areas (34.5 percent) in comparison to the A1 sector (16.7 percent). The A2 sector had stronger linkages to urban areas, since it had a higher proportion of beneficiaries who originated from the urban areas. In certain instances, some households commute from their original communal area homes (4.4 percent) and others from their places of origin within the LSCF areas (0.2 percent) due to the lack of adequate housing facilities in these new areas. The residency patterns were also similar across gender, as the majority of both male (72.7 percent) and female (74.5 percent) land owners were resident on the farms allocated under the FTLRP (Table 2-14).

Residency of	Male		Female		Total			
plot owner	No. of HH	% of HH	No. of HH	% of HH	No. of HH	% of HH		
Resident on farm	1041	72.7	254	74.5	1295	73.0		
Communal area	65	4.5	14	4.1	79	4.5		
Diaspora	17	1.2	3	0.9	20	1.1		
LSCF	4	0.3	0	0.0	4	0.2		
Urban area	297	20.7	68	19.9	365	20.6		
Prison farms	8	0.6	2	0.6	10	0.6		
Total	1432	100.0	341	100.0	1773	100.0		

Table 2-14: Residency of plot owners in newly resettled areas by gender

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

Even when the whole sample population was considered, field evidence showed that residency patterns amongst males and females were similar with most residing in the newly resettled areas, 71.8 percent and 73.6 percent respectively. This seems to suggest a reversal of the common trend found in the communal areas, where women dominate those resident in these areas, whilst most men are in wage employment in the urban areas (see Muchena, 1994; Moyo, 1995; Gaidzanwa, 1995; Chingarande, 2008 etc.)

When compared with the early 1990s data these trends suggest that the land reform could potentially have created conditions of a unitary permanent settlement of beneficiary households. The background provides a more coherent context of why this would be so. The economic structural reforms of the 1990s led to a number of job losses, as critical industries (e.g. manufacturing–textiles) were forced either to cut down on staff need or close down completely. The retrenchments of the 1990s cut across the private and public sectors. Prevailing within the SAP framework was the need for cutting down on expenditure within the public sector and also to place all commodities under open general import Ever since, the Zimbabwe economy has never completely recovered and the period after 2000 has been one of the accelerated economic decline, more job losses and factory closures have been experienced during this period. These factors also partially explain the resurgence of demands for accelerated reform on the policy agenda from the late 1990s suggesting an increase in landlessness.

Interestingly, the issue of residency in the newly redistributed areas is also reflected in the construction of housing facilities to show the commitment to residency in these areas. As discussed later (section 7.3), 62.0 percent of the land beneficiaries had constructed homesteads in the newly resettled and redistributed areas. Some have also constructed houses for their new farm workers (8.1 percent) given that the former farm compounds are still occupied by former farm workers, some of whom are not employed by new farmers. At the same time it is also important to point out that there are some land beneficiaries who still maintain their homes in the communal areas (19.5 percent). The most common reason for maintaining communal area homes was to house extended family members (56.8 percent).

Furthermore, this suggests that the majority of land beneficiaries could have been genuinely in need of land for social reproduction. Survey data shows that of the 2089 households interviewed only 565 (27 percent) have full time wage economy jobs.

## 2.5 Farm labourers' access to residential and agricultural land

Another critical aspect of the FTLRP's distributional efficacy is the nature and extent of access to land for farming and residential purposes by farm workers who were employed by former farmers and by new farm workers, employed now on the remaining LSCF farms and on A1 and A2 farms. Access to land by those farm workers who are not currently employed is also a critical concern.

The current structure of farm workers (employed and unemployed) in the newly settled areas has indeed changed dramatically. For instance, a number of A1 land beneficiaries report providing out labour services on other farms and elsewhere (7.6 percent). The A2 farmers employ former and new farm workers, who reside on the farms they work and on other farms and/or elsewhere. The land rights of farm workers, in terms of their access to residential land and infrastructure on former LSCF land and access to small food security plots, have always been informal and incidental to their provision of specific labour services to landowners. In the current situation most farm workers still have no residential tenure security, social protection or "human capital development support", and this undermines labour productivity. This also complicates assessments of farm workers' access to land.

## 2.5.1 Farm worker residency

The evidence suggests that a sample majority (79.9 percent) of the permanent farm workers have access to land or the compound for their residence. Thus 20.1 percent of the farm workers on the surveyed sites have no access to land for residence on the farm they work, and as such, reside on neighbouring farms (11 percent) or on another location such as a nearby communal area or rural centre. The provision of residency for casual employees on the farms they are employed was on a low scale as 62.0 percent reported that they were provided residency by their employers. When both

permanent and casual employees were aggregated, field evidence showed that 68.7 percent of the farm workers have residence on the mainly A2 farms that they work on, while 19.7 percent of the farm workers have residence on neighbouring farms.

A broader enquiry into the whereabouts or residency of farm workers who were employed by former LSCF farmers suggests that, they were dispersed in seven types of stations or locations: some stay on farms without a job; some are on A2 farms with new jobs; others are on A1 farms with new jobs; some are squatting in 'unclear' areas; others are in communal areas and some went to the towns and cities. The majority of former farm workers who took part in the farm workers' survey indicated that their former workmates remained in the LSCF compounds after the FTLRP (234 or 63.6 percent), whilst others were dispersed in the other sites (Fig 2-6).



# Fig 2-6: Current location of former farm workers

Source: AIAS Farm Worker Questionnaire Survey, N=368

Another unclear index which requires further exploration is that 25.5 percent of the A1 and A2 units surveyed indicate that they have farm workers who are not employed on that farm or its subdivisions, but are resident thereon. The various survey sources and former farm workers interviewed suggest that most former farm workers previously employed in the LSCF sector still resided on the original farms, which had since been redistributed. Thus, it is significant that most of these forms of access to residential land by farm workers remain uncertain and insecure.

For instance, 20.9 percent of the former farm workers identified insecure residence tenure as a critical challenge facing them since the FTLRP. About 17.1 percent of the former farm workers reported having been threatened with eviction by A1 and A2 farmers, and by the Government, while 2.9 percent of them reported having been actually evicted. Farm workers felt it was mainly the Government which was responsible for resolving their residential tenure, and that this should be done by Government providing them with residential land and secure tenure.

# 2.5.2 Former farm worker beneficiaries of farming land

The field survey data suggests that former farm workers comprise a larger proportion of the beneficiaries of farming plots than is reported in official reports or other sources. Overall 8.1 percent of beneficiaries in the sample were farm workers previously employed in the former LSCF (see also Section 2.1.2.1). Most of the former farm workers benefited in the A1 scheme where they accounted for 9.1 percent of the beneficiaries in comparison to 4.5 percent in the A2 scheme (Table 2-6) About

8.1 percent of land beneficiaries originated from the LSCF areas, most likely as former farm workers. The resettlement of former farm worker beneficiaries also varied between districts, as some were more accommodative such as Chipinge and Mangwe where 18.0 percent and 12.4 percent of the beneficiaries originated from the LSCF sector before the FTLRP (see also Section 2.1.2.1). This scale of farm worker beneficiaries is consistent with a recent study by the GoZ and International Organisation on Migration (IOM) which indicated that almost 15.0 percent of former farm workers had accessed land under the FTLRP (GoZ/IOM, 2005).

Preference	Chipi	nge	Goro	monzi	Chir	edzi	Kwe	ekwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	nba	Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No.	%
Re-employment	21	30.0	40	40.4	34	39.1	9	23.1	2	10	12	19.4	118	31.3
Resettlement	41	58.6	40	40.4	46	52.9	19	48.7	15	75	35	56.5	196	52.0
Retrenchment package	5	7.1	9	9.1	1	1.1	4	10.3	2	10	15	24.2	36	9.5
Relocate communal area	3	4.3	10	10.1	6	6.9	5	12.8	1	5	0	0.0	25	6.6
Retirement	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	5.1	0	0	0	0.0	2	0.5
Total	70	100	99	100	87	100	39	100	20	10 0	62	100	377	100

 Table 2-15: Former Farm Worker Preferences before the FTLRP

Source: AIAS Inter-district Farm Worker Survey (2005-2006)

Access to land under the FTLRP was the preferred choice for most former farm workers, as the evidence from the farm workers survey suggests that the majority of farm workers wished (desired) to have access to the redistributed land, either during the FTLRP land acquisition process (51.6 percent of them) and/or after the land allocations (57.3 percent), compared to 31.3 percent and 32.6 percent prior to and after land allocations of the FTLRP respectively, who prioritised re-employment on farms (see Tables 2-15 and 2-16).

The former farm workers reported in separate questions during their interviews that about 14.9 percent of them (in the sample) had gained access to FTLRP resettlement (A1/A2) land for farming purposes. The routes used by farm workers to obtain land were varied, but the majority who were allocated land reported having gained FTLRP land through the district administration offices (52.1 percent). Some also gained land through registration with traditional leaders in their communal areas (13.7 percent), whilst some participated in the land occupations and others were informally allocated land by war veterans and new farmers (23.5 percent). In some cases farm workers did not disclose their status as farm workers when they registered for land under the FTLRP with district administration officials or traditional authorities. Indeed, out of 55 former farm workers (in the sample) who gained access to land under the FTLRP, 37 did not disclose their status.

<b>Table 2-16</b>	: Former Farm	Worker Prefere	ences during the FTLRP

Preference	Chip	inge	Gord	omonzi	Chir	edzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	nba	Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Re-employment	27	37.0	44	44.4	28	30.4	9	22.5	3	14.3	15	24.2	126	32.6
Resettlement	44	60.3	42	42.4	51	55.4	25	62.5	17	81.0	43	69.4	222	57.4
Retrenchment	0	0.0	5	5.1	8	8.7	4	10.0	1	4.8	3	4.8	21	5.4
Repatriation	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.6	1	0.3
Relocate to CA	2	2.7	8	8.1	5	5.4	1	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	16	4.1
Retirement	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
Total	73	100.0	99	100.0	92	100.0	40	100.0	21	100.0	62	100.0	387	100.0

Source: AIAS Inter-district Farm Worker Survey (2005-2006)

In addition, about 8.6 percent of farm workers, who responded to the questions on their working conditions, indicated that they received small land plots from their farm employers as a benefit. Such plots ranged in size from 0.2 to 4 hectares, with the evidence on their farming activities on these plots indicating that the median hectarage they cropped was over 2 hectares. Yet up to 45.4 percent of the farm workers interviewed reported that they were also farmers, meaning that they have access to land somewhere for this purpose. Of this group of 'farm worker-farmers', 22.8 percent practised this farming in the farms they resided on (with 21.2 percent using the farm at large and 1.6 percent using land within the farm worker compound). As well, 21.8 percent of these farm worker-farmers said they had their own A1 plots elsewhere, while the remaining 55.4 percent farmed in the communal area. Indeed, 30.7 percent of these 'farm worker-farmers' reported hiring some labour on their plots mostly on a piecework basis. However, 29.4 percent of all the farm workers interviewed cited 'landlessness' as one of their most critical challenges.

The majority of the farm workers (75.5 percent) who resided on A1 and A2 farms believed that they had a right to use the natural resources (e.g. thatch, firewood, wood, fish and wildlife) found on these lands, and most reported that they had been able to use these resources. A minority reported not being allowed to use these natural resources (particularly fishing and gold panning). In a handful of cases, farm workers reported having been physically confronted for cutting trees. Some of the farm workers thought electrification would solve this problem. Only 19.6 percent of the farm workers interviewed admitted that they were engaged in non-farm income-generating work, most of which entailed selling firewood, extracting sand and wood carvings. These trends underscore the issues of land and natural resources, tenure security and sustainable management raised earlier.

## 2.6 Land access through sharing, rentals and "co-existence"

While the sale of freehold land not acquired by the state is known to be continuing, the nature and extent of recent land market transactions has not yet been researched adequately. Yet the emergence of informal land markets, through renting, subletting or 'sharing', has been observed in the newly redistributed lands (Sukume et al, 2003). The latest A2 leasehold contract retreats from the previous GoZ draft proposal, which outlawed the sharing and subletting of land; the new contract provides for this, on condition that the Minister approves it. The GoZ had originally argued (Utete Report, 2003) that since land was allocated to beneficiaries according to what they said they were able to utilise, there would be no land to sublet or share within the communities. Permission from the lessor to sublet land in the new 99 year leasehold document is to be given without specifying the possible grounds for the approval or refusal of requests, a situation which some fear could be open to abuse by land administrators (Vudzijena, 2007). It has been argued that transparency in the conditions under which ceding or subletting is allowable could help to address local land shortages and land use improvements leading to more efficient utilisation (Sukume et al, 2003). Again, little research has been conducted on the potential land losses the poor could face under a more liberal regulation of land rental markets, or on how to prevent this.

Table 2-17: La	and sharing in ne	w resettlement :	areas by model
----------------	-------------------	------------------	----------------

Is there anyone else	A1		A2		Total		
with access to your land?	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Yes	352	26.8	61	15.2	413	24.1	
No	962	73.2	341	84.8	1303	75.9	
Total	1314	100.0	402	100.0	1716	100.0	

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire

Nonetheless, field evidence suggests that a number of A2 farmers who are short of either arable or grazing land in relation to their current scale of production and apparent capacities for land utilisation should rent land (Sukume et al, 2005; AIAS Survey, 2007). The field survey found only 0.9 percent of A2 farmers who openly declared to be engaged in such rentals, which is low when compared to China for instance<sup>21</sup>. Sometimes this informal arrangement of renting of extra land is sanctioned by the land authorities on underutilised plots, and/or on unallocated lands.

Anyone else	Chip	inge	Chir	edzi	Gord	omonzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	ıba	Total	
with access to	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
your land?														
Yes	45	13.8	29	13.4	153	26.6	131	89.7	29	20.0	26	8.5	413	24.1
No	282	86.2	187	86.6	422	73.4	15	10.3	116	80.0	281	91.5	1303	75.9
Total	327	100.0	216	100.0	575	100.0	146	100.0	145	100.0	307	100.0	1716	100.0

 Table 2-18: Land sharing in new resettlement areas by district

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire

A phenomenon referred to as 'sharing' of land was also observed, in which neighbours, relatives and even "squatters" were allowed to use some of the landholders' land without necessarily paying a fee. Up to 26.8 percent of the A1 beneficiaries practised this in comparison to 15.2 percent of the households in the A2 scheme (Table 2-17). The extent of land sharing in newly resettled areas was more prevalent in Kwekwe District where it was reported by close to 90.0 percent of the beneficiaries followed by Goromonzi District (26.6 percent) (Table 2-18). In other remaining districts, land sharing was reported by less than 20.0 percent of the households in general.

Non-farm owners	A1		A2		Total	
with access to land	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
None	962	73.9	341	84.8	1303	76.5
Relative/friends	229	17.6	42	10.4	271	15.9
Squatters	10	0.8	5	1.2	15	0.9
Former farm workers	13	1.0	6	1.5	19	1.1
Former commercial farmers	21	1.6	2	0.5	23	1.4
Family members	34	2.6	5	1.2	39	2.3
Farm cooperatives	1	0.1	-	-	1	0.1
Gold miners and millers	29	2.2	-	-	29	1.7
Current farm workers	2	0.2	-	-	2	0.1
Urban dwellers	-	-	1	0.2	1	0.1
Total	1301	100.0	402	100.0	1703	100.0

Table 2-19: Non-farm owners with access to land by model

#### Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire

Land was mostly shared with relatives and friends, as this accounted for close to 16.0 percent of the sampled households (Table 2-19). Other categories of people who shared land with beneficiaries included (former and current) farm workers (1.2 percent), gold miners and millers (1.7 percent), nuclear family members (2.3 percent), former commercial farmers (1.4 percent) and "squatters" (0.9 percent).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup>A study on land markets in China (Yao, 2000) found less than 5 percent of the landholdings were involved in such rentals, and argues why this is so.

Inter-district analysis also revealed some interesting patterns of land sharing especially for Kwekwe District, where close to 8.0 percent of the beneficiaries reported that, they were sharing land with former commercial farmers, whereas in the other districts this was limited to less than 1.5 percent of the beneficiaries (Table 2-20). Furthermore, just over 20.0 percent of households in Kwekwe District – which is endowed with gold resources – reported sharing land with gold miners and millers. The current underutilisation of land in general, due to various factors such as farmers' capacities, input supply bottlenecks, and the fact that some land has not been allocated, seems to promote land subletting (GoZ, 2007). Some new landowners face temporary or long-term problems (e.g. illness, deaths resulting in orphan hood, desertion, divorce and pecuniary problems) which constrain their land utilisation, and they rent out land as a survival strategy (Sukume et al, 2004).

Non-farm	Chip	oinge	Chir	edzi	Gore	omonzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	ıba	Total	
owners with	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
access to land														
None	282	86.2	187	87.8	422	74.4	15	10.4	116	80.0	281	91.5	1303	76.5
Relative/friends	37	11.3	19	8.9	98	17.3	82	56.9	22	15.2	13	4.2	271	15.9
Squatters	2	0.6	-	-	5	0.9	2	1.4	1	0.7	5	1.6	15	0.9
Former farm	3	0.9	-	-	9	1.6	1	0.7	1	0.7	5	1.6	19	1.1
workers														
Former	-	-	3	1.4	7	1.2	11	7.6	-	-	2	0.7	23	1.4
commercial														
farmers														
Family	-	-	4	1.9	26	4.6	4	2.8	5	3.4	-	-	39	2.3
members														
Farm	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.3	1	0.1
cooperatives														
Gold miners	-	-	-	-	-	-	29	20.1	-	-	-	-	29	1.7
and millers														
Current farm	2	0.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0.1
workers														
Urban dwellers	1	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.1
Total	327	100.0	213	100.0	567	100.0	144	100.0	145	100.0	307	100.0	1703	100.0

 Table 2-20: Non-farm owners with access to land by district

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire

There are cases, such as dairy farms with high sunk costs, where the farm size limitations are considered by some farmers to necessitate their renting of additional grazing land from neighbours. Some plot holders with large farm infrastructures claim that these can only be used to optimal capacity if the custodian plot holders or their neighbours are able to gain access to more arable land (e.g. for tobacco or horticulture) on a rental basis, through subletting underutilised land or by exchanging land pieces to augment their arable land for specific crop enterprises. Thus, some A2 farmers claim that the lease subletting conditions should be less rigid, while preventing the reconcentration of land holdings and control through blocking outright land sales and ensuring fair rental fee payments and contracts<sup>22</sup>.

The one-household-one-farm policy which constraints legal land concentration is considered feasible and effective, if pursued alongside regulated land sharing arrangements, given that – in a dynamic farming industry – farmers with the capacity to work larger holdings should have an opportunity to expand their land sizes (Sukume et al, 2004). Farmers who wish to farm only a small fraction of their holdings (e.g. those going into flowers) should be allowed to let or cede the rest of their holdings to other farmers (Ibid). Establishing a regulated land rental or leasing market (e.g. with maximum area sizes as is done in India) and/or offloading land to new aspiring farmers would enable these variations in plot size. The adjustment of land allocations to bring in new farmers and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup>Personal communication with A2 farmers in the Norton area.

of the use of underutilised land through subletting may well be a critical mechanism for increasing the production of a variety of crops among the few new élite, given that agricultural financing is still low (Ibid).

But whether this would enhance the legitimacy of the A2 tenure system is a moot and untested point. The flexibility in the maximum farm size regulations (as a 'guideline') may well lead to the upward adjustment of land allocations to a few and to the exclusion of many others<sup>23</sup>. The purported advantage of a regulated land exchange system is that it would maintain the breadth of land ownership while at the same time, ensuring that land is fully utilised. These debates suggest that the question of designing a regulated land market, based on real practises on the ground, while defending against land concentration, is very much on the policy agenda, particularly that of the élite.

## 2.7 Concluding Statement

It is clear that the FTLRP has broadened access to land and related natural resources to a diverse set of beneficiaries dominated by landless and/or land short peasants from the Communal Areas. The beneficiaries of the FTLRP go beyond those formally allocated land by the state to include others who are labelled as ""squatters"" who co-exist with formal land beneficiaries under different land sharing arrangements. The position of women has vastly improved in newly redistributed areas in comparison to the communal areas as a sizeable proportion were allocated land in their own right, while some benefitted as joint owners through the marital institution. The plot sizes allocated under the FTLRP are much larger than in communal areas. This suggests the need for some form of extra labour on top of that which can be called household labour. Furthermore, the farm sizes imply that there is need for some level of farm mechanization. The next section discusses land tenure arrangements and land conflicts that are arising in newly redistributed areas following the FTLRP.

 $<sup>^{23}</sup>$ It was evident during 2003 and 2005 that a number of A2 landholders were bidding with land administrators to get their plots 'rationalised' upwards as a response to the Utete Review's proposal that national farm sizes be corrected or "re-planned", in what was commonly referred to as plot "consolidations". This meant the combining of two or more A2 plot allocations and, in some cases, it entailed attempts (some successful) to evict A2 or A1 neighbours (AIAS Survey Field Observations, 2005/06). But the data on this is also scant, while the number of A2 plots has increased to about 18 000.

# **3.0 LAND TENURE, RESOURCE CONTROLAND CONFLICTS**

Land reform substantially transformed agricultural land (property) relations, beyond the distributional question, by extending state land ownership to the bulk of Zimbabwe's prime land, and by expanding leasehold and permissory or permit forms of tenure. This reduced the area of freehold tenures in agricultural land, and limited the place of land markets in the social and economic relations of agricultural production and in social reproduction. In addition, the reform altered the land administration system at the central and local Government levels, as well as the legal framework of land law. This section firstly examines the forms of land tenure and tenure security obtaining in newly resettled areas. This is followed by an examination of land displacements and/or eviction of new land beneficiaries. Lastly, the nature of land conflicts that are currently being experienced in the newly resettled areas and mechanisms being utilised to redress these at the local level, are assessed.

## 3.1 Forms of land tenure and tenure security: local perspective

## 3.1.1 Forms of land tenure in practice

Various issues determine the perceived and actual security of tenure in the land held by beneficiaries. One of these factors is the method used to access land, the patterns of which were discussed earlier. The approaches used to gain access to land are useful not only in determining the resultant patterns of land distribution among beneficiaries, but also in discerning the potential sources of land tenure insecurity. The method or procedure used to confirm access to land is cited by beneficiaries as one critical land policy deficiency, since they remain uncertain over the granting of land offer permits or letters, and there are administrative gaps in ensuring that those with official land offers have secure tenure. Another factor which engenders insecurity of land tenure among beneficiaries, including those who have formal letters of offer to the land, was the degree to which they faced threats and actual evictions from the land.

Much of the literature on the FTLRP programme's security of tenure tends to be based on the authors' own value judgement or assessment of the efficacy of the official communications of land offers to the beneficiary through for instance offer letters. Rarely do they examine the beneficiaries' own view of such security, which is what the AIAS survey accomplishes. Self-declared forms of tenures held by land beneficiaries tend to vary from official or formal allocations of land tenure documents in the form permits for A1 scheme and 99 year leaseholds for A2 scheme, given that (so far) the formal landholding permits or lease documents have not been given out. In other words, only letters or verbal statements of land offers had so far been granted, which was confirmed by 78.5 percent of the land beneficiaries (Table 3-1). Up to 9.9 percent said they already had GoZ lease papers, when in fact these have officially not yet been issued. This reflects a misinterpretation or misunderstanding of the nature and terms of the land permits or leases to be allocated, vis-à-vis the A2 letters of land offer and A1 documents provided to assign land to the beneficiaries.

Type of documents	Possession of	A1		A2		Total	
	Documents	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Offer letter	Yes	1110	78.9	299	77.3	1409	78.5
	No	297	21.1	88	22.7	385	21.5
	Total	1407	100.0	387	100.0	1794	100.0
Title deeds	Yes	99	6.8	22	5.5	121	6.5
	No	1352	93.2	381	94.5	1733	93.5
	Total	1451	100.0	403	100.0	1854	100.0
Lease agreement papers	Yes	98	9.7	26	11.0	124	9.9
	No	914	90.3	210	89.0	1124	90.1
	Total	1012	100.0	236	100.0	1248	100.0

Table 3-1: Possession of relevant land tenure documents by model

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire

Yet this attitude among some of the interviewees to self-declare that they have the, as yet unissued, formal land tenure documents is telling, as it tends to reflect the beneficiaries' confidence in the definitiveness of transitional land allocation processes, and perhaps a belief that the promise by the GoZ that land tenures will be provided is assured. For the A1 beneficiaries, their interpretation of a permit may be a loose understanding of the notion, akin to the right to use and control land found in communal areas. Further enquiry showed that a small minority (13.9 percent), however, doubted the security of their current forms of land tenure, as they deemed their current tenure to be either vaguely stated or involving non-existent forms of formal land tenure documents that are being issued or will be issued by the GoZ in the form of permit and leases. For instance, this group included those who defined their landholding right as an "occupation" (4.5 percent of the total sample); another 1.8 percent considered it a license and 0.5 percent considered that they were "caretaking". This suggests that the landholders probably did not yet have any formal offer letter of land, verbally or documented.

As shown earlier, between 1.0 percent and 25.0 percent of the sample had sublet or leased out or shared land with other people who are not official land beneficiaries. This confirms an additional form of land tenure in the area, albeit an illegal and therefore insecure form of land tenure. Only 82.6 percent claim to have actually been officially offered land by the GoZ. Thus, altogether about 17.4 percent of the sample, distributed almost equally between the A1 and A2 beneficiaries, seems to have an unclear or doubtful land tenure status. These tenures could probably be disputed by the state or other beneficiaries at some future point.

Indeed, about 20.6 percent of the sample clearly stated that not only are they without land tenure documents, but that they encounter problems because of not having such documentation. Thus, a substantial minority find not having a clearly defined formal GoZ tenure document as being problematic. The problems they cited facing because of this include uncertainty and failure to access loans and/or financial resources. The group that faces uncertainty is almost equally divided between A1 and A2 beneficiaries, while a large majority of those who cite facing problems of access to finance and resources because of their lack of land tenure documentation, are A2 landholders. Yet, about 75.7 percent of those who indicated that they faced land tenure problems admitted that they had not done much to procure such documents (e.g. by lobbying the GoZ), while the others claimed they relied on their own financial resources, and were not bothered about loans and land as collateral.

In sum, the formality of tenure consciously in thought (as stated) and in practice or experience (considering that the problems indicated as encountered are factually true/correct), does not so far bother the majority of the land beneficiaries, most of whom are A1 landholders.

## 3.1.2 Tenure security

The land tenure security situation within the new landholding and tenure system is subject to various struggles over access to land and the social relations of production, which are highlighted by emergent class, gender and ethno-regional differentiations. Tenure inequity arises when the following are not ensured: equitable access to land, secure inheritance rights, the right to benefit equally from one's labour on land, and the protection of the land rights allocated from displacements, including eviction or the threat of it. The latter can include threats related to unjust demands by the state (alongside the traditional leadership) or related parties (husbands, farm employers, etc.) for various services (labour, benefit sharing, etc.) placed upon certain sections of the beneficiaries and/or the excluded, over whom some form of authority has been imposed. Class, ethno-regional and gender inequality in land tenure relations relate particularly to the unequal power relations and/or capacities of vulnerable social groups, such as women, farm workers, poor peasants and less educated small farming and landless households.

## 3.1.2.1Gender relations in land tenure

Regarding the gender relations of land tenure, which entails oppressive customary and policy-based patriarchal relations, inequitable land rights apply especially to vulnerable women (including the aged, divorcees, single women and the childless, particularly those without a son), as well as to married women, especially those in polygamous relationships (see Gaidzanwa, 1995; Chingarande, 2006; Chingarande, 2008; Paradza, 2007).

Available empirical evidence on women's access to redistributed land in their own right is varied. Government sources indicate that about 17 percent of the land beneficiaries were women (Utete Report, 2003; GoZ Audits, 2007; Buka Report, 2002). Other studies suggest that these beneficiaries constitute between 10 percent and 28 percent of the total (WLZ, 2007; Chingarande, 2006; Sadomba, 2006; Jiriria, 2007). Notably, research has so far not adequately exposed the effectiveness of such land access in terms of control of the benefits. Tenure insecurity from evictions (or the threat of same) was found among 12 percent of beneficiaries.

The sources of gendered land tenure inequity appear to relate to the constraints faced by women in applying for land – bureaucratic constraints, gender biases among the selection structures (which comprise mainly men), the lack of information on the application process, and inadequate mobilisation by women's activist organisations around the issue of applications. The GoZ selection system for A2 applicants gives women more score points at the starting line, but this has not adequately increased the proportion of their access. Women reportedly tended to use their husbands' physical addresses in applying for A2 land, with the expected or implied danger that men in this process had 'gifted' control over land by women who did not have an 'independent' physical address. Cultural (patriarchal) and ideological prescriptions that define property and the home as belonging to the husband contradict and undermine official GoZ's stance on land tenure issues.

The empirical evidence on whether the land tenures on which access to land is provided to households, rather than individual applicants, is also weak. Reports from both Government and civil society actors (NGOs, scholars, farm labour unions, etc.) suggest that, so far, the majority of the offer letters (in A2 schemes) and A1 permit allocations issued have been given in the name of the male spouses. There are also reports that some women, who had been given these tenure documents as individuals, reversed this by going back and getting Government officials to re-issue them in their husbands' names.

The GoZ policy is to offer spouses joint tenure (Ministry of Land; GoZ officials)<sup>24</sup>, but GoZ officials argue that the policy does not allow them to 'force' applicants applying individually to register jointly and/or to refuse the reversal of joint land offers, as this would be regarded as an intrusion into matrimonial affairs; in addition, their powers to insist on joint registration are not enforceable in law. Thus, while officials are expected to and do tend to encourage joint registration, those who are gender biased may not do so, leading to a situation in which the practice varies across the provinces (Ibid.).

The effective implementation of the gendered aspects of land tenure policy is limited by the preponderance of men in decision-making (Utete Report, 2003). In the land administration structures – GoZ land officials at national and district level land offices, National Land Board members, provincial and district land committees' members, traditional leaderships, and district administrators – women constitute less than 10 percent of those employees in positions of influence. The empirical evidence on the equitability of the distribution of Government inputs and credit support (and the benefits from women's labour and investments into land) is also weak, although observers (WLZ, 2006) suggest that these benefits are less easily accessed by women. This administrative inequity, alongside the absence of legally enforceable statutes to ensure equitable access and tenures, and the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup>Personal communication and interviews with Government officials.

limited capacity of women's organisations to mobilise for redress<sup>25</sup> within the prevailing patriarchal power relations of society, as well as the structural tendency that make more women poorer and less educated (and, therefore, lacking the resources of struggle), have limited the overall gender balancing of tenure rights.

In general, women's land rights have been restricted by the patriarchal conceptualisation of state policy and planning processes, as well as discriminatory implementation practices. Thus, the farmer "tends to be conceptualised as a man"<sup>26</sup>, as is the 'head of household', and access to land, tenure documents and Government support are restricted by this (WLZ, 2007). Furthermore, an important barrier to women's access to A2 land is the gender insensitive and onerous requirement that applicants should have the 'means' to farm, or prove their productiveness over the past three years, for them to be recommended for the issuance of a lease. Given women's structurally limited histories of capital accumulation, this leads to their lack of collateral to access credit. Women lack basic items such as scotch carts, oxen and savings, let alone vehicles, tractors and urban houses, which are also used as security and enable farmers to have a 'production record'.

While recognising that fewer women benefited in their individual right from the fast track process, in comparative African terms, this proportion (estimates vary between 10 and 28 percent) is relatively high<sup>27</sup>. Various aspects of customary law and practice underlie the discrimination against women in terms of access to land and asset accumulation in general, exacerbating the various disadvantages that face women as a result of their institutionalised insecurity in marriages and over divorces. These include inequities over inheritance of land, the division of property on divorce and the male head of household's control over resources such as commodity sales, income and cattle.

### 3.1.2.2 Class based tenure inequities and legitimacy

The key class based tenure inequity from the redistributed land and assigned tenures relates to the fact that A2 farmers, who generally comprise a 'better off' category of land beneficiaries (in terms of education, incomes from past or present jobs, assets, savings, etc.), were provided with leasehold tenure on relatively larger plots compared to permit tenure provided to the poorer A1 land beneficiaries<sup>28</sup>. In theory (for now) the leasehold provides a priori greater breadth of rights than the permit although there tends to be a much lower perception of tenure insecurity among A1 beneficiaries. Moreover, the permit tenure combines individual household rights with group rights over grazing lands, which may expose the beneficiaries to the wider risks of controlling resource utilisation by non-members and the unequal extraction of resources by the 'better–off', especially those with access to more cattle (of their own or 'kept' for association or on behalf of others) to graze.

Yet the class basis of tenure insecurity appears to be simmering around the contestation of the legitimacy of the level of land rights allocated to A2 beneficiaries, rather than involving the tenure system per se. Popular demand among the lower and middle class strata of society for a share of the redistributed land, especially from the larger sized allocations, suggests a threat to some A2 farmers. There is a perception that better off classes of people received larger land sizes than they required and that some of them can use, at least in the short term, while some of the vulnerable but needy groups (women, the poor, farm workers, etc.) were excluded. In some respects this concern reflects inter-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup>Recently (2006/7) a new 'women farmers association' was formed by WLZ (a network representing thirty NGOs). Membership of the association is still limited, while a few women lead existing farmers unions or new ones.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup>Mandimika, personal communication

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup>Few studies or audits in Zimbabwe articulate the proportion of men who benefited as individuals rather than husbands or 'heads of household'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup>A1 farmers mainly comprise people who originated from various rural occupations – peasants, farm workers, other workers, etc.

class and intra-class (across party political, gender, ethnicity and racial lines) competitive bidding for access to land. The right to access commercial farming land reflects an élite intra-class demand.

## 3.1.2.3 The land tenure situation of farm workers

Farm workers lost the most from land redistribution due to their loss of homes, employment and the compensation of severance benefits<sup>29</sup>. At least 150 000 former commercial farm workers (Magaramombe, 2003; Chambati and Moyo, 2004) have been left without secure housing, land or jobs and their receipt of wages has become precarious. Based on various estimates (Magaramombe, 2003; Chambati and Moyo, 2004), farm workers constituted about ten percent (or 15 000) of the beneficiaries. The rest are either still living within the redistributed farming areas' former farm compounds providing casual labour to A2 and A1 farmers, or are squatting on pieces of land within the farming areas. There are reported cases of eviction and conflict between former farm workers and newly settled farmers.

The land rights of farm workers, in terms of their access to residential land and infrastructure on former LSCF land and access to small food security plots, have always been informal and incidental to their provision of specific labour services to landowners. In the current situation, most farm workers still have no residential tenure security, social protection or "human capital development support", and this undermines labour productivity. Labour disputes generate resistance by new A2 land owners to engage former farm workers, leading to labour shortages and local conflict between the new farmers and former farm workers still residing on some farm compounds in A2 areas<sup>30</sup>.

Most former farm workers who are currently unemployed are women (Chambati and Moyo, 2004) They lack access to land and secure residential land rights, as well as to alternative income-generation opportunities. It is mostly the skilled former farm workers who managed to be re-engaged by the new farmers. Women farm workers tend, as in the past, to be subjected to piecemeal and casual labour tasks, with the lowest wages. This system also often requires the deployment of child labour on short and insecure work contracts. The tenure of women workers is the least secure and is dependent on husbands, employers and at times 'foremen', who frequently engage in sexual harassment. Their capacity to advocate for better labour rates and residential tenure rights is weak. As well, these women rely on gold panning as alternative employment to ameliorate their poverty and insecurity. However, due to the strenuous and physical demands of small scale gold mining, they depend on the less productive alluvial gold panning as an alternative income source. Current tenure policy does not address either the structural problem of gender equity in access to land and social reproduction, or the wider accommodation of the land rights of farm workers.

## 3.1.2.4 Ethno-regional exclusion and 'belonging'

Inter-regional or provincial grievances over access to A2 land, which at times cut along ethnoregional lines, have been a simmering aspect of intra-class (especially élite) competition and struggles over land. Firstly, there has been a general tendency for access to A2 land to be restricted to those who 'belong' to a particular province (or to exclude those who do not), such that only those from the province applied for land or were even considered in the allocation. The popular trend has been for élites to either seek land near the town they live in or to apply for land in their 'home area' (kumusha).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup>Estimates (Magaramombe, 2003; Chambati and Moyo, 2004) indicate that there were about 175 000 fulltime farm workers prior to the FTLRP, and an equal number of part time workers. Of these, about 80 000 retained their employment on the remaining white and black large scale commercial farms, parastatal farms, church owned farms and large scale plantations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup>In addition, in A2 areas, some new farmers distrust former farm workers due to their perceived loyalties to former LSCF owners, while farm workers also perceive new farmers as poor employers. In some areas, former farm workers are alleged to be involved in theft, stock rustling and other socially 'undesirable' activities (excessive drinking, prostitution and so on).

Eventually, the latter trend became more dominant when conflicts between A2 beneficiaries who 'belong' and those who do not surfaced. Indeed, there have been many cases of local élites pushing for the exclusion of 'strangers', who had been allocated land in some provinces<sup>31</sup>.

Thus, particularly during the height of land bidding (2000 to 2003), there were many 'evictions' or unfair rejections of applicants on ethno-regional grounds. For instance, applications of potential A2 beneficiaries in say Mashonaland West could be rejected because their areas of origin or kumusha is in Masvingo Province. Furthermore, some later land occupations, including by the landless, entailed struggles between 'autochthones' and 'alogenes'<sup>32</sup>. To date this remains a threat, mainly to tenure security among A2 beneficiaries who are considered not to have socially and politically constructed ethno-regional identities, which in any case are quite malleable.

This insecurity does not apply so much to A1 beneficiaries because most (over 70 percent) of the land allocated was distributed to people from within the relevant district or province, although this already reflected an ethno-regional bias given that the selection of beneficiaries was from neighbouring areas. Yet, as argued earlier, even in this instance former farm workers tended not to be seen as 'belonging' to an area where they may have worked for decades, and they tended to be excluded from A1 land allocations because these prioritised the 'indigenes', while they were often labeled as 'foreign'.

Therefore, when we consider the range of struggles over land in relation to various categories of the "elite", vis-à-vis peasants and the working classes (especially farm workers), as well as in relation to the diverse (perceived and actual) ethno-regional and nationality identities, and in terms of gender based discrimination, the scope of the tenure insecurity problem is diverse, particularly within A2 areas, even if it may not have been widespread. This, however, does not mean that there are no property rights per se, but that the potential for insecurity and land conflicts is real. For this reason, the new land rights need effective protection by a land administration system with adequate capacities to fairly resolve land disputes in principle.

#### 3.2 Land displacements, evictions and threats

The security of remaining on the landholding among actual or self-declared land beneficiaries is also a critical measure of the pattern of land tenure security derived from the FTLRP. Media representations of the FTLRP suggest that most beneficiaries, especially in A1 schemes, are being evicted from the land, especially those who had originally led the land occupations. Yet the survey found that approximately 16 percent of the land beneficiaries had been threatened with eviction, once or more times on the plot they reside (Table 3-2). Threats were slightly higher in the A1 schemes where 16.5 percent of the households faced eviction threats in comparison to 13.6 percent of the A2 households. Eviction threats from the land were more prevalent in peri-urban districts such as Goromonzi where 31.0 percent of the households faced eviction threats because of the greater competition for land closer to the capital city, Harare (Table 3-3). In the other survey districts, eviction threats were generally encountered by less than 17.0 percent of the households.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup>In a Mashonaland West example it was alleged that a list of non-indigenes had been compiled for purposes of their ejection (See Mutingwende, 2004). The case of Humphrey Malumo is a notable one.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup>"Autochthones" are those who are considered to be indigenous to the area i.e. their "kumusha" is located in that district or province whilst the "alogenes" are considered foreign to the area and do not originate in that district of province

Received	A1		A2		Total	
threats	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	207	16.5	48	13.6	257	15.8
No	1051	83.5	19	86.4	1370	84.2
Total	1258	100.0	369	100.0	1627	100.0

 Table 3-2: Eviction threats received by beneficiaries by model

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, 2005/06, Household questionnaire

Table 3-3: Eviction threats received by beneficiaries by district

Received	Chip	inge	Chir	edzi	Goro	monzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	ıba	Total	
threats ?	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	14	5.1	21	9.7	138	31.0	26	10.8	7	4.8	51	16.6	257	15.8
No	259	94.9	195	90.3	307	69.0	215	89.2	138	95.2	256	83.4	1370	84.2
Total	273	100.0	216	100.0	445	100.0	241	100.0	145	100.0	307	100.0	1627	100.0

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, 2005/06, Household questionnaire

The survey evidence suggests that just over one percent of the households had been threatened by GoZ officials, while former LSCF farmers had threatened 1.7 percent with eviction, local authorities threatened 4.0 percent and neighbours, 1.9 percent (Table 3-4). The sources of eviction threats thus varied, indicating a broader base of disputes over land rights than simply GoZ-based policy or elite threats, and a generally low level of such threats.

Who threatened farmer with eviction?	A1		A2		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Was not threatened with eviction	1055	86.2	321	88.7	1376	86.8
Other farmers	4	0.3	2	0.6	6	0.4
Former white farmers	20	1.6	7	1.9	27	1.7
Government	10	0.8	7	1.9	17	1.1
Local authority	52	4.2	11	3.0	63	4.0
Neighbour	23	1.9	7	1.9	30	1.9
Soldiers	35	2.9	1	0.3	36	2.3
Influential individuals	4	0.3	-	-	4	0.3
War vets	14	1.1	5	1.4	19	1.2
Mkwasine Estate	2	0.2	-	-	2	0.1
Relatives	5	0.4	-	-	5	0.3
Squatters	-	-	1	0.3	1	0.1
Total	1224	100.0	362	100.0	1586	100.0

Table 3-4: Sources of eviction threats received by land beneficiaries

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, 2005/06, Household questionnaire

Actual evictions affected only 7.3 percent of the sampled beneficiaries (Table 3-5). Slightly more A1 households (7.7 percent) were actually evicted from their farms in comparison to A2 households (5.7 percent). The peri-urban district of Goromonzi, which had a higher percentage of households encountering eviction threats, also had the highest percentage of households (16.5 percent) who were actually evicted from their farms (Table 3-6). The sources of actual evictions were varied to include Government officials (0.8 percent), local authorities (1.0 percent), former white farmers who led evictions through court orders (0.5 percent), and unemployed youths from towns (0.1 percent) who were possibly representing indigenous elite amongst others (Table 3-7). In addition, the data suggests that most of these self-declared evictees had subsequently gained access to land on other plots. But this household data does not necessarily tell us about those who did not get any other land, and might be "squatting" elsewhere, as we shall see as follows.

Evicted	A1		A2		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	92	7.7	20	5.7	112	7.3
No	1102	92.3	329	94.3	1431	92.7
Total	1194	100.0	349	100.0	1543	100.0

Table 3-5: Actual evictions of land beneficiaries by model

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, 2005/06, Household questionnaire, N=2089

## Table 3-6: Actual evictions of land beneficiaries by district

Evicted	Chip	inge	Chir	edzi	Gord	monzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	nba	Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	13	5.0	8	3.9	65	16.5	11	4.7	3	2.1	12	3.9	112	7.3
No	247	95.0	198	96.1	328	83.5	221	95.3	142	97.9	295	96.1	1431	92.7
Total	260	100.0	206	100.0	393	100.0	232	100.0	145	100.0	307	100.0	1543	100.0

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, 2005/06, Household questionnaire

The evidence shows that only 17.9 percent of the actual evictions occurred during 2000 and 2001, while 21.4 percent were evicted in 2004, when new A2 beneficiaries began to claim rights to "their" land. The bulk of the evictions, 41.1 percent, were done in 2003 when the GoZ land reform policy implementation 'corrections' had begun, following the Utete review report in that year.

Who evicted farmer	A1		A2		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Was not evicted	1102	95.2	329	96.2	1431	95.5
Other farmers	2	0.2	-	-	2	0.1
Former white farmers	7	0.6	-	-	7	0.5
Government	4	0.3	8	2.3	12	0.8
Local authority	13	1.1	2	0.6	15	1.0
Neighbour	5	0.4	1	0.3	6	0.4
Soldiers	17	1.5	-	-	17	1.1
Unemployed youths from town	-	-	1	0.3	1	0.1
War vets	7	0.6	1	0.3	8	0.5
Total	1157	100.0	342	100.0	1499	100.0

Table 3-7: Source of actual eviction of land beneficiaries

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, 2005/06, Household questionnaire

These shallow trends of eviction, however, tally with the fact that 9.1 percent of the land beneficiaries said they kept Communal Area homes because they feared that they could be evicted at some point in the future (Table 3-8).

Reason	Chipinge	Chiredzi	Goromonzi	Kwekwe	Mangwe	Zvimba	Total
To boost production	2	4	26	2	1	15	50
_	(4.3)	(13.8)	(23.0)	(5.7)	(5.9)	(27.3)	(16.9)
To reduce risk of crop	0	1	4	0	1	1	7
failure	(0.0)	(3.4)	(3.5)	(0.0)	(5.9)	(1.8)	(2.4)
In case of eviction	0	7	8	3	2	7	27
	(0.0)	(24.1)	(7.1)	(8.6)	(11.8)	(12.7)	(9.1)
Sentimental value	5	7	9	7	5	6	39
	(10.6)	(24.1)	(8.0)	(20.0)	(29.4)	(10.9)	(13.2)
Home to extended family	39	10	66	23	8	22	168
	(83.0)	(34.5)	(58.4)	(65.7)	(47.1)	(40.0)	(56.8)
Availability of a school	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(7.3)	(1.4)
Business area	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	(2.1)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.3)
Total	47	29	113	35	17	55	296
	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.)	(100.0)	(100.0)

Table 3-8: Reason for maintaining a communal home

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, 2005/06, Household questionnaire, N=2089

## 3.3 Land conflicts and sources

The land tenure problems of the beneficiaries are further reflected by the nature and extent of land conflicts which they reported having experienced. Up to 21.9 percent of the beneficiaries reported facing land conflicts (Table 3-9).

### Table 3-9:Involvement of land beneficiaries in land conflicts by model

Land conflicts?	A1		A2		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	317	21.5	92	23.2	409	21.9
No	1157	78.5	305	76.8	1462	78.1
Total	1474	100.0	397	100.0	1871	100.0

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, 2005/06, Household questionnaire

Land conflicts were slightly more prevalent in the A2 scheme where 23.2 percent of the beneficiaries experienced them in comparison to 21.5 percent in the A1 scheme. Land conflicts were generally reported by more households in districts located in the higher potential agro-ecological regions such as Chipinge, Goromonzi and Zvimba districts where over 20.0 percent of the land beneficiaries reported experiencing land conflicts in comparison to 5.5 percent of the households in Mangwe District which is located in Natural Region V (Table 3-10).

## Table 3-10: Land conflicts among beneficiaries by district

Land	Chip	inge	Chir	edzi	Gord	omonzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	ıba	Total	
conflicts	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	67	21.1	41	19.2	163	29.2	61	18.5	8	5.5	69	22.5	409	21.9
No	251	78.9	173	80.8	395	70.8	268	81.5	137	94.5	238	77.5	1462	78.1
Total	318	100.0	214	100.0	558	100.0	329	100.0	145	100.0	307	100.0	1871	100.0

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, 2005/06, Household questionnaire

Nature of land conflicts	A1		A2		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No land conflicts	1157	80.2	305	77.8	1462	79.7
Boundary disputes	145	10.1	42	10.7	187	10.2
Access to natural resources	38	2.6	11	2.8	49	2.7
Access to infrastructure	40	2.8	9	2.3	49	2.7
Animal disputes	-	-	1	0.3	1	1.1
Conflict over land/ownership of land	49	3.4	23	5.9	72	3.9
Double allocation	1	0.1	1	0.3	2	0.1
Eviction	4	0.3	-	-	4	0.2
Exchanging plots	3	0.2	-	-	3	0.2
Fraud/forged documents	1	0.1	-	-	1	0.1
Trespassers	3	0.2	-	-	3	0.2
Land re-planning issues	1	0.1	-	-	1	0.1
Total	1442	100.0	392	100.0	1834	100.0

Table 3-11: Nature of land conflicts by model

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, 2005/06, Household questionnaire

These conflicts included: boundary disputes (10.2 percent); extraction of natural resources (2.7 percent); access to infrastructure (2.7 percent); land ownership or rights (3.9 percent) and the GoZ's land reform re-planning programme (0.1 percent) (Table 3-11). The occurrence of the different sources of land conflicts within the two resettlement schemes were more or less similar except on the land ownership or rights, which was reported by close to 6.0 percent of the A2 households in comparison to 3.4 percent of the A1 households. In all the survey districts, boundary disputes in general were the major source of land conflicts, it was also found that land ownership was more contested in the higher potential agro-ecological districts of Goromonzi (6.0 percent) and Zvimba (9.2 percent) in comparison to the other districts (Table 3-12).

Nature of conflict	Chip	inge	Chir	edzi	Gord	omonzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	ıba	Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No land conflicts	251	78.9	173	83.6	395	73.6	268	82.7	137	96.5	238	77.8	1462	79.7
Access to infrastructure	13	4.1	7	3.4	18	3.4	6	1.9	-	-	5	1.6	49	2.7
Access to natural	10	3.1	5	2.4	18	3.4	6	1.9	2	1.4	8	2.6	49	2.7
resources														
Animal disputes	1	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.1
Boundary dispute	38	11.9	14	6.8	66	12.3	41	12.7	2	1.4	26	8.5	187	10.2
Conflict over	2	0.6	8	3.9	33	6.1	-	-	1	0.7	28	9.2	72	3.9
land/ownership														
Double allocation	2	0.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0.1
Eviction	-	-	-	-	4	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	0.2
Exchanging plots	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	0.9	-	-	-	-	3	0.2
Fraud/forged documents	1	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.1
Land replanning issues	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.3	1	0.1
Trespassing	-	-	-	-	3	0.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	0.2
Total	318	100.0	207	100.0	537	100.0	324	100.0	142	100.0	306	100.0	1834	100.0

 Table 3-12: Source of land conflicts by district

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, 2005/06, Household questionnaire

An examination of the source of the land conflicts, which affect 21.9 percent of the land beneficiaries, in terms of the type of actors whom the beneficiaries allege pose the land conflicts, six types of persona (including individuals and organisations) are identified as the instigators of the conflicts (Table 3-13).

The greatest source of conflicts is reported to come from neighbours, which affected 11.2 percent of the beneficiaries. This source is then followed by a relatively equal number of conflicts instigated by: the GoZ (central Government, extension officials and local authorities) at 2.9 percent; former LSCF farmers and their managers at 2.8 percent; army officials at 1.1 percent; and "illegal" settlers at 0.5 percent. The remaining source of the conflicts (affecting 1.6 percent of the sample) arose from war veterans, former farm workers and gold panners. This diversity in the nature and sources of land conflicts suggests that problems about the definition of land policy and/or its implementation are broadly based and affect the land tenure and management conditions of a significant number of the beneficiaries.

Source of conflict	A1		A2		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No land conflicts	1157	80.5	305	77.6	1462	79.8
AREX	2	0.1	-	-	2	0.1
Estate	3	0.2	-	-	3	0.2
Former farm manager	1	0.1	1	0.3	2	0.1
Former farm worker	6	0.4	1	0.2	7	0.4
Former white farmer	34	2.4	15	3.8	49	2.7
Gold panners	5	0.3	2	0.5	7	0.4
Government	10	0.7	3	0.8	13	0.7
Illegal settlers	7	0.5	3	0.8	10	0.5
Local authority	31	2.2	8	2.0	39	2.1
Neighbour	151	10.5	51	13.0	202	11.0
War vets	11	0.8	3	0.8	14	0.8
Army	20	1.4	1	0.3	21	1.1
Total	1438	100.0	393	100.0	1831	100.0

 Table 3-13: Sources of land conflicts

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, 2005/06, Household questionnaire

In general, 68.0 percent of the farm workers reported that land conflicts in terms of access to residency and to natural resources for their basic needs were the major problem in the newly redistributed areas. These land conflicts arose from the transgression of the boundaries of land beneficiaries, which had not been made clear to them by the GoZ, and the farm workers' own landlessness in general. The second major challenge (noted by 45.2 percent) they faced was problematic relations with the new landholders over sub-standard labour and living conditions. When considering the fact that food insecurity, which was identified as the major challenge by 30.8 percent of the farm workers, is also partly attributable to the lack of access to land for food production, then it is evident that inequitable land rights is a key source of conflict between farm workers and new landholders. Indeed, 13.1 percent of the farm workers interviewed had experienced violence between themselves and the new landholders owing to conflicts emanating from farm workers' access to residency, farming plots and natural resources.

The overall findings suggest that refining the land tenure policy and its implementation procedures, and using a participatory process is critical to improving the FTLRP's performance.

#### 3.4 Land conflict resolution mechanisms and land administration issues

The disputes resolution procedures or mechanisms followed are also critical in defining land tenure security. The evidence on mechanisms used to address evictions from land shows that 3.0 percent of the eviction threats were resolved through intervention of Government officials, whilst court rulings resolved 0.6 percent of the eviction threats (Table 3-14). However, some of the households (0.3 percent) threatened with eviction claim that they simply refused or resisted being removed, suggesting an unclear situation of dispute resolution in a number of cases. Other eviction threats were

resolved through the reallocation of a new plot (0.3 percent), and by the amendment of the constitution in 2006 that withdrew the right of former white farmers to appeal against land acquisition (0.3 percent). Comparing the two resettlement schemes, it was found that in the A1 sector eviction threats were mostly resolved by Government officials, whilst for the A2 farms the courts were the dominant route for the resolution of eviction threats.

How eviction threats were resolved	A1		A2		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No threats of eviction	1051	94.9	319	94.4	1370	94.7
Re-allocated a new plot	3	0.3	1	0.3	4	0.3
Amendment of the constitution	3	0.3	1	0.3	4	0.3
Death of plot owner	1	0.1	-	-	1	0.1
Intervention by authorities	39	3.5	4	1.2	43	3.0
Resisted eviction	3	0.3	2	0.6	5	0.3
Resolved by courts	1	0.1	8	2.4	9	0.6
Not yet resolved	7	0.6	3	0.9	10	0.7
Total	1108	100.0	338	100.0	1446	100.0

Table 3-14: Resolution of eviction threats

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, 2005/06, Household questionnaire

Traditional authorities in the form of chiefs and headmen were also involved in the resolution of land conflicts in newly resettled areas. Separate interview questions indicated that 8.6 percent and 28.1 percent of the land beneficiaries highlighted the pivotal role of the chiefs and headmen in the resolution of land conflicts in the newly resettled areas. From what was highlighted by most households, the headmen play a more critical role in conflict resolution as they interact more frequently with the communities in the traditional authority hierarchy.

## 3.5 Concluding statement

Most land beneficiaries do not cite tenure insecurity as an issue, despite the problems they do face, and less than a fifth report having encountered any type of land conflict. Yet some of the A2 landholders, supported by various stakeholders, demand transferable land rights. It may be that the majority of new landholders, while not necessarily perceiving their tenures to be insecure, feel that the land administration system needs to be more effective in communicating policy and implementing it consistently, so as to enhance their security.

Land redistribution has not yet been brought to its full conclusion especially with regards to land allocations, issuance of formal tenures, compensation for land improvements and the rationalisation of land administration structures. Land tenure insecurity is perceived by some beneficiaries, potential land users and financiers as affecting land utilisation and investments in newly redistributed areas, alongside other issues such as weak financial and input markets, and output pricing. While the tenurial provisions may constitute a constraint to the increased supply of credit for agricultural production, the critical starting point should be that all farmers and rural labourers in redistributed areas need to perceive their landholdings as secure.

Zimbabwe has established a new land tenure system, the property rights system of which most beneficiaries have confidence in. The exceptions to this are among the new commercial farmers. However, the land tenure policy objectives and strategy have tended to be poorly communicated, especially in stipulating the rights and obligations of various persons/entities. Procedures for accessing land and enforcing tenure rights have also not been adequately specified. The latter aspects immediately take us to the next chapter that focuses on land use and agricultural production.

# 4.0 AGRICULTURAL LAND USE AND PRODUCTION

### 4.1 Farm establishment and farm plans

The resettlement of land beneficiaries was not implemented in one uniform pattern as settlement was spread over a three to five year period in most districts. In general, most districts began by allocating land to the A1 sector where demand was perceived to be higher (especially among the land short communal area peasants) before A2 sector allocations were considered<sup>33</sup>. Thus, among other factors, the level of farm establishment and commencement of farming activities tend to be affected by the year in which land was allocated. In terms of farm establishment when a piece of land was allocated, beneficiaries had to prepare and mobilise resources for relocation and for infrastructural requirements, especially for residency and farming operations.

Year	Year	when	farmiı	ng com	mence	ed										
allocated	2000		2001		2002		2003		2004		2005		2000	5	Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
2000	127	46.2	111	40.4	21	7.6	10	3.6	3	1.1	3	1.1	0	0.0	275	14.4
2001	5	0.8	389	59.3	221	33.7	28	4.3	9	1.4	4	0.6	0	0.0	656	34.4
2002	2	0.4	7	1.5	332	71.6	112	24.1	7	1.5	4	0.9	0	0.0	464	24.3
2003	7	3.0	3	1.3	4	1.7	151	65.1	58	25.0	7	3.0	2	0.9	232	12.2
2004	2	1.3	5	3.3	6	3.9	3	2.0	97	63.8	34	22.4	5	3.3	152	8.0
2005	6	5.9	0	0.0	4	3.9	1	1.0	2	2.0	79	77.5	10	9.8	102	5.4
2006	2	8.0	1	4.0	2	8.0	1	4.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	19	76.0	25	1.3
Total	151	7.9	516	27.1	590	31.0	306	16.1	176	9.2	131	100.0	36	100.0	1906	100.0

Table 4-1: Year when piece of land was allocated vs. year when farming commenced

#### Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire

During the early resettlement in the 1980s, Government provided support to beneficiaries through prior infrastructural development in the resettlement areas (roads, houses, schools etc.), actual relocation and farming operations. This was not the case though under the FTLRP<sup>34</sup>. In general, the majority of the land beneficiaries in our sample managed to establish their farming operations in the year they were formally allocated their pieces of land. The incidence of beneficiaries being formally allocated land in a particular year and commencing farming operations in that same year was greatest in the first three years of the FTLRP, where 46.2 percent of those were formally allocated land in 2000 began their farming operations that year and in 2001, above 59 percent did the same (Table 4-1). From 2002 onwards, regardless of the limited state support for pre- and post-resettlement, in general over 65.0 percent of the land beneficiaries in our survey established their farming operations in the year they were formally allocated land (Table 4-1)<sup>35</sup>. For instance, more than 70 percent of the beneficiaries allocated land in 2002 commenced farming operations in the same year. Indeed, some of the beneficiaries who participated in the land occupations commenced farming operations even before their land allocations were confirmed through offer letters. These households were less than 5.0 percent of the beneficiaries allocated land during that year. Overall, 35.0 percent of the land beneficiaries had established farming operations by 2001, meaning that the majority of land beneficiaries have had only three full agricultural seasons prior to the execution of the field surveys in 2005 and 2006.

 $<sup>^{33}</sup>$ See section 2.1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup>The GoZ implemented the first phase of land reform between 1980 and 1997 which redistributed 3.5 million hectares to an estimated 60,000 households (GoZ, 2001).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup>During 2000 and 2001 there were sporadic violence and conflicts over land between land occupiers and former commercial farmers as well as the state, which tended to delay the settlement process (see also section 3.0; Moyo and Yeros, 2007).

Model	Year	Year	when fa	arminș	g comn	nenced	l										
type	allocated	2000		2001		2002		2003		2004		200	5	2000	5	Total	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
A1	2000	85	42.5	83	41.5	20	10.0	10	5.0	1	0.5	1	0.5	-	-	200	100.0
	2001	5	0.9	327	59.7	184	33.6	20	3.6	8	1.5	4	0.7	-	-	548	100.0
	2002	1	0.3	6	1.6	266	70.7	93	24.7	6	1.6	4	1.1	-	-	376	100.0
	2003	6	3.6	1	0.6	3	1.8	113	66.9	39	23.1	5	3.0	2	1.2	169	100.0
	2004	2	1.8	2	1.8	3	2.6	3	2.6	75	65.8	27	23.7	2	1.8	114	100.0
	2005	2	2.7	-	-	4	5.4	1	1.4	2	2.7	57	77.0	8	10.8	74	100.0
	2006	2	100.0	1	5.0	2	10.0	1	5.0	-	-	-	-	14	70.0	20	100.0
	Total	103	6.9	420	28.0	482	32.1	241	16.1	131	8.7	98	6.5	26	1.7	1501	100.0
A2	2000	42	56.0	28	37.3	1	1.3	-	-	2	2.7	2	2.7	-	-	75	100.0
	2001	-	-	62	57.4	37	34.3	8	7.4	1	0.9	-	-	-	-	108	100.0
	2002	1	1.1	1	1.1	66	75.0	19	21.6	1	1.1	-	-	-	-	88	100.0
	2003	1	1.6	2	3.2	1	1.6	38	60.3	19	30.2	2	3.2	-	-	63	100.0
	2004	-	-	3	7.9	3	7.9	-	-	22	57.9	7	18.4	3	7.9	38	100.0
	2005	4	14.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22	78.6	2	7.1	28	100.0
	2006	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	100.0	5	100.0
	Total	48	11.9	96	23.7	108	26.7	65	16.0	45	11.1	33	8.1	10	2.5	405	100.0

 Table 4-2: Year when piece of land was allocated vs. year when farming commenced by model

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Disaggregated analysis shows that the settlement pattern and commencement of farming operations in the A1 and A2 sectors was similar, as the majority of the land beneficiaries interviewed in both sectors initiated farming operations in the year they were formally allocated land. In the A1 scheme, the discrepancy between formal land allocation and commencement of farming operations was greatest in 2000 and 2001 where 42.5 percent and 59.7 percent of the land beneficiaries formally allocated land during these years managed to establish farming operations during the same years respectively (Table 4-2). From 2002 onwards, when the FTLRP allocations had stabilised, more than 65.0 percent of the land beneficiaries allocated in a particular year established farming operations during the same year in the A1 scheme. A similar pattern was also observed amongst A2 land beneficiaries (Table 4-2). This is understandable as some farmers would need some time to make the necessary preparations before embarking fully on farming operations, a process that may require some bit of time depending on the availability of farming resources.

Year	Chip	inge	Chir	edzi	Goro	monzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	nba	Tota	1
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2000	35	10.8	15	9.6	64	9.6	20	5.9	18	12.6	39	13.0	191	9.6
2001	50	15.5	44	26.9	180	26.9	133	39.1	49	34.3	79	26.4	535	26.9
2002	88	27.2	64	33.1	222	33.1	108	31.8	40	28.0	78	26.1	600	30.2
2003	68	21.1	47	14.0	94	14.0	40	11.8	18	12.6	44	14.7	311	15.6
2004	29	9.0	31	7.6	51	7.6	17	5.0	10	7.0	41	13.7	179	9.0
2005	44	13.6	12	6.1	41	6.1	15	4.4	7	4.9	18	6.0	137	6.9
2006	9	2.8	1	2.7	18	2.7	7	2.1	1	0.7	0	0.0	36	1.8

Table 4-3: Year farming operations commenced by district

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Generally, indications are that, the land beneficiaries strove to commence farming operations soon after being formally allocated land. For instance in Kwekwe District, out of 189 land beneficiaries formally allocated land in 2001, 133 commenced farming operations during the same year (see Tables 2-4 and 4-3). Of the 1.8 percent that commenced operations in 2006, 1.4 percent had been allocated land during the same year. While Chipinge District had the highest proportion of farmers commencing farming operations in 2006 (2.8 percent), only 1.5 percent had been allocated land before 2006 but had delayed commencement of operations until 2006. Chiredzi District registered the highest proportion of land beneficiaries who delayed operations until 2006 (1.7 percent). Only 1.0

percent had been allocated land during that year and 2.7 percent of land beneficiaries commenced operations in the same year.

# 4.2 Agricultural production patterns

The decline in the production of almost all the major agricultural commodities across the small and large producers in Zimbabwe has been documented (Moyo et al. 2008; Moyo, forthcoming; see Table 4-4). The levels of decline have however varied among the commodities and in different regions, while the outputs of some crops such as cotton (predominately grown by the smallholder sector) was stable and/or increased (ibid). The fast track land reform has been identified as one of the major causes of the decline, as any large scale land reform programme would be expected to do, at least for a while. The factors which have affected agricultural production levels and the evolution of agricultural inputs and outputs markets and distribution systems are complex, and cannot be compared simplistically to the pre-existing scenario established over a period of one hundred years, within a specific economic policy framework and financial system (Moyo and Yeros 2007). The beneficiaries of land reform also have their own perspectives on the production constraints they face, grievances they may have with the state, capital and other classes of farmers, and views they hold on how the rural economy can be resuscitated.

At a macro-level, the Zimbabwean economy has been going through its worst economic crisis. It is estimated that the economy has shrunk by 40 percent since 2000, with hyper-inflation having taken root in 2002 to about 100 000 percent- the highest in the world then. Factors that contribute to this economic decline are weak macro-economic management frameworks, frequent droughts, an unfavourable policy environment, and the disruptive effects of the 'fast track' programme as well as the impact of international isolation (World Bank, 2006). Furthermore, the period from 2001-2005 was characterized by poor rainfall distribution, the worst in the post-independence period (Moyo and Yeros 2007; Moyo, forthcoming), such that the effects of drought on the decline in the production patterns of crops such as maize and cotton which are mainly grown by the smallholder sector, is easily noted. The state of the macro-economy has had an adverse effect on the recovery potential of agriculture and related rural social reproduction strategies. The agro-industrial linkages developed over a number of years especially in the seed and fertilizer industry have been curtailed, as some companies are failing to meet demand.

Various scholars have argued (Moyo and Yeros, 2005; Sachikonye, 2004) that, land reform through 'fast track' resolved some aspects of the land question but not all the issues. Access to land is a necessary but not sufficient condition for improving social reproduction and growth in the rural sector. There is need for a more robust transformation of the economy to ensure that linkages among critical sectors are maintained or established, including improving input supply, credit support and access to markets, as well as the establishment of adequate physical infrastructure to support the new farming landscape. The emerging agricultural production patterns in newly redistributed areas are discussed next.

	TOMOT	000. ui u	tonnes an	nd % ch	ange fror	n 1990s.	average ir	n parenth	leses								
-	s,066)	2001/2		2002/3		2003/4		2004/5		2005/6		2006/7		2007/8	2008/9	2009/10	
7	Ave																
Main foods																	
Maize	,684	(-) 664	70.4)*	930 (	(-44.8)	1,059	(-37.1)	915 (-4	15.6)	1,485 (	-11.8)	953 (	(-43.4)	575.0 (-65.5)	1,242.6 (-25.5)	1,327.6 (-20.4)	
Wheat	248	20 (-	-92.2)	213 (	(-14.1)	49 (	(-80.2)	229 (	(-7.8)	242	(-2.6)	147	(-40.8)	75.0 (-65.8)	38.0 (-82.7)	1	
Small grains**	.67	89	(-46)	373 (	123.4)	90.7	(-45.7)	66	(09-)	164	(-1)	120	(-27)	93.2 86.4	270.2 440.4	193.9 (287.7	
Edible dry beans	4	50	(13)					21 (	(-52)	30	(-32)	30	(-32)	3.8 (-28.3)	37.3 (603.8)	17.2 (224.5)	
Groundnuts				147	(70.9)	141	(64)							131.5 (42.9)	216.6 (135.4)	186.2 (102.4)	
(shelled) {	20	120	(40)					58	(-32)	83	(-3)	125	(46)				
Oil seeds																	
Soy beans	8	83	(-15)	26 (	(-73.5)	41	(-58.2)	09	(-39)	71	(-28)	112	(14)	48.3 (-49.4)	115.8 (21.2)	70.3 (-26.4)	
Sunflower 4	13	8	(-82)	5 (	-88.4)	17	(-60.5)	7	(-83)	17	(-161)	26	(-40)	5.5 (-84.9)	39.0 (7.1)	14 (-61.5)	
Key export																	
Tobacco	86	178 (	(-10.0)	) 69	(-65.2)	94	(-52.5)	83 (-:	58.0)	4	-77.6)	6L	(-60.2)	69.8 (-64.7)	63.6 (-67.8)	85 (-57.0)	
Cotton	01	200	(-0.1)	228	(13.4)	228	(13.4)	196 (	(-2.1)	208	(3.7)	235	(17.2)	226.4 (5.7)	246.8 (15.3)	172.1 (-19.6)	
Estate crops***																	
Sugar cane														2,897.1 (-6.9)	2,582.2 (-17.1)	2,338.3 (	1
~ 1	3,113	4,200	(34.9)					3,290	(5.7)	3,600 (	(15.6)	3,600	(15.6)			24.9)	
Tea	5	22	(43.6)	22.9	(52.7)	22.5	(50)	22 (4	44.9)	22	(43.6)	22	(45.6)	22.3	22.3		
coffee	_	8	(-13.2)	10	(11.1)	6	(0)	4 (	53.4)	5	-51.5)	5	(-50.4)	4.6	4.6		
Other crops														1			
Citrus	00	125	(39.9)					130 (4	44.6)	123	(36.9	123	(37.0)	1			
Vegetables & Melons	49	162	(8.7)					181 (2	21.5)	161	(8.5)	162	(8.7)	1			

Table 4-4: Agricultural production trends

Source: Compiled by Sam Moyo from various sources in Moyo (forthcoming)

## 4.2.1 Overall net land utilisation levels and rates

Despite the difficult economic environment obtaining during the FTLRP years, new farmers managed to establish farming activities and were utilising sizeable portions of their allocated lands in the former large-scale commercial farms. In this section, utilisation of arable lands allocated in newly redistributed areas is assessed. The net land utilisation index is calculated as the percentage of the total cropped area over the total arable area for the 2004/05 season.

In terms of arable area utilisation, only 20.7 percent of the households had not cropped any of their arable area in the 2004/05 season before the implementation of the baseline survey in 2005/06. Less than 30.0 percent of the households utilised less than 40.0 percent of the arable area allocated under the FTLRP (Fig 4-1). At the same time, more than a quarter of the land beneficiaries (26.0 percent) had utilised over 80 percent of the arable land allocated to them. Land utilisation by the land beneficiaries was generally high given the state of the economy at the time of land allocations and the fact that inadequate support was rendered by the Government and other stakeholders.



Fig 4-1: Overall Arable land utilisation levels

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Data disaggregation by the resettlement model, the A1 sector had a higher proportion of households utilising a sizeable portion of their allocated arable area in comparison to the A2 sector. For instance, 25.4 percent of the A1 households were utilising between 1.0 percent and 40.0 percent of their available arable land in comparison to 38.7 percent of the A2 households, suggesting that land underutilisation increases with size of landholding. On the higher end, 27.1 percent of A1 households utilised at least 80 percent of their arable land in comparison to 21.9 percent of the A2 households (Fig 4-2). Plots allocated to A1 beneficiaries are smaller than A2 plots hence the higher utilisation level within the A1 sector.

Fig 4-2: A rable land utilisation levels by model type



Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

An assessment of land utilisation within the districts shows that Chipinge had the highest proportion of land beneficiaries utilising over 80 percent of their arable land (Table 4-5). Surprisingly, Mangwe District which is located in the semi-arid NR IV and V with lowest agricultural potential, had the second highest proportion of land beneficiaries utilising over 80 percent of their arable land (36.6 percent). These data indicate that some farming is taking place in newly redistributed areas, contrary to the widely held view that little or no farming is taking place in these areas.

Land	A1		A2		Chip	inge	Chir	edzi	Goro	monzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	ıba	Total	
rates	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	341	21.3	77	18.3	16	4.9	52	22.7	178	26.4	95	26.1	37	27.6	40	13.7	418	20.7
1-20	173	10.8	91	21.6	35	10.7	22	9.6	81	12	70	19.2	10	7.5	46	15.8	264	13.1
21-40	234	14.6	72	17.1	46	14	34	14.8	89	13.2	66	18.1	13	9.7	58	19.9	306	15.1
41-60	232	14.5	55	13.1	55	16.8	20	8.7	98	14.5	37	10.2	14	10.4	63	21.6	287	14.2
61-80	186	11.6	34	8.1	40	12.2	22	9.6	80	11.9	36	9.9	11	8.2	31	10.7	220	10.9
81-100	433	27.1	92	21.9	136	41.5	79	34.5	148	22	60	16.5	49	36.6	53	18.2	525	26
Total	1599	100	421	100	328	100	229	100	674	100	364	100	134	100	291	100	2020	100

Table 4-5: Arable land utilization levels

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire

Arable land utilisation rates in newly redistributed areas have not yet reached their optimum levels for various reasons as discussed later in this section. The current arable land utilisation rates are comparable to the LSCF sector which only managed to utilise  $\pm$  40 percent of their gross land over a 100 year establishment period (see Roth, 1994; Moyo, 1995), whereas the majority of new land beneficiaries have been on the ground for  $\pm$  5 years. The next section discusses the specific uses the arable land in newly redistributed areas.

# 4.2.2 Crop production patterns

## 4.2.2.1 Types of crops grown

The types of crops grown in Zimbabwe can generally be classified into major and minor crops in terms of their importance as a source of both food and income generation through sales in local, national and international markets. The major crops include the main staple food crops (maize, wheat and small grains), key export crops (tobacco and cotton), oilseeds (soya beans, groundnuts and sunflower), plantation crops (sugarcane, tea and coffee) and some horticultural crops. The minor crops are those normally grown by smallholder farmers on small areas to meet their food subsistence needs with little or no surplus for sale. Minor crops include potatoes, domestic vegetables, round nuts, pumpkins etc.





Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire

Whereas the capital intensive former large-scale commercial farms were mostly export oriented (tobacco, horticulture, floriculture, farm tourism, etc.), land use and agricultural production in the newly resettled areas is focused on food production for own consumption and surplus for sale in domestic markets. However, there are some newly resettled households especially the larger A2 family farms also involved in the production of export crops. (Fig 4-3).

Type of crop	Ι		II		III		IV		V		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Main foods												
Maize	247	93.2	829	87.8	429	91.5	129	84.3	149	57.8	1783	85.4
Wheat	3	1.1	44	4.7	28	6.0	-	-	10	3.9	85	4.1
Small grains	30	11.3	30	3.2	105	22.4	79	51.6	69	26.7	313	15.0
Edible dry beans	73	27.5	27	2.9	1	0.2	-	-	3	1.2	104	5.0
Groundnuts	23	8.7	124	13.1	194	41.4	36	23.5	56	21.7	433	20.7
Oilseeds												
Soya beans	9	3.4	57	6.0	50	10.7	-	-	21	8.1	137	6.6
Sunflower	5	1.9	4	0.4	25	5.3	5	3.3	7	2.7	46	2.2
Key exports												
Tobacco	1	0.4	91	9.6	4	0.9	-	-	1	0.4	97	4.6
Cotton	-	-	5	0.5	33	7.0	2	1.3	47	18.2	87	4.2
Estate crops												
Sugar	2	0.8	-	-	1	0.2	-	-	48	18.6	51	2.4
Tea	19	7.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19	0.9
Coffee	6	2.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	0.3
Horticultural ci	rops	•										
Paprika	3	1.1	6	0.6	1	0.2	-	-	2	0.8	12	0.6
Floriculture	-	-	1	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Citrus	4	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.4	5	0.2
Vegetables	5	1.9	19	2.0	29	6.2	2	1.3	16	6.2	71	3.4

Table 4-6: Major crops grown by agro-ecological region

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Disaggregated analysis by the resettlement models reveals a more or less similar trend in which maize is the most common crop grown by both newly resettled A1 and A2 farmers. There is, however, a higher concentration of maize in the A1 sector which was grown by close to 90 percent of the households in comparison to 69 percent in the A2 sector. The A2 sector tended to have higher percentages of households involved in the production of the other crop categories besides maize and small grains. Maize and small grains have been historically associated with smallholders (see Muir, 1994) which dominate the A1 scheme. The key export crops (tobacco and cotton) and other estate crops were grown by very few households, accounting for  $\pm$  5.0 percent of the total sample. Other crops which form an important part of the diet of rural households, groundnuts and small grains, were grown by 11.5 percent and 14.3 percent of the households respectively.

Gendered patterns also revealed similar trends as maize was the key crop grown by both male and female land owners accounting for over 70.0 percent in both categories. The other crops were grown by fewer households in both male and female-owned land in the new resettlement areas, but males had slightly higher percentages involved than females. For instance, in households where land is male-owned, 4.6 percent and 3.4 percent grew tobacco and cotton respectively in comparison to 3.8 percent and 0.1 percent in female-owned land.

Type of crop	Chipinge		Chiredzi		Goromonzi		Kwekwe		Mangwe		Zvimba		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Main Foods														
Maize	295	88.3	146	62.1	602	86.6	351	94.4	122	84.1	267	86.7	1783	85.4
Wheat	11	3.3	2	0.9	50	7.2	18	4.8	-	-	4	1.3	85	4.1
Small grains	34	10.2	69	29.4	23	3.3	98	26.3	78	53.8	11	3.6	313	15.0
Edible dry	80	24.0	-	-	10	1.4	-	-	-	-	14	4.5	104	5.0
beans														
Groundnuts	24	7.2	57	24.3	147	21.2	170	45.7	35	24.1	-	-	433	20.7
Oil seeds														
Soya beans	31	9.3	2	0.9	43	6.2	47	12.6	-	-	14	4.5	137	6.6
Sunflower	9	2.7	4	1.7	-	-	25	6.7	4	2.8	4	1.3	46	2.2
Key exports														
Tobacco	1	0.3	1	0.4	32	4.6	-	-	-	-	63	20.5	97	4.6
Cotton	-	-	49	20.9	6	0.9	32	8.6	-	-	-	-	87	4.2
Estate crops														
Sugar	3	0.9	48	20.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	51	2.4
Tea	19	5.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19	0.9
Coffee	6	1.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	0.3
Other crops														
Paprika	5	1.5	-	-	7	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	0.6
Floriculture	-	-	-	-	1	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0
Citrus	5	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	0.2
Vegetables	7	2.1	15	6.4	20	2.9	28	7.5	1	0.7	-	-	71	3.4

## Table 4-7: Major crops grown by district

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Maize production has become the dominant farming activity even in the drier natural regions IV and V which were previously used mainly for cattle and wildlife ranching by the former large scale commercial farmers, for example in the Matebeleland and Masvingo provinces. The sample data, which cuts across the five agro-ecological regions of the country, shows that in the drier natural regions IV and V, maize was cropped by 84.3 percent and 57.8 percent of the households respectively (Table 4-6). However, it is important to note that the percentage of households in the drier natural regions growing maize was relatively lower compared to the other regions where it was grown by at least 90 percent of the households. The other crops grown in specific agro-ecological regions tended to reflect the potential of the region as, for instance, cotton and sugar cane were grown by resettled households in natural regions IV and V as much as tobacco was grown in natural regions II and III. This pattern is also identifiable when major crops grown in newly resettled areas are analysed by district, as districts largely reflect the agro-ecological patterns in the country (see Table 4-7)<sup>36</sup>.
Fig 4-4: Minor crops grown by model type



Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

In addition to the major crops, newly resettled households are also involved in the production of some minor crops, mostly for own consumption. Minor crops are grown by both A1 and A2 households. The domestic vegetables (rape and tomatoes) were the most common minor crops grown by newly resettled households, cropped by 5.1 percent and 4.9 percent (respectively) of all households (Fig 4-4). Except for sweet potatoes, which were grown by 3.6 percent of the households, the other minor crops grown by households ranged from 0.1 percent to 1.7 percent of the sample. The assessment of trends within each model also showed similar patterns, with vegetables accounting for the largest percentages of minor crops grown by households in both A1 and A2 households.

#### 4.2.2.2 Cropped areas

Crop production in newly resettled areas was mostly done on small areas, generally less than 5.0 hectares. Some of the land beneficiaries were still in the establishment phase as they had recently been resettled on the farms just before the survey; in fact, 15.0 percent of the land beneficiaries were allocated land from 2004 onwards. More than 70 percent of the newly resettled households cropped a total area of 5.0 hectares or less each. The cropping of more than 10.0 hectares of land area was limited to 13.9 percent of the newly resettled households. The highest proportion of households (25.1 percent) was found in the cropping category of 1.1 to 3.0 hectares.





Data disaggregation by resettlement model shows that more land was cropped by the larger sized A2 farmers compared to the smaller sized A1 plot/farm holders. For instance, in the A1 resettlement model, 38.0 percent of the households cropped three or less hectares of land compared to 17.6 percent in the A2 sector (Fig 4-5). Another batch of A1 households (21.5 percent) cropped between 3.1 and 5.0 hectares of land in comparison to 10.6 percent for the A2 households. The A2 households were dominant in cropped areas above 5.0 hectares, where 43.0 percent were found in comparison to 18.9 percent in the A1 resettlement model. In the largest cropped area range of over 10 hectares, only 7.9 percent of the A1 households appear, whilst 36.6 percent appear under the A2 model.

In this regard, the areas cropped also tend to reflect the sizes of land allocated to the A1 and A2 households. When we relate the areas cropped in new resettlement areas to the farm sizes, our analysis shows that the higher cropped categories were dominated by the larger farms. For instance, in households who were allocated less than 20 hectares of land, only 7.7 percent cropped more than 10.0 hectares in comparison to 41.4 percent of those that got 300 hectares or more (Table 4-8). In the other farm size categories of between 20 and 299 hectares, cropping above 10 hectares was done by at least 17 percent of the households.

Cropped	Farn	n sizes (l	ha)									
area (ha)	1-19		20-4	9	50-9	9	100-2	299	300+	-	Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	177	18.8	122	19.8	30	16.3	49	27.5	11	37.9	389	19.9
0.1-1	90	9.5	44	7.2	13	7.1	27	15.2	-	-	174	8.9
1.1-3	285	30.2	145	23.6	27	14.7	37	20.8	3	10.3	497	25.5
3.1-5	222	23.5	105	17.1	24	13.0	23	12.9	3	10.3	377	19.3
5.1-10	97	10.3	92	15.0	40	21.7	12	6.7	-	-	241	12.4
10+	73	7.7	107	17.4	50	27.2	30	16.9	12	41.4	272	13.9
Total	944	100.0	615	100.0	184	100.0	178	100.0	29	100.0	1950	100.0

Table 4-8: Total cropped areas by farm sizes in new resettlement areas

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire

The cropped areas also varied across the six districts where data was collected. For instance, Chipinge and Chiredzi had the highest proportions of households cropping more than 10 hectares of land area, that is, 21.4 percent and 28.5 percent respectively (Table 4-9). In the other districts, more than 10 hectares were cropped by less than 12.0 percent of the households. The prevalence of more households with larger cropped hectarages in Chipinge is associated with the fact that the district falls under Natural Region I with the highest agricultural potential, especially for rain-fed agriculture considering that the majority of newly resettled farmers do not have access to irrigation<sup>37</sup>. Low hectarages cropped in other districts like Mangwe and Kwekwe can be explained by the low crop production potential in these areas which fall within the semi-arid agro-ecological regions suitable for livestock rearing.

In Chiredzi, irrigated sugarcane production was the dominant land use pattern in the former largescale commercial farms inherited by the newly resettled households, and it tends to be grown on large hectarages as smaller sizes are unviable. Mangwe District which lies in Natural Region IV had the highest proportion of households in the lower cropped area. Over 45.0 percent of the households had cropped 3 hectares or less. In addition, this district had – comparatively speaking – more households who had not cropped any land area during the 2004/05 season. Furthermore, in Mangwe District, only 9.8 percent of the households cropped more than 10.0 hectares of land compared to a minimum of 18.8 percent of the households in the other districts, all of which are located in the higher potential agro-ecological regions.

Cropped area	Chip	inge	Chir	edzi	Gore	omonzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	ıba	Total	
(ha)	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	16	5.0	52	22.1	178	25.6	96	26.4	44	30.8	40	13.2	426	20.7
0.1-1	10	3.1	16	6.8	77	11.1	32	8.8	24	16.8	25	8.2	184	8.9
1.1-3	86	27.0	46	19.6	180	25.9	74	20.3	42	29.3	89	29.3	517	25.1
3.1-5	77	24.2	37	15.7	129	18.6	69	19.0	19	13.3	64	21.1	395	19.2
5.1-10	61	19.2	17	7.2	65	9.4	51	14.0	3	2.1	53	17.4	250	12.1
10+	68	21.4	67	28.5	65	9.4	42	11.5	11	7.7	33	10.9	286	13.9
Total	318	100.0	235	100.0	694	100.0	364	100.0	143	100.0	304	100.0	2058	100.0

Table 4-9: Total cropped areas by district

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089; F=221.442, 4 d.f.=25, p=0.00 (significant at 0.05)

In the A1 sector, 65.4 percent of the households' cropped area which was on average between 0.1 and 1.0 hectares was covered with major crops (Table 4-10). The majority of the households cropped more than 1.0 hectare of major crops that included maize, cotton, wheat and sugar cane. In terms of areas cropped, sugar cane had particularly high percentages of household producers cropping more area, with 92.3 percent of the households having above 10 hectares. Maize and cotton cropping found the majority of the households having between 1.0 hectares and 3.0 hectares. In contrast to the A1 sector, only 23.0 percent of the major crops (small grains, sugar beans and groundnuts) were grown on small hectarages ranging between 0.1 and 1.0 hectares in the A2 sector. (Table 4-10). With regards to the major crops (wheat, tobacco, soya beans, sugarcane, tea and coffee) in A2 farms, there were at least 50.0 percent of the major crops tended to be higher in the larger A2 farms compared to the smaller A1 farms. On minor crops, the pattern in both A1 and A2 farms was more or less similar, as the majority of the household producers grew minor crops on hectarages of between 0.1 and 1.0 hectares.

Crop	A1							A2					
	Cropped are	ea ranges	(ha) (row percen	tages in par	entheses)								
	0.1-1	1.01-3	3.01-5		5.01-10	10	Total	0-1	1.01-3	3.01-5	10-May	10	Total
1.Food crop	is		•				•		•				
M aize	220 (17.8)		649 (52.5)	255 (20.6)	94 (7.6)	19 (1.5)	1237 (100.0)	39 (13.7)	61(21.4)	59 (20.7)	62 (21.8)	64 (22.5)	285 (100.0)
Wheat	7 (17.1)		6 (14.6)	14 (34.1)	-	14 (34.1)	41 (100.0)	3 (14.3)	1 (4.8)	-	-	17 (81.0)	21 (100.0)
Small grains	146 (67.0)		46 (21.1)	6 (2.8)	4 (1.8)	20 (9.2)	218 (100.0)	12 (54.5)	6 (27.3)	2 (9.1)	-	2 (9.1)	22 (10.0)
Sugar beans	52 (81.3)		9 (14.1)	2 (3.1)	-	1 (1.6)	64 (100.0)	17 (486)	9 (25.7)	5 (14.3)	-	4 (11.4)	35 (100.0)
2.Key expo	rt crops						•		•	•			
Tobacco	40 (52.6)		27 (35.5)	2 (2.6)	-	7 (9.2)	76 (100.0)	1 (6.3)	5 (31.3)	2 (12.5)	-	8 (50.0)	16 (100.0)
Cotton	31 (43.7)		36 (50.7)	2 (2.8)	-	2 (2.8)	71 (100.0)	2 (40.0)	2 (40.0)	1 (20.0)	-	-	5 (100.0)
3.Oilseed c	rops												
Soy a beans	48 (65.8)		6 (8.2)	8 (11.0)	-	11 (15.1)	73 (100.0)	5 (11.9)	3 (7.1)	9 (21.4)	-	25 (59.5)	42 (100.0)
Groundnuts	247 (90.8)		19 (7.0)	-	-	6 (2.2)	272 (100.0)	21 (80.8)	1 (3.8)	3 (11.5)	-	1 (3.8)	26 (100.0)
Sunflower													
4.Estate cro	ps						•		•	•			
Sugarcane	-		-	1 (7.7)	-	12 (2.3)	13 (100.0)	1 (2.9)	1 (2.9)	2 (5.9)	-	30 (88.2)	34 (100.0)
Tea	5 (83.3)		1 (16.7)	-	-	-	6 (100.0)	3 (25.0)	-	1 (8.3)	-	8 (66.7)	12 (100.0)
Coffee	1 (100.0)		-	-	-	-	1 (100.0)	-	1 (20.0)	-	-	4 (80.0)	5 (100.0)
5.Horticult	ural crops												
Paprika	2 (100.0)		-	-	-	-	2 (100.0)	1 (25.0)	3 (75.0)	-	-	-	4 (100.0)
Vegetables- food & export	117 (77.0)		12 (7.9)	3 (2.0)	2(1.3)	18 (11.8)	152 (100.0)	23 (56.1)	11 (26.8)	2 (4.9)	3 (7.3)	2 (4.9)	41 (100.0)

Table 4-10: Major crops by cropped area ranges

#### 4.2.2.3 Crop production levels

The crop output levels produced in new resettlement areas were mainly driven by the hectarages cropped by land beneficiaries. The A2 sector which cropped larger hectarages in comparison had higher outputs realised than the A1 sector in most of the major crops grown by the new land beneficiaries. In maize for instance, the average area cropped in the A1 sector was 3.50 hectares which resulted in average output of 3.6 tonnes per household, whilst in the A2 sector the average area cropped was 6.36 hectares which resulted in an average output of 13.3 tonnes per household (Table 4-11). Higher outputs were realised in the A1 sector for small grains and groundnuts in comparison to the A2 sector which had relatively lower hectarages planted for these crops. The A2 sector was also dominant over the A1 sector in the hectarages cropped and outputs realised in the remainder of the crops grown in the new resettlement areas.

The A2 sector realised slightly higher yields (tonnes/hectare) in comparison to the A1 sector across the majority of the crops grown in new resettlement areas. In maize for instance, yields averaged 1.5 tonnes per hectare in the A1 sector, with the A2 sector realising slightly less than 1.7 tonnes per hectare (Table 4-11). Yield differentials were highest in the tobacco export crop where the A2 sector averaged 3.7 tonnes per hectare, 1.3 tonnes higher than 2.4 tonnes per hectare realised in the A1 sector. The crop yields currently being realised in the newly resettled areas are lower than those realised in the former LSCF sector due to various factors experienced during the FTLRP years. Key among them has been the shortage of inputs such as fertiliser which requires significant foreign currency resources in its production, and these have been scarce in the economy.

Type of	A1				A2				Total			
crop	Ave	Ave	Yield	Ν	Ave	Ave	Yield	Ν	Ave	Ave	Yield	Ν
•	output	area	(t/ha)		output	area	(t/ha)		output	area	(t/ha)	
	(t)	cropped			( <b>t</b> )	cropped			( <b>t</b> )	cropped		
		(ha)				(ha)				(ha)		
Main foods												
Maize	3.6	3.50	1.5	1480	13.3	6.36	1.7	303	5.6	4.10	1.5	1783
Wheat	0.3	0.16	1.8	61	4.9	1.98	2.4	24	1.2	0.55	2.0	85
Small	0.1	3.01	0.7	289	0.05	0.19	0.5	24	0.1	2.42	0.7	313
grains												
Edible dry	0.02	0.41	0.5	67	0.2	0.22	1.0	37	0.05	0.08	0.7	104
beans												
Groundnuts	0.1	0.34	1.2	403	0.07	0.09	0.7	30	0.1	0.29	1.1	433
Oil seeds		-	-		-							
Soya beans	0.2	0.24	1.0	91	3.1	2.29	1.4	46	0.8	0.67	1.1	137
Sunflower	0.01	0.01	0.8	38	0.01	0.03	0.3	8	0.01	0.01	0.7	46
Key exports												
Tobacco	0.2	0.27	2.4	79	0.5	0.26	3.7	18	0.2	0.27	2.6	97
Cotton	0.1	0.08	1.2	82	0.001	0.03	0.04	5	0.09	0.07	1.1	87
Sugar	0.6	0.13	5.2	17	0.03	1.41	0.02	34	0.4	0.40	1.5	51
Tea	0.005	0.003	2.1	6	0.6	0.46	2.4	13	0.1	0.10	2.3	19
Coffee	0.00003	0.0001	0.5	1	0.03	0.22	0.3	5	0.07	0.47	0.3	6
Other crops												
Paprika	0.0006	0.0009	0.2	4	0.01	0.02	0.5	8	0.03	0.004	0.4	12
Floriculture	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Citrus	-	-	-	1	0.7	0.06		4	0.1	0.01		5
Vegetables	4.9	13.24	123.4	64	0.8	0.24	29.4	7	4.0	10.51	104.7	71

 Table 4-11: Crop outputs and yields in the new resettlement areas

An analysis across the districts shows Zvimba in the lead in terms of average maize outputs with 8.4 tonnes per household followed by Goromonzi and Chipinge with 7.1 tonnes and 6.2 tonnes respectively (Table 4-12). As anticipated, Mangwe District recorded the lowest average maize output of 0.7 tonnes per household which is half that of Chiredzi District (1.4 tonnes). Average maize outputs by district follow the potential of the agro-ecological region in which the district is situated. High performing districts of Chipinge, Goromonzi and Zvimba are within the favourable agro-ecological regions I and II while the poorly performing Chiredzi and Mangwe districts are located in the semi arid agro-ecological regions IV and V respectively. Chipinge and Kwekwe districts performed well in terms of wheat outputs with an average of 2.4 tonnes and 2.8 tonnes realised by producers respectively.

Type of crops	Chipinge	Chiredzi	Groromonzi	Kwekwe	Mangwe	Zvimba
Main foods	·				•	
Maize	6.2	1.4	7.1	4.6	0.7	8.4
Wheat	2.4	-	0.9	2.8	-	0.2
Small grains	0.07	0.2	0.03	0.2	0.2	0.1
Edible dry beans						
Groundnuts	0.02	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.03	-
Oil seeds						
Soya beans	3.7	0.009	0.2	0.8	-	0.1
Sunflower					-	
Key exports						
Tobacco	0.0006	0.001	0.2	-	-	1.2
Cotton	-	0.2	0.01	0.4	-	-
Estate crops						
Sugar	0.09	3.9	-	-	-	-
Tea	0.9	-	-	-	-	-
Coffee			-	-	-	-
Other crops						
Paprika	0.02	-	0.001	-	-	-
Floriculture	-	-	-	-	-	-
Citrus	1.0	-	-	-	-	-
Vegetables	8.3	0.1	7.5	0.3	0.006	0.6

Table 4-12: Average crop outputs per household (in tonnes) by district

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Chipinge District had an outstanding performance in terms of average soya beans output per household with 3.7 tonnes, 2.9 tonnes higher than second placed Kwekwe District. Other districts recorded average outputs of not more than 200kg per household. Average outputs of key exports are very low with the highest being 1.2 tonnes of tobacco per household recorded in Zvimba, followed by 200kg per household recorded in Goromonzi District. Cotton production is only undertaken in Chiredzi, Goromonzi and Kwekwe with average outputs of 200kg, 10kg and 400kg per household respectively. Sugar production is only significantly carried out in Chiredzi, which is suitably situated in the South-Eastern Lowveld of the country registering an average output of 3.9 tonnes. Higher average outputs for vegetables were recorded in Chipinge and Goromonzi with 8.3 tonnes and 7.5 tonnes respectively due to their agro-ecological regions and opportunities to sell surplus in close urban markets.

# 4.2.2.4 Crop production systems

Crop production in the newly resettled areas was mainly based on dry land farming. Irrigated crop farming was limited to less than 17.0 percent of the newly resettled households (Table 4-13). The A2 sector had higher percentages of households who practised irrigated crop farming (27.9 percent) in comparison to the A1 sector (14.1 percent). Irrigated crop farming was more prevalent in Chipinge and Chiredzi districts, where 24.3 percent and 29.4 percent (respectively) of the households were involved, in comparison to less than 16.0 percent in the remaining districts. More than 70 percent of households across all the districts were not engaged in irrigated agriculture.

Utilise	A1		A2		Chip	inge	Chir	edzi	Goro	monzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	ıba	Total	
irrigation	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	232	14.1	122	27.9	81	24.3	69	29.4	106	15.3	59	15.9	15	10.3	24	7.8	354	16.9
No	1419	85.9	316	72.1	252	75.7	166	70.6	589	85.7	313	84.1	130	89.7	285	92.2	1735	83.1
Total	1651	100	438	100	333	100	235	100	695	100	372	100	145	100	309	100	2085	100

Table 4-13: Land beneficiaries utilising irrigation for crop production

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Sugar cane is grown under irrigation and is the dominant crop grown in Chiredzi District. In this district, some of the land beneficiaries inherited irrigated sugar cane farms and access to irrigation is higher compared to other districts. Although irrigation facilities were existent in the former large scale commercial farms in some districts, various constraints have affected their utilisation by new farmers. In some instances, the irrigation systems that were existent in the former LSCFs are difficult to manage for small-sized farm units established under the FTLRP. To be functional, such systems would need to be reconfigured. Furthermore, some of the irrigation equipment in the former LSCFs was stolen and vandalised during the land occupations period, while some need to be rehabilitated.

With respect to types of crops, sugar cane was grown by most household producers under irrigation (90.2 percent), followed by wheat (60.0 percent) (Table 4-14). All the other major crops were grown under irrigation by less than 10.0 percent of the household producers except for paprika and soya bean which were grown under irrigation by 41.7 percent and 29.9 percent of the household producers respectively.

Type of crop	No. of	Total	Producer
	irrigation	househol	ds
	producers	No.	%
Food crops			
Maize	63	1783	3.5
Wheat	51	85	60.0
Small grains	17	313	5.4
Edible dry beans	6	104	5.8
Groundnuts	7	433	1.6
Key export crops	6		
Tobacco	-	-	-
Cotton	1	87	1.1
Oilseed crops			
Soyabeans	41	137	29.9
Sunflower	5	46	10.9
Estate crops			
Sugarcane	46	51	90.2
Tea	1	19	5.3
Coffee	-	-	-
Horticultural cro	ops		
Paprika	5	12	41.7
Floriculture	-	1	-
Citrus	2	5	40.0

Table 4-14: Major crops being grown by households under irrigation

In contrast to the major crops, although grown by fewer households in the newly resettled areas, most of the minor crops were grown under irrigation. Except for sweet potatoes and round nuts, most of the minor crops were grown under irrigation by over 79.0 percent of the household producers.

# 4.2.3 Livestock production patterns

# 4.2.3.1 Types of livestock kept

In addition to cropping, newly resettled households were also involved in the rearing of livestock as part of their farming or agriculture-based social reproduction. Cattle and poultry were the most common types of livestock, owned by over 40.0 percent of the newly resettled households (Fig 4-6). Outside cattle and poultry, goats were the other common type of livestock, owned by 21.0 percent of the households. The other livestock types were owned by less than 5.0 percent of the households. In comparison to the A2 sector, the A1 sector had higher percentages of households owning all the different types of livestock found in newly resettled areas. For instance, 43.8 percent of the A1 households owned cattle in comparison to 37.2 percent of the A2 households (Fig 4-6).

Fig 4-6: Types of livestock kept



Inter-district analysis reveals the dominance of the drier regions in terms of cattle and donkey ownership. There are higher percentages of households owning cattle in the newly resettled districts of Mangwe and Kwekwe (which were also dominant cattle zones prior to the implementation of the FTLRP) where 80.0 percent and 61.3 percent of households owned cattle respectively (Table 4-15). In the remaining districts, the percentage of households owning cattle ranged between 25.4 percent and 36.4 percent. The drier districts of Mangwe and Kwekwe are, in addition dominant, in the ownership of donkeys and goats. In all the districts, cattle are the most common type of livestock owned by households, except for Chipinge and Kwekwe where poultry is the dominant type of livestock amongst households.

Livestock type	Chip	oinge	Chir	edzi	Goro	monzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	ıba	Tota	1
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Cattle	85	25.4	84	35.7	261	37.6	228	61.3	116	80.0	112	36.4	886	42.4
Donkeys	10	3.0	6	2.6	7	1.0	54	14.5	54	37.2	3	1.0	134	6.4
Goats	116	34.7	30	12.8	106	15.3	102	27.4	47	32.4	38	12.3	439	21.0
Sheep	3	0.9	6	2.6	13	1.9	10	2.7	7	4.8	0	0.0	39	1.9
Pigs	16	4.8	0	0.0	18	2.6	7	1.9	2	1.4	4	1.3	47	2.2
Poultry	149	44.6	42	17.9	217	31.2	270	72.6	96	66.2	108	35.1	882	42.2
Rabbits	2	0.6	0	0.0	1	0.1	3	0.8	3	2.1	2	0.6	11	0.5

Table 4-15: Livestock ownership by district

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Given that the majority of newly resettled households, especially the small A1 farms, rely on draught animals for land preparation, other tillage operations and farm transport, the survey results suggest that land owners in newly resettled areas are constrained as regards ploughing capacity. As such, more land owners are reliant on outsourcing of ploughing services from fellow farmers and other service providers. This has implications for the timely land preparation and planting given that the demand for these services are currently outstripping supply. Furthermore, ownership of and access to capital equipment such as tractors are also limited in the newly resettled areas (see Section 4.3.3).

#### 4.2.3.2 Numbers of livestock kept

Across the different types of livestock found in the newly resettled areas, the numbers kept by households were generally limited to five or less. Poultry was dominant in terms of the numbers kept as 32.9 percent of the households owned at least nine of them, followed by cattle (9.9 percent) and goats (6.6 percent) (Table 4-16). In fact, amongst cattle and poultry owners, 50.9 percent and 75.6 percent of the households owned at least nine head and brood respectively. In the other livestock types, ownership of at least nine animals was limited to one percent of the newly resettled households.

No. owned	No. of house	eholds and %	o in parenthe	ses			
	Cattle	Poultry	Goats	Pigs	Sheep	Donkeys	Rabbits
0	1195(57.2)	1207(57.8)	1650(79.0)	2042(97.8)	2050(98.1)	1955(93.6)	2087(99.5)
1	39(1.9)	6(0.3)	30(1.4)	7(0.3)	2(0.1)	9(0.4)	
2	80(3.8)	24(1.1)	64(3.1)	13(0.6)	11(0.5)	32(1.5)	
3-5	184(8.8_	82(3.9)	132(6.3)	6(0.3)	7(0.3)	67(3.2)	3(0.1)
6-8	168(8.0)	83(4.0)	75(3.6)	4(0.2)	9(0.4)	23(1.1)	2(0.1)
9+	423(20.2)	687(32.9)	138(6.6)	17(0.8)	10(0.5)	3(0.1)	6(0.3)
Total	2089(100)	2089(100)	2089(100)	2089(100)	2089(100)	2089(100)	2089(100)

Table 4-16: Numbers of livestock kept by newly resettled households

Source: AIAS Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

More or less similar trends are exhibited when the data was disaggregated by resettlement model. In the A1 sector, 46.0 percent of the households owned at least one head of cattle in comparison to 39.3 percent in the A2 sector (Table 4-17). Although the A1 households had a higher proportion of households owning cattle, the A2 households were dominant in the number of heads of cattle owned. In the A2 sector, 72.2 percent owned nine or more head of cattle in comparison to 40.6 percent of the A1 households. In terms of numbers owned, poultry rearing was dominant amongst the newly A1 resettled households (with 37.8 percent owning stock of more than nine), whilst cattle was dominant in the A2 sector with 28.4 percent of the households owning more than nine head.

Model type	Range of	Cattle	Poultry	Goats	Pigs	Sheep	Donkeys	Rabbits
	livestock owned							
A1	0	828	772	1172	1497	1502	1411	1525
		(54.0)	(50.4)	(76.5)	(97.7)	(98.0)	(92.1)	(99.5)
	1	38	5	28	5	2	9	
		(2.5)	(0.3)	(1.8)	(0.3)	(0.1)	(0.6)	
	2	70	24	59	13	8	30	
		(4.6)	(1.6)	(3.9)	(0.8)	(0.5)	(2.0)	
	3-5	160	77	115	5	5	62	3
		(10.4)	(5.0)	(7.5)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(4.0)	(0.2)
	6-8	149	75	62	3	8	18	-
		(9.7)	(5.0)	(4.0)	(0.2)	(0.5)	(1.2)	
	9+	287	579	96	9	7	2	4
		(18.7)	(37.8)	(6.3)	(0.6)	(0.5)	(0.1)	(0.3)
	Total	1532	1532	1532	1532	1532	1532	1532
		(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)
A2	0	261	329	364	412	415	411	419
		(61.7)	(77.8)	(86.1)	(97.4)	(98.1)	(97.2)	(99.1)
	1	2	-	-	2	-	-	
		(0.5)			(0.5)			
	2	5	-	4	-	2	2	
		(1.2)		(0.9)		(0.5)	(0.5)	
	3-5	16	3	11	1	2	5	-
		(3.8)	(0.7)	(2.6)	(0.2)	(0.5)	(1.2)	
	6-8	19	5	8	1	1	5	2
		(4.5)	(1.2)	(1.9)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(1.2)	(0.5)
	9+	120	86	36	7	3	-	2
		(28.4)	(20.3)	(8.5)	(1.7)	(0.7)		(0.5)
	Total	423	423	423	423	423	423	423
		(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)

Table 4-17: Ownership of livestock by model

Similar to the cattle ownership patterns which were dominated by the drier districts of Mangwe, Chiredzi and Kwekwe, it also emerged that these districts had more households owning more herds in comparison to the other districts.

			-				
No. of cattle	No. of hou	seholds and	% in parenth	eses			
owned	Chipinge	Chiredzi	Goromonzi	Kwekwe	Mangwe	Zvimba	Total
0	248(74.3)	150(63.8)	431(62.0)	143(38.0)	29(20.0)	194(63.0)	1195(57.2)
1	7(2.1)	4(1.7)	7(1.0)	15(4.0)	2(1.4)	4(1.3)	39(1.9)
2	10(3.0)	8(3.4)	23(3.3)	21(5.6)	06(4.1)	12(3.9)	80(3.8)
3-5	21(6.3)	13(5.5)	69(9.9)	50(13.4)	14(9.7)	17(5.5_	184(8.8_
6-8	19(5.7)	18(7.7)	48(6.9)	43(11.6)	13(9.0)	27(8.8)	168(8.0)
9+	29(8.7)	42(17.9)	117(16.8)	100(26.9)	81(55.9)	54(17.5)	423(20.2)
Total	334(100)	235(100)	695(100)	372(100)	145(100)	308(100)	2089(100)

Table 4-18: Number of cattle kept by households by districts

Source: AIAS Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

For instance, in Mangwe, Chiredzi and Kwekwe, 61.1 percent, 73.6 percent and 50.0 percent of the cattle owning households owned at least nine head respectively (Table 4-18). In the remaining districts ownership of more than nine head of cattle was limited to less than 50.0 percent of the cattle owning households.

# 4.3 Agricultural Inputs

### 4.3.1 Inputs used in crop production

The FTLRP was implemented against a backdrop of an economic decline that impacted negatively on the capacity of agro-industrial companies to supply adequate agricultural inputs for the farming sector. Furthermore, the majority of the new farmers are resource-constrained and thus cannot afford to meet their input requirements from the market even when inputs are available. As such, the FTLRP period has been characterised by shortages of agricultural inputs and consequently their low utilisation in newly resettled areas. Fertiliser and agro-chemicals use have been most affected because they require some imported content yet foreign currency resources have been scarce. Whilst seed supply has been less affected, minimal disruption has occurred through the displacement of some former large-scale commercial seed growers.

Across some selected crops, inorganic fertiliser was utilised by less than 50.0 percent of the newly resettled households in the sample survey. The highest percentages of household producers utilising inorganic fertiliser were found in maize and tobacco production where 51.1 percent and 49.5 percent used fertiliser respectively (Table 4-19). Analysis by resettlement model showed that the A2 sector had higher percentages of households utilising fertiliser across most crops. Agro-chemicals use was more common in cotton and tobacco where negative yield impacts are severe in their absence, while their use in the other crops was generally limited to less than 20.0 percent of the households. Purchased seed utilisation was more common compared to the other input categories as it was used by more than 50.0 percent of the households in all the selected crops (Table 4-19).

In all the selected crops except tobacco, usage of purchased seed was over 90 percent of the producer households. Tobacco producers utilised purchased seedlings as the majority of them do not have the expertise and resources to manage nurseries. The patterns in the A1 and A2 sectors in seed utilisation are more or less similar, as in both sectors over 70 percent of the households used purchased seed in all the crops except tobacco and wheat.

Input type	Crop		A1		I	A2		Т	otal	
	type	Producer	No.	%	Producer	No.	%	Producer	No.	%
		hh*			hh			hh		
Inorganic	Maize	1480	734	49.6	303	178	58.7	1783	912	51.1
Fertiliser	Wheat	61	12	19.7	24	8	33.3	85	20	23.5
	Soyabeans	91	19	20.9	46	22	47.8	137	41	29.9
	Sunflower	38	7	18.4	08	3	37.5	46	10	21.7
	Tobacco	79	41	51.9	18	07	38.5	97	48	49.5
	Cotton	82	34	41.5	05	5	100.0	87	39	44.8
Agro-	Maize	1480	115	7.8	303	49	16.2	1783	164	9.2
chemicals	Wheat	61	2	3.3	24	2	8.3	85	4	4.7
	Soyabeans	91	6	6.6	46	16	34.8	137	22	16.1
	Sunflower	38	0	0.0	08	1	12.5	46	1	2.2
	Tobacco	79	31	39.2	18	5	27.8	97	36	37.1
	Cotton	82	20	24.4	05	3	50.0	87	23	26.4
Seed	Maize	1480	1415	95.6	303	281	92.7	1783	1696	95.1
	Wheat	61	61	100.0	24	24	100.0	85	85	100.0
	Soyabeans	91	90	98.9	46	46	100.0	137	136	98.9
	Sunflower	38	38	100.0	08	08	100.0	46	46	100.0
	Tobacco	79	41	52.0	18	6	33.3	97	47	48.5
	Cotton	82	77	93.9	05	05	100.0	87	82	94.3

 Table 4-19: Utilisation of agricultural inputs by model

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, \*hh - households

Inter-district analysis reveals a pattern where the utilisation of inputs is closely related to the agroecological potential of the district. The districts located in the higher agro-ecological potential regions in general tended to have higher percentages of producer households utilising inorganic fertiliser, agro-chemicals and purchased seed compared to the other districts in the low agroecological potential regions.

Chipinge District, where the bulk of the agricultural land falls in Natural Region I, had the highest percentages of household producers utilising agricultural inputs across all the input categories and crops except for cotton which is grown in the drier agro-ecological regions. Mangwe and Chiredzi, where the bulk of the land is located in Natural Regions IV and V respectively, had the lowest percentages of household producers utilising purchased agricultural inputs (Table 4-20).

Type of	Crop	Chip	inge	Chir	edzi	Goro	monzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	nba	Total	
input	type	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Fertilizer	Maize	295	68.1	146	13.7	602	59.1	351	25.4	122	9.0	267	63.7	1783	47.5
	Wheat	11	63.6	2	-	50	26.0	18	5.6	-	-	4	-	85	24.7
	Soyabeans	31	58.1	2	-	43	34.9	47	14.9	-	-	14	14.3	137	30.7
	Sunflower	9	22.2	4	-	-	-	25	4.0	4	-	4	-	46	21.7
	Tobacco	1	-	1	-	32	34.4	-	-	-	-	63	58.7	97	49.5
	Cotton	-	-	49	2.0	6	66.7	32	31.3	-	-	-	-	87	32.2
Agro-	Maize	295	18.6	146	6.2	602	11.6	351	4.8	122	4.9	267	10.5	1783	10.4
chemicals	Wheat	11	63.6	2	-	50	12.0	18	5.6	-	-	4	-	85	16.5
	Soyabeans	31	45.2	2	-	43	11.6	47	2.1	-	-	14	21.4	137	16.8
	Sunflower	9	-	4	-	-	-	25	-	4	-	4	-	46	2.2
	Tobacco	1	-	1	-	32	28.1	-	-	-	-	63	42.9	97	37.1
	Cotton	-	-	49	26.5	6	4.1	32	50.0	-	-	-	-	87	42.5
Seed	Maize	295	100	146	100	602	97.0	351	97.4	122	83.6	267	90.3	1783	95.9
	Wheat	11	63.6	2	-	50	32.0	18	11.1	-	-	4	-	85	29.4
	Soyabeans	31	67.7	2	-	43	76.7	47	93.6	-	-	14	71.4	137	77.4
	Sunflower	9	44.4	4	-	-	-	25	64	4	25.0	4	75.0	46	100
	Tobacco	1	-	1	-	32	56.3	-	-	-	-	63	52.4	97	52.6
	Cotton	-	-	49	73.5	6	100	32	93.8	-	-	-	-	87	100

 Table 4-20: Utilisation of agricultural inputs by district

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

# 4.3.2 Inputs used in livestock production

The utilisation of purchased inputs in the form of stock feeds and veterinary chemicals for the different kinds of livestock owned by newly resettled households was minimal. Overall, 7.9 percent and 11.7 percent of the livestock producers utilised purchased stock feeds and veterinary chemicals respectively (Table 4-21). Utilisation of purchased stock feeds and veterinary chemicals was slightly higher in the A2 scheme where they were used by 8.0 percent and 12.6 percent of the livestock producers respectively, in comparison to 7.9 percent and 11.5 percent in the A1 scheme.

When the utilisation of purchased inputs is disaggregated by the type of livestock, analysis shows that stock feeds were most commonly used by pig producers (34.0 percent) followed by cattle (11.7 percent) (Table 4-21). Newly resettled households who kept donkeys, sheep and rabbits did not use any purchased stock feed, whilst use in poultry and goats was limited to less than 6.0 percent of the producer households. The bulk of the poultry kept in new resettlement areas are mainly the traditional free range chicken which do not normally require with stock feeds, whilst rabbits are fed on wild leaves and vegetables. Similarly, the majority of cattle and donkey producers are reliant on natural grazing to meet the dietary needs of their livestock. Veterinary chemicals were used for cattle by 20.8 percent of the producers, pigs (19.1 percent), poultry (7.6 percent) and goats (5.9 percent) (Table 4-21). Donkey and sheep producers did not utilise any veterinary chemicals.

Livestock	Type of	A1			A2			Total		
input	Livestock	No. of producers	No. using	% using	No. of producers	No. using	% using	No. of producers	No. using	% using
			input	input		input	input		input	input
Stock feeds	Cattle	723	82	11.3	161	22	13.7	886	104	11.7
	Donkeys	122	-	-	12	-	-	134	-	
	Goats	375	11	2.9	60	4	6.7	439	15	3.4
	Sheep	31	-	-	8	-	-	39	-	-
	Pigs	34	13	38.2	12	3	25.0	46	16	34.0
	Poultry	774	43	5.6	94	7	7.5	882	50	5.7
	Rabbits	6	-	-	3	11	-	17	-	-
Veterinary	Cattle	723	140	22.4	161	44	33.0	886	184	20.8
chemicals	Donkeys	122	-		12			134	-	-
	Goats	375	18	4.8	60	8	13.3	439	26	5.9
	Sheep	31	-		8			39	-	
	Pigs	34	8	24.0	12	1	8.3	46	9	19.1
	Poultry	774	61	7.8	94	6	6.4	882	67	7.6
	Rabbits	6	-		3	-		17	-	

 Table 4-21: Inputs used for livestock production by model

The patterns of purchased livestock inputs utilisation (by livestock) were replicated when the data is disaggregated by resettlement model. In both the A1 and A2 schemes, the utilisation of stock feeds was highest among pig producers, followed by cattle producers (Table 4-21). In the A1 scheme, purchased stock feeds were utilised by 11.3 percent and 38.2 percent of the cattle and pig producers respectively, in comparison to 13.7 percent and 25.0 percent in the A2 scheme. In both the A1 and A2 schemes, donkeys, sheep and rabbit producers did not use any purchased stock feed. In the remaining livestock types (goats and poultry), the A2 scheme had slightly higher percentages of households utilising purchased stock feeds in comparison to the A1 scheme.

The utilisation of veterinary chemicals was dominant among cattle producers in both the A1 and A2 schemes, but the A2 scheme had a higher proportion of cattle producers (33.0 percent) using veterinary chemicals in comparison to 22.4 percent in the former (Table 4-21). In the A1 scheme, pig producers were the second most important users of veterinary chemicals (24.0 percent), whereas in the A2 scheme goat producers were dominant after cattle producers. In both the A1 and A2 schemes, donkey and rabbit producers did not use any veterinary chemicals.

An assessment of the utilisation of livestock inputs by the district of study shows dominance of the drier districts of Mangwe and Kwekwe in the use of both stock feeds and veterinary chemicals across most of the livestock types. The dominance of Mangwe and Kwekwe districts are clearly exhibited in cattle, where for instance 80 percent and 61.3 percent used purchased stock feeds in comparison to less than 40.0 percent in the remaining districts (Table 4-22). A similar pattern was also present in cattle veterinary chemicals which were used by 73.8 percent and 59.4 percent of producers in Mangwe and Kwekwe districts respectively, while usage tended to be limited to less than 25.0 percent in the other districts (Table 4-22).

Type of	Type of	Live	stock	Chip	inge	Chir	edzi	Goro	monzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	ıba	Tota	i –
livestock	livestock	prod	ucers														
input		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Stock	Cattle	886	42.4	85	25.4	84	35.7	261	37.5	228	61.3	116	80.0	110	35.7	884	42.3
feeds	Donkeys	134	6.4	10	3.0	6	2.5	7	1.0	54	14.5	54	37.2	3	1.0	134	6.4
	Goats	439	21.0	116	34.7	30	12.8	106	15.3	102	27.4	47	32.4	34	11.4	435	20.8
	Sheep	39	1.9	3	0.9	6	2.6	13	1.9	10	2.7	7	4.8	-	-	39	1.9
	Pigs	47	2.2	16	4.8	-	-	18	2.6	7	1.9	2	1.4	3	1.0	46	2.2
	Poultry	882	42.2	149	44.6	42	17.9	217	31.2	270	72.6	95	65.5	95	30.8	868	41.6
	Rabbits	11	0.5	2	0.6	-	-	1	0.1	3	0.8	3	0.8	-	-	9	0.4
Veterinary	Cattle	886	42.4	75	22.5	77	32.8	231	33.2	221	59.4	107	73.8	48	15.6	759	36.3
Chemicals	Donkeys	134	6.4	6	1.8	5	2.1	6	0.9	48	12.9	46	31.7	2	0.6	113	5.4
	Goats	439	21.0	67	20.1	24	10.2	77	11.1	90	24.1	43	29.7	16	5.2	317	15.2
	Sheep	39	1.9	2	0.6	6	2.6	11	1.6	9	2.4	7	4.8	-	-	35	1.7
	Pigs	47	2.2	12	3.6	-	-	15	2.2	7	1.9	2	1.4	1	0.3	37	1.8
	Poultry	882	42.2	71	21.2	34	14.4	142	20.4	210	56.4	80	552.	44	143	581	27.8
	Rabbits	11	0.5	1	0.3	-	-	1	0.1	2	0.5	2	1.4	-	-	6	0.3

Table 4-22: Inputs used by livestock owners by district

In addition to utilisation of purchased veterinary drugs, some cattle producers reported accessing disease management services from the state through the Department of Livestock and Veterinary Services. These services included dipping, and disease diagnosis and treatment. For instance, 35.5 percent of the cattle producers reported accessing dipping services from the state, whilst 33.8 percent received disease diagnosis and treatment services. Significant to note is that there was a higher percentage of A1 cattle producer households (42.0 percent) that received dipping services from the state than A2 producer households (19.2 percent). Access to disease diagnosis and treatment services between the two resettlement schemes was more or less similar, as 33.4 percent and 34.8 percent of the cattle producers in the A1 and A2 schemes respectively benefited from this service from the state.

#### 4.3.3 Farm equipment and machinery resources distribution and utilization

The access to productive assets was one of the key constraints facing newly resettled households, as such, assets were generally inaccessible. Except for certain categories of hand tools, animal and power-driven farm equipment was available to very few households.

Type of asset		HH wit	h asset	Ave no.	Type of	access (%)		
		access		accessed				
		No.	%		Owned	Borrowed/	Both	No
						Hired		access
Hand tools	Hoes	1601	97.0	7.0	97.0	-	-	3.0
	Axes	1575	95.4	2.8	94.6	0.5	0.2	4.6
	Mattocks	982	54.0	0.8	54.0	-	-	46.0
	Picks	1250	75.7	1.3	74.9	0.7	0.1	24.3
	Spades	1080	65.4	0.4	64.3	1.1	0.0	34.6
	Spade forks	451	27.3	0.4	26.9	0.4	0.0	72.7
	Wheel barrow	1108	67.1	0.9	66.2	0.8	0.1	32.9
	Knapsack	570	34.5	0.5	33.3	1.0	0.1	65.5
	sprayer							
Animal-drawn	Plough	854	51.7	0.6	50.5	1.3	-	48.3
implements	Planter	52	3.1	0.0	3.0	0.2	-	96.9
	Ripper	20	1.2	0.0	1.1	0.1	-	98.8
	Ridger	33	2.0	0.0	1.9	0.1	0.0	98.0
	Cultivator	305	18.5	0.2	18.1	0.4	-	81.5
	Harrow	203	12.3	0.1	12.1	0.2	0.0	87.7
	Spike-harrow	71	4.3	0.1	4.3	0.0	-	95.7
Power driven	Tractor	103	6.2	0.1	4.8	1.4	0.1	93.8
machinery &	Tractor trailer	58	3.5	0.1	2.9	0.5	-	95.6
equipment	Plough	173	10.5	0.1	9.1	1.4	-	89.5
	Planter	44	2.7	0.0	2.4	0.3	-	97.3
	Ripper	19	1.2	0.0	1.0	0.1	-	98.8
	Water	24	1.5	1.5	1.3	0.1	-	98.5
	cart/bowser							
	Water pump	54	3.3	0.1	3.0	0.2	0.1	96.7

The most common forms of hand tools (hoes and axes) were very accessible, with access levels of at least 95.0 percent to the newly resettled households (Table 4-23). Other categories of hand tools were accessible to at least 50.0 percent of the households except for the less common types of hand tools such as spade forks, wheel barrows and knapsack sprayers. Apart from the hand tools, animal and power driven farm equipment was generally available to less than 20.0 percent of the households. Animal driven ploughs were accessed by 48.9 percent of the newly resettled households.

Type of asset		HH wi	th asset	Ave no.	Type of	access (%)		
		No	0/2	accesseu	Owned	Borrowod	Both	No
		110.	70		Owneu	Dollowed	Dotti	110
Hand tools	Hoes	419	95.7	11.4	95.7	-	-	4.3
	Axes	403	92.0	3.1	91.6	0.2	0.2	8.0
	Mattocks	263	60.0	1.2	60.0	-	-	40.0
	Picks	340	77.6	1.3	76.7	0.7	0.2	22.4
	Spades	312	71.2	0.9	70.1	0.9	0.2	28.8
	Spade forks	162	37.0	0.4	36.3	0.5	0.2	63.0
	Wheel barrow	350	79.9	1.4	79.0	0.7	0.2	20.1
	Knapsack	302	68.9	1.6	67.8	0.9	0.2	31.1
	sprayer							
Animal-drawn	Plough	167	31.8	0.7	37.0	1.1	-	61.9
implements	Planter	32	7.3	0.1	6.8	0.5	-	92.7
	Ripper	14	3.2	0.0	3.2	0.0	-	96.8
	Ridger	22	5.0	0.1	4.6	0.2	0.2	95.0
	Cultivator	84	19.2	0.2	18.7	0.5	-	80.8
	Harrow	52	11.9	0.1	10.7	0.9	0.2	88.1
	Spike-harrow	20	4.6	0.1	4.1	0.5		95.4
Power driven	Tractor	157	35.8	0.1	31.7	4.1	0.0	64.2
machinery &	Tractor trailer	108	24.7	0.5	23.5	1.1	-	75.3
equipment	Plough	123	28.1	0.4	25.8	2.3	-	71.9
	Planter	54	12.3	0.2	11.4	0.9	-	87.7
	Ripper	33	7.5	0.1	7.3	0.2	-	92.5
	Water	50	11.4	1.4	11.0	0.5	-	88.6
	cart/bowser							
	Water pump	75	17.1	0.4	16.0	0.9	0.2	82.9

# Table 4-24: Access to productive tools – A2 model

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=438

An assessment of access trends between the resettlement sectors showed that access levels were generally higher amongst the A2 households for most types of farm equipment compared to the A1 sector. The A1 households' access levels were higher on animal drawn ploughs, which are common in smallholder farming where 51.7 percent had access in comparison to 31.7 percent amongst A2 households. The access levels for hand tools were generally high in both sectors, but with higher access levels in the A2 sector. For the power driven farm equipment, which is required to work large pieces of land such as those redistributed in the A2 scheme, the percentage of A2 households with access was more than three times to those obtaining such equipment in the A1 sector. For example, only 6.2 percent of the A1 households had access to tractors in comparison to 35.8 percent amongst the A2 households (Tables 4-23 and 4-24).

In terms of access to hand held tools and implements in the A1 sector, ownership is the most common means of access ranging from 26.9 percent for spade forks to 97.0 percent for hand hoes. Ownership of animal drawn implements, which also determines the level of access by those without ownership, was very low with only 50.5 percent of the households owning ox-drawn ploughs, 18.1 percent cultivators and 12.1 percent planters. About 48 percent of the household beneficiaries completely lacked access to ox-drawn ploughs, whilst over 80 percent of the land beneficiaries completely lacked access to other animal drawn implements. Less than 10 percent of all A1 beneficiaries owned at least one power driven machinery and equipment while over 89 percent had no access completely (Table 4-23), demonstrating the very low level of farm mechanisation within the A1 newly resettled areas.

The type of access for the range of farm machinery and equipment (hand tools, animal drawn and power driven) for A2 households was through ownership (Tables 4-24). Access through borrowing or

hiring from other farmers and service providers was limited in the new resettlement areas (0 to 4.1 percent across all equipment categories). The hand tools which were accessible to most A2 land beneficiaries had the highest percentages of households owning them in comparison to the other equipment categories. For instance, 95.7 percent of the households who had access to hoes did so through ownership (Table 4-24). Ownership patterns of animal drawn and power driven equipment were generally higher in the A2 sector in comparison to the A1 sector. For instance, tractors which constitute the most critical equipment in land preparation, given the larger land sizes in the A2 sector, were owned by 31.7 percent compared to 4.8 percent in the A1 sector (Table 4-24).

# 4.3.4 Financial resources

Commercial farming in Zimbabwe prior to the FTLRP was heavily supported by credit line from the state and private sector financial institutions, while very few smallholders (especially those located in the high potential agro-ecological zones) accessed credit (see Chimedza, 1994; Moyo, 1995; Mukwereza, 2004). After the implementation of the FTLRP, the majority of private financial institutions withdrew from agricultural financing, leaving the under-resourced state to provide the bulk of the financial resources for production to an increased number of farmers through various schemes (most of which have been controlled by the central bank). State-subsidised credit has been overstretched and limited to a small number of farmers in new resettlement areas. Because of this, agricultural production in the new resettlement areas was financed through own savings and external resources for agricultural production as these were utilised by 77.7 percent of the households (Table 4-25). The A2 sector had a higher percentage (82.6 percent) of households utilising own financial resources for their farming activities compared to the A1 sector (76.4 percent).

Own financial	A1		A2		Chip	inge	Chir	edzi	Goro	monzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	ıba	Total	
resources for farming	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	1262	76.4	362	82.6	312	93.4	209	88.9	478	68.8	298	80.1	94	64.8	242	78.6	1633	78.2
No	389	23.6	76	17.4	22	6.6	26	11.1	217	31.2	74	19.9	51	35.2	66	21.4	456	21.8
Total	1651	100	438	100	334	100	235	100	695	100	372	100	145	100	308	100	2089	100

Table 4-25: Utilisation of own financial resources for farming activities

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

District-wise, Goromonzi and Mangwe districts had the lowest percentages of households utilising own savings to fund their farming activities, 68.8 percent and 64.8 percent respectively (Table 4-25). In the other districts, the percentage of households who utilised their own resources ranged from 78.6 percent in Zvimba to a peak of 93.4 percent in Chipinge District.

Access to external financial resources to support agricultural production in newly resettled areas was generally limited to a few households. For instance, less than 10.0 percent of the households indicated receipt of external financial resources to support specific crop production activities (Table 4-26). Within the A1 and A2 sectors, 9.6 percent and 7.5 percent respectively accessed external funding for specific crop production.

Access	A1		A2		Chip	inge	Chir	edzi	Goro	monzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	ıba	Total	
to finance	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	159	9.6	33	7.5	43	12.9	6	2.6	64	9.2	16	4.3	3	2.1	60	19.5	192	9.2
No	1492	90.4	405	92.5	291	87.1	229	97.4	631	90.8	356	95.7	142	97.9	248	80.5	1897	90.8
Total	1651	100	438	100	334	100	235	100	695	100	372	100	145	100	308	100	2089	100

Table 4-26: Access to external finance for specific crop production

Zvimba District had the highest percentage of beneficiaries (19.5 percent) who accessed external finance for specific crop production, followed by Chipinge and Goromonzi with 12.9 percent and 9.6 percent respectively (Table 4-26). In the other districts, access to external financial resources was limited to less than 5.0 percent of the households.

Access to external financial resources for livestock production was also limited to a few households in newly resettled areas. Only 3.2 percent of the households indicated having accessed external financial resources for livestock production. The level of access was similar in both A1 and A2 sectors as an equal percentage of households (3.2 percent) accessed external finance for livestock production (Table 4-27).

Table 4-27: Access to external finance for livestock production by district

Access	A1		A2		Chip	oinge	Chir	edzi	Goro	monzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	ıba	Total	
to finance	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	53	3.2	14	3.2	2	0.6	8	0.4	27	3.9	18	4.8	10	6.9	2	0.6	67	3.2
No	1598	96.8	424	96.8	332	99.4	227	96.6	668	96.1	354	95.2	135	93.1	306	99.4	2022	96.8
Total	1651	100	438	100	334	100	235	100	695	100	372	100	145	100	308	100	2089	100

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Inter-district analysis shows that there were higher percentages of beneficiaries in the predominantly cattle districts of Kwekwe and Mangwe, where 4.8 percent and 6.9 percent of the households accessed external financial resources for livestock production respectively (Table 4-27). In the other districts, less than 1.0 percent of the households received such external finance. The Government was the major source of external finance for livestock production (involving 2.2 percent of the households), while the remainder were funded by commercial banks (0.7 percent) and private companies (0.3 percent).

Source of funding	A1		A2		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Did not access funds	1630	98.7	428	97.7	2058	98.5
Government	10	0.6	3	0.7	13	0.6
Private company	1	0.1	-	-	1	-
Commercial bank	10	0.6	6	1.4	16	0.8
Relatives & friends	-	-	1	0.2	1	-
Total	1651	100.0	438	100.0	2089	100.0

Table 4-28: Source of non-commodity specific finance

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire

Non-commodity targeted external financial resources in the form of cash loans and equipment were also inaccessible to the majority of the newly resettled households, as only 1.9 percent indicated receiving these resources (Table 4-28). The percentage of A2 households (3.2 percent) who accessed these resources was twice that of A1 households (1.6 percent). Private financial institutions which provided the bulk of the funding for commercial agriculture have largely been reluctant to support the newly resettled farmers, arguing that state tenures cannot be used as collateral to guarantee their loans in case of foreclosure. Furthermore, the Government has not had adequate resources to fund agriculture and thus, its programmes tended to have limited coverage.

# 4.3.5 Skills and knowledge distribution and utilization

# 4.3.5.1 Access to information

Various sources of agricultural information exist in the new resettlement areas. These include media sources, local networks, NGOs and Government extension officers. Radios are the most popular source of information, as highlighted by 81.1 percent of the newly resettled households, followed by friends and relatives (73.9 percent) (Fig 4-7). The key public sources of agricultural information, namely extension workers, were accessible to 67.1 percent of the newly resettled households. However, the public extension system seems to have been overstretched by the FTLRP with a vacancy rate of over 60 percent amid increased demand (World Bank, 2006), as more than 50.0 percent of the households in contact with extension workers indicated that contact was infrequent.







Farmer organisations which played key roles in providing extension services to former large-scale commercial farmers were the least popular source of information, given that very few households<sup>38</sup> have membership in these associations. Further to that, NGOs were not popular sources of agricultural information as their activities were mentioned by only 27.3 percent of the households. The agricultural programmes of NGOs have largely remained focused on the communal areas. Traditional authorities were also highlighted as a source of information by 4.2 percent of the land beneficiaries. Beyond these sources of agricultural information, as discussed earlier (section 2.0), important linkages in the form of urban links and formal employment has helped some of the land beneficiaries to receive agricultural information.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>38</sup>The low presence of NGOs as a source of information could be explained by the fact that most of them are funded by Western donors opposed to the FTLRP; these donors have largely refrained from funding activities in these areas (even for humanitarian purposes) for fear of legitimising the process. See also Section 8.2.3.

#### 4.3.5.2 Agricultural training

Debates prior to 'fast track' on eligibility for resettlement emphasised the need for one to have had some form of agricultural training in order to receive land. These debates were influenced by the fact that training in modern farming methods has dominated the agricultural landscape and has been identified as the pillar behind the agricultural boom experienced in the communal areas in the early 1980s. Furthermore, the LSCF sector had always been viewed as a bastion of efficiency and maximal utilization of land; hence any transformation of the landscape would have to be superior to this sector. Indeed, Zimbabwe's smallholder sector has been characterised by various training initiatives that vary from the more long term forms offered at tertiary level (degrees and diplomas in various aspects of agriculture) and short term courses offered to practicing farmers such as the Master Farmer Certificates and related training on environmentally sustainable agricultural practices. The latter were offered by Government extension agencies and non-state actors such as farmer unions, NGOs and the private sector.

In 1948 the colonial Government established the Department of Conservation and Extension (CONEX) heralding the beginning of institutionalised extension and training (Hanyani-Mlambo, 2005). However, CONEX focused on servicing white commercial agriculture. It was only in 1969 that the Department of Agricultural Development (DEVAG) was established to service communal area farmer needs. The training and extension offered focused more on environmental management. At independence, Government's thrust focused on levelling the ground for the smallholder sector that had been marginalised by the colonial Government's policies which favoured the large scale sector. Agricultural training centres were established in almost all the provinces, and extension support agents were mandated to carry out more field-based training through 'field day' demonstrations. The smallholder farmers' union, in collaboration with a number of NGOs also established a number of short term training initiatives for members. In most instances, the short term training initiatives targeted either household heads or respective spouses with ready access to land.

Survey findings indicate that very little training has been received by the newly resettled household heads. Formal agricultural training has been very limited amongst the newly resettled households, with more than half (78 percent) of the resettled households not having any formal agricultural training. Only 10 percent of the sample received training up to Master Farmer Certificate level and a mere 2 percent attained the Advanced Master Farmer Certificate (see Fig 4-8).



#### Fig 4-8: Level of Agricultural Training attained by land beneficiaries

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

The patterns of attaining formal agricultural training was more or less similar across the districts as generally less than 15.0 percent of the land beneficiaries possessed some formal agricultural-based qualifications, with Chiredzi and Mangwe marking the extremes: Mangwe District had the lowest percentage of land beneficiaries with acquired formal agricultural training (4.3 percent), whilst Chiredzi had the highest percentage (20.1 percent) (Table 4-29).

The lack of agricultural training amongst the majority of the newly resettled raises a number of issues. Firstly, it suggests that earlier training initiatives in the communal areas were exclusive, mainly targeted at land-owning persons and excluded those who were living as members of households either as children or part of the extended family. Secondly, the lack of training is influenced by the composition of the beneficiaries, especially the second largest category constituting of beneficiaries from the urban areas and had not been involved in any formal agricultural activity before resettlement. However, the lack of formal agricultural training should not be analysed in isolation from other important variables such as level of formal education reached by household head and also past and current professional experiences.

Formal	Chip	inge	Chire	edzi	Goro	monzi	Kwe	swe	Man	gwe	Zvim	ba	Total	
agricultural	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
training														
No formal	254	86.1	163	79.9	516	87.8	253	91.0	135	95.7	260	86.4	1581	87.5
training														
O' level	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	1.8	-	-	-	-	5	0.3
agriculture														
Diploma	11	3.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	0.6
Certificate	2	0.7	11	5.4	9	1.5	1	04	-	-	13	4.3	36	2.0
Degree	19	6.4	27	13.2	57	9.7	19	6.8	6	4.3	27	9.0	155	8.6
Master	9	3.1	3	1.5	6	1.0	-	-	-	-	1	0.3	19	1.1
farmer														
certificate														
Total	295	100.0	204	100.0	588	100.0	278	100.0	141	100.0	301	100.0	1807	100.0

Table 4-29: Formal agricultural training obtained by land beneficiaries

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Earlier sections have indicated that the majority of newly resettled farmers received some formal education and more than half of the sample population has reached 'O'level. Furthermore, the majority of the beneficiaries have been engaged in either a skilled or unskilled professional employment prior to being resettled. Although these experiences might not have a direct bearing on agricultural skills, there are a number of advantages that come with having received some form of education. It will be easier to roll out new training initiatives given the fact that the majority can read and write and so it is presumed that the uptake rate of extension messages will be easier. In addition, some of the skills gained in professional wage economy employment might be easily transferable to the new economic activities. It is also important to note that rural social reproduction is not necessarily agriculturally based, but also involve other artisanal trades and other non-farm incomegenerating strategies that might have been strengthened by previous experiences.

The majority of the land beneficiaries possessed invaluable experience earned through practising agricultural production in the communal areas, and some also possessed other skills that are transferable to agriculture (such as general management earned from previous and current professional employment). Land beneficiaries in our sample data had an average of 12.7 years agricultural experience from the communal areas.

#### 4.4 Emerging Agricultural markets

Zimbabwe has tried different marketing strategies ranging from Government-regulated to free market systems since independence, all aimed at improving farmers' social reproduction. The marketing of agricultural commodities and production inputs has been characterized by partial or full Government intervention, and/or proliferation of new actors in the marketing channel during the FTLRP era. Input markets were characterised by shortages as demand outstripped supply as a result of increased landowners/farmers owing to the land redistribution programme in the backdrop of economic hardships. Output markets on the other hand were characterised by unattractive producer prices attributable to state controls (market and price controls) and the prevalent hyperinflationary environment.

#### 4.4.1 Input markets

#### 4.4.1.1 Crop Inputs

Agricultural seeds were most readily accessible through input support schemes as 32.8 percent of the households obtained them through this route, but the open market was the major source for the remainder of the households (Table 4-30). The percentage of A1 households (32.7 percent) who sourced seeds from the Government input schemes was higher in comparison to A2 households (20.4 percent). There were marginal differences in the proportions of households who sourced inputs from private sector and NGO schemes in both resettlement schemes.

An analysis by district showed that Chipinge had the highest percentage of seed beneficiaries (almost 50.0 percent of the households) of Government input schemes, whilst Chiredzi had the lowest with only 9.1 percent of the households benefitting(Table 4-30). All the six districts had land beneficiaries receiving inputs under the Government scheme while Chipinge and Mangwe districts had no access to private sector and NGO/donor seed inputs support. Access to seed inputs through own purchase was highest in Chiredzi District (88.5 percent) and lowest in Chipinge (50.1 percent).

Source of	Chip	inge	Chir	edzi	Gore	omonzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	ıba	Total	
seed inputs	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Government	173	49.9	19	9.1	135	18.1	195	40.4	34	26.4	138	38.1	694	30.5
Private	-	-	-	-	10	1.3	4	0.8	-	-	9	2.5	23	1.0
sector														
NGOs and	-	-	5	2.4	1	0.1	11	2.3	-	-	2	0.6	19	0.8
donors														
Own	174	50.1	184	88.5	601	80.5	273	56.5	95	73.6	213	58.8	1540	67.7
purchase														
Total	347	100.0	208	100.0	747	100.0	483	100.0	129	100.0	362	100.0	2276	100.0

#### Table 4-30: Sources of seed inputs in New Resettlement Areas

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089 \*Multiple response analysis

Compared to seeds, there has been a larger proportion of households who accessed fertiliser and agrochemicals from the open market as fewer households accessed the subsidised inputs from the Government schemes. Only 12.0 percent of the newly resettled households sourced fertiliser from the Government input schemes, whilst 86.9 percent accessed from the open market and the remainder from private sector input schemes (Table 4-31). The percentage of A2 households (13.8 percent) accessing fertiliser from the Government input schemes was slightly higher than that of A1 households (11.6 percent).

Source of	Chipi	nge	Chire	edzi	Goro	monzi	Kwek	we	Mang	gwe	Zvim	ba	Total	
fertilisers	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Government	107	30.6	1	0.5	41	5.5	34	7.1	2	2.3	85	23.4	271	12.0
Private sector	-	-	-	-	5	0.7	2	0.4	-	-	20	5.5	27	1.2
NGOs and	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
donors														
Own purchase	243	69.4	206	99.5	696	93.8	440	92.4	126	97.7	258	71.1	1969	86.9
Total	350	100.0	207	100.0	742	100.0	476	100.0	129	100.0	363	100.0	2267	100.0

 Table 4-31: Sources of fertilizer in New Resettlement Areas

\*Multiple response analysis

Similar to the situation obtaining under sourcing of seeds, Chipinge District had the highest percentage of fertiliser beneficiaries (30.6 percent) and Chiredzi District had the lowest (0.5 percent). Besides Zvimba District, where 23.4 percent of the beneficiaries obtained fertiliser from the Government input schemes, the percentages of beneficiaries in the remaining districts ranged from 2.3 percent to 7.1 percent.

Agro-chemicals were sourced from the open market by over 96.0 percent of the land beneficiaries, whilst the Government and private sector input schemes catered for the remainder of the households (Fig 4-9). Little delivery was achieved by the Government programme in making agro-chemicals available to the land beneficiaries as evidenced by the fact that only 2.1 percent of the farmers benefitted. The majority of them were A2 beneficiaries (3.9 percent) compared to 1.7 percent A1 farmers who accessed agro-chemicals from the Government. The private sector's contribution as a source of agrochemicals was insignificant (1.5 percent).

# Fig 4-9: Source of agro-chemicals in New Resettlement Areas



Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

In terms of accessing agrochemicals for use in the newly resettled areas, the farmers relied almost entirely on purchasing from the open market. Government programmes mainly prioritize seeds and fertilizer inputs delivery with little emphasis on agrochemicals.

# 4.4.1.2 Livestock Inputs

Similar to crops, livestock inputs were mostly sourced through farmers' own purchase on the open market. Less than 1.0 percent of the households in the newly resettled areas had sourced their stock feeds or veterinary requirements through government input schemes (Tables 4-32). This is so because

Government's support to the livestock sector was limited to infrastructure development and rehabilitation (such as dip tank construction and repairs), provision of dipping chemicals for communal dip tanks, provision of funds for national herd rebuilding/restocking and fighting livestock pests and disease outbreaks. Veterinary drugs made available through the Government programme were accessible to farmers through the Veterinary Department's district and ward officers who would make them available to farmers upon request and in the event of signs and symptoms of disease being reported, usually free of charge after confirmation by the district officer. These district and ward offices continued to receive diminishing stocks of these vaccines as the Government failed to raise adequate funds for restocking.

Type of inputs	Source of	A1		A2		Total	
	livestock inputs	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Stock feeds	Government	16	0.9	1	0.3	17	0.8
	Private sector	-	-	-	-	-	-
	NGOs and donors	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Own purchase	1861	99.1	375	99.7	2236	99.2
	Total	1877	100.0	376	100.0	2253	100.0
Veterinary chemicals	Government	8	0.4	-	-	8	.04
	Private sector	-	-	-	-	-	-
	NGOs and donors	1	0.1	-	-	1	-
	Own purchase	1880	99.5	365	100.0	2245	100.0
	Total	1889	100.0	365	100.0	2254	100.0

 Table 4-32: Sources of livestock inputs under input schemes

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089 \*Multiple response analysis

Own purchases by the farmers through different channels dominated (almost 100%) in both the A1 and A2 resettlement schemes. Shortages of the drugs on the local market saw some enterprising individuals importing these drugs from neighbouring countries and selling them to the farmers at a premium and usually in foreign currency. This channel played an important role since the Government had also failed to maintain the communal dipping system owing to lack of resources.

#### 4.4.2 Output Markets

Government's agricultural commodity marketing regulations during the FTLRP compelled farmers to sell specified commodities (maize and wheat) through designated channels such as the Grain Marketing Board (GMB)<sup>39</sup>. In addition to the market intervention, the GoZ also resorted to producer price setting and even re-introduced price controls on the final products such as mealie meal. As shown in Table 4-33, the sale of main food crop commodities by A1 farmers, particularly the controlled staple cereals, has mainly been done through the GMB (52.5 percent for maize and 73.8 percent for wheat) in accordance with the law, while 41 percent and 23 percent A1 maize and wheat farmers respectively decided not to market their produce. The trend is almost similar to that obtaining in the A2 sector as 58.4 percent and 87.5 percent chose to market their maize and wheat through the GMB, while 37.3 percent and 12.5 percent respectively decided not to market their maize and wheat through any marketing channel. By indicating not having marketed their controlled commodities, the farmers could have been concealing informal sales made through undesignated channels.

The production, marketing and pricing of small grains have remained uncontrolled as the Government tries to promote their production and consumption. Production of small grains (sorghum and millets) is only undertaken by 5.5 percent of A2 farmers and none of these farmers sold their small

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup>These regulations have since been repealed with the implementation of the Short Term Economic Recovery Plan (STERP) in 2009.

grain produce through any marketing channel, probably meaning that the entire production was spared for household or on-farm consumption. Retention and/or non-marketing was also high for edible beans and groundnuts with 43.3 percent and 71.0 percent of A1 farmers respectively not selling their beans and groundnuts while in the A2 sector, complete retention was by 45.9 percent and 80 percent of the farmers for edible beans and groundnuts respectively. Marketing of edible beans was mainly done through the GMB (25.4 percent A1 and 21.6 percent A2) and local area channels (23.9 percent A1 and 21.6 percent A2). Fewer of the resettled farmers (5.5 percent A1 and 6.7 percent A2) sold their groundnuts through the GMB while slightly more (20.8 percent A1 and 10 percent A2) farmers marketed their groundnuts through the local area channels (Table 4-33).

Model Type	Type of crop	No. produ	of cers	Mar	keting	chann	el				
		No	%	GM	B	Loca	l area	Othe	er <sup>40</sup>	No ma	arketing
				No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Main foods										
A1	Maize	1480	89.6	777	52.5	85	5.7	11	0.7	607	41.0
	Wheat	61	3.7	45	73.8	2	3.3	-	-	14	23.0
	Small grains	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Edible dry beans	67	4.1	17	25.4	16	23.9	5	7.5	29	43.3
	Groundnuts	403	24.4	22	5.5	84	20.8	11	2.7	286	71.0
A2	Maize	303	69.2	177	58.4	7	2.3	6	2.0	113	37.3
	Wheat	24	5.5	21	87.5	-	-	-	-	3	12.5
	Small grains	24	5.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	24	100.0
	Edible dry beans	37	8.4	8	21.6	8	21.6	4	10.8	17	45.9
	Groundnuts	30	6.8	2	6.7	3	10.0	1	3.3	24	80.0

Table 4-33: Marketing channels of major food crops

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Oilseed crops (soya beans and sunflower) were produced by 5.5 percent and 2.3 percent of A1 farmers respectively. Of these, 39.6 percent and 7.9 percent respectively did not market their produce while those that marketed did so through a wide array of channels. The GMB was the most common channel used by 35.2 percent and 50 percent of A1 soya beans and sunflower producers respectively. Selling within the local area was done by 16.5 percent of A1 soya bean farmers and 10.5 percent of sunflower producers, while marketing through private agribusiness entities was done by 3.3 percent and 23.7 percent respectively.

Table 4-34	4: Marketing	channels for	oilseed and	kev export crops
	· · · · · ·			

Model Type	Type of crop	No. prod	of ucers	Mar	keting	chann	el						
		No	%	GM	В	Loca area	ıl	Private Agribus	siness <sup>41</sup>	Othe	er <sup>42</sup>	No mark	eting
				No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Oil seeds												
	Soyabeans	91	5.5	32	35.2	15	16.5	3	3.3	5	5.6	36	39.6
A1	Sunflower	38	2.3	19	50.0	4	10.5	9	23.7	3	7.9	3	7.9
	Key exports	;											
	Cotton	82	5.0	-	-	3	3.6	70	85.4	1	1.2	8	9.8
	Tobacco	79	4.8	-	-	4	5.1	40	50.6	9	11.4	26	32.9
	Oil seeds												
	Soyabeans	46	10.5	26	56.5	5	10.9	-	-	5	10.8	10	21.7
A2	Sunflower	8	1.8	3	37.5	1	12.5	2	25.0	-	-	1	12.5
	Key exports	:											
	Cotton	5	1.1	-	-	-	-	3	60.0	-	-	2	40.0
	Tobacco	18	4.1	-	-	1	5.6	11	61.1	2	11.1	4	22.2

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

<sup>40</sup>Includes middlemen, export, agro-processors, private companies and the nearest town

<sup>41</sup>Agro-processors and contracting private companies
<sup>42</sup>Middlemen, agro-dealers, export and nearest town

Similar to the situation obtaining in the A1 sector, the GMB was the mostly used channel for marketing oilseed crops by the A2 farmers. Fifty six percent and 37.5 percent of A2 soya bean and sunflower farmers sold their output through the GMB (Table 4-34). Despite there being no regulation compelling the farmers to sell their oilseed commodities through the GMB, the parastatal remained the major option for most of the farmers due to the wide network of depots scattered across the country. Other private sector players in the oil industry had not managed to reach to most newly redistributed areas and have thus largely been inaccessible to land beneficiaries.

Key export crops (tobacco and cotton) are marketed by over 60 percent of the A2 producers through private agribusiness companies outside the newly redistributed areas. Surprisingly, 40 percent and 22.2 percent of the A2 cotton and tobacco producers respectively could not market their produce through any of the available channels. The low prices that were being offered on the market could have forced the farmers to retain their produce and wait until such a time when prices would have improved.

Model type	Type of crop	No. produc	of cers	Mark	eting ch	annel					
	-	No	%	GMB		Private Agribus	iness <sup>43</sup>	Other	44	Not marke	eting
				No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A1	Sugar	17	1.0	-	-	13	76.5	2	11.8	2	11.8
	Tea	6	0.4	1	16.7	2	33.3	2	33.4	1	16.7
	Coffee	1	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100.0
	Citrus	1	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	100.0
A2	Sugar	34	7.8	-	-	22	64.7	4	11.7	8	23.5
	Tea	13	3.0	1	7.6	9	69.2	2	15.4	1	7.6
	Coffee	5	1.1	3	60.0	-	-	-	-	2	40.0
	Citrus	4	0.9	-	-	-	-	3	75.0	1	25.0

 Table 4-35: Marketing channels of plantation crops

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Marketing of estate and plantation crops (tea, sugar and coffee) was most done through private agribusiness firms involved in the processing of these commodities. In the A1 sector, sugar was the most common plantation crop marketed by 76.5 percent of the producers to private agribusiness (Table 4-35). Whilst in the A2 sector sugar and tea were marketed to private agribusiness by 64.7 percent and 69.2 percent of the producers respectively. Some of the agro-processing companies condemned and rejected produce from the newly resettled farmers with the practice being rife in the sugar industry. This might be the major reason why some of the new farmers failed to market their plantation crops.

A number of new marketing channels have emerged in the newly resettled areas as farmers try to obtain and fetch the best value. High transaction costs associated with marketing through the formal and usually distant markets, coupled with unattractive prices and delayed payments in the case of such crops as maize prompted the farmers to look for alternative markets. The farmer-to-farmer marketing phenomenon was recorded in all the districts save for Zvimba with 44.2 percent of the farmers indicating that they sold their produce to fellow farmers within the same locality. The phenomenon was most prevalent in Chipinge where 82.7 percent accessed the market for their commodities through other farmers, followed by Chiredzi (50 percent), Mangwe (33.3 percent), Goromonzi (19.7 percent) and Kwekwe (5.5 percent). Other channels used by the farmers include

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>43</sup>Agro-processors and private contract companies

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>44</sup>Middlemen, local area, export, and nearest town

agro-processing companies (12.3 percent), urban areas (17.1 percent), agricultural exhibition shows (1.5 percent), GMB (8.5 percent), private buyers (7.4 percent) and other channels (9.7 percent) such as exports, black market and gold panners (Table 4-36). Marketing through urban areas was recorded most in Goromonzi (50.8 percent), followed by Kwekwe (12.7 percent), mainly due to their proximity to popular urban produce markets like Mbare Musika in the case of Goromonzi.

All the marketing channels were used by both A1 and A2 farmers with local farmers providing the greatest marketing opportunities for 41.3 percent of A1 beneficiaries and 59.1 percent of A2 settlers (44.2 percent on average). The least used emerging marketing channel is through agricultural exhibition shows (1.5 percent) which are merely used by 1.8 percent of A1 beneficiaries (Table 4-37). Urban areas (nearest towns and Mbare Musika) were used by 17.1 percent of the new land beneficiaries, while agro-processing companies were preferred by 12.6 percent of the new farmers. An interesting phenomenon has emerged where those farmers selling through other informal channels such as gold panning areas, across the border and direct to consumers (8.6 percent) almost equal those selling through the GMB.

Dictmint						Mai	rketing Cha	annel								
DBUIC	Local F	armers <sup>45</sup>	Agro-pr firms	ocessing	Urban	Areas <sup>46</sup>	Agricultu	ral shows	GMB		Private	buyers	Othe	r47	Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	N0.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Chipinge	91	82.72	5	4.55	2	1.82	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	10.91	110	100
Chiredzi	10	50	4	20	6	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	100
Goromonzi	12	19.67	0	0	31	50.82	4	6.55	9	14.75	0	0	5	8.2	61	100
Kwekwe	3	5.45	21	38.18	7	12.73	0	0	9	16.36	12	21.82	9	10.9	55	100
Mangwe	3	33.33	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	55.55	1	11.11	0	0	9	100
Zvimba	0	0	4	28.57	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	50	3	21.43	14	100
Total	119	44.24	34	12.63	46	17.09	4	1.48	23	8.55	20	7.43	26	9.67	269	100
Counses AIA	C Hond	obold Doo	olino C	non Hon	وامطمو	anotiona	N_N_	0000								

Table 4-36: New Marketing Channels by District

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

# Table 4-37: New Marketing Channels by Model

Model						Mar	keting C	hannel								
type	Local farmer	Š	Agro- process compai	sing ny	Urban a	reas	Agricul shows	ltural	GMB		Privato buyers	B	Other		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A1	93	41.33	28	12.44	42	18.66	4	1.78	22	9.78	16	7.11	20	8.88	225	100
A2	26	59.08	6	13.63	4	9.09	0	0	1	2.27	4	9.09	3	6.82	44	100
Total	119	44.23	34	12.63	46	17.1	4	1.49	23	8.55	20	7.43	23	8.56	269	100
Source: A	<b>MASH</b>	lousehc	old Base	eline Su	rvey, H	onseho	ld ques	tionnai	ire, N=	2089						

 $^{45}$  LSC, A1 and A2 farmers resident within the same area  $^{46}$  Nearest town and Mbare musika  $^{47}$  Gold panners, black market, cross border, direct customers and prisons

#### 4.5 Forms of productive investment

In spite of the so-called "tenure insecurity" within the newly resettled areas, some land beneficiaries have made various productive investments to aid their land use capability in addition to the existing infrastructure in the former LSCF. However, resource constraints and the prevailing economic conditions have meant that productive investments have been limited to few land beneficiaries. The productive investments made by land beneficiaries include movable (farm machinery and equipment, livestock etc.) and immovable assets (storage facilities, tobacco barns, workers' housing, etc).

Type of investment	A1 n	odel	A2 r	nodel	То	tal
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Homestead	1089	66.0	206	47.0	1295	62.0
Irrigation equipment	168	10.2	48	11.0	216	10.3
Farm equipment & machinery	111	6.7	39	8.9	150	7.2
Storage Facilities	123	7.5	30	6.8	153	7.3
Livestock	200	12.1	79	18.0	279	13.4
Tobacco barns	22	1.3	6	1.4	28	1.3
Electricity	5	0.3	2	0.5	7	0.3
Worker housing	123	7.3	62	14.2	185	8.9
Plantations & orchards	12	0.7	2	0.5	14	0.7
Environmental works	18	1.1	5	1.1	23	1.1

Table 4-38: Forms of	productive investment i	in newly resettled areas
	productive my connent.	in newry rescued areas

Source: AIAS District Household Baseline Survey (2005/06); N=2089

Besides construction of homesteads (62.0 percent), purchase of livestock was the most common (13.4 percent) of investments made by newly resettled households after being resettled (Table 4-38). Irrigation equipment was the second most common investment made by 10.3 percent of the households. The construction of worker housing was the third most common investment made by land beneficiaries especially in the A2 sector which employs more hired labour (8.9 percent). The other productive investments were made by less than 10.0 percent of the households in the sample survey. Disaggregated analysis shows that in general, the A2 scheme had higher percentages of households who made investments after being resettled in comparison to the A1 scheme. For instance, 18.0 percent of the A2 households made investments in livestock in comparison to 12.0 percent amongst the A1 households (Table 4-38). The A1 households were slightly dominant in the investment of storage facilities (7.5 percent) compared to 6.8 percent in the A2 sector.

Given the withdrawal of financial institutions from financing agriculture and the overburdened fiscus, the major source of productive investments for newly resettled households has been their own savings. More than 95.0 percent of the households who had made any productive investment had used their own savings. Financing from commercial banks and other private financial institutions was reported by 3.9 percent, whilst the remainder (0.7 percent) got support from the state for productive investments. These patterns of financing were replicated in both the A1 and A2 resettlement schemes.

#### 4.6 Concluding remarks

The FTLRP was accompanied by a shift in the land use and agricultural production patterns that were existent in the former LSCF sector. The LSCF sector focused on production of high value commodities for the export markets, whereas in the newly redistributed areas land use and agricultural production seem to have shifted towards food produce for local and domestic markets. There are, however, a few land beneficiaries who have replicated past production pattern in the LSCF sector and have ventured into export crops such as tobacco and horticulture especially in the A2

scheme. Agricultural production in the newly redistributed areas was undertaken in a context of economic crisis in the country and the unfavourable hyperinflationary environment affected the supply and demand of agricultural inputs, which situation was compounded by recurrent droughts. Overall, there was agricultural production decline in both value and volume terms, but in a differentiated pattern across the key agricultural commodities produced in the country. The shifts in the agricultural production patterns in the newly redistributed areas are not yet adequately understood and comprise a multiple range of internal and external factors. Moreover, the production goals of the new land beneficiaries have also not been examined empirically and thus comparison of production patterns to the former LSCF seem inappropriate.

# 5.0 NON-AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION STRATEGIES

### 5.1 Non-farm production strategies

The dismantling of the freehold property rights tenure system in favour of leasehold and permissory forms of tenure where ownership is vested in the state in the former large-scale commercial farms, has opened up access to various natural resources and other non-farming activities, to land beneficiaries and others (new and former farm workers; and ""squatters""). These farms and natural resources were previously under the exclusive control of landed white farmers. Natural resources within the confines of freehold properties in the LSCF sector were protected by trespass laws which enabled land owners to exclude other segments of the population from access. Prior to the FTLRP, several cases were reported in the media in which women from neighbouring communal areas were harassed by landed white farmers for "poaching" firewood in the LSCFs. This section discusses the various non-agricultural activities being undertaken in the newly resettled areas that are contributing to the social reproduction strategies of the new farmers.

# 5.2 Natural resources utilisation

Rural households in the newly resettled areas are involved in various natural resource extraction activities some of which are contributing to their social reproduction regardless of their legal status. These include gold mining on some informal basis as opposed to the more formal mining operations that occurred in the former LSCF sector, firewood cutting for own use as well as for sale, fishing, and wildlife harvesting amongst other activities. Some natural resource extraction activities such as hunting have arisen out of the isolation of the country through sanctions that have adversely affected the tourism sector. This meant less foreign hunters coming to Zimbabwe, resulting in opportunities arising for local hunters as well as illegal poaching, since concessions were normally reserved for foreigners who paid in hard currency. The nature and extent of the different forms of natural resources utilisation activities occurring in the newly redistributed areas are discussed in detail below.

The scale of incidence of these extractive activities tended to be low, although it is considered that these levels may be slightly under-estimated given that the data was collected from self- declared extractors and the practice itself involves transgressions of general regulations. In all the cases, less than 6.0 percent of the land beneficiaries across all the districts admitted to having engaged in the natural resource extractive activities (Table 5-1). As such, very few households openly declared their involvement in natural resource extraction activities for monetary gain, most probably because most of the activities involved are illegal. Natural resource extraction activities were more common in the A1 sector as higher household proportions were involved in most of the activities than in the A2 households.

Non-farm	A1		A2		Chip	oinge	Chi	redzi	Goro	monzi	Kwe	ekwe	Ma	ngwe	Zvi	mba	Tota	ıl
income generating activity	No.	%	No.	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Gold panning	103	6	18	4	1	0.3	4	1.7	5	0.7	42	11	68	46.9	1	0.3	121	5.8
Firewood selling	12	1	3	1	-	-	4	1.7	4	0.6	5	1.3	-	-	2	0.6	15	0.7
River/pit sand selling	3	0	1	0	1	0.3	-	-	-	-	2	0.5	-	-	1	0.3	4	0.2
Wildlife harvesting	7	0	1	0	-	-	2	0.9	5	0.7	1	0.3	-	-	-	-	8	1.4
Wood carving	28	2	2	1	2	0.6	-	-	6	0.9	16	4.3	2	1.4	4	1.3	30	1.4
Stone carving	6	0	1	0	1	0.3	-	-	4	0.6	1	0.3	-	-	1	0.3	7	0.3

Table 5-1: Natural resources utilisation by land beneficiaries

Source: AIAS Baseline Survey 2005/06, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Gold panning which is associated with higher income rewards was the most common natural resource exploitation activity for monetary gains reported by 5.8 percent of the land beneficiaries (Table 5-1). Gold panning by the land beneficiaries was more common in districts endowed with alluvial gold resources such as Kwekwe and Mangwe which accounted for 11.3 percent and 46.9 percent respectively of the land beneficiaries involved in these activities. Least in undertaking gold panning for monetary gains were resettled households in Chipinge and Zvimba districts, each with 0.3 percent of the households. Other natural resource exploitation activities for monetary gain such as firewood selling, basketry, wildlife harvesting and wood and stone carving were each reported by less than 1.5 percent of the newly resettled households. Firewood selling which was reported by 0.7 percent of the land beneficiaries might have been expected to be marginally higher, given that there are several urban wood fuel markets located in proximity to some of the farms in the surveyed districts such as Goromonzi and Zvimba that are in proximity to urban suburbs of Ruwa town and Harare respectively<sup>48</sup>. For instance, key informant interviews on six former LSCF estimated that 30.7 percent of the residents were involved in firewood selling. Furthermore, 62.7 percent of the key informants indicated that there was a decline in forest area in the newly redistributed areas since commencement of the FTLRP. Chiredzi District had the highest proportion of key informants who alluded to this fact.

Land beneficiaries in Chiredzi District generally participated in the natural resources exploitation activities on a more pronounced scale when compared to other households in other districts, perhaps because the area is a low rainfall area where agricultural activities on their own may not adequately sustain the households. Therefore non-agricultural activities are undertaken as coping strategies for income generation to supplement income earned from agriculture-related activities. Participation in natural resource utilisation activities was lowest in Zvimba District, with only a few land beneficiaries involved.



#### Fig 5-1: Natural resource extraction by gender

Source: AIAS Baseline Survey 2005/06, Household questionnaire, N=2089

The natural resource extraction activities undertaken by newly resettled households were differentiated on the basis of the gender of the land owners. Activities that required more human physical power tended to be more common in male land owner households and vice versa.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>48</sup>Urban wood fuel markets in Zimbabwe have grown tremendously in the post 2000 economic characterised by shortage of foreign currency that made it difficult for the country to import electricity from neighbouring countries to meet local demand. The power utility company, Zimbabwe Electricity Supply Authority (ZESA) has had to introduce power load shedding to rotate the supply of electricity to different residential and industrial areas to manage demand. Thus as a result some urbanites relied on firewood to meet some of their energy requirements in the absence of electricity.

For instance, activities that were physically demanding such as gold panning and brick making were common among male land owner households than female land owner households (Fig 5-1). Firewood selling activities were undertaken by similar proportions of both male and female-headed households (0.7 percent and 0.8 percent respectively). It is interesting to note that a greater proportion of female farmers were involved in stone carving (0.8 percent) than their male counterparts who comprised only 0.2 percent. Overall, men were the predominant natural resource extractors comprising over 87 percent of decision-makers concerning utilisation of incomes realised from the extractive activities. The exploitation of natural resources in newly redistributed areas was also confirmed by key informant interviews.

The most common natural resource extraction activities in the survey districts, as revealed in key informant interviews, were fishing (53.7 percent of respondents), wildlife harvesting (55.7 percent), wood harvesting (34.8 percent), grass harvesting (17.7 percent) and gold panning (9.2 percent) (Fig 5-2). Furthermore, key informants also reported noticing a decline in the population of wild animals (61.7 percent) and wild fruits (36.1 percent) in the newly resettled areas, indicating their exploitation by land beneficiaries and non-land beneficiaries although such information was not openly declared in the survey responses.





#### Source: AIAS Original Farm Survey (2005/06), N=316

Former and new farm workers were also involved in natural resource extraction activities in newly redistributed areas even though the majority of them did not receive land allocations during the FTLRP. Only 14.8 percent of the farm workers reported to have received land allocations under the FTLRP. Key informant interviews confirmed that natural resources in newly redistributed areas were also being accessed by non-land beneficiaries (25.8 percent) that included former and new farm workers; as well as ""squatters"". In particular, farm workers were reported as the major beneficiaries of natural resources utilisation in the newly redistributed areas. People from neighbouring communal areas were also reported to be accessing natural resources such as firewood and thatching grass from the newly redistributed areas; while some were grazing their livestock through some arrangements with land beneficiaries (see also section 7.0).

Non-farm income	Chip	inge	Chi	edzi	Goror	nonzi	Kwe	ekwe	Mar	igwe	Zvir	nba	Tota	al
generating activity	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Gold panning	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	9.4	-	-	-	-	11	1.4
Firewood selling	-	-	14	6.2	-	-	3	2.6	4	5.9	1	1.3	22	2.8
River/pit sand selling	-	-	1	0.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.3	2	0.3
Wildlife harvesting	-	-	12	5.3	-	-	1	0.9	-	-	-	-	13	1.7
Wood carving	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	4.3	4	5.9	1	1.3	10	1.3
Stone carving	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.9	-	-	-	-	1	0.1

#### Table 5-2: Natural resources utilisation by farm worker households

Source: AIAS Farm Worker Survey (2005/06), N=760

Farm workers in Chipinge and Goromonzi districts were not involved in natural resources extraction activities (Table 5-2). Data analysis reveals that most farm workers were involved in activities that make use of tree-based resources (e.g. firewood selling and wood carving). In Chiredzi, Kwekwe, Mangwe and Zvimba respectively, 6.2 percent, 2.6 percent, 5.9 percent and 1.3 percent of the farm workers were involved in firewood selling. More than 4 percent of the farm worker population was involved in wood carving in both Kwekwe and Mangwe districts, whilst 1.3 percent was from Zvimba district. Again, the illegal nature of natural resources extraction might have compelled some respondents not to reveal their involvement in the practice. It is highly expected that more farm workers should have been found to be substantially engaged in the practice given that social reproduction options are limited within this category with most having no access to land.

There were some notable variations in natural resources utilisation by farm workers in gold panning and wildlife harvesting activities. A smaller proportion (9.4 percent) of farm workers in Kwekwe were involved in gold panning, while 5.3 percent in Chiredzi District were involved in wildlife harvesting (Table 5-2). Other activities that farm workers were involved in albeit on a very small scale, included river-pit sand abstraction and selling, and stone carving with  $\pm 1$  percent of farm workers being involved in these activities in the district that they are located (Chiredzi, Kwekwe and Zvimba).

Although very few farm worker households indicated that they were involved in natural resources exploitation activities for monetary gain, earlier survey responses revealed that 81.0 percent of them were allowed to exploit natural resources by land beneficiaries of the farms on which they were stationed. Access to natural resources on the farms on which they were stationed was confirmed by  $\pm 80$  percent of the former farm worker households across all districts, except in Chipinge where only 62.5 percent indicated to having access. Firewood and thatching grass were the most common natural resources that farm worker households indicated to be accessing, with 66 percent and 51.6 percent households respectively, admitting to having access. Fisheries were the other common natural resource that was accessed by 29.0 percent of the farm worker households.

Besides gold panning, which is entirely illegal whether one is a land beneficiary or not, other natural resources can be extracted for domestic use without one breaking the law as long as the utilisation is done sustainably. Fishing, for instance, is legal for an unlicensed fisher as long as one is using fishing hooks and becomes illegal when bulk catching methods such as nets are used. The same applies for firewood which is the major source of energy in rural areas.

#### 5.3 Non-agricultural income generating strategies

Besides natural resources exploitation activities for income generation, households were also involved in other petty entrepreneurial activities of which the vending of new and second hand clothes was the most common as reported by 5.1 percent of the newly resettled households. Other petty trading activities reported by newly resettled households included bricklaying (4.5 percent),

tailoring (4.3 percent), repair works (2.6 percent), carpentry (2.1 percent), brewing of traditional beer for sale (1.7 percent), basketry (1.6 percent) and pottery (1.0 percent) while operation of small tuck-shop businesses was reported by an insignificant proportion (0.3 percent) (Fig 5-3).





Source: AIAS Baseline Survey 2005/06, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Despite the low level of participation by the newly resettled farmers (less than 6.0 percent), all of these non-agricultural income generating activities were more common in the A1 sector than in the more commercially oriented A2 farming sector. Activities undertaken by more than 1.0 percent of A2 farmers included tailoring, bricklaying, vending of clothes and carrying out repair works (Table 5-3).

Non-farm	A1		A2		Chipinge		Chiredzi		Goromonzi		Kwekwe		Mangwe		Zvimba		Total	
income generating activity	No.	%	No.	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Tailoring	75	4.5	14	3.2	8	2.4	12	5.1	29	4.2	25	6.7	4	2.8	11	3.6	89	4.3
Basketry	33	2	-	-	1	0.3	17	7.2	2	0.3	6	1.6	3	2.1	4	1.3	33	1.6
Bricklaying	88	5.3	7	1.6	5	1.5	6	2.6	21	3	42	11	11	7.6	10	3.2	95	4.5
Pottery	17	1	4	0.9	1	0.3	1	0.4	7	1	4	1.1	4	2.8	4	1.3	21	1
Vending of clothes	96	5.8	10	2.3	17	5.0	20	8.5	16	2.3	40	11	4	2.8	9	2.9	106	5.1
Beer brewing	35	2.1	1	0.2	4	1.2	22	9.4	5	0.7	5	1.3	-	-	-	-	36	1.7
Carpentry	43	2.6	1	0.2	3	0.9	6	2.6	7	1	22	5.9	-	-	6	1.9	44	2.1
Repair work	46	2.8	9	2.1	9	2.6	4	1.7	11	1.6	18	4.8	2	1.4	11	3.6	55	2.6
Retail business	5	0.3	1	0.2	-	-	_	-	5	0.7	1	0.3	_	-	_	-	6	0.3

 Table 5-3: Non-farm income generating activities by land beneficiaries

Source: AIAS Baseline Survey 2005/06, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Tailoring, bricklaying and vending of new and second hand clothes also prevailed in all the districts of study. Fife percent of land beneficiaries in Chipinge District were involved in the vending of new and second hand clothes. Basketry dominated in Chiredzi District (7.2 percent) due to the ready

availability of raw materials (ilala palm) which grow well in the hot and dry lowveld conditions. Beer brewing is common and most pronounced in Chiredzi District (9.4 percent), again owing to the availability of raw materials (sugarcane, sorghum and ilala palm fruit) when compared to all the other districts where less than 1.5 percent of the households are involved in the activity (Table 5-3).

Interestingly, another non-agricultural entrepreneurial activity undertaken by the new farmers involved operation of small on-farm businesses in the form of farm grocery stores and tuck shops. These small businesses were active in areas that are nearer to major city centres and as such Goromonzi and Kwekwe districts had 0.7 percent and 0.3 percent of the households operating them. The huge transportation costs associated with the management of small businesses in districts that are far from the city centre may have discouraged other land beneficiaries in districts far away from urban centres from engaging in such business operations.



Fig 5-4: Gender categorisation of non-agricultural income generating activities

Source: AIAS Baseline Survey 2005/06, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Activities that are less physically demanding were more common in female-headed land beneficiary households. For instance, tailoring and vending of clothes were being undertaken by a greater proportion of females than males with 8.4 percent females involved in tailoring compared to only 3.4 percent of males. Bricklaying and carpentry proved to be a male domain with 5.1 percent and 2.2 percent of males participating in these activities compared to 2.5 percent and 1.5 percent in the female category respectively (Fig 5-4). There was not much difference recorded for the involvement in repair works and beer brewing by male and female land beneficiaries although repair works would have been expected to be higher in the male category.

In general, farm workers were mainly involved in repair works as a non-agricultural income generating activity. Districts that are further away from major urban centres (Chiredzi, Kwekwe and Chipinge) had more farm workers undertaking repair work activities compared to those that are nearer to urban centres (Goromonzi and Zvimba), whilst the opposite was observed with tailoring. Less than 1 percent of the farm worker population was involved in basketry and pottery (Table 5-4). Two percent of farm workers were involved in rendering bricklaying services to land beneficiaries for the construction of homesteads and other infrastructure in the newly redistributed areas.
Non-farm income	Chip	oinge	Chin	edzi	Goro	monzi	Kwe	ekwe	Mar	ngwe	Zviı	nba	Tota	al
generating activity	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Tailoring	-	-	1	0.4	5	2.7	1	0.9	1	1.5	3	3.8	11	1.4
Basketry	-	-	4	1.8	-	-	1	0.9	-	-	1	1.3	6	0.7
Bricklaying	1	0.9	2	0.9	5	2.7	4	3.4	4	5.9	-	-	16	2.0
Pottery	1	0.9	-	-	1	0.5	-	-	-	-	1	1.3	3	0.4
Beer brewing	1	0.9	11	4.9	1	0.5	1	0.9	1	1.5	2	2.5	17	2.2
Carpentry	-	-	3	1.3	1	0.5	5	4.3	-	-	-	-	9	1.1
Repair work	3	2.7	15	6.6	5	2.7	5	4.3	-	-	2	2.5	30	3.8

Table 5-4: Non-farm income generating activities by farm worker households

Source: AIAS Farm Worker Survey (2005/06), N=760

Art and craft works in the form of basketry and pottery were the two least common non-agricultural activities undertaken by the farm workers and constituting. Only 0.7 percent and 0.4 percent of workers respectively. Basketry was being undertaken by farm workers in Chiredzi (1.8 percent), Kwekwe (0.9 percent) and Zvimba (1.3 percent), while pottery was an undertaking for fewer farm workers in Chipinge (0.9 percent), Goromonzi (0.5 percent) and Zvimba (1.3 percent) (Table 5-4).

## 5.4 Other alternative land uses

There also existed other non-agricultural land uses that were undertaken by land beneficiaries in newly redistributed areas to aid their social reproduction. These included industrial activities on the farms, operation of weekend homes, brick moulding and overnight accommodation facilities in the form of chalets and lodges. These activities were also reported by very few land beneficiaries as discussed below.

Use of the farm as a weekend home by the land beneficiaries ranked top with 6.8 percent engaging in the practice. The phenomenon is common in the A1 subsector (7.8 percent) compared to the A2 subsector (3.0 percent). The use of the farm as a weekend home was not associated with any monetary reward. Land beneficiaries who are not permanently resident in the newly redistributed areas visit the farm on weekends to conduct their farming operations as well as other recreational activities. Such beneficiaries that uses the allocated farms as weekend homes is as a result of the majority of the land beneficiaries (73.1 percent) being permanently resident in the newly redistributed areas.



#### Fig 5-5: Alternative land use in new resettlement areas

Source: AIAS Baseline Survey 2005/06, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Except for a few land beneficiaries, especially those from the A2 sector, with allocated farm houses on their plots (24.6 percent), the majority of the beneficiaries have had to construct their own homesteads on the allocated lands. As such, resources for construction such as bricks tended to be on high demand in the newly redistributed areas. Some land beneficiaries seized this opportunity to mould bricks for sale and 3.8 percent of them were involved in brick moulding on their plots (Fig 5-5). Brick moulding was more common amongst A1 land beneficiaries where 4.4 percent of the households were involved in comparison to 1.6 percent amongst the A2 land beneficiaries.

Kwekwe and Mangwe districts had the highest proportions of land beneficiaries involved in brick moulding, 13.6 percent and 6.7 percent respectively. Industrial activities such as tractor and motor vehicle repairs were practiced by 3.5 percent of the land beneficiaries (Table 5-5). The industrial activities were more common in the A2 scheme where 5.7 percent of the land beneficiaries were involved compared to 2.9 percent in the A1 scheme. Chiredzi District had the highest proportion of land beneficiaries engaged in industrial activities on the farms (13.6 percent), whilst participation in other districts tended to be below 2.0 percent.

Alternative land use option	Chip	oinge	Chi	redzi	Goro	monzi	Kw	ekwe	Maı	ngwe	Zvii	nba	Tota	1
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Brick-moudling	-	-	1	0.4	18	2.5	50	13.4	10	6.9	-	-	79	3.8
Use of farm as weekend home	10	3	6	2.6	57	8.2	35	9.4	25	17.2	9	2.9	142	6.8
Industrial/commercial e.g. tractor repairs	5	1.5	32	13.6	23	3.3	7	1.9	4	2.8	2	0.6	73	3.5
Keeping livestock for others	9	2.7	10	4.3	21	3	36	9.7	36	31.7	12		124	5.9
Sub-leasing arable land for cropping	4	1.2	-	-	18	2.6	1	0.3	-	-	3	1	26	1.2

Table 5-5: Alternative land use options

Source: AIAS Baseline Survey 2005/06, Household questionnaire,

Given that the majority of land beneficiaries had not yet managed to mobilise resources to adequately utilise land allocated under the FTLRP, some were sub-letting their arable and grazing land to other farmers. As discussed earlier (section 4.2), 49 percent of the land beneficiaries were utilising  $\pm 40.0$  percent of their allocated arable land, while 1.1 percent of the beneficiaries sub-leased their allocated land to other people for cropping purposes. Of the few households that were involved in this practice, 2.6 percent were from Goromonzi District. There was not much distinct variation between districts for the sub-leasing of land by farmers, although Mangwe District showed a higher tendency (2.1 percent) mainly due to the large pieces of land allocated to the beneficiaries in these regions.

Some land beneficiaries were also keeping livestock on behalf of other farmers (5.9 percent). This activity was more common in Mangwe District, which is predominantly a livestock production area with 31.7 percent of the land beneficiaries involved. As discussed later, (section 7.2), communal areas households faced with shortage of grazing land were the majority of the beneficiaries of this arrangement. The benefits derived from keeping livestock on behalf of other farmers by land beneficiaries included; income (21.0 percent), draught power (18.7 percent) and breeding (0.8 percent). Forty-five percent of the land beneficiaries indicated that they did not derive any benefit and were only assisting relatives in the communal areas to cope with shortage of grazing in their areas.

Key informant interviews also revealed other non-agricultural land uses that were inherited by the new land beneficiaries of the former LSCF. These non-agricultural land uses centred around farm tourism activities had been initiated by former LSCF owners, mostly during the ESAP period, to expand their foreign currency earning capacity beyond agriculture, as well as mask the underutilisation of land (see Moyo, 2000). The most common form of farm tourism activity was the provision of over-night accommodation in lodges or chalets on 11.7 percent of the farms surveyed. The operation of overnight accommodation facilities was found in three districts, Chiredzi, Goromonzi and Zvimba with Chiredzi District having the highest proportion of farms surveyed that operated overnight accommodation facilities (57.5 percent). The high concentration of overnight accommodation facilities was found in three districts of wildlife conservancies that attracted a large number of tourists prior to the FTLRP. In Goromonzi and Zvimba districts, overnight accommodation facilities were found on 7.4 percent and 1.3 percent of the surveyed farms respectively. Crocodile farming was another non-agricultural land use revealed by the key informant interviews, albeit on a low scale. Only one farm in Kwekwe District had land beneficiaries involved in crocodile farming.

## 5.5 Concluding statement

Non-farming activities provide an alternative source of income for rural households, especially farm workers, to supplement the non-viable wages currently being paid in the new resettlement areas given that the majority of the farm workers do not have access to land. Amongst the land beneficiaries non-farming activities were more important as an alternative source of income to A1 households compared to A2 households most of whom are of the people employed in formal jobs, and thus, have stable sources of income outside agriculture. The economic crisis during the post-2000 era affected agriculture-based social reproduction mainly through the unavailability of inputs (seeds and fertilisers) and thus non-farming activities augmented social reproduction in newly redistributed areas.

# 6.0 AGRARIAN LABOUR PROCESSES AND SOCIAL RELATIONS

## 6.1 Forms of labour in New Resettlement Areas

The FTLRP transformed the rural labour patterns by increasing the degree of self- employment in new resettlement area households in the formerly wage labour commercial farms, with some who hire in labour to augment family labour while some also hire out their labour to other households. Hiring in of labour in new resettlement areas was undertaken by 74.0 percent of sampled households, mostly on a casual or part time basis, though some on a permanent basis. The survey data also indicated that over 75 percent of the employed workers worked on a part time basis. Furthermore, 7.7 percent of the sampled households hire out their labour to other households within the newly resettled areas. In addition, a new phenomenon of labour mobilisation has been identified whereby relatives from the extended family, mostly from the communal areas, are being recruited into the wage employment by land beneficiaries. This phenomenon reflects an emerging "social-patronage" system where work relations are also defined by kinship ties (see Chambati and Moyo, 2003). Other new forms of labour being mobilised in the new resettlement areas include the organization of former farm workers into teams or "labour gangs" not tied to a specific employer to provide labour services for general tasks (e.g. weeding, harvesting, stumping etc.) and "specialized task teams" (e.g. tobacco grading livestock disease diagnosis; machinery operations and repairs etc) as demanded by the new farmers also reciprocal labour services common in the communal areas is offered.

## 6.1.1 Family labour utilised on own farm plots

The household is an integral source of labour for own agricultural production activities in peasant societies and the newly resettled areas are no exception. Family labour was utilised to provide managerial/planning activities and manual work services on the farm and thus, family labour participation occurred in all the sampled households in newly resettled households. The number of family members involved in own agricultural production activities ranged from one to seven or more members. In the majority of the households (32.7 percent), three to four family members were involved in own farming activities. The A1 sector in general had more households involved in self-employment as own producers in comparison to the A2 sector. In the A1 sector, 35.1 percent of the households had five or more members involved in own agricultural production activities compared 23.3 percent in the A2 sector. The use of family labour on own family plots is closely related to family sizes as was found that households in the A1 sector which had larger family sizes resident in the newly resettled areas than those in the A2 sector and thus, could deploy more members to own agricultural production. There is no significant difference in the number of family members used for own agricultural production between male and female-owned land in the newly resettled areas. (Table 6-1).

Household	No. of family	No. of family members utilised on own plots									
category	1	2	3-4	5-6	7+	Total					
A1	266	154	437	417	377	1651					
	(16.1)	(9.3)	(26.5)	(25.3)	(22.8)	(100)					
A2	104	53	135	89	57	438					
	(23.7)	(12.1)	(30.8)	(20.3)	(13.0)	(100)					
Subtotal	370	207	572	506	57	2089					
	(17.7)	(9.9)	(27.4)	(24.2)	(13.0)	(100)					
Farm worker	312	104	275	71	23	785					
	(39.7)	(13.2)	(35.0)	(9.0)	(2.9)	(100.0)					

### Table 6-1: Family labour use on own farm plots

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

# 6.1.2 Family labour hired out to farms and non farming activities

In addition to contributing to labour resources for own agricultural production, some households also tend to hire out their labour in return for wages in cash and kind, to augment their social reproduction. The hiring out of labour by households has mostly been associated with poorer peasant households (see Moyo and Yeros, 2005; McReynolds, 1998; Leavy and White, n.d). Amongst the newly resettled households, only 7.7 percent of the households hired out their labour to paid agricultural work (Table 6-2).

Household category	HH performing paid farm work				No. of HH m farm work	yed in paid	No. in Sample	
	Yes	Yes No			1	2	3+	
	No.	% of	No.	% of				
		HH		HH				
A1	142	8.6	1509	91.4	5.5	1.6	1.5	1651
A2	16	3.7	422	96.3	2.7	0.9	0.0	438
Subtotal	158	7.6	1931	92.4	4.9	1.4	1.2	2089
Farm worker	781	94.5	4	5.5	70.7	16.3	7.6	785

Source: AIAS Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

## Fig 6-1: Hiring out of labour for farming activities by newly resettled households





A disaggregation of data on the newly resettled households by model type shows that 8.9 percent of the A1 households hired out their labour compared to 3.5 percent of the A2 households (table 6-2). In contrast, over 80 percent of the farm worker households hired out their labour for paid agricultural work. Amongst those who hired out labour, the majority deployed one member of the household (Table 6-2). Amongst farm worker households, although the majority of the households (43.0 percent) deployed one member to paid agriculture work outside the household, while 30.4 percent and 10.1 deployed two and three to four respectively.

The hiring out of household labour resources by newly resettled households tends to be mostly seasonal, as 48.0 percent indicated having performed paid agriculture work during the rainy season, whilst an equivalent percentage of 21.2 percent hire out labour in the dry season and throughout the year. During the rainy season there is increased demand for labour resources as agriculture is rain-fed

for most newly resettled households. In contrast, among farm worker households labour is hired out throughout the year. The dominance of farm worker households performing paid agriculture work could be explained by the fact that amongst the sampled farm worker households, only 14.8 percent had access to land in the newly resettled areas to practice own agricultural production, while 26.8 percent and 8.4 percent had access to land at their places of employment, mostly in the confines of the former farm compounds. Interviews with District Administrator's Office officials indicated that there were various resettlement arrangements for farm workers. In some districts such as Zvimba, some farms were set aside for the specific resettlement of farm workers under the A1 scheme with reduced farm sizes compared to other beneficiaries, whilst in others three farm worker households were allocated one plot, a size thar was normally allocated to one household. Furthermore, amongst those who have access to land, sizes tend to be small averaging 1.06 hectares per household, had to socially reproduce through only agricultural production.

## 6.1.3 Hired in labour for farming and non farming activities

As well as contributing their own labour to own agricultural production and non-farming activities, some households also hired in labour to augment family labour resources. Households hired in labour on both full-time and part-time basis<sup>49</sup>. Full-time workers are employed on a permanent basis by households, whereas part-time workers were employed on a task basis as and when households required augmenting their labour resources. Part-time workers were normally employed during peak periods such as weeding, planting and harvesting. Unlike part-time workers, full-time employees were contracted to households either verbally or in written form and received periodic wages and benefits, normally on a monthly basis. Part-time workers were paid for the performance of specific tasks for the period they are hired in by households. Field observations indicates that part-time workers are normally hired in and rewarded on a daily basis. Field survey collected data on the average number of part-time employees hired in by households on an annual basis. As such, the use of part-time labour is just indicative, since the time periods they were hired in is not available.

Hiring in of labour	A1		A2		Total		Farm worker	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Hires in labour	1182	71.6	363	82.7	1545	74.0	109	13.9
Does not hire in labour	469	28.4	75	17.1	544	26.0	676	86.1

Table 6-3: Hiring in of labour for farming

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Evidence from the sample survey showed that 74.0 percent of the newly resettled A1 and A2 households hired in labour to augment family labour resources either, on a full-time or part- time basis. An assessment of the trends within each of the household categories shows that 71.6 percent of the A1 households hired in labour for agriculture compared to 82.9 percent in the A2 households, meaning that the remainder of the households in both sectors relied exclusively on own family labour for their farming activities (Table 6-3). Thus, hired in labour use was more common among the larger A2 farms compared to the smaller A1 plots.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>49</sup>The terms full and part time workers are used interchangeably with permanent and casual workers respectively.



# Fig 6-2: Hiring in of farm labour by land beneficiaries

#### Source: AIAS Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

The hiring in of labour for farming activities in newly resettled areas varied by districts. The hiring in of labour tended to be higher in the districts located in the high potential agro-ecological regions such as Chipinge (NR I), Goromonzi (NRII and III) and Zvimba (NRII), where 80 percent of land beneficiaries hired in wage labour from outside the household (Fig 6-2). The hiring in of wage labour was lower in Mangwe (NR IV and V) and Kwekwe districts where approximately 60 percent of the land beneficiaries employed labour from outside the household (Fig 6-2).

No. of workers	No. and per	No. and percent of Households Hiring in Labour								
hired in	(column percentage in parenthesis)									
	A1		A2							
	Permanent	Casual	Permanent	Casual						
0	1134 (68.7)	657 (42.9)	217 (49.5)	158 (37.4)						
1	140 (8.5)	24 (1.6)	55 (12.6)	4 (0.9)						
2	129 (7.8)	48 (3.1)	34 (7.8)	11 (2.6)						
3-4	101 (6.1)	154 (10.1)	42 (9.6)	33 (7.8)						
5	147 (8.9)	649 (42.4)	90 (20.5)	217 (51.3)						
Total	1651 (79.0)	1532 (100.0)	438 (100.0)	423 (100.0)						

 Table 6-4: Households Hiring in Labour for Farming Activities

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Looking at the different forms of hired in labour, field evidence shows that the majority of A1 households (68.7 percent) did not hire any permanent workers (Table 6-4; Fig 6-3). Amongst those households who engaged permanent workers, 8.5 percent hired in one permanent worker, 7.8 percent hired in two permanent workers, 6.1 percent hired three to four permanent workers and 8.9 percent employed five or more permanent workers. The usage of hired in labour was more common on a part-time basis as 57.1 percent of the A1 households hired in at least one casual worker on an annual basis (Table 6-4; Fig 6-4). About 42.4 percent of the A1 households hired at least five casual workers on an annual basis (Table 6-4). Close to 43.0 percent of the A1 households did not hire in any casual labour.



## Fig 6-3: Hiring of permanent farm labour by newly resettled households

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

In the larger A2 households farm size, the hiring in of permanent workers was more pronounced than in the smaller A1 farms whereby 50.5 percent of the households hired in at least one permanent worker, whilst 12.6 percent hired in none (Table 6-4). The majority of the A2 households (20.5 percent) who hire in permanent workers engaged at least five or more permanent employees, whilst 12.6 percent hired in one permanent worker and 7.8 percent and 9.6 percent employed two and between three and four permanent workers respectively. Similar to the trends expressed in the usage of permanent workers, the usage of casual workers was also more common among A2 households than in A1. In the A2 sector, 37.4 percent of the households did not engage any part-time labour (Table 6-4). The majority of the A2 households (51.3 percent) hired in at least five casual workers on an annual basis.

There is no significant difference in the hiring in of both full-time and part-time labour by male and female-landed classes. However, there is a bias towards males in the recruitment of permanent workers by newly resettled households as males accounted 66.7 percent of the total number of full-time workers. Data on the gender differentiation of casual workers is not available, but historical trends suggest that the majority of female agricultural workers are employed on a part-time basis. The fact that the majority of the women are employed in the less secure forms of employment means that their social reproduction are more vulnerable than those of male workers, as casual work is irregular and earns low wages.





Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

In addition to the usual wage agricultural labour, other forms of labour are being mobilized in the new resettlement areas. These new labour services include the organization of former farm workers into teams or labour gangs to provide labour services for general (e.g. weeding, harvesting, stumping etc.) and specialized tasks (e.g. tobacco grading livestock disease diagnosis; machinery operations and repairs etc) as per demand from new farmers. Organised labour services or "labour gangs" involve a group of workers who contract out their services as a group and tend to demand higher payment rates than other forms of labour. Specialist consultancy services were offered in the areas of motor mechanics and veterinary service (diagnosis and treatment of farm animals) and were utilised by 11.2 percent of the land beneficiaries. The use of labour gangs for general tasks was on a low scale as only 24.4 percent of the households in the sample data indicated they used these specialist labour services. These services are mostly offered by former farm workers. This is corroborated by evidence from a survey of 789 farm workers where 9.1 percent reported that they offered their labour services through labour gangs. The labour gangs were deployed by both A1 and A2 households and the total number of users consisted of 22.6 percent and 1.7 percent from either sector respectively. Within the resettlement models, 29.7 percent of the A1 households made use of these services compared to 7.2 percent of the A2 households.

## 6.2 Mobilisation of agricultural labour

# 6.2.1 "Recruitment" of family labour

In this section, family labour mobilised by the households is analysed in terms of sex, skills, age and source. Field survey evidence shows that males accounted for 55.0 percent of the family labour utilised by land beneficiaries (Table 3-3). These trends are in contrast to widespread empirical findings that the burden of work in rural areas is carried mostly by women (Muchena, 1994; Potts, 2000). The trends established from the survey are reflective of the population in newly resettled areas, in which males resident in these areas constitute a slight majority, compared to most rural areas where women constitute the majority of the population. These findings imply that the land reform has regrouped families as opposed to the situation existent prior to 2000 where a substantial proportion of the rural areas and the towns where they were employed whilst women and the children were permanently resident in the countryside. The regrouping thus increased the possibilities of improved familial relations and bonding.

The bulk of the family labour resources mobilised by land beneficiaries is from within the nuclear household. In the sample, 60.7 percent of the land beneficiaries mobilised their labour from the nuclear household, while the remainder drew their labour from the extended family households. The pattern of distribution of nuclear and extended family households remains visible when the two resettlement sectors are disaggregated. Similarly, across all the survey districts, at least 60.0 percent of the land beneficiaries mobilised labour from within the nuclear household except for Mangwe District where close to 45.0 percent of the land beneficiaries drew their family labour from the extended family household.

There existed various formal agricultural training skills amongst the sample population, ranging from high school qualifications to tertiary qualifications. The majority of the sample population (71.6 percent) had no formal training qualifications in agriculture (Table 6-5). The Master Farmer Certificate which was possessed by 18.3 percent of the sample population was the most common formal training attained. Tertiary education at the degree level was limited to 0.3 percent of the sample population. Disaggregated by resettlement sectors, the A1 and A2 schemes had more or less similar percentages of their population (29.2 percent and 29.5 percent respectively) possessing some agricultural skills obtained from formal training. As discussed earlier, land beneficiaries possess other informal agricultural skills (such as those earned in the communal areas where the majority of the beneficiaries originated from) and other skills not directly related but transferable to agriculture such as managerial experience from current and previous jobs in the formal sector.

Formal	A1		A2		Total	
Agricultural						
Training	No. of HH	% of total	No. of HH	% of total	No. HH	% of total
	members		members		members	
No formal training	5187	71.8	1239	71.5	6426	71.7
Certificate	117	1.6	38	2.2	155	1.7
Master Farmer	1309	18.1	328	18.9	1637	18.3
certificate						
Advanced Master	40	0.6	15	0.9	55	0.6
Farmer						
Diploma	539	7.5	105	6.1	644	7.2
Degree	16	0.2	7	0.4	23	0.3
O'level agriculture	19	0.3	1	0.1	20	0.2
TOTAL	7227	100.0	1733	100.0	8960	100.0

# Table 6-5: Skills of Household Members Mobilised

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06) N=2089

In most of the households in the newly resettled areas, adult labour was mobilised to perform services in agriculture, and children under the age of sixteen years were also deployed in some households. The AIAS survey could not ascertain the level of involvement of children, time periods, actual tasks carried out and length of time that they were employed.

In addition to mobilisation of labour from within the nuclear and extended families, there also existed inter-family arrangements of reciprocal labour exchanges. Under these arrangements, several households team up to work on one household's plot, normally during peak periods such as weeding and harvesting, and each participating household received these services in turn. In most cases under reciprocal labour arrangements, the household that is receiving labour services provided food and non-alcoholic drinks to other members during the time they are worked on their respective plots. Reciprocal labour arrangements enabled tasks that would take a long time to be competed quickly if each household relied only on its own labour pool. These reciprocal labour arrangements, which are very common in the communal areas, have to a limited extent been imported into the newly resettled areas. In the sample data, only 0.19 percent of the beneficiary households are involved in reciprocal labour exchanges and all of them are located in the A1 sector.

## 6.2.2 Nature of hired labour mobilised

The nature of hired labour in newly resettled areas can be delineated on the basis of its sex, age and skills. Data on the gender disaggregation of casual workers is not available from the field survey, but permanent work was biased towards males, as they averaged 78.3 percent of the full-time workers employed by newly resettled households. This pattern of recruitment of permanent workers was reflected in both the A1 and A2 schemes as males accounted for 77.9 percent and 79.2 percent of the permanent employees in the A1 and A2 households respectively. Across all the survey districts, males accounted for at least 70.0 percent of the permanent employees in newly resettled areas. Overally, males accounted for 66.8 percent of the permanent workers are employed in new resettlement areas. The implication is that the majority of hired female workers are employed in the least secure, casual or part-time work in the newly resettled households.

A new phenomenon albeit on a small scale seems to be emerging in the recruitment of relatives as part of the wage labour force. This phenomenon reflects what is termed the 'social patronage' system and presents an alternative to the highly oppressive system that governed work relations in the former LSCF that has been euphemised as "domestic government" by scholars such as Rutherford (1995). The social patronage system involves the recruitment of members of the extended family among the labour force, and work relationships tend to be defined by kinship ties (Chambati and Moyo, 2003). In the AIAS sample survey, an estimated 12.6 percent of the households recruited permanent workers from within their extended family, usually from the communal areas, whilst 6.1 percent of the households recruited relatives into casual workforce. The recruitment of relatives into the permanent workforce was more common in the A2 scheme where 16.0 percent of the households were involved in this practice compared to 11.5 percent in the A1 sector. The recruitment of relatives into the casual workforce was more common in the A2 scheme close to seven percent of the households were involved compared to four percent in the A2 sector.

The skills of hired labour can broadly be classified into four categories according to the roles performed and as defined by the households. These are managerial, supervisory, specialist skills – (tobacco, tractor drivers, livestock diagnosis, etc.) - and general hands. The hiring of managerial skills is low, with less than 20.0 percent of the newly resettled households engaging in such services. In most households, this function was met by the landowners themselves. Managerial personnel tend to demand relatively high remuneration that might not be affordable to new farmers in this transitional phase of the land reform programme. Furthermore, the small land sizes, especially in the A1 sector, might not warrant the engagement of outside managerial skills. Supervisory and specialist skills were hired in by 11.1 percent and 10.3 percent of the households respectively. The vast majority of the hired labour (78.6 percent) is classified as 'general hands' by the households. However, as discussed later, some former farm workers employed by newly resettled households were not utilising, the skills they gained in the LSCFs in their current jobs and, thus, their optimum potential is not being realised by the new land beneficiaries.

Although the bulk of the workforce was composed of adults above the age of sixteen years, children were also deployed by some households as hired-in labour. According to the Labour Relations Act, Chapter 28:01, the employment contract of any person under the age of sixteen years cannot be enforced, but the activity is not classified as illegal. However, the International Labour Organisation (ILO) Minimum Age Convention, to which Zimbabwe is a signatory, makes the employment of people below the age of fifteen years illegal. The implementation of these statutes is weak and children continue to be employed in various sectors, and especially in agriculture and mining. The study did not extensively address the involvement of children in wage employment but observation and press reports have indicated the proliferation of child labour utilisation in the newly resettled areas<sup>50</sup>. Less than six percent of the households in the A1 and A2 schemes openly declared the hiring of child labour (Fig 6-5). Their utilisation within the family is discussed in the next section.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>50</sup>A tragedy in January 2004 in Bindura exposed the growth of child labour when a lorry carrying farm workers after a day's work overturned killing 22 people and the survivors included children aged between thirteen and eighteen years (www.independentcatholicnews.org Zimbabwe: Child labour a growing problem, 6 February 2004). In related developments, school children at Kuwadzana High School in Banket were reported to have been forced to provide supplementary labour at North Banket Farm and another farm owned by a high profile business executive based in Harare in exchange for payment of a portion of their school levies directly to the school (Zimbabwe Independent, 19 March 2004). Children refusing to work are required to pay an extra ZW\$20 000, which the school claims is for sport development. A similar scenario existed at another farm in Odzi District, where the farmer took advantage of the shortage of books at the farm school by asking students to work on the farm in exchange for books from the owner (www.newzimbabwe.com, General Nyambuya's workers desert farm, 16 March 2004).





Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

# 6.2.3 Sources of labour

Hired labour represents the major source of labour in the resettlement areas, accounting for 71.7 percent of the total employment in newly resettled households, with the remainder being family workers (Table 6-6). A total of 19 243 hired labourers were employed by 2,089 households, of which 77.7 percent were engaged on a part-time or casual basis. In the A1 sector, hired in labour accounted for 68.7 percent of the workforce, and constituted 79.3 percent in the A2 sector. Thus, family workers are a more important source of labour on the smaller A1 farms than on the larger A2 farms. Hired labour seemed to be engaged mostly for agricultural production activities. Non-farming labour activities were not frequently reported by households, but the labour sources for these are mostly from within the family.

	No. and percentage of workers									
		A1			A2		Total			
Type of labour	No.	% of Hired labour	% of Total labour	No.	% of Hired labour	% of Total labour	No.	% of Hired labour	% of Total labour	
Hired labour										
Permanent										
workers	2873	21.6	14.8	1419	23.8	18.9	4292	22.3	16.0	
Çasual workers	10418	78.4	53.8	4533	76.2	60.4	14951	77.7	55.7	
Total Hired Labour	13291	100.0	68.7	5952	100.0	79.3	19243	100.0	71.7	
Family labour	6063		31.3	1549		20.7	7612		28.3	

Table 6-6: Composition of Rural Employment in New Resettlement Area	as
---	----

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Geographically, agrarian labour is sourced from within and outside the newly resettled areas. Within the newly resettled areas are four broad sources of labour – former farm workers, own family, other resettled households hiring out labour and squatter households. In the 278 former large-scale commercial farms covered by the field survey, key informant interviews revealed that on 47.5 percent of the farms, former farm workers were the dominant group of people employed on those farms,

## 6.2.4 Farm labour supply and demand in newly redistributed areas

Since the commencement of the FTLRP, there have been several media reports and studies<sup>51</sup> highlighting the shortage of farm labour in some newly resettled areas. The reasons noted for the shortages of farm labour experienced by land beneficiaries included the refusal of former farm workers to work for new farmers and competing in alternative income earning activities such as gold panning and food aid programmes targeting former farm workers (Chambati and Moyo, 2004). Earnings from gold panning work, for instance, are much higher than farm labour rates and have created labour scarcities for new A1 and A2 farmers as well as the remaining LSCF farmers in districts where alluvial gold is found in abundance (Chambati and Moyo, 2004).

Overall, 38.4 percent of the land beneficiaries in the sampled households experienced shortages of farm labour (Fig 6-6). The shortages of farm labour were not so different across the resettlement schemes, as 38.6 percent and 37.4 percent households faced them in the A1 and A2 schemes respectively. However, the variation in the shortage of labour is apparent when the data is disaggregated by the district of study. The shortage of labour was more acute in Goromonzi and Kwekwe districts where it was experienced by 47.6 percent and 42.5 percent respectively, whilst in the other districts less than 30.0 percent of the land beneficiaries experienced labour shortages. Goromonzi and Kwekwe districts are endowed with alluvial gold which has attracted former farm labourers as it has higher returns in comparison to farm wages, hence the high percentages of farm labour shortages suffered and experienced by land beneficiaries in these districts.



#### Fig 6-6: Land beneficiaries experiencing farm labour shortages

District

The opportunities for gold panning in the former LSCFs have been created by the removal of freehold property rights which white farmers formerly used to exclude others from exploiting natural resources (see section 5.0). The new forms of tenure introduced by the GoZ have opened up access to natural resources that were mostly the preserve of white farmers exploitation and benefit.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>51</sup>See Sachikonye, 2003; Chambati and Moyo, 2004; Chambati, 2007; and Chambati, 2009.

Reasons for shortages of labour	No.	% of beneficiaries
Competing alternative sources of income	58	9.5
Poor wages	60	9.8
Increased number of farmers	442	72.1
Farm workers have their own plots	17	2.8
Mistrust between former farm workers and new farmers	31	5.1
HIV and AIDS	5	0.8
Total	613	100.0

## Table 6-7: Reasons for farm labour shortages

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=613

Various reasons were highlighted by land beneficiaries as accounting for the shortages of farm labour in newly redistributed areas (Table 6-7). The increased number of farmers as a result of land redistribution from about 4,500 farms to about 150,000 new farm units was the widely cited reason by land beneficiaries (72.1 percent) (Table 6-7). It was noted that there was competition for farm labour amongst land beneficiaries as different payment incentive schemes were introduced to attract labour. For instance, some land beneficiaries were paying their work force with scarce food commodities such as sugar, cooking oil and mealie-meal, that were not readily available on the open market.

Competing alternative sources of income for farm labourers and poor wages were cited by 9.5 percent and 9.8 percent of the land beneficiaries respectively. The majority of the new land beneficiaries have been complaining that since they are only starting up, they cannot afford the wages demanded by farm workers through their labour union, General Agriculture and Plantation Workers Union of Zimbabwe (GAPWUZ) in the collective bargaining processes and thus, the wages they have been offering have pushed former farm workers to more rewarding alternative sources of income such as gold panning.

Some former farm workers who formed the labour pool in the former LSCF sector were allocated land under the FTLRP in their own right. As such, 2.8 percent of the land beneficiaries cited this as a reason for shortages of farm labour in newly redistributed areas. Land beneficiaries highlighted that since some former farm workers now have access to land to which they devote their services, cannot afford to hire out their labour to other land beneficiaries as was the case in the LSCF sector before the FTLRP.

Mistrust between former farm workers and land beneficiaries were also cited by 5.1 percent of the land beneficiaries as causing farm labour shortages. Land beneficiaries accuse former farm workers of refusing to work for new farmers and are thus perceived to be against the land reform programme. On the other hand, former farm workers allege that land beneficiaries are poor employers who pay sub-economic wages for their labour services. The mistrust between former farm workers and land beneficiaries was bred during the period of land occupations, where the former tended to forge alliances with the white farmers in defence of LSCF against land occupation movement with other peasants from the communal areas (see Sadomba, 2008). It is during this period that the tag of being "anti land reform" was attached to farm workers.

The farm workers union, GAPWUZ, is aligned to the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC) that mobilised its constituencies for the "NO VOTE" on the new constitution referendum in 2000. This was perceived by the land occupation movement as being anti-land reform. The 2000 Referendum "NO VOTE" is perceived to have consciously blocked the clause for compulsorily acquiring agricultural land without paying compensation for the land itself (Chambati and Magaramombe, 2008; Sadomba, 2008).

On the demand side, 48.5 percent of the land beneficiaries indicated that they required additional farm labour to meet their current agricultural activities. The need for additional labour was slightly higher in the A1 schemes where it was expressed by 50.1 percent of the land beneficiaries in comparison to 43.0 percent in the A2 scheme. District-wise, the analysis shows that the Goromonzi and Kwekwe, where higher percentages of land beneficiaries faced labour shortages also, had the highest percentages requiring additional labour, 59.2 percent and 63.1 percent respectively. Although the farm labour supply situation was constrained to an extent, the majority of land beneficiaries that required additional labour (72.9 percent) indicated that they failed to mobilise additional labour due to resource constraints. Only 16.7 percent of the land beneficiaries highlighted the unavailability of farm labour as the reason they could not employ additional requirements and 50.0 percent of these were found in Goromonzi and Kwekwe districts which expressed a high incidence of labour shortage in comparison to the other districts.

#### 6.3 Farm wages and benefits

The wages of farm workers in the new resettlement areas have remained precarious after the implementation of the FTLRP. During the time the field survey was conducted in November 2005, the urban Poverty Datum Line  $(PDL)^{s^2}$  was pegged at \$Z 9 500 000 per month for an average household of 4.6 persons and the rural PDL is estimated to be about 60 percent of the urban PDL, after deducting expenses not incurred in rural areas (Kanyenze, 2001). On this basis, the rural PDL as at November 2005 was equivalent to \$Z 5 700 000 and thus farm worker wages constituted less than 10 percent of the PDL. The gazetted wage constituted 11 percent of the PDL. Evidence from the farm worker survey shows that poor wages was one of the major problems faced by the majority of the workers (60.9 percent) who were in current employment.

However, it is also important to note that the marked decline in wage earnings among farm workers has to be understood in the broader context of macroeconomic instability in Zimbabwe, characterised by hyperinflation of 502.35 percent as in November 2005 (RBZ website, <u>www.rbz.co.zw</u>, accessed 10 November 2007) that has affected the generality of the people, including the urban working classes. Wages for farm workers which have been, historically low are adjusted on a quarterly basis, while inflation increases rapidly on daily and monthly basis, causing wages for all economic sectors to compare poorly with the PDL. For instance in mid 2005, the minimum wage in the urban commercial sector only covered 33 percent of the Consumer Council of Zimbabwe (CCZ) 'food basket' and wages in the manufacturing sector were outpaced by household expenditure needs throughout 2005 (Famine Early Warning System Network [FEWSNET], 2005). Although the farm worker wages compare poorly to the PDL, it is important to note that their total earnings also include other income transfers through various benefits provided by employers as discussed below. If these income transfers (housing, food rations, land to grow crops, etc.) are added to wages received by farm workers, the total income may not be as low if compared to the PDL as appears to be the case above. However note that the additional income transfers received, were guaranteed.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>52</sup>The PDL measures the income required to meet the basic needs of an average family composition and size, and provides a useful tool for assessing the adequacy of current farm worker earnings. The PDL, is calculated by the Poverty Assessment Study Survey (MPSL&SW, 1997). The use of the PDL as a minimum wage indicator has been in the policy debates since it was proposed by the Riddell Commission in 1978, but its implementation has been heavily resisted by employers in all economic sectors because of its implication on their wage bills (see Herbst, 1987; Gandure and Marongwe, 2006). Despite being rejected, the PDL is commonly used in assessing vulnerability of wage incomes in Zimbabwe (see MPSL&SW, 1997).

Benefit	No. of farm	% of total
	workers	
Food rations	171	50.6
Fuel	63	18.6
Health insurance	54	16.0
Food security gardens	57	16.9
Grazing land	5	1.5
Annual leave	135	39.9
Protective clothing	121	35.8
Funeral assistance	55	16.3

## Table 6-8: Additional Benefits Provided to Wage labour

#### Source: AIAS District Household Baseline Survey (2005/06), N=338

There are various benefits provided to farm workers as part of the remuneration for their labour services in addition to their wages. Benefits provided include housing, fuel, food rations, land to grow crops (food security gardens), annual leave, funeral assistance and protective clothing (Table 6-8). However, very few farm workers who were currently employed indicated receiving these benefits and they are usually below the gazetted statutory requirements for permanent workers<sup>53</sup>. According to gazetted statutory requirements, employers are obliged to pay the following benefits: transport, fuel, light and accommodation. Other benefits that need to be provided to workers are governed by other pieces of legislation that include the Pensions and Other Benefits Act (Chapter 16:01), and the National Social Security Authority (NSSA) Act (Chapter 17:04).

With redistribution of land under the FTLRP, farm compounds were inherited by the new farmers and this has presented its own set of challenges. In the case of A2 farms, 'ownership' of infrastructure on the previous LSCF farms before the subdivisions is vested in the plot in which it is located and there has been a tendency among A2 farmers to exclude neighbouring plot holders from accessing such infrastructure. For instance, if the farm compound that used to house workers in the former LSCF is located on a given plot, the owner of that plot tends not to want workers from other plots to reside there as the costs of maintaining the infrastructure accrue to the plot owner. In the A1 sector, ownership of infrastructure inherited from the former LSCF sector is vested in the state, so the problems tend to be different.

Government policy on the fate of former farm workers resident in farm compounds on resettled farms is not clear but implies they should be allowed temporary residence on these sites while solutions are being sought (Chambati and Moyo, 2004). The AIAS field survey found that an estimated two thirds of the former farm workers are still resident in the farm compounds regardless of their employment status, implying that new farm workers may require alternative accommodation. Following the habit of the former LSCF sector, new farmers tend to favour the linking of residency in the farm compound to employment on the farms. As discussed in section 2.3.3, close to 80.0 percent of the farm workers are resident in the former farm compounds not necessarily located on the plots they are employed. In the survey of farm workers, 73.1 percent of the farm workers in employment. As such, farm workers in new farms do not necessarily reside on the farms on which they are employed. Some live in farm compounds at a particular farm but are employed elsewhere, while some reside on their plots gained during the FTLRP, and others live in the neighbouring communal areas.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>53</sup>Employers can seek exemptions from the MPSL&SW on paying the gazetted wages and benefits. Very few employers have sought such exemptions in the post 2000 period. The majority of the new employers have not yet familiarised themselves with the requirements of the labour laws.

manent workers<sup>53</sup>. According to gazetted statutory requirements, employers are obliged to pay the following benefits: transport, fuel, light and accommodation. Other benefits that need to be provided to workers are governed by other pieces of legislation that include the Pensions and Other Benefits Act (Chapter 16:01), and the National Social Security Authority (NSSA) Act (Chapter 17:04).

With redistribution of land under the FTLRP, farm compounds were inherited by the new farmers and this has presented its own set of challenges. In the case of A2 farms, 'ownership' of infrastructure on the previous LSCF farms before the subdivisions is vested in the plot in which it is located and there has been a tendency among A2 farmers to exclude neighbouring plot holders from accessing such infrastructure. For instance, if the farm compound that used to house workers in the former LSCF is located on a given plot, the owner of that plot tends not to want workers from other plots to reside there as the costs of maintaining the infrastructure accrue to the plot owner. In the A1 sector, ownership of infrastructure inherited from the former LSCF sector is vested in the state, so the problems tend to be different.

Government policy on the fate of former farm workers resident in farm compounds on resettled farms is not clear but implies they should be allowed temporary residence on these sites while solutions are being sought (Chambati and Moyo, 2004). The AIAS field survey found that an estimated two thirds of the former farm workers are still resident in the farm compounds regardless of their employment status, implying that new farm workers may require alternative accommodation. Following the habit of the former LSCF sector, new farmers tend to favour the linking of residency in the farm compound to employment on the farms<sup>54</sup>. As discussed in section 2.3.3, close to 80.0 percent of the farm workers are resident in the former farm compounds not necessarily located on the plots they are employed. In the survey of farm workers, 73.1 percent of the farm workers in employment. As such, farm workers in new farms do not necessarily reside on the farms on which they are employed. Some live in farm compounds at a particular farm but are employed elsewhere, while some reside on their plots gained during the FTLRP, and others live in the neighbouring communal areas.

The housing facilities provided by new farmers are mostly those already existing in the former farm compounds. This tends to result in conflicts between new farmers and farm workers with regards to those who are not currently employed on the new farms, with some farm workers interviewed indicating that they had been threatened with eviction by the new farmers, although very few were eventually evicted (see section 2.3.3). Former farm workers who have known no other home except the farm compound believe it is their right to reside there, regardless of their employment status (Chambati and Magaramombe, 2008). An overall result may have been a failure by new farmers to provide accommodation for their farm workers, given the shortage of resources for construction of alternative housing.

Another benefit that farm workers are accorded is the allocation of garden plots or food security gardens to practise subsistence agriculture at their places of employment. In the resettlement sector, only 16.0 percent of the farm workers were provided with space for food security gardens by their employers.

Besides access to land through their employment links, 26.8 percent of farm workers also reported having access to land in their communal areas<sup>56</sup> and some (14.8 percent) had gained access to land during the FTLRP. Evidence from the household survey also showed that 8.1 percent of the beneficiaries openly identified themselves as former farm workers. In reality, more farm workers gained land through multiple routes, including through registering with chiefs in the communal areas

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>54</sup>Philip Chiyangwa, a leading ZANU-PF politician and businessperson, was granted an order by the High Court to evict his 36 Old Citrus farm workers from the farm compound after they failed to agree on new employment contracts (Daily Mirror, 17 June 2005). However Mr Chiyangwa subsequently lost the case on appeal.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>55</sup>In some instances, access to land in the communal areas by farm workers from the former LSCF was used by white farmers to justify low wages as work was considered to be supplementing subsistence agricultural production (see Rubert, 1997).

and land occupations in their own right, in alliance with war veterans and landless peasants (see Chambati and Moyo, forthcoming). The plot sizes available to farm workers through the different routes range from 0.20 ha to 4.0 ha per household. Land access for farm workers through these different routes has been critical in subsidising their meagre wages to socially reproduce themselves through subsistence agricultural production. The fact that few workers have access to food security gardens has the effect of increasing the proportion of food purchased by farm workers to meet their subsistence needs. As farm workers have always been below the Food Poverty Line (FPL)<sup>56</sup> since the colonial period (Clarke, 1977; Kanyenze, 2001), this trend has the potential to further entrench food insecurity among farm workers' households.

However, some new farmers are issuing food rations to cushion their workers from food insecurity, following the trend in the LSCF sector. Fifty percent of the farm workers also confirmed that they received food rations, mostly in the form of maize grain, while others received meals during working hours ) and some received a defined food basket comprising basic requirements (maize grain, cooking oil, soap, dried fish, etc.). The maize grain provided to farm workers ranged from 10 to 50 kilogrammes per household per month during the time of the survey.

The NSSA Act (Chapter17:04) stipulates that workers in the agricultural sector should be provided with protective clothing that limits their exposure to harmful chemicals (pesticides, agrochemicals, etc.) used in the agricultural production process. Despite the existence of statutes governing safety at the workplace, the major factor limiting compliance, is the poor enforcement of the legislation by the state, largely because of the costs of inspections given the spatial dispersion of farms, against a background of strained Government resources. The redistribution of land has increased these costs due to the increased number of farmers. Close to 36.0 percent of the interviewed workers reported that they were provided with protective clothing that included overalls, gumboots, work suits and safety shoes.

The provision of health insurance to farm workers is also low, as only 16.0 percent of the farm workers interviewed reported receiving this benefit, despite the absence of healthcare services in new resettlement areas. The model of health insurance is a demand driven process whereby workers are given some level of assistance in the form of cash to cover medical bills and transport to a health centre in the event that they fall ill.

The Labour Relations Act (Chapter 28:01) stipulates that all employees are entitled to a minimum of 30 days paid annual leave and twelve occasional leave days per year (Gwisai, 2006). However, field evidence reveales that only 39.9 percent of the farm workers interviewed were granted annual leave by their employers. This is in violation of existing labour statutes. This was corroborated by evidence provided by employers, in which 37.7 percent reported providing such benefits to their workers. The length of the annual leave for those who receive it ranges from twelve to 30 days. At this point in time, worker rights are not being realised in the new resettlement areas as most new farmers might not yet be conversant with the requirements of the labour statutes.

## Perceptions of conditions of work

The conditions of work for both new and former farm workers in the new resettlement areas varies widely as reflected in the perceptions of the workers themselves. In the farm worker survey, 46.4 percent of the former farm workers interviewed perceive working conditions to have improved from those of the former LSCF sector, while 36.6 percent and 17 percent respectively felt that there had been deterioration or no change (Fig 6-7).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>56</sup>The Food Poverty Line (FPL) represents the minimum consumption expenditure necessary to ensure that each household member can (if all expenditure were devoted to food) consume a minimum food basket representing 2 100 kilocalories (CSO, 2007).

Inter-district analysis also shows the variation of former farm worker perceptions on the working conditions in comparison to the LSCF sector. In general across all the districts, slightly more former farm workers perceived conditions to have improved in the new resettlement areas (Fig 6-5). In order to assess the conditions of work in new resettlement areas, the survey examined the relations existing between workers and employers, the methods used to allocate and ensure task completion or work objectives, the hours of work, the occurrence of labour disputes and resolution mechanisms.



Fig 6-7: Farm Worker Perceptions of working conditions in comparison to LSCF

## Source: AIAS Farm Worker Survey (2005/6) N=789

The occurrence of labour disputes is a usefull indicator of the relations prevailing between workers and employers. In the farm worker survey, only 17.8 percent of the workers who were currently employed as either full or part time workers reported that they had a labour dispute with their respective employer, indicating the existence of cordial relations for the majority of workers in newly resettled areas. The labour disputes highlighted mainly focused on wages (low wages, 51.8 percent; refusal to pay wages by new farmers, 1.8 percent; and late payment of wages, 8.9 percent). Other labour disputes included long working hours (35.7 percent) and refusal of employers to provide protective clothing (1.8 percent). The methods of supervision for the accomplishment of tasks have shifted from the intimidating and harassment tactics of employees once common in the LSCF sector (Clarke, 1970; Loewenson, 1992; Amanor-Wilks, 1995; McIvor, 1995; Rutherford, 2001) to negotiation with employees. None of the farm workers interviewed reported being harassed or intimidated by their employers in the process of ensuring the accomplishment of tasks in new resettlement areas. All the farm workers in the sample indicated that there are negotiation processes between employers and employees in the accomplishment of tasks.

There are two dominant models of task allocation to agricultural workers in the new resettlement areas, the 'output based' and temporal methods. The output based method also popularly known as mugwazo involves the allocation of tasks to employees for completion within a given time period, normally the work day. The system has its origins in the ticket system used in South African mines in the 1950s and later adopted in the LSCF sector in the Southern Africa region (Clarke, 1977; Mathers, 1997; Rubert, 1997). Under the ticket system, workers were required to complete 30 full tickets which were supposed to be equivalent to 30 days work, but it usually took 40 days to complete 30 tickets. Under the temporal method, workers are assigned a task and accomplish what they can during a set work day. In the field survey districts, 74.3 percent of the currently employed farm workers have temporal working arrangements, while the remainder have a mugwazo task allocation system at their places of employment. But 61.0 percent and 79.6 percent of the employers indicated that they utilised the mugwazo system to allocate tasks to permanent and casual workers respectively, indicating its

importance in the accomplishment of farm activities. Although the mugwazo task allocation system was meant to ensure timely accomplishment of farming activities in both the former LSCF sector and new resettlement areas, in the latter it has not been tied to wage cuts as was the case in the former LSCF sector. The majority of agricultural workers (71.9 percent) reported working between nine and twelve hours a day over a six day working week (Table 6-9), and 21 percent worked between five and eight labour hours per day. Thus, it seems that the bulk of the farm workers in the surveyed new resettlement areas are working beyond the regulated eight working hours per day as stipulated by the Labour Relations Act (Chapter 28:01).

No. of working	No.	% of total		
hours				
1-4	15	2.8		
5-8	113	20.9		
9-12	388	71.9		
>12	24	4.4		
Total	540	100.0		

Table 6-9: Working Hours in New Resettlement Areas

Source: AIAS Farm Workers Survey (2005/06), N=540

However, there appears to be a compensatory process for the additional labour hours contributed by workers through overtime pay and granting of extra leave days in addition to those already guaranteed/granted. The majority of the workers who worked beyond the regulated working hours (71.3 percent) received compensation through payment of overtime (39.6 percent), 31.7 percent were granted additional leave days, and 28.1 percent did not receive any compensation for the extra hours worked.

#### 6.4 Rural labour structures and relations

#### 6.4.1 Emergent structure of rural labour

Field evidence allows us to discern an emergent structure of rural labour utilisation among A1 and A2 households. Households were empirically classified into three categories from low to high depending on the absolute level of farm labour utilisation (Table 6-10). The first category of low level farm labour utilisation consists of households who utilise family labour in combination with part time labour only. The second category of medium level labour users hires in one full time worker plus some part time labour to augment family labour resources. The third category of high level labour users hires in at least two permanent workers plus some part time workers to augment family labour. Across the three categories of households, some households also hire out their labour to other households in return for wages in cash or kind.

Level of	No. of households	% of	Average labour used ( No. of persons)							
labour use		HH								
			Hired In		Family*	Family	Hired			
						+Full Time	Out*			
			Full time	Part Time						
Low	1351	64.67	0.0	5.52	3.61	3.61	0.13			
Medium	195	9.33	1.0	7.69	3.53	4.53	0.14			
High	543	25.99	7.55	12.87	3.77	11.31	0.10			
Total	2089	100.00	2.05	7.64	3.64	5.70	0.12			

Table 6-10: Overall Emergent Structure of Rural Labour in New Resettlement Areas

Source: Moyo and Chambati (forthcoming) derived from AIAS Household Survey (2005/06), N=2089

1. Household utilises family labour in combination with part time labour hired in

2. Household hires in one fulltime worker plus some part time workers

3. Household hires in at least two fulltime workers plus some part time workers

\*not statistically different across labour classes

It is possible to deduce from the figures in Table 6-11 some specific trends within each of the different forms of labour (hired-in, hired-out and family labour use) in newly resettled households, beyond those dictated by the classification itself. The distribution of households based on absolute labour utilisation classification showed that it is skewed towards the low level labour users. Overall, 64.7 percent of the land beneficiaries were found in the low level labour users' category, 9.3 percent in the medium level labour users and 26 percent in the high level labour users (Table 6-10). When the households were disaggregated by resettlement scheme, our data shows that absolute farm labour utilisation was higher in the larger sized A2 farms compared to the smaller A1 farms. In the A1 sector, 68.4 percent of the households were classified as low level labour users compared to 48.9 percent in the A1 sector (Table 6-12). Medium and high level labour users accounted for 8.4 percent and 23.6 percent in the A1 households in comparison to 12.4 percent and 38.7 percent in the A2 sector. However, there are some individual A1 households that utilise more labour than their counterparts in the A2 sector.

There was differentiation between the A1 and A2 sectors across the low labour use category, in which the greatest proportion of both A1 and A2 households fall. A1 households do not hire in fulltime labour but engage an average of 4.22 part time workers per year, in addition to 3.65 family members, and hire out an average of 0.14 family members to other households. A2 households in this category (49.05 percent of the total A2 households) utilise almost three times as many part-time workers (averaging 12.36 per household annually) as their A1 counterparts, alongside use of an average of 3.38 family members. The hiring out of family labour to other households was limited in the A2 scheme as only 0.02 family members performed paid farm work outside the household.

Level of	A1					A2						
labour	No. of	% of	Avera	age labo	ur use		No. of	% of	Ave	Average labour use		
use	HH	HH	FT	РТ	Family*	Hired	HH	HH	FT	РТ	Family*	Hired
						out*						out*
Low	1134	68.7	0.0	4.22	3.65	0.14	217	49.5	0.0	12.36	3.38	0.02
Medium	140	8.5	1.0	5.95	3.56	0.17	55	12.6	1.0	12.13	3.45	0.05
High	377	22.8	7.2	12.75	3.77	0.11	166	37.9	8.2	13.15	3.76	0.06
Total	1651	100.0	1.74	6.31	3.67	0.14	438	100.0	3.2	12.63	3.53	0.04

Table 6-11: Emergent Structures of Rural Labour in New Resettlement Areas by model

Source: Moyo and Chambati (forthcoming) derived from AIAS Household Survey (2005/06), N=2089

1. Household utilises family labour in combination with part time labour hired in

2. Household hires in one fulltime worker plus some part time workers

3. Household hires in at least two fulltime workers plus some part time workers

\*not statistically different across labour classes

The medium level labour use category was not common among either A1 (at 8.5 percent) or A2 (12.6 percent) households. The category is defined by the hiring in of one fulltime worker. Over and above this, the A1 households hire in an average of 5.95 part-time workers annually, to augment the labour of an average of 3.56 family members, while households in the A2 sector hire in one fulltime employee and an average of 12.13 part-time workers annually and utilise an average of 3.45 family members. Few family members are hired out from households in this category, especially in the A2 sector, at an average of 0.05 family members and 0.17 members in the A1 sector.

The percentage of A2 households in the high level labour user category (37.9) was 1.6 times higher than that for A1 households in this category (22.8). The A1 and A2 households in this category hired in an average of 7.2 and 8.2 fulltime workers respectively, but the A1 households hired slightly fewer part-time workers, at an average of 12.75 than the A2 households, averaging 13.15. Family labour usage was similar across both schemes averaging 3.7 workers. Similar to the situation pertaining in the other labour use categories, hiring out of labour outside the household was more common in the A1 sector, averaging 0.14 workers in comparison to 0.04 workers in the A2 sector.

There is some degree of semi-proletarianisation of rural labour in the new resettlement areas. This is a phenomenon whereby small landowners combine petty agricultural production with wage work to sustain their social reproduction (Moyo and Yeros, 2005; also see McReynolds, 1998). As discussed earlier, wage work takes different forms and is done either within communities or outside. Within communities, wage work involves the hiring out of labour to other households for both agricultural and non-agricultural activities and a diverse range of non-farm income earning activities, from petty commodity to cross-border trade. Outside their communities, wage work usually involves the migration of household members to towns and cities to work. In addition to the activities already discussed, field survey evidence shows that 27.0 percent of the household heads maintain professional employment in addition to practising agricultural production in the newly resettled areas (see section 2.0). The higher proportion of those with current employment links was found among A2 households, in which 44.7 percent of the household heads still maintained professional employment, compared to only 22.4 percent among A1 households. Besides the household heads, we also saw that other members of the household are involved in migrant employment activities outside the locale.

The semi-proletarianisation of rural labour has stimulated a wide debate on the relevance of agriculture in the countryside. On one hand, because of the greater contribution of non-farm activities to total household income in the rural areas, a 'de-agrarianisation' or 'de-peasantisation' is said to be underway in rural areas (Bryceson, 1999). On the other hand, some scholars (Moyo and Ngobese, 1991; Mkandawire, 1999; Moyo and Yeros, 2005) argue that these patterns are part of smallholder farmers' strategies to cope with the effects of the Bretton Woods Institutions' supported Structural Adjustment Policies (SAPs) that disrupted agricultural support systems (e.g. removal of input subsidies, reduced role of the Government in infrastructure provision and other basic services, lack of market access, bias towards large export farms) in the countryside, thereby creating disincentives to smallholder farming. The narrow focus of income diversification literature on peasant agriculture's role as an income earner neglects its social and cultural value, in addition to the potential for households meeting their food needs through own production rather than through purchase in volatile food markets. Thus, we concur here that income diversification is part of smallholder farmers' strategies to respond to the economic stress in the countryside resulting from structural adjustment.

Further analysis also showed that 43 percent of those who originated from the urban area held professional employment prior to the FTLRP. These findings could well be associated with an emergent're-peasantisation' of urbanites as they migrate from the towns and cities, leaving their jobs voluntarily or involuntarily to socially reproduce themselves in the rural areas (Moyo and Yeros, 2005). The decline in professional employment opportunities among urbanites could be explained by two factors which are closely linked and are difficult to delineate without further research. Firstly, the rapid contraction of the Zimbabwean economy which began in the late 1990s and gathered momentum from 2000 (Matshe, 2002; Moyo et al, 2003) has resulted in limited employment opportunities in the towns and cities. Secondly, it is justified to argue that some urbanites could have terminated their professional employment to concentrate on fulltime farming. It is the contention that agriculture in the new resettlement areas is increasingly recognised as being able to sustain social reproduction on its own, as households have access to more arable land in higher potential agro-ecological areas and can thus crop more extensively than they would have been able to in dry and marginal communal areas.

			•				
Year employment	A1		A2		Total		
ended	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1964-90	98	10.36	9	3.4	107	8.86	
1991-99	167	17.6	34	12.8	201	16.5	
2000-05	686	72.1	223	83.8	909	74.7	
Total	951		266		1217		

Table 6-12: Termination of Employment by Household Heads

 $Source: AIAS \, District \, Household \, Baseline \, Survey \, (2005/06), N{=}1217$ 

These contentions are bolstered by an analysis of the periods in which the majority of the household heads who held professional employment before the FTLRP left employment (Table 6-12). Although there could be other reasons contributing to an individual leaving employment, it can justifiably be argued that, since 74.7 percent of those who held previous employment left in the post 2000 period, they wanted to be involved in fulltime farming. It is also important to note that the 2000-05 period coincided with rapid economic decline, characterised by severe job losses and retrenchments, the impact of which requires further research on termination of employment and newly resettled households requires further research.

## 6.4.2 Land sizes and labour use

Land sizes are an important determinant in farm labour utilisation by households. As such, the study analysed the relationship between the land size (overall plot size/gross land available, arable area and actual areas cropped) and the labour utilisation in newly resettled areas. The study compared the average farm labour utilisation across the ranges of farm sizes, arable area and areas cropped by land beneficiaries.

Average labour per HH	Size of farm	n holding (l		Average for	
	1-19	20-49	50-99	>100	total sample
Permanent workers	1.82	2.17	2.16	2.96	2.09
Casual workers	7.09	8.42	6.46	4.08	7.13
Family labour	3.60	3.81	3.79	3.28	3.65
Family labour + permanent	5.42	5.99	5.94	6.24	5.74
Ν	962	620	191	208	1981

Table 6-13: Labour Employed by size of land holding

# Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06), N=1981

#### ANOVA Results

Size of holding by average number of permanent workers, F=1.68,3d.f., p=0.169 (not significant at 0.05)

Size of holding by average number of casual workers, F=4.49,3 d.f, p=0.004 (significant at 0.05)

Size of holding by average number of family labourers, F=4.94,3 d.f., p=0.002 (significant at 0.05)

Size of holding by average number of family labour + permanent workers index, F=129,3 d.f., p=0.274 (not significant at 0.05)

The relationship between farm size or gross land size and absolute labour use showed no clear emergent pattern in new resettlement areas. A priori expectation is that the absolute labour utilised by households increases as the farm sizes increase based on the assumption that productive activities requiring more labour also increase with the land size. However, in this transitional phase of land reform, there has been a differentiated land use pattern that has not necessarily meant the existence of more productive activities in the larger land sizes as obtaining in the former LSCF sector. For instance, our analysis showed that there was no significant difference in the average number of permanent farm workers across the different land sizes (Table 6-13). In the casual workers category, though significantly different, there was an increase in the average labour used per year from 7.06 to 8.42 between the 1 - 19 hectares and 20-49 hectares before it began to decline to a low 4.08 casual workers in land sizes in excess of 100 hectares. A more or less similar trend was experienced in the average family labour utilised by land beneficiaries.

The average labour utilisation, however, showed an incremental pattern when assessed in relation to the arable areas available to households. The average number of permanent and casual workers employed by households significantly increased simultaneously as the arable area available to land beneficiaries increased. The average number of permanent workers increased from 1.22 in the lowest arable area category (1 - 5.0 hectares) to 4.87 for arable hectarages of above 40 hectares, whilst the average number of casual workers increased from 5.32 to 10.69 for the same arable area ranges (Table 6-14). Small increases were recorded for the family labour category across the arable area categories

of less than 40 hectares before declining in arable areas above 40 hectares.

Average Labour per HH	Size of a	arable area		Average for		
						total sample
	1.0-5.0	5.01-10.0	10.01-20	20.01-40	40.01+	
Permanent workers	1.28	1.91	2.31	2.50	4.87	2.07
Casual workers	5.43	7.28	7.29	9.62	10.69	7.26
Family labour	3.59	3.75	3.81	3.86	3.68	3.72
Family labour + permanent	4.87	5.66	6.12	6.35	8.55	5.79
workers index						
Ν	515	875	224	176	151	1941

 Table 6-14: Labour Employed by Size of Arable Area in Newly Resettled Areas

#### Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06) ANOVA Results

Size of arable area by average number of permanent workers, F=8.675, 4 d.f., p=0.000 (significant at 0.05)

Size of arable area by average number of casual workers, F=4.843, 4 d.f., p=0.001 (significant at 0.05)

Size of a rable area by average number of family labourers, F=1.117, 4d.f., p=0.347 (not significant at 0.05)

Size of a able area by average number of family labour + permanent workers index, F=8.485, 4d.f., p=0.000 (significant at 0.05)

The Survey also examined the relationship between the average labour utilisation and the areas cropped by households. The cropped area to labour utilisation relationship is a more reliable indicator of labour use than the gross land and arable area size, as it relates to the actual areas where labour is engaged. The overall trend noticed was an increase in the number of hired workers as the area cropped by land beneficiaries increased. The average number of permanent workers hired in by households increased from 1.50 in the lowest cropped area (0.1 - 1.0 hectares), to 2.98 in the highest cropped area category of over 10 hectares, whilst the average number of casual workers increased from 4.67 to 11.76 for the same cropped area ranges (Table 6-14). The average family labour utilised by households increased from 3.18 in the lowest cropped area category to reach a peak of 4.25 for cropped areas between 5.01 and 10.0 hectares before declining to 3.68 in cropped areas in excess of 10.0 hectares (Table 6-15). These data suggest that changes in the labour utilisation patterns as the cropped area increases are more influenced by the hiring in of farm labour by newly resettled households, rather than by the availability of family labour resources, the use of which recorded minor increases across the cropped area categories.

Average labour per HH	Average	verage for total sample						
	0	0.1-1	1.01-3	3.01-5	5.01-10	>10		
Permanent workers	1.70	1.50	1.80	1.77	3.01	2.98	2.06	
Casual workers	5.54	4.67	6.86	6.49	8.34	11.76	7.21	
Family labour	3.20	3.18	3.51	4.01	4.25	3.68	3.63	
Family + permanent	4.90	4.68	5.31	5.78	7.26	6.66	5.68	
workers index								
Ν	426	188	517	395	250	2s86	2058	

Table 6-15: Labour Employed in Newly Resettled Areas by Cropped Area

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06) ANOVA Results

Size of cropped area by average number of permanent workers, F=2.89, 5 d.f., p=0.013 (significant at 0.05) Size of cropped area by average number of casual workers, F=6.77, 5 d.f., p=0.000 (significant at 0.05) Size of cropped area by average number of family labourers, F=16.81, 5d.f., p=0.000 (significant at 0.05)

Size of cropped area by average number of family labourers, F=10.81, 50.11, p=0.000 (significant at 0.05) Size of cropped area by average number of family labour + permanent workers, F=5.83, 5 d.f p=0.000 (significant at 0.05)

## 6.4.3 Labour Intensities in New Resettlement Areas

Beyond the assessment of the utilisation of labour in absolute terms, it is also important to examine the intensity of labour use defined as the number of workers per land area available (gross land size, arable and cropped area). The intensity of labour use measures the utilisation of labour per land area and allows for comparisons to be made between different farm sizes as, in general, those on larger sized farms are expected to mobilise more labour in absolute terms than those on smaller farm sizes.

Firstly, the survey examined the gross labour intensities (calculated as the number of workers divided by the overall plot size) in relation to the farm size. There was significant difference in the average labour intensities across the different farm sizes (Table 6-16). There was a tendency for the gross labour intensities to decrease as the farm size increases ( in all the forms of labour). On the overall labour index (family plus permanent workers), the general trend is a significant decrease in the labour intensity as the farm size increases. The overall labour index per hectare of land area significantly decreased from 0.94 to 0.04 workers per hectare between the 1 - 19 hectares and the largest farm size category of 100 hectares or larger. In the permanent workers category, the gross labour intensity decreases significantly from 0.33 workers per gross land area in the lowest farm size category to 0.16 workers per gross land area in the largest farm size category. In the casual and family labour categories, a similar trend was also observed with gross labour intensities decreasing as the farm size increased from 1.20 to 0.02 workers per hectare between the smallest and largest farm size categories, while the intensity of family labour use decreases from 0.60 to 0.21 workers per hectare.

Labour type	Labour i	ntensity (No	. of workers	) by croppe	d area (ha)
	1-19	20-49	50-99	100+	Total
By Gross Land Size					
Permanent workers	0.33	0.88	0.33	0.16	0.19
Casual workers	1.20	0.37	0.10	0.02	0.71
Family labour	0.60	0.15	0.06	0.21	0.35
Family + permanent	0.94	0.23	0.10	0.04	0.54
Ν	962	620	191	208	1981
By Arable Area					
Permanent workers	0.39	0.24	0.09	0.22	0.30
Casual workers	1.54	0.94	0.23	0.15	1.08
Family labour	0.76	0.50	0.20	0.64	0.61
Family + permanent	1.16	0.75	0.30	0.87	0.92
Ν	049	609	188	192	1938

#### Table 6-16: Labour Intensities by Farm Sizes

#### Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06) ANOVA Results

1. Gross land size

Number of permanent workers per Ha by farm size, F=16.51, 3 d.f., p=0.000 (significant at 0.05) Number of casual workers per Ha by farm size, F=42.08, 3 d.f., p=0.000 (significant at 0.05) Number of family workers per Ha by farm size, F=500.67, 3 d.f., p=0.000 (significant at 0.05) Number of family + permanent workers per Ha by farm size, F=114.19, 3 d.f., p=0.000 (significant at 0.05) 2. Arable area

Number of permanent workers per Ha by farm size, F=3.32, 3 d.f., p=0.019 (not significant at 0.05) Number of casual workers per Ha by farm size, F=23.50, 3 d.f., p=0.00 (significant at 0.05) Number of family workers per Ha by farm size, F=52.27, 3 d.f., p=0.00 (significant at 0.05) Number of family + permanent workers per Ha by farm size, F=19.12, 3 d.f., p=0.00 (significant at 0.05)

Similar trends were revealed when the labour intensities were calculated on the basis of arable area available to households. There existed a significant difference in the average labour intensities for all the labour forms, except for permanent workers, across the different land sizes (Table 6-16, ANOVA results). The general trend is a decrease in the labour intensity as the arable area increases. The larger

farm sizes are associated with households that are better endowed than those on the smaller-sized farms and possess labour displacing farm machinery and equipment endowments.

Thirdly, the study examined the labour intensities on the basis of the areas cropped by newly resettled households. There were significant differences in the average labour intensities in all the forms of labour except permanent workers across the various cropped area categories (Table 6-17, ANOVA results).

Labour type	Labour i	Labour intensity (No. of workers) by cropped area (ha)								
	0.1-1	1.01-3	3.01-5	5.01-10	>10					
Permanent workers	1.79	0.74	0.42	0.41	0.14	0.62				
Casual workers	6.14	2.90	1.59	1.21	0.64	2.29				
Family labour	4.35	1.55	0.97	0.62	0.15	1.34				
Family + permanent	6.14	2.29	1.38	1.03	0.29	1.96				
Ν	184	517	395	250	286	1633				

Table 6-17: Labour Intensity by Cropped Areas in Newly Resettled Areas

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06) ANOVA Results

Number of permanent workers per Ha by cropped area, F=12.82, 5 d.f., p=0.000 (not significant at 0.05)

Number of casual workers per Ha by cropped area, F=23.03, 5 d.f., p=0.000(significant at 0.05)

Number of family workers per Ha by cropped area, F=255.83, 5 d.f., p=0.000 (significant at 0.05)

Number of family + permanent workers per Ha by cropped area, F=120.06, 5 d.f., p=0.000 (significant at 0.05)

The average number of casual workers per cropped area significantly decreases, from 6.14 in the lowest cropped area category (0.1 - 1 ha) to 0.41 in the highest cropped area category (> 10 ha) (Table 6-17), implying that those who crop the smallest land area utilise 9.6 times more casual labour per unit of cropped area than those in the largest cropped area category. Similarly, the average number of family workers per unit of cropped land also significantly decreases as the cropped area increases, from 4.35 in the lowest cropped area category to 0.15 in the highest cropped area category. The overall labour index follows a similar pattern, where the average labour intensity decreases from 6.14 in the lowest cropped area category to 0.29 in the highest cropped area category. Thus, newly resettled households that crop small areas utilise significantly more labour per unit of cropped area than those that crop larger land areas. These findings are similar to evidence from other literature, which has generally shown the existence of an inverse relationship between the labour input per hactare of cropped area and the cropped area (Bhala and Roy, 1988; Binswanger et al, 1993; Ellis, 1993; Newell, Pandya and Symonds, 1997).

# 6.5 Concluding statement

The FTLRP led to the transformation of the agricultural labour processes and relations that are reflected in the increase in the degree of self-employment as own producers, although some do hire labour on either a permanent or casual basis. Casual labour, however, is the dominant form of labour hired by land beneficiaries. Some land beneficiaries hire in more labour than others, some are solely reliant on family labour, while others also hire out their labour to other land beneficiaries. This situation in newly redistributed areas shows a new process of social differentiation based on farm labour utilisation, scale of land resources, access to other economic resources and socio-political connections. These aspects are pursued in more detail in section 9.0.

# 7.0 SOCIAL SERVICES AND REPRODUCTION STRATEGIES

## 7.1 Overview of social conditions in newly redistributed areas

Newly redistributed areas are faced with a diversity of social conditions which in turn define their social reproduction strategies. The social conditions facing newly redistributed areas are reflected in various indicators which include the demographic structure of the population, food security status, health status, HIV and AIDS situation, and school enrolment amongst other indicators. The status of various social indicators in newly redistributed areas is discussed below.

## 7.1.1 Age structure

The structure of the population with respect to the proportion of the economically active (15-59 years who are able to work) and economically dependent (0-14 years who are too young to work and 60+ years who are too old to work) population is critical in how households socially reproduce themselves. As discussed earlier (section 2.3.2), 35.0 percent of the population consisted of economically dependent people (30.8 percent below 15 years and 4.2 percent above 60 years). Thus 65 percent of the population in our sample is tasked with the responsibility of maintaining the economically dependent people in the newly resettled areas. The newly redistributed areas have relatively lower proportions of dependent people in comparison to other rural areas where 54 percent of the population was found to be too young or old to work (see CSO, 2002). Thus, newly redistributed areas have a relatively higher proportion of active labour force at their disposal to socially reproduce themselves in comparison to other rural areas.

# 7.1.2 School enrolment

Amongst the sampled land beneficiaries, there is a total of 2,787 youths of school-going age (7 - 19) years). Seventy seven percent of the school-going youths were found to be in school, while 1.0 percent was in pre-school. The majority of the remainder of the youths of school-going age were unpaid family workers (14.8 percent), while some were involved in the farm labour market as either permanent or casual employees (4.9 percent) within the newly redistributed areas (Table 7-1). School enrolment rates were much lower amongst farm worker households. Out of an estimated 880 school-going age youths in farm worker households, 22.0 percent were attending school, whilst 3.9 percent were in preschool (Table 7-1). Participation in farm labour markets was high amongst youths of school going age in farm worker households, as 15.8 percent and 30.9 percent were employed as casual and permanent farm workers respectively (Fig 7-1). Another 25.8 percent were unpaid family workers (Fig 7-1).



## Fig 7-1: Educational status of school going youths in newly redistributed areas

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

As discussed earlier, land beneficiaries in newly redistributed areas are generally more educated in comparison to other rural sectors (communal and old resettlement areas). The majority of land beneficiaries have completed Ordinary Level (59.0 percent) (see Table 2-10), suggesting high literacy levels in these areas. In contrast, farm workers were less educated than land beneficiaries, as only 25.8 percent had completed ordinary level. The majority of the farm workers (35.0 percent) interviewed had only completed primary level education, while 11.0 percent had no formal education.

## 7.1.3 HIV and AIDS situation

The HIV and AIDS pandemic is one of the key social challenges facing the country with an estimated 19.1 percent of the population living with the disease (ZHDR, 2003). The prevalence of HIV and AIDS was higher in the former LSCF sector (43.7 percent) in comparison to the national levels (35.0 percent) (ZHDR, 2003). In the newly redistributed areas, there was a high awareness of the existence of HIV and AIDS amongst all land beneficiaries, including 98.2 percent of the farm worker households in our sample population, and the various avenues through which the pandemic is transmitted. Three major social practices were highlighted as exposing communities in newly redistributed areas to the HIV and AIDS pandemic. The existence of temporal marriages or *kubika mapoto*<sup>57</sup> was the most common practice highlighted by 45.3 percent and 51.2 percent of the land beneficiaries and farm worker households. The inheritance of spouses after the death of a sibling was the third social practice that communities pointed out by 19.4 percent and 22.9 percent in land beneficiaries and farm worker households respectively.

Close to nine percent of the land beneficiaries indicated that they had been directly affected by the HIV and AIDS pandemic as a member of their household had either been ill or died in the year preceding the field surveys. Land beneficiaries in Chipinge District were the worst hit and most affected as 14.4 percent had a member who was ill or had died as a result of HIV and AIDS, whilst Mangwe District was the lowest affected with only 2.8 percent of the land beneficiaries affected. Farm workers had slightly more households (11.5 percent) that were affected by the HIV and AIDS pandemic compared to land beneficiaries. Evidence from our field surveys corroborated earlier studies which showed a higher prevalence of the HIV and AIDS pandemic amongst farm worker households in the former LSCF sector (Amanor-Wilks, 2000; ZHDR, 2003) as more former farm worker households were affected by the HIV and AIDS pandemic (13.0 percent) in comparison to new farm worker households (9.8 percent).

Evidence from farm worker households was also corroborated by 2.7 percent of the land beneficiaries who indicated that a member of their hired labour force had died or was ill due to HIV and AIDS. The A2 land beneficiaries which tended to engage more hired labour force were more affected by the deaths or illnesses of their workers (5.7 percent) in comparison to the A1 land beneficiaries (1.9 percent). Similar to the situation pertaining to land beneficiary households, Chipinge District also had the highest percentage of land beneficiaries (7.5 percent) who had a member of their labour force who had died or was ill due to the HIV and AIDS pandemic, whilst Mangwe District was lowest with none of the land beneficiaries affected.

The field survey questions also sought perceptions of the land beneficiaries and farm worker households on the HIV and AIDS situation in newly redistributed areas. On the visibility of the mortality as a result of the HIV and AIDS, 25.6 percent of the land beneficiaries indicated that deaths

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>57</sup>Kubika mapoto is a Shona term that is used to refer to situations where a man cohabits with a woman without paying a bride price to the inlaws. These arrangements are usually short term in nature.

were very visible in the newly redistributed areas, 27.1 percent indicated visibility and 47.2 percent highlighted that deaths were not visible. In farm worker households, the visibility of HIV and AIDS mortality was reflected by absenteeism from work to attend funerals. In the month before the survey, 19.1 percent of the farm worker households had missed work to attend a funeral of a relative who had died as a result of HIV and AIDS.

In addition to decimating families and subsequently the active labour force, the HIV and AIDS is impacting on social reproduction strategies in the newly redistributed areas in a number of ways. With specific regards to agriculture, there were varied perceptions of the effects of the HIV and AIDS pandemic by land beneficiaries. Close to 38.0 percent of the land beneficiaries indicated that reduced investment to agriculture as a result of HIV and AIDS was visible in the newly redistributed areas (Table 7-1). Other forms of visible impact highlighted by land beneficiaries include among others: reduced cropping area (35.0 percent); reduced input use (30.4 percent) and disruption of extension services (30.6 percent).

Impacts	Impact is	visible (no. :	and % in pare	entheses)			
	Chipinge	Chiredzi	Goromonzi	Kwekwe	Mangwe	Zvimba	Total
Reduced investment	135	78	206	102	34	81	636
	(44.1)	(39.5)	(48.8)	(31.3)	(24.1)	(28.1)	(37.8)
Reduced cropping	134	60	181	100	35	79	589
Area	(43.6)	(30.6)	(42.9)	(30.7)	(24.6)	(27.4)	(35.0)
Reduced input use	127	50	153	66	29	76	511
	(41.4)	(25.5)	(36.3)	(20.2)	(20.4)	(26.4)	(30.4)
Disruption of	105	67	145	74	33	67	501
extension service	(35.3)	(35.4)	(35.8)	(23.2)	(23.4)	(23.3)	(30.6)

Table 7-1: Land beneficiaries Perceptions on HIV and AIDS impacts on agriculture

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

Various coping strategies have been adopted in newly redistributed areas to cope with the HIV and AIDS pandemic. These have included the liquidation of assets by 4.0 percent of the farm worker households. Common responses in managing agricultural production activities amongst HIV and AIDS affected land beneficiaries have been the adoption of labour saving technologies (e.g. herbicides and machinery) (29.0 percent) and reducing the area under crop production (26.3 percent).

# 7.1.4 Impact of drought on farming based social reproduction

Since 2000, the country has been affected by two severe droughts (2001/02 and 2003/04 seasons) which impacted farming-based social reproduction in newly redistributed areas which is predominantly rain-fed (see also section 4.2). The droughts mostly affected crop production as reported by 61.3 percent of the land beneficiaries. Former LSCF farms with irrigation infrastructure were mostly allocated to A2 land beneficiaries under the FTLRP and thus there were a higher percentage of A1 land beneficiaries (66.2 percent) whose crop production was affected by the droughts in comparison to A2 land beneficiaries (44.4 percent) (Fig 7-2). Farmers with access to irrigation practised supplementary irrigation to remedy the effects of drought. As discussed earlier (section 4.2), 16.9 percent of the land beneficiaries practised irrigation of which the A2 land beneficiaries had a higher percentage (27.9 percent) in comparison to the A1 land beneficiaries (14.1 percent).



Fig 7-2: Land beneficiaries' crop production affected by drought

#### Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

The drought affected a higher percentage of land beneficiaries crop enterprises located in the drier districts of Kwekwe (NRIII and IV) (84.5 percent) and Mangwe (NRIV and V) (71.0 percent) in comparison to the other districts. Zvimba District which is located in NR II had an exceptionally high percentage of households (77.0 percent) affected by the drought similar to those in the drier districts. Chipinge District which is located in NRI had the lowest percentage of land beneficiaries whose crop enterprises were affected by the drought (45.8 percent) followed by Goromonzi District (46.1 percent).

The droughts have had several effects on land beneficiaries' crop production activities. The most common impact cited by households was reduction of crop yields and the subsequent crop outputs (73.9 percent). In severe instances, the droughts led to total crop failure as indicated by 16.2 percent of the land beneficiaries. Close to 6.0 percent of the land beneficiaries mentioned that the droughts resulted in food insecurity since they derive most of their food from own agricultural production activities. Food insecurity as a result of the drought was more common among A1 land beneficiaries (6.7 percent) than A2 land beneficiaries (0.6 percent). Other effects of the droughts on crop production activities included: reduced output quality (0.4 percent); shortage of water for human and livestock consumption and inability to pay loans as a result of the reduced output (0.2 percent).

In comparison to crop production, fewer households (10.1 percent) indicated that their livestock production was affected by the droughts. Similar to the situation obtaining with crop production, slightly more A1 land beneficiaries (10.5 percent) had their livestock production activities affected by the drought in comparison to the A2 land beneficiaries (8.4 percent). As expected, the districts where livestock is the dominant agricultural activity had a higher percentage of land beneficiaries who were affected by the drought. Kwekwe and Mangwe districts had the highest percentage of land beneficiaries, 15.3 percent and 37.9 percent respectively. In the other households the percentage of land beneficiaries affected tended to be lower than 7.0 percent, except for Zvimba District where 11.0 percent were affected.

The key impact of drought on livestock production in newly redistributed areas was the loss of animals through death as indicated by 55.0 percent of the land beneficiaries. Grazing pastures were also exhausted (20.0 percent) during the drought years. The other impact of the droughts on livestock production included: animal weight loss (14.0 percent); shortage of supplementary feeds (3.5 percent); reduced animal off-takes (5.5 percent) and straying of animals in search of pastures (2.0 percent).

## 7.2 Social security services and strategies

Prior to the FTLRP, social service provision in the large scale farms was minimal. In some instances farm workers depended on mobile clinics and, although large scale commercial farmers began to build schools in earnest after independence, the pace of setting up such infrastructure was not uniform and some areas remained without access to schools. There was no compelling administrative directive from Government. Thus, the large scale farm worker communities have always been marginalised in terms of accessing vital social services such as health facilities and schools for their dependents. Current data show a continuation of this marginalisation in the case of the newly resettled areas, as there has been little investment in social infrastructure in these areas since the FTLRP. Below we discuss access to various social services by land beneficiaries and farm worker households.

# 7.2.1 Access to social services within the newly redistributed areas

The FTLRP was implemented by the Government without prior provision of social infrastructure and services as was the case under the old resettlement programme in the 1980s. Land beneficiaries were resettled with minimal social services provided for by the Government. As such, access to social services and requisite infrastructure in newly resettled areas tends to be limited. The majority of the minimal social facilities that were existent in the former LSCF sector tend to be dysfunctional.

Access to various social services within the newly resettled areas was generally limited to below 40.0 percent of the farms surveyed. Health workers and telecommunication services were the most common social services accessible to most farms, 39.9 percent and 38.3 percent respectively (Table 7-2). The health worker programme is a continuation from the LSCF sector that commenced in the mid 1980s as collaboration between the Ministry of Health and Child Welfare and several NGOs lead by the Save the Children (United Kingdom) that focused on providing care to farm workers.

Educational facilities in the form of primary and secondary schools were existent on 31.9 percent and 19.5 percent of the surveyed farms respectively. The availability of educational facilities, especially primary schools, varied by district. Zvimba District had the highest percentage of farms (83.3 percent) which had a primary school followed by Mangwe District (52.6 percent) (Table 7-2). In the other districts the presence of a primary school on the farms was generally limited to below 20.0 percent. Secondary schools tended to be less available on most of the farms, compared to primary schools. Zvimba District was exceptional as it had secondary schools on over 71.4 percent of the farms. In other districts, secondary schools availability tended to be below 15 percent of the farms. A similar pattern also obtained with regard to pre-school child care facilities.

Social services/	No. and %	in parenth	ieses				
infrastructure	Chipinge	Chiredzi	Goromonzi	Kwekwe	Mangwe	Zvimba	Total
Bar	11	17	16	1	16	26	87
	(22.0)	(25.0)	(20.8)	(5.6)	(39.0)	(55.3)	(28.9)
Bus service	18	16	51	5	9	5	104
	(36.0)	(23.9)	(65.4)	(26.3)	(22.0)	(10.4)	(34.3)
Telecomm	24	32	38	2	9	10	115
Services	(48.0)	(48.5)	(50.0)	(10.0)	(22.5)	(20.8)	(38.3)
Available	39	59	66	3	38	22	227
Electricity	(78.0)	(90.8)	(84.6)	(15.8)	(92.7)	(46.8)	(75.7)
Recreational	10	20	22	1	9	35	97
Facilities	(20.0)	(29.9)	(28.6)	(5.3)	(22.0)	(71.4)	(32.0)
Health worker	28	19	16	7	20	29	119
	(56.0)	(30.2)	(20.8)	(36.8)	(48.8)	(60.4)	(39.9)
Childcare	17	23	8	2	10	37	97
Facility	(34.7)	(34.3)	(10.3)	(11.1)	(26.3)	(78.7)	(32.7)
Primary School	12	10	11	3	20	40	96
	(24.5)	(14.3)	(14.1)	(16.7)	(52.6)	(83.3)	(31.9)
Secondary School	7	9	4	0	3	35	58
	(14.3)	(13.0)	(5.3)	(0)	(8.3)	(71.4)	(19.5)
Health	6	37	10	3	1	6	63
Facilities	(12.0)	(77.1)	(15.6)	(7.5)	(5.0)	(7.7)	21.0)
Farm store	11	25	30	16	2	14	98
	(22.0)	(53.2)	(45.5)	(39.0)	(10.5)	(18.2)	(32.7)

 Table 7-2: Access to social infrastructure on the farm

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

Electricity was connected on most of the original farms (75.7 percent of those within our sample), but electricity was not accessible to most of the beneficiaries household plots as obtained in the former LSCF where it was only used by white farmers while farm workers had no access. Electricity was only supplied to the farm houses occupied by commercial farmers and their productive activities such as irrigation. Thus, in the newly resettled areas, in the case of A2 households, those who were allocated the farm houses (24.6 percent of the beneficiaries) tend to have access to electricity, whilst others do not have access. The allocation of farm houses was on an individual and sharing basis. Of the 24.6 percent of the A2 land beneficiaries allocated farm houses, 17.8 percent were allocated on an individual basis, whilst 6.8 percent were sharing with others. The allocation of farm houses in the A1 scheme was on a lower scale compared to the A2 scheme, as only 13.4 percent were allocated (6.1 percent on an individual basis and 7.3 percent on sharing basing).

In the A2 sector, as per Government policy, access to infrastructure is generally limited to the beneficiaries who inherited the particular infrastructure on their plot allocations. Some A2 households have, however, invested in electricity since being resettled under the FTLRP independent from the infrastructure existent in former LSCF. With respect to A1 households, farm houses which had access to electricity are state property and have been converted to social services utilisation such as schools, clinics etc. and in some cases house Government employees such as extension workers, and these are the ones with access to electricity in the A1 sector. These new uses for these facilities are meant to benefit land beneficiaries on that original farm and surrounding areas. Such conversions were confirmed by key informant interviews, which revealed the most common conversions of farm houses as schools (21.7 percent), health centres (11.7 percent) and residences of Government personnel (lands officers, extension officers, teachers and nurses) (41.7 percent).

Transportation is also problematic in the new resettlement areas given that access roads networks have not been adequately developed. As such, most newly resettled farms (65.0 percent) have no access to regular bus service in their areas. Transportation tends to be more accessible to the new farms in the peri-urban district of Goromonzi (65.4 percent) partly due to its close proximity to Harare, whilst access in the other districts transport was generally accessible to below 25.0 percent of the beneficiary farms. Rural bus operators are unwilling to service these areas in the absence of developed road networks. The unavailability of reliable transportation systems negatively affects the marketing of agricultural produce and access to information by newly resettled areas that could aid in their social reproduction.

## 7.2.2 Access to social services through communal areas interactions

There are various types of interactions between the newly resettled areas and the communal areas, including some which diversify sources of farming and incomes generating strategies and others which expand access to social services by the land beneficiaries (see Table 3-8). For instance, 80.0 percent of the households who maintained communal area homes practised agricultural activities there and had arable plot sizes that averaged 2.9 hectares. The linkages between the newly resettled areas and the communal areas arise from both the proximity of many newly resettled areas to communal areas, and the fact that almost two thirds of the beneficiaries originated from communal areas. Most of these beneficiaries have relatives and friends in the communal areas and retain associational links with these areas. The existence of such interactions is significant, because of suggestions that the resettled communities do not perceive a physical barrier between the two zones, instead they consider resettlement areas as a frontier for expanding their social reproduction and accumulation strategies.

Both land beneficiaries and former and new farm workers had links with the communal areas through the maintenance of homes which housed extended family members. As discussed earlier, 19.5 percent of the land beneficiaries still maintain their homes in communal areas. An average of 4.85 family members and/or relatives was housed in the communal area homes maintained by land beneficiaries. The land beneficiaries of Mangwe District housed more members in the communal area homes (5.85 members per household), whilst Kwekwe District had the lowest average of family members in communal areas (3.65 members per household). The majority of the land beneficiaries who maintained communal area homes (53.4 percent) indicated that the communal areas housed between three and five family members and/or relatives, followed by those who housed between six and ten people (Table 7-3)

No. of pple	No. of h	ouseholds	and % in	parenthese	es				
	Model t	уре	District						Total
	A1	A2	Chipinge	Chiredzi	Goromonzi	Kwekwe	Mangwe	Zvimba	
1	19	1	3	1	7	5	0	4	20
	(9.1)	(1.2)	(6.4)	(3.8)	(6.0)	(15.2)	(0.0)	(7.7)	(6.8)
2	18	9	5	2	9	5	0	6	27
	(8.7)	(10.5)	(10.6)	(7.7)	(7.7)	(15.2)	(0.0)	(11.5)	(9.2)
3-5	115	42	22	14	67	16	10	28	157
	(55.3)	(48.8)	(46.8)	(53.8)	(57.3)	(48.5)	(52.1)	(53.8)	(53.4)
6-10	50	28	12	8	31	7	8	12	78
	(24.0)	(32.6)	(25.5)	(30.8)	(26.5)	(21.2)	(42.1)	(23.1)	(26.5)
>10	6	6	5	1	3	0	1	2	12
	(2.9)	(7.0)	(10.6)	(3.8)	(2.6)	(0.0)	(5.3)	(3.8)	(4.1)
Total	208	86	47	26	117	33	19	52	294
	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)
Ave.	4.56	5.50	5.33	5.16	4.81	3.65	5.89	4.73	4.84

Table'	7_3.	Num	herd	of house	hold	memh	ersin	communal	areas	hvl	and h	enefic	riaries
Table	1-3.	Tinn	DCIU	л nouse	noiu	memo	CI 3 III	communai	arcas	D Y I	anu u	Jeneine	1ai ics

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

The maintenance of communal area homes was found prevalent amongst farm worker households where it was practised by 54.1 percent of them. New farm workers, the majority of whom originated from the communal areas, had a higher percentage of households who maintained communal area homes (63.9 percent) in comparison to former farm workers previously employed in the LSCF (46.2 percent). While in both new and former farm worker households, the most commonly cited reason for maintaining a communal area home was that it was the area of origin, 60.4 percent and 40.5 percent respectively, close to 36.0 percent of the former farm workers indicated that the communal area acted as social insurance against loss of employment in comparison to 29.2 percent of the new farm workers. The concern of loss of employment signifies the insecurity of jobs that former farm workers experienced in the LSCF sector prior to the FTLRP (see Loewenson, 1992; Amanor-Wilks, 1995; Amanor-Wilks, 2000; Chambati and Moyo, 2004; Chambati and Magaramombe, 2008)

As such, the movement between these areas to visit friends and family and to attend social functions (church, weddings, traditional functions and funerals) is part of the social structure and organisation of the communities in both these areas. In the sample survey, 69.3 percent of the households indicated the existence of both social and economic interactions with the communal areas (Fig 7-3).



Fig 7-3: Interactions between communal and new resettlement areas

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

The interactions with communal areas were more common in the A1 sector, which had the highest proportion of beneficiaries who originated from these areas, accounting for 71.8 percent of the households in comparison to 60.0 percent in the A2 sector. The intensity of interactions between communal and resettled areas is greater in Chiredzi (87.6 percent), Chipinge (80.5 percent), Goromonzi (75.0 percent) and Mangwe (71.4 percent) districts largely because of the proximity of the A1 farms surveyed in these areas to the communal areas. The GoZ in its implementation of the FTLRP deliberately designated farms close to the communal areas for the A1 scheme. The high intensity of interactions in Mangwe District could also be explained by the fact that close to 50.0 percent of the land beneficiaries originated from communal areas within the same district.

The nature of interactions between newly resettled areas and the communal areas can be viewed in two dimensions. The dimensions are: how the newly resettled areas interact with communal areas and vice versa. Newly resettled areas mainly interacted with communal areas for purposes of facilitating their agricultural production activities. The sourcing of labour from communal areas by newly

resettled farmers was the most common form of interaction whereby 47.6 percent of the households drew some of their labour from these areas (Table 7-4). Newly resettled farmers also sourced draught power and equipment from the communal areas. Thirty six percent of the households were involved in this activity which was dominated by A1 households where close to 40.0 percent interacted with the communal areas in this way. Close to 30.0 percent of the newly resettled households also acquired their agricultural inputs from the communal area dealerships.

Type of interactions	No. and % of households in parentheses								
	Chipinge	Chiredzi	Goromonzi	Kwekwe	Mangwe	Zvimba	Total		
Economic benefits									
Farmers getting labour from	206	146	390	132	57	64	995		
CA	(61.7)	(62.1)	(56.1)	(35.5)	(39.3)	(20.8)	(47.6)		
Farmer utilizing productive	139	90	261	125	44	94	753		
resources from CA	(41.6)	(38.3)	(37.6)	(33.6)	(30.3)	(30.5)	(36.0)		
Farmer sourcing inputs from	125	88	259	38	36	74	620		
agro dealer in CA	(37.4)	(37.4)	(37.3)	(10.2)	(24.8)	(24.0)	(29.7)		
Market output in CA	1	0	0	0	2	0	3		
	(0.3)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(1.4)	(0.0)	(0.1)		
Social benefits									
Marriage	0	0	2	0	1	0	3		
	(0)	(0.0)	(0.3)	(0.0)	(0.7)	(0.0)	(0.1)		
Students enrolled in schools	125	99	181	63	39	84	591		
in neighbouring CA	(37.4)	(42.1)	(26.0)	(16.9)	(26.9)	(27.3)	(28.3)		
Access to health facilities in	68	23	88	20	23	72	294		
neighbouring CA	(20.4)	(9.8)	(12.0)	(5.4)	(15.9)	(23.4)	(14.1)		

Table 7-4: Social and economic benefits derived by newly resettled people from CA

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

On social interactions, newly resettled households sought mostly educational and health facilities in the communal areas where 28.3 percent and 14.1 percent benefitted from these respectively. Educational and health facilities are currently limited in the newly resettled areas as settlement occurred before the provision of these social amenities by the Government.

Type of interaction	No. and % of households in parentheses							
	Chipinge	Chiredzi	Goromonzi	Kwekwe	Mangwe	Zvimba	Total	
Economic benefits								
CA farmers benefiting from	106	63	283	81	65	100	698	
grazing resources	(31.7)	(26.8)	(40.7)	(21.8)	(44.8)	(32.5)	(33.4)	
CA households harvesting	130	65	274	59	27	100	655	
firewood	(38.9)	(27.7)	(39.4)	(15.9)	(18.6)	(32.5)	(31.4)	
RA's serving as markets for	109	45	139	79	43	53	468	
livestock in neighbouring CA	(32.6)	(19.1)	(20.0)	(21.2)	(29.7)	(17.2)	(22.4)	
CA farmers benefit from	0	0	2	0	2	0	4	
thatching grass	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.3)	(0.0)	(1.4)	(0.0)	(0.2)	
Social benefits								
Migration of people from CA to	129	100	231	81	34	79	654	
RA's	(38.6)	(42.6)	(33.2)	(21.8)	(23.4)	(25.6)	(31.3)	

Table 7-5: Social	and economic be	enefits derived	l by people from	CA from new RA
iubic / cibociui	and coonomic st		i of people if one	

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06

Land beneficiaries indicated that communal area residents were accessing natural resources from newly redistributed areas as the most common form of interaction. Over the years, there has been growing concern over the deforestation processes taking place in communal areas due to energy requirements and clearing land for cultivation. The opening up of the former large scale commercial farm sthrough the FTLRP has meant an increase in the supply of firewood. The administrative framework is not yet clear as to the measures that have been put in place to curb or control the deforestation practices.

At least 30.0 percent of the households indicated that communal area households were grazing their animals, harvesting firewood and thatching grass from the newly resettled areas (Table 7-5). In the sampled land beneficiaries, 5.3 percent kept cattle on behalf of other farmers. Mangwe District had the highest percentage of land beneficiaries who kept cattle for other farmers (22.8 percent), whilst in the other districts, the land beneficiaries involved tended to be below 4.0 percent. The majority of the beneficiaries of this arrangement were communal area farmers (61.9 percent). Mangwe and Zvimba districts had exceptionally high percentages of beneficiaries from the communal areas, 94.3 percent and 75.0 percent respectively in comparison to the other districts where beneficiaries from the communal areas were just above 50.0 percent. Other beneficiaries of cattle being kept in newly redistributed areas were old resettlement areas (28.0 percent); large-scale commercial farmers (3.6 percent) and other land beneficiaries within the newly redistributed areas (6.0 percent). The most common reason cited by land beneficiaries for keeping cattle on behalf of other farmers was to alleviate the shortage of grazing in communal areas (45.1 percent). The other reasons cited by land beneficiaries included: income generation activity (21.0 percent); source of draught power (18.7 percent); breeding (0.8 percent); newly redistributed areas closer to cattle markets (3.4 percent) and owners of the cattle were away (11.0 percent).

Other forms of interaction included the migration of people from the communal areas to the newly resettled areas mostly in search of jobs. The growth, through resettlement, of the farmer population from the few thousand former large scale commercial farmers and their workers has meant the creation of a market for goods from the communal areas. Newly resettled households (22.4 percent) also indicated that they provided a market for communal area livestock.

## 7.3 Social reproduction strategies/incomes

Social reproduction focuses on the ways in which communities reproduce themselves and is based on analyses of household survival/income generation strategies to meet needs such as food, health, education, transportation etc. Prior to independence social reproduction was characterised by contradictory processes; proletarianisation was limited and was complemented by a politically engineered functional dualism, in which petty commodity production and unwaged labour (especially female and child labour) in the communal areas subsidised the social reproduction of male labour power on mines and farms (Moyo and Yeros 2005:168). This semi-proletarianisation process produced neither a settled industrial proletariat nor a viable peasantry, but a workforce in motion straddling communal lands, white owned farms and industrial workplaces. The discussion in this subsection focuses on locating elements which improve the prospects for households to reproduce themselves. Post-independence studies of agrarian relations (especially Moyo, 1995) have analysed the different strategies that rural households utilise to achieve sustainable social reproduction. A comprehensive discussion of social reproduction in newly resettled areas needs to be undergirded by revisiting the political economy of Zimbabwe, especially the constraints that existed within the communal areas prior to land reform. The communal areas are used as a baseline due to the fact that the majority of the land beneficiaries are from communal areas.

## 7.3.1 Sources of incomes in newly resettled areas

This section discusses the various sources of income with which people in newly redistributed areas reproduce themselves. Incomes in newly redistributed areas were derived from agricultural and non-agricultural production activities, farm wages, formal jobs in towns and cities, and other sources (remittances). Data on the actual incomes earned from the various sources is not available and furthermore poses a challenge due to the hyperinflationary environment that characterised the
country at the time the field surveys were implemented. As such, the discussion below is explores multiple sources of income from which communities in newly redistributed areas reproduce themselves beyond agricultural production activities.

### 7.3.1.1 Incomes and use-values derived from agricultural production

Land beneficiaries and farm worker households (who had access to land to practise agricultural production) derived incomes from the sale of crop and livestock outputs, as well as through own consumption of some of the output produced.

Contrary to the widely held perception that the majority of land beneficiaries are subsistence agricultural producers, meaning total output from own production is channelled towards own consumption, the majority were integrated into agricultural markets through the sale of different agricultural commodities. For instance in the most common crop grown by land beneficiaries, maize, 60.3 percent of the producers sold part of their output (Table 7-6).

TIME	In the the first	h arre back			I man man man							
Type of crop	A1				A2				Total			
	No. of	No. of	% of	Ave	No. of	No. of	% of	Ave	No. of	No. of	fo %	Ave
	producers	producers	producers	sold	producers	producers	producers	sold	producers	producers	producers	sold
		who sold		(tonnes)		who sold		(tonnes)		who sold		(tonnes)
Food crops												
Maize	1480	882	59.6	1.7	303	194	64.0	3.9	1783	1076	60.3	2.1
Wheat	61	53	86.9	0.4	24	19	79.2	4.6	85	72	84.7	1.3
Small grains	289	67	23.2	0.06	24	8	33.3	0.03	313	75	24.0	0.05
Dry beans	67	35	52.2	0.01	37	23	62.2	0.1	104	58	55.8	0.03
Oilseeds												
Groundnuts	403	121	30.0	0.05	30	7	23.3	0.05	433	128	29.6	0.06
Soya beans	91	64	70.3	0.2	46	38	82.6	3.2	137	102	74.5	0.8
Sunflower	38	15	39.5	0.01	8	4	50.0	0.1	46	61	41.3	0.03
Key exports												
Tobacco	62	65	82.3	1.3	18	15	83.3	0.4	<i>L</i> 6	80	82.5	1.3
Cotton	82	75	91.5	1.3	5	2	40.0	0.4	87	LL	88.5	1.3
<b>Estate crops</b>												
Sugar	17	13	76.5	0.6	34	25	73.5	0.7	51	38	74.5	0.6
Теа	9	9	100	0.01	13	12	92.3	0.7	19	18	94.7	0.2
Coffee	1	0	0.0	0.0	5	3	60.0	0.03	9	3	50.0	0.01
Horticulture												
Paprika	4	2	50.0	0.001	8	3	37.5	0.12	12	5	41.7	0.02
Floriculture	0	I	•	•	1	0	0.0	-	1	1	100	8
Citrus	1	0	0.0	•	4	3	75.0		5	3	0.09	I
Vegetables	64	55	86.0		7	4	57.0		71	62	87.3	I
Source: AL	<b>AS House!</b>	hold Baselin	ne Survey,	Househo	old questic	nnaire						

Table 7-6: Major crop sale patterns in newly resettled areas (2004/05 season)

TILLIATONT	don rofm	יק ווטוווטוט ו			con ai can							
Type of crop	<b>A1</b>				A2				Total			
	No. of	No. of	% of	Average	No. of	No. of	Average	Jo %	No. of	No. of	% of	Average
	producers	producers	producers	retained	producers	producers	retained	producers	producers	producers	producers	retained
		who refained	who retained	(tonnes)		who retained	(tonnes)	who retained		who retained	who retained	(tonnes)
Food crops			namna			namnar		namna		T CLUTTER	1 (1111)	
Maize	1480	1305	88.2	3.26	303	259	6.85	85.5	1783	1564	87.7	8.83
Wheat	61	41	67.2	0.16	24	12	0.03	50.0	85	53	62.4	0.10
Small grains	289	216	74.7	0.05	24	17	0.19	70.8	313	233	74.4	0.08
Dry beans	67	59	88.1	0.01	37	29	0.32	78.4	104	88	84.6	0.07
Oilseeds												
Groundnuts	403	345	85.6	0.1	30	25	0.19	83.3	433	370	85.5	0.12
Soya beans	91	67	73.6	0.02	46	17	0.27	37.0	137	84	61.3	0.07
Sunflower	38	23	60.5	0.03	8	3	0.02	37.5	46	26	56.5	0.03
Key exports												
Tobacco	79	4	5.1	0.001	18	1	0.02	5.6	97	5	5.2	0.01
Cotton	82	5	6.1	0.00	5	0	0.00	0.0	87	5	5.7	0.00
<b>Estate crops</b>												
Sugar	17	2	11.8	0.00	34	2	0.14	5.9	51	4	7.8	0.00
Tea	9	0	0.0	0.00	13	1	0.03	7.7	19	1	5.3	0.01
Coffee	1	1	100.0	0.00	5	0	0.00	0.0	9	1	16.7	0.00
Horticulture												
Paprika	4	1	25.0	0.00	8	1	0.019	12.5	12	2	16.7	0.004
Floriculture	0	0	I	I	1	0	-	0.0	1	0	0.0	
Citrus	1	0	0.0	I	4	0	-	0.0	5	0	0.0	
Vegetables	64	50	78.1	0.34	7	4	0.81	57.1	71	54	76.1	0.44
Source: AIA	<b>AS Househo</b>	ld Baseline	Survey, H	ousehold	questionna	ire						

Table 7-7: Major crop retention patterns in newly resettled areas (2004/05 season)

Integration into maize markets was slightly higher amongst the A2 producers (64.0 percent) in comparison to the A1 producers (59.6 percent). On average, A1 producers sold 1.7 tonnes of maize to the market in comparison to 3.9 tonnes sold by A2 producers. Higher percentages of land beneficiaries derived incomes from the sale of crops that are primarily grown for the market.

Approximately 80.0 percent of tobacco, wheat, cotton and tea producers sold their output to the market (Table 7-7). Small grains had the lowest percentage of producers (24.0 percent) who derived income from its sale, as it is predominantly grown for own consumption and the markets tend to be underdeveloped.

Land beneficiaries also derived their incomes (use-values) from retentions of part of their produced crop output. Thus, instead of purchasing particular food items in volatile food markets, the land beneficiaries meet some of their social reproduction requirements from their own production. Food crops had the highest percentages of producers who retained part of their production (Table 7-7). In particular, the staple crop, maize, was retained by 87.7 percent of the producers. The percentage of maize producers who did not sell part of the maize output was at least 85.0 percent amongst both A1 and A2 producers. The average maize retained by producers was 1.9 and 1.7 times higher than the output sold by A1 and A2 producers respectively. The retention of the other crop categories outside the food crops tended to be below 10.0 percent (Table 7-7).

Туре	A1				A2				Total			
	No.	No.	% of	Ave.	No.	No. of	% of	Ave.	No.	No. of	% of	Ave.
	of	of	pp	no.	of	pp. who	pp	no.	of	pp.	pp	no.
	pp.	pp.	who	sold	pp.	sold	who	sold	pp.	who	who	sold
		who	sold				sold			sold	sold	
		sold										
Cattle	723	147	20.3	0.2	163	40	24.5	0.4	886	187	21.1	0.3
Donkey	112	7	6.3	0.04	22	1	4.5	0.03	134	8	6.0	0.03
Goats	352	75	21.3	0.76	87	10	11.5	2.04	439	85	19.4	1.0
Sheep	29	2	6.9	1.0	10	3	30.0	1.0	39	5	12.8	1.0
Pigs	39	5	12.8	1.1	8	3	37.5	1.5	47	8	17.0	1.4
Poultry	713	157	22.0	13	169	38	22.5	36	882	195	22.1	17
Rabbits	10	1	10.0	0.0	1	1	24.5	0.0	11	2	18.2	0.0

 Table 7-8: Livestock sale patterns in newly resettled areas

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire

Fewer households derived incomes from sales of livestock in newly redistributed areas in comparison to crop output markets. Cattle and poultry were the livestock mostly sold by producers who were active in livestock output markets in the agricultural season (2004/05) prior to the survey, accounting for 21.1 percent and 22.1 percent of the producers respectively (Table 7-8). The patterns of livestock sales among the A1 and A2 producers were more or less similar across the different livestock categories. The numbers of livestock sold tended to be +/- 1, except for poultry where an average of 17 was sold. Livestock sales, it seems, are still depressed in the newly redistributed areas as the ownership is limited to below 50 percent of the land beneficiaries and thus those who currently own livestock are building their herds to sustainable levels before integration to livestock output markets.

#### 7.3.1.2 Incomes derived from farm wages

Some land beneficiaries and farm worker households derived incomes from the sale of labour power to other households' farming activities in return for wage income in cash and/or kind to complement their social reproduction strategies. Incomes from the sale of labour for agricultural production activities was mostly dominated by farm worker households where 94.5 percent were involved, whilst close to 8.0 percent of the land beneficiaries received incomes from farm wages (see also

section 6.1). Amongst land beneficiaries, wage incomes from farm work was dominated by A1 land beneficiaries (8.6 percent), whilst only 3.6 percent of the A2 land beneficiaries derived incomes from farm wages (see Table 6-2).

As discussed earlier, the incomes derived from paid farm work have further deteriorated after the FLTRP and are not adequate to meet the social reproduction needs of those involved (section 6.3). During the period when the field surveys were conducted, the gazetted wages of farm workers averaged below 10 percent of the rural PDL. The poor wages earned by farm workers were also reflected in their food security situation given that the majority of them lack access to land for own production and thus relied on the volatile food markets to meet their needs. In the sample of land beneficiaries, only 9.1 percent declared themselves as former farm workers, and 14.8 percent in the farm worker survey indicated having been allocated land under the FTLRP (see section 6.3). Some farm workers also had informal access to land at their places of employment (26.8 percent). Over 70 percent of the interviewed farm workers highlighted that they faced food security challenges in the new resettlement areas. Furthermore, only 45.0 percent of the farm worker households indicated that they were managing to have three meals per day, while 5.2 percent and 49.8 percent had one and two meals per day respectively.

### 7.3.1.3 Incomes and use-values derived from non-agricultural activities

As discussed earlier (section 5.0), land beneficiaries and farm worker households were also involved in non-agricultural income generating activities that contributed to their social reproduction. The non-agricultural income generating activities included the extraction of natural resources in newly redistributed areas for sale and own consumption (firewood, thatching grass, alluvial gold, fishing, wildlife harvesting etc.), and other petty trading activities (vending, beer brewing, repair work etc.).

Natural resource extraction activities were reported by less than 10.0 percent of both land beneficiaries and farm workers because of the illegality of most of the activities, and most respondents to questionnaire survey tended to withhold this information for fear of victimisation. Key informant interviews also confirmed the prevalence of natural resource extraction activities in newly redistributed areas as over 50.0 percent of the respondents indicated that these activities (fishing, wildlife hunting, firewood cutting and, grass harvesting) were common in their areas and former farm workers were the predominant extractors of these natural resources.

The farm worker household survey also revealed that there were some former farm workers who are no longer willing to work on the new farms and are now involved full-time in natural resource extraction activities for sale. A case in point is a group of former farm workers in the Gwebi-Manyame area of Zvimba District who specialise in processing and selling thatching grass to land beneficiaries for use in the construction of homesteads. Close to 16.0 percent of the farm worker households interviewed indicated that there were some former farm workers now involved in natural resource extraction for commercial purposes in the newly redistributed areas. The percentage of former farm workers who are involved in natural resource extraction activities on a full-time basis was estimated around 20.8 percent. Chipinge, Goromonzi and Kwekwe had the highest estimated proportions of former farm workers who were now into full-time natural resource extraction activities, 27.0 percent, 30.7 percent and 21.0 percent. Goromonzi and Kwekwe districts are endowed with alluvial gold which attracts high income from panning compared to farm work and thus, higher percentages of farm workers who have moved full time into natural resource extraction in these districts (see also Chambati and Moyo, 2004; Chambati, 2009). The high percentage of former farm workers now involved in natural resource extraction activities on a full time basis in Chipinge is explained by the fact that the district is in close proximity of the Marange Communal Lands in Manicaland Province, experiencing the diamond rush at the abandoned Chiadzwa Mining Fields and to which former farm workers amongst others have been trekking.

#### 7.3.1.4 Incomes derived from formal employment in towns and cities

Some land beneficiaries have maintained their formal employment links in the towns and cities where they derive wage incomes as part of their social reproduction mix. As discussed earlier (section 2.3), 27.0 percent of the land beneficiaries are still currently formally employed in the towns and cities (Table 2-12). The A2 land beneficiaries had a higher percentage of those who were currently employed households (44.7 percent) in comparison to the A1 land beneficiaries (22.4 percent). This is so because the A2 land applications required proof of resource mobilisation in the business plans required by the Ministry of Lands and Agriculture and thus tended to attract those in formal employment in the towns and cities. Furthermore, the A2 land applications were handled from the Ministry of Lands and Agriculture at the head office in Harare in close proximity of most potential land beneficiaries employed in the capital.

In all the districts, the percentage of land beneficiaries who gained incomes from professional employment tended to range between 20.0 percent and 25.0 percent, except for Chipinge District. Chipinge District had an exceptionally high percentage (42.7 percent) of land beneficiaries in current employment.

The jobs in which land beneficiaries are currently engaged range from the high income (managerial jobs); middle income (semi-skilled professionals) and low income (unskilled professionals) categories. In the A2 scheme, approximately 50.0 percent of those in formal employment were in high income managerial jobs in private and public sectors, whilst these accounted for 17.4 percent of those in formal employment in the A1 scheme (derived from Table 2-12). The majority of land beneficiaries in the A1 sector had jobs in the middle income category (38.3 percent). Thus in general, land beneficiaries in the A2 scheme tended to be employed in better paying jobs in comparison to those in the A1 scheme.

Some farm worker households also received incomes from formal employment links. Thirteen percent of the farm worker households had a member who was employed in the military service, whilst 16.3 percent had a member who was self-employed in the towns and cities from which they derived wage incomes.

In addition to those land beneficiaries who are still in formal employment, there were also others who had retired from their jobs and were receiving pension incomes. Pensioners accounted for close to 2.0 percent of the land beneficiaries.

#### 7.3.1.5 Incomes from other sources

Remittances from friends and relatives employed in formal jobs in the towns and cities have been a key part of the social reproduction mix in Zimbabwe's rural areas (see Moyo, 1995) and newly redistributed areas are not an exception. The flow of remittances to the newly redistributed areas was limited to very few households amongst both land beneficiaries and farm worker households. Only 3.4 percent and 6.5 percent of the land beneficiaries and farm worker households received remittances from friends and relatives respectively. Amongst both A1 and A2 land beneficiaries the percentage of those who received remittances was almost similar, 1.7 percent and 1.3 percent respectively. The limited flow of remittances to the newly redistributed areas is largely due to the fact that the post-2000 period was characterised by an economic crisis in the country characterised by a hyperinflationary environment that eroded urban wages that made it difficult to transfer remittances to rural areas. Most urban wages could not meet the food basket needs, let alone transferring remittances. As discussed earlier (section 6.3), in mid 2005 the average wage in the urban commercial sector accounted for only 33 percent of the Consumer Council of Zimbabwe food basket (FEWSNET, 2005). In our sample, none of the land beneficiaries indicated receiving remittances from the diaspora. However, other studies e.g. Bracking and Sachikonye (2007) have shown the importance of remittance from the diaspora in the income streams of urban households. As high as 50

percent of sampled households in Harare and Bulawayo were found to be receiving remittances from the diaspora and a "..substantial majority of them were dependent on them for essential household goods, including food." (Ibid, pp. 8) In the absence of systematic data collection of inflows of international remittances given that most of them were routed through informal channels during the economic crisis, it is possible that the quantification of these sources of incomes might be overestimated.

### 7.3.2 Household consumption patterns

Food sources in newly resettled areas included own production, purchases, food aid, food for work programmes and food rations from employers. Own agricultural production was the major source of food for newly resettled households. Close to 90.0 percent of the newly resettled households highlighted that food produced from own agricultural production was their most important source of food, and was supplemented by purchases from the market. In general, less than 5.0 percent of the newly resettled households accessed food from other sources (food aid, food for work programmes and food rations from employers) outside own production and purchase from the market.

The situation was different for farm worker households, the majority of whom did not have access to land for own agricultural production. Purchases and rations from employers were the two most important sources of food as reported by 67.0 percent and 25.6 percent of the farm worker households respectively. Own agricultural production was reported as the most important source of food by only 4.8 percent of the households, whilst only 1.9 percent mentioned food aid.

The food consumed by households from own production in the 2004/05 season was adequate to cover the majority of the households' requirements of their diet for at least 10 months. Close to 73.0 percent of the newly resettled households indicated that food stocks from own production were adequate for at least 10 months (Table 7-9).

Period(months)	No. and %	of HH in pa	arentheses					
	Model typ	e	Districts*					
	A1	A2	Chipinge	Chiredzi	Goromonzi	Kwekwe	Mangwe	Total
1-3	135	24	25	16	34	67	17	159
	(10.1)	(7.6)	(7.6)	(8.0)	(5.4)	(19.0)	(12.5)	(9.6)
4-6	73	12	11	6	31	14	23	85
	(5.5)	(3.8)	(3.4)	(3.0)	(4.9)	(4.0)	(16.9)	(5.2)
7-9	167	37	43	62	43	32	24	204
	(12.5)	(11.7)	(13.1)	(30.8)	(6.8)	(9.1)	(17.6)	(12.4)
10-12	958	242	248	117	523	240	72	1200
	(71.9)	(76.8)	(75.8)	(58.2)	(82.9)	(68.0)	(52.9)	(72.8)
Total	1333	315	327	201	631	353	136	1648
	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)

## Table 7-9: Duration of food stocks from own production

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06) \*Excludes Zvimba District

This scenario was replicated when the data was disaggregated by resettlement model. Less than 10.0 percent of the households indicated that their food stocks from own production lasted three or less months. Food stocks for households in the higher agro-ecological potential districts tended to last longer than those in drier regions of the country. For instance, in Chipinge and Goromonzi districts which are mainly in Natural Region I and II, 75.8 percent and 82.9 percent of the households respectively indicated that their food stocks lasted for at least 10 months , whilst in the drier districts of Chiredzi and Mangwe, 58.2 percent and 52.9 percent respectively could be found in this category (Table 7-9)



Fig 7-4: Number of meals consumed per day

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

This study did not investigate the nutritional quality of the food consumed by newly resettled households, but examined the daily frequency of consumption. Normally, three meals per day (breakfast, lunch and supper) are recommended by food and nutrition experts. The majority of the newly resettled households (75.2 percent) managed to have three meals per day as per normal practice (Fig 7-4). Only 1.5 percent reported that they could have only one meal per day during the survey period, whilst the remainder was on two meals per day schedule. There were more households in the A2 sector who ate three meals per day (82.3 percent) in comparison to the A1 sector (73.4 percent). In both resettlement models, less than 2.0 percent of the households were on a one meal per day schedule. Barring nutritional quality, it seems the majority of newly resettled households had access to adequate food as represented by the number of meals consumed per day.

Food consumption patterns for farm worker households were different from those of newly resettled households. There was a lower percentage of farm worker households (52.6 percent) who could have three meals per day (Fig 7-4). Close to 42.0 percent of the farm worker households had two meals per day, whilst 4.8 percent consumed one meal per day. The reduction of food intake was reported by the majority of farm worker households (68.0 percent) as a strategy to ensure that their food resources can stretch for longer periods than they would. Another strategy reported was the involvement in non-farm income generating activities (18.5 percent). Thus access to land for agricultural production activities plays a key role in food access in new resettlement areas as land beneficiaries generally consumed more food than the landless farm workers reliant on poorly paid wage employment to meet their social reproduction needs.

#### 7.4 Social assistance programmes

Beyond own strategies, land beneficiaries and farm workers were also recipients of social assistance programmes that aided their social reproduction in newly redistributed areas. The social assistance programmes focused on providing food aid and HIV and AIDS services.

Former farm workers were the most commonly targeted beneficiaries of food aid in which NGOs and donors were the dominant actors. Twenty eight percent of the farm worker households indicated that there was a food aid programme specifically targeting them. The level of beneficiation of farm worker food aid programmes was, however, limited to 8.1 percent of the households (or 28.8 percent of those who were aware of the programmes). Seventy five percent of the beneficiaries of food aid amongst farm worker households were former farm workers. The farm worker beneficiaries received food aid from Government (34.8 percent), donors (34.8 percent), NGOs (28.8 percent) and private companies (1.5 percent). There was variation in the level of involvement of different providers of food aid within the survey districts. Some districts such as Mangwe were dominated by NGOs which provided food aid to 75.0 percent of the farm worker beneficiaries, whilst donors provided aid to 64.3 percent in Zvimba District. The Government was the dominant provider of food aid in Chipinge and Goromonzi districts where 44.4 percent and 54.5 percent respectively of the farm worker beneficiaries were recipients from the state.

Donors and NGOs have generally been reluctant to provide food aid to newly redistributed areas for fear of legitimising the FTLRP and their focus has been assistance to "displaced" farm workers (see section 8.7; Chambati and Magaramombe, 2008). In actual fact, some donors and NGOs have been accused for causing some of the farm labour shortages in newly redistributed areas through food aid provision to "displaced" farm workers as this discouraged them from seeking employment since most of their needs were provided for in the food aid packages (Chambati and Moyo, 2004). Very few land beneficiaries (5.4 percent) have received food aid, given that the Government which was the major actor servicing this group had its resources over-stretched and could not reach out to most of those in need. The level of beneficiation across the resettlement schemes was slightly higher in the A1 scheme (5.6 percent) compared to the A2 scheme (5.0 percent). Within the districts, Mangwe had the highest level of beneficiation of food aid with 13.1 percent of recipients amongst land beneficiaries, whilst Kwekwe had the lowest with 1.6 percent. Around 8.0 percent of the land beneficiaries received food aid in Chipinge and Chiredzi districts.

	A	1	A	.2	To	otal
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Information	126	59.2	24	64.9	150	60.0
Food Aid	12	5.6	6	16.2	18	7.2
School Fees	7	3.3	0	0.0	7	2.8
Testing	19	8.9	3	8.1	22	8.8
Nutrition Gardens	9	4.2	1	2.7	10	4.0
Condom Distribution	10	4.7	0	0.0	10	4.0
Home Based Care	30	14.1	3	8.1	33	13.2
Total	213	100.0	37	100.0	250	100.0

 Table 7-10: HIV and AIDS social assistance programmes

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

With regards to HIV and AIDS, 12.0 percent of the farm worker households indicated that assistance programmes were targeting farm workers. The level of awareness of HIV and AIDS assistance programmes was higher in Chipinge (22.4 percent) and Chiredzi (15.4 percent) compared to other districts with below 10.0 percent. This is due to the fact that Chipinge and Chiredzi districts are home to large tea and sugar estates respectively, with high concentrations of agricultural workers, are characterised by a high prevalence of HIV and AIDS amongst the farm worker population (see ZHDR, 2003), and have thus been a major target for most HIV and AIDS intervention organisations. The HIV and AIDS assistance provided to farm workers included: information and awareness

campaigns (28.5 percent), food rations (28.4 percent), counselling services (36.8 percent), and training of care givers (6.3 percent). (76.6 percent), followed by the Government (14.4 percent). Local authorities and donors were reported by 7.9 percent and 1.0 percent of the land beneficiaries respectively. There was a broad range of services provided in HIV and AIDS social assistance programmes, of which information dissemination was the most common as reported by 60.0 percent of the land beneficiaries. Other services provided included food aid, HIV & AIDS testing, nutrition gardens, school fees assistance and home-based care (Table 7-10).

#### 7.5 Concluding statement

Social reproduction strategies in the newly redistributed areas are affected by the diverse and complex social conditions faced by land beneficiaries. The social conditions affect both land and nonland based reproduction. The social security services (health and education) in newly redistributed areas are yet to be adequately developed and the inter-linkages with communal areas play a critical role in expanding the frontier of access to social services for new land beneficiaries. In the next chapter discussions centres on how land beneficiaries are responding to different social challenges through organising themselves in various ways to aid their social reproduction strategies.

# 8.0 LOCAL 'GRIEVANCES' AND SOCIAL ORGANISATION

#### 8.1 Land and agrarian impacts: beneficiary discourses

In this chapter discussion is on the nature of land and agrarian issues that remain unresolved from the perspective of our sample of the land beneficiaries and others who live in the newly redistributed areas. The social and political organisation(s) of the beneficiaries and farm workers are presented, within the context of local state administration and traditional leadership structures, in order to gauge the way in which this population addresses the identified grievances. Furthermore, in the following chapter we will discuss the broad perspectives of the land beneficiaries on the nature of social stratification that is emerging in their communities, including their definition of emerging classes and the issues that shape social differentiation, and the social struggles that have emerged.

Much of the discourse on the positive or negative effects of the FTLRP has focused on the perspectives and grievances of former land owners, and former farm workers. Recent studies have attempted to broaden this discourse to a wide section of civil society (see Moyo, Helliker and Murisa [eds], 2008) and to broaden the sources of research (e.g. Scoones 2008). A host of new post-graduate theses is beginning to broaden the voices in the land reform discourses. Interestingly, some of these studies have solicited the views of beneficiaries on the extent and impact of the land reform. The official Land Review process (Utete, 2003) indicated that most beneficiaries were extremely happy with the fact that land redistribution had finally happened and that they had gotten land. During this study many beneficiaries expressed this sentiment, but cited a range of constraints and grievances related to a range of land conflicts, agricultural production facilities and access to social services.

Land and agrarian reform and the consequences of improved access to land, including the opportunities and constraints to land utilisation, are perceived by rural people in ways different to the narrow technocrats' perspectives, which focus on agricultural cash cropping, as espoused by state bureaucrats, academics and NGOs. The benefits from land transcend its agricultural production function, because the peasantry has a broader understanding of land ownership, which includes its role as a storehouse of nature for reproduction in the future, an agricultural production tool for subsistence and sales, and its role as marker of a social and political territory of which defines community reproduction (Moyo 1995). Given the above difference in the understanding of the significance of land, it is necessary to analyse the constraints and grievances that militate against rural social reproduction as well as accumulation, as articulated by the land beneficiaries within a broader perspective. Although to a certain extent 'fast track' has managed to redistribute vast amounts of land to over 170 000 households, there still remain some outstanding land policy issues that constrain more robust forms of social reproduction which are discussed below.

#### 8.1.1 Land grievances cited by the beneficiaries

Recent studies (Utete, 2003; World Bank, 2006) suggest that land conflicts and even pervasive grievances arise from land tenure policy ambiguity, inconsistency of implementation procedures in land allocations and the ineffectiveness of the land administration structures. These land conflicts are seen as a constraint to effective land utilisation and agricultural productivity (World Bank, 2006). Some of these concerns tended to be pervasive at the formative period of the fast track resettlement exercise, particularly because there was uncertainty about the form of tenure to be assigned to both A1 and A2 land contestations of the farm acquisition and the large demand for land until around 2002 (see Moyo 2001).

#### Fig 8-1: Land grievances by model



Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, 2005/06, Household questionnaire N=1834

The analysis indicates that while there are some grievances associated with access to and secure use of land, (cited by 21 percent of the beneficiaries) their prevalence is much lower than has been suggested in earlier studies (see PLRC, 2003 and the World Bank, 2006). Possibly this change is due to some policy revisions that have taken place since the earlier studies were carried out. The majority of the households (79.7 percent) did not highlight any land grievance as a key issue (Fig 8-1).

However, some farmers still feel insecure due to the fact that Government has yet to formally issue them with permits and leases for A1 and A2 respectively. Clause 7 of the offer letter states that the offer can be withdrawn at any time, with the Government having no obligation to compensate for any improvements that might have been made. The World Bank (2006) notes that some of the settlers have been reluctant to commit substantial investment in on-farm infrastructure against this background of uncertainty (Ibid: 22). Other land allocation grievances that have been noted in earlier studies include conflicts among those who have been allocated land and other claimants over some pieces of land and over boundaries. In our survey only about 15 percent of the sample cited competing claims over boundaries and/or land allocations as a production.

The land access related grievances identified in the districts include, evictions and threats of evictions, boundary disputes, access to natural resources in common areas and access to infrastructure (see Fig 8-1). Land grievances were reported by fewer households in the drier districts of Kwekwe (17.3 percent) and Mangwe (4.5 percent) lying in Natural III and IV where contests for land were not as intense as in the higher rainfall districts (Annex 8-1). In the rest of the districts land grievances were reported by over 20 percent of the households. As discussed earlier (section 3.2.2), evictions and threats of eviction are very rare; only 15.8 percent have been threatened with evictions, and only 7.3 percent have actually been evicted. Of the 15.8 percent threatened with eviction, most of the threats came from the local authority (4.0 percent), followed by the army (2.3 percent). The former LSCFs were responsible for 1.7 percent of the eviction threats. Most of these evictions took place in 2004, when Government was undertaking a re-planning exercise whereby those who had settled on unlisted farms were being removed and some of the farms were being re-zoned to either A1 or A2. However, field observations also show that there were cases in which the evictions were caused by Government élites muscling into prime lands and farms with well developed infrastructure.

In some instances, the threats of eviction have been in cases where two or more beneficiaries make claims to the same piece of land. In some cases, all of the beneficiaries have an offer letter for the same piece of land, while in others just one beneficiary may have the offer letter, but other contestants have been resettled on the farm already. Grievances related to "ownership" of the land were limited to 4.0 percent of the beneficiaries (Table 8-1). These were slightly more common in the A2 sector (6.2 percent) where larger land sizes were distributed and some allocations were privileged with farm infrastructure inherited from the LSCF in comparison to 3.5 percent in the A1 sector.

Land grievance	Chip	inge	Chir	edzi	Gore	omonzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	ıba	Total	
-	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No grievance	251	78.9	173	83.6	395	73.6	268	82.7	137	96.5	238	77.8	1462	79.7
Access to infrastructure	13	4.1	7	3.4	18	3.4	6	1.9	-	-	5	1.6	49	2.7
Access to natural	10	3.1	5	2.4	18	3.4	6	1.9	2	1.4	8	2.6	49	2.7
resources														
Animal disputes	1	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.1
Boundary dispute	38	11.9	14	6.8	66	12.3	41	12.7	2	1.4	26	8.5	187	10.2
Conflict over	2	0.6	8	3.9	33	6.1	-	-	1	0.7	28	9.2	72	3.9
land/ownership of land														
Double allocation	2	0.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0.1
Eviction	-	-	-	-	4	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	0.2
Exchanging plots	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	0.9	-	-	-	-	3	0.2
Fraud/forged	1	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.1
documents														
Land re-planning issues	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.3	1	0.1
Trespassers	-	-	-	-	3	0.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	0.2
Total	318	100.0	207	100.0	537	100.0	324	100.0	142	100.0	306	100.0	1834	100.0

 Table 8-1: Land grievances

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, 2005/06, Household questionnaire

Given that during the FTLRP, land subdivisions were not defined technically through land surveys, boundary disputes were the second most common land grievance reported by beneficiaries (10.2 percent). The disputes of boundaries existed on a more or less similar scale in both A1 and A2 sectors where they were reported by 10.1 percent and 10.7 percent respectively. Other land grievances were reported by less than 3.0 percent of the households.

#### 8.1.2 Production constraints and grievances of the beneficiaries

Prior to 2000, the LCSF generally had better productive infrastructure than the communal areas. However, these capacities have been eroded through vandalism and the removal of some infrastructure by evicted farmers. The Utete Commission (2003) states that generally existing productive infrastructure is not adequate to support the welfare of settlers, and this weakness has been blamed for the low plot uptake, especially in A2 areas. Some of the infrastructural constraints include the lack of a good road network in resettled areas, limited on-farm water capacity and policy ambiguity concerning the utilisation of inherited farm infrastructure.

Around 30 percent of the beneficiaries cited high transport costs as a major problem (Fig 8-2) with about 15 percent of the farmers in Mangwe District citing this constraint. In 2001 the Department of Roads estimated that a total of about 7 076.4 km of road network needs to be developed over a period of three years. The fast track process did not take into account the need for fairness in the allotment of water resources (World Bank, 2006:30).



#### Fig 8-2: Production grievances in new resettlement areas by model

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, 2005/06, Household questionnaire

Previous studies (World Bank, 2006, Chigumira and Matshe, 2004) note the ambiguity of Government policy in terms of the use of inherited productive farm infrastructure and also that this ambiguity varies from A1 to A2 schemes. Government treats productive facilities in A1 areas as state property to be used on a shared basis (World Bank, 2006:24). The constraints that emanate from such a scenario have to do with the efficacy of the types of sharing mechanisms adopted. In A2 areas, the lease agreement grants infrastructure control rights to those plot holders on whose plot the structure is located and gives authority to such plot holders to sublet infrastructure (Ibid:24). Plot holders without infrastructure on their plots do not have any right of control, access to or use of any infrastructure not located on their farms. The A2 areas are, therefore, beset with problems of asset ownership, access, equity and overall utilisation of A2 infrastructure (Ibid: 24).

Other farm production constraints cited by the beneficiaries and their grievances include the nonavailability of credit and inputs, labour and draught power shortages, high prices of inputs and agricultural marketing related problems such as transportation costs and lack of markets (see Fig 8-2). These constraints vary across the six study districts.

Forty nine percent of the households reported the unavailability of credit as a production grievance (Fig 8-2). The non-availability of credit and input support is partially caused by the fact that, unlike in the communal areas where there were a number of different actors (private sector companies and NGOs), Government is the only major provider of credit and input support for the resettled communities.

Production	Chip	inge	Chir	edzi	Gord	omonzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	ıba	Total	
constraints	No.	% of	No.	% of	No.	% of	No.	% of	No.	% of	No.	% of	No.	% of
		HH		HH		HH		HH		HH		HH		HH
Credit unavailability	332	99.4	92	39.1	230	33.1	173	46.5	47	32.4	164	53.2	1038	49.7
Input unavailability	160	47.9	102	43.4	386	55.5	227	61.0	67	46.2	180	58.4	1122	53.7
High Inputs prices	162	48.5	129	54.9	332	47.8	192	51.6	79	54.5	109	35.4	1003	48.0
Lack of draught power	137	41.0	103	43.8	258	37.1	201	54.0	70	48.3	130	42.2	899	43.0
Labour bottlenecks	67	20.1	17	7.2	116	16.7	135	36.3	27	18.6	40	13.0	402	19.2
Lack of agricultural	47	14.1	12	5.1	54	7.8	90	24.2	16	11.0	6	1.9	225	10.8
markets														
High transport costs	109	32.6	78	33.2	183	26.3	146	39.2	65	44.8	55	17.9	636	30.4
HIV and AIDS	334	100.0	17	7.2	46	6.6	98	26.3	12	8.3	18	5.8	525	25.1
Land conflicts	30	9.0	21	8.9	44	6.3	74	19.9	4	2.8	36	11.7	209	10.0
Recurrent drought	69	20.7	81	34.5	51	7.3	179	48.1	80	55.2	124	40.3	584	28.0

### Table 8-2: Production grievances

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, 2005/06, Household questionnaire

The demand for credit and inputs has outstripped supply and, in many instances, the support that has been provided has either been inadequate in terms of quantity or has come late, thereby affecting the smooth flow of farming operations. For instance, 99 percent of the beneficiary farmers in Chipinge District cited lack of credit as a critical constraint, compared to around 30 percent to 40 percent in Chiredzi, Goromonzi and Mangwe districts. Also related to the inadequacy of credit and input support, farmers complained about the negative conditions and terms attached to the provision of credit and that these impinge negatively on the farmers' autonomy in the choice of land uses.

Unavailability of inputs was the most commonly cited production grievance by land beneficiaries (53.7 percent) (Table 8-2). As highlighted earlier (chapter 4.0), agricultural input industries have not been able to supply adequate inputs to meet the demand of the expanded farming sector given that they were also affected by the economic decline and were operating below capacity due to foreign currency shortages. Most of the inputs produced locally were being acquired through Government input programmes and there was little supply on the private markets.

The farmers also identified the high prices of inputs (43.0 percent), when these inputs are available, as a constraint against production and productivity. The farmers argued that the problem is exacerbated by the fact that they produce controlled commodities (prices pegged by Government which is also the only authorised buyer of such commodities) whose prices are at times not in line with market prices for the other commodities they need to purchase. This has been worsened by the hyperinflation that affected the economy during this period.

As has already been mentioned, the FTLRP period was also accompanied by several recurrent droughts that affected the local farming system given its dependency on rain-fed production. Some of the irrigation facilities existent in the former large-scale commercial farms were vandalized by new farmers or removed from the farms by former owners. In addition, some irrigation systems which functioned as a single unit have been affected by land subdivisions given the constraints of sharing infrastructure that were being experienced in new resettlement areas. Close to 30 percent of the households highlighted the recurrent droughts as an impediment to their production activities. Farms with irrigation facilities were mostly allocated to A2 beneficiaries, thus a higher percentage of A1 farmers (29.9 percent) were more affected by the recurrent droughts compared to 20.8 percent from the A2 sector.

Prior to fast track the LSCF accounted for over 80 percent of the area under irrigation (Manzungu, 2003), but this capacity has been eroded due to vandalism and the breaking up of irrigation operations when farms were demarcated. According to GoZ estimates, 49 380 hectares need varying levels of irrigation rehabilitation. Efforts aimed at rehabilitation of equipment have been constrained by the

prohibitive costs of materials, inaccessibility of materials, as well as the ineffective nature of the water sharing institutions.

Forty three percent of sampled households were facing draught power shortages (Table 8-2). The lack of draught power contributes to delays in the preparation of land for planting, which in turn also affects crop quality. The farmers themselves put forward a number of reasons, to at least partially explain this, arguing variously that: they could not bring their cattle onto the new farms due to Government's restriction on cattle movement (an effort aimed at curbing the spread of foot and mouth disease). The land beneficiaries argue that prior to the FTLRP they were landless and had no cattle of their own, and the few cattle they have do not provide adequate draught power for the new land sizes they have.

Again, the GoZ is the major actor on this issue through the ARDA and DDF tillage support programme. However, the programme is failing to satisfy demand due to the increase in the number of farms they have had to service since the FTLRP. The erratic supply of fuel has also negatively affected planning, as has the constant breakdown of the tractor fleet due to ageing and lack of proper maintenance.<sup>58</sup>

### 8.1.3 Social grievances

There are a variety of social constraints affecting newly resettled land beneficiaries, the most apparent of which include the unavailability of suitable water for domestic use and lack of sanitation facilities, inadequate health and education facilities and generally, poor planning for any investment in social infrastructure. The increase in terms of population in formerly under- populated LSCF areas has put a strain on the pre-existing infrastructure. The worst effect has been on the capacity to draw sufficient clean water for domestic use. The situation has been worsened by the vandalism that has led to many resettled families using untreated and unsafe water from nearby rivers and dams (Standard, 15 December 2002). The sanitation challenge predates the 'fast track', according to a study by the FCTZ (2000), as only 34.9 percent of farm worker households had toilets of their own. The increased number of residents in the former LSCF has only served to worsen the situation.

The health and schooling facilities prior to FTLRP were barely sufficient to cover farm worker households. Only 10.5 percent of the households had access to clinics, and only 12.9 percent of children under the age of six were benefitting from early childhood education and care programmes (Ibid). The average distance to the nearest primary school was 14.3 km. The increase of population in the former LSCF has contributed towards the stretching of this situation and there has not been any notable improvement, given the preoccupation of Government with improving on-farm productivity, and its limited resources. The planning for and investments in social infrastructure within A1 schemes has generally been poor.

The key informant interviews confirm some of the above issues and reveal the extent of earlier identified grievances. The key informant interviews mainly focused on issues of access to health and education facilities. Table 8-3 provides a summary of some of the social challenges that the land beneficiaries are facing.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>58</sup>Informal interviews with AREX officers, November 2006.

Social grievances	Chip	inge	Goro	monzi	Zvin	ıba	Man	gwe	Kwe	kwe	Chir	edzi	Tota	1	Ν
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Exorbitant consultation	17	39.5	28	51.9	43	55.1	4	57.1	10	41.7	18	42.9	120	48.4	248
charges at clinic															
Inadequate availability	6	13.6	9	16.4	16	21.1	2	14.3	6	22.2	3	6.5	42	16.0	262
of drugs															
Shortage of skilled	7	17.5	17	29.8	20	29.4	3	23.1	8	27.6	17	38.6	72	28.7	251
personnel in the clinics															
Exorbitant school fees	11	22.9	30	44.8	34	47.2	6	40.0	13	35.1	42	89.4	136	47.6	286
Lack of essential text	4	8.3	19	30.6	3	4.5	2	13.3	19	51.4	13	27.7	60	21.7	276
books															
Shortage of skilled	2	4.2	17	26.6	9	13.4	6	40.0	13	35.1	10	21.7	57	20.6	277
personnel in the															
schools															

Table 8-3: Social grievances in newly resettled area

Close to 50 percent of the key informants identified consultation fees at the local clinics as too high and felt that this discourages the habit of seeking treatment at an early stage. Sixteen percent also complained about the unavailability of essential drugs at the clinics. In terms of education, the respondents identified the major challenges as, unaffordable school fees (47.6 percent), unavailability of essential books (21.7 percent) and inadequate staffing levels (20.6 percent).

### 8.2 Local state structures and societal relations

The above constraints or grievances relate to the manner in which the land beneficiary households in newly redistributed areas, farm workers and other people settled legally or not, are also partly shaped by the nature of the state structures, the role of traditional leadership, and the way in which they respond to local demands.

#### 8.2.1 Local state structures

During the FTLRP process, particularly between 2000 and 2003, there was a temporary change in the local administrative framework regarding land management, local security and other rural services. The Rural District Councils (RDCs) and traditional leadership structures, alongside the district administration and the various local arms of administration representing central Government, remained the key institutions with overall authority to coordinate rural development in the newly redistributed areas.

Zimbabwe's local Government system had evolved since independence to an extent that traditional leadership structures in the communal areas had lost their land allocating powers to the District Councils. In practice, the passing of the Communal Land Act (1982) did not have any significant impact on the role of traditional leaders, (Anderson, 1999; Ranger, 1993; Dzingirai, 1995), as people in the Communal Areas continued to recognise traditional authorities in terms of their land allocation and dispute settlement responsibilities.

The Rural Councils (responsible for LSCF areas) and the District Councils responsible for CAs<sup>59</sup> were in 1988 amalgamated through the Rural District Councils Act, with traditional leaders being subordinated more effectively under RDCs. The RDC is composed of elected ward representatives (councillors) and a Chief Executive Officer who is responsible for the daily operations of the Council. The RDC receives guidance from the Rural District Development Committee (RDDC), which is made up of the Chief Executive Officer, the chairpersons of every committee established by Council,

Source: AIAS Baseline Survey, 2005/06, Original Farm Questionnaire, N=316

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>59</sup>Rural councils pertained to the LSCF areas and were mostly run by whites, while the District Councils were introduced by the transitional Government just before independence and were established around chieftaincy based African councils in customary areas.

senior officers of the district in the police, the army, and the President's Office (security intelligence) and other ministries in the district. The RDDCs' main function is to consider ward development plans and to make recommendations to the Council as to matters to be included in the annual development plans and other long term plans for the district. The Act is notably silent on the role of traditional authority, and neither the Council nor the RDDCs accommodate traditional leaders.

However, some observers (e.g. Anderson, 1999) argue that these were ignored in practice as they hardly seemed to function in terms of land allocation and settlement of land related disputes. Even in instances where a land case reached the RDC, the headman's court (dare) remained as the leading site of dispute settlement<sup>60</sup>. There was an apparent shift in Government thinking in 1999, as traditional leaders were once again upgraded to the status of salaried civil servants through the Traditional Leaders Act. The Act officially delegated responsibility for land allocation and dispute settlement in the communal areas to the chiefs and headmen. Some commentators (Chaumba, 2002; Alexander, 2006) have interpreted this policy shift as an attempt on the part of ZANU (PF) to further co-opt the rural electorate<sup>61</sup>.

At the peak of the FTLRP, Government created a decentralised structure from national level to the farm level, of land administration. The District Land Committees (DLCs), were the most influential, and these included the Rural District Council (RDC) Chairperson, the District Chairperson of the War Veterans Association, traditional leaders (headmen and chiefs), an officer from each of the President's Office, the Zimbabwe Republic Police (ZRP) and the Zimbabwe National Army (ZNA), and officials from the departments of Social Welfare, Health, Veterinary and Agricultural Research and Extension (AREX).

The responsibilities of the DLC included identification of land for resettlement, beneficiary selection, and attending to land disputes among the newly resettled. This approach was intended to replace the ascendance of war veterans' power over land administration and other matters at the peak of the land occupations. The war veterans had made an effort to involve traditional leaders in identifying ancestral lands and also in leading cleansing ceremonies during and after the occupation of land, and traditional leaders were instrumental in mobilising 'subject' communities to occupy lands on the basis of restitution claims<sup>62</sup>. The DLCs by 2004 had wrestled control over land administration, although local farm committees were kept in place on the redistributed farms.

The majority of the beneficiaries (91 percent) were aware of the existence of local Government structures in their newly redistributed areas, particularly in the form of ward councillors. The level of awareness of the existence of ward councillors was more common in the A1 sector (92.2 percent) in comparison to the A2 sector (85.6 percent). The key perceived roles of the ward councillors were to spearhead development, initiate community projects and dispute resolution. Another local Government structure that was found in existence in newly resettled areas was the Village Development Committees (VIDCOs). The existence of VIDCOs was known to fewer land beneficiaries (53 percent) than was the case with ward councillors, and VIDCOs were also more commonly known in the A1 areas (58.6 percent) than in A2 areas (34.6 percent). The key roles ascribed to VIDCOs by land beneficiaries were also similar to those of the ward councillors. In general, the A2 beneficiaries tended to distance themselves from these two structures, although their linkages with higher level district and central Government structures are considered to be more favourable.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>60</sup>The continued dominance of the headmen and chiefs in the allocation of land and dispute settlement was mostly due to two reasons; (i) most council administrators, who largely determine the policy process at district level, have little understanding of the land disputes brought to their attention, (ii) the people at the centre of the disputes recognise the centrality of the chiefs and headmen in allocating land and resolving disputes.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>61</sup>But in practice the powers of Chiefs remained diluted.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>62</sup>Personal discussions with Chief Bushu, 2005.

### **Government agencies**

Traditionally, service organisations from both the private and public sectors (marketing boards and other Government departments) have been involved in the supply of inputs, credit and extension support to smallholder farmers. Different approaches have been used but the most common have been contract farming arrangements (preferred by the private sector), out- grower schemes and input credit schemes (made popular by the Cotton Company of Zimbabwe [Cottco]). Most of the service organisations operating in the newly resettled areas are Government agencies (e.g. AREX, ARDA, Department of Veterinary Services, and Department of Natural Resources).

Government	Household	with contac	t to Govern	ment agenc	ies				
agencies		A1			A2			Total	
	No. of	% of HH	Ν	No. of	% of HH	Ν	No. of	% of HH	Ν
	HH			HH			HH		
AREX	1382	96.7	1429	329	89.4	368	1711	95.2	1797
ARDA	169	16.8	1006	40	14.9	268	209	16.4	1274
Veterinary	462	44.4	1040	106	38.0	279	568	43.1	1319
Services									
Dept of Livestock	149	15.7	947	28	11.1	252	177	14.8	1199
& Devpt									
Dept of Irrigation	76	8.4	910	36	14.3	252	112	9.6	1162
& Techn Services									
Dept of Natural	177	19.3	918	44	17.9	246	221	19.0	1164
Resources									
Forestry	213	23.5	907	38	15.3	249	251	21.7	1156
Commission									

Table 8-4: Contact with Government agencies in newly resettled areas

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

The majority (95.2 percent) of those aware of the existence of external support identified AREX as the most visible agent in the area (Table 8-4). However, newly resettled households highlighted that contact with AREX was infrequent due to several resource constraints they are facing such as mobility to reach out to most farms and inadequate manpower on the ground. There is dissatisfaction with the manner in which other Government agencies, such as the Agricultural and Rural Development Agency (ARDA) and the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), are conducting their activities, as contact with the farmers has been minimal. The percentage of beneficiaries in contact with these Government agencies was generally below 20.0 percent in both the A1 and A2 sectors.

## 8.2.2 Traditional leaders

In 1999, the Government passed the Traditional Leaders Act, which provided for salaried chiefs and village headmen. Through this Act, traditional leaders can now participate in council activities in an ex-officio capacity. According to Constitutional Amendment No. 17, all resettlement areas, shall fall under the jurisdiction of the RDCs and shall be incorporated into either existing wards, or new wards shall be created as and when necessary.

It is notable that the authority and institution of chiefdom has not been challenged in the process of mobilisation for land reform. Rather, the chiefs played a leading role in mobilising for land occupations. Chatterjee (1986) observes that traditional leaders lend credibility to processes of mobilisation and, in this context, the discourse on the repossession of ancestral lands further strengthened the leadership role of the chiefs and their subordinate structures. The Traditional Leaders Act (Chapter 20:17) states that resettlement areas shall be placed under the relevant traditional chiefs or headmen and that as local level governance systems take hold in resettlement areas the administration of these areas from the central state (Ministry of Lands and Rural Resettlement and Ministry of Local Government) shall diminish.

However, the current draft<sup>63</sup> of the lease document does not make any reference to traditional institutions. Instead, it states that the lease will be administered by the Ministry of Lands or any other designated public agent. The draft A1 permit makes clear reference to the traditional structures in the disposal clause (4.4b) where it states that the permit holder may dispose of his/her rights under the permit only with the written consent of the headman, the chief and the Rural District Council established for the area concerned (GoZ, 2007). Only the permit makes explicit reference to the traditional institutions, thus A2 land beneficiaries might perceive a much clearer relationship with central Government.

Newly resettled land beneficiaries were generally aware of the existence of traditional leaders in their area in the form of chiefs and headmen. Out of 1,789 respondents, 82.7 percent knew of the existence of a chief in their area (Table 8-5). The level of awareness of the existence of chiefs was higher in the A1 sector (86.0 percent) compared to the A2 sector (69.5 percent).

Table 8-5: Level of awareness of traditional leaders in new resettlement areas

Availability of institutional structure	A1		A2		Total		Ν
	No	%	No	%	No	%	
Are chiefs available in this area?	1226	86.0	253	69.5	1479	82.7	1789
Are headmen available in this area?	1126	78.9	216	58.5	1342	74.7	1797
Are spirit medium available in this area	579	49.6	96	29.2	675	45.1	1496

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

The presence of the chief's assistants in the form of headmen was less known to newly resettled households in comparison to chiefs. Close to 75.0 percent of the newly resettled households knew of the existence of headmen in their area. The perceived roles of the chiefs highlighted by beneficiaries included the resolution of land disputes, enforcement of Government laws and regulations, assisting farmers in agricultural production activities (marketing, sourcing inputs and agricultural implements), preservation of traditional values and general community welfare. There were also informal traditional institutions in newly resettled areas in the form of spirit mediums, but the level of awareness of their existence was known to 45.1 percent of the newly resettled households. The awareness of the existence of spirit mediums was more common in the A1 sector (49.6 percent) than in the A2 sector (29.2 percent).

## 8.3 Land beneficiary organisation and advocacy

Newly resettled households respond to land and production grievances through negotiations and/or confrontations with the state and traditional leadership structures. The strategies used combine individual or household level efforts and associative networks established within the new communities and beyond. The various actions undertaken by individual households to overcome some of the immediate challenges in the newly resettled areas have already been discussed. Some of their strategies entail the maintenance of a relationship with neighbouring communal areas, engaging in other non-farm income generating activities and also retaining employment in the formal wage economy (see chapter 7). In this sub-section we focus on agency in the newly resettled areas through associative networks.

There are various types of associative networks that were found to be emerging from within the newly distributed areas, while others existent in communal areas are also being replicated Such organisations include farmers associations, women's organisations, religious (church) groups and other groups.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>63</sup>The Lease document has gone through a number of drafts, due to representations from various stakeholders including civil society organisations such as AIAS. The AIAS convened various policy dialogues on land tenure issues since 2004.

In discussing the origins and motivation of the emergence of these various forms of groups, it is instructive to bear in mind the nature of the underlying social structures which characterise rural "communities" in Zimbabwe, the evolution of new forms of social and political organisation that emanated from the land occupations' movement and related processes, and the emergent social differentiation processes that tend to shape social organisation.

As mentioned before in section (2.3.1), around 60.9 percent of the land beneficiaries do not come from within the districts of the farms they are settled on, and as such, there are no local traditional leaderships which are extended from neighbouring Communal Areas into the newly redistributed areas. Some of this is reflected in the relatively high degree to which the land beneficiaries were not aware of the existence of traditional leadership and also the fact that many of the beneficiaries from afar may tend to ignore paying homage to the local chiefs and spirit mediums. Some lineage heads and others such as war veterans or other spiritual leaders (church elders) have been creating new leadership structures based on blood relations, patronage and protection of the settlers.

It is also important to note that most of the land occupiers during the 2000 and 2001 phase came into the newly redistributed areas as "pre-organised" groups or social/political organisations. Some groups of war veterans came in under their own provincial or district organisational fabric within the Zimbabwe Liberation War Veterans Association (ZLWVA), and together with their relatives and friends moulded new forms of socio-political organisations. For instance 18.8 percent and 14.5 percent of the settlers were war veterans and land occupiers respectively. Some of these organisations formed the core of the "Committees of Seven" on A1 farms and other wider associations cutting across farms and schemes (e.g. Nyabira-Mazowe War Veterans Association now called MwMART (Mashonaland West Mining Agriculture and Residency Trust) in the Zvimba-Mazowe area (Masuko, forthcoming). Some of these and other dimensions of the roots of social organisation in newly redistributed areas are explored further below.

#### 8.3.1 Farmer Organisations among land beneficiaries

Rural organisation is complex but most analyses of immediate associative networks have focused on the structured formations such as Zimbabwe Farmers Union (ZFU) at the expense of the more unstructured, organic forms of organisation that continue to inform social organisation and agency. The survey found that there is some form of coexistence between the unstructured networks and the more formal farmer groups. Below the study discusses both the unstructured immediate associative networks and the more structured farmer groups, in terms of their rationale, and their activities, strategies and goals.

## 8.3.1.1Unstructured networks

The land redistribution process was implemented in such a way that it subdivided large scale farms into smaller units, thereby necessitating the adoption of sharing arrangements of immovable infrastructure and other assets left behind by the previous farm owners. The study identified eight areas in which resettled farmers are cooperating.

Areas of cooperation	A1		A2		No. and o	f HH in par	entheses				
	No.	% of HH	No.	% of HH	Chipinge	Chiredzi	Goromonzi	Kwekwe	Mangwe	Zvimba	Total
sharing of productive					168	141	349	234	104	96	1092
infrastructure	887	53.7	205	46.8	(50.3)	(60.0)	(50.2)	(62.9)	(71.7)	(31.2)	(52.3)
sharing of non-											
productive					99	98	218	177	21	117	730
infrastructure	567	34.3	163	37.2	(29.6)	(41.7)	(31.4)	(47.6)	(14.5)	(38.0)	(34.9)
reciprocal hiring					166	43	252	110	42	119	732
arrangements	568	34.4	164	37.4	(49.7)	(18.3)	(36.3)	(29.6)	(29.0)	(38.6)	(35.0)
reciprocal labor					88	43	117	29	54	98	429
sharing	328	19.9	101	23.1	(26.3)	(18.3)	(16.8)	(7.8)	(37.2)	(31.8)	(20.5)
combined farming					17	8	63	5	2	77	172
operations	144	8.7	28	6.4	(5.1)	(3.4)	(9.1)	(1.3)	(1.4)	(25.0)	(8.2)
membership in											
common agric and					41	58	29	9	10	38	185
social group	129	7.8	56	12.8	(12.3)	(24.7)	(4.2)	(2.4)	(6.9)	(12.3)	(8.9)
sharing of advice and					162	93	193	28	45	50	571
information	419	25.4	152	34.7	(48.5)	(39.6)	(27.8)	(7.5)	(31.0)	(16.2)	(27.3)
sharing of seed and					44	14	43	4	7	17	129
planting material	101	6.1	28	6.4	(13.2)	(6.0)	(6.2)	(1.1)	(4.8)	(5.5)	(6.2)

 Table 8-6: Cooperation among newly resettled households

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

Farmers have had to devise mechanisms for sharing infrastructure in compliance with Government policy regulating the use of such infrastructure. Sixty one percent of the households stated that they have a sharing arrangement on productive infrastructure (Table 8-6). Government involvement, in the form of directives on access and usage of infrastructure on the farms, in some instances directly influences cooperation levels among the farmers on specified issues and has an indirect multiplier effect, in that farmers have also come to realise other spheres in which they can cooperate to increase productivity. However, as discussed earlier, problems of infrastructure sharing are prevalent in the A2 scheme.

Shared productive infrastructure includes tobacco barns, irrigation infrastructure, farm compounds, dams, cattle handling facilities and dip tanks, and various moveable capital assets. The sharing of productive infrastructure has necessitated the formation of groups or committees to oversee the management and equal access to these vital assets. Interviews with key informants revealed that some of the organisational structures that were instituted during the peak of the land occupations, such as the Committee of Seven, have evolved into management committees responsible for ensuring equal access and maintenance of productive infrastructure.

Other farmers (35.2 percent) were also involved in the sharing of non-productive infrastructure such as compounds, houses and cottages. The incidence of sharing of non-productive infrastructure is greater among A2 farmers (37.4 percent) than among their A1 counterparts (27.3 percent). In the A2 sector, 37.4 percent of the farmers have equal access to the farm compounds for their workers but the farmhouses have been occupied by the farmer who owns the plot on which the house is located. In most A1 cases, the non-productive infrastructure includes previous farm owners' houses and cottages, which have been converted into public social facilities, such as pre-schools, primary schools and clinics.

Thirty five percent of the farmers are involved in reciprocal labour hiring arrangements. These arrangements include utilising one pool of semi-skilled workers, such as mechanics, tractor drivers, seedbed handlers and tobacco curing experts. Farmers then devise an agreement as to when these workers' services will be required on each farm. These arrangements also apply to the hiring of general casual workers.

Farmers also revealed that they engage in combined farming operations (8.2 percent). This involves the pooling of resources to crop a piece of land after which they share the output depending on the resources contributed. Reciprocal labour arrangements were also being practiced by 20.5 percent of the newly resettled farmers. This entails the grouping of available labour from group of households to carry out a specific task, such as harvesting on a single plot over an agreed amount of time which is then reciprocated to all the households participating in the group. This practice is common in communal areas, where generally the available labour is mostly family labour, which might not be sufficient to carry out such tasks in a short space of time. The practice of 'nhimbe' has been imported across models by the newly resettled farmers, possibly as a strategy to address labour shortages and also to maximise productivity (see also section 6.0).

Close to 30 percent of the farmers are involved in localised extension support through the sharing of information. The issues that farmers advise each other on include, where seeds or fertilisers are available, the dates on which to plant, types of seeds to use and type of chemicals to buy. The advice is normally reciprocal and, in most cases, is offered without payment. Some of the farmers (8.9 percent) resettled on a previous large scale farm belong to the same farmer and social groups. Most of the farmer groups formed after the FTLRP have been fairly localised and serve a small group of farmers (see below).

## 8.3.1.2Structured farmer groups

There existed different types of farmer groups initiated by land beneficiaries in the newly resettled areas. The farmer groups were not automatically formed at the time of settlement, but their formation was influenced by the environmental challenges faced and the social origins of the land beneficiaries. The farmer groups serve different roles which are both social and economic in nature, including mobilising resources and expertise for production, ensuring access to inputs, mediation and resolution of farmers' grievances, information gathering, and marketing of farm outputs. The categories of farmer groups found in the area include savings and loans groups, extension groups and production groups. The awareness of the existence of different farmer groupings was known to 25.4 percent of the newly resettled households (Table 8-7).

The knowledge of existence of farmer groups by newly resettled households varied by the district of study. Kwekwe and Zvimba districts had the highest percentage of households who knew about the existence of farmer groups in their areas, 42.7 percent and 41.9 percent respectively (Table 8-7). The level of awareness was lowest in Mangwe and Goromonzi districts where 9.7 percent and 11.7 percent of the households knew about farmer groups in their areas (Table 8-7).

Knowledge of	A1		A2		No. and %	of HH in p	arentheses				
existence of	No. of		No. of								Total
farmer groups	HH	%	HH	%	Chipinge	Chiredzi	Goromonzi	Kwekwe	Mangwe	Zvimba	
Yes	122	26.2	00	22.6	77	71	81	159	14	129	531
	432	20.2	99	22.0	(23.1)	(30.2)	(11.7)	(42.7)	(9.7)	(41.9)	(25.4)
No	1210	72.0	220	77 4	257	164	614	213	131	179	1558
	1219	/3.8	539	//.4	(76.9)	(69.8)	(88.3)	(57.3)	(90.3)	(58.1)	(74.6)
Total	1651	100.0	128	100.0	334	235	695	372	145	308	2089
	1031	100.0	436	100.0	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)

 Table 8-7: Knowledge of existence of farmer groups

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

The membership in the different types of farmer groups that existed in the newly resettled areas was very low. Only 10.7 percent of newly resettled households were members of a farmer group (Fig 8-3). The level of membership across model types was more or less similar as 10.8 percent and 10.5 percent of A1 and A2 households belonged to farmer groups. Kwekwe District which had the highest level of awareness among newly resettled households also had the highest percentage that belonged to a

farmer group (18.5 percent). Membership to farmer groups was generally below 10.0 percent in the remaining districts.



Fig 8-3: Membership to farmer groups by land beneficiaries

Numerous benefits associated with membership to farmer groups were highlighted by households and these tended to coincide with the type of group. The majority of the members (50.0 percent) indicated extension support as the major benefit derived from farm groups (Table 8-8). Input procurement was the second most common benefit derived by households belonging to farmer groups. Farmer groups procured inputs in groups and thus enjoyed discounts in bulk purchases. Other benefits of belonging to farmer groups included labour provision and profit sharing from group activities.

Benefit	A1		A2		Total	
	No. of HH	% of HH	No. of HH	% of HH	No. of HH	% of HH
Social support	21	16.2	4	10.5	25	14.9
Extension	67	51.5	17	44.7	84	50.0
Marketing support	5	3.8	6	15.8	11	6.5
Input procurement	29	22.3	10	26.3	39	23.2
Labour provision	1	0.8	0	0.0	1	0.6
Profit sharing	7	5.4	1	2.6	8	4.8
Total	130	100	38	100	168	100

Table 8-8: Major benefit derived from famer groups by members

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

The farmer groups found in newly resettled areas tended to be location specific and were not normally linked to larger farmer groups at district, provincial or national level. It seems there is no clear mechanism linking these fragmented organizations to the national unions: Zimbabwe Farmers Union (ZFU), Zimbabwe Commercial Farmers Union (ZCFU) and Commercial Farmers Union (CFU). In the absence of these linkages, the multiplicity of farmer groups that have emerged in newly resettled areas may not necessarily lead to the development of one voice, but rather to a multiplicity of voices which could be used against each other by political élites, especially given the fact that the state is a major actor in the provision of inputs to the farmers, and is also the only outward conduit for most of the goods they produce. Rahmato (1991) argues that, most of the farmer groups are led by élites for narrow gains, such as political patronage and diversion of state support for individual benefit. Such a

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

multiplicity of farmer groups poses problems for mobilisation on policy issues, as different groups might adopt contradictory positions. Another possible explanation for the multiplicity of groups and apathy in membership has to do with the fact that external means, such as NGO capacity support, have not been availed to these farmers and this might have contributed towards duplication between the groups established to date.

### 8.3.1.3Social origins of farmer group members

As previously indicated in the preceding chapters, the majority of the farmers (62.7 percent) who belong to farmer groups originated from the communal areas (see Table 8-9). Across model types, in the A1 sector there is a dominance of membership from people who originated from the communal areas, whilst in the A2 sector membership in farmer groups is slightly skewed towards those who originated from the urban areas (41.5 percent) than those from communal areas (39.5 percent) (Table 8-9).

The tendency towards association among farmers from the communal areas is partially explained by an understanding of the social organisation prevailing in communal farmers' areas. Communal areas have, over the years, developed their own mechanisms of association and cooperation and these have been a subject of enquiry by many scholars (Rahmato, 1991; Hyden, 1983; Moyo, 2002). The communal areas have also come under the influence of external agency (the private sector, NGOs, the church and the state), which has sought to 'modernise' communal area farming and organisation among farmers. Traditionally, farmers have always used a wide range of collective action mechanisms, such as the pooling of labour for farm production activity, joint community welfare schemes<sup>64</sup> and assisting each other during social occasions such as weddings, funerals, etc. External agents have promoted group formation among farmers for a variety of reasons such as: easier reach of extension support, pooling of labour for community projects, easier distribution of inputs and marketing of produce, and to facilitate joint production schemes.

Origin	A1 m	odel	A2model		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Communal area	111	68.9	17	39.5	128	62.7
LSCF	16	9.9	5	11.6	21	10.3
Urban area	27	16.8	18	41.9	45	22.1
Place of employment	4	2.5	3	7.0	07	3.4
growth point, mining area old resettlement area & Diaspora	3	1.9	0	0	03	1.5
Total	161	100	43	100	204	100.0

 Table 8-9: Social origins of farmer group members

#### Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

The tendency to replicate some of these associative formations among the newly resettled farmers is evident, although membership levels are still very low. It is important to note in this regard that most of the cooperation in the communal areas has been informally defined by ties of mutual obligation and did not have to take place in formalised groups. Actual membership in formal community based organisations or other externally driven farmer groups has generally always been low<sup>65</sup>. Cooperation is loosely built around familial and kinship ties, which provide an organic form of obligation and reciprocity<sup>66</sup>. The apparent apathy in farmer group membership does not necessarily imply low levels of cooperation among the newly resettled farmers, but may instead suggest the existence of other deeper, organic forms of cooperation which are not formalised in groups as discussed earlier.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>64</sup>Zunde Ramambo concept.

The low levels of membership in these communities can also be ascribed to the central role that the state has been playing for the past five years. In most cases, especially among the A1 farmers, there has been a high level of state intervention in terms of supplying inputs (seed and fertiliser) and other production related services, such as tillage support and transportation of produce to the grain depots. The state's activities have, therefore, created some form of dependency on the part of the farmers, stunting initiative and group efforts.

### 8.3.1.4Gender relations in farmer groups

Historically, farmer groups have been dominated by males<sup>67</sup>. There is a strong (67.9 percent) presence of males in most of the farmer groups that were identified (Table 8-10). The A1 sector had a higher percentage of females participating in farmer groups (37.1 percent) in comparison to 13.0 percent in the A2 sector. The dominance of males in the farmer groups, and in leadership positions, is also influenced by the social background of the members.

Gender	A1 A2					No. and %	No. and % of HH in parentheses						
	No. of	% 0	f N	lo. of	% of	Chipinge	Chiredzi	Goromonzi	Kwekwe	Mangwe	Zvimba	Total	
	HH	HH	Η	IH	HH								
Female	66	37.	L	6	13.0	8	8	16	25	5	10	72	
						(21.6)	(34.8)	(64.0)	(30.5)	(71.4)	(20.0)	(32.1)	
Male	112	62.	)	40	87.0	29	15	9	57	2	40	152	
						(78.4)	(65.2)	(36.0)	(69.5)	(28.6)	(80.0)	(67.9)	
Total	178	100.	)	46	100.0	37	23	25	82	7	50	224	
						(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	

Table 8-10: Gender of household member belonging to a farmer group

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

Most of the group members are from the communal areas, which are influenced by deeply patriarchal systems. However, the modernising influence of both the state and non-state actors in the newly resettled areas has, to an extent, opened up space for the participation of women in farmer groups. As discussed earlier, the Government has been promoting the position of women in the newly resettled areas in the proposed tenure documents (99 year lease and permit document) which require joint registration of land in both spouses' names in the case of married people, a departure from the patriarchal systems in communal areas where women's land rights are derived through their relationship to men. Some of the farmer groups that have emerged have actually been formed to specifically address issues that affect women or women-headed households.

#### 8.4 Other forms of organisation

One of the enigmatic but critical aspects of the social and political organisational frameworks of the newly redistributed areas is the Committee of Seven. Within the study area field observations showed that on each of the former large scale commercial farm redistributed under the A1 scheme, there existed a Committee of Seven composed of a village head, youth representative, women representative and four other committee members chosen from the settlers. The Committee of Seven structures were only set up on A1 farms which housed more beneficiaries and they were non-existent on A2 farms. The Committee of Seven were dominated by war veterans. The broad functions are reported to be the managing of security on A1 farms as well as the resolution of land related disputes. In this regard, there seems to be a duplication of roles with traditional institutions (chiefs and headmen) which also perform the same role.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>65</sup>See for instance Moyo's (1995) study on Mhezi Ward.

 $<sup>^{66}</sup>$ Rahmato (1991) has analysed some of these forms of associative activities.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>67</sup>Rahmato, 1991

The War Veterans also continued to maintain their own forms of socio-political organisation. These organisations tended to be locally based with no formal linkage to their apex body, the ZNWLA. A case in point is that of the Nyabira-Mazowe War Veterans association in the Zvimba District which spearheaded land occupations in these areas. The Nyabira-Mazowe War Veterans Association transformed itself from the land occupations period to organising around agricultural production to support its membership base that got access to land under the FTLRP (see Masuko, forthcoming).

### 8.5 Organisations of new and former farm workers

The formal organisation of frameworks, albeit weak, has been a feature of the LSCF areas which were redistributed. There are over 1,500 former farm workers in the six study districts as well as over 1,600 new farm workers. Below the discussion in centres on how farm workers are organising themselves to respond to the different challenges they face in social reproduction and how other external agents try to organise them around workerist issues pertaining to wages and working conditions.

#### 8.5.1 Unionisation of farm workers

The formal organisation of farm workers has weakened further following the implementation of the FTLRP. At its peak, at the end of the 1990s, the largest agricultural labour union, GAPWUZ, organised a third of the permanent workers (or 65,000) as paid up members of the union (Chambati and Magaramombe, 2008). Following the implementation of the FTLRP, awareness and membership of labour unions among new and former farm workers has declined drastically in new resettlement areas. In the sample survey of farm workers, only 4.4 percent knew about the existence of a labour union in their area and only 3.0 percent were paid up members of a labour union (Fig 8-4). In general, awareness and membership to agricultural labour unions was more common in the Mashonaland provinces which have historically formed the largest base of agricultural workers in the country. For instance, Goromonzi, Mashonaland East Province, had the highest awareness of the existence of labour unions among farm workers (10.6 percent) and a membership base of 9.6 percent amongst the sampled farm workers. Membership to labour unions was lowest in Mangwe District, Matebeleland South Province, where all sampled farm workers were neither aware of their existence nor members of labour unions.



Fig 8-4: Awareness of existence of agricultural labour union among farm workers

Low unionisation of agricultural workers tends to limit the options available to workers to channel their grievances. The main agricultural labour union, GAPWUZ, has failed to reach out to most new resettlement areas, largely because of its perceived association with the Movement for Democratic Change and National Constitutional Assembly through its support for the 'NO' campaign in advance of the national Constitutional Referendum in 2000. Its attack on land occupations has also rendered it unacceptable to most new farmers, in addition to the union's own organisational weaknesses (see Chambati and Magaramombe, 2008)<sup>68</sup>. Furthermore, workers' committees, the grassroots structures for handling worker grievances that were common in the LSCF sector, despite their limited success in addressing worker rights (Loewenson, 1992; Chambati and Magaramombe, forthcoming), are almost nonexistent in new resettlement areas, as only 12.0 percent of the workers had such structures at their places of employment (Fig 8-5).



Fig 8-5: Membership of agricultural workers to labour unions

Workers committee structures were more common in the Goromonzi and Chipinge districts where 20.1 percent and 23.5 percent respectively of the sampled farm workers indicated the existence of such structures at their places of employment in the new resettlement areas. The establishment of workers committees on new farms might have been slow because of the small numbers of workers currently employed per household (see Section 6.1).

Source: AIAS Farm Worker Survey (2005/6) N=789

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>68</sup>For instance, the union only managed to establish a physical presence in Mashonaland Central Province in 2007, seven years after the commencement of the FTLRP (Chambati and Magaramombe, 2008).



Fig 8-6: Existence of workers committee structures in newly resettled areas

Source: AIAS Farm Worker Survey (2005/6) N=789

### 8.5.2 Collective bargaining: wage determination in newly resettled areas

The rewards of waged agricultural workers are supposed to be determined through a collective bargaining process, as stipulated in the Labour Relations Act (Chapter 28:01), administered by the Ministry of the Public Service, Labour and Social Welfare (MPSL&SW). The National Employment Council of the Agricultural Industry of Zimbabwe (NECAIZ), which includes employers, the Agricultural Labour Bureau (ALB) and employee representatives, including the General Agricultural and Plantation Workers Union of Zimbabwe (GAPWUZ), oversees such bargaining. More recently the NECAIZ has been expanded to include representatives of new farmers. The bargaining process is expected to cover wage rates, grading of employees, nature of contracts, benefits such as leave including during sickness, provision of protective clothing, and gratuities payable on termination of employment. Agreements are registered with the MPSL&SW, which in turn gazettes them as statutory requirements for the agricultural industry. The employer representatives, ALB, are an arm of the Commercial Farmers Union, a grouping of mainly current and former white large scale commercial farmers. The collective bargaining process covers only the wages and working conditions of permanent farm workers, while those of casual workers are negotiated between the employee and the employer. Wages of farm workers are negotiated on a quarterly basis, therefore collective bargaining agreements are binding for a period of three months.

In the newly resettled areas, various methods of wage determination were noted, including the collective bargaining agreements gazetted by the Government, which are utilised by 23.4 percent of the households that hire in labour. Other methods include the valuation of specific tasks where workers are paid for the delivery of agreed outputs (31.0 percent), market rates or what other households in the respective area are paying their workers (12.1 percent), employers' discretion (9.6 percent) and through internal negotiations between workers and newly resettled households (24.0 percent) (Table 8-11). The task valuation method is mostly used for rewarding casual workers. The application of the different methods of wage determination was more or less similar between the A1 and A2 schemes. Collective bargaining agreements were more commonly applied in the A2 scheme (33.6 percent) which was dominant in the hiring in of permanent workers which are covered under this arrangement, whilst in the A1 scheme which relies mostly on casual workers beyond family labour resources, the task valuation method was the most common wage determination method (33.8 percent).

Method of wage determination	A1		A2		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Employers' discretion	87	10.2	21	7.7	108	9.6
Task valuation/output based	288	33.8	61	22.3	349	31.0
Collective bargaining	171	20.1	92	33.6	263	23.4
Employer-employee negotiation	203	23.8	67	24.5	270	24.0
Market rates	103	12.1	33	12.0	136	12.1
Total	852	100.0	274	100.0	1126	100.0

Table 8-11: Wage determination methods in new resettlement areas

Source: AIAS District Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

Zimbabwe's commercial agricultural sector was built on the backbone of a cheap labour policy regime that was predicated on land alienation of the indigenous population that forced migration from the communal areas to seek low paying jobs in the large-scale commercial farms to supplement subsistence agricultural production (Clarke, 1977; Loewenson, 1992; Moyo, 1995; Amanor-Wilks, 1995). Despite contributing the bulk of the formal labour force (20 percent), commercial farm workers were the lowest paid and lived under precarious conditions in the large-scale commercial farms. With the redistribution of land under the FTLRP, it seems new farmers, especially the large A2 farmers, prefer the continuation of a cheap labour regime to propel agricultural accumulation. At several instances during the post- FTLRP period, new farmers have refused to endorse collective bargaining agreements arguing that they were not affordable to them since they were only starting up. For instance in July 2003, the Ministry of Public Service, Labour and Social Welfare was forced to refer back initial collective bargaining agreements to the National Employment Council for the Agricultural Industry after resistance from new A2 farmers about the affordability of wages (Chambati and Moyo, 2004). This was the second time such a situation had occurred following protests in December 2002 when the National Employment Council had agreed for a 50 percent wage increase for farm workers (Ibid). The preference of a cheap labour regime could be attributed to the limited resources available to new farmers during this transitional period of land reform. For instance, in the data sample, 39.7 percent of the households indicated that they required additional labour to meet their needs, and of these households 83.7 percent of them indicated being hampered by the nonavailability of financial resources to reward the workers.

#### 8.5.3 Labour syndicalism, skills use and survival strategies.

As highlighted earlier (section 4.3.5), most newly resettled farmers do not possess formal agricultural training but have other skills gained from previous employment as well as higher education qualifications that can be transferable to agriculture and enable the implementation of faster skills transfer programmes. In this regard, the utilisation of former farm workers who gained valuable skills and experience from their employment in the LSCF sector through their re-employment in new farms is critical to foster skills transfer. However, due to various problems highlighted earlier, which include their poor relations with new farmers and alleged poor working conditions, their reengagement in newly resettled areas has been limited. Field evidence shows that 36.0 percent of the land beneficiaries employ former farm workers as part of their employee workforce (Fig 8-7). The employment of former farm workers was more common in the A2 scheme where 43.6 percent of the land beneficiaries engaged them in comparison to 33.9 percent in the A1 scheme. Inter-district patterns revealed that the utilisation of former farm workers tended to be higher in the higher potential agro-ecological districts (Goromonzi, Chipinge and Zvimba) which had more diversified farming systems in comparison to the drier districts (Mangwe and Kwekwe) (Fig 8-8). Utilisation of farm managerial skills that was predominant in the former LSCF sector was also low, compounding the

skills deficit problem in new resettlement areas. The majority of the newly resettled farms were owner managed as only 8.5 percent and 19.6 percent of A1 and A2 respectively land beneficiaries recruited professional farm managers.





Source: AIAS Farm Worker Survey (2005/6) N=789



### Fig 8-8: Employment of former farm workers by district

Source: AIAS Farm Worker Survey (2005/6) N=789

However, on further questioning on how they were applying the skills they gained in the LSCFs, 57.8 percent of the former farm workers revealed that their skills were not relevant to their current jobs in newly resettled areas (Fig 8-9). This reflects a skills mismatch because of the changes in production and land use patterns currently being pursued by land beneficiaries in comparison to the export-oriented land uses dominant in the former LSCF sector. As such, some valuable skills earned by

former farm workers are not being utilised in some areas, although they may be in short supply in other areas of the country.



Fig 8-9: Relevance of former farm worker skills to current employment

Source: AIAS Farm Worker Survey (2005/6) N=789

#### 8.6 Political parties

As discussed elsewhere<sup>69</sup>, the land resettlement programme was led by a highly militant war veterans' movement, invoking the ideologies of restitution, final liberation and nationalism. The occupation process was accompanied by a political mobilisation process to the extent that the FTLRP has been seen, in some circles, as an attempt by ZANU (PF) to retain its rural vote<sup>70</sup>. Due to the sensitivity of politics (especially membership of different parties), the survey deliberately avoided asking respondents directly about their political affiliation. Instead, it sought to determine the level of awareness among respondents on the presence of political leaders and their roles, and also a determination of the political participation (without asking the identity of the party) of respondents in leadership positions. Such an approach is helpful in determining whether people are aware of the political leaders in their areas and also how they relate to the existing political formations.

Eighty five percent (1,788 households) of the respondents responded to the question on the presence of political leaders in the community under study and, of these, 826 (46 percent) were aware of the presence of political leaders. The majority of those aware of the presence of political leaders were also aware of the appointment processes (through elections) of political leaders. The respondents expect political leaders to play different roles, from providing political leadership, to being the link between the community and the Government, to contributing towards peace and development.

There was a high number (529 or 25.3 percent of the total sample population) of respondents who are office bearers in political parties. Close to the 30 percent of the office bearers held positions at the district and branch levels. This suggests high levels of mobilisation in terms of political party

<sup>69</sup>See Sadomba, forthcoming.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>70</sup>See Hammar et al (2003), Moore (2004).

activism. The number of office bearers in political parties also points to the existence of decentralised party structures at the local level within the new resettlement areas.

#### 8.7 Formal civil society organisation and interventions

The presence of NGOs in the newly resettled areas was generally limited. Most of NGO work centres on provision of extension services, disseminating information about HIV and AIDS, and humanitarian relief. Activities focusing on production, such as input support schemes, were limited in the newly resettled areas.

Only 2.9 percent of the land beneficiaries had received extension support from NGOs. Input assistance from NGOs was on even lower with 1.7 percent of the beneficiaries having received such assistance. NGO assistance to farm workers was also low as the number of NGOs servicing farm workers has declined from a peak of about twelve in the late 1990s to only three in the post-FTLRP period, largely as a result of failure to access donor funds to work in newly resettled areas (Chambati and Magaramombe, 2008). Only 8.2 percent (or 64) of the farm workers interviewed had benefitted from NGO food aid assistance programmes. NGO activities mostly focused on HIV and AIDS support programmes. For instance, 36.7 percent and 21.5 percent of the land beneficiaries and farm workers respectively, indicated receiving HIV and AIDS information from NGOs. However, only 1.3 percent of the land beneficiaries mentioned it as the most important source of information on HIV and AIDS. Approximately 16.2 percent of the sample indicated that they had received information about HIV and AIDS from NGOs.

There are several reasons for the minimal NGO activity in the newly resettled areas. Most NGOs have never advocated for a radical land redistribution exercise and a number of them 'opposed' the processes of land occupation and the FTLRP<sup>71</sup>. Furthermore, most NGOs in Zimbabwe are funded by Western donors who have categorically refused to fund activities in newly resettled areas under the guise of being "contested land" even for humanitarian aid. For instance, the European Commission's call for food security proposals directed towards NGOs in January 2009 categorically state that, no activities in new resettlement areas will be funded under this initiative (European Commission, 2009). During the 2002 and 2004 droughts that affected Zimbabwe, despite the humanitarian principle of aid based on need, many donors including UN agencies such as the World Food Programme were reluctant to support food distribution in newly resettled areas (Chambati and Magaramombe, 2008). This situation is aggravated by the following facts: state-NGO relations have always been strained and, in one instance NGOs were described as "unguided missiles whose activities do not necessarily contribute to the objectives of national development"; the land acquisition process was organised through the militant war veterans who are seen in some quarters as an appendage of the ruling party; and most NGOs are urban-based and were perceived by the state to be sympathetic to the constitutional and regime change agenda and emergence of the opposition MDC.

Similar to the NGO activities, private sector initiatives were also limited in newly resettled areas. The survey found that there was little private sector involvement in the areas studied. For instance, only 43 out 2,089 households indicated having benefitted from private sector crop input schemes and none were beneficiaries for livestock programmes. As such, Government has been the dominant actor in the newly resettled areas as other players have generally been reluctant to invest in these areas.

#### 8.8 Concluding Statement

The above discussion, shows that the social and political organisation of people in newly redistributed areas is quite complex since it entails a web of interpenetrating structures involving

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>71</sup>Several international NGOs argue that entering the newly resettled areas would provide legitimacy to a process they considered illegitimate (AIAS interviews with NGO actors).

traditional leadership, farmers organisations, war veterans structures and associations, political parties, women's groups and NGOs, as well as the state. Further research (e.g. Murisa; 2009; Chambati, forthcoming) develops further issues raised about the agency and strategies of these new communities. The next chapter assesses some of the social struggles that are found in these newly redistributed and resettled areas.

## 9.0 AGRARIAN STRUCTURE AND CLASS FORMATION

#### 9.1 Social Differentiation in Newly Resettled Areas

There are different methods for classifying farmers into distinct homogenous groups based on their socio-economic attributes. One way is to create a typology using some a priori information about the material conditions and capacity of the farmers to mobilise resources, and this requires the researcher to identify which variables are important to classify farmers. The major disadvantage of this method is that the researcher has to choose which variables to use in the classification. This method uses statistical classification as the clustering strategy. Another approach relies on farmer perceptions of their differences. An example of this is a wealth ranking exercise whereby key informants in a community identify farmer groups based on wealth. In this study we had two methods of classifying farmers into distinct groups: i) based on the farmers and class differentiation within the newly resettled areas and ii) statistical clustering. The methods utilised are discussed in the following sections.

Understanding the heterogeneity of conditions faced by land beneficiaries and their different needs is critical for the design and implementation of better policies and social reproduction strategies. Furthermore, there is a need to come up with meaningful groups of farmers beyond the current dichotomy of model A1 and model A2. The identified domains can improve targeting of farmers for effective policies and appropriate intervention strategies.

#### 9.1.1 Social differentiation as perceived by beneficiaries

Asking land beneficiaries to do a wealth ranking analysis of themselves produces very insightful understanding of the nature of social classes within the newly redistributed areas. It assists in understanding local definitions of wealth, which notably may not always be measured materially. It also allows detailed characterization of the wealth groups, and their distribution. All this will help better understand why some people are better-off than others in the society and this can be important for development planning.

A very large percentage (74.2 percent) of the farmers perceived that there were no clear social classes in their farming communities (Table 9-1). This implies that perhaps at this early stage of settling on the land, most beneficiaries were homogeneous with regards to wealth levels. The prevailing economic environment at that time period (2002-2005), may largely explain the 'thin' class structures within the farming community. The country's economy under increasing international isolation and increased Government intervention was characterized by hyperinflation, shortages of inputs and other commodities and sub-economic agriculture output prices among many several other rigidities that stifled agricultural production (Worldbank, 2006; Sukume and Guveya, 2009; Ministry of Economic Development, 2007). Such an economic environment did not allow investment in agriculture and stalled accumulation of wealth which sets forth the process of class differentiation of farmers.

		A1 model	A2 model	Total
		N=1651	N= 438	N=2089
Existence of class structures	%	%	%	
	yes	27.2	20.6	25.8
the farming community?	no	72.8	79.4	74.2
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

However, about a quarter of the land beneficiaries perceived existence of class structures in their communities. Three social classes were distinguished: low class, middle class and high class. The distribution of the three classes as perceived by farmers (Table 9-2) shows a generally expected trend. The high class, constituting about 20 percent of the community is usually the rich few, while the middle class (about 40 percent) and low class (about 40 percent) are the larger generally poorer groups.

	A1 model	A2 model	Total
Class	%	%	%
high class	23.3	23.7	23.5
middle class	39.7	40.4	40.1
low class	37.0	35.9	36.4
Total	100	100	100.0

 Table 9-2: Class distribution by model

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

### 9.1.1.1Basis of defining the social classes

Farmers were asked to state the most distinguishing characteristics of the three classes: low class, middle and high class. Farmers' responses were categorized into eight factors as summarized in Table 9.3. For both A1 and A2 farmers, livestock was the most frequently mentioned wealth classification factor. Livestock ownership was particularly a dominant class differentiating factor among the A1 model farmers with 41 to 60 percent of the farmers mentioning it compared to 20 to 33 percent among A2 farmers. This confirms that farmers, particularly in the A1 scheme, still perceive livestock, especially cattle, as a symbol of wealth in Zimbabwe. Land, ownership of farm equipment and access to capital were the next most important factors for A1 farmers. For A2 farmers, livestock, farm equipment, land, access to capital, housing type and ability to hire labour were the most important class defining factor by both A1 and A2 farmers, suggesting existence of some disparity in the land sizes owned among the resettled farmers.

Distinguishing	A1 (N=	=449)		A2 (N=90)			Overall (N=539)			
attribute	Frequency (%)			Frequency (%)			Frequency (%)			
	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	Low	Middle	High	
	class	class	class	class	class	class	class	class	class	
Land	15	10	18	2	12	14	3	8	10	
Livestock	60	53	41	28	20	33	22	17	23	
Housing	11	6	8	12	15	13	8	9	8	
Farm										
equipment	13	12	22	19	17	13	12	11	10	
Access to										
capital	8	13	8	16	22	17	10	14	10	
Ability to hire										
labour	3	6	5	7	15	14	4	9	8	
Food security	1	8	3	5	4	1	3	3	1	
Household										
assets	3	2	14	14	7	7	8	4	5	
Social relations										
and habits	2	3	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	

 Table 9-3: Most important distinguishing factors for social classes

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)
## 9.1.1.2 Characterisation of the social classes

Table 9-4 is a summary of the description of social classes perceived by land beneficiaries. Personal characteristics like age, gender and education level are not included in the classification, most are economic attributes like access to resources (capital and labour), ownership of livestock and farming equipment and food security status of household.

The picture emerging from Table 9-4 suggests that low class farmers have no or few cattle, no farm equipment, few hand tools, but have poultry. The high class has both irrigation and farm equipment. The middle class has average hand tools and farm equipment. In terms of access to resources, the low class is resource poor, with little or no access to capital and labour. The middle class has average farm capital and has medium labour force. Beneficiaries in the high class are food secure and can afford to sell surplus food, whilst low class farmers have insufficient food and buy food from the market throughout the year. The middle class produce enough food for their own consumption but not enough to sell. In terms of behaviour and social relations, there are no clear cut differences besides the fact that high class farmers drink clear beer, whilst those in lower class drink opaque beer.

Distinguishing attribute	Distribution of class in commun	ity	
	Low class	Middle class	High class
Land	Have small plots	Large plots	Big plots>20ha
Livestock	Have no or very few cattle (2), Have 0-2 goats, Have poultry, Little draught power	Have some cattle, Have draught power	Have herd of over 40 cattle, Have draught power
Housing	Poor housing, Dagga houses and huts,	Good houses, Flat houses	Asbestos roofed houses, Decent accommodation
Farm equipment	No farming equipment, No irrigation equipment, Have few hand tools and depends on borrowing	Have few farming equipment and machinery, Have few irrigation equipment, Have average farm tools	Have irrigation equipment, Own tractor and tractor drawn implements, Have hand tools
Access to capital	Lack finance, Limited sources of income, Poor	Have average farm capital, but still needs assistance, Have some money to hire equipment.	Earn forex and own companies, Finance from high salary, Saves money
Ability to hire labor	No hired labor force, Resource-poor.	Medium hired labor force,	High production and can hire a lot of labor,
Food security	Doesn't produce enough to meet households needs, Buys food throughout the season.	Produce food for consumption, Don't have excess output to sell,	Produce enough for the household, Have surplus food to market,
Household assets	No shoes and don't have decent clothing	Decent clothing, Few have cars,	Have cars
Social relations and habits	Attend church services during weekends, Always drinking beer, Belong to traditional and church groups, Political party supporters	Always drink beer, Participates in politics, Church groups and services,	Drink clear beer; Attend church services and hold own meetings, Members of parliament

#### Table 9-4: Description of farmer classes according to the beneficiaries

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

In summary, farmers were able to identify social classes existent in their communities. They suggested a distribution of the social classes that is consistent with a well-known trend observed in many communities whereby the rich are usually a few at the apex, typically comprising around 20% of the population.

Livestock ownership was a strong wealth defining factor in the cattle keeping farming community of Zimbabwe, particularly among A1 farmers where the majority originated from communal areas. This could be very understandable since livestock, particularly cattle, play a very important role in the largely draught power driven farming system. Cattle ownership determines size of land cultivated, timely planting, timely weeding and also provides manure, a key factor to improved crop yields given limited ability to purchase inorganic fertilizer common among the resource-constrained farmers. Among the A2 farmers, access to capital, ownership of farm equipment (particularly tractor and irrigation) and housing type were the additional key defining factors of social classes. This is understandable for this relatively more resource-endowed group: higher level factors beyond ownership of livestock become more important. Access to capital and farm equipment is important in the ability to profitably exploit the larger land sizes allocated to this group of farmers. Notably land was considered an important class differentiation factor by both A1 and A2 farmers. Farmers also defined social classes using other non-material measures such as social relations and habits like church attendance and political party affiliations.

## 9.1.2 Statistical classification of beneficiaries<sup>72</sup>

The method adopted for classifying land beneficiaries into homogeneous but distinct groups based on socio- economic attributes uses a statistical clustering strategy. This methodology is a standardized process for identifying the number of groups that exist in a given sample. It gives the probability that each farmer belongs to that group. Generally, the variables to be used in classifying land beneficiaries are chosen within the context of an explicitly stated theory or with a specific goal in mind. For this study we used socio-economic variables which describe the characteristics of land beneficiaries. Specifically, we used factors extracted in the analyses of responses to questions measuring socioeconomic status of beneficiaries.

The study adopted a two stage process of classifying farmers which involves exploratory factor and cluster analysis. Due to the large set of possible clustering variables for land beneficiaries, it becomes necessary to combine cluster and exploratory factor analysis (see Everitt, 1993). In the first stage, exploratory factor analysis was used to develop a small number of variables from the large set of variables that will account for most of the variability in observed variables amongst land beneficiaries. Factor analysis is an econometric model whose essential purpose is to describe the covariance relationships among many variables in terms of a few underlying, but unobservable, random quantities called factors and interpreted through weights of the variable called factor loadings organized in a matrix of factor loadings (Johnson and Wichern, 1992). The factor analysis model is organized in such a way that all variables within each factor are highly correlated among themselves, but have relatively small correlations with variables in other factors (Gorsuch, 1983). In the second stage, the small numbers of variables that are accounting for most of the variation amongst land beneficiaries were then used to cluster land beneficiaries into homogenous groups.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>72</sup>The authors would like to acknowledge the assistance of Shepard Siziba and Godfrey Mahofa in the statistical classification of land beneficiaries in newly redistributed areas. For the detailed statistical procedures used in classifying beneficiaries into distinct groups, see Siziba and Mahofa (2008).

## 9.2 Key differentiating factors: Production relations and accumulation

Variable description	Significant Variables (***)
Type of resettlement model (binary ; Model A1= 0, model A2=1)	***
Size of plot holding in hectares	***
Cultivated land area in 2004-2005 (natural log)	***
Cultivated land area as a percentage of arable area	
level of agricultural investment (index)	
Ownership of capital intensive farm equipment (score): number owned out of the selected farm equipment (tractor; tractor trailer; dehuller; motor vehicle; ULV sprayer; combine harvester; maize sheller; tractor drawn disc, harrows, row-markers plough, planter, ripper, ridger, cultivator water bowser.	***
Hiring in of labour (binary ; no=0, yes=1)	
Level of labour use (1=low; 2 =medium; 3=high)	***
Available farm labour (family +permanent employees) (natural log)	***
Number of permanent workers employed	***
Number of casual workers employed per year	
Ownership of livestock (index) Available draft power (cattle & donkey)	
Gender of plot holder (binary ; female=0, male=1)	***
Marital status of plot holder (binary; married=1, else=0)	***
Whether plot holder is widowed (binary; widowed=1,else=0)	***
Age of plot holder	
Size of household	
Level of agricultural training (ordinal; no training=0, basic=1,intermediary=2, high=3)	
Level of education attained by plot owner( ordinal;no formal education=0,primary & standard six=1,O level & ZJC=2,A level & tertiary=3)	
Number of social networks established by the plot holder (index)	
Whether plot holder originates from urban area (binary; yes=1,no=0)	
Whether plot holder is still in professional employment (binary; yes=1,no=0)	***
Whether plot holder is a civil servant (binary; yes=1,no=0)	***
Year when plot holder was allocated land	***
Year plot holder started farming on the allocated land	***

#### Table 9-5: Variables used in classifying land beneficiaries

#### Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

Several socio-economic variables expected to be relevant for clustering farmers were observed from land beneficiaries. A large number of variables measuring land beneficiaries' socio-economic attributes were selected from the AIAS survey data base for use in exploratory factor analysis (Table 9-1). These variables were correlated. Out of this list of variables, fourteen variables were identified using exploratory factor analysis as accounting for the variation between land beneficiaries (Table 9-5; see also annex 9-1). The 14 variables account for most of the variance (88 percent) observed over the original socio-economic set of 27 variables.

The 14 variables accounting for the variation amongst land beneficiaries were used to classify land beneficiaries into homogenous groups utilising statistical clustering methodology. Five groups of land beneficiaries were identified on the basis of the socio-economic attributes (Table 9-6). Group 5 had the largest number of land beneficiaries (441), followed by group 3 (388), while group 1 (171) had the lowest number of land beneficiaries. The characteristics of the identified groups are detailed below (Table 9-7). Annexes 9-2 to 9-13 depict the profiles of the identified land beneficiaries groups.

Group			
	Ν	% of Combined	% of Total
1- Capital Intensive farmers	171	12.00	8.20
2 – Unmarried (widowed) farmers	206	14.50	9.90
3- Civil servants	388	27.30	18.60
4- Latest entrants	217	15.20	10.40
5 – "Ordinary" majority	441	31.00	21.10
Sample size	1423	100.00	68.10
Excluded cases	666		31.90
Total Sample	2089		100.00

## Table 9-6: Distribution of land beneficiary groups

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

## 9.2.1 Group 1- Capital intensive farmers.

This group comprised the smallest percentage (12 percent) of the sampled beneficiaries. The land beneficiaries in this group distinctively cultivated the largest land areas averaging 19.31 hectares in comparison to less than 9.0 hectares in the other groups. The group notably was the most capital intensive group, owning the highest number of farm machinery equipment (such as tractors, tractor drawn implements, combine harvesters etc.) It almost exclusively comprised of model A2 farmers (90 percent), and had the largest plot holdings than all other groups. The group also hired relatively more labour in comparison to other land beneficiary groups. It seemed to have been allocated land and settled on the farms earlier than other groups. A few land beneficiaries (15 percent) in the group were still in professional employment.

## 9.2.2 Group 2-Unmarried (widowed) farmers

Group 2 was relatively a small group, comprising 14.5 percent of the sample. The distinct characteristic of the group is that it comprised exclusively (100 percent) unmarried plot holders. It had the highest proportion (54 percent) of widowed plot holders of all groups. In terms of agricultural production, this group cultivated small land areas and employed low numbers of hired workers. These unmarried land beneficiaries also had very low ownership of capital intensive farming equipment. None of the members in this group was professionally employed elsewhere. Notably the group was allocated land and started farming relatively early (around 2001). Fifty five percent of the land beneficiaries in this group had been allocated land by 2001.

## 9.2.3 Group 3-Civil servants

Group 3, which constituted about 27 percent of the sample, can be labelled civil servant beneficiaries. Characteristically, it was composed largely of current and former civil servants, amounting to 38.4 percent of the sample. Furthermore, it is the only group with a very large share of land beneficiaries still in professional employment, mostly in the civil service. Conspicuously it had the second, after group 1, largest share of model A2 farms (35 percent of the farmers were in model A2 scheme). The group cultivated average land areas, employed average labour, and had slightly above average level of ownership of capital intensive farming equipment. The group seems to have been allocated land and started farming three years later, around 2002.

## 9.2.4 Group 4-Latest entrants

Group 4 is a relatively small cluster making up about 15 percent of the sample. Two features distinguish this group: they were the latest to be allocated land (around 2003) and they employed relatively large number of permanent labour. They also, like Group 2 and 5, had a very low score on ownership of capital intensive farming equipment. Besides the aforementioned, all other attributes were not distinct. They were all A1 farmers (like group 5) and cultivated small land areas. The real remarkable observation about this group is that for the small land areas they cultivated (similar to groups 2, 3 and 5), they employed significantly more labour.

Variables characteristics		Land benef	ficiary groups			
		1	2	3	4	5
		Capital intensive	Unmarried	Civil servants	Latest entrants	Ordinary majority
model type	A1	10.50%	97.10%	64.90%	90.30%	100.00%
model type	A2	89.50%	2.90%	35.10%	9.70%	0.00%
Size of plot in ha		112.5	22.64	31.72	23.06	23.66
total area cultivated		19.31	5.97	8.72	8.55	6.06
number of permanent workers hired		9	1	2	4	0
capital intensive farm equipment		3	0	1	0	0
	2000	18.70%	13.60%	14.40%	7.40%	13.80%
	2001	31.60%	41.70%	31.40%	37.80%	33.60%
	2002	22.20%	18.40%	24.20%	23.50%	27.40%
year land was allocated	2002 and earlier	72.50%	73.70%	70.00%	68.70%	74.80%
	2003	14.00%	10.20%	15.50%	14.70%	9.30%
	2004	7.60%	9.20%	7.70%	9.20%	7.90%
	2005	5.30%	5.30%	5.40%	6.90%	5.90%
	2006	0.60%	1.50%	1.30%	0.50%	2.00%
	2000	11.70%	6.30%	8.20%	5.50%	7.30%
	2001	29.80%	32.50%	23.20%	27.60%	27.20%
	2002	28.10%	28.20%	30.70%	28.10%	33.30%
Year started farming	2002 and earlier	69.60%	67.00%	62.10%	61.20%	67.80%
	2003	11.70%	16.00%	19.30%	19.80%	15.00%
	2004	10.50%	8.30%	9.30%	8.80%	8.20%
	2005	7.00%	7.30%	6.20%	9.70%	7.00%
	2006	1.20%	1.50%	3.10%	0.50%	2.00%
gender of plot owner	Male	85.80%	56.50%	88.80%	79.20%	85.00%
	Female	14.20%	43.50%	11.20%	20.80%	15.00%
	Divorced	3.20%	19.60%	1.10%	0.00%	0.00%
Marital status of plot owner	Married	87.30%	0.00%	92.20%	100.00%	100.00%
	Single	8.20%	26.10%	3.00%	0.00%	0.00%
	Widowed	1.30%	54.30%	3.60%	0.00%	0.00%
Plot holder is/was a civil servant	no	95.90%	100.00%	61.60%	100.00%	100.00%
	yes	4.10%	0.00%	38.40%	0.00%	0.00%
Plot holder is still in professional employment	no	84.80%	90.80%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
- mprogramme	yes	15.20%	9.20%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey (2005/06)

## 9.2.5 Group 5- "Ordinary majority"

Group 5 was the largest cluster, constituting about a third (31 percent) of the sample. This group can be labelled the "ordinary majority" because there is really nothing peculiar about the group. This group is characterised by the ownership and cultivation of small land areas. This group of land beneficiaries employed low levels of hired labour and capital intensive farming equipment. The typical member of this group was married and not in professional employment elsewhere. The group was allocated land relatively late, around 2002.

Considering farm structure and production levels, two general groups are discernible. The first group was a small cluster (12 percent) who were largely model A2 farmers, employed relatively large labour force, owned capital intensive farming equipment and hence able to cultivate larger parcels of arable land. This smaller group can be seen as the emerging commercial farmers. All the other aforementioned groups can be considered as one cluster, the poorly-resourced farmers. They were commonly characterized by low productive capacity levels (low cultivated land areas, low employed labour and low ownership of capital intensive equipment). Notably, nearly all farmers in the latter group were in model A1 scheme. This second group of farmers were further classifiable into more clusters (group 2, 3, 4 and 5) based on some distinguishing socio-economic attributes. The discriminating socio-economic variables were marital status (group 2), being employed in the civil service (group 3) and year of allocation (group 4), and then group 5 was the remnant, ordinary majority.

## 9.3 Further analyses of the groups

Group1 for example seems to have been only well defined in as far as the farm and productivity aspects are concerned, but still appears faceless in terms of social variables. While the group 4 farmers typically employed a lot of labour, the reason is not apparent. Table 9-8 shows some further characterization of the groups by some selected variables. These additional variables, though not statistically significant for clustering, could be more revealing about the groups.

In terms of gender, the proportion of male plot holders is significantly lower in group 2 as compared to other groups. Also the proportion of farmers with no formal education is significantly higher in group 2 than group 1 and 3, but not significantly different from groups 4 and 5. This might not be surprising since group 2 has a high proportion of female farmers. Traditionally, females have been deprived of access to higher educational levels. The analysis also revealed that the proportion of land beneficiaries with "A" level and tertiary education is significantly higher in groups 1, the "progressive farmers" and group 3, which has many persons still in professional employment.

However, in terms of levels of agricultural training achieved, there seem to be no significant differences among the groups. Consistent with their higher productive capacity, group 1 farmers owned the largest number of cattle and they also cropped the largest land areas to food and 'cash' crops compared to other groups. Groups 1 and 4 significantly cropped higher proportions of their cultivated lands to cash crops than all other groups, except group 3. This explains why groups 1 and 4 employed relatively more labour than the other groups which did not do as much as cash cropping. Group 4 are the recent entrants, and are similar in many respects with other low capital intense A1 farmers and seem to do a lot more cash cropping.

Socio-economic characteristics			Group		
	1- Capital	2-	3- Civil	4- Latest	5 –
	intensive	Unmarried	servants	entrants	Ordinary
	farmers	(widowed)			majority
	05 58	farmers	00.03	<b>7</b> 0 <b>0</b> <sup>3</sup>	05.03
Gender of plot holder (% male)	85.5*	56.5°	88.8"	79.2ª	85.0ª
Urban origin (%)	49.1	42.2	45.6	37.8	37.0
Level of education (%)					
no formal education	3.3 <sup>b</sup>	12.2 <sup>a</sup>	3.9 <sup>b</sup>	7.1 <sup>ab</sup>	7.4 <sup>ab</sup>
primary & standard 6	16.6	40.3	23.7	32.1	33.7
O level & ZJC	46.4	39.6	44.6	45.8	48.7
A level & tertiary	33.8 <sup>b</sup>	7.9 <sup>a</sup>	27.9 <sup>b</sup>	15.10 <sup>a</sup>	10.2 <sup>a</sup>
Agricultural training (%)					
no formal training	74.1	78.7	78.5	89.6	82.5
O level agric & certificate	12.6	9.0	11.8	0.5	5.1
master farmer & advanced master	9.6	12.3	6.2	9.9	12.1
farmer certificate					
diploma & degree	3.7	0.0	3.5	0.0	0.3
number of cattle owned (mean)	23 <sup>b</sup>	4 <sup>a</sup>	6 <sup>a</sup>	5 <sup>a</sup>	6 <sup>a</sup>
Cash crop area (mean ha)	7.36 <sup>b</sup>	1.27 <sup>a</sup>	1.98 <sup>a</sup>	1.98 <sup>a</sup>	$0.8^{\mathrm{a}}$
Food crop area (mean ha)	9.25 <sup>b</sup>	3 <sup>a</sup>	4.69 <sup>a</sup>	3.59 <sup>a</sup>	3.46 <sup>a</sup>
Percentage cash cropping	45.0 <sup>b</sup>	32.5 <sup>ba</sup>	29.9 <sup>a</sup>	42.4 <sup>b</sup>	33.8 <sup>ba</sup>
Percentage food cropping	81.9 <sup>b</sup>	94.2ª	91.0 <sup>a</sup>	95.9ª	96.1ª
Cash crop area proportion (for those cash cropping)	25.5	22.3	22.4	21.1	19.4

## Table 9-8: Further Characterization of Land Beneficiary Groups

#### 9.4 Concluding Statement

As the social facts of land reform have been entrenched, there has been the emergence of new class formation and social differentiation process in the former LSCF. This situation in newly redistributed areas shows a socially differentiated community with some land beneficiaries commanding a larger scale of land and other economic resources and performing better in agricultural production than others. Newly redistributed areas are thus not composed of a homogenous group of land beneficiaries as is often assumed. The study found five groups distinguished by areas cropped, plot sizes, labour utilisation, ownership of farm machinery and equipment, marital status, professional employment and year of land allocation, suggesting that a complex set of variables explain the emergence of social differentiation and production patterns. However, this work is limited by inadequate data (e.g. incomes and production) and the absence of detailed information on social relations of production and other household interactions. Further research is required to examine the emerging class formation processes in newly redistributed areas. The next chapter summarises the key findings from the study as well as outlining the emerging agrarian questions after the implementation of the FTLRP.

## 10.0 CONCLUSIONS: EMERGING AGRARIAN QUESTIONS AND POLITICS

This study is the only extensive survey of 6 districts across 6 provinces in most of the agro-ecological regions, which has so far been carried out on the newly redistributed lands in Zimbabwe since 2000, although there are a growing number of post-graduate studies which have surveyed a few districts. The survey provides valuable baseline data across different socio-economic, political and economic settings, drawing out the diversity of outcomes, as well, as quite interestingly, the fact that there are many common features that characterise the key aspects of the reform, such as aspects of access to land, land tenure and social conditions. The main purpose of this volume has been to disseminate the basic data to a wider readership and to begin to establish baseline indicators of the conditions in these areas, as well as to assess some of the key tendencies. It is hoped that a second round survey will soon be undertaken. Meanwhile, various studies on the key issues raised by the survey have been subjected to in-depth examination in numerous AIAS monographs and articles, and the post graduate work of its staff and networks.

We now provide a brief summary of the key issues raised by the study in relation to the wider debates on the outcome of the FTLRP. This is followed by a brief sketching out of the implications of the emergent social differentiation on the future agrarian reform, and an outline of the main unresolved agrarian questions of productivity, labour relations, financing and market development. Finally, the chapter discusses some of the remaining land questions that will continue to define the future politics of land.

#### 10.10 verview of land redistribution outcome and agrarian change

The results of this survey indicate that there is scant evidence to support most of the commonly held assertions regarding the outcome of the fast track land reform process in terms of who gained access to land, their security of tenure and the failure to realise meaningful rural social reproduction. Only about 15 percent of the land beneficiaries could be considered 'elites', including high level employees and business people, who are connected to Government and the ruling ZANU PF. By far the largest number of land beneficiaries, are people who have a relatively low social status and limited political or financial (commercial) connections, although some of these may have important local connections and influence.

Most of the beneficiaries were from rural farming backgrounds (mainly in Communal Areas and as farm workers), while many of the urban beneficiaries are working people and from among the unemployed. The majority were resettled from neighbouring rural settings, to which many remain connected. A much lower proportion of the land beneficiaries than is often alleged, remain in formal employment and have access to state resources, given also that the job market has been deteriorating and that there has been inadequate public inputs supply and financial support.

Land tenure insecurity is not commonly cited as a problem in the newly redistributed areas, as only 18 percent of the beneficiaries cite either land conflicts, including their lack of "title" and fear of eviction, as factors which limit their social reproduction and /or production. Instead, crop inputs by most land beneficiaries are found to be the main constraint to agricultural production. It is among some of the better off A2 farmers that the issue of "title" is cited as being critical for their land tenure security, particularly in relation to their search for credit. Even then, title is considered to be secondary to inputs shortages and limited draught power.

When we add to the official number of beneficiaries who were allocated land in the study area, the additional number of families that were found to have access to land, who use it for agricultural and related social reproduction activities (from crop and livestock farming, farm labour and natural resources utilisation), through official beneficiaries, the number of households which benefited from the land redistribution programme is quite expansive. Over 25 percent of the official beneficiary count can be considered to have benefited.

People socially reproduce themselves in a variety of ways, including through land use (cropping, livestock production), residency of often very extended families, the extraction of natural resources such as wood, gold and wildlife, and a range of local farm and non-farm labour 'opportunities'. The range of crops they produce is diverse, although it is carried on relatively small household plots. Moreover, the entire enterprise is dominated by food crops, with mainly the better-off 20 percent engaged in crops such as tobacco and sorghum and commercial beef production. Nonetheless, even though income levels are low, a substantial range of families can socially reproduce themselves, including many who were employed before the FTLRP.

Many beneficiaries and former farm workers hire out their labour to other local farmers, while over 50 percent of the beneficiaries also hire in labour (mainly on a temporary basis). About 12 percent of the land beneficiaries hire relatively large numbers of permanent labourers (ca 10 per farm), although less than the former LSCF farms, given their relatively smaller farm sizes and capitalisation. Casual labour is relatively high within the newly redistributed areas, although when we consider that 50 percent of the former LSCF's labourers were also casual or temporary workers, this trend cannot be considered an "increase in casualisation", as is often asserted by some scholars and the media.

New forms of contract (consultancy) labour services and labour 'gangs' have however been on the rise, as the highly skilled former LSCF workers have tended to organise themselves to negotiate better working conditions with the new farmers. The former social relations of the master-servant (euphemised as 'domestic' Governments by some critics like Rutherford (1995) has given way to qualitatively different, but still exploitative, relationships. These include family- and residency-based patron-client relations on the one hand, and skilled labour bargaining given the limited number of highly skilled former farm workers. Nonetheless, farm wages were relatively low throughout this highly inflationary period and often payments tended to be in kind (mainly food). This means that the social reproduction of the more unskilled and casual farm workers has remained precarious, although even these have diversified their labour market towards mining, petty trade and extraction of natural resources. New farmers claim, that they have been unable to pay better wages due to their production and market constraints, although many A2 farmers have clearly taken advantage of the weak labour markets and food shortages, especially during the drought periods. Indeed, the farm mechanisation programme since 2005, was intended to address the labour problem.

The often cited criticism that overall agricultural output levels and productivity (yields/hectare) declined within newly redistributed areas is relatively correct, although there has been no total collapse as is often alleged. Indeed, our production data shows that there were lower yields realised in the production of almost all the crops (food grains such as maize and 'cash' crops such as tobacco, cotton and soya beans), compared to previous LSCF and some past Communal Area yields. The evidence, as observed by the survey, and from the views of the beneficiaries and extension workers, is that yields have declined mainly because of the shortages of (and failure to access) inputs such as improved seeds and fertilisers among new farmers with inadequate access to credit, own incomes from sales and wage remittances. Yields were also affected by frequent bouts of inclement weather. In some cases, the shortage of draught power (mechanised and animal driven) is a key constraint to timely and adequate ploughing.

This pattern of low yields based on inputs' constraints also affected Communal Area farmers, such that it may be misleading to single out the newly redistributed areas for low productivity. Indeed, a large proportion of the marketed maize and cotton in recent years is found to have originated from the newly resettled areas (FAO/WFP, 2009), although this also reflects the fact that more of the state input support programmes often went to newly redistributed areas.

Moreover, there is little evidence to suggest that the fall in agricultural production is mainly caused by the new farmers' skills deficiency and/or their alleged lackadaisical attitudes to farming compared to their erstwhile white counterparts. The majority of the beneficiaries are resident full time farmers, and many have deployed large numbers of their family members and hired labour to work on the land.

The gross area that was cropped stood at 40 percent of the arable area, despite the resultant low yields. This represented a relatively higher level of gross land utilisation rates than that which obtained previously in the LSCF areas. Livestock numbers in these newly redistributed areas may have declined, compared to the pre-existing LSCF stocks, but this decline is below 20 percent of the LSCF levels. However, the "quality" of beef, which is increasingly sold through mainly informal channels, can be said to be lower (less suitable for European export markets), due to reduced access to livestock inputs (mainly dipping chemicals and medicines).

There has been a substantial effort by the farmers to establish themselves through regular ploughing and cropping of the land, as well as through the construction by most beneficiaries of new homesteads (albeit mostly based on thatch, pole and dagga). Some have made relatively significant physical investments from their own savings, with around 25 percent of the beneficiaries investing in various forms of farm infrastructure, such as the setting up of new irrigation infrastructure, barns, workers' houses and so forth. A few have invested in motorised machines including vehicles and farm machinery, as well as agro-processing equipment. These efforts, made during a highly inflationary period, starved off private credit and wage income remittances, reflects a substantial commitment to farming among most of the beneficiaries.

There is of course a substantial group (40 percent) of highly disadvantaged beneficiaries (educationally, in marital terms, etc) who have been unable to invest in any significant infrastructure beyond homesteads, and whose cropped areas are much lower than the observed average. Many of these 'low production performers' also tended to have obtained land much later than the rest of the beneficiaries. Only about 155 of the beneficiaries were found to be high level production performers. Nonetheless, the farm production and income levels realised from farming and wage labour so far is relatively lower than could potentially be realised, and this has had some effects on food security and wider social reproduction, as has been the case throughout the countryside (including Communal Areas).

It is also correct to say that social services such as clinics, schools, sanitation facilities and other welfare support systems are relatively lower in the newly redistributed areas than the levels available in Communal Areas. This is largely because pre-existing social infrastructure in LSCF areas had not been adequately developed, even to cater for the former farm workers, let alone for these combined with the newly resettled populations. It is also true that Government social infrastructure investments and recurrent expenditures (salaries of teachers, nurses, other health workers, transport, and so forth) have been lower than is required to cater for the social needs of the newly resettled and pre-existing populations.

Yet the evidence from the survey and interviews (and other secondary data sources) does not indicate that the levels of food insecurity, morbidity and other ailments, as well as of school attendance, vary significantly from those obtaining today in the Communal Areas. This may be surprising to some critiques of the FTLRP. However, it is understandable when we consider that most of the newly resettled areas are closely inter-linked to Communal Areas social services and, to the rural centres and towns, which had been developed for the LSCF areas, and that these provide people in many resettled areas (e.g. some Mashonaland areas with large settler populations) some access to social services, transport and other forms of connectivity to urban areas.

Thus, the newly resettled areas have in general the same levels of reduced coverage in social amenities, as well as in other Government agricultural services (e.g. extension services, research, marketing and so forth), which have been experienced nationally. Some would even argue that food security in these areas (except among the former farm workers, who remain unemployed) has generally been better than in Communal Areas. This is considered to be due to the increased access per capita to arable lands, which enable more families to produce at least some of their subsistence food needs, while also having access to natural resource-based foods in the former LSCF woodlands. The level of mobilisation of rural organisations to advocate for various benefits and against a variety

of grievances among the newly settled land beneficiaries has also grown substantially over the short period observed. However, it is less densely elaborated than that which obtains in Communal Areas, but is certainly more intricate and secure than obtained in former LSCF areas. The resettled society has encountered much less NGO support, but exhibits a greater level of farm worker unionisation, than is found in Communal Areas (building upon previous unionism in the LSCF areas). Various farmer and women's groups had emerged within a short time period, but these have had less access to state and NGO (including donor) support, than would have been found in the 1990's, in Communal Areas, and even today.

Traditional leaders have a significant influence over some aspects of social life and local administration in A1 areas, although this is limited by the fact that they had or have little influence over land allocations in these areas. Moreover, there are substantially high numbers of the land beneficiaries (close to 30 percent) who do not belong to the local ethno-regional networks and/or clans, which are tributary to these Chiefs. This has diluted some of their influence in a number of important aspects (such as land use and other regulations). War veterans played an important role in diluting the local influence of Chiefs in land allocations and thus in the composition of membership of local social structures, as well as in the definition of issues related to security and social hierarchy. Chiefs have little (if any) influence over people in the A2 farming areas. Furthermore, there are more independent women landholders in both A1 and A2 areas, than can be found in Communal Areas. The fast track thus modified the local social structures, organisations and administrative practices substantially, albeit not in a revolutionary manner, within the newly redistributed land areas. However, this level of rural organisation has not led to the redress of the key grievances and constraints cited by most land beneficiaries, such as access to more inputs and social services, let

constraints cited by most land beneficiaries, such as access to more inputs and social services, let alone the increase of wages, increased crop prices (by that time -2006) and wider agricultural support services. The main achievement of this mobilisation seems to have been to defend the access to the land that has been gained, to regulate security in general (except in the case of stock theft), and to improve social and production networking.

## 10.2 Social differentiation and the agrarian question

Our overall assessment of the short span of social and economic developments within the surveyed areas is that there is an incipient social differentiation among the land beneficiaries, which may generally hold in the long run. However, only 25 percent of the beneficiaries recognised the entrenchment of a class of "rich' farmers compared to the majority who are poorer, largely due to the relative perception of 'rich' farmers being equated with the highly capitalised farms, such as were found in the LSCF. The main factors which differentiate the farmers, between those who crop larger areas of land and others in that they have more food supplies and enjoy the more desirable social niceties (e.g. access to clear beer, mobility and beneficial social networks), seems to be their degree of formal education, farm capitalisation (machinery and equipment, etc), capacity to hire more labour and earlier access to land, as well as past and current employment.

Below 15 percent of the beneficiaries had these advantages, while most of those who can be considered poorer tended to have less education, lacked previous and/or current employment, had the least farm equipment and - which put together- limited their access to farm inputs. Gender differences also determined some of the disadvantages faced by the beneficiaries.

During this period of study and the later period characterised by inputs shortage, limited credit supply and limited development aid to poorer farmers (which may possibly continue until 2010) this pattern of social differentiation could be expected to persist. We project that around 10 percent of the settlers may continue to fit the general cap of the 'richer' farmers, because of the increased but selective access to finance. About 50 percent of the farmers could remain in the "poorer" category, unless public policy shifts substantially towards the increased subsidising of farm inputs among the poorest. These broad patterns suggest that the agrarian question of land and farm productivity as a whole, the exploitative farm labour relations (oppressive social relations of production), the constrained public financing of agriculture and the market re-orientation towards cut-throat contract farming, remain critical weaknesses of the fast track land reform, and its attendant (largely ad hoc) agrarian reform programme. Unequal class-based access to farming inputs will remain a determinant of social differentiation, and a key source of rural grievance. Moreover, the sustainability of farming will depend on improved rural development, including access to better social services and infrastructure, and new investments in ecological security, to improve access to energy and water, and to reduce labour costs.

#### 10.3 Remaining land questions and the politics of land

In addition to the above trends and issues, there are a range of specific land questions which remain unresolved, and which will continue, for some time, to determine the emerging agrarian questions that will confront Zimbabwe. As has been discussed earlier, not enough women and war veterans gained proportionately adequate access to land, although they did get more access than they did before 2000. Moreover, some people (whose numbers remain to be determined) feel that they were excluded from access to land on ethno-regional grounds, even though over 20 of the beneficiaries did not come from the neighbouring areas and clans. The most glaringly unresolved land issue is the inadequate and insecure access to land that is experienced by former farm workers, many of whom live on farms on condition of providing cheap labour to new landholders. This is reminiscent of bonded labour relations, which cannot be acceptable, even if former LSCF landowners had practised the same (if not worse) labour control system.

Then there is the ever lurking danger that the land tenure system and the new relatively more equitable landholding patterns that accompany it could regress towards a more inequitable situation. Already, many in Zimbabwean society do not approve of the relatively larger landholdings that the so-called 'elite' (albeit small size of 15%) hold in the A2 areas. This is because their lands are considered to deprive many others from gaining access to land, and because some of them also gained access to most of the better farm infrastructure, which was unequally spread over the total land. Moreover, these gains are resented because the beneficiaries are considered not to have paid for the 'extra advantage' they have had through access to more land and capital investments. There is a distinct possibility that the landless will seek to redress this situation through land occupations or that a new Government may seek to reverse the gains of these elites, even if only to accommodate a new set of elites. This trajectory could lead to violent conflicts over land.

There is also the opposite possibility that some of the current 'elite' beneficiaries, who harbour the wish to 'consolidate' (enlarge) their land sizes, will seek to do so by encroaching on the land of poorer or less influential land beneficiaries. Furthermore, other 'elites', who did not get land (e.g. among opposition party members and otherwise), as well as former white land owners who want to regain land, may also pursue various strategies (such as further litigations, farm buyouts and mortgaging and eviction of land 'under-users') to gain access to land. It is the latter aspect which some ZANU PF supporters see as the threat to 'reverse' the land reform. However, it is necessary that they address the present inequities on the margin to avert the above sources of land conflict as well.

Such a trajectory will become even more real, if and when, the Government, decides to convert most of the newly redistributed farmlands to a freehold land tenure system. Indeed, there are many among the existing beneficiaries, former white land owners, other non-beneficiary black elites, other middle class professionals and some influential donor bureaucrats, who clamour for a freehold based system of land tenure, based on the argument that it is the only form of tenure which is "collaterable" or "bankable". This perspective is an ideologically contrived argument, which promotes the interests of capital, against the social reproduction needs of the poorer landholders and the remaining unemployed and landless people. Thus, a more class-based struggle over land can be expected to emerge in the next decade, although its race- based tentacles may linger for a while.

### REFERENCES

AIAS, (2004), Midlands Provincial Stakeholders' Dialogue Workshop on Land and Agrarian Reform, in collaboration with the Ministry of Special Affairs in the President's Office Responsible for Lands, Land Reform and Resettlement, 30 Sept-1 October 2004

AIAS, (2004), Mashonaland East Provincial Stakeholders' Dialogue Workshop on Land and Agrarian Reform, in collaboration with the Ministry of Special Affairs in the President's Office Responsible for Lands, Land Reform and Resettlement, 11-12 October 2004

AIAS, (2004), Manicaland Provincial Stakeholders' Dialogue Workshop on Land and Agrarian Reform, in collaboration with the Ministry of Special Affairs in the President's Office Responsible for Lands, Land Reform and Resettlement, 14-15 October 2004

AIAS, (2004), Matebeleland South Provincial Stakeholders' Dialogue Workshop on Land and Agrarian Reform, in collaboration with the Ministry of Special Affairs in the President's Office Responsible for Lands, Land Reform and Resettlement, 28-29 October 2004

Alexander J. (2003), *The Unsettled Land: State-making and the Politics of Land in Zimbabwe*, 1893-2003. Weaver Press, Harare

Amnesty International, (2004), Amnesty International Report 2004. Amnesty International, New York

Bond P., (1998), *Uneven Zimbabwe: A Study of Finance, Development and Underdevelopment.* Trenton NJ: Africa World Press

Buka Report, (2002), A Preliminary Audit Report of Land Reform Programme. Government of Zimbabwe

Burawoy M. (1980), "Migrant Labour in South Africa and United States", in Nichol, T. (ed), *Capital and Labour: Studies in the Capitalist Labour Process*. London, Athlone Press

Bracking, S. And L. Sachikonye (2007), "Remittances, poverty reduction and the informalisation of household wellbeing in Zimbabwe", Paper prepared for the Living on the Margins Conference, Stellenbosch, 26–28 March 2007.

Bruce J. (1990), Legal Issues in Land Use and Resettlement, Zimbabwe Agriculture Sector Memorandum, Agriculture Division, Southern Africa Department of the World Bank, Washington DC

Chair S.L. (1999), 'Human Rights and Aid: An Australian Parliamentary Perspective' in Human Rights Council of Australia (1999) Symposium Papers – A Human Rights Approach to Development.

Chari U. (1999), The Land Question in Zimbabwe: NGO Action Beyond Advocacy-The Role of NGOs on the Implementation of Land Programs in Zimbabwe: A Gender Perspective. A paper presented at a MWENGO NGO Forum

Chasi, M., Frank Chinembiri, Charles, Mudiwa, Godfrey Mudimu and Peter Johnson, 1994. "Land fragmentation", study Number 3, The Commission of Enquiry into Land Tenure Systems in Zimbabwe, Government of Zimbabwe, September 1994.

Chaumba J, Scoones I and Wolmer W., (2003), From Jambanja to planning: The Reassertion of Technocracy in Land Reform in South-Eastern Zimbabwe. *The Journal of Modern Studies* (2003), 41:4:553-554. Cambridge University Press.

Chambati W. And Moyo S. (2003), The Political Economy of Agricutural Labour and Land Reform. African Institute for Agrarian Studies, Harare

Chambati W., and Moyo S., (2004), "Impacts of Land Reform on Farm Workers and Farm Labour Process", Review of the Agricultural Sector Following the Implementation of Land Reform, AIAS Monograph No. 5/2004, Harare

Chambati W. (2007), "Emergent Agrarian Labour Relations in Zimbabwe's New Resettlement Areas". Review of the Agrarian Sector Following the Implementation of Land Reform, AIAS Monograph Series No 3/07, Harare

Chambati W. (2009), Land Reform and Changing Agrarian Labour Processes in Zimbabwe. University of Witwatersrand, Master of Management Thesis

Chingarande S., (2004), "Gender Relations and Land Reform", Review of the Agricultural Sector Following the Implementation of Land Reform, AIAS Monograph No. 6/2004, Harare

Chingarande S. (2006), Women and Access to Land in the Context of the Fast Track Land Reform Programme. AIAS, Harare

Chingarande S., (2008), 'Gender and the Struggle for Land Equity' in Moyo S., Helliker K and Murisa T. (2008) *Contested Terrain: Land Reform and Civil Society in Contemporary Zimbabwe*. Pietermaritzburg SS Publishing

CSO (2002). Census 2002: Zimbabwe National Census 2002. Harare: Government Printers. FAO/WFP (2009). Crop and Food Security Assessmen Mission to Zimbabwe. FAO Global Information and Early Warning System on Food and Agriculture. Special Report, 22 June 2009.

Farm Community Trust of Zimbabwe (FCTZ) (2000), Final Report of on the Baseline Survey on Commercial Farms, Harare

Farm Community Trust of Zimbabwe (FCTZ), (2002a), Report on the Impact of Land Reform Programme Commercial Farm Worker Social reproduction. Harare

Farm Community Trust of Zimbabwe (FCTZ) (2002b), Baseline Assessments of Informal Settlements. Harare, June 2002

GoZ and IOM, (2005) "Zimbabwe Third Farm Workers Survey Report: Labour Dimensions of the Land Reform Programme". Government Printers: Harare

GoZ and SIRDC, (2007), National A2 Land Audit Report. Preliminary Report. Harare

Hammar A., Raftopolous B, and Jensen S. (2003), Zimbabwe's Unfinished Business: Rethinking Land, State and Nation in the Context of Crisis. Weaver Press, Harare.

Hanyani-Mlambo B.T., 2005, Agricultural Extension and Farmer Support Systems in Zimbabwe's Resettlement Areas, AIAS Policy Brief Series, Issue No. 5/2006

Hellum, A and Derman (2004) 'Land Reform and Human Rights in Contemporary Zimbabwe: Balancing Individual and Social Justice through an Integrated Human Rights Framework', *World Development* Vol. 32, No. 10, 1785-1805.

Hellum A. And Derman B., (2005), 'Negotiating Water Rights in the Context of a New Political Legal Landscape in Zimbabwe'. In von Benda-Beckmann F., von Benda-Beckmann B. & Griffiths A. (eds), *Mobile People, Mobile Law. Expanding Legal Relations in a Contracting World.* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Helliker K., (2008), 'Dancing on the Same Spot' in Moyo S., Helliker K and Murisa T. (2008) *Contested Terrain: Land Reform and Civil Society in Contemporary Zimbabwe*. Pietermaritzburg SS Publishing

Human Rights Watch (2005), Human Rights Watch World Report 2005. Human Rights Watch, New York

Kinsey B., (2003), "Comparative Economic Performance of Zimbabwe's Resettlement Models" prepared for the Symposium Delivering Land and Securing Rural Social reproduction: Post-Independence Land Reform and Resettlement in Zimbabwe, held at Mont Clair, Nyanga

Leavy J. and White H. (1999), Rural Labour Markets and Poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa. Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex

Maguwu F. (2008). "Land Reform, Famine and Environmental Degradation in Zimbabwe" *Journal* of Human Security, 3(2): 32-46.

Masiiwa M. (2004). Post-Independence Land Reform in Zimbabwe: Controversies and Impact on the Economy. FES & IDS, Harare.

McReynolds, S.A. (1998), "Agricultural Labour and Agrarian Reform in El Salvador: Social Benefit or Economic Burden?" Journal of Rural Studies, 14: (4) 459-473, October 1998.

Meninger, William A (1977)., 'The Process of Forgiveness,' IMTD

Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement (2001), "The Agricultural Sector of Zimbabwe: Statistical Bulletin 2001", Harare

Ministry of Economic Development (2007). "State of the Economy:2000-2007". Draft Chapter for the Zimbabwe Economic Development Strategy. Harare.

Moyo S. (1995), The Land Question in Zimbabwe. Sapes Trust, Harare

Moyo, S. (1999) 'The Political Economy of Land Acquisition in Zimbabwe, 1990-1999', *Journal of Southern African Studies*, vol. 26, No. 1, 5-28.

Moyo S. (2000), Land Reform under Structural Adjustment in Zimbabwe: Land Use Change in the Mashonaland Provinces, Uppsala:NorkiskaAfrikaInstitutet

Moyo S. (2001), 'The Land Occupation Movement and Democratisation in Zimbabwe: Contradictions of Neoliberalism', Millennium: Journal of International Studies 30(2): 311-30.

Moyo S. (2003), 'The Interaction of Market and Compulsory Land Acquisition Processes with Social Action in Zimbabwe's Land Reform', *in Pan Africanism and Integration in Africa*, ed Mandaza I. and Nabudere D. SAPES Books, Harare

Moyo S. (2003), Report of The Presidential Land Review Committee Under the Chairmanship of Dr C. Utete. Volume II: Special Studies to His Excellency the President of the Republic of Zimbabwe.

Moyo S. (forthcoming), 'Three Decades of Land Reform in Zimbabwe: Part 2 – Changing Agrarian Structure'. *Journal Peasant Studies*.

Moyo S. and Sukume C. (2004), Agricultural Sector and Agrarian Development Strategy. Consultancy Paper prepared for the World Bank.

Moyo S. & Yeros P. (2005), *Reclaiming the Land: The Resurgence of Rural Movements in Africa, Asia and Latin America.* Zed Books, London.

Moyo S., (2006) 'Land policy, poverty reduction and public action in Zimbabwe in Haroon Akram-Lodhi A., Saturnino M. Borras Jr and Cristobal Kay (eds) *Land, Poverty and Social reproduction in an Era of Globalization: Perspective from Developing and Transition Countries.* Routledge ISS Studies in Rural Social reproduction

Moyo S and Yeros P. (2007), The Radicalized State: Zimbabwe's Interrupted Revolution. *Review of African Political Economy*, No 111, 2007. 103-121

Moyo S. and Murisa T., (2008), 'Civil Society: Public Action towards a Transformative Agenda?' in Moyo S., Helliker K and Murisa T. (2008)

Moyo S. et al, (2008) 'Who will feed the Poor: The Future of Food Security for Southern Africa. A discussion policy paper developed for Southern Africa Trust.

MPSL & SW, (1998), "Farm Workers Survey Report", Harare

MPSL & SW, (2001), "Farm Workers Survey Report", Harare

Muir-Leresche K. (1994), 'Agricultuture in Zimbabwe' in Rukuni M., Tawonezvi P. and Eicher C. (eds), (2006), *Zimbabwe's Agricultural Revolution Revisited*. University of Zimbabwe Publications. Harare

Murisa T, 2007, "Social Organisation and Agency in the New Resettled Areas of Zimbabwe: The Case of Zvimba District", Review of the Agrarian Sector Following the Implementation of Land Reform, AIAS Monograph Series No 1/07, Harare

Murisa T., (2008), 'Civil Society, the State and the Land Question' in Moyo S., Helliker K and Murisa T. (2008)

Ndoro, C., (2006), Women and Land in the Context of the Fast Track Land Reform Programme. Policy Brief prepared for AIAS, Harare

Peta G. et al, (1991), An Organisational Survey of Five Trade Unions in Zimbabwe, Harare: Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions

Utete C., (2003), Report of the Presidential Land Review Committee into the Implementation of the Fast Track Land Reform Programme 2000-2002. Government Printers: Harare.

RBZ, Monetary Policy Statement: The First Quarter to 31 March 2004

RBZ, Monetary Policy Statement: The Second Quarter to 30 June 2004

RBZ, Monetary Policy Statement: The Third Quarter to 30 September 2004

RZB, Monetary Policy Statement: The Second Quarter, 20 July 2005

RBZ, Monetary Policy Statement: The Third Quarter, 20 October 2005

RBZ, Monetary Policy Statement: Fourth Quarter 2005, 24 January 2006

RBZ, Monetary Policy Statement: First Half 2006, 31 July 2006

RBZ, Monetary Policy Statement: Second Half 2006, 31 January 2007

Richardson R. (2005), The Loss of Property Rights and the Collapse of Zimbabwe. *Cato Journal* 25(3), Fall. Available online at www.cato.org/pubs/journal/cj25n3/cj25n3-12.pdf

Roth, M. (1990). "Analysis of agrarian structure and land use patterns in Zimbabwe". Zimbabwe Agriculture Sector Memorandum. Harare: World Bank

Sachikonye, L. (2003). The Situation of Commercial Farm Workers after Land Reform in Zimbabwe. Harare: Unpublished Report prepared for FCTZ.

Sachikonye L., (2004), Land Reform and Farm Workers in Harold-Barry D., (ed) Zimbabwe: The Past is the Future. Weaver Press, Harare. Pp 69-76

Sachikonye L. (2005), "Political Parties & the Democratisation Process in Zimbabwe", EISA Report 16.

Sachikonye, L. (2005) 'The Land is the Economy: Revisiting the Land Question', African Security Review 14 (3): 31-44

Sadomba W.Z. (2006), The War Veterans Movement: Historical Origins, Development and Linkages. AIAS, Harare

Scoones I. (2008), 'A New Start for Zimbabwe'. Mines

Sukume C, S. Moyo and P. Matondi (2003) 'Farm Size, Viability and Land Use in The Fast Track Land Reform Programme', African Institute for Agrarian Studies, Mimeo.

Sukume C., Moyo S. and Matondi P., (2004), Farm sizes, Decongestion and Land Use: Implications of the Fast Track Land Redistribution Programme in Zimbabwe, Review of the Agricultural Sector Following the Implementation of Land Reform, AIAS Monograph No 2/2004, Harare

Sukume C.and E. Guveya (2009). "Improving Input and Output Markets for Smallholder Farmers in Zimbabwe". A Study Commissioned by the World Bank, Harare Office.

Utete Report (2003) Report of the Presidential Land Review Committee under the chairmanship of Dr Charles M.B. Utete, Vol 1 and 2: Main report to his Excellency The President of The Republic of Zimbabwe, August 2003, Harare: Presidential Land Review Committee (PLRC).

Van Onselen C., (1980), *Chibaro: African Mine Labour in Southern Rhodesia 1900-1933*. Johannesburg, Ravan Press (first published London, Pluto Press, 1976)

Vhudzijena V. (2007), "Investment and Productivity Prospects in the A2 Resettlement Areas". AIAS, Harare

WLZ, (2007), "Women and Land in Zimbabwe: Its Formation, Strategies and Lessons Learnt". WLZ, Harare

World Bank, (2006), "Agricultural Growth and Land Reform in Zimbabwe: Assessment and Recovery Options. Report No. 31699-ZW. World Bank

Yao, Y. (2000). The development of the land lease market in rural China. Land Economics 76(2): 252-266

## ANNEXURE











# Annex 1-4: Kwekwe District map



Annex 1-5: Mangwe District map





Land	Chip	oinge	Chi	redzi	Goro	monzi	Kwe	ekwe	Mar	ngwe	Zvi	mba	То	tal
rates (%)	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	16	4.9	52	22.7	178	26.4	95	26.1	37	27.6	40	13.7	418	20.7
1-20	35	10.7	22	9.6	81	12.0	70	19.2	10	7.5	46	15.8	264	13.1
21-40	46	14.0	34	14.8	89	13.2	66	18.1	13	9.7	58	19.9	306	15.1
41-60	55	16.8	20	8.7	98	14.5	37	10.2	14	10.4	63	21.6	287	14.2
61-80	40	12.2	22	9.6	80	11.9	36	9.9	11	8.2	31	10.7	220	10.9
81-100	136	41.5	79	34.5	148	22.0	60	16.5	49	36.6	53	18.2	525	26.0
Total	328	100.0	229	100.0	674	100.0	364	100.0	134	100.0	291	100.0	2020	100.0

Annex 4-1: Land utilization levels by district

**Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089** Land utilization levels by district of study, F=188.423, d.f.=25, p=0.00 (significant at 0.05)

Type of	feron	Chip	pinge	Chir	edzi	Goro	monzi	Kwe	ekwe	Mar	gwe	Zvi	mba	То	tal
Type of	стор	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Food o	crops														
Potatoes	Irish	2	0.6	1	0.4	12	1.7	1	0.3	-	-	1	0.3	17	0.8
Totatoes	Sweet	46	13.8	4	1.7	11	1.6	7	1.9	2	1.4	6	1.9	76	3.6
	Rape	37	11.1	3	1.3	40	5.8	16	4.3	2	1.4	9	2.9	107	5.1
	Cabbage	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Domestic	Spinach	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
vegetables	Tomatoes	20	6.0	4	1.7	43	6.2	19	5.1	2	1.4	15	4.9	103	4.9
	Onions	6	1.8	1	0.4	15	2.2	7	1.9	1	0.7	6	1.9	36	1.7
Roundnuts		4	1.2	10	4.3	2	0.3	-	-	5	3.4	-	-	21	1.0
Pumpkins		5	1.5	3	1.3	12	1.7	5	1.3	1	0.7	-	-	26	1.2
Macadamia	nuts	5	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	0.2
Chillies		1	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Baby corn		1	0.3	-	-	1	0.1	1	0.3	-	-	-	-	3	0.1
Okra		1	0.3	-	-	4	0.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	0.2
Watermelon	IS	-	-	2	0.9	0	0	1	0.3	-	-	-	-	3	0.1
Peas		-	-	-	-	2	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0.1
Bananas		3	0.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	0.1
Gemsquash		-	-	-	-	1	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Honeydew		1	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Green beans	3	-	-	-	-	4	0.6	1	0.3	-	-	-	-	5	0.2

Annex 4-2: Minor crops grown by district of study

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

	ĺ												
Crop		$\mathbf{A1}$						<b>A2</b>					
		Cropped ar	rea ranges (r	ow percentag	ges in pa	rentheses)							
		0.1-1ha	1.01-3ha	3.01-5ha	5.01- 10ha	10ha	Total	0.1-1ha	1.01-3ha	3.01- 5ha	5.01- 10ha	10ha	Total
1.Food crops													
Potatoes Ir.	ish	4 (33.3)	3 (25.0)	1 (8.3)	4 (33.3)	1	12 (100.0)	1 (20.0)	1 (20.0)	ı	3 (60.0)	1	5 (100.0)
Ś	weet	66 (97.1)	1 (1.5)	1	I	1 (1.5)	68 (100.0)	7 (87.5)	1 (12.5)	1	1	1	8 (100.0)
Domestic R	ape	79 (88.8)	3 (3.4)	2 (2.2)	1	5 (5.6)	89 (100.0)	17 (94.4)		1 (5.6)	1	1	18 (100.0)
veg	abbage												
S	pinach												
Ľ	omatoes	60 (80.0)	3 (4.0)	3 (4.0)	ı	9 (12.0)	75 (100.0)	20 (71.4)	4 (14.3)	2 (7.1)	1 (3.6)	1 (3.6)	28 (100.0)
Ö	nions	19 (76.0)	2 (8.0)	2 (8.0)	-	2 (8.0)	25 (100.0)	10 (90.9)	1 (9.1)	1	-	-	11 (100.0)
Green beans		2 (66.7)	I	I	1	1 (33.3)	3 (100.0)	-	2 (100.0)		I	-	2 (100.0)
Round nuts		15 (100.0)	ı	1	-	1	15 (100.0)	5 (83.3)	1 (16.7)	1	-	-	6 (100.0)
Pumpkins		19 (86.4)	ı	I	I	3 (13.6)	22 (100.0)	3 (75.0)	1	1	1 (25.0)	I	4 (100.0)
Cassava													
Chillies		1 (100.0)	1	1	1		1 (100.0)			1 (20.0)	1 (20.0)	3 (60.0)	5 (100.0)
Macadamia nu	ıts	I	I	I		I	-	1 (50.0)	I	1 (50.0)	-	-	2 (100.0)
Baby corn		I	I	1	I	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)						
Okra		1 (25.0)	1	1 (25.0)	ı	2 (50.0)	4 (100.0)	1 (100.0)		1	1	I	1 (100.0)
Watermelon		2 (66.7)	1	1	I	1 (33.3)	3 (100.0)						
Peas		1(100.0)	ı	I	I	I	1 (100.0)	-	1	1	I	1(100.0)	1 (100.0)
Bananas		3 (100.0)-	I	1	1	I	3 (100.0)		I	I	I	I	ı
Gemsquash		1 (100.0)	ı	I	ı	I	1 (100.0)	ı		ı	I	I	
Honeydew		ı	ı	ı	ı	1(100.0)	1(100.0)		ı	ı	I	I	
Source: AI	AS Hous	whold Baselin	ne Survey, H	ousehold, N	=2089								

Annex 4-3: Minor crops by cropped area and ranges by model

Type of crop		No. of irrigation	Producer househo	eholds		
		producers	No.	%		
Food crops		•				
Potatoes	Irish	15	17	88.2		
	Sweet	4	76	5.3		
Domestic	Rape	90	107	84.1		
vegetables	Cabbage	5	-	-		
	Spinach		-			
				-		
	Tomatoes	82	103	79.6		
	Onions	20	36	55.6		
Round nuts		1	21	4.8		
Pumpkins		28	28	100		
Cassava		-	-	-		
Macadamia nuts		1	5	20.0		
Chillies		-	1	-		
Green beans		6	6	100.0		
Baby corn		-	3	-		
Okra		6	6	100.0		
Watermelons		17	17	100.0		
Peas		2	2	100.0		
Bananas		1	3	33.3		
Gemsquash		-	1	-		
Honeydew		-	1	-		

Annex 4-4: Minor crops being grown by households under irrigation

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Annex 4-5: Access to	productive assets	by	district
----------------------	-------------------	----	----------

Type of asset		Chip	inge	Chir	edzi	Goro	monzi	Kwe	kwe	Mang	we	Zvim	ıba	Total	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Hand tools	Hoes	331	99.1	223	94.9	986	98.7	347	93.3	134	92.4	299	97.1	2020	96.7
	Axes	306	91.6	211	89.8	677	97.4	347	93.3	140	96.6	297	96.4	1978	94.7
	Muttocks	153	45.8	99	42.1	392	56.4	242	65.1	79	54.5	190	61.7	1155	55.3
	Picks	212	63.5	167	71.1	565	81.3	289	77.7	130	89.7	227	73.7	1590	76.1
	Spades	192	57.5	126	53.6	552	79.4	218	58.6	98	67.6	206	66.9	1392	66.6
	Spade	62	18.6	46	19.6	275	39.6	95	25.5	31	21.4	104	33.8	613	29.3
	forks														
	Wheel	199	59.6	164	69.8	482	69.4	274	73.7	1125	77.2	81	26.3	631	30.2
	barrow														
	Knapsack	139	41.6	119	50.6	301	43.3	118	31.7	35	24.1	160	51.9	872	41.7
	sprayer														
Animal-	Plough	115	34.4	124	52.8	269	38.7	254	68.3	98	67.6	161	52.3	1021	48.9
drawn	Planter	11	3.3	5	2.1	21	3.0	11	3.0	2	1.4	34	11.0	84	4.0
Implements	Ripper	3	0.9	5	2.1	12	1.7	3	0.8	0	0.0	11	3.6	34	1.6
	Ridger	4	1.2	6	2.6	32	4.6	7	1.9	0	0.0	6	1.9	55	2.6
	Cultivator	34	10.2	17	7.2	136	19.6	87	23.4	8	5.5	107	34.7	389	18.6
	Harrow	19	5.7	14	6.0	86	12.4	75	20.2	2	1.4	59	19.2	255	12.2
	Spike-	10	3.0	4	1.7	29	4.2	32	8.6	3	2.1	13	4.2	91	4.4
	harrow														
	Tractor	48	14.4	37	15.7	85	12.2	27	7.3	4	2.8	59	19.2	260	12.4
Power	Tractor	37	11.1	21	8.9	50	7.2	16	4.3	1	0.7	41	13.3	166	7.9
driven	trailer														
machinery	Plough	43	12.9	32	13.6	83	11.9	79	21.2	4	2.8	55	17.9	296	14.2
&	Planter	17	5.1	2	0.9	27	3.9	22	5.9	2	1.4	28	9.1	98	4.7
equipment	Ripper	13	3.9	6	2.6	17	2.4	5	1.3	0	0.0	11	3.6	52	2.5
	Water	14	4.2	3	1.3	25	3.6	7	1.9	4	2.8	21	6.8	74	3.5
	cart/bowser														
	Water	21	6.3	14	6.0	48	6.9	15	4.0	2	1.4	29	9.4	129	6.2
	pump														

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Formal	Chip	inge	Chire	edzi	Goro	monzi	Kwe	kwe	Man	gwe	Zvin	ıba	Total	
agricultural	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
training														
No formal training	254	86.1	163	79.9	516	87.8	253	91.0	135	95.7	260	86.4	1581	87.5
O' level agriculture	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	1.8	-	-	-	-	5	0.3
Diploma	11	3.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	0.6
Certificate	2	0.7	11	5.4	9	1.5	1	04	-	-	13	4.3	36	2.0
Degree	19	6.4	27	13.2	57	9.7	19	6.8	6	4.3	27	9.0	155	8.6
Master farmer certificate	9	3.1	3	1.5	6	1.0	-	-	-	-	1	0.3	19	1.1
Total	295	100.0	204	100.0	588	100.0	278	100.0	141	100.0	301	100.0	1807	100.0
~				~										

## Annex 4-6: Formal agricultural training obtained by land beneficiaries

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089

## Annex 9-1: Rotated Factor Loadings and unique variances for significant variables

Variable	Factor1	Factor2	Factor3	Factor4	Factor5	Uniqueness
Model type		0.7058				0.4496
Plot size		0.4403				0.7276
Farm machinery ownership						
index		0.5785				0.6039
Cultivated area		0.5108				0.4145
Level of labour	0.7066					0.3528
No. of permanent and						
family workers	0.908					0.1158
No. of permanent workers						
employed	0.731					0.3734
Gender						0.8376
Marital status				0.7279		0.4559
Widowed				-0.743		0.4389
Professional employment					0.6457	0.5521
Civil servants					0.6301	0.594
Year land allocated			0.846			0.2819
Year farming started			0.8485			0.2761

Source: AIAS Household Baseline Survey, Household questionnaire, N=2089





Within Cluster Percentage of model type

Annex 9-3: Whether plot holder is married or not







Annex 9-5: Whether plot holder is still in professional employment



Percent within Cluster





Annex 9-7: Whether plot holder is/was a civil servant



## Annex 9-8: Plot size in hectares



Simultaneous 95% Confidence Intervals for Means

Reference Line is the Overall Mean = 36.30

## Annex 9-9: Number of permanent workers employed





Reference Line is the Overall Mean = 2





Simultaneous 95% Confidence Intervals for Means

Reference Line is the Overall Mean = 1.50

Annex 9-11: Cultivated land area in natural logs



### Simultaneous 95% Confidence Intervals for Means

Reference Line is the Overall Mean = 1.41





Simultaneous 95% Confidence Intervals for Means

Reference Line is the Overall Mean = 2002

Annex 9-13: Ownership of capital intensive farm equipment (score)



Simultaneous 95% Confidence Intervals for Means

Reference Line is the Overall Mean = 1

Annex 9-14: Year land was allocated



Simultaneous 95% Confidence Intervals for Means

Reference Line is the Overall Mean = 2002