



# **Report**

on

## **Assessment of the Impact of Land Reform Programme**

on

## **Commercial Farm Worker Livelihoods**

May 2002

Farm Community Trust of Zimbabwe  
45 Glengary Avenue  
Highlands  
Telephone 498332/326

## **Executive Summary**

Farm Community Trust of Zimbabwe (FCTZ) undertook an assessment of the situation on farms which have been acquired for resettlement under the government sponsored fast track resettlement programme from 10-16 May 2002. The research covered the provinces of Mashonaland Central, Mashonaland West, Mashonaland East and Manicaland.

The research was necessitated by the fluid nature of developments in this sector which made it difficult to make informed decisions on what the current situation is, particularly after the March 2002 presidential elections. Reports from different sources were pointing to rampant closing down of almost all commercial farms and massive displacement of farm workers.

It was therefore necessary to verify the situation on the ground in order to determine the way forward in terms of programming.

### **The aim:**

The aim of the research was to assess the impact of current land reform programme on farm worker livelihoods.

The objectives were to;

- Establish the population and employment status of farm workers prior to the land reform programme on large scale commercial farming areas of Manicaland, Mashonaland East, Mashonaland Central and Mashonaland West provinces;
- Determine the number of farm workers currently living on the affected farms and their employment status;
- Determine trends of movement of farm workers on displacement from the farms;
- Establish the sources of livelihood for farm workers who are either unemployed or are on reduced wages;

Determine access to play centre and schools by the children of farm workers

A rapid assessment at farm level was conducted in the four provinces of Mashonaland West, East, Central and Manicaland provinces.

## **Methodology**

Quantitative as well as qualitative data was collected at farm level from 235 farms representing 10 percent of all farms identified as affected in the four provinces.

Data was entered and processed using SPSS software.

## **Findings**

Generally three scenarios were observed on the farms visited. The first scenario involved farms, which have completely stopped operations. The second involved farms, which have scaled down significantly and are in the process of winding operations mostly in the next three months. The third scenario involved farms, which have been operating near normal but have been served section 8 and given 90 days to wind operations

The research highlights the further deterioration of farm worker livelihoods and increased vulnerability of farm workers in face of land reform. A large number of farm workers, about 50 percent, have lost employment and are relying on charity of farmer and relatives

## **Food security and employment**

The staple food situation on all the farms surveyed was found to be quite critical. Although on some of the farms the farmers had been assisting with subsidised supplies, they had since run out of resources.

There was also a marked decline in maize planting on the affected farms

The unemployed farm workers are in dire need of food aid because they no longer have any alternative source of income with which to sustain themselves. A few of the farm workers managed to harvest some maize from the pieces of land allocated by the farmers and are making do with that but this will last until June at most.

There were also a few cases of provision of subsidised maize by the farmers before the onset of the land reform programme but these had since stopped. Those farm workers who are still on the farms and are unemployed no longer enjoy either of these privileges

A total of 47 240 farm permanent and seasonal farm workers had lost employment but were still on farms at time of research.

## **Displacement scenarios**

Forty-eight percent of farm workers indicated that they will stay on on the farms while 26 percent indicated that they would go to their communal homes. Only 3 percent had been settled at time of survey. A further 18 percent percent had/would move to other farms.

## **Coping strategies**

Coping mechanisms for this sector have been greatly eroded and opportunities for access alternative sources of income have dried out. The future of these workers is uncertain given the present environment where one day they are asked to leave and the following allowed to stay. The type of new farmers in the area largely determines their security.

Most unemployed workers are relying on piece-jobs contributing 52.7 percent of coping strategies sited in all provinces. It is important to note, however the significant over 50 percent on farm workers in Manicaland province, who indicated that they are just sitting and doing nothing.

## **Other services**

Less than 20 percent of farm worker children on all farms surveyed were currently benefiting from supplementary feeding. Supplementary feeding seems to be the first casualty when a farm is affected which can have implications on nutrition levels for children in these communities.

Other services like schooling and health have declined but all farms assessed had access to these either on the farm or off the farm. Over 70 percent of farms visited had access to protected sources of water

## **Recommendations**

The affected farm workers need assistance urgently. The main priority at the moment is food. It is important that interested stakeholders move in swiftly into these areas to avert massive starvation

## **1. Introduction**

Farm Community Trust of Zimbabwe (FCTZ) undertook an assessment of the situation on farms which have been acquired for resettlement under the government sponsored fast track resettlement programme from 10-16 May 2002. The research covered the provinces of Mashonaland Central, Mashonaland West, Mashonaland East and Manicaland.

The research was necessitated by the fluid nature of developments in this sector which made it difficult to make informed decisions on what the current situation is, particularly after the March 2002 presidential elections. Reports from different sources were pointing to rampant closing down of almost all commercial farms and displacement of farm workers.

It was therefore necessary to verify the situation on the ground in order to determine the way forward in terms of programming for FCTZ.

### **1.1 Scenario analysis for farm worker displacement**

The farm worker population in Zimbabwe, currently estimated at two million people, has generally been characterised by poor working and living conditions, poor remuneration, job insecurity, and a lack of residence rights on the farms where they are employed.

This situation has left farm workers extremely vulnerable to any socio-economic /political change. Farm worker livelihoods are hence extremely vulnerable to the impact of both the current political situation in Zimbabwe and the resettlement programme currently being implemented by the Government of Zimbabwe (GOZ).

Previous considerations of the impact of land reform in Zimbabwe have pointed to the fact that the resettlement programme, in its current form, was likely to trigger a large displacement of farm workers (UNICEF 1999, ZINISA 2000, UN 2000). This perception has been based on the fact that the current GOZ policy does not appropriately address the issue of farm worker resettlement or compensation for those farm workers who are likely to be displaced by the land reform programme.

Interviews and interactions with the farm workers, revealed that the majority of farm workers have nowhere to go should they be displaced from their farms. Furthermore, it has been reported that farm workers have not developed plans as to where they would go should they be displaced as part of the resettlement process, although information points to the fact that in the majority of cases the 'farm community' has been quite effective in the development of adaptive movement strategies.

This apparent lack of feasible long-term alternatives for farm workers probably goes some way to explaining the apparent resilience of the farm / farm worker community during the fast track resettlement process. During this period farm workers have become assertive in resisting eviction from the farms where they have lived and worked for a long time.

Some groups have tried to lobby local governing authorities. This strategy has, however, had varying levels of success, and displacement in the face of continued harassment and high levels of violence has occurred in many areas.

The farm workers most vulnerable to displacement have been considered as those farm workers who, although Zimbabwean by naturalisation, are of foreign origin, and who thus do not have land rights in the communal areas, or access to traditional or local government leaders through whom they can be allocated land.

### **The aim:**

The aim of the research was to assess the impact of current land reform programme on farm worker livelihoods.

The objectives were to;

- ❑ Determine the population and employment status of farm workers prior to the land reform programme on large scale commercial farming areas of Manicaland, Mashonaland East, Mashonaland Central and Mashonaland West provinces;
- ❑ Determine the number of farm workers currently living on the affected farms and their employment status;
- ❑ Determine trends of movement of farm workers on displacement from the farms;
- ❑ Establish the source of livelihood for farm workers who are either unemployed or are on reduced wages;
- ❑ Determine the access to play centre and schools by the children of farm workers .

## **2. Background**

According to the 1992 census 1.2 million people live on large-scale commercial farms, representing 11.3 percent of the total Zimbabwean population. The total number of permanent farm workers on all farms was estimated to be in the range of 290,000 to 461,000.

Another survey by FEWS/FCTZ in 1997/98 found that the overall number of permanent male farm workers maintaining a communal home to be 40.5 percent. This ranges from approximately 30 percent in Mashonaland Central, West and East, to 80 percent in Masvingo and the Midlands. The numbers were slightly reduced when including all permanent farm workers.

### **2.1 Ethnicity**

The issue of nationality is very important in determining the possible impact of land reform on farm workers, Zimbabwean farm-workers forming a multi-ethnic community.

Several studies and reports have produced different figures on the composition of farm worker population in terms of origin. The 1998 FEWS / CFU / FCTZ survey reported that, a substantial proportion of farm workers, approximately 25 percent, traced their origins to Zambia and Malawi.

Most farm worker families have been present on the farms since the early 1940s, and most of the current farm workers (92 percent) have hence been born in Zimbabwe regarding themselves

as Zimbabweans. Many farm workers of 'foreign origin' possess identity cards (85 percent in one survey) and birth certificates. Many also have residence permits. However, farm workers of foreign origin have no access or rights to agricultural land, and in addition, unless through marriage, are

unlikely to have links to the communal areas. Although often labelled as 'foreign' or 'alien' hardly any of the farm workers have a base in neighbouring countries.

## **2.2 Land Reform Process**

During the immediate post independence period although farm workers were not considered as a specific category in the resettlement program, they fell into the broad category of "poor and landless" who were the main targets of the initial program. A number of farm workers managed to resettle themselves on abandoned farms and state land in different parts of the country, and were officially recognised as resettlement farmers *ex post* at independence.

However, a shift in land policy in the mid 1980s towards more "efficient" and "productive" farmers resulted in a negative official policy towards farm workers, who became characterised as foreigners, as unproductive and 'persona non grata' on resettlement farms.

It was only in the 1990s when government was reformulating the land policy, that due to the advocacy efforts by the farm workers union, NGOs and academics, that farm workers came to be accepted as a category to be resettled. This resulted in the incorporation into the draft Land Policy Document of 1999, of issues related to the land rights by farm workers, both in terms of residential rights and rights to resettlement under the land reform program.

However with the introduction of the fast track resettlement program in July 2000 the land needs of farm worker communities would seem to have been ignored.

## **2.3 Farm Worker Vulnerability**

Farm workers' livelihoods are inextricably linked with the fate of the farm on which they live and work, and hence are extremely vulnerable to the recent changes brought about by recent political changes and the land reform process. Previously almost all of farm workers' food and cash income was derived from activities on the farm. Their homes are on the farms; and they are paid, in the majority of cases, relatively low wage or get subsidised prices for foodstuffs from the farm store. Some farm workers have also been assisted with access to health and education services.

## **2.4 Geographical Vulnerability**

Analysis of farm worker vulnerability has focused on those areas most likely to be affected by the fast track resettlement programme. Analysis was based on a consideration of those farms Gazetted for acquisition by the GOZ by March 2002.

Analysis of this information indicated that the area most likely to be affected by farm worker displacement was the Mashonaland Region where over 3 000 farms had been earmarked for acquisition.

The impact of the fast track resettlement scheme was predicted to be greater in the Mashonaland region, both due to the high concentration of permanent farm workers living in the region and the low percentage of farm workers maintaining a home in the communal areas.

### **3. Research Methodology**

A rapid assessment at farm level was conducted in the four provinces of Mashonaland West, East, Central and Manicaland provinces.

A comprehensive list of farms acquired for resettlement as at March 31, was obtained from the local government CFU and Agritex. This information was compiled by district for all provinces to be covered. Numbers of farms acquired per district tables were generated. This number came to about 2300 farms. From these a 10 percent sample was picked for the survey distributed proportionately by district.

Provincial coordinators facilitated in identification of the farms on the ground to ensure that all aspects in the farming environment for the relevant provinces were covered. The knowledge of local staff on the ground ensured that possible visits to farms that had not been affected was minimised

A structured questionnaire was administered to a knowledgeable person found on the farm to include the farmer, the farm health worker, the manager or foreman. Crosschecks were also done with farm workers where the key respondent was not very clear

Qualitative information was also gathered from farmers, settlers and farm workers on their experiences, concerns and expectations.

A total of 235 farms were accessed but 216 questionnaires had full information and were used for analysis. Analysis was done using SPSS software.

## **4. Results: Presentation and Analysis**

### **4.1 Overview**

The situation on commercial farms visited differed from province to province. In some provinces like Manicaland and Mashonaland West provinces the environment was calm with the new settlers co-existing with the farmer and the farm workers. In Mashonaland East and Central, however, the situation is more tense with farm workers being constantly threatened with eviction.

Generally three scenarios were observed from the farms visited. The first scenario involved farms, which have completely stopped operations. The second involved farms, which have scaled down significantly and are in the process of winding operations mostly in the next three months. The third scenario involved farms, which have been operating near normal but have been served section 8 and given 90 days to wind operations

In Mashonaland East province, the situation is generally confrontational between farm workers and the new settlers. In Chikomba and Wedza districts, in particular, most of the farm have stopped operations (Chikomba with over 90 percent and Wedza 80 percent followed by Marondera and Seke with over 50 percent). Goromonzi was the least affected with about 20 percent of farms in this category.



In Mashonaland West province, on the few farms where new settlers had moved in, the farmers and the settlers co-existed well. Most of the commercial farmers are still staying on their farms, with some even going ahead with preparations for winter cropping. Those who had cropped their land the previous summer were also busy harvesting or preparing their harvest for the market. Although most of the farms were said to have been demarcated, the settlers had not moved in.

No tension between the three parties was apparent on farms where the settlers had moved in. Those of the settlers who had moved in the previous summer and put in a summer crop were busy harvesting their crop. Generally a lot of farm workers are still on the farms.

The environment in Manicaland province was similar to experiences of Mashonaland West in that the settlers have been allocated a certain portion on the farm under mainly the A2 scheme and are not necessarily interfering with the activities on the farm. Most farms have been subdivided to adhere to the new 400-hectare farm size regulation with the effect that most farmers have scaled down and not completely stopped. The natural casualties are the seasonal farm workers who have lost employment but are still staying on the farms.

About ten percent of the farms in this province have shut down with new farmers moving in but have let most of the farm workers stay. Most farm workers indicate they will stay on these farms awaiting resettlement

In Mashonaland Central, nearly 80 percent of the farm workers have continued to stay on the farms. In Mazowe, Shamva, and Guruve the situation on the ground was found to be quite tense. Most farmers have left and the settlers have moved in but some e workers have remained. The settlers are now threatening the farm workers with eviction. The settlers are increasingly becoming impatient with the farm workers' continued presence long after the farmers who employed them have left.

In Centenary and parts of Bindura district, where most of the farms have been earmarked for model A2, most of the farmers are still on their farms with their workers. The settlers have occupied about 50 percent of the affected farms in Mt Darwin but the farm workers are still on the farms.

Close to eighty percent of the commercial farmers in Bindura have recently been served with Section 8. Only three percent of the farms have benefited from de-listing.

## **4.2 Food Security**

In Mashonaland East province some farmers who grow maize to feed their workers did not harvest much due to the drought. Some farmers are buying grain from the Grain Marketing Board and selling it to the workers. Unfortunately supplies are inadequate to cover the maize needs of the workers.

In Mashonaland West province the staple food situation on all the farms surveyed was found to be quite critical. Although on some of the farms the farmers had been assisting with subsidised supplies, they had since run out of resources. It was also observed that what made the situation even more critical was the abandonment of maize farming by most farmers. It was, however, encouraging to note that FCTZ is quite active on the ground in Kadoma district where supplementary feeding is well established.

In Manicaland province, the unemployed farm workers are in dire need of food aid because they no longer have any alternative source of income with which to sustain themselves. A few of the farm workers managed to harvest some maize from the pieces of land allocated by the farmers and are making do with that but this will last until June at most.

In Mashonaland Central province, farm workers used to be allocated pieces of land by the commercial farmers. On these, they could practice subsistence farming to supplement their incomes. There were also a few cases of provision of subsidised maize by the farmers before the onset of the land reform programme but these had since stopped. Those farm workers who are still on the farms and are unemployed no longer enjoy either of these privileges. Although the province had a relatively good season, the former workers are desperate for food aid.

The food security situation can be indirectly determined by the following indicators; summer crop planting which includes maize; access to free or subsidised maize meal; access to land for cultivation and, particularly for under 5s, if supplementary feeding was currently taking place.

The following table gives a province-by-province overview of the summer cropping situation on commercial farms affected by land reform.

**Table 1: Percent Distribution of Summer Crop Planting by Province**

Province	Summer crop planted		Total percent
	Yes	No	
Mash West	48.9	51.1	100
Mash East	50.0	50.0	100
Mash Central	40.0	60.0	100
Manicaland	80.7	19.3	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>51.4</b>	<b>48.6</b>	<b>100</b>

Fifty percent of farms surveyed in Mashonaland West and East did not plant summer crop while in Mashonaland Central two thirds of the farms did not plant a summer crop. In Manicaland on the other hand, only 20 percent of the farms surveyed did not plant a summer crop. This confirms the fact that Manicaland was the least affected province.

Where a summer crop was planted, two thirds of the farms included maize, which is a staple food in Zimbabwe.

The following table gives the provincial distribution of availability of subsidised maize meal to farm workers.

**Table 2: Percent Distribution of Provision of Subsidised Maize-meal by Province**

Province	Subsidised maize meal provided			Total Percent
	Never	Previous	Currently	
Mash West	27.6	30.6	41.8	100
Mash East	50.0	34.6	15.4	100
Mash Central	50.0	40.0	10.0	100
Manicaland	38.4	30.8	30.8	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>38.4</b>	<b>33.3</b>	<b>28.3</b>	<b>100</b>

Mashonaland West province features prominently in terms of farmer's provision of subsidised maize meal to farm workers with nearly 42 percent of farms accessed having this privilege. This is followed by Manicaland with 30 percent, Mashonaland East 15 percent and Mashonaland Central 10 percent. No free maize meal was given in all provinces surveyed.

Farmers in all provinces indicated that the rations they were getting cannot meet the current demands of the workers. The other important aspect was that only the permanent farm worker was getting a ration irrespective of size of households and all seasonal workers, employed and unemployed were not getting these rations.

**Table 3: Percent distribution of Land for Cultivation for Farm Workers by Province**

Province	Land for cultivation			Total Percent
	Never	Previous	Currently	
Mash West	20.4	33.6	46.0	100
Mash East	44.2	28.9	26.9	100
Mash Central	40.0	27.5	32.5	100
Manicaland	46.2	26.4	26.4	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>33.3</b>	<b>30.5</b>	<b>36.6</b>	<b>100</b>

In Mashonaland West province 46 percent of farm workers had access to land for cultivation with Mashonaland East and Manicaland having 26 percent each, and Mashonaland Central, 33 percent. However, due to the poor rains this year most did not harvest much.

Less than 20 percent of farm worker children on all farms surveyed were currently benefiting from supplementary feeding. Supplementary feeding seems to be the first casualty when a farm is affected which can have implications on nutrition levels for children in these communities.

### 4.3 Employment levels and tenancy scenario

In Mashonaland East province, most farm workers have lost employment particularly where the farmer has left. Less than 10 percent of the original farm worker population remains on these

farms and where employed, are either guarding the farmhouse while the rest r are just sitting in the village because they have nowhere to go.

**Table 4: Summary of Employment and Tenancy Levels by Province**

Province	Permanent workers normally employed	Seasonal workers normally employed	Permanent workers currently employed	Seasonal workers currently employed	Permanent workers who normally lived on farm	Seasonal workers who normally lived on farm	Permanent workers who currently live on farm	Seasonal workers who currently live on farm
Mash East	5 168	4 800	3 693	2462	7 710	4 111	3 918	4 417
Mash West	6855	7930	4151	2472	6640	6818	5362	4 347
Mash Central	3 637	3 550	1 060	457	3 702	3 109	1 952	2 019
Manicaland	1432	1398	1061	505	1325	1102	1198	770
<b>Total</b>	<b>17 093</b>	<b>17 678</b>	<b>9 965</b>	<b>5 895</b>	<b>19 377</b>	<b>15 140</b>	<b>12 430</b>	<b>11 553</b>

**Table 5: Mashonaland East -Employment and Tenure Statistics**

District	Permanent workers normally employed	Seasonal workers normally employed	Permanent workers currently employed	Seasonal workers currently employed	Permanent workers who normally lived on farm	Seasonal workers who normally lived on farm	Permanent workers who currently live on farm	Seasonal workers who currently live on farm
Wedza	246	100	28	10	246	30	28	20
Seke	108	50	68	5	108	30	68	20
Murewa	243	162	116	41	311	94	121	80
Chikomba	465	168	47	3	465	168	49	25
Goromonzi	2 206	2 931	1 714	1 404	2 247	2 652	1 883	3 165
Marondera	2 252	1 389	1 720	999	2186	1137	1769	1 107
<b>Total</b>	<b>5 168</b>	<b>4 800</b>	<b>3 693</b>	<b>2462</b>	<b>7 710</b>	<b>4 111</b>	<b>3 918</b>	<b>4 417</b>

In Mashonaland East province 1953 seasonal and 225 permanent workers have lost employment but are still on the farms translating to 2 147 workers. It was evident though that most of the seasonal workers were wives and children of farm workers. This means if one

assumes that a third of all seasonal workers are not part of the households of permanent farm workers, this translates to 876 farm workers households. Since the above figures represent 10 percent of the total workers for the provinces surveyed this translates to 8 760 household for all four provinces. When this figure is multiplied by average household size of 6 people this gives a total of 52 560 people.

Seke and Wedza districts are currently no longer employing seasonal workers most of whom have moved off the farms.

In Mashonaland West where most farms have been taken under model A2, the farm workers were still on the farms. Some were on reduced working hours, which translated into a cut in remuneration. On farms that had completely stopped operations, the majority of ex-farm workers were staying on the farm in apparent hopelessness, as they were not clear as to where to go.

**Table 6: Mashonaland West -Employment and Tenure Statistics**

District	Permanent workers normally employed	Seasonal workers normally employed	Permanent workers currently employed	Seasonal workers currently employed	Permanent workers who normally lived on farm	Seasonal workers who normally lived on farm	Permanent workers who currently live on farm	Seasonal workers who currently live on farm
Chegutu	1237	1464	775	578	1213	907	779	713
Kadoma	418	876	330	465	417	582	367	593
Zvimba	2245	2150	910	458	2085	2240	1865	1511
Hurungwe	1463	1188	1344	647	1428	1073	1289	910
Makonde	1 492	2252	792	324	1497	2016	1062	620
<b>Total</b>	<b>6855</b>	<b>7930</b>	<b>4151</b>	<b>2472</b>	<b>6640</b>	<b>6818</b>	<b>5362</b>	<b>4 347</b>

Currently there are 1876 seasonal and 1211 permanent unemployed workers staying on the farm. Using the same assumption used for Mashonaland East this translates to 18 360 workers or 110 180 people.

Most permanent farm workers in all province surveyed are still on the farms. The number of permanent farm workers who are currently employed matches closely the number of workers who are still living on the farm. The scenario is different for seasonal farm workers where the number of employees is significantly lower than the number currently living on the farm. This confirms the fact that seasonal workers are the first to lose employment under the current land reform programme.

Most farmers in Manicaland have been left to continue their operations after the downsizing of the farm hectareage. The downsizing has resulted in the scaling down of operations and

subsequent reduction in the labour requirements. However, most of the farmers have retained their permanent workers but have stopped hiring seasonal workers who mostly constituted the permanent worker's spouses and children.

**Table 7: Manicaland -Employment and Tenure Statistics**

District	Permanent workers normally employed	Seasonal workers normally employed	Permanent workers currently employed	Seasonal workers currently employed	Permanent workers who normally lived on farm	Seasonal workers who normally lived on farm	Permanent workers who currently live on farm	Seasonal workers who currently live on farm
Chipinge	30	20	30	0	30	20	30	0
Makoni	781	788	585	300	731	753	614	445
Headlands	150	210	110	45	147	60	147	60
Nyanga	154	80	96	15	100	65	90	15
Rusape	120	60	110	30	120	60	120	40
Mutare	197	240	130	115	197	144	197	210
<b>Total</b>	<b>1432</b>	<b>1398</b>	<b>1061</b>	<b>505</b>	<b>1325</b>	<b>1102</b>	<b>1198</b>	<b>770</b>

In Manicaland province, 265 seasonal and 138 permanent workers are unemployed but staying on the farms sampled. This translated to 13,600 people.

In Manicaland province while the number of employed permanent farm workers are close to those living on the farm, statistics point to the fact that some permanent workers live off the farm. This could be attributed to the geographical location of some farms, which are adjacent to communal lands. The same scenario noted in last province concerning seasonal farm workers applies in Manicaland

In Mashonaland Central, on farms that have stopped operations completely, the farm workers are unemployed but some continue to stay on the farms because they indicate that they have nowhere to go while some have moved to farms that are still operational but still remain unemployed

**Table 8: Mashonaland Central -Employment and Tenure Statistics**

District	Permanent workers normally employed	Seasonal workers normally employed	Permanent workers currently employed	Seasonal workers currently employed	Permanent workers who normally lived on farm	Seasonal workers who normally lived on farm	Permanent workers who currently live on farm	Seasonal workers who currently live on farm
Bindura	550	677	81	45	550	427	287	100
Guruve	625	505	194	110	625	685	229	370
Mazowe	1230	1618	616	212	1395	1603	937	1151
Mt Darwin	144	68	60	20	144	42	60	31
Shamva	421	352	88	30	421	352	266	297
Muzarabani	567	331	31	40	567	333	173	80
<b>Total</b>	<b>3 637</b>	<b>3 550</b>	<b>1 060</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>3 702</b>	<b>3 109</b>	<b>1 952</b>	<b>2 019</b>

In Mashonaland Central province, 892 permanent and 1 562 seasonal workers are unemployed but still on the farms. This translates to about 90 000 people.

Mazoe and Shamva districts have the highest numbers of unemployed seasonal farm workers living on the farm. with both provinces indicating that they have about five times the number of seasonal workers living on the farm but unemployed.

Both permanent and seasonal workers on farms now occupied by settlers and former seasonal workers on farms that are still operating remain in a state of unemployment.

#### **4.4. Coping mechanisms**

In Mashonaland East province, most of the unemployed are doing piece jobs or relying on working relatives for survival. About one third of the farm worker population in this province indicated that they were just sitting at home doing nothing.

In Mashonaland West province, the farm workers who had lost employment and had opted to remain on the farms are engaged in three main activities in order to sustain themselves. The most common and generally acceptable activity was piecework during periods of peak labour on operational farms. Particularly in Kadoma district, a considerable number resorted to illegal gold panning and poaching for both fish and wild animals on those farms that had big dams and engaged in game farming, respectively.

In Manicand province the main coping mechanism emerged as that of engaging in piecework. Former seasonal workers who are mainly spouses and children of the permanent employed workers now entirely depend on the earnings of the household heads or employed members of the households.

In Mashonaland Central, the most popular coping mechanisms involved piecework. The former farm workers hire out their labour to those settlers whose workload would have increased to levels that they cannot cope with. The second most popular alternative means of livelihood is gold panning followed by fishing and lastly vending.

The following table gives the provincial analysis of coping mechanisms of unemployed farm workers

**Table 9: Percent Distribution of :Source of Livelihoods for Unemployed Farm Workers**

Province	Source of livelihood					Total Percent
	Piece-jobs	Gold panning	Fishing	Nothing	Other	
Mash West	46.9	1.0	3.1	37.7	11.2	100
Mash East	55.9	0.0	1.9	32.6	9.6	100
Mash central	70.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	100
Manicaland	43.3	0.0	0.0	53.8	3.8	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>52.7</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>33.3</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>100</b>

Most unemployed workers are relying on piece-jobs contributing 52.7 percent of coping strategies sited in all provinces. It is important to note, however the significant over 50 percent on farm workers in Manicaland province, who indicated that they are just sitting and doing nothing.

#### **4.5 Displacement scenario**

In Mashonaland East province, the displacement scenario varies from district to district with most farm workers in Chikomba and Wedza indicating past and possible movement to their communal areas. The situation differs in Marondera where most of the farm workers have stayed on on the farms because they have nowhere to go or have moved to other farms in the same area in search of employment.

Most respondents for Seke indicated that they would stay on the farm until they are resettled. Some farmers who had more than one farm have moved their workers to the un-designated farms but some have sited capacity problems and cannot absorb an extra complement of farm workers.

In Mashonaland West province some of the farm workers had either moved to nearby farms in search of employment or had some arrangements made by the farmer to work at a relative's nearby farm, which might not have been served with Section 8. In few cases, the farm workers had moved to their rural homes. A common observation was that most of the farms lined up for model A2 resettlement had some farming activities still going on and this tends to give the impression that the situation on the farms is normal. Such situations have the potential of changing abruptly in the event of those allocated the land deciding to move in.



In Manicaland province little movement of farm workers has taken place in the province due to the manner in which resettlement has proceeded. The majority of the farm workers have continued to stay on the farms while retaining their employment status. Those few workers, who moved, did so to other operational farms in the neighbourhood of the affected farms.

In Mashonaland Central province most of the workers do not have rural homes, which explains the highly constrained off-farm movement even after the settlers had moved in. The few who had rural homes have long moved back to their rural homes. Some are now settled in the Mahuwe area of Muzarabani in the Lower Zambezi Valley.

**Table 10: Percent Distribution of Past/Current and Proposed Destinations for Evicted Workers by Province**

Province	Destination for evicted farm workers					Total\ Percent
	Communal	Other farms	Stay on farm	resettlement	other	
Mash West	17.3	16.3	56.1	4.1	6.1	100
Mash East	46.1	17.3	34.6	0.0	1.9	100
Mash Central	35.0	15.0	45.0	5.0	0.0	100
Manicaland	11.5	30.8	53.8	3.8	0.0	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>26.9</b>	<b>18.1</b>	<b>48.6</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>100</b>

In Mashonaland West province close to 60 percent of farm workers indicated that they will stay on on the farms. The peculiar scenario in this province is that the District Administrator has assured the farm workers on farms affected that they can stay on. Four percent of farm workers have been resettled

It is interesting to note that there were no indications of farm workers being resettled in Mashonaland East but the same province has the highest proportion which indicated that they would go to their communal homes, Most of the farm workers who indicated that they would go to the communal areas were in Chikomba and Murehwa districts.

## 4.6 Pre school analysis

The following table gives provincial statistics on pre-schools in the areas surveyed.

**Table 11: Percent Distribution of Pre-school Availability by Province**

Province	Pre-school of farm			Total Percent
	Never	Previous	Current	
Mash West	42.6	30.3	26.1	100
Mash east	26.8	44.3	28.9	100
Mash central	7.5	70.0	22.5	100
Manicaland	42.3	19.2	38.5	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>32.4</b>	<b>38.8</b>	<b>27.8</b>	<b>100</b>

Statistics indicate that less than 30 percent of farms surveyed had a pre school which is currently operating while the other 70 percent had never had one or it had stopped operating. .

Mashonaland West and Manicaland had the highest proportion, about 40 percent, of farms which never had a pre-school, while in Mashonaland Central over 70 percent of the pre-schools have stopped operations

**Table 12: Percent Distribution of Child Vaccination by Province**

Province	Where vaccinated		Total Percent
	On farm	Off farm	
Mash West	27.3	72.7	100
Mash East	23.1	76.9	100
Mash Central	42.5	57.5	100
Manicaland	15.3	84.6	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>27.3</b>	<b>72.7</b>	<b>100</b>

In all provinces most children get vaccinated at centres off the farm with Mashonaland Central putting a good showing on farm vaccinations.

**Table 13: Percent Distribution of Source of Drinking Water by Province**

Province	Source of water		Total Percent
	Protected	Unprotected	
Mash West	79.6	20.3	100
Mash East	96.2	3.8	100
Mash Central	65.0	53.0	100
Manicaland	84.6	13.4	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>81.4</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>100</b>

Most farm workers get their drinking water from a protected source with around 80 percent having access to protected water in all provinces except Mashonaland central where the proportion declines to about 70 percent.

## 5. Conclusions

The research highlights the further deterioration of farm worker livelihoods and increased vulnerability of farm workers in face of land reform. A large number of farm workers, about 50 percent, have lost employment and are relying on charity of farmer and relatives.

Coping mechanisms for this sector have been greatly eroded and opportunities for access alternative sources of income have dried out. The future of these workers is uncertain given the present environment where one day they are asked to leave and the following allowed to stay. The type of new farmers in the area largely determines their security.

Where the farmer is still on the farm and managed to grow a summer crop, the immediate food needs of the farm workers is secured but will run out in next two months. Where the farmer has shut down completely and no summer crop was grown, the farm workers who remain on the farm are desperate for food.

Most farm workers in the provinces of Manicaland and Mashonaland West and some parts of Mashonaland East have managed to stay on the farms where most permanent workers are still employed. The worst affected districts include Chikomba and Wedza in Mashonaland East and Guruve and Muzarabani in Mashonaland Central, where most farm workers have moved out. Indications are that most workers from these districts have moved to communal area.

Most of the farm workers remaining on the farms indicate that they will stay on the farm even if the farm winds off, as they have nowhere to go. This was particularly more so in Mashonaland East districts of Marondera and Seke. The same scenario was observed in Mazoe district of Mashonaland Central province. In Manicaland province most farm workers have rural homes and indicated that they will go there if evicted. Coincidentally Manicaland province seemed to be fairing better than all other provinces in terms of farm worker employment and security. This could be attributed to the fact that most farms were not completely taken over but subdivided with the farmer allowed to operate at a lower scale on part of the farm.

However most seasonal workers have lost employment while those still employed are employed only for the purpose of picking the current crop. Farmers who still employ their permanent

workers are only doing so until they wind up operations or finish harvesting after which they will pay off their workers.

The major farm worker expectations emerged as:

- ❑ To be given resettlement priority on the farms on which they worked/are working;
- ❑ Facilitation of employment elsewhere on farms that are still operational;
- ❑ Change of heart on the part of the government so as to save their jobs.

## 6. Recommendations

Farm workers need food assistance urgently. The dilemma is that the most affected farm workers are not necessarily the most accessible. The situation is such that in three months time farms which have been served with notices will have closed down and the future of the farm workers in terms of tenancy is not secure.

The magnitude of farm workers affected is very large and at worst is estimated at half a million for the four province.

It is not feasible to feed such a large number of people and taking into consideration the fact that the situation is very dynamic these figure can change significantly in the next month or so. This could be due to some unemployed workers moving out and the possible resumption of operations on some farms which will benefit from the recent legislation on removal of settlers on farms not listed. This could mean the number of employed workers might increase.

For the purposes of targeting, the best option is to consider only the unemployed permanent farm workers. The reasons being that most seasonal workers are part of the household of permanent worker. The second reason is that permanent workers are more stable and live on one farm for a long time.

The following is an indication of numbers involved

**Table 14: Summary Statistics of Farm Workers Affected**

<b>Province</b>	<b>Number of sampled workers</b>	<b>Population of affected workers</b>	<b>Total number of beneficiaries</b>
Mash West	1 836	18 360	110 180
Mash East	1 162	11 620	52 560
Mash Central	1 500	15 000	90 000
Manicaland	226	2 260	13 600
<b>Total</b>	<b>4 724</b>	<b>47 240</b>	<b>266 340</b>

The food aid programme will feed 80 000 people representing 30 percent of the above number.

It is therefore necessary to reaffirm the figures with actual registers of farm workers before food is distributed. The challenge is how best to target farm workers who are living in the same compound with new settlers, who are probably the most needy.



12. School operational on farm?

1. Yes 2. No

If yes, number of children enrolled

\_\_\_\_\_

13. Source of livelihood for unemployed workers  
(Rank in order of importance)

piece jobs  
gold panning  
fishing  
Other specify \_\_\_\_\_

	1.Never	2. Previous	3. Currently	4. By Whom?
14. Farm Health Worker employed?				
15. Pre-school on farm?				
16. Supplementary feeding?				
17. Free/subsidised maize provided				
18. Land for cultivation for workers				

19. Where do children get vaccinated? 1.On farm 2.Off farm at clinic 3.Nowhere

20. Source of water for drinking

1.Protected 2. Unprotected

21. Number of working latrines

\_\_\_\_\_