



**UNIVERSITY OF
KWAZULU-NATAL**

**INYUVESI
YAKWAZULU-NATALI**

RESEARCH TOPIC:

The effects of the Fast Track Land Resettlement Programme on family structures and livelihoods: A case study of resettled households in the Masvingo Province, Zimbabwe.

BY

THEBETH RUFARO MUKWEMBI

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

MASTERS OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

In the School of Built Environment and Development Studies

University of KwaZulu Natal

College of Humanities

Durban

South Africa

November 2012

RESEARCH TOPIC

The effects of the Fast Track Land Resettlement Programme on family structures and livelihoods: A case study of resettled households in the Masvingo Province, Zimbabwe.

BY

THEBETH RUFARO MUKWEMBI

SUPERVISOR: PROF. DORI POSEL

DECLARATION

I declare that this dissertation is my own original work that has not been submitted in any form for a degree or diploma to any institution. Any other citations and borrowed ideas have been duly acknowledged by means of complete references. It is being submitted for the degree of Masters in Development Studies in the School of Built Environment and Development Studies, University of KwaZulu Natal, Durban.

Signature:.....:

Date:.....:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was made possible by the grace of God Almighty and the generous contribution and support of many people to whom I owe great thanks and gratitude, but mostly I would like to acknowledge the following people:

- ❖ Professor Dori Posel, my supervisor, for the financial assistance she gave me during the field work. Moreover, I would like to thank her for constructive comments to my work and guidance.
- ❖ All the study participants for their patience throughout the course of the field work; this dissertation would not have been completed without their co-operation.
- ❖ My husband, Dr Simon Mukwembi, for the moral and emotional support, and encouragement on dark days.
- ❖ My children, Peter and Panashe, for their patience and allowing me to take away ‘some of their time’ to work on my dissertation.

May God continue to bless you all!

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AEO	Agricultural Extension Officer
DAO	District Administration Officer
FTLRP	Fast Track Land Redistribution Programme
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GMB	Grain Marketing Board
LHA	Lancaster House Agreement
LRRP	Land Redistribution and Resettlement Programme
MDC	Movement for Democratic Change
MP	Member of Parliament
ZANU (PF)	Zimbabwe African National Union (Patriotic Front)

DEFINITION OF SHONA TERMS

Chipani	four or more cattle that can be used as draught power
Dare	community forum where community issues are discussed
Madzoro	turns taken in herding livestock
Makombo	new resettlement areas
Maricho	providing labour for payment in cash and kind
Mukando	informal savings club
Mushandira	people coming together to assist each other with farm work

LIST OF TABLES AND DISCUSSION BOXES

- Table 4.1 Marital status of participant household heads
- Table 4.2 Percentage of livestock ownership of participant households
- Box 4.1 Livelihood strategies before resettlement
- Box 4.2 Reports on work groups and their effects on household's livelihoods
- Box 4.3 Reasons for less commitment to social work groups

ABSTRACT

Social relations are valued by many in rural settings as they provide strong sources of social support among rural households. Barr (2004) and Dekker (2004a) indicate that such strong social relations exist mainly in small villages where kin and family members stay close to each other. They both highlight the importance of kin networks for most rural families to strengthen their social capital and resource-pooling strategies. Through strong and reliable social networks, people can work together for a common good and improve their well-being. It is therefore important for rural households to live close by their kin and friends so that they can pool resources and help each other in times of need. However, following land reform in Zimbabwe, many people left their communal homes and moved to the resettlement areas. These movements impacted on family structures, social networks as well as the livelihood strategies that were established in the communal areas over the years.

This study investigates how the movement to resettlement areas has affected the day-to-day lives of the resettled families. This question is explored through a case study of resettled households at Dellos farm, in the Felixburg resettlement area in Zimbabwe. Given that their existing social networks were disrupted with the resettlement at Dellos farm, households established new social networks which they now rely on in their daily lives. Although these new networks are not based on kinship, which is regarded as a strong source of social support, they have proven to have great influence on people's livelihoods at the farm. Regardless of the limited support households received from the government and other institutions, their social networks allowed them to improve their livelihoods and in turn improve their social and economic status.

Table of Contents

Research Topic.....	ii
Declaration.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
List of acronyms and definitions.....	v
List of tables and discussion boxes.....	vi
Abstract.....	vii
1 CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	2
1.1 BACKGROUND.....	2
1.2 CONTEXT.....	5
1.3 RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY.....	7
1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	7
1.5 STRUCTURE OF THE DISSERTATION.....	8
2 CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW AND PRINCIPLE THEORY.....	9
2.1 SOCIAL CAPITAL.....	9
2.1.1 SOURCES OF SOCIAL CAPITAL.....	12
2.1.2 SOCIAL CAPITAL AND COLLECTIVE ACTION.....	13
2.1.3 ROLE OF TRUST IN COLLECTIVE ACTION.....	15
2.1.4 ANOTHER VIEW OF SOCIAL CAPITAL.....	16
2.2 SOCIAL RELATIONS AND MUTUAL RISK SHARING ARRANGEMENTS.....	17
2.2.1 SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS IN COMMUNAL AND RESETTLEMENT AREAS.....	18
2.2.2 RISK AND MUTUAL ASSISTANCE IN COMMUNAL AND RESETTLEMENT AREAS.....	19
2.3 LIVELIHOOD STRATEGIES IN RURAL SETTINGS.....	22
2.4 EFFECTS OF LAND REFORM PROGRAMMES ON RESETTLED HOUSEHOLDS.....	25
2.5 CONCLUSION.....	28
3 CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY.....	30
3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN.....	30
3.2 DATA COLLECTION.....	32
3.3 DATA ANALYSIS.....	34
4 CHAPTER 4: STUDY AREA AND RESEARCH FINDINGS.....	36
4.1 HISTORY OF DELLOS FARM.....	36
4.2 GEOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION.....	38
4.3 DEMOGRAPHIC FEATURES OF DELLOS FARM.....	41

4.4	LIVELIHOODS BEFORE RESETTLEMENT	43
4.5	LIVELIHOOD ACTIVITIES ON THE FARM	46
4.5.1	<i>CROP PRODUCTION</i>	47
4.5.2	<i>LIVESTOCK REARING</i>	49
4.5.3	<i>OTHER ACTIVITIES</i>	51
4.6	SOCIAL NETWORKS AMONG HOUSEHOLDS AT DELLOS FARM	51
4.7	EFFECTS OF LAND REFORM ON PEOPLE’S LIVES	58
4.8	CONCLUSION	59
5	CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	61
5.1	CHANGES IN THE LIVELIHOOD STRATEGIES: BEFORE AND AFTER RESETTLEMENT	61
5.1.1	<i>DIVERSE LIVELIHOOD STRATEGIES: LIFE BEFORE RESETTLEMENT</i>	62
5.1.2	<i>FARMING AS A LIVELIHOOD STRATEGY: LIFE IN THE RESETTLEMENT</i>	63
5.2	EFFECTS OF SOCIAL NETWORKS ON SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC LIFE OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS	64
5.2.1	<i>ADVANTAGES OF SOCIAL CAPITAL IN COMMUNAL AREAS</i>	64
5.2.2	<i>LIMITATIONS OF SOCIAL CAPITAL IN COMMUNAL AREAS</i>	65
5.2.3	<i>ADVANTAGES OF SOCIAL CAPITAL AT DELLOS FARM</i>	65
5.2.4	<i>LIMITATIONS OF SOCIAL CAPITAL AT DELLOS FARM</i>	68
5.3	THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN ENSURING THE SUCCESS OF RESETTLEMENT	69
5.4	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	70
6	BIBLIOGRAPHY	72
7	APPENDIX.....	76

1 CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Debates on Zimbabwe's land reform programme have been going on since the country got its independence in 1980. However they intensified from 1997 when liberation war veterans embarked on farm invasions that saw many white farmers losing their land. Literature on the land reform programme that followed from that time focused more on the effects these land invasions had on the nation's agricultural production as well as economic indicators such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP). In this dissertation I will investigate the effects of these invasions on the lives of individual households that resettled as a result of the programme. In essence I will be investigating the effects the Fast Track Land Redistribution Programme (FTLRP) had at a household level. Land reform programmes, especially the FTLRP, saw people moving from their homes in communal areas to the resettlement areas. In the process of doing so their social and economic lives were disrupted, hence they had to establish new ways of living. The aim of this dissertation is to highlight these changes, and to explore how people rebuild their lives in new environments.

1.1 BACKGROUND

Access to land was and will remain at the centre of political, social and economic debates in Zimbabwe. In the words of Moyo (1986 cited in Akwabi-Ameyaw, 1997:438): "(The) land issue is about everything in Zimbabwe". The land issue dates back to the colonial era, and it was one of the reasons for the liberation struggle that gave birth to the independent Zimbabwe in 1980 (Thomas, 2003; Kinsey et al., 2004). According to Thomas (2003: 692) "the land conflict in Zimbabwe should be understood primarily as a legacy of colonialism". Literature has pointed out that it was during the colonial period that African people were dispossessed of their land by the white settlers. After gaining independence it became a priority for the new government to redress the land issue.

During the colonial era in Zimbabwe, then Rhodesia, land was unequally distributed on a racial basis in terms of both the quality and quantity. Indigenous groups were forcibly removed from their original land/ homes to make room for white farmers and in the process

they were stripped of their land rights (Thomas, 2003). Through the Land Appointment Act of 1930 African people were confined to Reserves (now known as the communal areas) which were not very suitable for crop production due to high temperatures and unreliable rainfall (Thomas, 2003). In contrast, white farmers occupied the Natural Regions 1 and 2 that are also classified as agro-ecological zones with fertile soil and adequate rainfall for crop production. Prior to independence, about 15 million hectares of good quality land were owned by 6 100 families of white farmers (Thomas, 2003; Palmer, 1990). In contrast, about 800 000 indigenous families owned 16.4 million hectares of less fertile land (Kinsey et al., 2004). It therefore became the first priority of the newly elected government to redress such inequalities.

In an attempt to settle the land problem and in turn end the war, an Anglo-American ‘Zimbabwe Development Fund’ was established to which Britain agreed to contribute at least £75 million (Palmer, 1990). The funds were to be used for buying out white farmers in order to acquire land for redistribution. However, there was a government change in Britain before the agreement was reached; hence changes were made to the earlier proposal when contending parties (that is, the British and the Zimbabwean sides) sat down at the Lancaster House in 1979. The new British government added some clauses to the original proposal such as the request that the Zimbabwean government guarantee that existing property rights would be observed and that there would be no land expropriation (Palmer, 1990). The two sides made an official agreement at the Lancaster House Conference in 1979.

The agreement, now known as the 1979 Lancaster House Agreement ‘(LHA)’ marked the first move towards the land reform programme in Zimbabwe. Under the LHA it was agreed that some portions of land should be given back to indigenous people through the land reform programme. Clauses stipulated in the LHA were set to bind the land reform programme until 1990; that is, land reform in the first ten years of the country’s independence was directed by the LHA (Palmer, 1990). Land reform during this period was characterised by a market driven approach. During this period farms were only sold on the basis of a “willing seller, willing buyer”. The agreement entailed that white farmers would only sell their land if they were willing to do so, and they were also free to keep it if selling was not favourable to them. In addition to buying land that white farmers were willing to sell, the government could also confiscate farms that were underutilized and use the land for the redistribution programme.

The stipulation of a “willing seller” made it difficult for the government to resettle people at the pace it had envisioned since the number of farms available for sale was very low compared to the amount of land required for the redistribution programme. The government had set a target of redistributing land to 162 000 families within the first five years of the Land Redistribution Programme (LRP). However, given the constraints set in the LHA, only 22 per cent of these families were resettled by September 1985 (Akwabi-Ameyaw, 1997). Most of the landowners were not willing to sell their farms; hence it became difficult for the government to acquire land for resettlement. Palmer (1990) stated that during this time, the land reform programme was carried out in a carefully planned manner since the government did not have enough land to resettle a lot of people at once.

After the expiry of the LHA in April 1990 the government amended its constitution to allow compulsory acquisition of land with compensation under the Land Redistribution and Resettlement Programme (LRRP) (Kinsey et al, 2004; Thomas, 2003). During this phase white-owned farms were appropriated if the owner had more than one farm, if the farm was underutilised or if it bordered on a communal area (Thomas, 2003). In 1997 the government launched LRRP officially and 1 471 farms were designated for compulsory acquisition. The Zimbabwean government urged the British government to compensate white farmers who were going to lose their land since they (the British government) had not yet paid the agreed amount in the LHA. However, after a change of government in the UK in 1997, the new government had new priorities for international development assistance and plans to assist in the resettlement programme stalled (Palmer, 1990). As a result, the Zimbabwean government failed to secure funds to compensate farmers for the appropriated land.

The Zimbabwean government later realised that limited donor support to the land reform programme might slow down the process as it did under the LHA contract. In order to avoid that from happening, the government amended its constitution and introduced a number of laws to allow for the confiscation of land without compensation. First was the Constitutional Amendment 16 of 2000 which emphasised that UK had the liability to pay compensation for the land. The government also enacted the Land Acquisition Act 1 of 2004 which allowed the state to seize more land than it had confiscated in the first phase of the resettlement programme (Thomas, 2003). With the law on its side the government had nothing hindering it from acquiring as much land as it needed for the programme. This marked the beginning of the Fast Track Land Resettlement Programme (FTLRP) in 2000 (Thomas, 2003).

This phase of land redistribution saw a number of farm invasions in a short space of time. According to Lupiya and Hakata (2001 cited in Thomas, 2003), 800 000 families were resettled on 2.5 million hectares of land between June and December 2000 under the FTLRP. However, unlike the land reform programme implemented through the LHA clauses, where settlers were assisted by the state, FTLRP settlers received very little support from the state (Thomas, 2003). Such limited state support can be partly a result of lack of donor funding to the land reform programme. Apart from these challenges, FTLRP also saw a number of unplanned migrations taking place throughout the country as many people joined in land invasions (Thomas, 2003).

1.2 CONTEXT

The issue of land reform in Zimbabwe over the years has been at the centre of development, political and economic debates among national and global organisations. I mentioned earlier that different circumstances and situations had influenced the process of land reform at different phases of the programme. This study focuses specifically on the FTLRP. The FTLRP was launched at a time when the government and the country at large were in the midst of an extreme financial crisis. The financial crisis was partly caused by the effects of the Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) that were adopted in the early 1990s as well as the recent hyperinflation experienced in the country (Moyo, 2005). Due to the conditions attached to SAPs, such as reducing government expenditure, the government was left with limited capacity financially to assist resettled households under the FTLRP (Moyo, 2005). Hence the government of Zimbabwe offered very little and in some areas no assistance at all to resettled households under this phase. As a result the resettled individuals were vulnerable to economic problems, given that the country was in deep economic crisis and no one was able to assist them. Not only did these settlers lack government support in their new environments, but they frequently had to settle in these new areas without the assistance of their kin who were left behind in the communal areas.

According to Barr (2004) kin networks are very important in providing social support for rural households. Such networks can be necessary for rural households to solve common problems that affect them collectively. These networks can also be crucial for rural people to take advantage of shared opportunities and establish social groupings that can help them

improve their well-being through working together. Given that FTLRP settlers were moving into new areas without their kin support, they found themselves heading into the unknown literally on their own devices.

In this study I investigate how the movement from communal to resettlement areas impacted on the lives of resettled households, given the economic environment in which the programme was established. I also explore how these resettled households managed to establish new homes (communities) in such harsh economic environments with limited social support from their kin, given that many households left kin behind in communal areas. I also consider the migration process of these resettled households - why they decided to move, who among their kin they moved with, as well as the effects of moving with/without their kin members.

The lack of state support for resettled households under FTLRP is of great importance, given the economic hardships experienced by ordinary Zimbabweans for the past decade. Individuals on their own could not afford basic human necessities, let alone farming equipment to use in resettlement areas. It therefore became a challenge for these resettled households to engage in productive farming and make better use of the acquired land. Consequently, most of the aspired goals for land reform were not realised. Improving the welfare of rural people who relied on subsistence farming for survival by allowing them access to land was one of the goals aimed to be achieved by the programme (Kinsey, 1999). However, given the limited state support, it was difficult for such goals to be fully attained (Kinsey, 1999).

For example, David Samuriwo, one of the farmers in the Manica land Province who was resettled under the FTLRP, stated that “land reform will never achieve the aspired goals ... without proper training and assistance we cannot produce more on these farms. Both our social and economic lives are being threatened” (The Zimbabwean, 2011: 13). In some instances resettled households resorted to using unfortified maize seeds which in turn guarantee them very low harvests (Dekker, 2004b). In the end the settlers have managed to gain access to land but benefit very little from it as they still lack other resources that are necessary for them to be productive. A key objective of my study therefore is to investigate how these resettled households managed to establish new lives under such conditions.

1.3 RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

Barr (2004) and Dekker (2004a) highlighted the importance of kin networks for most rural families to strengthen their social capital and resource-pooling strategies. Through strong and reliable social networks people can work together for a common good and improve their well-being. It therefore becomes important for rural households to live close by their kin and friends so that they can pool resources and help each other in times of need. However, following land reform in Zimbabwe, many people left their communal homes and moved to the resettlement areas. These movements impacted on family structures, social networks as well as on the livelihood strategies that had been established in the communal areas over the years.

This dissertation is based on a case study of Dellos farm in Felixburg resettlement area in Gutu district in Masvingo Province. Dellos farm consists of about 111 households, where most of them are male headed. Out of the total population, twenty households were selected to participate in the study. The case study investigates how the movement to resettlement areas has affected the day-to-day lives of the resettled families. The rationale behind the study is therefore to understand the social and economic effects of the movements made under FTLRP at household level.

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The main question that this study seeks to answer is: How did the migration from communal areas to resettlement areas affect the structure, support networks and livelihood strategies of resettled households?

To address this broad question, the dissertation uses information collected in the case study to investigate the following specific research questions:

- What were the livelihood strategies of families before resettlement and what are their current livelihood strategies?
- How has access to land affected the livelihood strategies of resettled households?

- What kinds of social interactions exist between resettled families, and how do these compare with social interactions before resettlement?
- What kinds of social networks do resettled families draw on in the event of a negative shock (such as a drought or the death of a family member) and how do these networks compare to those before resettlement?
- What are the positive and negative experiences these households have had since they were resettled, and how do such experiences impact on their livelihood strategies?

1.5 STRUCTURE OF THE DISSERTATION

Chapter 1 of the dissertation provides the background of the land reform programme in Zimbabwe. Chapter 2 looks at the literature on social relations and life of individuals in resettlement areas as well as communal areas in Zimbabwe. The chapter starts with an overview of the literature on social capital, and then focuses on the social relations that people draw from to cope with social and economic challenges faced in both resettlement and communal areas. Literature on risk-sharing and risk-coping strategies in both communal and resettlement areas is also included in this chapter. The chapter then reviews literature on common livelihood strategies in rural areas, looking at the assets that people have as well as the activities they engage in both in communal and resettlement areas.

Chapter 3 provides the methodology employed in the study to collect data. The chapter also highlights some of the strengths and limitations these methods had in the process of collecting data. Chapter 4 introduces the study area and the study findings. It provides a brief geographic and demographic description of Dellos farm; however, it focuses more on the findings of the study.

Chapter 5 gives a discussion of the main findings in a way that answers the research questions posed. It also presents the conclusion and recommendations on how social capital can be enhanced in order to improve the well-being of people at Dellos farm.

2 CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW AND PRINCIPLE THEORY

There have been extensive studies done by different scholars regarding the social life and livelihood strategies of people living in developing countries, mostly in rural areas around the world. Among other things, it has been realised that cooperation and working together is crucial for human survival in rural areas and in some urban areas where most of the people are poor. Narayan (1999: 3) uses the African proverb ‘*a human becomes a human because of others*’ to highlight the importance of working together for individuals to realise their full potential. Through working together people can learn from others and use that knowledge to improve their well-being (Narayan, 1999). To describe these relations of cooperation and working together, social scientists use the concept of “social capital”.

This chapter discusses the literature on social capital. This is the principal body of work that informs the focus of this dissertation, which investigates how resettlement programmes in Zimbabwe have affected the livelihood strategies of individuals. In order to explore the concept of social capital, I will discuss different social relationships or networking strategies that people use to get by in their day to day life. The chapter will also look at literature on risk sharing and risk coping strategies that are employed by resettled households when dealing with the different risks they may face. Moreover, the chapter will discuss some of the livelihood strategies that are employed by people in both resettlement and communal areas. Understanding different livelihood strategies, risk sharing and coping strategies used in both communal and resettlement areas is crucial in drawing conclusions on whether or not the resettlement programme benefited people at Dellos farm. Lastly the chapter will review existing research which examines the effects of land reform on the lives of resettled households since its inception in the early 1980s.

2.1 SOCIAL CAPITAL

Social capital is among the most debated concepts in social science and authors have different views about how to define and conceptualise it (Dekker, 2004b). A key criticism of social

capital is that the concept is very broad and vague (Arrow 2000). Nonetheless, Janssens (2007) argues that the value of social capital in both the sociology and the economic literature is appreciating rather than depreciating. Woolcock and Narayan (2000: 2) also regard social capital as one concept that “enjoyed a remarkable rise to prominence across all the social science disciplines” in the 1990s.

Social capital is crucial in understanding the importance of co-operation and working together for mutual benefit. According to Janssens (2007:6), “A crucial aspect of social capital is that it generates externalities”. This entails that the outcomes for an individual are determined not only by their own endowments and behaviour, but also by other people’s knowledge and behaviour. Therefore, social capital is about people working together for mutual benefit.

Putnam (1995: 2) describes social capital as “features of social organisation such as networks, norms and social trusts that facilitate co-ordination and co-operation for mutual benefit”. Putnam added that such networks facilitate co-ordination and co-operation in a way that promotes collective action. For Putnam, social capital is not only a resource for an individual but it is also an asset for communities that enhances their well-being and promotes development.

Janssens (2007) describes social capital as the ability of individuals to mobilise resources through their social relations. This ability depends mainly on the number and types of social relations individuals have access to, as well as on the resources that those relations possess. It therefore explains how the interdependence of relations builds social capital: the more connected individuals are, the better the chances they have of producing good outcomes. In contextualising social capital, Janssens pointed out that social capital generates externalities. That is to say, outcomes for individuals are not only determined by their own endowments, knowledge and behaviour, but also by other people’s attitudes, norms and values (Janssens, 2007). The consequences of other people’s behaviour have the potential to influence the outcomes of the individuals they interact with.

Narayan (1999: 6) shares the same sentiments when he states that “social capital is not a private property of any person who benefits from it; rather it is an attribute of the social structure in which a person is embedded”. In this regard social capital can benefit all who participate through working together for mutual gain. For such reasons Narayan viewed social capital generally as the glue that hold groups and societies together. He defines social

capital as the “norms and social relations embedded in social structures of the society that enable people to co-ordinate action and achieve desired goals” (Narayan 1999: 6). The ability of people to work together for the benefit of all strengthens their social capital. Woolcock (1998) gave a similar definition and described it as a broad term that encompasses the norms and networks that facilitate collective action for mutual benefit.

Dekker (2004b: 36) states that social capital “is increasingly used to explicitly describe social interactions or the vitality and significance of community ties as a determinant of observed behaviour”. It is through the interaction between community members and their ability to cooperate that social capital is strengthened. Dekker pointed out that some authors equate social capital with trust and trustworthiness while others regard it more broadly as those social relations or social networks that allow people to work together and assist each other in a way that benefits all. These social interactions and networks are non-monetary, and Portes (1998) highlights how these non-monetary interactions can be important sources of power and influence. Social capital in this regard has abstract gains to participants. Being part of an influential and powerful social group can enhance the status of disadvantaged individuals in society. For example, Dekker (2004b) explains that widows benefit from having the support and backup from their group members if their land is being taken away from them illegally. Such support becomes part of the benefits that accrue to individuals by virtue of being a member of that particular social group.

Both Dekker (2004b) and Portes (1998) also argue that through social capital actors gain direct access to economic resources. Moreover, they can increase their cultural capital through contacts with different people and experts from various fields. Janssens (2007) describes this process as information diffusion where information on certain issues is circulated among group members, thereby empowering one another. The information may be economically or socially beneficial. In some rural settings, for example, information on agricultural techniques and even contraceptives can be scarce and costly to acquire. Social networks will in such instances play a vital role in transmitting information (Janssens, 2007). Dekker (2004a) describes how women in many rural settings come together and form sewing cooperatives. In these cooperatives they share a number of skills and information other than sewing. They can share ideas on how best they can improve their relationships with their spouses as well as their children’s health. These cooperatives can also be a source of income as the women may earn an income by selling some of the products they make.

2.1.1 SOURCES OF SOCIAL CAPITAL

An important source of social capital is the social relationships that people have with others. As Portes (1998:7) explains: “Whereas economic capital is in people’s bank accounts and human capital inside their heads, social capital inheres in the structure of their relationships”.

Portes (1998) points out that the view of human nature in modern economics is that social capital is primarily the accumulation of obligation from others according to the norms of reciprocity. The more one assists or helps others, the more likely one is to receive help in the future or when the need arises. However, the accumulation of these social gifts differs from pure economic exchange in that the currency in which obligations are repaid may be different from that with which they were incurred. Moreover, the timing of repayment is unspecified (Portes, 1998). As a result, the transaction is not defined as a market exchange. It is through these non-market relations that people gain trust in each other and improve their stocks of social capital. The need to have assurance that someone will be there to assist in times of need encourages people to conform to the norms of reciprocity, thereby repaying any social gift or service received from others (Portes, 1998).

In addition to reciprocity norms, the motivation to work with and assist others may come as a result of social integration (Durkheim [1893], 1984 cited in Portes, 1998). Social integration theory entails that people experience some mental, emotional and physical benefits when they believe they are contributing to their community’s well-being. Portes (1998) highlighted that in some instances it is not the need to secure future cover/insurance that motivate people to assist others. An individual may also assist other group members in order to improve his/her status and honour among peers. Portes (1998) gave an example of a member of an ethnic group endowing a scholarship for young students from the same ethnic group, without expecting direct repayment, but rather for reasons of status upliftment and approval from other group members.

In order to understand the role of group membership in fostering social capital, we need to understand the dynamics of bonding and bridging social ties, as described by Narayan (1999). Narayan stated that bonding social ties refers to the networks of closely related individuals such as family, friends or neighbours who all know and support each other. In contrast,

bridging social ties are the network relations that help individuals to get ahead when resources in their direct social networks are limited. In other words, bridging social ties are those connections that one can rely on in the event that close networks do not have the capacity to assist. Narayan (1999) and Adger (2003) argue that both bonding and bridging social ties are important in improving the well-being of individuals. They argue that different combinations of these elements allow communities to confront poverty and vulnerability as well as take advantage of new opportunities necessary to improve their well-being.

Karl Marx's analysis of the emergent class consciousness in the industrial proletariat highlights another source of social capital (Portes, 1998). As the workers found themselves in similar situations they learnt to identify with each other and support each other's initiatives. The workers managed to build solidarity which was not internalised during childhood but came about as a result of facing a common fate. Such relations are referred to as bounded solidarity (Portes, 1998). In some cases it is through such bounded solidarity that social relations are established, thereby strengthening the community's or country's social capital. Bounded solidarity helps individuals to identify with a certain group, hence giving them a sense of belonging and willingness to work together for a common good.

2.1.2 SOCIAL CAPITAL AND COLLECTIVE ACTION

Social capital has the potential to improve people's well-being through its influence on the propensity of communities to engage in collective action (Janssens, 2007). Collective action consists of a group of individuals working together towards reaching a common goal. Collective action can also produce intangible benefits where a group of people, organisations or institutions work together towards achieving a safe environment where social ills and criminal activities are not tolerated (Janssens, 2007).

One common element of all collective action is that the benefits accruing to individuals depend not only on their own efforts, but also on the efforts of other participants (Woolcock and Narayan, 2000; Janssens, 2007). In most, if not all collective action, the behaviour of one participant has either a positive or negative effect on the outcomes of other participants. Adger (2003) mentions that it is therefore necessary for groups engaging in collective action to have a set of social norms that govern the behavioural patterns of individuals. Moreover,

choosing group members or a group to join is a critical decision since one has to join a group with people who are willing to follow the rules/ norms that govern their group.

In order to understand the nature of collective action and how this can benefit individuals, Woolcock and Narayan (2000) identifies four different perspectives from which social capital can be analysed. The communitarian view emphasises the number and density of local level organisations, such as associations and civic groups, which are in a given community. This perspective stresses the centrality of social ties in helping the poor to manage risk and vulnerability. The main actors in this perspective are community groups and the voluntary sector and it recognises the social assets of the poor. Critics, however, argue that establishing community groups that lack connections with outside resources may yield very little with regard to poverty reduction.

The networks view is another perspective which stresses the importance of both vertical and horizontal associations between people, as well as relations within and among other organisational entities (Woolcock and Narayan, 2000). The networks view recognises the importance of intra and inter community ties in the acquisition of knowledge and the skills necessary for poverty reduction. These intra and inter social ties are also known as bonding and bridging social capital in the language of Narayan (1999) and Adger (2003). Although this view acknowledges the benefits of social capital, it also recognises that there are costs that can be incurred in the process of enhancing it. In particular, favourable outcomes for one group may be attained at the expense of another group or they may come at a price of significant costs tomorrow (Woolcock and Narayan, 2000). The networks view therefore exposes both the advantages and disadvantages of social capital.

Another view is the institutional view which argues that, “the vitality of community networks and civil society is largely the product of the political, legal and institutional environment” (Woolcock and Narayan, 2000: 11). The institutional perspective recognises that the capacity of social groups to act in their collective interests depends on the quality of formal institutions that control them (Narayan and Woolcock, 2000). It is therefore crucial to have good political and legal environments within which local groups can work effectively and efficiently in enhancing the well-being of individuals.

The last view discussed by Woolcock and Narayan is the synergy view. This view tries to integrate work from the networks and institutional camps (Woolcock and Narayan, 2000). Evans (1996 cited in Woolcock and Narayan 2000) pointed out that the synergy between the

government and citizen action is based on two elements. First is complementarity which refers to the mutual supportive relations between public and private actors. This complementarity is exemplified in the frameworks of rules and laws which protect the right to associate. Embeddedness is the second element which refers to the nature and extent of the ties connecting citizens and public officials. Adger (2003) argues that synergistic social capital - that is when local leadership works with the state - can promote the adaptive capacity of societies to cope with challenges they face. It is through these different views that researchers and theorists can analyse the effects of social capital and collective action in societies.

2.1.3 ROLE OF TRUST IN COLLECTIVE ACTION

Barr (2003) states that trust is a very important lubricant of social systems. It allows people within a society to rely on each other and have faith in each other's word even if an agreement is only verbal. Janssens (2007) describes trust as the expectation that one will not be betrayed or cheated by the other individual in collective action. Uncertainties regarding other people's behaviour can form a barrier to collective action. It is therefore important for individuals to trust each other for collective action to be enhanced in any society.

Barr (2003) and Janssens (2007) both argue that beliefs held by individuals regarding another individual in a community influence their expectations of that particular individual's behaviour. That is, if one individual suspects that there are free-riders in the community, it is unlikely that the suspecting individual will expect the other members to participate or contribute in collective action. However, if an individual expects that other members are willing to participate, then the individual will be more willing to initiate collective action.

Past experience regarding the co-operative behaviour of other individuals is very influential in determining the levels of trust the individual has of other group members (Janssens, 2007). If an individual is known to defect or fail to co-operate in previous collective action programmes, the levels of trust from other people will be low. Adger (2003) argues that this lack of trust will in future become a source of social exclusion for individuals that are regarded as defectors. Hence social norms that produce trust and trustworthiness are required to solve the problem and ensure credible commitment from all participants (Adger, 2003).

Adger (2003) highlighted that there are two different categories or levels of trust. There is particularised trust, which refers to trust between people who are known to each other, and generalised trust. Individuals are more likely to trust people who are known to them. In such instances the need for external institutions to facilitate co-operation will be relatively low. Hence co-operation and trust levels are generally high in such small groups (Adger, 2003). Generalised trust is when people generally trust other individuals even if they have not met them or have only briefly interacted with them. In such instances people give their trust to individuals whose co-operative social behaviour they know nothing or very little about (Adger, 2003). Generalised trust occurs on a larger scale, for example with national or international organisations and institutions. Local people or community members put their trust in organisations and institutions that promise to work with them.

2.1.4 ANOTHER VIEW OF SOCIAL CAPITAL

Woolcock and Narayan (2000) argue that social capital can be a double-edged sword in that some of the processes that are considered beneficial to society may also have negative effects on that very same community. Trust and co-operation are regarded as the most required elements for social capital to be established. However, Janssens (2007) states that although these two elements of social capital can strengthen social relations within a social group, they can also promote low interaction and trust in non-group members, even if these non-group members are also members of the same community. In this way, social capital can perpetuate social and economic exclusion especially of marginalised groups. Portes (1998) similarly argues that strong ties that bring benefits to members of a particular group are also responsible for barring non-group members from benefiting, thereby creating either social or economic exclusion. Social capital therefore may only benefit members of the in-group, and may provide no benefits to out-group members who might be in need of these benefits. By so doing, its capacity to enhance the well-being of all individuals is limited.

In most cases people prefer to associate with people of the same social class as theirs, enhancing bonding social ties. As such the poor and better off tend to associate with the poor and better off respectively. Moreover, trust and interaction across social groups are substantially lower compared to within groups. Woolcock and Narayan (2000) argue that social capital is not about what you know; rather it is about who you know. Knowing people

with power and influence paves the way to access quality resources. This renders bonding social capital problematic since low interaction with the outside world will mean limited access to outside resources (Adger, 2003). Given that some of the social groups only comprise of the poorest people, such groups will be less effective in dealing with their problems since they lack information and resources that the other groups may have access to.

Strong norms of trust and co-operation may also become destructive if they are not in harmony with the operation of the society and good governance (Portes, 1998; Adger, 2003). For example, Portes and Adger argue that groups such as criminal gangs have strong social capital but their objectives undermine the social capital of others in society. Members in such groups will use their social capital to achieve their “common goal” which is to the detriment of society more broadly. Dekker (2004b) also raises the same argument as she states that rivalry between social groups in the same community may hinder development rather than enhancing it. The rival groups will end up using their social capital to pull down each other and sabotage the efforts of other groups.

2.2 SOCIAL RELATIONS AND MUTUAL RISK SHARING ARRANGEMENTS

Much of the literature suggests that risk-sharing arrangements and mutual assistance often take place within villages where kinship networks are stable (Dekker, 2004b). Dekker (2004a) argues that such arrangements generally occur between people with a high frequency of interaction, such as in kin groups, marriage or between inhabitants of a small village. In the event that some kin members move out of the village, the closeness and tightness of their kinship networks will be disrupted. Barr (2004) points out that the relocation of these individuals to new communities that are relatively scarce in intra-village kinship relations may affect their coping behaviour and types of relations they use to get support in times of need. It takes time for households or individuals who have migrated to establish reliable and trustworthy acquaintances since they might have different social backgrounds (Barr, 2004). Hence during the early stages of migration, people may have fewer support structures to draw from.

2.2.1 SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS IN COMMUNAL AND RESETTLEMENT AREAS

In their study of the structures and organisation of families and the effects of social, economic, political and cultural changes in Zimbabwe, Women and Law in Southern Africa (WLSA) (1997: 102) states that, “the greatest laments of resettled households was their dislocation from their natal families and the lack of regular interaction with them”. Kinship relations are regarded as one of the strongest sources of social support in most rural life in Zimbabwe (Barr, 2004). It is therefore important for kin members to stay close to each other; mostly in the same village in order to pool their resources and assist each other when the need arises (Barr, 2004). However, with the availability of land to many poor Zimbabweans under the Fast Track Land Redistribution Programme (FTLRP), many people left their natal families to secure more land in resettlement areas.

Given the limited interaction with their family members who remained behind in communal areas, households in resettlement areas tend to focus more on their nuclear family and build bonds with their neighbours who provide substitute support networks (Dekker, 2004b). Moreover, in some cases, resettled households relocated with acquaintances (neighbours) or relatives (blood or marriage relatives), and this co-migration sustained social networks in resettlement areas (Dekker 2004b). However, WLSA (1997) found that on average, households in communal areas have almost five times as many relatives in the same village compared to households in resettlement areas. Consequently, the social structure in resettlement communities typically is very different from that in communal areas (Dekker 2004b).

Given the dislocation from their natal families, resettled individuals receive little assistance from their kin who remain in communal areas (WLSA, 1997). Consequently, households in resettlement areas are more likely to develop individual risk coping strategies. However, resettled individuals also develop new relationships with their neighbours. Barr (2004) describes how resettled individuals transformed their co-villagers from strangers to neighbours through investing in civil society. As time progressed these resettled individuals began to trust and understand each other. They found it much easier to trust people who came from the same geographical area, even regarding each other as relatives based on their totem and lineage relations (Dekker, 2004b). Such relationships help resettled individuals to

compensate for their separation from kin in communal areas and encouraged most resettled individuals to invest in establishing new social relationships (Barr, 2004).

2.2.2 RISK AND MUTUAL ASSISTANCE IN COMMUNAL AND RESETTLEMENT AREAS

Rural households face a variety of risks and shocks that affect their livelihoods (Dercon, 2000; Dekker, 2004a). Risk and uncertainties refer to possible events or actual occurrences that affect or interrupt the day to day life of people and are also known as shocks (Dekker 2004b). Households should therefore have strategic plans they can employ in the event they experience such occurrences.

Risks (negative) can be caused by natural hazards such as floods or drought while others are non-natural risks that are induced by human behaviour such as inflation caused by bad economic policies (Dekker, 2004b). Zimbabwe's economy suffered the effects of both natural and non-natural risks over the past decade. Dekker (2004b) argued that some of the economic and social policies adopted by the country impacted negatively on agriculture and economic growth. Zimbabwe was the world's fastest shrinking economy in July 2003 with the official inflation rate pegged at 365 % in June 2003 (Dekker, 2004b). In the 2003/2004 growing season the prices of agricultural inputs increased by more than three hundred per cent, making it difficult for farmers to purchase them. Moreover, the country suffered one of its worst drought years in the past decade. With most of the livelihoods of small-scale farmers in Zimbabwe depending largely on rain-fed agriculture, farmers became more vulnerable.

The economic hardships experienced over this period of time to a certain extent contributed to the social disintegration in Zimbabwe. Barr (2004) suggests that family is the basic unit of society and in the event that the family is absent, the society at large will step in. However the economic crisis has affected the family's and society's abilities to play their roles effectively. High rates of unemployment deprived many families of the means to support themselves as many breadwinners could no longer provide for their families (Chitambara, 2010). Many people began to concentrate more on their nuclear families, paying less attention to their extended families.

Dekker (2004a) identifies some common risks that affect the livelihood of small-scale farmers in rural Zimbabwe. These risks include failure of a household to plough enough land due to the death of their cattle or their cattle being stolen, which may result in low or insufficient harvest. Sickness of a family member may also bring unexpected medical expenses which in most cases are very high, at the same time causing an unexpected labour shortage. In most cases, risks and especially idiosyncratic risks make households more vulnerable to serious hardships and recovering from such risks can be a hurdle (Dercon, 2000). Effects resulting from such shocks can be long term, thereby reducing the household's production and impacting on its income and consumption (Dekker, 2004a).

However, rural households do not just sit back and watch as these risks affect their lives (Dekker, 2004a). Instead, they develop strategies to deal with such risks and to reduce the impact of negative shocks when they occur. Blaike et al (1994 cited in Dekker, 2004a) distinguishes between risk prevention, risk mitigating and risk coping strategies. Risk prevention strategies in this context are regarded as strategies aimed at reducing the occurrence of a risk. In a drought prone area, farmers ensure that they grow more drought resistant crops to reduce the effects of drought on their crop production.

Risk mitigation strategies aim to reduce the impact or severity of a risk if it were to occur (Dekker, 2004a). This can be achieved by the diversification of assets and income sources as well as by participating in insurance arrangements. Participating in such arrangements allows households to foster social capital by forming groups to assist each other when the need arises. They set up insurance arrangements that can either be formal or informal; but most rural households engage in informal arrangements. Such informal arrangements are characterised by labour and cattle sharing in order to deal with labour and draught power shortages. Barr (2004) argues that such arrangements best work in small communities where kin members stay close to each other. In the event that one household's draught power gets lost or dies, they can borrow from other households that have extra cattle or who are done ploughing (Dekker, 2004b). As Dekker (2004a) states that labour and draught power shortages are among the common risks faced by rural households, it is therefore important that individuals participate in insurance arrangements to protect themselves from such risks.

Another common social security arrangement in Zimbabwe is the burial society to cover funeral costs in the event that a family member passes away (Dekker, 2004b). Funeral costs are part of the common risks that are faced by most rural households; therefore joining a

burial society is a better way for households to cushion themselves from experiencing the full effects of this risk. Dekker (2004b) argues that in most, if not all villages, villagers establish burial societies where villagers contribute a certain (specified) amount every month. Other than money contributions villagers also contribute food parcels, such as mealie-meal, firewood and labour. By so doing households share the risk or shock with other households.

There are also risk coping strategies that are aimed at alleviating the impact of the shock once it has occurred (Dekker, 2004b). The ability of a household to cope with or recover from a shock depends on the assets it owns or has access to. Coping with negative shocks such as drought or a sudden need for cash requires households to have other assets accumulated in good years (Dekker, 2004b). Kinsey et al. (2004:90) indicate that, "... accumulation of cattle by panel households provides them with greater flexibility in coping with drought than many households in Zimbabwe experience". Households can sell their livestock and other assets they own for consumption smoothing; therefore accumulation of assets in good years enables households to cope with different shocks. However, both Kinsey et al. (2004) and Dekker (2004b) explain that although selling of livestock and assets is an alternative for coping with risks, it does not help in recovering from that particular risk. According to Kinsey et al. (2004) recovering from a risk means that a household is able to go back to the level it was before the risk occurred. By selling their assets, households will be reducing their asset levels from where they were before the shock occurred; hence they will still need to recover from losing their assets by getting back to their original asset level.

Drought affects livelihoods of households as well as their food consumption in a number of ways (Kinsey et al., 2004). In a drought year, food consumption falls below the average of good years and households may also shift expenditure from non-food to food items. Most of the income they raise will be used to buy food (Kinsey et al., 2004). Although households have other mechanisms to smooth consumption, Dekker and Hoppenbrouwers (1994) found that in drought years, food consumption always falls. Households sharply reduce not only the frequency of their meals, but also the quantities of meals they serve. In addition, households change their diet and consume more wild fruits (Dekker and Hoppenbrouwers, 1994).

2.3 LIVELIHOOD STRATEGIES IN RURAL SETTINGS

The concept of “livelihood strategies” represents the complexities of survival notably in developing countries (Dekker, 2004a). It has been recognised that very few households rely on a single income generating activity for survival. Households engage in a wide range of activities to pursue a livelihood, ranging from agriculture to off-farm activities (Dekker, 2004b). Some livelihood strategies that people employ are natural resource based, such as cultivation of food and non-food crops, gathering and livestock rearing. They can also engage in non-natural resource based strategies such as trading, manufacturing, remittances and other transfers (Chimhowu and Hulme, 2006). Therefore contextualising livelihoods requires one to understand the diverse portfolios that individuals, households and communities establish to make a living.

Historically, communal areas in Zimbabwe were regarded as the labour reservoirs for urban areas, mines and commercial farms (Chimhowu and Hulme, 2006). Many households relied on the salaries and remittances they received from the circular migrant labour system. One or more household members (most often including the household head) would leave their home to work elsewhere where they received an income that would supplement the household’s agricultural produce. Chimhowu and Hulme (2006) highlight that in most cases the woman (wife) stayed at home and worked on the family land to produce food for the household. On the other hand, the husband would use the salary he got to meet other family expenses such as school fees, clothing and maize seed among others. Thus the household not only depends on the family land or the salary of the father as their means of livelihood; rather they would need both activities to meet their basic needs.

Soon after independence there was an urgent need to redress the injustices that came about as a result of the colonial rule. These included among others the discrepancies in access to productive resources such as land. The introduction of the land reform programme in dealing with this land problem brought about a number of changes to the farming system. Chimhowu and Hulme (2006) and Kinsey (1999) state that the aim of the programme was to transform peasant agriculture and encourage meaningful agricultural activities. During the first phase of land reform programme in Zimbabwe, household heads in resettlement areas were prohibited from taking up non-farm employment (Kinsey, 1999; Chimhowu and Hulme, 2006). Kinsey (1983 cited in Chimhowu and Hulme, 2006) points out that the new resettlement schemes

were perceived as a replacement for communal areas which were seen as poverty traps. It was projected that incomes in resettlement schemes would double those in communal areas with beneficiaries engaging in agriculture alone (Chimhowu and Hulme, 2006).

In a bid to discourage circular labour migration, Agricultural Extension Officers (AEOs) insisted that household heads devote themselves exclusively to agriculture (Kinsey, 1999; Chimhowu and Hulme, 2006). The assumption was that by concentrating on agriculture, livelihoods of resettled households would be able to depend solely on farming (Kinsey, 1999). The planners were against the idea of multiple livelihoods that characterised communal areas (Chimhowu and Hulme, 2006). However, given the repeated droughts that reduced production levels in the early 1990s, AEO realised that it was essential for household heads to take up non-farm employment to make up for the reduced production levels (Kinsey, 1999). However, they insisted that household heads were only permitted to take up other employment if the agricultural management of their plots remained satisfactory as judged by local resettlement officials (Kinsey, 1999).

Although the intention of the land reform programme as mentioned earlier was to distinguish the livelihood strategies in resettlement areas from those in communal areas, Chimhowu and Hulme (2006) highlight that this was not fully achieved. In their study on the livelihood dynamics in planned and spontaneous resettlements, they found that livelihoods in resettlement areas often mirror those of communal areas. According to Chimhowu and Hulme (2006) planned or state sponsored resettlement areas were effective and achieved secure livelihoods when the state was still involved. Where resettlements were not state sponsored, spontaneously resettled farmers established mutual benefit networks to cope with the risks and challenges of the early days of resettlement (Chimhowu and Hulme, 2006; Dekker, 2004a). In state sponsored resettlement, the state provided assistance such as loans and AEOs until it was perceived that “the farmers could do it by themselves”. The assistance helped farmers to rely on agriculture as their sole livelihood means. With the state withdrawing its services and continuing drought spells, households were exposed to a number of risks and could not maintain the high production levels. Relying on agriculture as the only livelihood strategy became problematic, and they had to revert to circular labour migration – a system most common in the communal areas (Chimhowu and Hulme, 2006).

Diversification into non-farm income sources now accounts for a considerable share of household income. Mainly because of the risks associated with farm employment and other

agriculture-based livelihoods, people try to diversify their livelihood strategies to off-farm employment. Dekker and Hoppenbrouwers (1994) explain how the 1992 drought experienced in Zimbabwe affected production of maize and other cash crops that most Zimbabweans used to sell to make a living. Not only did the drought affect crop production; but it also impacted on livestock rearing (Kinsey et al., 2004). As a result many households were forced to establish alternative livelihood strategies such as rural trading and gold panning to make ends meet (Dekker and Hoppenbrouwers, 1994). The main problem is that in Zimbabwe most livelihoods of the rural households depend on rain-fed agriculture, making such livelihoods susceptible to natural disasters such as floods or drought (Ersado, 2003).

Mandizadza (2010) uses the livelihoods framework to analyse how rural households and communities make ends meet. He states that there are different components that are necessary for people to establish a livelihood. According to Mandizadza (2010),

The livelihoods framework offers a way of thinking about livelihoods that helps order complexity and makes clear the many factors that affect livelihoods. It also presents the main factors that affect people's livelihoods, and the typical interrelations between them. The framework is a people-centred analysis that begins with simultaneous explorations of people's assets, their objectives (the livelihood outcomes they are seeking) and the livelihood strategies they employ to achieve these goals. Feedback relations between these and the transforming structures and processes affect livelihoods. The framework identifies five important types of capital assets: human, natural, financial, social and physical (2010: 3).

It is through the livelihoods framework that assets and strategies employed by people to make a living can be analysed. The availability of different types of capital assets at people's disposal is also very important in determining their livelihoods strategies. Mandizadza (2010) highlighted that human capital entails the skills, knowledge and the ability of labour that enable people to pursue different livelihood strategies. Physical capital comprises the basic infrastructure and manufactured goods necessary to maintain livelihoods. Natural capital consists of a wide range of resources from intangible public goods to divisible assets like trees, land. Natural capital is an essential asset to people who derive their livelihoods from resource based activities. Financial capital denotes financial resources such as cash, credit or other liquid assets that people use to achieve livelihood objectives. Social capital, as discussed earlier, determines people's ability to manage relationships with other actors. These relationships can be developed through networks and social contacts.

The combination of all or some of the above-mentioned forms of capital enables individuals to enhance and sustain their livelihoods. Mandizadza (2010) suggests that the accessibility or the availability of one capital may predispose an individual to generate multiple benefits. It is however necessary for these capital assets to complement each other for them to sustain livelihoods. Mandizadza points out that land was a key natural asset provided to people through the land reform programme. However, without access to other capital assets it cannot be a sufficient livelihood resource.

Assets do not necessarily have to be owned by individuals in order to contribute to their livelihoods (Dekker, 2004a). But individuals need to have control of or access to assets in order for them to contribute to a livelihood strategy. It is also important that through their access to certain assets, individuals can accumulate their own assets. Chimhowu and Woodhouse (2008) explain how people who rely on *maricho* (casual work on someone's field to get paid in cash and kind) find it difficult to sustain their livelihoods. They identified that it is important for these workers to use the payments they get to accumulate their own assets. Dependence on *maricho* is regarded as a defining feature of the poorest household in Zimbabwe. In this instance social position plays a major role in understanding the vulnerability of households as some individuals may have limited access to assets because of their position in society. Social constructs such as gender, ethnicity and class enable or obstruct individuals to or from accessing certain resources necessary for enhancing their livelihoods. Hence livelihoods of marginalised individuals are threatened because of their social status; in a way perpetuating their vulnerability (Dekker, 2004a).

2.4 EFFECTS OF LAND REFORM PROGRAMMES ON RESETTLED HOUSEHOLDS

Existing research shows that the movement of individual households from communal areas to resettlement areas has had a great effect on the lives of households involved; the effects appear to be both positive and negative. Kinsey (2004: 1682) argues that, "Whether Zimbabwe's land reform should be regarded as a "success" is a matter of both opinion and further debate".

In evaluating land reform programmes in Zimbabwe, it is important to recognise the objectives that were formulated when the programme was originally established (Kinsey, 1999) together with the effects it had on the lives of people involved. The original objectives include alleviating population pressure in communal areas, extending and improving the base for productive agriculture in the peasant farming sector, and bringing abandoned and underutilised land into full production among others. However, land reform also disrupted existing social networks among villagers, with some villagers moving to the resettlement areas while others remained in the communal areas.

From the time of its inception one major effect of resettlement programme is that it provided settlers with the opportunity to access larger pieces of both arable and grazing land. Dekker (2004b) highlights that in resettlement areas land size in principle, is equal, with all resettled households having use rights to equal arable land. Moreover, legally there are no landless in resettlement areas. Barr (2002) also indicates that the resettlement programme enhanced the well-being of many rural households whose livelihoods depend on subsistence farming as they now had access to large pieces of land. Thomas (2003) identifies that both arable and grazing land in communal areas was shrinking as both the human and livestock populations were increasing. Availability of land under the resettlement programme therefore relieved the over populated communal areas.

Individuals in resettlement areas now can engage in a number of agricultural activities they could not explore in communal areas due to limited land. Resettled households cultivate more land than those in communal areas. Hoozeveen and Kinsey (2001) estimate that land reform beneficiaries cultivated nearly 50% more land than non-beneficiaries, and as a result they obtained four times as much in crop revenue. Kinsey (2004) also points out that production levels and productivity increased substantially with resettlement. However, although land was made accessible to many under the programme, Harts-Broekhuis and Huisman (2001) argue that production levels increased in some areas but not in all of the resettlement schemes.

In studying the results of land reform in resource-poor regions in Zimbabwe Harts-Broekhuis and Huisman (2001) found that some schemes were implemented in regions with unfavourable conditions for arable agriculture making such areas less productive regardless of the size of land available for farming. With annual rainfall below 500mm, severe dry spells during the rainy season, low fertile sands with poor water-retention capacity and periodic seasonal drought, arable agriculture becomes a challenge (Harts-Broekhuis and Huisman

2001). Such areas would be suitable for livestock production and not crop production. Moreover, some resettlement areas lack basic infrastructure like roads, schools and clinics. The areas are not fully developed for human habitation, thereby limiting the settlers' ability to access other basic services.

Although many people managed to have access to land, an important natural asset for many rural households' livelihood strategies, Mandizadza (2010) highlights that on its own land cannot be sufficient as a livelihood resource. There is the need for other capital assets to be available to the resettled farmers for their livelihoods to be enhanced. Chimhowu and Hulme (2006) found that people who resettled needed to have access to at least financial and social capital for them to make a living from the land they acquired. Having land without the resources needed to work the land was identified as a major setback for many people who acquired land under the FTLRP (Chimhowu and Hulme, 2006). Most of the resettled individuals were not in a financially strong position and because they lacked the capital to increase their farm production, their benefits from the land have been limited (Chimhowu and Hulme, 2006). Moreover, with the lack of social support from their kin, the risk-coping strategies of resettled households have been compromised (Chimhowu and Hulme, 2006; Dekker, 2004b).

The movement to resettlement areas gave settlers the opportunity to have a fresh start in life (Barr, 2002; Dekker, 2004b; Harts-Broekhuis and Huisman, 2001). In her study on risk, resettlement and relations in rural Zimbabwe, Dekker (2004b) found that some resettled individuals were happy to move away from their relatives whom they had constant quarrels with. In some instances relatives were jealous of each other's success while in some, accusations of witchcraft were constant sources of conflict, thereby perpetuating family feuds. As a result moving away and starting a life away from other kin members allowed them to live a more peaceful and conflict-free life (Dekker, 2004b).

However, for many people who participated in the land reform programmes, the relocation to resettlement areas negatively affected their social capital, by disrupting the support structures provided by kin, neighbours and villagers. WLSA (1997) points out that, on average, households in communal areas had almost five times as many relatives in the same village compared to households in resettlement areas. This lack of social support combined with limited financial resources forced some people to move back to their communal areas because they could not cope on their own (Chimhowu and Hulme, 2006). For those who

remained in the resettlement areas, the lack of kin support had effects on their risk-coping strategies (Chimhowu and Hulme, 2006; Dekker, 2004b).

Some researchers, however, suggest that individuals also developed social relations with their new neighbours in resettlement areas. According to Barr (2002), people compensated for the lack of kin members living close by encouraging intermarriages between unrelated households or developing civil society by forming clubs and associations. In the process they expanded their networking structures; thereby moving beyond the networks they had before the programme was initiated. As a result, resettled households improved their stocks of social capital by sharing resources with their new neighbours as well as their relatives they left in communal areas (Barr, 2002).

2.5 CONCLUSION

The literature review in this chapter analysed different aspects of social capital and how they impact on the lives of rural people. The first section of the review presented different definitions of social capital and highlighted that, through co-operation, social capital not only benefits individuals but also communities at large. The review also explained how through collective action, stocks of social capital are enhanced and people's well-being is improved. Moreover, it was explained that trust plays an important role in fostering social capital. Although social capital has the potential to enhance people's well-being, studies have also exposed some of its shortfalls that undermine its ability to bring about positive change in people's lives. The literature review also discussed the importance of social networking in human life, especially in risk-sharing and mutual assistance arrangements. These arrangements require constant interaction between parties and hence they are more pronounced within kin groups and small villages.

The review also highlighted some of the livelihood strategies employed by people in both communal and resettlement areas in Zimbabwe. Evidence from other studies showed that it is difficult for small-scale farmers to rely solely on agriculture as their only livelihood strategy. People need to diversify their livelihood means in order to spread the risks.

The final section discussed the effects that land reform programmes have had on the lives of resettled households. Existing studies have found that the programme has had both positive and negative effects on the lives of beneficiaries. Accessing bigger portions of land allowed resettled households to expand their agricultural activities. However, the availability of land without other capital assets made it difficult for the new farmers to get a sustainable livelihood from the land they accessed. The programme also disrupted the social capital of the resettled households, increasing their possible vulnerability to the effects of negative shocks. The main objective of this dissertation is to probe further the effects of land reform on resettled households. In particular, the study explores the challenges faced by resettled households and it investigates whether and how these households compensated for the loss of social capital when they left their communities and kin behind.

3 CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

In doing research, it is essential that an appropriate approach is used in order for the central research question to be answered. Haverkamp and Young (2007:268) point that, “one must recognise and understand the philosophy of science paradigm that informs a given research project because an investigation’s paradigmatic base determines the appropriate standards for evaluating its rigor and trustworthiness”. Research approaches normally intermingle with certain research methods; hence the selection of research approaches and methods are to some extent mutually inclusive. In this chapter I will discuss the approach and methods I employed to collect data at Dellos farm, which is the study area for this dissertation. (More information regarding the study area will be provided in Chapter 4.) The study adopted a qualitative approach and data were collected using in-depth interviews and narratives. In this chapter, I will also highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the approach and methods employed in the study.

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

The three objectives of this study are to investigate the impact of resettlement on people’s livelihoods; to explore people’s perceptions of their social and economic life in a resettlement area; and to identify social relations and how they affect people’s livelihood strategies. To investigate these issues, the study adopted a qualitative approach.

According to Haverkamp and Young (2007) a qualitative inquiry is described mainly as an inquiry that seeks to understand lived experiences within their socio-historical context. Creswell (2009) gives a similar definition as he defines qualitative research as a means for exploring and understanding the meanings individuals ascribe to a social problem. Creswell explains it further pointing out that by engaging in qualitative research, researchers get the opportunity to study the phenomenon in its natural setting; thereby understanding the meanings that people attach to the phenomenon in their daily experiences. Given that the study seeks to probe the challenges faced by resettled households in their new environments and to explore how they have established new social relations, a qualitative approach is an appropriate method of study.

In order to elicit information about the meanings participants attached to changes in their lives, the researcher needs to have a personal interaction with the participants. Locke et al. (1987 cited in Creswell, 2009) indicate that qualitative research focuses on participants' perceptions, experiences and the way they make sense of their lives. Creswell (2009) claims qualitative researchers have, through face-to-face interaction, have a variety of ways of getting to know the meaning the participant attaches to a given phenomenon. Besides listening to participants' responses to questions posed, qualitative researchers can also read the body language of participants when responding to certain questions; thereby giving them more information on the meanings ascribed to the topic by the participants.

The type of research question and the information sought in this study rendered a qualitative approach the most relevant approach to adopt. However, there were also some challenges with this approach encountered during the study. According to Carr (1994) and Creswell (2009), the ability of qualitative researchers to acquire more information from their participants lies in the relationship they build during the study. Both authors emphasise the importance of trust between the interviewer and the interviewee for information to be given freely. The current political situation in Zimbabwe to some extent affected my relationship with the participants. During the data collection period I had to be very cautious that the participants would not associate me with any political party, especially the opposition party¹. During the narratives, some participants were not sure which political party I was affiliated with. As a result they were not very comfortable to discuss their experiences. People at Dellos farm do not want to be associated with the opposition party, so those who thought I was from the opposition were not very keen to participate and share their experiences. In contrast, those who associated me with the ruling party² were mainly romanticising the programme. They were not willing to be critical of the programme with the fear that they might lose the land or be labelled supporters of the opposition. However, their stance changed during the one-on-one interviews as they began to understand more fully the purpose of the study, and they began to open up. This process highlighted to me the importance of trust between the interviewer and interviewee and how this can hinder or enhance the eliciting of information.

¹ The opposition party refers to the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC) – people at Dellos farm do not want to be associated with the MDC.

² The ruling party refers to the Zanu PF and almost all people on the farm are Zanu PF supporters – if anyone is suspected of being an opposition supporter he or she will be 'dealt with, by the comrades'.

3.2 DATA COLLECTION

Determining who represents the general population or group in the study is a very crucial stage in any research process. Selection of a few individuals or units to represent the whole group in research is called sampling. Creswell (2009) explains that sampling is a technical procedure whereby inference of the whole is made by examining only a few. There are however different ways in which samples can be drawn. There are probability sampling techniques that are mainly used in quantitative studies and non-probability techniques that are used mainly in qualitative studies. In this study I used a systematic random sampling method which falls under the probability sampling techniques. Babbie and Mouton (2001) describe systematic random sampling as a technique that allows for the population to be evenly sampled.

Households at Dellos farm were randomly settled; no criteria were used when land was allocated to households. Using systematic random sampling in this study allowed the population to be evenly sampled given the manner in which the households were settled. In selecting the sample units for the study I used the village chairman's register. Every household at Dellos farm appears in the chairman's register and is arranged in ascending order from stand number one to stand number 111. I randomly selected stand number three to be the starting point for my selection and I had an interval of five; hence from the starting point I skipped four households before picking the next sample unit. The process carried on until I had twenty households; which was my sample size out of the total of 111 households.

The aim of this study was to investigate the perceptions of all resettled individuals at Dellos farm, and systematic random sampling therefore allowed me to randomly select study participants that would represent the population without considering any characteristics. However, there are resettled households who found life too difficult at Dellos farm and have relocated, some moved back to the communal area while some went to neighbouring countries. Consequently, there is a "selection bias" of the relatively more "successful" households which remained on the farm.

In most rural settings, next-door neighbours are acquaintances as they share and assist each other in times of need (Dekker, 2004b). Given such closeness of next-door neighbours,

systematic random sampling allowed me to avoid having all next-door neighbours in the study sample thereby excluding other sections of the village. However, there were some challenges encountered as a result of using this sampling technique during the study. Two of the households that were systematically included in the sample group could not participate. One woman declined stating that her husband was away and she could not participate without his consent. The other residential stand did not have any one residing there during the time of the study. Therefore the process of selection had to continue, using the same interval until the number of sample units was reached³.

In collecting data, I also triangulated data collected from narratives and in-depth interviews with the same group of people. Narrative interviews entail retelling of stories from the informant's point of view; that is, the reconstruction of social events from the informant's perspective (Bauer 1996; Jovchelovitch and Bauer 2000). Participants get to tell their stories without the researcher controlling the topics and issues they wanted to discuss. By narrating their stories, informants recall what has happened, putting those experiences into sequence and finding possible explanations for them. Jovchelovitch and Bauer (2000) point out that narrative accounts go beyond the listing of events. They do not consider stories or events in isolation but rather attempt to link them with time and meaning. This method of collecting data was therefore relevant for the study since it gave participants the opportunity to tell stories from their own perspectives. Moreover, it allowed me as a researcher to familiarise myself with the participants and their experiences before we started the one-on-one interviews which was my main data collection method.

Miller and Glassner (2004) argue that interviews in a qualitative study provide the researcher with the opportunity to explore a participant's point of view regarding the issue at hand. According to Sullivan (2001: 26), interviews are "a social relationship designed to exchange information between the respondent and the interviewer". In a more general sense, interviews entail a two-way dialogue in which the interviewer poses questions to the interviewee who then gives responses. In the event that the response given is not clear, the interviewer will follow up with probes thereby eliciting further information from the interviewee. Through this social relationship, trust can be forged thereby making it easier for information to be

³ Given that the two households could not participate, I carried on the selection and picked two more households. Instead of having household 98 as the last entry to the sample, I carried on with the process and included household number 103 and 108 to replace household 28 and 53.

shared (Sullivan, 2001). The in-depth interview sessions I had with the participants managed to elicit more information than the narrative sessions. The interviews revealed that most households on the farm are male-headed and consequently decisions are made by men. Moreover, these interviews revealed that although men are regarded as the sole decision makers, in some instances women have an indirect influence on the decision making.

During the narratives with the participants I realised that some of them were not very forthcoming with information. However, their responses began to change during the in-depth interview as we began to engage in a two-way dialogue. Participants began to open up and pointed out some of the shortcomings of the resettlement programme as well as challenges they were facing in the resettlement area, which they did not mention in the narratives. The in-depth interviews collected basic demographic information on the participants, the households in which they live, the livelihood strategies they engaged in before and after resettlement and the role of social capital in these livelihood strategies. A copy of the broad set of questions which were asked in the study is included in the appendix. Although they began to open up in the interviews, only 15% of the participants (or three of the 20 participants) agreed to audio recording of the interview. For most of the interviews, I was not able to tape record most interviews but was aware of the importance of having accurate notes to aid recall during analysis so I made hand-written notes during interviews.

Mathison (1988) highlights that good research practice require the researchers to triangulate data in order to enhance the validity of their research findings. Using both narrative and in-depth interviews gave me the opportunity to understand some aspects of the study population which would not have been possible had I used only one method of data collection. In particular, in-depth interviewing techniques created more trust with participants and thereby elicited more uncensored responses.

3.3 DATA ANALYSIS

Data collected through qualitative methods comprises mainly of words in contrast to the numeric nature of quantitative data. After collecting the data, the researcher begins to analyse and interpret the data in order to create meaning. There are different ways to analyse qualitative data. Data collected in this study were analysed using the thematic analysis

method. According to Braun and Clarke (2006) thematic analysis is a method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns within data. It involves identifying patterns or themes, selecting those of special interest and reporting on them. By so doing it brings order to, and a better understanding of, the collected data.

The data collected in this study went through the process of sifting and analysis. Firstly, I read through the notes over and over again and highlighted key issues and ideas that stood out in the findings. I then began to draw links between these key ideas and grouped similar ideas together and considered what they were implying. The fact that most of the participants were not comfortable with audio recording of the interview was a limitation of the study. In such instances I only relied on the notes taken during the field work as compared to having both the notes and the audio recorded data. However, that did not compromise the findings of my study as I did preliminary analysis of the interview soon after collecting the data. As a result I managed to keep a full record of the interviews. These preliminary analyses formed part of the data as I always referred back to them for clarity.

Regardless of the challenges encountered during the study, the research design and data collection methods employed in this study were the most relevant, given the nature of the information sought. Were it not for the direct interaction I had with the participants, for example if I had used a questionnaire for data collection, the hostility between myself as a researcher and the participants was going to prevail, hence yielding biased responses. It was through sustained one-on-one interaction that I gained the participants' trust. Other than understanding the social aspects of people's lives at Dellos farm, the approach gave me an opportunity to understand the political dynamics on the farm. Party politics at Dellos farm proved to have a great effect on the way people live and report about their lives: no one wanted to be associated with an opposition party for fear of reprisals. Using a qualitative approach, however, I was able to distance myself from political dynamics and thereby obtain more candid responses from participants.

4 CHAPTER 4: STUDY AREA AND RESEARCH FINDINGS

Land invasions under the Fast Track Land Reform Programme (FTLRP) saw a number of white-owned farms in Zimbabwe being appropriated without any compensation and redistributed to the landless black population (Kinsey et al, 2004; Thomas, 2003). Dellos farm, the study area on which this dissertation is based, is one of the farms that was appropriated for redistribution. This chapter presents a brief geographic and demographic description and history of Dellos farm. The focus of the chapter, however, is on the research findings. Attention will be given to the findings on livelihood strategies of households before and after resettlement; the nature of the social networking systems on the farm and their impact on livelihoods; and the perceptions of people regarding the resettlement programme and its effects on their lives. Although the main focus will be on these issues, some of the other findings will also be discussed in the chapter. To ensure anonymity, the names of all participants in the study have been changed.

4.1 HISTORY OF DELLOS FARM

Prior to April 2000 Dellos farm was owned by Mr Michael⁴ who used the farm for cattle production. In April 2000 a group of war veterans went to Mr Michael claiming co-ownership of the farm. According to Mr Matsvimbo, one of the war veterans who invaded the farm, a group of 34 men came and occupied the paddock areas of the farm and put up their temporary shelters. Every day the group would go to the farm owner threatening to burn his house and cattle if he refused to leave the farm. A day after the farm invasion, Mr Michael's family left the farm but Mr Michael remained behind with his brother and farm workers. However, most of the farm workers left a few days later fearing for their safety as they were constantly harassed by the war veterans. Only two farm workers, who were originally from Mozambique, remained behind looking after hundreds of cattle. The situation forced Mr

⁴ Except for the government officials, the names of all participants in this study have been changed.

Michael to confine his livestock to a small part of the farm fearing that war veterans might kill them.

During this time, war veterans vandalised farm property and equipment in an attempt to frustrate the farmer so that he would leave the farm. They pulled out the fence that separated paddocks, filled water ponds and dip-tanks with logs and stones, and blocked roads that linked the farm to other farms in the area. After about a month of sharing the space with the war veterans, Mr Michael and the two workers took the cattle, packed all the remaining farm equipment and left the farm.

After his departure, settlers began to allocate land to each other and went back “home” to take their families (mainly their wives and children) to join them. In August 2000 government officials, including Cde Made and Cde Hunzvi, came to address the settlers, telling them that officials from the Ministry of Land and Agriculture and the Local Government would come to allocate the land formally. They also informed the war veterans that some more people from Gutu and Chirumhanzu districts would join them in this new resettlement area since the government had planned to use the area to resettle people from the two districts. The government had planned to implement the A1⁵ model of resettlement at Dellos farm. Prior to resettlement, people who wished to acquire land through the FTLRP registered their names with their local councils to be eligible for selection when the land was available. Since the A1 model was tailored for subsistence farming, anyone who had small pieces of land in communal areas was free to register, even if they did not have the means to finance their farming activities. As a result, Dellos farm comprises of war veterans and the other people who did not fight in the liberation struggle but were landless in communal areas. Hence reasons for resettling varied among the households on the farm.

However, some of the people who invaded the farm did not have the intentions of staying on the farm. They were part of the group that sought to “facilitate” the land grabbing process and they moved to another farm once the previous owner had vacated the farm. At Dellos farm, there were four such people and they left the area soon after the farm owner departed. Regardless of the government’s call for people not to sell the land, a few years into the resettlement, some land beneficiaries at Dellos farm sold their land. Some sold their land and

⁵ The government designed different resettlement models to cater for different groups: the A1 model caters for the poor and landless who practice subsistence farming, and the A2 model prioritises increased production or commercial farming.

went back to the communal areas while others sold it and left the country to look for a better life in neighbouring countries. One of the participating households in this study bought the land in 2010 after the beneficiary decided to leave the country.

By November 2000 many people had moved into the area and the formal allocation of land began around March 2001. The District Administrating Officer (DAO), Agricultural Extension Officers (AEO) and other government officials held a meeting with the settlers informing them how the land was going to be partitioned. The DAO told the people that the government had planned to adopt the A1 model of resettlement in the area. The model entails that each settler household is allocated a portion of land for a residential stand, arable purposes and communal grazing land, where every household would have equal access (Thomas, 2003). Each household at Dellos farm was allocated 5,625 square metres for residential purposes, one hectare for vegetable gardens and three hectares for main crop production. The officials also allocated some space for infrastructural development such as a business centre, school and clinic. The grazing land was left to be of common use with everyone having equal access. Although people were allocated specific units of land, most people, and especially those who live at the outskirts, extended their portions. Two participants mentioned that they extended their residential units since the land on their exterior was not allocated to anyone; hence their residential stands are bigger than that of other settlers on the farm.

4.2 GEOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION

Dellos farm is part of the Felixburg resettlement area situated in Gutu North district in Masvingo Province, Zimbabwe. It is in ward 32b and both the Member of Parliament (MP) and local Councillor who represent the area are members of the ZANU (PF) party. Dellos farm lies along the border of the Masvingo Province and the Midlands Province. The farm is about 54km from the Gutu District Office and 67km from the Chirumhanzu District Office in the Midlands Province. It is in Zimbabwe's Natural Farming Region 4 and receives between 450 and 600mm of rainfall per year (Rukuni, 1994). Because the area receives fairly low rainfall with periodic seasonal droughts and dry spells during the rainy season, it is therefore more suitable for livestock rearing than crop production.

Although Dellos farm is under the Gutu District Council jurisdiction, settlers used to (and even currently) receive some of the basic services from the Chirumhanzu District Council. During the early days of resettlement, all children from Dellos farm attended school at Chaka Primary School and Gonawapotera Secondary School in Chirumhanzu. Both schools are 13km from the farm and the children would have had to walk to and from school every day. This was a big challenge for the new farmers and their families and consequently many of them opted to leave their children in communal areas where schools were close by. Others however came with their children who walked this long distance, with the risk that children would drop out of school, especially those in lower grades. A few years after their resettlement, parents who had left their children in communal areas decided to take their children to join them in the resettlement area. In 2009 the new farmers decided to build a primary school in the area. After consultations with the relevant authority and the Department of Education, they put up temporary classroom structures in August 2009 in the area. The Department of Education then officially opened Badza Primary School in January 2010 which at first enrolled 18 Grade 1 learners and 12 Grade 2 learners. Currently the school has Grade 0 to Grade 4 classes with the vision of having Grade 7 by 2017.

Other than attending school in Chirumhanzu, most of the Dellos farm residents also use the health care centre next to Chaka Business Centre, which is 15 km from the farm. Chatsworth Clinic, the one in Gutu district, is about 21km from the farm and requires people to pay for transport since people cannot walk such a distance. However, there are complaints that Chaka Rural Clinic is so under-staffed and under-equipped that some people from Dellos farm now sacrifice US\$2 for transport to go to Chatsworth Clinic which is said to be much better. One participant expressed her unhappiness with the services offered at Chaka Clinic as she feels that there are elements of discrimination in their provision of health care services. She said, “I don’t really know what is the problem at the clinic; it’s either the nurses are not qualified or they just don’t want to provide services to the people who come from *makombo* (resettlement area). Because if you come from this area whether you have a headache, running stomach or an open cut wound, all you get is a Panado”. While some participants blamed the clinic’s poor service provision on the country’s economic crisis, most of them cited political reasons as they feel that they are being discriminated against because of their political affiliations. Their argument is based on the fact that the Gutu district is run by ZANU (PF) while the Chirumhanzu district is run by the opposition MDC.

Although their area has limited access to proper schools and health facilities, Dellos farm residents have no problem in accessing transport facilities. The area lies along the Beit-bridge – Harare highway making it easy for settlers to access any mode of road transport at any time of the day. Participants reported that they take advantage of trucks using that route as they seem to be cheaper than buses. During the allocation of land in 2001, the District Administration Officer (DAO) set aside a portion of land to establish a business centre. Currently on that land there is a grinding mill and a tuck-shop (spaza shop) which are both owned by two families in Dellos farm. Another family is currently constructing a big structure with the intention of opening a supermarket. People get a few basic groceries from the spaza shop and also from the Chaka Business Centre, although they complain about high prices. Sometimes people travel to Masvingo where they get more groceries and other necessities at cheaper prices.

At Dellos farm almost all households now have houses or huts made out of bricks, an indication that they are making permanent homes. During the first three years of resettlement, all houses were made of mud and logs as people were not sure if they would live in the area permanently. Although most houses are thatched with grass, some households now have bigger houses with either asbestos or zinc roofing and cement floors. This indicates that some households at Dellos farm can afford to buy building materials.

In terms of sanitation, most settlers have pit latrines and also protected wells at their residential areas. However, some noted that during the dry season their wells run dry, forcing them to get water from their neighbours and the local river. Although many households have pit latrines, some are still using the bush system which exposes them to the risk of contracting diseases such as cholera. There is also Shashe River which provides water for other household uses and gardening. Moreover, there are wetlands on Dellos farm where each household is allocated a portion to use as a garden. They use the wetlands for growing vegetables which most participants identified as a convenient source of income. Although the wetlands dry up in the dry season, residents regard them as the most fertile pieces of land they have.

There are however some problems that have surfaced on the farm since people moved in. According to Mr Matsvimbo, one of the study participants, during the early days of resettlement most parts of the farm were covered with dense forests. However these forests no longer exist after settlers cleared most of the land for residential and farming purposes.

Another participant said that there were plenty of wild animals during the early days of resettlement. However, he explained that now it is very rare to see any of these animals because there are no more bushes to shelter them, and also settlers continuously hunt them for consumption. In a nutshell, some participants indicated that the depletion of natural resources at Dellos farm is happening at a faster rate since their arrival. Their main concern is that although everyone could see the effects of the depletion of these natural resources, very little is being done to prevent it and some residents are continuing to exploit the resources. Consequences especially of deforestation are starting to show as most parts of the farm are lying bare without any trees to cover them; yet people are still cutting down trees and selling firewood.

4.3 DEMOGRAPHIC FEATURES OF DELLOS FARM

Most households at Dellos farm are male-headed households: of the 20 households that participated in the study, 14 are male headed households, with five being headed by females who are mainly widows, and one is child-headed⁶. There are some households where the male head (father) is working in an urban area, in which case the wife assumes some of the responsibility for household decision-making. However, there are certain major decisions, such as the selling of livestock or the lending a piece of land to someone, that the woman cannot make on her own. In the event that such decisions are to be made, she will have to consult with her husband first and then act on his directives.

Of the participant households, 14 household heads are married, with three being widows and three single. Some of the household heads at Dellos farm have been in a polygamous relationship: 35% of heads were at some point in a polygamous marriage. Table 4.1 shows the marital status of household heads who participated in the study. Although 25% of the participant household heads are currently in a polygamous marriage, none had more than one wife staying at Dellos farm (the other wife remained in the communal area).

⁶ The child-headed household is made up of two orphan brothers whose mother and father died in 2008 and 2010 respectively.

Table 4.1: Marital status of participant household heads

Marital status	Number of households
Married in a monogamy	9
Married in a polygamy	5
Monogamy widow	2
Polygamy widow	1
Single never married	2
Polygamy divorcee	1

Note: information was obtained from interviews with participants

The average household size at Dellos farm is 4.85 resident household members. On average, there are 2.75 resident children per household. When non-resident children are included the average number of children per household increases to 4.3. Most households at Dellos farm are “old” households, meaning that couples were married more than five years prior to resettlement. Such households have a larger number of children but in many cases, children are now adults and some also have their own families. In such households, most children do not stay at the farm but the grandchildren now reside at Dellos farm. There are also “young” couples, who were married after resettlement or less than five years before resettlement. Although these young households have fewer children, the number of household members is high as most of them have extended family members staying with them. Many households at Dellos farm therefore include members of the extended family. Households not only comprise the father, mother and their children but other relatives as well. Ensuring a bigger household size, especially with more adults, is valued by many at Dellos farm since adults in particular are regarded as a source of labour. Hence households with more children and fewer adults are more affected by labour shortages.

4.4 LIVELIHOODS BEFORE RESETTLEMENT

Before their resettlement at Dellos farm, households had a variety of livelihood strategies and they varied depending on where the household used to live. Some households before resettlement were located in urban areas while others were in rural areas. Most of the household heads that lived in urban areas reported to have been employed, either in the formal or the informal sector. Nonetheless, the money they earned was never enough to sustain their families given the country's economic challenges. People who were employed in the formal sector were the most affected since they had fixed monthly salaries while prices of goods were always increasing. Like most urban households in Zimbabwe, participants reported that although they had one household member formally employed, other members of the household engaged in some income-generating activities to supplement the salary. The black market⁷ was the main route taken by many people in order to earn a living. Mrs Chipuro, one of the participants said that in her former residential area in Gweru, most of the people were participating in the black market. Some people saw it as an opportunity to make more money while others used it as their only means of earning a living.

Although most of the households that lived in rural areas before resettlement were regarded as peasant farmers, poor soil quality and shortage of land in communal areas prevented them from making agriculture their sole livelihood activity. Participants reported that they had to find other means to make ends meet. Remittances from relatives and other family members were used to smooth consumption and expenditure. Some participants also reported that they used to provide labour for a fee to other households that were well off economically, a practice known as *maricho*. Livestock ownership before resettlement was rarely reported, especially among young households. Although most households that reported owning livestock before resettlement were the ones residing in rural areas, older households that resided in urban areas before resettlement also reported owning livestock before resettlement. Their relatives in rural areas kept the livestock for them. Box 4.1 summarises these different livelihood strategies of the households before resettlement.

⁷ With high unemployment, scarcity of basic commodities and sky rocketing inflation in Zimbabwe in the past decade, many people began to engage in foreign currency trading and reselling of basic commodities to earn a living.

BOX 4.1 LIVELIHOOD STRATEGIES BEFORE RESETTLEMENT

Chitsa household

Mrs Chitsa is a widow who came from Gondwi communal areas in Gutu. She decided to resettle when her husband got sick and her husband's first wife accused her of witchcraft and of wanting their husband dead. This caused tension between her and the in-laws as they believed the allegations of witchcraft. She moved to the resettlement after the death of her husband. Mrs Chitsa's husband had a supermarket and a bottle store which were the family's source of income, and they gave the family a stable livelihood. She said that although they were living in a rural area, the family never considered farming as a means of survival. Her husband had a portion of land which he, together with his four brothers, had inherited from their father. However, he gave his portion of the land to one of his brothers who relied on subsistence farming. After her husband's death, Mrs Chitsa's in-laws refused to give her and her children any of her husband's assets, and she decided to leave the area and start a new life with her children.

Taruvinga household

Mr Richard Taruvinga and his wife, who have been married for 22 years, decided to move to the resettlement areas in 1999 when they heard that the government was going to embark on a fast track resettlement scheme. Before resettlement they stayed in Mushayavanhu communal areas in Gutu, where Mr Taruvinga had never had any formal employment. Mr Taruvinga does not have any secondary school education or any vocational training; as a result he could not find 'proper' employment. He used to work as a part-time security guard at Maipe Primary School, which was next to their home in the communal area. Mr Taruvinga reported that he was not paid in cash for his security guard services; rather, he was relieved from paying school fees for his children. For survival the family relied on subsistence farming and doing casual jobs, such as herding other people's cattle and providing labour to other households for a fee. Mrs Taruvinga said that life was very difficult before resettlement since they could not provide for their children. She added that it was very rare to buy clothes for her children because all the money was spent on buying food. "We never used to buy new clothes; normally we used to do *maricho*, and people would pay us with their old clothes", said Mrs Taruvinga. As a result they spent more time doing *maricho* than working their own land. Mr Taruvinga reported that they never had a

good harvest due to low rainfall, and also that the area of land they had was too limited to produce enough food for the family. Upon hearing the news of resettlement, the family thought that it was their only way to have access to a bigger portion of land and improve their social and economic status.

Chipuriro household

Mr and Mrs Chipuriro have six children. Before they came to Dellos farm, the family used to stay in Gweru where Mr Chipuriro was working as a Military Police Officer. The household livelihood depended on Mr Chipuriro's salary. Although the salary could provide for basic necessities, the household budget was strained after the two older children went to the university and most of the salary was used to pay for the children's university fees. Mrs Chipuriro said that after her two children enrolled at the university, she started selling popcorn and cool drinks at a nearby secondary school to cover the household expenses. She said her husband's monthly income was no longer enough as the prices of basic commodities were always rising yet salaries were stagnant. She later expanded her popcorn and cool drinks business and opened a spaza shop. However, she said that it was very stressful as she had to run around to secure stocks. Mrs Chipuriro said she later closed the spaza shop because it was no longer profitable due to the price controls imposed by the government. Since they did not have the supplementary income any more, they decided that Mrs Chipuriro and the children should go and stay in their rural home in Mapako in Zaka. Upon retirement in 2009, Mr Chipuriro joined his family in Mapako. Mr Chipuriro said that after staying at home for about half a year, he heard from his cousin, who relocated to a farm next to Dellos, that someone was selling his land in Dellos. "We saw the land and realised that it was bigger than what we had in Mapako, and we decided to buy it", said Mr Chipuriro. They said that since their livelihood was going to depend on agriculture, they thought it would be better if they got access to a bigger portion of land. Mr and Mrs Chipuriro bought the land and relocated to Dellos farm in 2010.

Mafuta household

Mrs Mafuta is a widow and has one child, a girl who is ten years old. Her husband passed away in February 2010 when she was seven months pregnant. Unfortunately, her second child died two weeks after birth. Currently, her daughter and her brother and his wife are staying with her at the farm. After her husband's death, Mrs Mafuta took in her brother and

his wife after her brother lost his job as a cleaner and could no longer afford to pay for his accommodation in Masvingo. Mrs Mafuta said that her brother and his family are only staying with her until he (the brother) gets a job enabling him to provide for his family. Before resettlement, Mrs Mafuta and her husband were staying in the Muwani communal areas in Chirumhanzu. When they got married, Mrs Mafuta and her husband stayed with her in-laws, and three months later they were given their own house so that they could start providing for themselves. This is part of the Shona culture when the in-laws give their daughter in-law “permission to start her own family”, known as *kupiwaimba* or *kubikiswa*. She said that both she and her husband had never been formally employed and to provide for themselves they had to rely on *maricho*. Mrs Mafuta said that although they relied on *maricho*, they never over-worked themselves as other people who rely on *maricho* do since their family was very small. She also said that her husband used to herd cattle for a local business man in Muwani which gave them extra cash. Mrs Mafuta and her husband decided to resettle on Dellos farm in order to have their own piece of land instead of relying on the small portion they were given by Mr Mafuta’s father.

4.5 LIVELIHOOD ACTIVITIES ON THE FARM

Households at Dellos farm engage in a number of livelihood activities, including crop production, livestock rearing and other activities they pursue to earn an income. Although there is division of labour in pursuit of some of these livelihood strategies, farming and livestock herding is done by both men and women at the farm. They both engage in all farming activities from ploughing to harvesting both on the plots and in the gardens. However, groundnut production is mainly done by women and children. Also, any household member can herd the cattle and other livestock the household may have. It is mainly activities such as beer brewing, selling vegetables and making mats that are specifically done by women only, while brick making is mainly done by men.

4.5.1 CROP PRODUCTION

The resettlement plan at Dellos farm is based on arable agriculture; consequently most households depend mostly on crop production for their livelihood. Rain-fed crop production is the main livelihood activity for households on the farm, and they grow different types of crops. Since maize is the staple food for Zimbabwe, all households at Dellos farm grow maize every season for both consumption and sale. There are however some crops, such as sorghum and millet, that are regarded as cash crops and households produce them mainly for the market. Although these crops are intended for the market, households do not sell them to the Grain Marketing Board (GMB). Households at Dellos farm sell their crops at the local markets since their production is very low. Although many people “plan” for commercial production before the rainy season, they find it difficult to execute their plans due to limited resources and low amounts of rainfall. As a result, they have little left to sell after their own consumption.

Households also grow groundnuts for both household consumption and the market. In most households at Dellos farm, income raised from selling maize, sorghum and millet is regarded as “family income” and the household head is responsible for allocating the money. The family income is used to cover household expenses such as groceries, school fees and farming inputs. In contrast, income raised from selling groundnuts is for the mother to allocate. As a result, women at Dellos farm put as much time and effort as possible into groundnut production so that they can have more income at their disposal. Women normally use their money to buy kitchen utensils and sometimes clothes for their families. Most women also indicated that they want to have money so that they could join *mukando* or *society* or *round*.⁸ These are saving clubs, where a group of women contribute a certain amount of money on a monthly basis, which is then given to members rotationally at the end of each month. However, since the income from groundnut production is not demarcated as “family income”, women are given less time to work on their groundnuts field. Much of their work time is spent on the production of crops for “family income”, and in most cases, women have to spend their “spare” time in groundnut production.

⁸ People at Dellos farm have three different terms they use to refer to informal savings club; they can refer to them as *mukando*, *society* or *round*.

Given the limited output from farm production, and the income this generates, household heads have to be very disciplined and responsible not to “waste” their agricultural produce. According to Mrs Chitsa, one of the participants, “a responsible household head will not waste the family’s produce ... and sell only when necessary. It is much easier to keep stocks of grain than to keep stocks of money because you can misuse it (the money)”. She added that some people are tempted to sell a lot of grain at once with the hope that they will keep the money and use it when necessary. However, she said that this is problematic as they will end up buying impulsively when traders come to the area and spend the money on unnecessary items. As a result they will have to sell more grain when a real need arises, and they end up with nothing to see them through to the next season.

Households also have gardens, where they grow vegetables which are irrigated using the bucket system. Of the participant households in this study, 65% indicated that they generate most of their household *income* from these gardens. Unlike the sale of crops, the sale from vegetables does not come in a lump sum, but participants indicated that it has a greater significance on their day to day expenses. For example, one participant (Mr Hungwe) said that when drawing up a family budget, he does not include school stationery for his children because during the weekend, the children can earn the income for this by selling tomatoes. Participants indicated that for as long as they take good care of their vegetable gardens, they can sell the vegetables and generate income they need for other household expenses. They take advantage of staying along the Harare–Beit-bridge highway where they can easily sell their vegetables and other produce to passers-by who travel along the road. Mrs Hungwe said that vegetables and other farm produce are expensive in urban areas and most people prefer to buy these in rural areas where they are cheaper. As such they sell most of their vegetables to urban dwellers who travel along the highway on a daily basis. The money acquired from vegetable sales is also considered to be family income since it is used for covering household expenses. However, women have more control over this money as they are the ones who sell the vegetables.

Overall, participants in the study identified that they are now able to generate more income compared to when they lived in communal areas. As one participant said, “I don’t think I will be able to survive in communal areas anymore because I am now used to making money from selling these vegetables. Back then (in communal areas) I used to get money once a month when my husband came from Harare, but now I can just sell whatever I have from the garden and get some money”. Mrs Chipuro, a participant who previously lived in an urban area

highlighted that unlike in the urban area where most of the income they acquired was used to pay for rentals and buying food, now they use their money to accumulate more assets. She said that although they earn less from their agricultural production than they used to get, they feel it has great value since they are able to accumulate more assets than before. She said, “What is the point of getting \$400 per month when you spent all of it on rentals and buying food than getting \$200 per month and buy a goat or an ox-drawn plough? Here we do not pay any rent and we produce most of our food, so the money we make is for ‘development’”.

4.5.2 LIVESTOCK REARING

Households at Dellos farm also keep livestock as another livelihood strategy. Households keep different types of livestock which they use for different purposes. Cattle provide many benefits, and are given great value by the people at Dellos farm compared to other livestock such as donkeys, goats, sheep and chickens. Of the households participating in this study, 80% reported to own cattle and the number of cattle per household ranges from 2 to 13. Older households seem to have more cattle than young households. A possible explanation is that unlike young households that did not own any cattle before resettlement, older households had owned cattle. They then relocated with their cattle to the resettlement areas where some of them are accumulating more.

Cattle are very expensive and selling a cow can fetch a lot of money in the event of the household’s unexpected need for cash. However, participants indicated that selling cattle would always be the last resort, as cattle are an important investment asset for the household. Instead of selling their cattle they would rather borrow the money, or sell small livestock such as goats, sheep and chicken. It is only when the circumstances make it unavoidable that people sell cattle at Dellos farm. One participant mentioned that he sold one cow in 2010 to pay for his wife’s medical bill and was still struggling to replace the cow.

People at Dellos farm normally acquire cattle to use as draught power and because of their other benefits such as manure and milk. They associate cattle ownership with economic status; anyone who owns more than four cattle is considered to be “better off” by those with none or less. Mr Mhizha, one of the participants said, “You will always feel a lesser man among other men if you do not have cattle, especially if you are among those with *chipani*”

(four or more cattle that can be used as draught power). Households with *chipani* indicated that they can also make money by leasing out their cattle to those who do not have.

Smaller livestock are used for consumption smoothing and other expenses in many households at Dellos farm. In the event that a household's food stocks are running low, the household head may decide to sell a goat and buy a 50kg bag of maize. Mrs Mhizha said that she always kept a goat or two to sell in the event that the family experiences an urgent need for cash. In some instances, the income from the sale of small livestock is used to hire labour. A household head may realise that the household needs extra labour, and would ask someone to assist and pay them with a goat, chicken or sheep, depending on the time spent and type of job done.

Table 4.2 shows the type and percentages of livestock owned by participant households at Dellos farm. Although all participant households reported to own chickens, it is one type of livestock that is less valued at Dellos farm. In the words of one participant: "even a newly born child can own a chicken, how then can a grown-up man include chicken when calculating the wealth he accumulated in the resettlement area?" Regardless of the low value placed on chickens, they still play vital role in the livelihood activities and consumption smoothing of people at Dellos.

Table 4.2: Percentage of livestock ownership of participant households at Dellos farm

Animal type	% owning
Cattle	70
Goats	55
Chickens	100
Donkeys	20
Sheep	10

Note: Information was obtained from interviews with participants

4.5.3 OTHER ACTIVITIES

Beer brewing is another income-generating activity especially for women at Dellos farm. Households grow sorghum or millet to make beer which they sell to local people. Other households however do not grow the grain on their own; rather, they buy from neighbours who grow sorghum but do not brew the beer. By so doing, growing sorghum or millet becomes an income-generating activity on its own. Some women indicated that they generate income by selling mats and brooms they make from reeds, while others generate income from making and selling clay pots. Women also indicated that during the rainy season, they collect mushrooms and sell these to passers-by on the highway. Regardless of having other income-generating activities, most of the women participate in *mukando* (society). They regard this savings club as one source of income that is reliable although they get it at certain intervals. They know that for as long as they pay their monthly premium, they are guaranteed their share when it is their turn to be given the money.

Men at Dellos farm also reported making extra cash from other activities too. While some men make bricks and sell firewood to earn extra cash, others engage in the informal economy through black market trading. They buy motor fuel, especially diesel from cross-border truck drivers, and resell it to the local taxi and bus operators. They indicated that during the fuel crisis in Zimbabwe, they made lots of money because the fuel was in high demand and they could charge very high prices. Remittances from migrant labourers were reported to be another source of income for households and especially for older households with children working in urban areas and elsewhere.

4.6 SOCIAL NETWORKS AMONG HOUSEHOLDS AT DELLOS FARM

Unlike other resettlement areas where beneficiaries were complete strangers to each other (Barr, 2004), many households at Dellos farm reported some familiarity with some of their new neighbours prior to resettlement, since most of them came from the same district. However, although there was some familiarity among the settlers, none of the participants reported that they had interacted socially before resettlement as they had come from different villages. As a result they had to establish new social relationships when they moved to Dellos

farm. Two participant households who were among the first people to settle on Dellos farm said that in the early days, it was difficult to trust anyone especially those from a different district. They both admitted that there was some kind of animosity between settlers originally from Gutu and those from Chirumhanzu.

Settlers from Chirumhanzu felt that the government gave first preference to people from Gutu to acquire land, resulting in more people from Gutu getting land than people from Chirumhanzu. In general, the modal percentage of households at Dellos farm is originally from the Gutu district: 55% of the participating households are originally from Gutu; 20% come from Chirumhanzu and 25% from elsewhere. Households that originated from neither Gutu nor Chirumhanzu first came to Dellos farm to work as labourers for some households on the farm, or they bought the land from people who relocated elsewhere. In the early days of resettlement, people from each district socialised amongst themselves. However, as more people came to the farm, the animosity lessened and people began to associate with others regardless of their place of origin.

Households at Dellos farm have a number of social activities they engage in, and these serve different purposes at both household and community levels. A key social activity is *dare*, a social gathering held every fortnight, where all households at the farm gather and discuss issues that affect their community. *Dare* is a compulsory meeting, and every household on the farm is required to have at least one adult representative at each meeting. Participants indicated that *dare* is a very important gathering as it allows the community to make major collective decisions concerning the development of their community. The establishment of Badza Primary School, for instance, was initiated and implemented through these meetings.

There are also religious gatherings where members of a particular denomination congregate and share religious teachings. Membership in these groups is not compulsory, and individuals can choose any denomination they want to be part of. In these religious groups, people then form social work groups where they assist each other with farm work. These groups are commonly known as *mushandira*.

A certain number of households come together to form a group where they rotate working on each other's plot. Member households allocate days when they assist each other with farm work, and the member to be assisted will tell the other group members the type of work they need to be assisted with. Whether they need garden fencing, weeding or planting, members will spend a specified number of hours working on that member's field. Time they spend

working varies among the work groups. Households also form herding groups where member households take turns in herding the livestock of group members, a practice which is known as *dzoro*.

Households in a herding group put their livestock together and each household will spend one week looking after the livestock of all members. For example, if there are four households in a herding group, each household will spend only one week in a month herding. After one week, it will be another household's duty to herd the livestock. Through this division of labour, other member households are able to engage in other farm work when they are not on duty to herd. It is mainly through *mushandira* and *dzoro* that women initiate their *societies*.

Women from the same *mushandira* or *dzoro* can come together and start a savings club. Not only do these women benefit economically from their *societies*, but they also use this club as a platform for socialisation, holding their social meetings every Thursday afternoon to share social and religious ideas.

Church membership is not a prerequisite for joining such social work groups, and there are households that do not belong to any denomination but participate in different work and herding groups. Participants pointed out that these groups are formed mainly on the basis of trust and trustworthiness. Selection of which group to join, or which household to accept into a group, is very important since members should accept a household that is committed and hard working. One participant said, "If you need progress on your plot, you need to join a group of hard working people, teaming up with people with "glass hands" will not do you any good".

Also after joining the group people should continue to work hard as they may be expelled from the group. However, the expulsion from a group is not done directly. One study participant indicated that if group members want to exclude a member household they may begin by showing less interest in working when it is that particular household's turn. For example, they give excuses that they will not be available to work on the day they are supposed to, and some may send young children who may not be able to do the work required. As a result, group members know that it is in their best interest to continue working hard if they want to remain part of the group. Households that are participating in these groups reported a reduction of work load and increased levels of production since the time they joined the groups. Box 4.2 presents reports of how these groups impacted on the life most of the participants.

Box 4.2: Reports on work groups and their effects on household's livelihood

Chitsa Family

Mrs Chitsa is a widow with eight children, but currently only two of her younger children and four grandchildren stay with her at the farm. Mrs Chitsa said that the early days of resettlement were very difficult for her because she did not have any resources required to cope with the amount of work in resettlement. Her children used to send her some money to pay labourers to work on her plot since she was the only adult in the household and could not do all the work by herself. Moreover, she said that she took her two cattle and gave them to her brother to look after since she could not herd them. Mrs Chitsa then joined both a cattle herding group and a work group which she said have allowed her to accomplish more work than before. Now she can keep her cattle and enjoy the benefits of owning cattle that she could not enjoy before. One of her cows has just had a calf and produces enough milk for the family to consume and sell. Since she is now in a work group, Mrs Chitsa can cultivate her entire one-hectare garden with the assistance of her group members. She said that since she joined the groups in 2006, she has managed to save most of the money her children send her, and bought two cattle which she could not have done if she was still paying labourers. She also reported an increase in her production as she now had a surplus which she could sell.

Tarwirei family

Mrs Tarwirei is a second wife of Mr Tinaye Tarwirei and currently stays at Dellos farm with her two grandchildren, and her nephew's wife and child. Mr and Mrs Tarwirei do not have children together but they both have children from other relationships. Mrs Tarwirei said that it was her idea to move to the resettlement area as she wanted her own home where her children could visit without her in-laws' interference. Although her husband is regarded as the household head, he is always away from home and she assumed the role of the household head. Mr Tarwirei stays in Masvingo where he works as a security guard, and sometimes visits his first wife in their communal home. Mrs Tarwirei joined the work group only because she does not own cattle. She is very grateful that she joined a group of hard working and committed people. Since she joined the work group she has managed to increase the portion of land she cultivates and has increased her production levels. Between

2008 and 2010 Mrs Tarwirei raised money from selling sorghum and vegetables to buy building material and she built a four roomed house. She is now working towards buying furniture for her house. Mrs Tarwirei is very pleased with her achievements since she moved to Dellos farm. She said that since she built the house, her husband respects her far more, and no longer makes any major decisions without consulting her. She said, “I have achieved something not even my own husband has ever achieved, he never owned a big house as the one I built; now ‘he owns’ one and it’s all thanks to my hard work”. Before she joined the work group, Mrs Tarwirei said she never thought she would clear more land other than her garden and the residential stand. Currently she has managed to clear all the hectares allocated to her husband for arable agriculture through the assistance of her group members.

Hungwe family

Mr and Mrs Hungwe have five children but currently only two of their children and a helper are living with them at Dellos farm. Two of their children are married and live with their families in Harare while the other one is not yet married and is living in Mutare, where he is working in the National Defence Forces. Both Mr and Mrs Hungwe acknowledge that their children try their best to send them some money for household expenses, but given the economic challenges that most people are experiencing, they sometimes fail to send money home. The Hungwe household joined the work and herding groups which they say has greatly relieved their work load and taken the pressure off their shoulders. Mr Hungwe said “Before we joined these groups life here was not pleasing at all, no wonder some people opted out and sold their land, it was unbearable”. He said that it was very rare for him to have any time to relax, “if I am not working in the garden, I am in the field and if not that, I am herding my cattle which in most cases I will have to herd next to my plot so that I will look after the cattle at the same time working in the field” said Mr Hungwe. However, this changed after they joined the work groups. Mrs Hungwe said that now they can afford to skip a day or two without working in the field or garden since one day of group work will cover a week’s work of their own. As such they have managed to expand the portion of land they cultivate. Their production levels have increased and they can now provide their children in urban areas with mealie-meal. Mr Hungwe was also very happy by the fact that since joining the herding group he does not have to herd the cattle every day. Mrs Hungwe also joined a *society* which she says is a very good way of saving: “It is difficult to save money on your own but if you join the *society* you will be obliged to save”. Mr Hungwe

also appreciated the significance of the *society* in their household as he said that they normally use the money to pay for school fees for their children.

However, regardless of the benefits reported by many, not all households at Dellos farm participate in these groups. Reasons cited for less commitment vary from household to household. Box 4.3 presents some of these reasons.

Box 4.3: Reasons for less commitment to social and work groups

Machimbi family

Mr and Mrs Machimbi live in a household on Dellos farm with their five year old son and Mrs Machimbi's younger sister. Their second son died in 2010 when he was only six months old. Mr Machimbi is originally from Zaka while his wife is originally from Buhera. They first came to Dellos in 2004 when they were working as helpers at one household at Dellos farm. They got married a year later and then received their own piece of land. Since they came to the farm as helpers/ labourers, they did not and still do not have the resources to build a new home. Both Mr and Mrs Machimbi said that they are socially and economically struggling on the farm. They have no resources necessary for them to function in the resettlement, and they also feel that they are looked down upon by their neighbours. They were both diagnosed with TB and their health is deteriorating. Mrs Machimbi said their main challenge on the farm is starvation: they are both too weak to work on their land; as a result they always struggle to produce enough food. They rely more on the food parcels they receive from a mission hospital that supplies them with the medication. Mrs Machimbi said that she asked her sister to stay with them since she and her husband are always in and out of the hospital, and their child will need someone to look after him. According to Mrs Machimbi, they stopped participating in work groups "after realising that they were not benefiting much from it". "Everyone thinks that we are HIV positive, they talk bad about me and my family, I don't think I can continue to stay here", said Mrs Machimbi, trying to hold tears from her eyes. Mrs Machimbi said there were very few people who truly feel pity for her; those are the ones she can rely on for assistance. The family feels that most people at the farm, especially those who were in their work group, were not sympathetic with them as they expected them (the Machimbi family) to work just like anyone else in the group. Mrs Machimbi said that maybe if she or her husband was strong enough to work, life would have

been better for them. She went on saying that many people look down upon them because of their health problems and that they are poor. Mr Machimbi said, “everyone wants us to work for them and most of them do not pay us like they would pay other people, they know that if they give us something to eat we will be grateful”. Both Mr and Mrs Machimbi feel their life would be better if they were staying where their relatives were close by.

Dzikamai family

Mr and Mrs Dzikamai have five children and four of their children have their own families. Two of their children stay in Bulawayo where they also work, and the other two are in Botswana. Mr and Mrs Dzikamai currently live in a household with their youngest son, two grandchildren and a helper. They came to Dellos farm in 2003 after Mr Dzikamai retired from the National Railways of Zimbabwe where he had worked for 37 years. Mrs Dzikamai said that their reason for relocation was not because they wanted land for agricultural purpose. They just wanted a rural home to retire to other than their communal home in Chivi where they did not have good relations with their relatives (from the husband’s side). “We wanted to stay in the rural areas so that we can rent out our house in Bulawayo, but staying in Chivi was not an option for me because I have never been the best daughter-in-law in the eyes my husband’s family ”, said Mrs Dzikamai. However she said that they occasionally visit them; especially her husband. Both Mr and Mrs Dzikamai said their livelihood does not rely on agriculture. Mr Dzikamai gets some money from his pension fund and they also get some money from the rental of their house in Bulawayo. Mrs Dzikamai however also said that their children assist them very much by taking turns to buy monthly groceries. She used the Shona phrase *Chirere mangwanana chigokurera* (look after your little ones today so that they will also look after you tomorrow) to express their relationship with their children. Mrs Dzikamai said they sent their children to school and they now have good jobs, and now their children are looking after them. She said that there is really no need for them to join the work groups since they do not aim for any mass production. However, they did join the herding group since they have some livestock, and they thought it would give them the opportunity to be part of some group in their community.

4.7 EFFECTS OF LAND REFORM ON PEOPLE'S LIVES

Kinsey (2004) argues that the issue of whether the land reform in Zimbabwe was a success or not is debatable. The effects of the programme on households at Dellos farm contribute to this debate, as participants identified both positive and negative effects of resettlement. Moreover, a few households fared very badly after resettlement and have subsequently left Dellos farm. However, in this particular case study, the positive effects of resettlement appear to outweigh the negative ones.

Livelihoods of many rural households in Zimbabwe depend on subsistence farming and land is therefore an invaluable natural resource for many rural households. Study participants reported that the land reform programme gave them the opportunity to access more land than they had before. They argued that before resettlement they had very small pieces of land and that limited their farming activities. Participants argued that having access to more land helped them improve their livelihoods as they could now grow a more diverse range of crops than before. Although they do not earn much from their agricultural activities, almost all households at Dellos farm believe that their socio-economic status is much better than it was before resettlement. Ms Muvhimi's livelihood strategies after resettlement highlight how access to land improved her economic status. Before resettlement Ms Muvhimi said that she relied on *maricho* for everything. Although she now does not produce enough to sell to the GMB, she can produce enough to feed her children and she also earns an income from selling vegetables which she uses to pay for other household expenses. She said that since she came to Dellos in 2005, she only did *maricho* in that first year of resettlement.

Some of the participants, and especially the men, felt that land gave them a sense of worthiness as household heads. Most of the male heads at Dellos farm reported that since they now have bigger portions of land, they have the liberty to grow as many crops of different types as they can. One participant said, "Having my own land where I can produce enough to feed my family makes me feel man enough. There is nothing as bad as looking at your children starve and not being able to help them. At least now I know that if I plan well as the father, my family will not starve". As a result most of them have no intention to return to their communal area, nor do they wish to leave the farm for any other place. Some participants indicated that they will not stand anyone who threatens to take their land away. Mr Matsvimbo said, "The land was lost once and that will never happen again. No one will

take this land away from me for as long as I live. I even told my sons that if I die they should take care of it". In their opinion, people at Dellos farm feel that the programme gave them a means to a better future and most of them are prepared to hold on to it at any cost.

Moving from communal areas entailed that resettled households had to leave their natal families behind (WLSA, 1997; Barr, 2004; Dekker, 2004b). Although households at Dellos farm left their natal families in communal areas, the effects of this break-away had different impacts on households. While some households reported that they missed the support they received from their family members when they were still living together, others were relieved that they were staying away from them. Households that resettled at Dellos farm because they did not get along with their families in the communal areas reported that they do not miss most, if any, of the social relationships they had before resettlement. One participant said that the programme gave her the opportunity to start a new life with her children away from her in-laws who were treating her like a slave after the death of her husband.

There are however other households that had good relationships with their relatives before resettlement but now the relationships have become strained by the long distance between them. One participant indicated that he had a good relationship with his brothers before resettlement. They stayed in the same village and often held family gatherings where they performed different rituals in honour of their ancestors. Now that he stays away from his brothers, he cannot attend all the family gatherings and is beginning to feel as if he is no longer part of the family. He said that even if he attends a gathering, he will feel like a guest as all the planning is done in his absence, and he is only there on the day of the function and leaves soon after the function. As a result he no longer has a sense of belonging among his own people because of the distance that separates them.

4.8 CONCLUSION

The chapter has discussed some of the major findings of the study. Accessing land has proven to be invaluable to many households at Dellos farm. Most participants revealed that their livelihoods are now more dependent on agriculture; which was not possible before resettlement given the limited land they had to cultivate in communal area. Also, accessing land gave people who were previously living in urban areas the opportunity to produce their

own food and acquire more assets than they did before. Overall, accessing more land gave resettled households the means to improve their livelihoods. However, although livelihoods of many people at the farm depend on farming, it has also been realised that there is need for people to diversify their livelihood strategies in order to spread the risks of farming and increase income. Problems of limited resources and inputs, and low rainfall, make it difficult for settlers to depend fully on farming. As a result they engage in other income-generating activities to cover for the shortfall.

Social networks at Dellos farm proved to be strong and to have great influence on people's livelihood strategies. The chapter has indicated that it is through the different social network structures at the farm that settlers are able to utilise more of their land and thereby enhance their livelihoods. Social work groups and other social activities at the farm play a critical role in rallying people together to pursue the most important activity on the farm, farming, which is the main livelihood strategy. Participation in the work groups, however, requires that households actively contribute their labour, and these groups therefore may not benefit households where adult members are sickly. Social groups have also been important in overcoming some of the other challenges that the resettled households faced, and particularly, the lack of a nearby school for children living at the farm. However, other problems, such as the availability of a clinic and shops, persist.

5 CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Data collected by qualitative means are textured and detailed, and they highlight the subjective realities of the people involved in the issue under investigation. It therefore requires the researcher to analyse the findings in order to get a better understanding of how study participants make sense of the phenomenon or issue under investigation.

This chapter presents a summary of the major findings and conclusions of the study of resettled households at Dellos farm, and it identifies recommendations for how the social and economic life of these households can be improved. The major findings in this chapter are summarised in a way that answers the research questions posed in the study. Three broad themes that emerged from the findings are used to structure the chapter. These are changes in the livelihood strategies of households from pre-resettlement to post-resettlement; the effects of social networks in enhancing social and economic life of rural households; and the role of government in ensuring the success of the resettlement programmes. Other sub-themes that fall within these three main themes will also be discussed in the chapter.

5.1 CHANGES IN THE LIVELIHOOD STRATEGIES: BEFORE AND AFTER RESETTLEMENT

Most of the participant households reported a difference between the livelihood strategies they had pursued before resettlement and those they were now pursuing at Dellos farm. Through the in-depth interviews, participants revealed that before resettlement they had diverse livelihood strategies as compared to the ones they now have that are more centred on agriculture. It was evident from these interviews that people's choice to pursue different strategies is influenced mainly by the type and availability of resources in the areas of their residence.

5.1.1 DIVERSE LIVELIHOOD STRATEGIES: LIFE BEFORE RESETTLEMENT

Nhamo (2009: 46) highlights that, “The economy is the backbone of almost all sectors of the society. When there is a setback in the economics of a country, almost all facets of the society do not work”. The economic meltdown that hit the Zimbabwean economy over the past decades impacted negatively on the livelihoods of many, and especially the poor. Chimhowu and Hulme (2006) argue that many people living in communal areas in Zimbabwe leave their homes in search of employment and that these areas therefore are regarded mainly as labour reservoirs for urban areas and the mines. Some of the study participants also highlighted that it was the migrant labour system that served as their main livelihood strategies before they resettled at Dellos farm.

However given the economic crises, starting from the early 1990s with the structural adjustment programmes (Moyo, 2005) to the recent hyperinflation that saw the country’s economy classified as the world’s fastest shrinking economy in 2003 (Dekker, 2004b), many people struggled to make ends meet. Salaries received by many were no longer sufficient to meet basic needs. As a result many people began to engage in the informal economy to supplement the low salaries they received. Informal trading became the livelihood strategy of many especially those who previously lived in urban areas. In communal areas many participants revealed that they relied on *maricho* for survival; and it was very degrading for many since doing *maricho* is an indication of high levels of poverty in a household.

These economic challenges faced by many ordinary Zimbabweans forced them to realise the importance of having access to other natural resources such as land that can be used to earn a living. In both communal areas and urban areas, ordinary people have limited access to natural resources; hence their livelihoods rely more on the market. As a result they became susceptible to economic shocks without any or adequate protection. Accessing land therefore provided an alternative means for earning a living.

5.1.2 FARMING AS A LIVELIHOOD STRATEGY: LIFE IN THE RESETTLEMENT

Land reform in Zimbabwe was established with the aim of giving poor people access to land, alleviating population pressure in communal areas and encouraging meaningful agriculture among subsistence farmers (Kinsey, 1999). It was the government's vision that unemployed people could make a living from agriculture and improve their social and economic well-being. Study participants, especially those previously living in rural areas, revealed that they never had any meaningful form of employment in their lives. In such instances people's livelihoods would depend more on natural resources. Given that many communal areas have limited resources that people can use to earn a living, many people failed to meet their basic needs. The availability of land to such people gave them the opportunity to improve their social and economic status.

Many participants, and especially men, expressed that they were embarrassed by their social status before resettlement as they had no means to provide for their families. Access to land boosted their self-esteem and gave them something to hold onto in their quest to improve their socio-economic status. Unlike in communal areas, where land was very limited and production was for consumption only (which was not even enough), people at Dellos farm have more land on which they grow different crops for both consumption and the market. Although production is still at a small-scale level, individuals are able to produce enough to feed their families and have a surplus to sell. Most importantly, although many ordinary Zimbabweans are still struggling to make ends meet, both in urban and communal areas, people at Dellos farm are able to meet their basic needs from the little they produce. As much as they are also affected by the country's unstable economy, they have access to land which is not available to people in urban and communal areas. Moreover, farming at Dellos farm gave women economic freedom which they did not have before resettlement. At the farm women had the opportunity to make money from growing vegetables and groundnuts which was not possible in communal areas.

Distribution of land among households at Dellos farm has fulfilled the government's goals of having meaningful agriculture among peasant farmers and relieving over-populated communal areas (Kinsey, 1999). People at the farm are able to make a living from agriculture which they could not do before resettlement. Most of them stated that farming before

resettlement was not enough as a livelihood strategy and as result they did not put much effort in it. Rather they focused more on other income-generating activities that put food on their tables. However having access to more land allowed them to put all their efforts into farming in order to make a success of it. Moreover, their departure from the communal areas left the areas less populated thereby giving more land to the people who stayed behind. By so doing, land reform may have benefited both households that were resettled and the ones that remained behind.

5.2 EFFECTS OF SOCIAL NETWORKS ON SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC LIFE OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS

Putnam (1995: 2) describes social capital as “features of social organisation such as networks, norms and social trust that facilitate co-ordination and co-operation for mutual benefit”. In this chapter social capital is investigated by exploring the advantages and disadvantages of people's social networks. Households at Dellos farm reported to have a variety of social networks they rely on to improve their social and economic well-being. Membership in these different social networks is reported to have a number of effects on households at the farm.

5.2.1 ADVANTAGES OF SOCIAL CAPITAL IN COMMUNAL AREAS

Communal areas in Zimbabwe are characterised by having kinship networks which are believed to be crucial for increasing stocks of social capital (WLSA, 1997; Barr, 2004). The argument is based on the belief that kin members are always there for each other and assist one another without expecting anything in return. Moreover family is regarded as the basic unit of society as extended family members cushion each other from any kind of risk. Most of the participants indicated that their first days of resettlement were very challenging as they did not have (extended) family members around to assist them in establishing their new homes. They pointed out that they had to pay for the assistance they received from their neighbours unlike in communal areas where most of their neighbours were kin members who helped them without expecting anything in return.

5.2.2 LIMITATIONS OF SOCIAL CAPITAL IN COMMUNAL AREAS

Although communal areas are commended for having strong social support structures through kin networks (WLSA, 1997; Barr, 2002), the economic meltdown in the past decades put that to a test. High levels of unemployment posed a bigger challenge for many people to have a means to provide for their families, let alone their extended families. Many people began to concentrate more on their nuclear families, paying less attention to their extended families. Participants highlighted that many families in communal areas are no longer as united as they were before. The strength of kin networks was weakened as jealousy began to show between family members, which in turn generated family feuds. Some of the study participants revealed that continued conflict and quarrels with their kin members in the communal areas forced them to resettle. They explained that some families accuse their kin members of witchcraft and the misfortunes in their lives. Dekker (2004a) highlights similar conflicts among kin members and regarded such as the cause of social disintegration among kin members. Instead of blaming the economic crisis, some family members are blaming each other for their financial problems, and this weakened and even severed existing kinship ties and forced families to become more insular.

Moreover the idea that kin members normally assist one another without expecting anything in return is a limitation on its own. Since they know that they do not have to be repaid, some kin members do not give their best which affects output. Participants revealed that if kin members realised that one of their own was short of labour, they would sometimes send their children to help, who may not be very effective. As a result, some participants felt that the social assistance they had received in communal areas made a smaller contribution to their livelihoods compared to the social assistance they receive at the farm.

5.2.3 ADVANTAGES OF SOCIAL CAPITAL AT DELLOS FARM

Although resettled households at Dellos farm were separated from family members who remained behind particularly in communal areas and lack state support, the interviews in this study show that many households had developed new social networks. Chimhowu and Hulme

(2006) highlight that those settlers that lack state support develop support systems to see them through common risks faced in in resettlement. Participants indicated that there are different social activities they engage in that cushion them from certain risks and allow them to improve their livelihoods, given that they lack kin and state support. Dekker (2004a) argues that among households which rely on agricultural activities, labour and draught power shortages are among the common risks faced by rural households, and it is therefore important that individuals participate in insurance arrangements to protect themselves from such risks. The social networks formed by resettled households at Dellos farm form an important part of these risk-mitigating strategies of households.

In order to avoid shortages of labour, which in turn causes food shortages, households at the farm established work and cattle herding groups. Participating in these groups helped many to have access to more labour which in turn increased their production levels and lessened their work loads. Participants argued that two hands are better than one; for example having a group of six or seven committed adults weeding on one field a day yields better results than having one person weeding the same field for week. Hence, group work at the farm is attributed with solving the problem of labour shortages.

Joining cattle herding groups also had many advantages among households that owned livestock. For example, a household with two adults who have livestock to look after every day will not have enough labour both to look after the livestock and to farm the land. For such households, joining herding groups reduced the number of days that they look after their cattle, leaving them with more time to do other farm work. Hence joining the work and herding groups allowed households to cover most of the farm work in a short space of time instead of taking weeks doing the same thing. It is through these work groups that households at the farm are able to utilise land they acquired to improve their livelihoods.

Membership in different churches at the farm is another way in which households enhance their social networks. Although membership in these denominations was reported to allow people to grow spiritually, it also had a number of social benefits. Participants pointed out that at church they are taught to live in harmony with their neighbours and treat each other with respect. Such teachings help to endorse the principles of reciprocity. As a result churches encourage people to conform to the values of reciprocity, values that are important in the social life at the farm. Moreover, churches were commended for their ability to provide counselling to their members, from youth to married couples. Church members with

rebellious children get support for helping their children from church members. Also senior church members provide counselling to couples in the church whenever they are having problems. By so doing members support each other in times of need and provide the kind of support mainly given by kin members.

Women's meetings held by different churches on Thursdays were also identified as another activity that helps women to come together and share their different knowledge and experiences. Janssens (2007) regards this as diffusion of information which is another advantage of social capital, where group members circulate knowledge and ideas for the benefit of all.

The number and strength of social networks a household has at Dellos farm plays a role in determining its social and economic well-being. Janssens (2007) indicates that the ability of individuals to mobilise resources depends on the number and type of social relations they have access to. Households that participated in three or more social activities were in a better position to cope with most of the challenges and requirements of resettlement. They reported improvements in their social and economic life since they came to the farm, mainly after the work and herding groups were established.

However it is the ability of households to invest in these networks that proved to be of greater importance in ensuring that livelihoods are enhanced through such networks. Trustworthiness and reciprocity were reported as the main characteristics needed to participate in these social networks. People are expected to display these characteristics signalling that they would be reliable group members. For example, a person who is regarded as trustworthy at the farm is mainly someone who honours the norms and values of reciprocity, one who is willing to assist others when they are in need, and one who sticks to his/her word, for example by repaying money borrowed from a neighbour in the time promised to repay the loan. It is therefore each household's responsibility to display these characteristics so that they can be trusted by their neighbours and be part of the social networks.

Investing in these social networks was reported to have various benefits for individuals at the farm, in addition to directly economic benefits. Participants indicated that it is very important to have good relations and strong networks with neighbours and other acquaintances in order to lead a socially balanced life at the farm. As WLSA (1997) and Barr (2004) highlight, a key challenge of resettled individuals is that they are separated from their kin members who are a strong source of support. Households at Dellos farm used social networks to fill the gap left

by this separation. Although some settlers have relatives on the farm and on neighbouring farms, much support is drawn from the new networks established on the farm. When people first came to the farm, the challenges they faced helped them to realise the importance of collective action in order to solve their common problems. Portes (1998) regards this as bounded solidarity which helps people facing the same fate to unite and support each other's initiative. As a result, social capital at the farm has allowed people to get most of the social support they need in their day-to-day lives from their neighbours. Since households at the farm pursue similar livelihood strategies, they manage to rally together to improve their livelihoods. For many households at the farm, co-operation contributed more to their livelihoods than it had done in communal areas.

5.2.4 LIMITATIONS OF SOCIAL CAPITAL AT DELLOS FARM

Social capital is hailed for its ability to facilitate co-operation for mutual benefit, and as this study has highlighted, social capital was identified as a key to successful livelihood strategies among the resettled households at Dellos farm. However, social capital can also be exclusionary (Woolcock and Narayan, 2000). Strong social networks allow people in a particular group to bond together, while applying social sanctions helps to discipline free riders. Although such values enhance social capital, they also aid in excluding those people who would perhaps most benefit from the networks. As most literature on social capital highlights, social networks are based on the norms and values of reciprocity. In order to receive something, an individual must be willing to give something in return. This becomes a challenge to people who have very little to contribute to a group. As a result they are excluded and remain marginalised. Janssens (2007) and Portes (1998) both argue that strong social ties perpetuate both social and economic exclusion of marginalised groups.

The study revealed that some households were poor when they came to the farm, and they have not been able to take advantage of the social capital at the farm to improve their social status. Their inability to contribute to the requirements of most of the social groups at the farm prevented them from participating. For example, in one household, both adults were too sick to participate in a work group, although they would have greatly benefited from the labour provided by a work group in cultivating their land. It is such scenario that limits social

capital from improving the well-being of all. Rather social capital at the farm only benefited those who could contribute, thereby excluding the most vulnerable groups.

5.3 THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN ENSURING THE SUCCESS OF RESETTLEMENT

The land distribution programme in Zimbabwe was carried out in different phases starting from the early 1980s. The government however did not provide uniform support systems to settlers in these different phases. Chimhowu and Hulme (2006) discuss the difference between resettlement areas that were sponsored by the state and the resettlements that were not sponsored. They argue that state-sponsored resettlement areas were more productive since the government provided settlers with capital and other services to boost their production levels. Dellos farm represents resettlement areas that had very minimal state sponsorship. Participants indicated that little or no government support in terms of capital and other agricultural inputs has limited their production. In particular, households at Dellos farm believe that if the government could make loans available they could improve their production levels. Mandizadza (2010) indicates that capital assets should complement each other for them to sustain livelihoods. It is therefore important that the government make financial assistance available to settlers to increase their production levels.

Resettled households also face challenges of limited provision of infrastructure at the farm. Although the settlers have managed to organise and put temporary classrooms at Badza Primary School, they need funding in order to construct permanent structures. Since the school does not have proper infrastructure, it has failed to attract qualified teachers. The headmaster of the school is the only qualified teacher at the school. Participants felt that it is the government's responsibility to improve the standards of the school. Their main worry is that the poor standards of the school would affect the pass rate of the school and in turn affect their children's future. Moreover although people at the farm are situated very conveniently in terms of transport access, their access to health facilities is limited. Chaka, the closest clinic (15km from the farm), is poorly equipped and is understaffed, and as a result, staff at the clinic often refers patients to mission hospitals which are very far from the farm. However, people reported that they frequently travel the long distance to the clinic but come back without receiving any treatment. Those who can afford transport fees would go to

Chatsworth Clinic which is about 21km from the farm. It would be desirable if the government provided a mobile clinic so that those who cannot afford to go to Chatsworth could also access better health facilities.

5.4 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that the land reform programme had a positive effect on the lives of many households at the farm. It gave these households the opportunity to access land, a resource that is invaluable among rural households whose livelihoods depend on farming. However co-operation and working together through social networks have been identified as the most important aspects that enabled people at the farm to make a living from the land they acquired. Although gaining access to bigger portions of land and working together improved the livelihoods of households at the farm, there is still the need for support from the government in terms of capital and farming inputs in order to improve production. Dekker (2004b) highlighted that having land alone and lacking other necessary resources is not enough to make agriculture a sustainable livelihood strategy for resettled households. This has proven to be the case at Dellos farm: households have the natural resource and social capital, but their ability to increase production levels is limited by a lack of financial capital.

A number of recommendations therefore can be made for how life of resettled households can be improved. Given that households at the farm do not have any agriculture training, it is important that the government make Agricultural Extension Officers (AEO) available to settlers. Availability of AEOs would help settlers to acquire necessary information, for example on how to improve their production levels as well as how to preserve the natural resources at the farm. Production at the farm is currently based on trial and error as settlers have no guidance on what crops to grow, when to grow them, and how best to market their surplus output. Having experts guiding them can be very empowering. Also, the settlers need to be educated on the importance of natural resource preservation so that they will not continue depleting the natural resources at the farm.

In addition, accessing micro loans would help farmers acquire more inputs so that they can increase their agricultural output. Since these settlers have no assets for collateral to secure

loans from commercial banks and other institutions, the government should therefore make micro finance available to these new farmers. The government could also ensure enabling environments for the microfinance sector to raise funds that would be made available to new farmers at lower rates.

Moreover given that people at the farm have shown the ability to work in groups, the government should provide support structures for such initiatives. Encouraging the establishment of cooperatives can improve the livelihoods of households at the farm. Such messages can be conveyed to people through workshops. In these workshops it would also be important that people are advised on how the social networks they have can also benefit community members who want to participate but have no means to do so.

In addition the government should take responsibility for developing sustainable infrastructure at the farm. It is the government's responsibility to develop the school at the farm so that it can meet the standards of other schools in the country. The people at Dellos farm took great initiative to build the school and the government should therefore support them by developing it further. Permanent classrooms need to be constructed so that learners at Badza Primary School can have a conducive and enabling learning environment. Moreover the government can provide a mobile clinic to the people at the farm so that they would not travel long distances to access primary health care services. Also, council clinics should be fully equipped to avoid the unnecessary referral of patients to mission hospitals. The money people spend going to the mission hospital unnecessarily could then be used for other needs instead.

In conclusion, land redistribution has benefited the residents of Dellos farm. Moreover, the development of social networks has allowed the settlers to overcome many of the problems that came with resettlement. However, there is also scope for further intervention by the government, to assist farmers in developing more successful livelihood strategies, and to provide the education and health services needed to create a sustainable environment for the community.

6 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adger, N. (2003). Social Capital, Collective Action and Adaptation to Climate Change. *Economic Geography*, 79 (4), 387-404.

Akwabi-Ameyaw, K. (1997). Producer Cooperative Resettlement Projects in Zimbabwe: Lessons from a failed agricultural development strategy. *World Development*, 25 (3), 437-456.

Arrow, J. (2000). Observations on Social Capital. *Social Capital: A Multifaceted Perspective*. Partha, D. and Ismail, S. (eds.) Washington DC, World Bank.

Babbie, R. E. and Mouton, J. (2001). *The Practice of Social Research*. Oxford University Press Southern Africa, Cape Town.

Barr, A. (2002). "From Strangers to Neighbours: Identifying the pre-conditions for social capital development". Research Report ESCOR # R7650. http://www.dfid.gov.uk/r4d/PDF/Outputs/Mis_SPC/R7650-report.pdf

Barr, A. (2003). Trust and Expected Trustworthiness: Experimental Evidence from Zimbabwean villages. *The Economic Journal*, 113, 614-630.

Barr, A. (2004). Forging Effective New Communities: The Evolution of Civil Society in Zimbabwean Village. *World Development*, 32 (10), 1753-1766.

Bauer, M. (1996). "The Narrative Interview: comments on technique for qualitative data collection". *Social Research Methods Qualitative Series* 1. <http://www2.lse.ac.uk/methodology/pdf/QualPapers/Bauer-NARRAT1SS.pdf>

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101.

Carr, L. T. (1994). The strengths and weaknesses of quantitative and qualitative research-what method for nursing? *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 20, 716-721.

Chimhowu, A. and Hulme, D. (2006). Livelihood Dynamics in Planned and Spontaneous Resettlement in Zimbabwe: Converging and Vulnerable. *World Development*, 34 (4), 728-750.

- Chitambara, P. (2010). Social Protection in Zimbabwe. Labour and Economic Development Institute of Zimbabwe. <http://www.ledriz.co.zw/research-papers.html?download=29%3Asocial-protection-in-zimbabwe>.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed approaches. 3rd edition*. SAGE, USA.
- Dekker, M. (2004a). Sustainability and Resourcefulness: support networks during periods of stress. *World Development*, 32 (10), 1735-1751.
- Dekker, M. (2004b). "Risk, Resettlement and Relations: Social Security in Rural Zimbabwe". Tinbergen Institute Research Series no. 331. Thesis <http://www.csae.ox.ac.uk/conferences/2004-GPRAHDIA/papers/4r-Dekker-CSAE2004.PDF>
- Dekker, M. and Hoppenbrouwers, A. (1994). The River Become Their Field: Survival Strategies in Semi-Arid Areas in Zimbabwe. (Masters Thesis, University of Amsterdam).
- Dekker, M. and Kinsey, B. (2011). "Coping with Zimbabwe's economic crisis: Small-scale farms and livelihoods under stress". ASC Working paper 93/2011. <http://www.ascleiden.nl/Pdf/workingpaper93.pdf>
- Dercon, S. (2000). "Income, Risk, Coping Strategies and Safety Nets". World Development Report 2000/01. <http://www.csae.ox.ac.uk/workingpapers/pdfs/20-26text.pdf>
- Ersado, L. (2003). "Income Diversification in Zimbabwe: Welfare Implications from Urban to Rural Areas". FCND Discussion Paper 152. <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/16467/1/fc030152.pdf>
- Harts-Broekhuis, A. and Huisman, H. (2001). Resettlement revisited: land reform results in resource poor regions in Zimbabwe. *Geoforum*, 32, 285-298.
- Haverkamp, B. E. and Young, R. A. (2007). Paradigms, Purpose and the Role of Literature: formulating a rationale for qualitative investigations. *The Counselling Psychologists*, 35(2), 264-294.

Hoogeveen, J.G.M. and Kinsey, B.H. (2001). Land Reform, Growth and Equity: Emerging Evidence from Zimbabwe's Resettlement Programme – A Sequel. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 27 (1), 127-136.

Janssens, W. (2007), “Social capital and cooperation: An impact evaluation of a women’s empowerment programme in rural India”, Doctoral Dissertation, Amsterdam: Thela Thesis.

Jovchelovitch, S. and Bauer, M. W. (2000). Narrative interviewing. London: LSE Research Online. Available at: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/2633>

Kinsey, B.H. (1999). Land Reform, Growth and Equity: Emerging Evidence from Zimbabwe's Resettlement Programme. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 25(2), 173-196.

Kinsey, B.H. (2004). Zimbabwe’s Land Reform Programme: Underinvestment in Post-conflict Transformation. *World Development*, 32 (10), 1669-1696.

Kinsey, B. H.; Deininger, K. and Hoogeveen, H. (2004). Economic Benefits and Costs of Land Reform in Zimbabwe in the early 1980s. *World Development*, 32 (10), 1697-1709.

Mandizadza, S. (2010). *The Fast Track Land Reform Programme and Livelihoods in Zimbabwe: A Case study of households at Athlone farm in Murehwa district*. Livelihoods after land reform Zimbabwe working paper 2 www.larl.org.za/zimbabwe/zimbabwe-working-papers-Mandizadza

Mathison, S. (1988). Why Triangulate? *Educational Researcher*, 17 (2), 13-17.

Miller, J. and Glassner, B. (2004). ‘The Inside and The Outside: finding realities in interviews’. In Silverman, D. (ed), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*, 2nd edition. Sage, London.

Moyo, S. (2005). Land, Policy and Public Action in Zimbabwe. ISS/UNDP Land, Poverty and Public Action Policy Paper No.11 http://www.kubatana.net/docs/landr/sam_moyo_land_policy_zim_0509.pdf

Narayan, D. (1999). Bonds and Bridges: Social Capital and Poverty. World Bank. <http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/9747/narayan.pdf>

- Nieuwenhuis, J. (2010). 'Analysing qualitative data'. In Maree, K. (ed), *First Steps in Research*. Van Schaik, Pretoria
- Nhamo, G. (2009). A study on the role of old age institutions in the case of hyperinflation: The case of Mucheke, Masvingo, Zimbabwe (Masters Dissertation, University of Kwa-Zulu Natal).
- Palmer, R. (1990). Land Reform in Zimbabwe, 1980-1990. *African Affairs*, 89 (355), 163-181.
- Portes, A. (1998). Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in the Modern Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology* 27, 1-24.
- Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal of Democracy* 6(1), 67-78
- Rukuni, M. (1994). "The Evolution of Agricultural policy 1890-1990" in Rukuni, M. and Eicher, C. (eds) *Zimbabwe's Agricultural Revolution*, University of Zimbabwe Press, Harare.
- Sullivan, T. J. (2001). *Methods of Social Research*. Harcourt, London.
- The Zimbabwean (2011) Farmers seek assistance to increase production. <http://www.thezimbabwean.co.uk/news/36376/farmers-seek-assistance-to-increase-production.html>
- Thomas, N. H. (2003). Land Reform in Zimbabwe. *Third World Quarterly*, 24 (4), 691-712.
- Women and Law in Southern Africa (1997). *Continuity and Change. The Family in Zimbabwe*. Women and Law in Southern Africa, Harare.
- Woolcock, M. (1998). Social capital and economic development: Toward a theoretical synthesis and policy framework. *Theory and Society* 27, 151-208.
- Woolcock, M. and Narayan, D. (2000). Social Capital: implications for development theory, research and policy. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 15(2), 225-249

7 APPENDIX

Interview Guide

Demographics - resettled household

1. What is your name? – are you the head of the household?
2. Where were you born?
3. Are you married – were you married before you came to this place?
4. How many children do you have – their sexes and ages? Do all your children stay with you- if not where do they stay and why are they not staying here?
5. Other than your children, are there other people you are living with and how are you related to them?
6. Before you came here, where were you staying?
7. When and why did you decide to resettle in this area?
8. Who else moved with you from your original home area?
9. Has the composition of your household changed from what it was before you were living here? If so, how has it changed?

Demographics – Kinship of the resettled household

1. Where do your parents live?
2. How many siblings do you have and where do they stay?
3. Compared to before you moved here, are there fewer or more family members living close by? *Probe:* What effect does that have on your life, if there is any?
4. How can you describe your relationship with your kin members during the time you lived in communal areas and in what ways has it changed?

Livelihood Strategies

1. What is the highest level of education do you have?
2. Were you employed before you came to this area? *Probe:* Can you describe what this employment was and for how long were you employed?
3. Are you currently employed? *Probe:* If not why - have you looked for employment?
4. How do you earn a living currently/ how do you provide for your family? (question is asked if the household head is not employed)
5. Is there any other member of the household employed? *Probe:* who is employed and what kind of job do they do?
6. How does having access to land impact on your livelihood strategies? *Probe:* can you compare it with the livelihood strategies you had before resettlement?
7. Other than land what are the other resources that you now have access to that were not available in the communal areas for improving your livelihoods and what effect does that have on your livelihood?
8. Do you receive any assistance from the government and other organizations (for example grants, farming equipment, food etc)?

Social networks and support structures

1. Other than working in your fields, what other activities do you engage in?
2. In some resettlement areas people form cooperatives and different projects. Do you have such initiatives around?
3. Can you describe those projects and do you take part in such initiatives?
4. What are the benefits of participating in such projects, if there are any?
5. Did you have such projects and cooperatives in the area you lived before? *Probe:* were you involved in such projects?

6. How much influence do social groups in this area have on livelihoods – does having strong social networks impact on people’s livelihoods? *Probe:* in what ways?
7. If you were to compare the social networks that were in your communal area and the ones in resettlement areas, which would you say are better in enhancing your livelihood strategies? *Probe:* why do say so?
8. In the event that the community is facing a common problem such as the roads being washed away by heavy rains or any other common property being destroyed, how do people organise to solve such problems? *Probe:* how easy is it to get people to participate in such initiatives and what happens to those who do not participate?
9. If you or your household is experiencing a negative event (such as the death or serious illness of a household member; losing a job; theft or fire), who do you rely on for assistance? *Probe:* how much trust do you have in them- can they see you through your problem?
10. Are the organizations in place (such as burial societies) to help people to cope in such instances? *Probe:* how effective are they?
11. Is there anyone in this area who relies on you for any kind of support/ assistance? *Probe:* what motivates your support to them and to what extent can you offer them your support?
12. Do you think you share similar values and norms with other people living in this community? *Probe:* Why do you say that?

People's perceptions

1. When you first moved to this area how was your experience given that you were new to the environment and the people?
2. Can you please describe benefits and challenges of staying in this area? *Probe:* How is that different from experiences in communal areas?

3. Are you better off economically now than you were before you came here? *Probe:* In what way? If not, why not?
4. Do you think you are generally happier living here than you were before you moved here? *Probe:* Why or why not?
5. What dreams or expectations do you have for your family? *Probe:* What do you wish to see happen to your family in future and why?
6. With the experience you had of staying in resettlement areas, what advice would you give to people in communal areas who also want to resettle under the land resettlement programme?
7. Is there anything you think could have been done differently to enhance the lives of resettled individuals?