

OCCASIONAL RESEARCH PAPER

Land Reform and the Political Economy of Agricultural Labour in Zimbabwe

Walter Chamabati and Sam Moyo

January 2007

Drawing on fieldwork carried out in Chikomba District in 2003, this paper provides a socioeconomic analysis of the pre and post fast track resettlement agrarian employment structure in Zimbabwe's commercial farming sector. In comparing the findings of the field study to previous research and reports, it finds that the extent of the employment on farms prior to the FTLRP has been overstated, while the re-absorption of former farm workers into the agriculture sector by both formal and informal means has been greater than previously understood. Thus, although there have been job and livelihood losses associated with the FTLRP, these have not been as pervasive as is widely claimed.

Occasional Research Paper Series

No. 4/2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY.....	1
2	BACKGROUND.....	3
2.1	Overall Economic Context.....	3
2.2	The Agrarian Economy.....	4
2.2.1	<i>Agrarian Structure Before the Fast Track Land Reform</i>	4
2.2.2	<i>The Reformed Agrarian Structure Post Fast Track Land Reform</i>	4
2.2.3	<i>Evolving Production Systems and Patterns, and Wage Farm Labour</i>	5
2.3	The Sociopolitical Context: Zimbabwe’s Population and Farm Labour.....	7
3	AGRICULTURAL LABOUR BEFORE THE FTLRP.....	8
3.1	Overall Rural Employment.....	8
3.1.1	<i>Agricultural Wage Employment</i>	10
3.1.2	<i>Gender Dimensions of Wage Employment</i>	10
3.2	Disaggregated Structure of Agricultural Wage Employment.....	11
3.2.1	<i>Spatial Distribution</i>	11
3.2.2	<i>Commodity Wise Distribution</i>	12
3.3	Wages and Benefits.....	12
3.3.1	<i>Real Wages of Commercial Farm Workers</i>	13
3.3.2	<i>Effects of Globalisation on Agricultural Wage Employment</i>	15
3.3.3	<i>Employment Benefits</i>	16
3.4	Skills and Quality of Agricultural Labour.....	16
3.5	Poverty and Rural Labour.....	17
4	OVERALL IMPACT OF FTLRP ON AGRICULTURAL WAGE LABOUR.....	17
4.1	Employment Status of Farm Workers.....	19
4.2	Land Allocation to Farm Workers.....	21
4.3	Residential Uncertainty and Relocation to Communal Areas.....	23
4.4	General Social Impacts of FTLRP on Farm Workers.....	25
5	NEW LABOUR PROCESSES IN RESETTLEMENT SCHEMES.....	27
5.1	Structure and Forms of Employment.....	27
5.2	Wages Paid, Negotiations and Alternative Incomes.....	28
5.3	Skills, Technology, Labour Management Processes and Commodity Wise Labour Use.....	29
6	CONCLUSIONS.....	31
7	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	32
	REFERENCES.....	33
	ANNEXURE.....	37

List of Tables

Table 1	Changing LSCF Structure, Zimbabwe 1970-2003	4
Table 2	Comparative Farm Labour Count in Zimbabwe, 1997	9
Table 3	Shifts in LSCF Wage Labour Population in Zimbabwe, 1983-2000	10
Table 4	Wage Employment by Gender in Zimbabwe, 1996-2000	11
Table 5	Minimum Wages for the Agriculture Sector and Averaged Minimum of Other Sectors in Zimbabwe, 1996-2001	13
Table 6	Functional Distribution of Gross Domestic Income, 1987-1997	15
Table 7	National Wages, Skills and Income, 2000	16
Table 8	Status and Destination of Former Farm Workers in Chikomba District, 2003	18
Table 9	Farm Worker Resettlement in Model A1 in Chikomba District	22
Table 10	Labour Usage in New Resettlement Areas in Chikomba District	27
Table 1	Changing LSCF Structure, Zimbabwe 1970-2003	4

List of Annexes

Annex 1	Imports and Exports, Zimbabwe 1991-2001	37
Annex 2	Changing Farm Structure, Zimbabwe 1997 vs. 2002	38
Annex 3	Employment by Sector in Zimbabwe, 1991-2000	38
Annex 4	Provincial Farm Labour Distribution in Zimbabwe, 1983-2000	39
Annex 5	Natural Region Characteristics of the 1 471 Designated Farms, 1998	39
Annex 6	Farming Enterprise versus Labour Mix, 1997	39
Annex 7	Indices of Real Average Earnings by Sector, 1980-1997	40
Annex 8	Farm Worker Skills Characteristics	40
Annex 9	Case Study of New Agrarian and Employment Structure in Chikomba District	41

1 INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

This paper provides a socioeconomic analysis of the pre and post fast track resettlement agrarian employment structure in Zimbabwe's commercial farming sector focusing predominantly on model A2 under the government's land redistribution programme and, to a lesser extent, on the smallholder farming sector. The major focus of the study was to evaluate the impact of the Fast Track Land Reform Programme (FTLRP) upon the former farm workers of the old large scale commercial farms (LSCF) and new processes in the new farming communities. New commercial agrarian labour systems and social relations, and governance structures in the former LSCF have emerged since the FTLRP (Moyo, 2003) and these need careful analysis.

Former commercial farm workers¹ constituted the majority of wage paid agrarian labourers in Zimbabwe before land expropriations in the old large scale commercial farming sector for resettlement. But unpaid family workers have always formed the bulk of the agricultural workers in the communal and resettlement areas. In Zimbabwe, the common facts about commercial farm workers are that they form the largest stratum of the working class, and that they are the lowest paid group. Farm workers have historically lacked a coherent voice and their needs have been low on the development agenda. They are poorly organised because of the spatial dispersion of farms. They live under appalling housing conditions and their access to health, schools and other basic facilities is generally poor.

The study was carried out through extensive desk research, which involved reviewing existing literature on farm workers and past surveys from various organisations.² In addition, field surveys and informal interviews were carried out to ascertain the current status of agricultural wage employment after the FTLRP. Field surveys were carried out in Chikomba District, Mashonaland East Province. Interviews were conducted with farm owners and workers, and other key informants on both model A1 and A2 farms. Purposive sampling was used to identify respondents for a semi structured questionnaire survey and informal key informant interviews. Primary research was carried out in Chikomba District, Mashonaland East Province. Key informants for the study included the District Council, Department of Agricultural Research and Extension (AREX) and area extension officers. Four model A1 farms were conveniently sampled – Honeyspruit, Duncstan, UITKYKIK and Tantalone. For the model A2, Scud and Beaver, Hazeldene and Kwesifontein farms were selected.

Before convenience sampling respondents for questionnaire interviews, an overview of the particular farm was provided by the area extension officer and, in the case of model A1 farms, there was also an input from the chairperson of the farm committee encompassing production patterns, settlement, and labour perspectives among other issues. The interviews focused on household demography, farm labour demand, supply

¹ The International Labour Organisation (ILO) defines farm workers as men or women wage earners working on a permanent, casual, seasonal or migrant basis for large or small farming, forestry or fishing concerns, or as self employed share croppers and tenants who work on land or boats (Kibble and Vanlerberg, 2000).

² Farm Community Trust of Zimbabwe (FCTZ), Save the Children Fund-UK, Ministry of Public Service, Labour and Social Welfare and Central Statistical Office.

and utilisation, agricultural activities, access to social services, the fate of former farm workers and off-farm activities.

In particular, the field research sought to answer the following questions:

- Where are the farm workers who were formerly employed on expropriated farms?
- Did they obtain land under the FTLRP?
- If they received land, which route did they use?
- Have the former farm workers been re-employed by the new farmers?
- Under what employment conditions have they been re-employed?
- What happened to those former farm workers who have not been accommodated in the new agrarian structure?

The major objective was to account for former farm workers who used to work on farms acquired for resettlement and evaluate the gains and losses in the agrarian employment structure as a result of the land resettlement programme. However, it is important to note that the findings of the field research cannot be considered conclusive during this transitional phase of the agrarian reform, where land uptake in both model A1 and A2 is yet to reach optimum level and agricultural production is still settling. The situation could be different in the next season and thereafter.

Some of the setbacks of this study pertain to the reliability of the secondary farm workers data used, the lack of information on a number of aspects, and the fact that most surveys are not representative of the farm worker population. There are wide differences with farm labour data estimates from various sources.³ Very few farms were conveniently sampled for the case study in Chikomba District, which might have led to an overrepresentation of the situation of former farm workers and biases may also have been introduced by the use of convenience sampling.

The timing of some of the other surveys also raises questions, especially those that were carried out during the implementation of the land reform programme, which may have affected the quality of data obtained. Furthermore, a number of surveys were undertaken by organisations interested in the issues affecting the farm workers, and bias is quite likely where an organisation has a vested interests. There are also instances in which wage employment in the LSCF has been overstated. Similarly, some surveys have tended to exaggerate the origins of farm workers and to understate the social conditions in which they live. In addition, most studies have been focused on social aspects of farm workers' lives, while large research gaps exist on economic issues. The economic issues that this study addresses include the shifts in demand, supply and utilisation of labour, wage settings, incomes, structure and forms of employment.

Quite crucially, many of the recent studies on the impact of land reform on former farm workers tend to be pursued out of context, in terms of the quality of labour, its location in provincial and agro-ecological terms, its performance, the intensity of its use across various commodities and types of farms, its relocation to the communal areas and its gender dimensions. Their lack of an adequate assessment of the structure of pre 2000

³ For instance CSO versus FCTZ.

farm labour, its scale and the incomes realised, the inadequate assessment of the variety of forms of their absorption in new farm work and in communal areas, alongside an omnibus of treatment of aggregated job losses and gains, are of limited value in assessing the meaning of these shifts and the real potential for further accommodating them. Correcting these deficiencies and providing a proper historical context is valuable for the impacts of land reform to be evaluated meaningfully.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 Overall Economic Context

Zimbabwe is a fairly developed economy with extensive linkages amongst the various sectors. The dominant sectors of the economy in terms of their contribution to national output, exports and employment, are manufacturing, agriculture and mining. For instance, in 2000, manufacturing contributed 17 percent of the gross domestic product (GDP), while agriculture and mining contributed 18 percent and 4 percent respectively (CSO, 2002). Because of the backward and forward linkages between the agricultural sector and other economic activities, its performance has a huge impact on the GDP.

A major shift in economic policy in Zimbabwe occurred in 1991, with the introduction of the Economic Structural Adjustment Programme (ESAP). This programme was aimed at replacing the 'state interventionist' model with the 'free market' model of economic management. The development paradigm changed from being inward looking towards export led growth through integration into regional and global markets. The components of ESAP were trade liberalisation, domestic deregulation, fiscal and monetary reform, and social and public awareness programmes.

Trade liberalisation and domestic deregulation (through the deregulation of the labour market) had the greatest effect on agricultural workers. It removed most barriers in the foreign exchange market and those associated with international trade and investment, making it easier to import and export and creating an export drive that resulted in new land use patterns and labour demands in the commercial agricultural sector.⁴ The deregulation of the labour market was characterised by the introduction of new flexible labour arrangements that placed employers in the driving seat.

The country exports mainly primary commodities, of which agriculture contributes more than 40 percent of the national total.⁵ The exports include unprocessed tobacco, ferro-alloys, nickel, cotton lint, horticultural produce and fresh cut flowers, as well as low value added manufactures and minerals. Imports mainly consist of machinery and transport equipment, petroleum products, and basic and industrial chemicals.⁶ The country's major trading partners are South Africa, accounting for roughly 19 percent of the trade flow, Britain (11 percent), Germany (6 percent), United States of America (8 percent) and Botswana (3 percent).⁷

⁴ The effects of ESAP are covered in detail in section 3.6.

⁵ Tobacco is the country's largest export, accounting for 30 percent of total exports.

⁶ See annex 1 for export and import trends in Zimbabwe since 1991.

⁷ Zimbabwe's trade also takes place within the framework of the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC), the Lome IV Convention (which gave it preferential access to exports, mainly boneless beef to the

2.2 The Agrarian Economy

2.2.1 *Agrarian Structure Before the Fast Track Land Reform*

As already highlighted above, agriculture remains the mainstay of the Zimbabwean economy despite contributing less than 20 percent of the national output. Before the fast track land reform in 2000, the country was characterised by a dual agrarian structure, composed of LSCF and smallholder communal farmers. In the old agrarian structure inherited from the colonial era, the LSCF sector was composed of more than 4 500 farms occupying some 11.2 million ha of land, with 34 percent of this land being located in Natural Regions I and II, 21.5 percent in Region III and 43.9 percent in Regions IV and V (UNDP, 1998). Table 1 shows the evolving structure within the large scale commercial farming sector.

Table 1 Changing LSCF Structure, Zimbabwe 1970-2003

Year	No. of Farms	Total Area (million ha)	Average Farm Size (ha)	Labour Force ('000)
1970	7 116	14.80	2 080	*241.1
1980	6 034	14.79	2 452	n.a.
1985	5 128	12.48	2 434	276.4
1990	4 992	11.43	2 290	290.0
1997	5 146	11.29	2 196	339.0
2003**	1 000	1.20	400	?

Sources: CSO, 1998; * Clarke, 1978; **Moyo, forthcoming

Farm sizes averaged over 2 000 ha for owner operated farms, which accounted for close to 30 percent of the LSCF sector (Muir, 1994), while plantation estates and wildlife ranches larger than of 10 000 ha per unit accounted for the balance. Plantation estates are mainly owned by large transnational corporations (TNCs) such as Anglo-American (the Hippo Valley Estates in the Chiredzi area) and are concentrated in the sugar and forestry sub sectors. Other TNCs are also involved in coffee, tea, cotton and horticulture.

On the other hand, the communal areas held a population of about one million households or six million blacks on 16.4 million ha, with 74.2 percent of this land being in marginal areas of Natural Regions IV and V (Moyo, 1995). Most smallholder farmers are involved in subsistence food production and, in good agricultural seasons, a surplus is sold to the domestic market. Commercialisation is prevalent in prime potential agro-ecological regions I and II, for example Murehwa and Hurungwe (maize), and the Mashonaland provinces and eastern highlands (horticulture).

2.2.2 *The Reformed Agrarian Structure Post Fast Track Land Reform*

In 1980, the government embarked on a vigorous land redistribution exercise to redress the colonial inequities. The programme peaked over the first three years of independence during which about 2 334 396 ha (54 percent of the total land acquired by government between 1980 and 2000) were acquired, then slowed down dramatically until 1997 (Chambati, 2001). The land redistribution programme gained momentum again in 1997 when the government listed 1 471 LSCFs for compulsory acquisition, although less than

European Union), the Preferential Trade Agreement of Southern and Eastern Africa (PTA), and the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) (ZIMTRADE, undated).

300 of these were eventually acquired between the Land Donors Conference of 1998 and the year 2000 (Moyo, 2000).

In 2000, the government introduced the FTLRP⁸ that has now changed the dual structure of the agricultural sector. The changing agrarian structure has various implications for labour demand and utilisation in large scale commercial farming⁹.

The evolution from a bi-modal to tri-modal agrarian structure after the FTLRP as estimated by Moyo (forthcoming) is shown in Annex 2. In the new tri-modal agrarian structure, the small-medium commercial farm sector that was considered insignificant before the fast track reform now features prominently alongside the large scale commercial farm and communal/model A1 sectors and plantation agriculture. Statistics for small scale commercial farm sector were usually incorporated into those of the LSCF. A peculiar feature of the new tri-modal agrarian structure is the reduction of farm sizes in the LSCF and plantation agriculture sectors, in line with the new maximum farm size policy recently introduced by the government.

2.2.3 Evolving Production Systems and Patterns, and Wage Farm Labour¹⁰

During the 1920s, both large scale and communal agriculture utilised labour intensive and capital extensive production systems, relying on seasonal agriculture (Muir and Blackie, 1994). Tobacco and maize were the major crops grown.

By 1980, the LSCF sector had diversified from the maize-tobacco production system to include, sugar, cotton, wheat, soyabean, coffee, tea, beef and dairy, utilising high levels of modern technologies (hybrid seeds, pesticides and fertilisers) and capital intensive production systems, mainly geared towards exports.¹¹ The intensification of capital in large scale agricultural production led to the decline in farm labour demand and about 100 000 jobs were lost between 1974 and 1984 (Loewneson, 1992).

Although maize as an export crop lost its attractiveness in the LSCF sector, it has remained important in communal areas. The area under maize production in the large scale commercial farming sector decreased from 363 448 ha in 1981 to 204 100 ha by 1997 but, in the communal areas, it increased from 900 000 ha to 1 286 000 ha during the same period (CSO, 1998a). To date, the smallholder farmers produce the bulk (70 percent) of the maize consumed in the domestic market. While the large scale commercial farmers moved into new, capital intensive commodities, smallholder farmers increased the production of labour intensive crops with little application of modern inputs.¹² Agricultural production in the smallholder farming sector has largely remained subsistence in nature, with commercialisation and integration into the markets confined to those communal areas that are located in prime agricultural potential Natural Regions I and II. Communal areas produce mainly cheap food crops (maize, sorghum, millet,

⁸ Under the fast track land reform, redistribution occurred under two models – A1 (villagisation scheme, an average of 10 to 15 ha per family) and A2 (commercial farm settlement scheme, 200 to 500ha).

⁹ The impact of the land reform on commercial agricultural workers is covered in a later section in this paper, specifically focusing on the income and welfare effects.

¹⁰ Most of the discussions on evolving production patterns borrow heavily from Muir and Blackie, 1994.

¹¹ Tobacco was the only labour intensive crop that expanded in area in the mid 1970s (Loewenson, 1992).

¹² By 1994, large scale commercial farmers were applying fertiliser at an average rate of 723 kgs per ha, compared to 47 kgs per ha in the smallholder farming sector (Muir and Blackie, 1994).

groundnuts and, more recently, oilseeds). Production is geared mainly towards subsistence and the domestic market. Smallholders who have ventured into export production are involved in labour intensive and low technology commodities such as cotton, burley tobacco and bulky vegetables (Moyo, 2000).

New demands of export production in the early 1980s led to rapid mechanisation, expansion of the area under irrigation and modern input use, although there were constraints to international trade in the controlled economy (foreign currency and import restrictions). There was a sharp growth in the cropped area under irrigation between 1970 and 1980, from just above 50 000 ha to above 140 000 ha of the cropped area, of which 70 percent was located in the LSCF sector (Rukuni et al, 1994).

The export oriented drive increased tremendously in the LSCF sector with the implementation of trade liberalisation as component of ESAP in 1991. Diversification intensified in the agricultural sector as farmers moved away from the traditional export crops to new exports that fetched high prices on the international market. But tobacco has remained the largest export earner in the economy. Horticulture and both intensive and extensive wildlife ranching enjoyed rapid growth in the ESAP and post ESAP era due to the overt foreign currency policy drive. Specialised horticultural exports, such as paprika, fresh cut flowers, mange-tout, asparagus, courgettes, cherry tomatoes, and baby carrots, and out of season fruits became important exports to Europe.

Horticulture does not require large tracts of land and farm sizes can be as small as 10 ha with access to water, but the financial returns can be as high as those from a 2 000 ha farm. However, horticultural production requires a huge initial capital outlay (irrigation pipes, greenhouses chemicals etc.).¹³ By the end of 1995, 35 percent or 1 600 large scale commercial farmers were into horticultural production for exports, of whom 60 percent were in the Mashonaland provinces (Moyo, 2000). Horticulture export earnings grew from about US\$ 28 million in 1991 to about US\$ 82 million in 2001. The capital intensity in the horticultural sector greatly reduces the demand for permanent labour. Farmers prefer employing seasonal workers, mainly female, in peak periods (for example during harvesting).

Another sub sector that has registered growth is wildlife ranching and farm tourism, both intensive and extensive in nature. This has been stimulated by the potential of earning foreign currency. Live animals, ostrich and crocodile meat and skins are the major exports destined for the Far East. The 3 percent of large scale commercial land under wildlife in 1960 had increased to about 31 percent of the number of LSCFs in the mid 1990s (Moyo, 2000). Extensive wildlife ranching land uses were in the marginal areas of Natural Regions IV and V, with little investment as the environs naturally suited wildlife. Intensive wildlife land uses also sprouted in the Mashonaland Provinces (to form mixed farming entities) in the form of wildlife farm tourism (game viewing, ostriches and overnight accommodation). Cropping land has been converted to wildlife conservancies on a much smaller scale (1 000 to 2 500 ha), estimated at about 10 percent of the extensive ranches in dry marginal areas. Intensive wildlife ranching has reduced

¹³ The establishment of one hectare of flowers under greenhouse required approximately US\$ 100 000 in that period (Moyo, 2000).

employment in the large scale commercial farming sector by taking cropland out of production.

The heavy mechanisation on commercial farms has had a huge impact on commercial agricultural workers through the loss of jobs and the casualisation of labour (Amanor-Wilks, 1995). Although the new land use patterns driven by foreign currency earnings boosted the incomes of farm owners, profits were not passed on to the workers. Workers in export oriented land uses remained on the same wage level as those in other sub sectors in the industry.

2.3 The Sociopolitical Context: Zimbabwe's Population and Farm Labour

Zimbabwe has just come out of a national census and analysis of results is still ongoing. The provisional total population figures released put the Zimbabwean population at 11.4 million people. Latest computed results are those for the last population census in 1992. The 1992 census recorded a total population of 10.4 million, of which females constituted 51 percent (CSO, 1994). The majority of the population (51 percent) fell in the 15 to 64 years age category. This was followed by those under 15 years (45 percent) with the remainder being over 65 years.

The majority of the population is rural based, accounting for 69 percent of the total population.¹⁴ Farm workers and their families constitute the majority of the people residing in the LSCF areas. In 1976, one fifth of the rural population of Zimbabwe lived in the commercial farming areas, and 97 percent of them were black; there was a total of 332 000 farm workers on 6 682 farms (Auret, 2000). Statistics from the 1992 Census showed that the proportion of rural people living on commercial farms had declined since the pre-independence era.

As Europeans had harshly driven locals off their land, these people resisted or shunned working on LSCFs. This led to a foreign labour recruitment policy during the colonial period in Rhodesia. Workers were brought into Zimbabwe from Malawi (formerly Nyasaland), Mozambique and Zambia (former Northern Rhodesia) as cheap labour, which was critical in the development of the commercial agriculture sector. Several studies and reports have given different figures on the composition of the farm worker population in terms of origin and the formal recruitment of foreign labour was abandoned in 1980. In any case, before independence, foreign workers accounted for the largest proportion of the total wage agricultural workers on LSCFs. This was above 50 percent before the change in foreign labour policy in 1958 (Clarke, 1977).

The proportion of migrant workers has changed significantly since then. By 1974, it had decreased to 34 percent and, more recently, the share of migrant workers in agricultural wage employment had declined to between 10 and 30 percent.¹⁵ Migrant workers have historically been employed as part of the non permanent wage (contract, seasonal or

¹⁴ The rural area comprises the communal, resettlement and large scale commercial farming areas. According to the 1992 Census, the communal lands accounted for 51.4 percent of the population, LSCF (11.3 percent), small scale commercial farms (1.6 percent), resettlement areas (4.1 percent), state land (0.4 percent) and urban areas (31.2 percent) (CSO, 1994).

¹⁵ FCTZ, 2000; MPSL&SW, 1998; GAPWUZ/Magaramombe, 2002; Sachikonye, 2003. This MPSL&SW survey was conducted after 1 500 farms were listed for compulsory acquisition in 1997.

casual) labour that was badly underpaid. Foreign workers that remain on large scale commercial farmers are now second or third generation Zimbabweans, although most of them do not possess official documentation to qualify them as Zimbabweans (Magaramombe, 2001).

3 AGRICULTURAL LABOUR BEFORE THE FTLRP

The agriculture sector is the largest formal employer in Zimbabwe's economy, accounting for 26 percent of the total paid labour force. Most of those employed in this sector are poorly paid farm workers on LSCFs. After agriculture, the manufacturing sector is the second largest employer in the formal sector. Other major employers in the economy include the education, domestic and distribution sectors, each accounting for at least 8 percent of the total formal employment establishment (see Annex 3).

The structural adjustment programme was accompanied by a 10 percent increase in the number of paid employees in the agriculture sector, but the overall economy registered a decline as result of the massive retrenchments that took place as a result of the deregulation of the labour market and flexible labour arrangements introduced during ESAP, as shown in Annex 3. The post ESAP period was characterised by a further decline in total wage employment, which also affected the agricultural sector as some farm workers were lost their jobs then. More jobs have been lost since the land reform in 2000.

3.1 Overall Rural Employment

Agricultural employment can be classified as wage and non-wage. Communal farmers constitute the bulk of non-wage agricultural employment, producing for subsistence and surplus for the domestic market. On the other hand, wage employment is concentrated in the LSCF. The bulk of agricultural workers are self employed family labourers.¹⁶ In addition to unpaid family labour, there exist reciprocal labour arrangements in communal areas during peak periods.¹⁷

On communal farms, about 90 percent of all agricultural workers are own account or unpaid family labour (CSO, 1998a). The Central Statistical Office (CSO) estimates the number of communal area farm workers in 2000 at 1 696 128 persons, representing a decline of 27 percent from the 1993 figures. There has been little research on wage labour in communal area; most studies have focused on wage employment on LSCF (Leavy and White, 1999). One of the very few studies shows that there exists an active full and part time wage labour market in smallholder farming communities in Zimbabwe (Adams, 1991).¹⁸ Of the 136 communal households hiring in agricultural labour interviewed in Masvingo District, 39 percent hired permanent labour, normally paid a monthly wage and

¹⁶ Most communal households are also reliant on remittances from their urban ties to sustain their livelihoods.

¹⁷ Community members can pool their labour to weed family A's maize plot and the same arrangement is reciprocated among other members as well. The hosting family, in some instances, provides traditional beer or beverage drink, 'mahewu' to their guest workers during the weeding, harvesting etc. exercise.

¹⁸ This survey focused only on households hiring in agricultural labour. Because of this, no comparative analysis is possible and activity of the labour market cannot be quantified.

other non-monetary benefits (housing, food, use of land etc.), and 77 percent casual labour, paid on a piecework basis.

Wage employment on commercial farms can be categorised into permanent and casual/seasonal/contract farm labour.¹⁹ CSO calculations from 1993 show that agricultural wage employment constituted 11 percent (300 400) of the total labour force (2 628 622), and the rest was non-wage communal farm workers. In 1999, the share of wage employment in total agricultural labour force (2 018 808) rose to 16 percent (CSO, 1999; 2001). Although there was an overall decline in the total agricultural labour force, there was an increase in the share of wage employment. These trends reflect a cyclical instability of the size and quality of agricultural wage labour.

There is controversy over the actual size of the farm worker population. Surveys that have been carried by some researchers and non governmental organisations have tended to present higher estimations of its size than the official estimates of farm worker figures provided by the CSO. A 1997 survey by various organisations,²⁰ of commercial farm workers estimated the total number of agricultural workers to be 451 456 (USAID, 1998), a difference of 112 444 from the yearly CSO survey. But another survey²¹ carried out during the same year came up with an estimate of 332 875, differing only slightly from the CSO total figure of agricultural workers (339 012). The differences between official and independent surveys results have mainly been with respect to casual labour (see Table 2).

Table 2 Comparative Farm Labour Count in Zimbabwe, 1997

Variable	ALB led Survey	CSO Survey	Difference
Number of farms	4 247	4 245	2
Total No. of farm workers	451 456	339 012	112 444
No. of workers per farm	106	80	26
Permanent workers	201 733	172 926	58 807
Permanent workers per farm	48	41	7
Casual workers	249 724	166 086	83 638
Casual workers per farm	59	39	20

Sources: CSO, 1998; USAID, 1998

According to the Agricultural Labour Bureau (ALB) led survey, causal labour accounted for 55 percent of the total wage employment on LSCFs, compared to 48 percent for the CSO based data. A verification report of the ALB led survey (Vhurumuku et al, 1999) suggests the wide difference from CSO figures could have been on the classification of wives of seasonal workers as part of the casual labour force. This agrees with our observations that numbers of casual workers with meaningful employment tends to be exaggerated.

¹⁹ The terms 'casual', 'seasonal' and 'contract' are usually used interchangeably.

²⁰ Agricultural Labour Bureau (ALB) of the Commercial Farmers Union (CFU), FCTZ and USAID Famine Early Warning System (FEWS) carried out the survey. In 1997 the GoZ had designated 1 471 LSCF for compulsory acquisition, most of which were owned by members of the CFU. The fact that there was so much at stake for CFU, could have led to the overestimation of the number of agricultural workers on LSCFs.

²¹ The survey was carried out by the National Employment Council for the Agricultural Industry (MPSL&SW, 1997).

While, this paper emphasises the importance for policy of recognising the presence of both wage and non-wage employment in the communal areas, our focus now shifts to the LSCF areas, where wage employment is concentrated.

3.1.1 *Agricultural Wage Employment*

Official data from the CSO shows that, by 2000, that there had been minimal change in permanent wage agricultural workers on LSCF since 1983 (Table 3) in terms of numbers. But a closer look reveals that the proportion of permanent wage labour had changed significantly. While, in 1983, permanent labour accounted for 76 percent of the agricultural workers on LSCFs, it dropped to 50 percent in 1996 and to 53 percent in 2000. Thus there has been an increase in the share of casual labour.

The structural changes in the agrarian labour market, from a previously large permanent force to more casualisation of farm labour, were driven by the new flexible labour laws, growth of new capital intensive horticultural production systems and extensive wildlife land uses during the ESAP and post ESAP period. These processes built upon the decline in the production of labour intensive grain crops in the LSCF sector.²²

Table 3 Shifts in LSCF Wage Labour Population in Zimbabwe, 1983-2000

Category	1983	1996	2000
Permanent	166 411	167 911	167 459
Casual	51 761	162 670	146 420
Total	218 817	334 521	313 879

Source: CSO (1984; 1997; 2001)

Between 1983 and 1996, permanent farm labour increased by 0.9 percent and then decreased by 0.2 percent between 1996 and 2000. On the other hand, casual wage agricultural labour surged upwards by 214 percent between 1983 and 1996, but recorded a 10 percent decline from 1996 to 2000. The total number of agricultural workers decreased by 6 percent between 1996 and 2000. Based on these data, it can be concluded that changes in the total number of agricultural workers up until 2000 had largely been caused by fluctuations in casual farm labour.

3.1.2 *Gender Dimensions of Wage Employment*

Statistics from the latest Labour Force Survey, carried out in 1999, show that, of all employed female workers, 70 percent are employed in the agricultural sector, compared to 51 percent of males. There has not been much change in the share of total female agricultural wage employment between 1996 and 2000 (Table 4).

The proportion of women in the total commercial farm worker population has remained constant at 30 percent during this period, slightly increasing by 1 percent in 1999 and maintaining that increase through to 2000. Female permanent wage labour increased from 9 percent to 10 percent during this period. Women seem to have gained more ground in the less secure forms of employment, having increased by 3 percent to reach 55 percent of the casual labour force. A classic pre independence study estimated the share of female wage labour to be about 23 percent of the total in 1972, out of which 17 percent was

²² See section 1.2.3.

employed as casual labourers (Clarke, 1977). Thus, in essence, women farm workers constituted 65 percent of the total casual labour force. Comparing this to the 2000 situation, the share of women in the casual labour force had declined, while in the ‘permanent employees’ category it has remained relatively constant at 9 percent. The fact that most women were employed as casual farm workers meant that their jobs were more vulnerable to farm expropriations than those of male farm workers.

Table 4 Wage Employment by Gender in Zimbabwe, 1996-2000²³

Year	Total		Permanent		Casual	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
1996	234 685 (70%)	99 836 (30%)	154 233 (92%)	13 618 (8%)	80 452 (48%)	86 218 (52%)
1997	236 103 (70%)	102 909 (30%)	157 828 (91%)	15 098 (9%)	78 275 (47%)	87 811 (53%)
1998	226 544 (70%)	97 745 (30%)	155 519 (91%)	15 972 (9%)	71 025 (46%)	81 773 (54%)
1999	221 838 (69%)	100 842 (31%)	152 788 (90%)	16 469 (10%)	69 050 (45%)	84 373 (55%)
2000	216 630 (69%)	97 789 (31%)	150 322 (90%)	17 137 (10%)	66 308 (45%)	80 652 (55%)

Source: CSO (2001)

Recent results from smaller surveys on the share of female wage employment concur with official data from the CSO, estimating it at around 30 percent (MPSL&SW, 1998; Sachikonye, 2003). But the 1997 ALB led survey had estimated this at around 38 percent. It surprising that recent studies on the impacts of land reform on commercial farm workers tend to ignore their differentiation by gender, while placing emphasis on the total number of farm workers.²⁴

3.2 Disaggregated Structure of Agricultural Wage Employment

3.2.1 Spatial Distribution

Spatial distribution can be considered in the following ways:

- **PROVINCIAL DISTRIBUTION** Farm labour is concentrated in the Mashonaland Provinces²⁵ (Central, East and West), accounting for about 65 percent of the total farm labour force. This is followed by Manicaland (16 percent), Matabeleland North and South and Midlands (6 percent) and Masvingo (10 percent).

Structural changes in farm labour have been most pronounced in the Mashonaland and Manicaland Provinces, which experienced phenomenal growth in horticultural production for export (see Annex 4). Also wildlife farm tourism has grown in strength in Mashonaland. In 1983, close to 73 percent of the labour force in Mashonaland was permanently employed, declining to 54

²³ Percentages in parentheses indicate the row percentage within each category. For example in 1996, the 92 percent under the males represents the proportion of males in the permanent employee category.

²⁴ FCTZ, 2001, 2002; MPSL&SW, 2001.

²⁵ 75 percent of Zimbabwe’s prime agricultural land is located in the Mashonaland provinces and these provinces have the largest number of LSCF and the bulk of surplus smallholder producers (Moyo, 2000).

percent by 2000, while in Manicaland, the casual labour force grew from 26 percent to 59 percent during the same period. In Matabeleland North and South, and Midlands, where extensive cattle ranching was the dominant farming activity before the economic reform programme, structural changes in agriculture were not as pronounced as in the Mashonaland provinces, although there was a dramatic increase in wildlife ranching from 1991. Hence casual labour grew from 21 percent in 1983 to 36 percent in 2000 in these regions.

- **DISTRIBUTION BY NATURAL REGION**²⁶ Analysis of the farm characteristics of a sample of 581 farms, which were among the 1 471 farms designated by the government for compulsory acquisition in 1997, shows that farm labour varies directly with the agro-ecological region. There seems to exist a strong relationship between the average labour establishment per large scale commercial farm and the potential of the agro-ecological region in which it is located.

Farm labour decreases as one moves from Natural Region I to V (see Annex 5). Agricultural labour is concentrated in the regions (I, II and III) of intensive agricultural production and is minimal in the extensive regions of production, which are dominated by cattle and wildlife ranching (IV and V).²⁷ This is true for both forms of agricultural wage employment, permanent and casual labourers.

3.2.2 Commodity Wise Distribution

Farming enterprises have different labour requirements.²⁸ Farms that are involved in plantation crops (coffee, tea and sugar) tend to have the largest labour establishment (USAID, 1998). Annex 6 shows that, aside from plantation crops, farms engaged in tobacco and wheat production have the highest average permanent labour establishment, while those involved in beef have the lowest.

Disaggregating by gender shows that female labour establishments for both permanent and seasonal categories were almost the same for all enterprises, save for cotton, coffee, tea and sugar where there had at least 1.7 times more female seasonal labourers than in other enterprises. More women than men are usually employed as cotton and coffee pickers during peak harvesting periods, which are usually exclusively casual jobs.²⁹

3.3 Wages and Benefits

The pre ESAP period was characterised by rising real wages in the agriculture and mining sectors (Annex 7). The introduction of economic reforms was accompanied by a

²⁶ Zimbabwe is partitioned into five natural regions based on the climatic conditions for agricultural production (Vincent and Thomas, 1962). Natural Region I receives the highest rainfall. The annual rainfall received decreases as one moves from Natural Region I to V and so does the intensity of agricultural production.

²⁷ For detailed analysis of farming patterns by agro-ecological region, see Muir (1994).

²⁸ The least profitable yields per ha of the following crops; wheat, sugar and cotton grown on a large scale require 20, 150 and 38 labour days respectively (CFU, unpublished records). Thus labour establishment per farm depends on the enterprise mix.

²⁹ Women are mostly employed as casual farm labourers (see Section 3.1.3) and also because of a widely held notion that they are better harvesters than their male counterparts.

drastic decline in real wages in all sectors of the economy, including agriculture, mining and the manufacturing sectors.

Between 1990 and 1997, real wages in the agriculture sector declined by more than 1.6 times. Although constituting the bulk of the formal wage employment, workers in the agriculture sector are the least well paid. For example, in 2001, the lowest paid employee in all other sectors earned three times more than the lowest paid employee in the agricultural sector (Table 5).

3.3.1 *Real Wages of Commercial Farm Workers*

Since the colonial period, farm labourers have been the worst paid in the formal employment sector.³⁰ While there have been minimum wages in all other sectors of the economy since 1934, there had been none for the agriculture sector (Clarke, 1977). Post independence wages were set in terms of the Minimum Wages Act of 1980 by Government, until ESAP introduced collective bargaining as a method of wage setting. Employers and employees strike wage deals under collective bargaining method through their respective organisations.

In 1980, farm workers were earning an average Z\$ 30 per month. After independence, there were substantial increases in farm worker wages but, by 1987, the nominal wage of Z\$ 85 per month was worth Z\$ 2.91 at constant 1980 prices (Amanor-Wilks, 1995; Kanyenze, 2001). Real wages in the sector have fluctuated between 1996 and 2001 (Table 5). While nominal wages increased by 440 percent during this period, real wages actually declined by 20 percent. Between 1996 and 1998, real wages increased from about Z\$ 360 to Z\$ 424, an increase of about 18 percent. In 1999, real wages declined by 27 percent compared to the previous year, but reached their highest level of Z\$ 433 the following year, before declining by a third a year later.

Table 5 Minimum Wages for the Agriculture Sector and Averaged Minimum of Other Sectors in Zimbabwe, 1996-2001 (Z\$ per month)³¹

Year	Agricultural Sector		Other Sectors	
	Nominal Wage	Real Wage	Nominal Wage	Real Wage
1996	359.35	359.35	818.00	818.00
1997	503.09	423.25	1169.00	983.48
1998	664.08	424.08	1484.00	947.69
1999	763.69	307.70	2266.00	913.01
2000	1 676.72	433.00	3970.00	1 026.31
2001	1 932.00	290.45	5953.00	894.97
2002	7 500.00	483.50	?	?

Source: MPSL&SW (2001)

Minimum wages from the collective bargaining exercise only protect permanent workers, and thus exclude contract/casual or seasonal agricultural workers. The farm worker survey carried out by the Ministry of Public Service, Labour and Social Welfare (MPSL&SW) in 2001 showed that 71 percent of farmworkers had a monthly wage of Z\$ 1 000 to Z\$ 1 999, conforming to the minimum wage of Z\$ 1 932 as at 2001. Only 3

³⁰ Clarke, 1997; Amanor-Wilks, 1995; Moyo et al, 2000; Sachikonye, 2003.

³¹ Wages are for the lowest grade. Real wages are calculated at constant 1996 prices (1996=100)

percent had incomes above the minimum wage. The 2001/02 collective bargaining exercise had proposed to peg the minimum wage at Z\$ 4 300, a figure which most farmers had already been paying (Sachikonye, 2003). But, because of the hyper-inflationary environment in Zimbabwe, the new minimum wage was, in real terms, only worth Z\$ 277.21 at constant 1996 prices.

Although farm workers are being paid nominal wages above the minimum wage, these were not enough to meet their subsistence requirements and compare poorly with the Poverty Datum Line (PDL).³² About 70 percent of the farm workers fell below the PDL of Z\$ 980 per month for an average household of 4.6 persons in 1997, while average monthly wages were about 51 percent of the PDL. This is consistent with Kanyenze's (2001) finding that farm worker wages were 50 percent of the PDL in 1990. The non-viability of farm worker livelihoods is critical in assessing the income losses resulting from job losses in the post FTLRP period.

To supplement their wage earnings, farm workers are involved in other income generating activities.³³ These activities generate between 15 percent and 20 percent of total household monthly income (FCTZ, 2001). In some instances, farmers provide subsidised food to cushion their workers. According to a FCTZ survey in 2002, 42 percent of the farms in Mashonaland West provided subsidised maize meal. Some farmers also allocate farm workers land to engage in their own production. In addition, some farm workers still maintain a rural communal home as a fallback position. About 40.5 percent of the male permanent employees maintained a communal area home according to a 1998 survey (Vhurumuku et al, 1998), a pattern that is crucial to understanding their post 2000 fate.

Most organisations³⁴ involved in the collection and analysis of commercial farm worker data do not disaggregate wage earnings of commercial farm workers by gender. But, since women constitute the largest proportion of the casual workers and only about 10 percent of the permanent wage labour force in agriculture, it can be deduced that women are paid less than men. Casual labour is usually paid far less than permanent workers. The discrimination against women has been acknowledged in the literature.³⁵ In fact, the low wages in some female headed households have driven them to resort to coping strategies that represent disruptions to societal norms, such as prostitution among seasonal female workers to support themselves between cropping seasons (Amanor-Wilks, 1995).

The nominal and real terms value of farm wages or the costs of these to their employers have thus been consistently low, as reflected also in the precarious living conditions of this population. Farm workers have always been undervalued and vulnerable.

³² The PDL measures the income required to meet the basic needs of a family of average composition and size. It is a useful tool for assessing the adequacy of current farm worker earnings. The PDL is calculated by the Poverty Assessment Study Survey (MPSL&SW, 1977)

³³ These include subsistence cropping on the farm, piecework on neighbouring farms, poultry keeping, petty trading, gardening and gold panning.

³⁴ For example, ALB, CSO, FCTZ, FEWS and Save the Children (UK).

³⁵ Amanor-Wilks, 1995, 1996; Rutherford, 2002; Sylvester, 2000.

3.3.2 *Effects of Globalisation on Agricultural Wage Employment*

The conditions of farm worker labour have increasingly been affected by globalisation³⁶ since ESAP began. Workers were largely affected through the liberalisation of the labour market, which encompassed new flexible labour arrangements that largely favoured employers. ESAP made it easy for employers to ‘hire and fire’ workers through the new regulations introduced during the reforms (Kanyenze in UNDP, 1999). With Zimbabwe increasingly integrated into the regional and global economy, farm workers have paid dearly with their jobs and declining wages. Because of the new agricultural export drive, the vagaries of international market pricing of tradable agricultural commodities has had a direct bearing on farm workers (Oxfam, 2002).³⁷ When prices fall on the global market, farmers pass on the effects to farm workers in the form of reduced wages and retrenchments.

While the pre ESAP period was characterised by a growth in real average earnings in the agricultural sector, the post ESAP period has been characterised by a rapid decline. At constant 1980 prices, real average earnings per month for farm workers were about Z\$ 164 in 1982 and by 1997 were Z\$ 79, but profits were increasing (UNDP, 1999). Profits as a share of the GDP rose from a level of 47 percent in 1987 to reach 61 percent in 1997, while wages fell from 54 percent to 39 percent during the same period (UNDP, 1999) (Table 6).

In addition to job losses, farm workers also paid dearly through the loss of job security. In a bid to evade paying extra labour costs tied to permanent wage employment (pensions, medical aid and housing), employers responded through the casualisation of the labour force (Amanor-Wilks, 1995; UNDP, 1999; Magaramombe, 2003).

Table 6 Functional Distribution of Gross Domestic Income, 1987-1997 (%)

	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997
Wages	54	49	47	47	43	43	40	37	40	37	39
Rent	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2
Profit	47	51	52	53	58	57	60	63	52	63	61
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: UNDP, 1999.

The loss of jobs in the agriculture sector was not only as a result of farmers hedging themselves against the vagaries of the international market, but also as a result of the new demands of export oriented agricultural production, requiring higher labour productivity in response to the incentives involved.

³⁶ ‘Globalisation’ is loosely defined as “the export of capital” (UNDP, 1999: 9). Economic performance in a country is now not only determined by domestic policies, but also to a large extent by international or external forces. The economic development paradigm has shifted from the ‘state intervention model’ to ‘free market model’. The Government of Zimbabwe embraced economic reforms under pressure from the IMF and World Bank in 1991.

³⁷ Although export oriented land uses, which include horticulture, wildlife tourism and ranching, flourished under ESAP through expansion in both area and export receipts, benefits in the form of wages were not transferred to the workers (Amanor-Wilks, 1995). Wages remained at the same level as other sub-sectors in agricultural production. For a detailed analysis of changes in land use as a consequence of globalisation, see Moyo (2000).

3.3.3 *Employment Benefits*

In addition to their monthly wage, farm workers have access to a number of other benefits, including housing, food rations, fuel for cooking and lighting, recreational facilities and on-job training in the various specialist areas of agricultural work. In 2000, the basic income of farm workers was Z\$ 1 650 a month, to which free accommodation, fuel for cooking and lighting, and transport were added. Direct wages contributed 61 percent of the total basic income, while the remainder came from other employment benefits.

Farm workers are usually resident on the farms on which they are employed. A small percentage of their houses comprise of brick under asbestos and brick under thatch, brick under iron/tin sheets, while most are of pole and dagga and other forms.

Farm workers may also have access to individual plots for their own use, buy subsidised maize meal on farms and/or be provided with food rations. Plot sizes usually range from 0.2 ha to 0.6 ha (Rutherford, 2002; Vhurumuku et al, 1998).

3.4 Skills and Quality of Agricultural Labour

Farm worker skills were categorised in a collective bargaining exercise through the National Employment Council (NEC) for the Agricultural Industry. All farm workers belong to one of the grades 1 to 7, ranging from the least skilled general hands to the highest level, which comprises head clerks (tea estates), senior medical orderly and maintenance operative.³⁸

Using data from the CSO on earnings and minimum wage settings from the NEC for the Agricultural Industry for the year 2000, permanent farm workers were classified into their respective grades (Table 7).³⁹ The bulk of farm workers (82 percent) belonged to the unskilled and semi-skilled range (Grade 1). The proportion of permanent farm workers in each respective grade decreases as one moves towards the most skilled workers.

Table 7 National Wages, Skills and Income, 2000

Grade	ZW\$ per Month		Total Workers	
	Minimum Wage	Adjusted Wage	Number	% of National
1	1 000.43	1 500.0	132 770	81.5
2	1 114.75	1 750.5	18 176	11.1
3	1 152.88	2 250.5	6 759	4.1
4	1 179.08	2 750.5	2 669	1.6
5	1 205.28	3 250.5	1 555	1.0
6	1 236.25	4 000.5	1 909	1.1
7	1 374.41	4 250.0	3 446	2.1
Total			167 284	

Source: Derived from CSO (2001).

Thus, less than 12 percent of the farm workers were formally classified as 'skilled' (Grade 3 upwards) and an equal percentage is viewed as 'semi-skilled', meaning that it is

³⁸ For a detailed description of the skills, see Annex 8.

³⁹ Most of the non-permanent workers belong to Grade 1.

only among about 20 percent of the farm workers that key skills and higher value livelihoods have been potentially at risk of loss since 2000.

3.5 Poverty and Rural Labour

These data suggest that farmworkers have been amongst the poorest in Zimbabwe, although there are no more recent official figures on poverty amongst them since than those in the 1995/96 Poverty Assessment Survey Study (PASS).⁴⁰ Recent literature has acknowledged the prevalence of poverty among agricultural workers⁴¹ but falls short of giving estimates. Income Poverty was measured by PASS using two poverty lines – the Food Poverty Line (FPL) and the Total Consumption Poverty Line (TCPL)⁴².

According to PASS, 61 percent of the households in Zimbabwe were classifiable as ‘poor’ and 45 percent as ‘very poor’. More specifically, 56 percent of the farm worker households on LSCF were classified as poor, compared to 82 percent and 88 percent in the communal and resettlement areas respectively (CSO, 1998b). The same study also shows that female headed farm worker households are the hardest hit by poverty. A disaggregation by the type of employment status did not give rise to different estimates between permanent and casual agricultural workers. Poverty is more prevalent in the communal areas than amongst farm worker communities in the LSCF areas. As a proportion of the PDL they have been declining rapidly, from about 60 percent in 1990 to 24 percent in 1999 (Kanyenze, 2001). Wages have been eroded by inflation, which accelerated during the ESAP and post ESAP period.⁴³ The PDL is also expected to have risen with inflation, and it is very likely that the number of commercial farm worker households that have fallen below the poverty line has also increased.⁴⁴

4 OVERALL IMPACT OF FTLRP ON AGRICULTURAL WAGE LABOUR

Farm workers were largely sidelined by the land reform programme through out the 1980s and up until a shift in policy in the late 1990s (Moyo et al, 2001), when farm workers were incorporated as a resettlement target (GoZ, 1999). Since then, the government, through the MPSL&SW, has been involved in assessments of the impacts of land reform on farm workers following the GoZ gazetting of 1 471 LSCFs for resettlement in 1997. Since the new fast track land reform process, a number of stakeholders, including the General Agricultural and Plantation Workers Union of Zimbabwe (GAPWUZ) and NGOs involved in farm worker rights and welfare, have expressed concern over Government’s inadequate effort to address the needs of farm workers.

⁴⁰ MPSL&SW (1998).

⁴¹ GTZ, 1999; FTCZ, 2000; 2001; Magaramombe, 2001b; Moyo et al, 2000; Sachikonye 2003; Save the Children Fund, 2002.

⁴² The FPL represents the cost of a basket of basic food needed by an average person each year, whilst the TCPL is a combination of the FPL and non-food items (clothing, housing, education, health etc.). If the income per person fell below the TCPL, the household was classified as ‘poor’ and, if it fell below the FPL, the household was classified as ‘very poor’.

⁴³ Between 1990 and 2001, annual inflation rose from 16 percent to 72 percent. More recently, it has surpassed the three digit mark and is now pegged at more than 200 percent.

⁴⁴ Recent studies on farm workers have shown that they are involved in other income generation outside their employment activities to supplement their wages (see Section 3.4).

With the introduction of the FTLRP in July 2000, the land needs of farm worker communities seem not to have been adequately addressed. It is alleged that about 150 000 farm workers' families⁴⁵ have been severely affected by the programme and that only 10 percent have been offered resettlement on farms where they are already employed (Kibble and Vanlerberghe, 2000). Many are said to face the threat of losing their homes, their communities and their livelihoods. To date, the plight of the 300 000 farm workers⁴⁶ and their 1.5 million dependents is not well known, but it is claimed they are the hardest hit by Zimbabwe's FTLRP (ibid). Five farm workers and five farm owners have lost their lives since 2000, while job loss affected the livelihoods of many.

Others note that "effort to ease land hunger [in Zimbabwe] through the current land reform programme have accelerated squatting, unemployment, and destitution especially amongst farm workers". (FES and FWAG, 1998:1). A member of the Cabinet Committee on Resettlement and Development also acknowledged that current government policy does not address the problem of displaced farm workers because the assumption has been that the resettled new landowners will re-engage the farm workers as labourers (ibid). Our assessment shows that some of the former farm workers have been re-employed by new farmers, remaining LSCFs and state farms, others have relocated to their communal areas, some have stayed on the farms they worked on and some have migrated to the informal settlements that have emerged since the beginning of the FTLRP. In addition, a few have been reportedly returned to their foreign homes of descent in Mozambique, Malawi, Zambia, etc. This study on the impacts of the FTLRP assesses the destinations of the displaced former farm workers.

The pattern of impact on former farm workers varies widely among districts, depending on their nature of agricultural activities, the scale of farms, their vicinity to the communal areas and other local economic and social dynamics. For instance, in the Chikomba case study, we found a broadly based distribution of former farm worker destinations (Table 8).

Table 8 Status and Destination of Former Farm Workers in Chikomba District, 2003

Status	Number	Percentage (%)
Allocated Land	123	20
Re-employed		
State Farm	100	17
New Farms (Model A1 and A2)	none	none
Relocated to other LSCF	60	10
Relocated to Communal Area	302	50
Squatting	18	3
Total	604	100

Source: Field Evidence

Forty seven of the former farm workers have been visibly accommodated in the new agrarian set up, disaggregated as follows; allocated land (20 percent), re-employed (27 percent) and another 3 percent estimated to be squatting in the Charter Estate and in peri-urban Chivhu. But in other districts, such as Chiredzi and those in the Eastern Highlands,

⁴⁵ An estimated 50% of the total number of farm workers employed in the LSCF sector.

⁴⁶ Estimated total number of farm workers employed in the LSCF sector.

more farm workers remained employed within the farms. The specific impacts of the FTLRP on the former farm workers are discussed in the three sub-sections below.

4.1 Employment Status of Farm Workers

The employment status and livelihood of former farm workers is one of the most critical variables assessed by most studies on the impacts of the FTLRP. There has been an outcry in media reports and by NGOs and civil society that farm workers have lost their jobs in large numbers following the expropriation of the former LSCFs for resettlement. Assessments of job losses have been measured only in the context of the former LSCFs but losses or gains in employment should be considered from a wider perspectives that includes remaining white LSCFs, indigenously run farms, state owned farms and new farms (model A1 and model A2). A broader context to analyse the losses or gains in the employment in the agrarian sector should consider job losses by former farm workers in the old LSCF versus the 'new' farm workers who have been engaged by the new farmers, as well as their re-engagement on the remaining LSCFs not acquired by Government, indigenously owned LSCFs, state farms or as new farmers in their own right. This critical issue has been largely ignored by most recent, studies evaluating the effect of the FTLRP on former farm workers. However it important to note that any analysis on the losses or gains can only be tentative during this transitional period, because both uptake of land and establishment of production are yet to be normalised and the situation may still change.

The large agro-industrial estates (sugar, coffee, tea and forest plantations), which employ higher averages⁴⁷ of farm workers than other LSCFs, were the least affected by the land resettlement programme (Moyo, 2003). Currently, it is estimated that over 85 000 fulltime farm workers are still in employment (Magaramombe, 2003 quoting CFU, 2003), of which the greater proportion works on agro-industrial estates. Thus the majority of former farm workers who have lost their jobs worked on farms with lower permanent farm labour forces (maize, beef, tobacco and wheat) compared to the plantation estates mostly located in the Eastern Highlands (Manicaland Province) and the Lowveld (Masvingo Province) (Moyo, 2003).

Of the remaining 85 000 full time workers who lost their jobs, some have been re-engaged in various sub-sectors, state, model A2, indigenous farms and remaining white LSCFs. Moreover, many of these have been re-employed on a part time basis. In Zvishavane District for instance, all former farm workers remained with their employers after the expropriation of LSCFs for redistribution, except for just two workers who opted to be resettled under the FTLRP.⁴⁸ A 50 percent loss of farm workers' jobs⁴⁹ is commonly cited but gains through the creation of new jobs for new farm workers are ignored and other forms of employment, such as piecework or *maricho* have largely been considered as 'unemployment'.⁵⁰ In other parts of the country, such as Midlands Province, job losses by former farm workers have been minimal (Provincial Land

⁴⁷ See Annex 6.

⁴⁸ The high retention of former farm workers by previous employers in the Midlands Province is because the government policy of 'one man, one farm' was practiced. In cases were a farmer had one farm, they retained a portion of the farm and multiple owners relocated to their other farms.

⁴⁹ FCTZ, 2001; 2002; Sachikonye, 2003, Zimbabwe Community Development Trust, 2003.

⁵⁰This issue is explored further in Section 5.1.

Committee, 2003), since most were retained by former employers and thus additional employment has been created by the FTLRP as new farmers hired labour outside the existing former farm workers.

Former farm workers who have been re-engaged to work with non-estate LSCF sector have been employed most often as contract/casual or seasonal workers in their new positions. For instance, before the FTLRP there were 465 (73 percent) permanent and 168 (27 percent) casual farm workers in Chikomba District (FCTZ, 2002). It follows that, as result of the FTLRP, the majority of former farm workers who have not been re-engaged in Chikomba have lost their job security and employment benefits associated with permanent positions. The government run Charter Estates, which absorbed most of the former farm workers in Chikomba, drawing close to 40 percent of its labour force from former white owned LSCFs (annex 9), has re-employed only managerial and administrative staff (about nine posts) in permanent positions at the present moment. None of the former farm workers from the Chikomba District was engaged as a permanent employee. The management running the Charter Estate was brought in from other ARDA operations. Thus, we find a new agricultural employment structure accompanying the changed agrarian structure, in which more new potential employers have emerged, including model A2 farmers, ARDA, and remaining large scale commercial and indigenous farmers (Annex 9).

There appears to be a general increase in the number of people who are employed in commercial agriculture following the resettlement programme, be they former farm workers or new farm workers. Case study evidence from Chikomba District shows that there was a net increase in commercial agricultural labour as a direct result of the FTLRP, encompassing both new farm workers employed and former farm workers re-engaged to work on the state run farm (Charter Estate) and indigenously owned and remaining LSCF. Excluding indigenously owned farms, there has been a 256 percent increase in the number of farm workers in the district (an increase from an estimated 604 farm workers on LSCFs before the FTLRP to a new total establishment of 2 155 farm workers on new farms and the state run Charter Estate). Of the increased new farm labour totals, 94 percent represents a gain in farm worker employment since they are new jobs created by the land redistribution programme, while 5 percent were already farm workers. On one farm with a total employment establishment of five farm workers, four of them were former farm workers from Chikomba District.⁵¹ But, their employment status and conditions were not clear and the workers themselves did not know whether their positions were permanent or not.

Other former farm workers, including those now self-employed as beneficiaries of land from the FTLRP, are providing 'consultancy labour services' to new farmers at a fee, especially in the area of cattle disease diagnosis and treatment, at UITYKIK farm in Chikomba.

In some cases farm workers were reported to have relocated with former employers to their other farm or business interests. Retention of former farm workers by previous employers has also been reported on wide scale in Midlands Province (Provincial Land Committee, 2003). At Charter Estates (Chikomba), the former farm manager is reported

⁵¹ The farm is involved in extensive beef production; with herd of 200 cattle on an 800 ha.

to have relocated with about 10 percent of the former farm workers from the total establishment to his wildlife interests in Chiredzi and, at another farm, the whole labour force of fourteen workers relocated with the former employer to the owners' other farm in the district.

There also seems to be an emerging pattern whereby new farmers are bringing their own labour instead of hiring the available labour of former farm workers from expropriated farms. The new farm workers are usually members of the farm owner's extended family. In these circumstances, re-absorption of former farm workers on new farms has been minimal, but the situation is different in other districts. For instance, in Chegutu, Kadoma and Kwekwe, an estimated 50 percent of former farm workers are still employed and, of these, 40 percent are employed by new farmers (ZCDT, 2003).

There are various reasons given for the non-engagement of former farm workers by the new farmers. Former farm workers have been largely viewed as opponents of the FTLRP, because of the role they played during farm occupations; the route used by the majority of the model A1 beneficiaries before they were officially resettled through the District Councils. During the farm occupations, workers tended to protect the employers' property, hence the existing animosity between them and new model A1 farmers. For the model A2 farmers, this seems to be a case of general mistrust; the need to employ someone you have character references for. On one hand new A2 farmers accuse farm workers of anti-social behaviour (theft, tree cutting, poaching, gold panning, prostitution etc.). Whilst on the other hand farm workers accuse new farmers of being bad employers who pay paltry and infrequent wages. Also the former farm workers, having been in employment, are relatively aware of the labour laws and the conditions (wages and benefits) under which they are supposed to work, and this has made them less attractive to new farmers.

In some districts there have been overall gains realised in agrarian employment through the new jobs created by the FTLRP for new farm workers, since job losses in the former LSCF sector are offset by additional jobs created on the new farms. Excluding the indigenously owned farms where some of the former farm workers are reportedly engaged, evidence from the Chikomba case study is that an additional 2 035 new jobs were created. Some of the former farm workers are now in non-wage self employed agricultural production in the communal areas where they relocated and had access to land. Even if these are measured as job losses, former farm workers lost only 362 jobs yet over 2 000 new jobs were created for new farm workers. However, in other districts there were net job losses.

4.2 Land Allocation to Farm Workers

There is a national perception⁵² that very few former farm workers benefited from the FTLRP as new landowners. This view is bolstered by official GoZ statistics, which show that only 2 percent of the total beneficiaries of the model A1 by mid 2002 (2 087 former farm workers out of 110 885 beneficiaries) were former farm workers.⁵³ These GoZ figures suggest that only 0.6 percent of the former farm workers accessed land through

⁵² Especially in media, NGO and civil society circles.

⁵³ Ministry of Local Government, Public Works and National Housing, 2002 quoted in Magaramombe, 2003.

the land redistribution programme. The rate of land allocation to former farm workers varies in different parts of the country.

In Goromonzi, official records show that 1.5 percent (26 former farm workers out of 1 719 beneficiaries of model A1) of the beneficiaries of the land resettlement programme were former farm workers (Marongwe, 2003) at an average of 1.8 former farm workers per farm on the 47 farms expropriated for redistribution. The rate of land allocation to former farm workers in the Midlands Province was very low, according to both field evidence and official data from the Provincial Land Committee report on the FTLRP. Based on four districts, the average rate of land allocation to former farm workers was 0.46 per farm, Gweru (0.5), Kwekwe (0.19), Mberengwa (1.2) and Zvishavane (0.11). These estimates calculated from official data are in agreement with another field study on four farms in Kwekwe and Gweru where only one out of 150 beneficiaries was a former farm worker (Shiku, 2003).

Table 9 Farm Worker Resettlement in Model A1 in Chikomba District

Name of Farm	Total No. of Plottolders	No. of Farm Workers Resettled	% of Farm Workers Resettled	Average Plot Size (Ha)
Ingulubi ⁵⁴	145	8	5.5	30.00
Uitky	21	2	9.5	15.00
Bathest	46	6	13.0	30.00
Nyatsitsi	62	4	6.0	4.25
Total	274	20	8.5	

Source: Field Surveys

While official records, from the Chikomba District Council for instance, show that only 12 former farm workers (0.36 percent of the beneficiaries) out 3 292 new farmers in model A1 were beneficiaries of the programme, field evidence shows otherwise (Table 9) since more than 5 percent of the beneficiaries of model A1 farms were former farm workers. Chikomba had, on average, 3.3 farm workers per farm, while official data suggests 0.32 per farm. There is a huge disparity between official records from the District Council, in which twelve former farm workers are said to have benefited on 37 farms, and our field data which show 20 benefiting on only six farms. This suggests that a number of farm workers benefited from the FTLRP through their communal areas 'disguised' as peasant farmers. However, it is important to note that our sample might be an over representation of the situation of former farm workers since Chikomba District, where most of the former farm workers are from communal areas and surrounding districts, provided greater opportunity for this form of land access.

Projecting our field findings of a land allocation rate of 3.3 former farm workers per farm on 37 expropriated farms shows that potentially an estimated 123 former farm workers could have benefited from the FTLRP in Chikomba District. This implies that, potentially, about 20 percent of the former farm workers from expropriated farms were allocated land. This figure could actually be higher if farm workers on farms not expropriated for resettlement are considered since some of them also received land. These figures confirm field interview statements from the District Council that many

⁵⁴ Ingulubi Farm consists of three farms that were combined for resettlement purposes.

former farm workers who had nowhere to go after farm expropriations were allocated land.

Thus, among beneficiaries of the model A1 resettlement, based on field evidence, an estimated 8.5 percent were former farm workers, compared to official figure of 2 percent. Taking this into account, we estimate that at least 5 percent of the beneficiaries of the model A1 resettlement are former farm workers. Since farm workers constitute about 10 percent of the rural population, the estimated level of 5 percent of the total beneficiaries implies that their land quota was not that low. In Mazowe District, where an estimated rate of land allocation of 8.1 former farm workers per farm was found (Magaramombe, 2003), they constituted 16 percent of the total beneficiaries of the FTLRP, but within their class they only amounted to 2.3 percent of all former farm workers on expropriated farms.

Although some former farm workers who benefited from the land reform programme practice farming in their own right, preliminary field findings show an emerging pattern of maintaining employment contacts as a strategy to cushion themselves from poverty. A case in point is the government run Charter Estate, where close to 60 workers have plot holdings acquired during the FTLRP within and outside the district. This dual 'belonging' is not new to farm workers as their spouses maintain their plots during their absence. Thus, during the rainy season there is a critical shortage of labour in general as workers engage in their own agricultural production.

Another reason for engaging in multiple jobbing by farm workers is the fact that their specialist skills are mostly in areas not dominant in new resettlement schemes, which are mostly maize focused. This leads them to contract themselves out on short assignments whenever they are needed since there is a mismatch of skills deployment.

4.3 Residential Uncertainty and Relocation to Communal Areas

The FTLRP has had numerous effects on the residential status of former farm workers, who have resided on their employers property for the greater part of their employment life. Some farm workers have been forced to move off the farms to make way for new settlers under either the A1 or A2 models, while some are still resident on farms acquired under FTLRP, either as squatters or in agreement with the new owners. Those displaced in this manner are often stranded on the outskirts of the farms or they trek to the fast growing 'informal settlements' where social conditions are desperate. Others with ties in the communal area have relocated there.

Various studies,⁵⁵ have exposed the potential problem of farm worker displacement, although these have no in depth analysis of the precipitating factors, the possible magnitude, the time scale of this displacement and the possible destinations of displaced people. Neither do they consider the capacities of the destinations to hold increased populations, or the capacities of central and local government, NGOs and civil society to manage the displaced farm workers (Zimbizi, 2000).

⁵⁵ For example, Sachikonye and Zishiri (1999), Zishiri (1999), Magaramombe, Waterloos and Muti (1998) and the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare (1998).

Although new farmers in the former LSCF have displaced former farm workers from their previous homes, the ‘squatter problem’ is varied and, in fact, seems to be limited. For instance, in Chikomba District, it is limited to a section of the Charter Estate and an indigenously owned farm which was not gazetted for resettlement, where farm occupiers are still waiting to be allocated land elsewhere by the District Council. These are mostly people from outside the district and they include former farm workers estimated to be about 3 percent of the previous commercial agricultural labour establishment. Farm workers remaining on farms are those who have been allocated land under the FTLRP, re-engaged to work or both.

There are claims by Rural District Council (RDC) officials in Mberengwa District, for example, that no former farm worker has been left homeless or destitute as a result of the land redistribution programme. The Chikomba District Council also made this claim. There were no informal settlements in Chikomba, although these have sprouted since the onset of the FTLRP in other districts, such as in Chihwiti and Gambuli informal settlements in Chinhoyi, where an estimated 51 percent of the households were former farm workers in the district (Save the Children Fund and FCTZ, 2002).

Former farm workers in other districts, such as Seke, Hwedza, Esigodini and Marondera, mainly remained in the former LSCF areas, only migrating temporarily within these confines to informal settlements, sought work on new farms and remaining LSCFs, and some simply stayed put on the farms they used to work on with various arrangements in existence with the new farmers.⁵⁶ In Mazowe District, only 3 percent of the former farm workers were reported to have relocated to their communal homes. Most of those former farm workers who did not access land under the FTLRP and remained in the former large-scale commercial farming areas are migrant workers with no links to the communal areas.

Evidence from our case studies, for instance the one in Chikomba District, shows that 50 percent of the former farm workers on expropriated farms went to the communal areas (Table 8). This supports arguments of the ‘peasantariat’ nature of former farm workers, through ties with the communal areas.⁵⁷ They belonged to two communities, the LSCF and the communal area, mainly because close to 50 percent of the former farm workers were employed on a part time basis and practiced their own agricultural production in their communal areas. This is consistent with our earlier argument that at least 50 percent of the former farm workers were part time workers with links to the communal area, especially in a district like Chikomba. This category of former farm workers already had access to land before the FTLRP, although questions might be asked about the size and quality of their landholdings in the communal areas to provide a sustainable livelihood.

Our findings support an earlier study by FCTZ in 2002, in which it was found that the most widely proposed and/or current destination after the FTLRP in Mashonaland East was the communal areas (about 46 percent) and Chikomba District was cited as having the highest number of former farm workers who indicated they would relocate to the communal areas. While in other provinces, the highest proportion of former farm workers

⁵⁶ FCTZ, 2002; Magaramombe, 2003; Sachikonye, 2003; Save the Children Fund and FCTZ, 2002.

⁵⁷ USAID, 1998; Moyo et al, 2000; AIAS and KWA, 2002.

indicated they would remain within the LSCF areas e.g. Mashonaland West (56 percent), Mashonaland Central (45 percent) and Manicaland (54 Percent) (FCTZ, 2002).

This is because, contrary to the widely held perception that former farm workers are of foreign origin, most workers in the previous LSCFs are not fully foreign, as was the case in Chikomba District they were mostly from communal areas within the district and communal areas from surrounding districts (Chihota, Buhera, Gutu, Mwenezi, Masvingo and others). Given this dual belonging, many former farm workers have resurfaced in the new resettlement areas as they were given land as peasants through their chiefs in the communal areas.

4.4 General Social Impacts of FTLRP on Farm Workers

In 2002, the GoZ gazetted Statutory Instrument 6 to cater for the terminal benefits and entitlements of farm workers affected by compulsory farm expropriations to cater for their transition from their former jobs. The farmers were obliged to pay their former workers retrenchment packages.⁵⁸ The magnitude and scale of payments varies widely by district.

Sachikonye (2003) estimated that only 23 percent of the former farm workers had received their severance packages countrywide. Other evidence (ZCDT, 2003) in Kadoma, Chegutu and Kwekwe districts also found only 21 percent had received their packages from former employers. Very few former farm workers received their terminal benefits and, because the retrenchment packages were closely linked to their low wages, the majority (74 percent) even among those former farm workers who were paid used the bulk of the money to meet their food requirements, while some used it for various other purposes, including school fees, lobola, asset accumulation, etc. (ibid).

The retrenchment packages of former farm workers did not last long enough to secure their future livelihoods after the farm. Some are reported to be living under desperate conditions and have resorted to other alternative legal and/or illegal sources of income. The situation is even more critical for part time workers who were not eligible for terminal employment benefits. Former farm workers are suspected of being involved in antisocial activities, such as theft and prostitution, in resettlement areas to eke out a living (see Magaramombe, 2003; Midlands Provincial Land Committee, 2003). Some are also reported to have joined the band of illegal gold panners, further exacerbating environmental degradation. In Kadoma District for instance, gold panning is the major source of income for 46 percent of the former farm worker households (ZCDT, 2003).

The state has tended to view the provision of health and educational services to farm workers as the responsibility of the RDCs and farmer/employers. Unfortunately, the Councils had limited financial resources, being dependent on rates from the farms, government grants and vehicle taxes, which were inadequate to meet the construction

⁵⁸ The following were due to the employee compulsory land acquisition; severance pay equivalent to full wages of the employee for a period of three months prior to termination of employment, wages in lieu of notice under the contract of employment, an amount equivalent to twice the employee's current monthly wage for each completed year of continuous service, Z\$ 5 000 for relocation and gratuity on termination of employment in terms of Agricultural Industry Agreement (GoZ, 2002).

costs of the schools and clinics needed. Councils spent most of their income on road construction and maintenance and it was found that thirteen of them provided no such services at all (Auret, 2000).

Access to social services among the former farm workers has further deteriorated as a result of the FTLRP, especially for those who have been displaced. Schooling rates have always been lower in the farm worker community, even before the land redistribution programme. For example in 1997, only 59 percent of the children of farm workers attended primary school, compared to 79 percent and 89 percent in the communal and urban areas respectively (Sachikonye and Zishiri, 1999). Schooling rates have worsened since the FTLRP. There was an estimated primary school dropout range from 15 percent to 55 percent in Manicaland (Sachikonye, 2003). The major reasons for dropping out of school were the inability to pay school fees after the breadwinners lost their jobs and, for those displaced, schools were sometimes located very far away from their new residential places.

Health centres have always been limited and located far away from the LSCF areas. Farm worker households were usually served by mobile clinics, which visited on a monthly basis. In addition, most farms employed a farm health worker (close to 60 percent of the former farm workers had access to a health worker before the FTLRP). The functions of the farm health worker were broad, ranging from basic primary health care, hygiene, to HIV and AIDS awareness among farm workers. The provision of health services and other community support systems, which received support from the former employers, has been disrupted by the land reform. A survey by FCTZ in 2002 showed the level of basic primary healthcare had decreased among farm worker households. For instance, 42 percent of the mothers knew how to prepare sugar and salt solution used to treat diarrhea, a decline from rates of above 60 percent in the late 1980s. Incidences of infant mortality have increased and the situation is worse for displaced farm worker households. At an informal settlement in Macheke, 33 percent of the households had lost a child under five years to sickness (Sachikonye, 2003). Health facilities are now available off-farm at government or council run clinics, but these can be as far as 50km and are, therefore, practically inaccessible. HIV infection rates were estimated to range between 20 and 36 percent in the commercial farms before the FTLRP (Mutangadura and Jackson, 2001) and, in the absence of awareness programmes and given the prevalence of activities such as prostitution driven by the need to sustain livelihoods after job losses in the LSCF sector, infection rates are bound to increase (see Magaramobe, 2003).

Despite these overwhelming social problems, some of which had been in existence in the LSCF sector before the FTLRP, humanitarian assistance to the former farm workers, especially among the vulnerable groups, has been limited to only very few NGOs (e.g. FCTZ and Save the Children Fund). Coupled with the loss of employment and a devastating drought, food insecurity has reached alarming levels among the former farm workers who used to rely on their employers for subsidised or free food rations. At least 75 percent of the former farm worker households have been estimated to be food insecure (Sachikonye, 2003). Former farm workers are reportedly not benefiting from government food relief programmes. For instance, in the Kadoma, Chegutu and Kwekwe districts, less than 25 percent benefited from the scheme, while another 21 percent had received food assistance from NGOs, with the rest having to meet their own needs under difficult circumstances (ZCDT, 2003).

For those former farm workers who have been resettled and/or re-engaged by the new farmers, their integration in these new societies has been very poor. They have largely been excluded in the new settler associations and thus have no influence in developmental activities in their areas. Neither have RDCs been able to reach out to the new resettlement areas. Where they have been employed, the landlord-labour tenant relationship that existed in the former LSCFs under what was termed ‘domestic government’ (Rutherford, 2000 in Moyo, 2003) has largely been replaced by the new social patronage systems in low paying and less secure jobs

5 NEW LABOUR PROCESSES IN RESETTLEMENT SCHEMES

5.1 Structure and Forms of Employment

The changing agrarian structure has been accompanied by a shift in the demand for and utilisation of farm labour. New forms of employment have emerged in resettlement areas. Although part time farm workers constituted a significant proportion of the total number of farm workers, casualisation of labour has increased on both new farms and remaining white and indigenous LSCFs. Remaining large scale commercial farmers are usually not operating to full capacity and have therefore casualised their labour force, while the undercapitalised new farmers cannot afford to pay the benefits associated with permanent employment. According to Sachikonye (2003) and the Zimbabwe Community Development Trust (ZCDT) (2003) part time workers have been the hardest hit by the FTLRP, as permanent workers were converted to casual labour replacing them in their positions in the remaining LSCFs. Employment conditions have greatly deteriorated and there are usually no employment contracts on the new farms (model A1 and A2). Under these new forms of employment in the new resettlement areas, the employer’s social responsibility for worker welfare has diminished considerably.

Table 10 Labour Usage in New Resettlement Areas in Chikomba District

Category	Number of Employers	Avg Labour Per Farm	% of Farm Hiring Labour	Total Labour Demand
Past Scenario Old LSCF	42	12	100	504
New Scenario Model A1 ⁵⁹ (Self Contained)	3 142	1	50	1 571
New Scenario Model A2 (Current Uptake)	167	2	100	334
New Scenario Model A2 (Optimal Uptake)	309	2	100	618

Source: Field Evidence

The demand for labour was estimated to be more than threefold higher than the pre FTLRP era, even at the current level of land uptake of in the model A2, which stands at about 54 percent in Chikomba (Table 10). Although, demand for labour has increased as a result of the FTLRP, former farm workers have not been absorbed in the labour sector in the new resettlement areas in the district. There were, on average, two farm workers permanently residing on the plot in model A2 farms, while in A1 schemes, about 50

⁵⁹ Land uptake in the model A1 has already reached optimal level (100 percent occupancy).

percent of the farmers hire ‘permanent’ labour at a rate of one farm worker per farm (Table 10).

Former farm workers involved in the provision of piecework to new farmers have been considered as ‘unemployed’ and lowly paid.⁶⁰ But piecework is indeed a ‘form of part-time employment’ and in some instances, where specialised skills are being deployed, it pays much more than a full time job. At Charter Estate in Chikomba District, one of the former farm workers employed as a casual workshop assistant claimed to earn Z\$ 30 000 per month on specialised piece jobs (repairing tractors and windmills) to new model A2, indigenous and remaining large scale commercial farmers. This amounts to 2.7 times the monthly farm worker salary of Z\$ 11 000 per month.

Unlike the in the old LSCFs, where farm workers were graded according to their skills, as per NEC for the Agricultural Industry guidelines, with a defined employment contract and rewarded accordingly, no such systems exist in the new resettlement areas at the moment. However, there seems to be implicit grading via differential wages paid for specialised short time work. In no case of plottolders and their employees in either model A1 or A2 interviewed during our field research, was there an employment contract between the employer and employee. There are no clearly defined employment terms on new farms, but workers reside on the farm. It may be plausible to term this ‘permanent employment’, since they are paid wages at the end of the month.

5.2 Wages Paid, Negotiations and Alternative Incomes

The poor employment conditions outlined in the previous section are also reflected in the wages paid to the ‘new farm workers’ in resettlement schemes. Although employment conditions and remuneration for former farm workers have always been poor, they have worsened since the FTLRP. The situation for the new farm workers has not been any better.

Evidence from Magaramombe (2003) and Sachikonye (2003) suggests that wages are usually below the stipulated minimum and former farm workers re-engaged to work on new farms are earning less than their previous establishments with a diminished set of benefits. A recent survey by ZCDT (2003) in Kwekwe, Kadoma and Chegutu reported a 50 percent drop from the level of their previous wages for former farm workers employed by new farmers. Our field evidence corroborates this.

Field findings in Chikomba show that most workers were paid a cash monthly salary and other benefits. Earnings are below the stipulated minimum wages gazetted by the NEC for Agricultural Industry of Z\$ 9 500 per month for the lowest grade, which mainly consists of unskilled workers. The majority of workers in the new resettlement areas are unskilled. Monthly salaries for new farm workers range between Z\$ 5 000 and Z\$ 10 000 per month. The government run Charter Estates rewards workers according to the wage schedules gazetted by the NEC for the Agricultural Industry. In addition, all commodities produced on the farm are sold to workers at a subsidised price (normally half the price sold to outsiders), and housing, transport to the medical centre, contributions towards funeral expenses and subsidised school fees for workers’ children are among the benefits.

⁶⁰ FCTZ, 2002; Magaramombe, 2003; Rutherford, 2002; Sachikonye, 2003.

The employer determines wages and no formal wage negotiation mechanisms exist, particularly for unskilled workers. Determination of wages has mostly been linked to how much the new farmers can afford or are 'willing to pay' their farm workers, not to statutory requirements. There is no defined set of benefits for farm workers in new resettlement schemes. They do exist but they differ across farms and are difficult to quantify. In cases where the employer is resident on the farm, workers in most cases are provided with food and housing together with the employer's family. The most common type of housing that exists in the resettlement schemes is the pole and dagga type, while brick housing facilities are confined to very few plots in either models A1 or A2. Some employers use these benefits to justify paying their workers less than the statutory requirements. Where the employer is not resident on the farm, in addition to housing, employees are provided with monthly food rations (usually maize) and vegetables grown on the farm. The employer usually brings food rations at month end. Fuel for firewood is available on-farm for use by both the workers and employers. Workers benefits are usually limited to food, fuel and housing with other benefits such as health insurance and leave days not being common.

Even before the FTLRP, farm workers, especially those employed on a part time basis, had always relied on alternative sources of income to supplement their wages.⁶¹ With the loss of their jobs, it has become increasingly necessary for some former farm workers to rely entirely on alternative source of incomes for their livelihood. Alternative jobs that former farm workers are involved in include gold panning, fishing and petty trading (Magaramombe, 2003; Sachikonye, 2003). The number of former farm workers engaged in gold panning has been on the increase in districts in which mineral resources are present, such as Kadoma and Shurugwi (Provincial Land Committee, 2003; ZCDT, 2003). In Chikomba District, one of the most important alternative sources of income for former farm workers has been associated with infrastructural development, especially the construction of homesteads. Because of the huge demand, as new farmers set up infrastructure including their houses and other farm structures, building has become an important alternative for those former farm workers who possess the appropriate skills.

5.3 Skills, Technology, Labour Management Processes and Commodity Wise Labour Use

The utilisation of the agricultural skills and experience of former farm workers in new farms is evident, albeit on a limited basis. New farmers rely on former farm workers to augment their labour pool when there is an increased workload and also for the provision of skills that they might not use constantly but only require for specific assignments over a short space of time. Former farm worker skills are also being utilised as they practice farming in their 'own right' as beneficiaries of the FTLRP.

The utilisation of former farm workers in new resettlement areas has been limited to providing piecework on a part time basis. Former farm workers who have been retained in the new agrarian structure as farmers in their own right are also not utilising some of their specialist skills. Former farm workers have been allocated land in the model A1 scheme, where traditional cropping is common, yet their skills maybe in extensive beef production and specialised commercial crops. The strained relations between former farm workers and their counterparts from the communal areas, where their skills could

⁶¹ See Section 3.3.1.

beneficial in the new farming communities, is another reason that these skills are not being put to use.

Also deserving mention is the fact that farm workers resettled in model A1, although they are resource poor just like the peasants, have not benefited from the government input schemes in support of the agrarian reform for cropping and livestock. The Agricultural and Rural Development Authority (ARDA) and Grain Marketing Board (GMB) ran the cropping input scheme, while the Livestock Development Trust (LDT) for cattle, focused on the more integrated groups of beneficiaries. Although we could not establish their fate in private sector initiatives, indications are that the farm committee structures, which are influential especially when input schemes follow the group format such as the one run by FSI Agricom, former farm workers have generally been marginalised.

Technology in the new resettlement schemes, in both models A1 and A2, has become more labour intensive, more or less mirroring the scenario in the communal area. Farmers in the model A2, and to lesser extent in the model A1, rely on hired mechanisation to carry out ploughing. The District Development Fund (DDF) and ARDA are the major sources of tractors for ploughing, although there also exists inter-farmer arrangements. In Chikomba, there is an estimated average of three tractors per ward, encompassing both models of resettlement. In model A1, farmers mainly use ox-drawn implements (plough, harrow, cultivator etc.) for their farming operations. In Chikomba District, for example, only an estimated 10 percent of farmers possess the basic equipment for expanded cropping, while the rest have to hire from their counterparts or else are benefiting from government initiatives such as the free tillage programmes. Even some farmers in the model A2 use labour intensive, ox-drawn implements for their cropping activities. About 60 percent of the model A2 farmers in Chikomba District are estimated to possess the basic resources for farming, but still require a large component of hired mechanisation.

The new resettlement farms are owner managed, just like the old large scale commercial operations, the only difference being that most 'new farmers' from the model A2 are middle class professionals working in the urban centres and do not reside on the farms.⁶² This is also the case to some extent on the model A1 farms, where there are also absentee owners working in towns, although not usually in high paying jobs. At one of the model A1 farms sampled in Chikomba District, only six out of a possible 21 farmers were permanently residing on the farms, while the rest were employed and lived in towns. Non-resident plot owners usually come during weekends and at month ends to assess farming operations. The process of hiring experts in the form of farm managers is almost non-existent in the new resettlement areas. Workers who are resident on farms have little or no decision making powers on operations and have to wait for the plot owner for direction. This presents a lag in decision making and can have disastrous consequences in areas where communication between the workers and the owner in the urban areas is difficult.

The old large scale commercial farmer tended to divide their employment establishment according to agricultural products i.e. an employee would be permanently stationed in the dairy or tobacco section. The division of labour by specialisation is not yet being

⁶² At one model A2 farm (Hazeldene), absentee ownership was as high as 90 percent, i.e. out of eighteen plots only two plotters were resident on the farms.

practiced in new resettlement areas during this transitional phase, due to the limited diversification of production. The division of labour along product lines has also been limited to the very few farms involved in tobacco⁶³, dairy and specialised crops, such as paprika, even in the old LSCF areas in Chikomba. As agricultural diversification⁶⁴ proceeds and farmers increase the product lines they are involved in, perhaps the division of labour might occur.

6 CONCLUSIONS

The situation of former farm workers before the FTLRP, which forms the benchmark for any impact assessment has not been well-analysed in the literature, and this renders the analysis of the impacts after the land redistribution programme unclear. The pre 2000 situation provides the basis against which potential effects of the land reform programme can be measured. It is very important to accurately represent the situation of former farm workers because of the divergences that exist between official GoZ data and that generated by independent NGOs involved in the representation of farm workers' interests.

There has been overestimation of the total number of the former farm workers employed in the LSCF sector and exaggeration of their foreign origination. At the same time, some aspects have been understated or misrepresented. For instance, in terms of the form of labour, the majority of job losses have been measured as permanent losses, in actual fact, the loss of fulltime and part time farm workers jobs has been almost equal. There is also a lack of differentiation of the quality of agricultural labour. Very few of the former farm workers are skilled and failure to acknowledge this has led to overstating of the losses of skills as a result of the FTLRP. In addition, other studies on the impacts of the land reform on the former farm workers lack clear analysis of the distribution of labour among regions and crops. This is important in order to disaggregate the nature of losses among provinces, agro-ecological regions and crops. For instance, the large agro-industrial estates, mainly located in the Eastern Highlands and the Lowveld (sugar, tea, coffee, forestry etc), which had a higher concentration of farm workers, were largely not affected by the land redistribution programme and still retain most of their labour force. Other commodities (maize, beef, wheat etc.) with lower farm worker concentrations, mainly in the Mashonaland provinces, incurred a lot of job losses. Another area which has been overstated are the income losses of former farm workers. In fact, there existed very few viable livelihoods among the former farm workers given that the wages of the majority were below the PDL even before the land redistribution programme.

While official GoZ statistics, media reports and NGO comments suggesting that below 2 percent of the beneficiaries of the redistribution programme were former farm workers, field evidence suggests an average of 8 percent, and as high as 10 percent in some districts. However, in some areas, former farm workers have been completely marginalised from accessing land. It is also important to note that a proportion of former

⁶³ Out of the 42 previous old large scale commercial farmers, only five were involved in tobacco production.

⁶⁴ In the last agricultural season, the majority of farmers in the new resettlement area grew an average of two crops, mostly maize and another crop, in addition to cattle production.

farm workers already had access to land in the communal areas, although there are concerns around its capability to sustain their livelihoods.

The retention of half of the former fulltime commercial agricultural labour force is not widely. While it also seems that up to 15 percent of the former part time farm workers have been re-engaged, but in diverse farms beyond model A2 that include state, indigenous and remaining the LSCFs. The retention and re-engagement of former farm workers varies by province, agro-ecological region and commodity type.

The destitution and homelessness among former farm workers as result of the FTLRP seems not to be high. There are few informal settlements, but squatting is also limited to various areas where there are higher proportions of migrant workers. At least 25 percent of the former farm workers have relocated to the communal areas. Also, there exists an overlap between the communal areas and access to land in the new resettlement areas, since some of those former farm workers who initially relocated, registered and received land through their traditional chiefs.

There has been a loss of skills and experience of the former farm workers in the new resettlement areas because of low re-engagement on new farms. The majority of farm labourers in new resettlement areas are ‘new farm workers’ with agricultural experience from the communal areas. The size of farm worker force has expanded because of the introduction of new agricultural wage labour, although this could mask a net loss in terms of skills and experience. Where former farm workers have been allocated land, there is usually a mismatch in skills deployment because of land use changes, since their specialist skills are in areas not common in model A1 resettlement schemes.

Both new and former farm workers in model A2 are less protected than those in new indigenous, state and remaining LSCFs. The model A2 farms are characterised by low wages and poor employment contract and the casualisation of farm labour. The employer’s social obligation for worker welfare has been eroded.

New labour relations have emerged on resettlement farms. The ‘domestic government’ of the old LSCF has been replaced by a new social patronage governance system where, in most cases, the workers on new farms are distant relatives of the owner.

In concluding, it is important to note that the land and agrarian reform are in a transitional phase and it requires concerted government, private sector and NGO collaboration to address existing problems, which range from inequitable access of former farm workers to land under the FTLRP to their integration into the new societies.

7 RECOMMENDATIONS

The general strategy is integrated care for resettlement populations in which there is absorption of former farm workers and peasants. Specific recommendations include:

- 1 **LAND OFFERS** There is a need to find ways of giving more land to former farm workers, as both residential and agricultural plots.
- 2 **RELATIONS BETWEEN FORMER FARM WORKERS AND NEW SETTLERS** Coexistence of former farm workers and new settlers should be encouraged to

minimise conflicts. Both parties need to accept the past and this will require counselling and mediation from outsiders. Local committees and development associations should also involve former farm workers, who have largely been excluded. Finally, former farm workers who are second or third generation Zimbabweans should be accorded National Registration Identity so that they can be seen as part of the citizenry.

- 3 **SKILLS, BENEFICIATION AND UTILISATION** There is a need for new farmers to grade and upgrade their workers according to the skills they possess, as per the guidelines of NEC for Agricultural Industry. New farmers should be trained in labour relations especially aspects relating to worker welfare. They should also be encouraged farmers to hire former farm workers so that they can benefit from the skills and the experience these farmers amassed in the old LSCF.
- 4 **WAGES AND CONTRACTS** There is a need to standardise conditions of service and benefits for all farm workers in new resettlement areas. Farm workers should be given at least proforma contracts to increase their job security. Information on statutory wage requirements should be disseminated widely to all new farmers and farm workers. New farmers should be encouraged to engage specialist consultancy labour services at higher rates as per area production patterns.
- 5 **EXCISION OF LAND FOR SATELLITE RESIDENTIAL AND SOCIAL SERVICES** These are needed for former farm workers, new workers, retired workers and non-farm artisans. Social services are required on a per capita basis in new resettlement schemes and should encompass common schools, clinics and business centres. Residential plots should include small gardens.
- 6 **SOCIAL SERVICES PROGRAMMES FOR FARM WORKERS AND NEW SETTLERS** These should include HIV and AIDS education and awareness programmes, and development of recreational and sporting facilities.
- 7 **PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAMMES FOR FARM WORKERS AND NEW SETTLERS** There is a need to introduce public works programmes in the off season to create resettlement infrastructure (roads, weirs, dams, bridges, social infrastructure etc), and to provide more consistent employment opportunities to rural people.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. (1991) 'The Rural Labour Market In Zimbabwe', *Development and Change* 22 pp. 297-320.
- AIAS and KWA (2002) 'Conflict Resolution and Management in the Phase II Resettlement Schemes in Zimbabwe: Case Studies of Fast Track Models, A Concept Note', Harare.
- Amanor-Wilks, D. (1995) *In Search of Hope for Zimbabwe's Farm Workers*, Harare: Dateline Southern Africa and Panos Institute.

- Amanor-Wilks, D. (1996) 'Invisible Hands: Women in Zimbabwe's Commercial Farm Sector', *Southern African Feminist Review* 2(1), pp. 37-57.
- Auret, D. (2000) 'From Bus Stop to Farm Village: The Farm Worker Programme in Zimbabwe', Harare: Save The Children Fund (UK).
- Clarke, D. G. (1977) *Agricultural and Plantation Workers in Rhodesia*, Gwelo: Mambo Press.
- Chambati, W. (2001) 'A Review of Land Reallocation in Zimbabwe: 1980-2000', Working Paper AEE 1/2001, Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, University of Zimbabwe, Harare.
- Chambati, W. and S. Moyo (forthcoming) 'Agrarian Employment Structure: Farm Labour Markets in Zimbabwe', African Institute for Agrarian Studies Discussion Series Paper, Harare.
- CSO (1984) 'Indicator Monitoring Labour Force Survey', Harare.
- CSO (1994) 'Population Census 1992', Harare.
- CSO (1998a) 'Statistical Yearbook 1997', Harare.
- CSO (1998b) 'Poverty in Zimbabwe', Harare
- CSO (2000) '1999 Indicator Monitoring Labour Force Survey', Harare.
- CSO (2001a) 'Agricultural Production on LSCF 2000', Harare.
- CSO (2001b) 'ARDA Estates 1996-2000', Harare.
- CSO (2002) 'Economic Growth, Zimbabwe 1990-2000', Harare
- Dansereau, S. (2001) 'Legacy of Colonialism in Zimbabwe's Labour Utilisation Model: Mineworker's Wages, Skills and Migration', in Raftopolous, B. and L. Sachikonye (eds) *Striking Back: The Labour Movement and the Post Colonial State in Zimbabwe, 1980-2000*, Harare: Press, pp. 221-249.
- FCTZ (2000) 'Survey Of Commercial Farm Worker Characteristics and Living Conditions', Harare.
- FCTZ (2001) 'The Impact of Land Reform on Commercial Farm Workers' Livelihoods, Harare.
- FCTZ (2002a) 'Report on Assessment on Chihwiti/Gambuli Informal Settlements', Harare.
- FCTZ (2002) 'Assessment of the Impact of Land Reform Programme on Commercial Farm Worker Livelihoods', Harare.
- FOST (1998) 'Farm Orphans: Who Is Coping ? A Study Of Commercial Farm Workers and Their Responses to Orphanhood and Foster Care in Mashonaland Central Province of Zimbabwe'.
- GoZ (1999) *National Land Policy*, Harare: Government Printers.
- IMF (2001) *Zimbabwe Statistical Appendix*, IMF Country Report No. 02/126, Washington DC: IMF.
- Kanyenze, G. (2001) 'Zimbabwe's Labour Relations Policies and the Implications for Farm Workers' in Amanor-Wilks, D. (ed) *Zimbabwe's Farm Workers: Policy Dimensions*, Lusaka: Panos Southern Africa, pp. 86-114.
- Kibble, S. and P. Vanlerberghe (2000) *Land, Power and Poverty: Farm Workers and the Crisis in Zimbabwe*. London: CIIR.
- Laver, S. M. L. (1997) 'An Approach to Developing a Community-Based HIV/AIDS Intervention; The Case Of Farm Workers in Zimbabwe'. Unpublished mimeo.
- Leavy, J. and H. White (1999) 'Rural Labour Markets and Poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa', Brighton: Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex.
- Loewenson, R. (1992) *Modern Plantation Agriculture: Corporate Wealth and Labour Squalor*, London and New Jersey: Zed Books.

- Magaramombe, G., P. Waterloos and G. Muti (1998) 'Survey Report of Farm Workers on Designated Farms', Mimeo, Harare
- Magaramombe, G. (2001a) 'Housing, Sanitation and Farm Worker Settlements', in Amanor-Wilks, D. (ed) *op. cit*, Lusaka: Panos Southern Africa, pp. 115-136.
- Magaramombe, G. (2001b) 'Rural Poverty: Commercial Farm Workers and Land Reform in Zimbabwe', Paper at the SARPN Conference on Land Reform and Poverty Alleviation in Southern Africa, Pretoria.
- Magaramombe, G. (2003) 'Resource Base and Farm Production: Farm Labour Relations Use and Needs', African Institute for Agrarian Studies Discussion Series Paper, Harare.
- McIvor, C. (1995) *Zimbabwe: The Struggle for Health: A Community Approach for Farm Workers*, London: CIIR.
- Moyo, S. (1995) *The Land Question in Zimbabwe*, Harare: SAPES.
- Moyo, S. (1998) *The Land Acquisition Process in Zimbabwe (1997/98)*, Harare: UNDP.
- Moyo, S. (2000) *Land Reform under Structural Adjustment in Zimbabwe: Land Use Change in the Mashonaland Provinces*, Stockholm: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.
- Moyo, S., B. Rutherford and D. Amanor-Wilks (2000) 'Land Reform and Changing Social Relations for Farm Workers in Zimbabwe', *Review of African Political Economy* 84(18), pp.181-202.
- Moyo, S. (forthcoming) 'Agrarian Reform, Rural Development and Economic Policy in Zimbabwe', AIAS Discussion Paper, Harare.
- Moyo, S. (2003). "Overall Impact of the Fast Track Land Reform". Harare: AIAS Research Monograph.
- MPSL&SW (1997) 'Poverty Assessment Study Survey', Harare.
- MPSL&SW (1998) 'Farm Workers Survey Report', Harare.
- MPSL&SW (2001) 'Land Reform: A Labour Perspective Farm Workers Survey Report', in Collaboration with International Organisation for Migration, Harare.
- Mugwetsi, T. and P. Balleis (1994) *The Forgotten People: The Living and Health Conditions of Farm Workers and their Families*, Harare: Mambo and Silveira House.
- Muir, K. (1994) 'Agriculture in Zimbabwe', in Rukuni and Eicher (eds), *Zimbabwe's Agricultural Revolution*, Harare: University of Zimbabwe Publications.
- Muir, K. and M. Blackie (1994) 'Commercialisation of Agriculture in Zimbabwe' in Rukuni and Eicher (eds), *op. cit*.
- NEC for the Agricultural Industry, (2001), 'Farm Workers – Farmers the Enemy: a Preliminary Report on the Human Rights Violations on the Farm Workers and Farmers of Zimbabwe as a Result of Recent Farm Invasions', Harare.
- Nyagura, L.M and A.C. Mupawaenda, (1994) 'A Study Of the Factors Affecting the Education Of Women and Girls in Commercial Farming Areas Of Zimbabwe', prepared for the Swedish International Development Agency, Harare.
- Oxfam (2002) *Rigged Rules and Double Standards: Trade, Globalisation and the Fight against Poverty*, Washington DC.
- Rukuni, M., M. Svendsen, R. Meinzen and G. Makombe (1994) *Irrigation Performance in Zimbabwe*, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Zimbabwe.
- Rutherford, B. (2002) 'Labour, Land and Civil Society: the Case of Farm Workers', paper presented at the Institute of Development Studies, Department of Agrarian and Labour Studies, First Annual Colloquium, University of Zimbabwe, Harare.
- Sachikonye, L. M. and O. J. Zishiri (1999) *Tenure Security for Farm Workers in Zimbabwe*, Harare: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung.

- Sachikonye, L.M. (2003) 'The Situation of Commercial Farm Workers after Land Reform in Zimbabwe', (draft) FCTZ, Harare.
- Save the Children UK (2000) *We Learn With Hope*, London: SCF
- Save the Children UK and FCTZ (2001) 'Rapid Household Economy Assessment: Chihwiti and Gambuli Informal Settlements, Makonde District, Mashonaland West Zimbabwe', Harare.
- Sylvester, C. (2000) *Producing Women and Progress in Zimbabwe: Narratives of Identity and Work from the 1980s*, Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Townsend, R. (1999) *Agricultural Incentives in Sub Saharan Africa Policy Challenges*, World Bank Technical Paper No. 444, Washington DC.
- UNDP (1998) *Zimbabwe Human Development Report 1998*, Harare.
- UNDP (1999) *Zimbabwe Human Development Report 1999*, Harare.
- USAID (1998) *Commercial Farm Worker Characteristics and Living Conditions: Results of a Survey of Commercial Farm Owners and Managers*, Harare.
- Vhurumuku, E., M. McGuire and V. Hill, (1999) 'Survey of Commercial Farm Worker Characteristics and Living Conditions in Zimbabwe: Verification Report', ALB, FCTZ, USAID, FEWS, Harare.
- Vincent, V. and R. G. Thomas (1962) *An Agricultural Survey of Southern Rhodesia: Part I Agro-ecological Survey*, Harare: Government Printers.
- ZCDT (2003) 'Report on Internally Displaced Farm Workers Survey: Kadoma, Chegutu and Kwekwe Districts', Harare.
- ZimDev Consultancy (2000) 'Final Report on the Baseline Survey on Commercial Farms', Harare.
- Zimbizi, G. (2000) 'Scenario Planning For Farm Worker Displacement', Report prepared for Zimbabwe Network for Informal Settlement Action (ZINISA), Harare.

ANNEXURE

Annex 1: Imports and Exports, Zimbabwe 1991-2001 (value in US\$ millions)

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
EXPORTS											
<i>Agricultural exports</i>	700.1	531.8	498.6	684.4	718.1	927.2	886.0	793.1	844.4	761.2	769.7
Tobacco	532.4	450.2	366.1	422.5	477.8	702.1	608.6	523.8	612	548.7	550.5
Sugar	51.8	8.0	28.0	92.9	70.0	68.4	80.5	62.9	51.5	59.3	66.7
Maize	36.2	2.7	14.6	57.3	22.3	23.0	36.1	46.4	9.1	0	0
Cold Storage Company Beef	14.3	29.7	52.8	50.6	45.2	29.1	26.4	32.1	32.6	39.7	40.4
Coffee	20.7	7.4	4.1	12.3	27.0	27.2	41.6	51.2	37.2	17.1	7.7
Horticulture	28.3	20.3	19.5	27.1	45.8	53.6	64.8	67.0	82.6	74.8	82.4
Other agricultural	16.3	13.5	21.5	30.0	30.0	24.2	28.0	22.2	19.4	21.6	22.0
<i>Mineral Exports</i>	438.5	353.2	389.1	436.0	520.4	514.2	462.0	382.1	371.8	387.6	337.0
<i>Manufacturing exports</i>	547.9	580.5	652.0	749.6	828.7	845.7	899.7	655.2	623.6	566.6	535.0
Total exports	1686.5	1465.5	1539.7	1870.0	2216.2	2496.1	2423.5	1925.5	1923.7	1791.2	1715.2
IMPORTS											
Food	19.8	321.4	151.4	53.6	98.0	197.9	122.6	108.5	103.1	45.4	127.6
of which the following accounted for:											
Maize and wheat	5.1	238.1									
Tobacco and beverages	6.2	6.9	5.5	8.3	10.8	27.8	34.8	36.4	31.9	21.3	5.1
Crude materials	96.6	108.1	91.1	72.5	92.4	84.1	97.9	92.8	72.5	91.0	45.4
Fuel and electricity	281.4	259.6	281.4	242.3	250.4	289.5	300.9	374.6	301.1	268.9	391.7
of which the following accounted for:											
Petroleum products	276.6	255.4	263.9	216.8	234.9	287.6	299.5	281.3	215.1	231.7	317.3
Oils and fats	22.0	26.1	36.4	41.8	44.4	53.9	39.5	51.2	46.4	23.6	18.0
Chemicals	350.9	261.9	251.8	363.4	366.0	372.9	435.1	419.8	363.1	257.2	187.0
Machinery and transport equipment	882.1	800.0	635.5	929.3	1125.6	1078.8	1141.0	1000.8	752.5	427.0	424.2
Other manufactured goods	504.7	418.4	337.3	511.3	672.2	684.9	765.8	405.7	395.3	242.6	178.9
Total Imports	2163.7	2202.4	1709.4	2222.5	2659.8	2789.8	2937.6	2660.3	2208.0	1462.7	1454.3
As % of total imports											
Food	0.9	14.6	8.5	2.4	3.7	7.1	4.2	4.1	4.7	3.1	8.8
Petroleum products	12.8	11.6	14.7	9.8	8.8	10.3	10.2	10.6	9.7	15.8	21.8

Source: IMF, 2001

Annex 2 Changing Farm Structure, Zimbabwe 1997 vs. 2002

Social Categories	Pre 2002		Post 2002	
	Number	Average Ha	Number	Average Ha
Landless	500 000	-	200 000	-
Peasantry (Pop/middle) (Communal/A1/Model A)	1 100 000	15	1 400 000	20
Small/Medium family farms (SSCF/ Purchase Areas; A2; Peri-Urban)	15 000	100	58 000	75
Large Scale Farms				
White	4 500	2 000	3 000	1 000
Indigenous	750	800	3 000	500
Agro-industrial Estates	500	15 000	200	10 000
Employed Farm Labour (fulltime and part time)	350 000			100 000
Total Farmers	1 120 800			1 464 200

Source: Moyo, forthcoming

Annex 3: Employment by Sector in Zimbabwe, 1991-2000 (thousands of paid employees)

Sector	1991	1995	2000
Agriculture, forestry and fisheries	304.2	334	325
Mining and quarrying	50.9	59	45
Manufacturing	205.4	186	181
Electricity and water	8.9	10	11
Construction	81.0	72	54
Finance	18.2	21	35
Distribution	100.7	101	103
Transport and communication	56.4	51	44
Public administration	94.9	77	59
Education	109.5	116	140
Health	26.5	26	28
Domestic	102.1	102	102
Other	85.3	86	107
Total	1 244.0	1 240	1 234

Source: IMF, 2001

Annex 4: Provincial Farm Labour Distribution in Zimbabwe, 1983-2000

Province	Permanent Workers			Casual Workers			Total		
	1983	1996	2000	1983	1996	2000	1983	1996	2000
Manicaland	22 555	21 324	21 317	7 864	37 964	30 034	30 419	59 288	51 351
Mash Central	27 271	34 352	33 289	10 895	32 267	32 150	38 166	70 619	65 439
Mash East	29 201	30 344	31 354	8 070	27 048	24 252	37 271	57 392	55 606
Mash West	44 499	48 851	49 238	17 150	40 672	37 907	61 649	89 523	87 145
Mat North	4 868	3 367	3 055	775	1 694	1 064	5 643	5 061	4 119
Mat South	6 223	5 497	5 439	2 316	3 148	3 011	8 539	8 645	8 450
Midlands	6 971	5 777	5 587	1 790	3 891	3 668	8 761	9 668	9 255
Masvingo	24 823	18 399	18 180	2 901	15 986	14 334	27 724	34 325	32 514
Total	166 411	167 911	167 459	51 761	162 670	146 420	218 172	334 521	313 879

Source: CSO (1984; 1997; 2000)

Annex 5: Natural Region Characteristics of the 1 471 Designated Farms, 1998

Natural Region	I	IIA	IIB	III	IV	V
Permanent Labour per Farm	174.0	141.0	75.5	42.0	25.0	17.5
Median	100.0	85.0	60.0	29.0	20.5	17.5
Seasonal Labour per Farm	209	70	28	25	28	0
Median	60	30	12	1	5	
Farm Area						
Mean	2 800.3	1 162.2	1 149.8	1 954.2	5 981.3	13 686.2
Median	340.5	982.0	972.4	1 176.4	2 610.0	13 686.2
Number of Responses	39	153	77	91	10	2
Total No. of Farms	55	212	110	187	15	2

Source: CFU unpublished records

Annex 6: Farming Enterprise versus Labour Mix, 1997

Enterprise	No. of Farms	Average No. of Workers			
		Permanent		Seasonal	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Beef	1 205	51.9	7.7	29.7	50.3
Maize	987	58.1	8.2	37.3	62.5
Tobacco	917	65.9	10.1	36.0	62.6
Cotton	191	59.2	8.7	62.6	105.4
Coffee/Tea	35	100.8	18.1	138.4	218.9
Sugar	54	145.3	12.8	111.2	68.2
Wheat	300	67.1	9.8	51.7	79.2
Horticulture	499	56.5	13.0	41.9	62.1

Source: Calculated from USAID (1998)

Annex 7: Indices of Real Average Earnings by Sector, 1980-1997 (constant 1980 prices)

Sector	1980	1990	1994	1997
Agriculture, forestry and fisheries	100	130	75	79
Mining and quarrying	100	116	90	110
Manufacturing	100	103	74	80
Electricity and water	100	94	85	133
Construction	100	78	46	68
Finance	100	93	78	76
Distribution	100	85	58	69
Transport and communication	100	90	61	62
Public administration	100	61	35	74
Education	100	82	49	82
Health	100	90	56	105
Domestic	100	82	31	18
Other	100	80	55	66
Average	100	103	67	88

Source: UNDP, 1999

Annex 8: Farm Worker Skills Characteristics

Grade	Skills Characteristics
1	General farm worker; Herdsman
2	Cutter or stacker – sugar cane; Debarker; Fire lookout – timber; Groom class 1; Vaccinator unqualified; Workshop attendant; Stock attendant
3	Brooder man – poultry; Chainsaw operator – timber; Charge hand (gang supervisor); Groom class 2; Kiln attendant; Houseman – poultry; Maintenance worker; Master blender; Spray operator; Store man (clerk); Tally clerk – timber; Telephone clerk; Workshop serviceman
4	Charge hand – dairy; Crops scout; Driver – large commercial vehicle; Tractor driver; Foreman; Groom class 3; Wages clerk
5	Combine driver; Dozer operator D4 tap; Groom class 4; Lorry driver – heavy duty; senior foreman
6	Clerk class 4 – tea estate; Clinic orderly; Sergeant
7	Head clerk – tea estate; Maintenance operator class 6; Senior medical orderly

Source: CFU

Annex 9: Case Study of New Agrarian and Employment Structure in Chikomba District

	Pre 2000			Post 2000				
	White LSCF	Indigenous LSCF	Estate Farm ⁶⁵	White Old LSCF	Indigenous LSCF	Estate Farm	New Farms ⁶⁶	
							A1 Self Contained	A2
No. of farms	42		1	5		1	3 142	309
Average farm size (ha)	2 900		34 000			8 000	30	98
Average farm labour size	12		100	12		250	1	2
Total farm workers	504		100	60		250	⁶⁷ 1 571	⁶⁸ 334
No. of former farm workers employed						100	-	-
No. of outside workers						100	1 571	334
Difference ex-farm workers and outside workers						10	1 571	334
Ex-farm worker in self employment						50	123	-
Net job gain/loss							1551	

Source: Field Evidence (2003)

⁶⁵ Charter Estate, which was owned and run by the conglomerate Lonhro before the FTLRP, encompassed some 34 000 ha in extensive beef production and game ranching, was acquired by the government and re-employed most of the farm workers previously employed in the white LSCF sector. The government parastatal, Agricultural and Rural Development Authority (ARDA) now runs 8 000 ha of the estate and the rest was allocated to the resettlement programme. ARDA is now involved in mixed farming encompassing extensive beef production with a herd of 750 cattle, maize, tobacco, paprika, potatoes and winter wheat among others.

⁶⁶ A typical A2 farm consists of 15 ha arable land, and 6 ha in A1 farms. The rest is grazing land with an average carrying capacity of one livestock unit to five ha (1LU: 5HA). A 100 hectare plot of grazing area can carry 20 livestock units. One LU is equivalent to 500 kg of live mass. Extensive beef production is not viable in either the new A1 or A2 schemes in Chikomba. In the A1 schemes 50 percent of the arable area is allocated to maize production. Stocking rates are still very low in resource poor model A1 schemes, e.g. a farm of 21 plottolders had a total herd of only 4 cattle. This has been exacerbated by the incidence of foot and mouth disease. Farmers from outside the district are finding it difficult to obtain permission from the Veterinary Services to move their cattle from the communal areas to their farms.

⁶⁷ According to AREX, only 50 percent of new model A1 farmers hire labour for their operations, with the rest relying on family labour.

⁶⁸ The total number of farm workers employed in A2 schemes takes into account the proportion of plots that have been taken up, which was 54 percent in the district at the time of field visits.