IMPLEMENTATION OF LAND REFORM POLICIES ON MODEL A1 FARMS IN ZIMBABWE.

Collen Moyo

A research report submitted to the Faculty of Commerce, Law and Management, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg in 50% fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Management (in the field of Public Policy).

FEBRUARY, 2017

An abstract:

The government of Zimbabwe embarked on a land redistribution programme at the turn of the twentieth century. The programme has been mired in controversy which has culminated in polarisation. The major objective of the land redistribution was to redress historical imbalances and to increase food security by increasing access to fertile and arable land to indigenous people. Due to lack of policy clarity and consensus, the programme has so far been a huge failure. This study sought to interrogate the policy implementation and how this had impacted on productivity on the A1 model of farming in Zimbabwe. Results showed that the programme was adversely affected by lack of political will and lack of policy clarity while it was clogged with political interference. The government had failed to provide sustainable funding to enhance productivity. This had led to despondency among civil servants and beneficiaries of the land reform programme. There is ineffective implementation of policy due to factors such as lack of experienced personnel and unavailability of funding. Polarisation has seen other key stakeholders shunning this programme. Under the prevailing socio-political environment, this programme is set to be an outright failure to enhance food security sustainability. The study unpacked valuable impediments which inevitably, were drivers of poor attainment of the objectives of model A1 farming in Zimbabwe.

Declaration:

I declare that this report is my own, unaided work. It is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Management (in the field of Public and Development Management) in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other university.

C. Moyo

Collen Moyo

February 2017

Dedication:

I would like to thank God, the Almighty for this blessing. I would also like to express my appreciation to my wife, Vimbainashe for the full support she gave me throughout my studies. Vimbai, this is for you my loving wife! My special thanks also go to my daughters, Awakhiwe and Awandiswe whose smiles continuously revitalised my desire to push an extra mile.

Acknowledgements:

I am grateful to my supervisor, Professor Gavin Cawthra for his guidance throughout the research process. I fully appreciate his commitment in ensuring that the standard of this research was of high quality. Without his assistance, this research would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENT

Subject Page

An abstract---------- i

Declaration---------- ii

Dedication---------- iii

Acknowledgements---------- iv

CHAPTER 1---------- 1

1.0. RESEARCH INTRODUCTION---------- 1

1.1. Problem statement---------- 1

1.2. Purpose statement---------- 3

1.3. Research objectives---------- 3

1.4. Primary research question---------- 3

1.4.1. Supplementary research questions---------- 3

1.5. Relevance of the study---------- 4

1.6. Contribution of the study---------- 4

1.7. Field of study---------- 5

1.8. Summary---------- 5

CHAPTER 2---------- 7

LITERATURE REVIEW---------- 7

2.0. Introduction---------- 7

2.1. Theoretical framework---------- 8

2.1.1. Policy implementation---------- 8

2.1.2. Policy implementation models---------- 10

2.1.3. Top-down versus bottom-up policy implementation---------- 12

2.1.4. 5-C protocol for implementation---------- 14

2.2. Conceptual framework---------- 16

2.3. Regulatory framework---------- 32

2.4. Summary---------- 36

CHAPTER 3---------- 38

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY---------- 38

3.0. Introduction---------- 38

3.1. Research design---------- 39

3.2. Research instruments---------- 40

3.2.1. Archival material and documents---------- 40

3.2.2. In-depth interviews---------- 40

3.3. Sampling of respondents---------- 41

3.3.1. Overview of respondents---------- 42

3.4. Data analysis procedures---------- 42

3.5. Implementation of research methods---------- 43

3.6. Ethics---------- 44

3.7. Limitations/ Delimitations---------- 44

3.8. Summary---------- 45

CHAPTER 4---------- 47

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSION OF RESEARCH RESULTS---------- 47

4.0. Introduction---------- 47

4.1. Research findings: An overview---------- 48

4.1.1. Role of model A1 farmers on national food security---------- 48

4.1.2. Factors hindering productivity on model A1 farms---------- 51

4.1.3. Current production levels on model A1 farms---------- 55

4.1.4. Model A1 farmer capacitation levels---------- 57

4.1.5. Role of local leadership on subsidised inputs---------- 59

4.1.6. Role of AGRITEX on farmer skills development---------- 61

4.1.7. Model A1 farmer benefits from AGRITEX activities---------- 61

4.1.8. Role of leadership and AGRITEX on Cereal and crops---------- 63

4.1.9. Solutions to model A1 farms---------- 64

4.2. Summary---------- 65

CHAPTER 5---------- 67

GENERAL ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH---------- 67

5.0. Introduction---------- 67

5.1. Key success factors for land reform policies---------- 67

5.1.1. Political commitment and leadership---------- 67

5.1.2. Strong collaborative partnerships---------- 68

5.1.3. Rehabilitation and development of key infrastructure---------- 72

5.2. The relevance of the 5-C protocol---------- 73

5.2.1. Content---------- 73

5.2.2. Context---------- 74

5.2.3. Commitment---------- 75

5.2.4. Capacity---------- 76

5.2.5. Clients/Coalitions---------- 77

5.3. Key strategies for land reform policies---------- 78

5.3.1. Investing on sustainable and robust solutions---------- 78

5.3.2. Subsidised agricultural inputs---------- 79

5.3.3. Sequence pattern for cereal and small grain crops---------- 80

5.4. Summary---------- 80

CHAPTER 6---------- 82

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS---------- 82

6.0. Introduction---------- 82

6.1. Summary of the study---------- 83

6.2. Conclusions---------- 84

6.3. Recommendations---------- 85

6.4. Areas for further research---------- 85

Bibliography ---------- 86

APPENDICES----------i-xxviii

CHAPTER 1

1.0. INTRODUCTION

This chapter introduces the research study which investigated the implementation of the land reform policies on model A1 farms in Zimbabwe with regards to food security sustainability. Model A1 is a creation of the land reform programme in Zimbabwe, which resulted in arable land formally for the white farmers redistributed to the indigenous Zimbabweans. Since the land redistribution programme, the country has been plunged into severely poor harvests resulting in starvation in the country. The threat on food security in the country has raised serious concerns about the implementation of land reform policies on model A1 farms. To mitigate on this effect, the study selected Nkenyane community in the Bubi District of Matabeleland North province to interrogate these claims of policy failure. Therefore, this chapter begins by highlighting the research objectives, the field of study as well as the questions which were used to guide the focus of the study. The relevance of the study was also discussed in this chapter.

1.1. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Levels of food insecurity in Zimbabwe have been increasing since year 2000 when a huge part of land was haphazardly redistributed from the white minority farmers to the landless black Zimbabweans. This indigenisation process was meant to correct the colonial imbalances which had seen the minority white farmers occupying the largest land, whereas the black majority were bundled in unproductive areas infested with tsetse flies. About 20% of the white population had occupied 80% of the arable land in Zimbabwe while 80% of the indigenous black Zimbabweans were congested in the remaining 20% arid and inhabitable land. Such unfair distribution of land was orchestrated by colonial land reform policies which created reserves in poor soils. This process in turn, unduly benefited the white minority farmers. The black majority attained independence in 1980 through the 1979 Lancaster House Agreement. This agreement created constraints by barring the independent government from implementing a massive land distribution. A policy of willing-buyer willing-seller was promulgated to guide the resettlement programme to which the British government pledged financial support to the implementation

of this policy. However, the policy hit a snag as white farmers who owned prime land adamantly opposed the policy and refused to sell any meaningful tracks of land, some which were not being utilised. The black majority remained impoverished and crowded in the arid land for a good 10 years during the tenure of the policy. On one hand, the minority white farmers continued benefiting from the land under the new government. However, such a scenario seemed to be favourable to the government of Zimbabwe as the country performed well in agriculture. Zimbabwe became known as the food basket of the Southern Africa. The Zimbabwe African National Union Patriotic Front (ZANUPF) government did not change the constitution on the expiry of the Lancaster House Conference document.

Despite this success in food security sustainability by the country, the back majority remained discontented and the government was aware that it had not fulfilled its obligation to empower its citizens with the land. The ZANU PF led-government realised that the people's feelings of betrayal by the ruling government were intensifying. The opposition party, the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC) was gaining momentum and electoral support, while the ruling ZANU PF began to lose support. In order to regain the electoral support, ZANU PF then unleashed war veterans to forcefully occupy farms owned by white farmers. Nonetheless, this happened almost twenty years after independence - thus ten years after Lancaster House Agreement had lapsed. The fast track land reform programme (FTLRP) was then implemented without any policy in place to guide the land redistribution process. The formulation of land reform policies came way after the land had been redistributed. There were serious hitches in the implementation of such policies. More so, the drafting of these policies was largely influenced by historically entrenched power imbalances characterised by racial segregation. Genuine efforts for indigenisation seemed to be compromised by racial hatred and bigotry which undermined the worthy cause of the indigenisation policies. Also, the model A1 agricultural farming land was allocated to indigenous Zimbabweans purportedly with little supervision. Furthermore, lack of consensus on land reform policies divided and polarised the country. These supposedly divisive policies have been contested locally, regionally and even abroad. Such contestation seemed to hamper effective implementation of the land reform policies in Zimbabwe. The government was accused of allegedly formulating policies seen by

many people as a ploy to leverage political mileage of the ruling party. With inadequate financial resources to improve food security sustainability, the country now depended on international aid to try to revive the subdued agricultural production. It is this background that motivated this study to examine the role of policy implementers at district level in their effort to improve food security sustainability on model A1 farms. This model has a potential to become the backbone of the Zimbabwe economy since it occupies the second largest agricultural land in the country.

1.2. PURPOSE STATEMENT

The purpose of the research study was to get a deeper understanding of the role played by policy implementers on model A1 farms in Zimbabwe in their bid to improve food security sustainability in the country. The model A1 is the agricultural farming sector that was allocated the second largest portion of land in the indigenisation programme.

1.3. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The specific objectives of the study were:

i. To investigate policy implementation factors which inhibit model A1 farms from contributing in the improvement of the country's food security.
ii. To find current food productivity trends on model A1 farms.
iii. To recommend strategies for consideration on model A1 farms to improve national food security.

1.4. PRIMARY RESEARCH QUESTION

How do policy implementers participate on model A1 farms in their bid to improve national food security?

1.4.1. Supplementary research questions:

i. To what extent do policy implementers participate on model A1 farms in their bid to improve national food security?

ii. How do current food productivity trends on model A1 farms reflect on the participation of policy implementers as means to try to improve food security in the country?
iii. How do farmers on model A1 respond to policy implementers' participation in the sector to improve national food security?

1.5. RELEVANCE OF THE STUDY

The relevance of the study was mainly based on the prevailing conditions in Zimbabwe and the Southern African Development Community (SADC) region. Zimbabwe has been experiencing severe shortages of basic agricultural products for almost two decades now. This was mainly because of lack of consensus on indigenisation policy by local and international stakeholders. Solutions to the persisting drought in the country are not effective even though a huge portion of the land was in the hands of the majority indigenous Zimbabweans. To find out the root cause of the problem food insecurity in the country, a number of studies have been conducted. Studies have focused on beneficiaries of the land reform programme and specifically those that own pieces of land in the A1 model. However, little had been done to investigate the role of policy implementers in this sector. Thus, through this study it was presumed that answers to the research questions would help both policy implementers and model A1 farmers to enhance agricultural productivity that would irrevocably strengthen the country's food security system. This could reduce the pressure on commercial farmers who were equally struggling to avert the current food shortages. The study also came at a time when the whole of the Southern African region was experiencing the worst drought in the 2015-2016 seasons. For these reasons, the utilisation of the knowledge generated by the study and recommended policy strategies thereof, would likely improve agricultural outputs and hence food security sustainability in Zimbabwe in particular. The results of this study would confirm if the land reform policies were effectively implemented to propel production on model A1 farming.

1.6. CONTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY

It was presumed that through this study, policy actors would appreciate the role of the model A1 smallholder farming sector. Such an appreciation would inevitably influence change of policy processes and approaches and bring about new strategies favourable to this sector to help

enhance food security sustainability in the country. It would increase knowledge of policies among implementers and farmers. The study would presumably sensitise and motivate the farmers in this sector to contribute meaningfully to the national economy. It was also believed that the generated knowledge of the model A1 farms would create a framework to facilitate the improvement of agricultural productivity on the smallholder farming scheme. More importantly, the insights gained from an in-depth qualitative study should help in the formulation and implementation of strategies and policies for model A1 farmers throughout the country in their inalienable endeavour to improve food security sustainability. Such developments may then result in the attainment of the indigenisation policy goals.

1.7. FIELD OF STUDY

The field of study was at the policy implementation stage where a number of policy implementers and policy beneficiaries were involved. The policy implementers included the lands committee at provincial level which designated land for resettlement purposes. There were lands officers who were mandated to come up with the criteria for selecting the model A1 beneficiaries. This process was highly politicised. When the process was concluded, the Agricultural Extension officers complemented the lands officers by pegging the designated areas. These were the officers who injected technical expertise in model A1 farming. Also, the traditional leaders then supervised the implementation of the policy. The monitoring of the implementation process was done by the lands committee, the media, civic organisation groups, Agricultural Extension officers, opposition political parties as well as the parliamentary lands committee.

1.8. SUMMARY

The first chapter discussed the background of the study which was conducted at Nkenyane community in Matabeleland North region. Key issues underlying the necessity for the study were discussed. Objectives and research questions used in the study were also highlighted. The chapter also discussed the purpose of the study which was to get a deeper understanding of the role played by policy implementers on model A1 farms in Zimbabwe in their bid to improve food security sustainability in the country. Also, deliberated on in this chapter was the

relevance of the study to the prevailing conditions in Zimbabwe and the Southern African Development Community (SADC). The assumptions that this study would contribute to improved policy processes and strategies in Zimbabwe to enhance the country's food security sustainability were also discussed.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0. INTRODUCTION

The main thrust of this chapter was to review the theoretical framework on the implementation of land reform policies in Zimbabwe. This review was significant in order for this study to have a theoretical basis on which its results were to be analysed. The literature review also focused on conceptual literature framework. The aim of reviewing this framework was be to understand what other scholars and researchers were saying about indigenisation, in particular the agricultural sector where the focus was on food security sustainability with regards to model A1 smallholder farming scheme. The final review focused on regulations on indigenisation in Zimbabwe. This was to understand the regulatory framework of the indigenisation programme in Zimbabwe. The aim of this type of literature was to try to understand the legal implications of the indigenisation programme. In totality, the literature review focused on the understanding of the integration of indigenisation programme in Zimbabwe with food security sustainability and how land reform policies on model A1 were implemented to enhance food security sustainability in the country. The rationale of the literature review was to try to understand what implementation entailed so that the researcher could be able to make conclusions on how implementation of land reform policies in Zimbabwe inhibited or enhanced food security sustainability on the model A1 farming sector. That was achieved when the researcher used the knowledge gained from the literature to find food productivity trends on model A1 farms. Based on that literature, then the researcher was able to recommend policy implementation strategies which could help the country regain its former status as the bread basket of the Southern African Development Community (SADC).To understand that, the study tried to get a deeper understanding of the role played by land reform policy implementers to help land reform programme beneficiaries on model A1 to improve national food security sustainability.

2.1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1.1. Policy implementation

According to Hill and Hupe (2002, p.4), there is confusion as to when policy implementation begins, when it ends and how many types of policy implementation exist. Such confusion makes not only the study of policy processes and implementation difficult but also leads to the lack of clarity on definition of policy. This could be one reason why it is difficult to implement indigenisation policies in the model A1 farming sector in Zimbabwe. The confusion related to policy implementation could also be as a result of so many different definitions of policy implementation. This scenario may have affected the implementation of the indigenisation policies on the model A1 sector in Zimbabwe, resulting in poor agricultural productivity as is the situation in the country.

Van Meter and Van Horn (1974) define policy implementation as encompassing actions by public or private individuals (or groups) that are directed at the achievement of objectives set forth in prior policy decisions (Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.137). An assessment of this definition depicts policy implementation as a process of carrying out instructions as set out somewhere for the purposes of achieving programme goals. However, this definition brings a limitation as it does not spell out who makes such instructions and to whom in particular in the public. Such lack of clarity in the definition of policy implementation may result in policy failure because of lack of accountability on the part of the supposed policy implementers. This could be what is impacting negatively on the implementation of the indigenisation policies in Zimbabwe's model A1 farms, leading to lack of agricultural productivity in the country which has adversely affected the country's food security sustainability.

Another definition of policy implementation by Moore (1995) does little to clarify the concept of policy implementation. Moore asserts that policy implementation is not only about operational feasibility and technical capacity; rather it is also about the substantive value of the policy (Cloete and De Coning, 2011, p.137). This suggests that policy implementation does not always translate into tangible achievements, but could work possibly as a form of identity to those who might be the custodian of such a policy. This could be another possibility with the

indigenisation policies in Zimbabwe, especially on the implementation part to enhance agricultural productivity in model A1, thereby improving national food security sustainability. The agricultural sector continues to fall, subjecting the country's citizens to hunger and starvation despite the seemingly sound policies. Looked from this policy implementation perspective, one could assume that the main objective of the indigenisation policies in Zimbabwe is not only to bring visible achievements to the public, but also to add political value to the government.

According to Pressman and Wildvsky (1973), implementation is a difficult concept to explain because as a noun, it has a different meaning from what it has as a verb form. Thus, as a noun, implementation is the state of having achieved the goals of the policy, but as a verb, it becomes a process, from policy making to the results achieved after implementation. This means that implementation is everything that is carried out to achieve the objectives of the policy. Based on this conceptualisation of implementation, one cannot conclude that because implementation as a noun was not achieved means that implementation as a verb does not happen (Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.144). For the purposes of this study, implementation would be considered as both a noun and a verb because the two forms are inseparable. Thus, if one is to be able to evaluate land reform policies' effectiveness (the noun form), one must first understand the process of implementing (the verb form) such policies so that one might influence that process to give model A1 farms a priority in the form of resources (Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.144).

One of the most interesting definitions of policy implementation is the one that views implementation as conversion of physical and financial resources into concrete service delivery outputs in the form of facilities and services or into other concrete outputs aimed to achieving policy objectives (Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.137). This policy implementation perspective is what this study investigated with regard to the implementation of the land reform policies to enhance national food security sustainability in Zimbabwe. The study investigated how policy implementers had converted physical and financial resources into tangible services and facilities on the model A1 farming scheme to help the new farmers

improve agricultural productivity. Therefore, understanding of what policy implementation entails would help policy makers, policy implementers and policy beneficiaries to understand the policy gap in the policy implementation process between policy expectations and perceived policy results (Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.137). According to Brynard (2007), policy gaps are necessitated by compliance issues and the desired results of the policy implementation. This explains the linkages in the implementation of public policy which include policy legitimacy, political sustainability, operational and administrative feasibility as well as sustainability value of the public policy (Moore, 1995 in Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.137). Thus, in Moyo's (2002) views, the services given to the policy beneficiaries through policy implementation should be of value to such beneficiaries. Also, the strategies employed by policy implementers should be legitimate as well as politically sustainable. This means that such strategies should embrace authority and attract political will for funding purposes. When such conditions prevail, that is when it is likely that new farmers on model A1 would be able to fully contribute to the national food security.

2.1.2. Policy implementation models

There are guiding principles to be followed in the process of policy implementation. If these are followed they would help model A1 farmers to improve the country's food security and to alleviate hunger and starvation in Zimbabwe. Thus, policy implementation process should be understood by both policy makers and policy implementers as to where the process starts and ends. This understanding could be provided by policy implementation models, known as the three generations of research into implementation (Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, pp.138-145).

2.1.2.1. First generation: The Classical model

This generation assumes that policy implementation happens automatically once appropriate policies have been authoritatively proclaimed (Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.138). This model is of the view that policy implementation is hierarchical, where decision makers at the top create policies and policy implementers at the bottom dutifully carry out the implementation (Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.138). In other words, the Classical model

views policy implementation as a top-down process where policy implementers and policy beneficiaries play a passive role in the process. The assumptions of this generation depicting policy implementation process have some implications on how policies are implemented. However, in Woodrow (1887) framework, policy formulation and policy implementation are two different entities, the latter being neutral, professionalised and non-political (Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.138). Therefore, understanding this school of thought as policy makers, policy implementers, policy analysts and policy beneficiaries of the land reform programme in Zimbabwe is very crucial. This also helps researchers in various sectors of the indigenisation programme to understand which policy implementation perspective the country employs. This is also of great significance to this study as the bases for interpretation of the findings.

2.1.2.2. Second generation: The complexity model

The second generation perspective views policy implementation as far more complex and political than the classical assumptions had depicted them to be (Simon, 1947; Kaufmann, 1960 and Etzioni, 1964; in Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.139). This generation believes that it is a wrong assumption to believe that proclamation of a policy would automatically results into implementation. Their assumption is that, it is hard to design public policies and hence so difficult to implement them in such a way as to please anyone at all, including the supposed beneficiaries (Bardach, 1977, in Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.139).

Thus, the first two generations of research into implementation share the view that implementation process of public policies is highly political and complex. This also concurs with what empirical literature on indigenisation programme revealed about the sensitivity of the whole issue surrounding this programme. Thus, the programme is a political ploy, guided by political principles and hence, the policy implementation of this programme is also a political process. As portrayed by the perspectives of the two models, the results of this study were impacted by the political environment of the implementation of highly politicised land reform policies. This theoretical framework of the integrated themes of indigenisation, food security sustainability and policy implementation highlights crucial elements which link the performance on the new farmers on the model A1 and the way the policies are supposedly implemented.

2.1.2.3. Third generation: The analytical model

The proponents of this model believe that there is still need to search for information on the analysis of policy implementation. Their assumption is that policy implementation, as opposed to the first two generations, is bottom-up rather than top-down (Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.139). The debate on whether policy implementation is top-down or bottom-up was relevant in this study.

2.1.3. Top-down versus bottom-up policy implementation

According to Mazmanian and Sabatier (1981), policy implementation can be viewed from three different ways; the policy maker, the field level implementing officials and the policy beneficiaries whom the programme is directed (Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.141). The scholars of the two traditions, the top-down and bottom-up policy implementation agree on this regard, but differ on which actors and organisations are the most relevant in the policy implementation process (Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.142). However, both acknowledge the importance of this process. For the implementation of the land reform policies to try to improve agricultural outputs on model A1 farms, one would envisage a situation where the two perspectives are integrated for the benefit of the country's food security.

The most important aspect to understand about public policy implementation is that, the process is not just a managerial or administrative issue, but a political process concerned about who gets what, when, how, where and from whom (Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.144). An understanding of this view point of implementation could help policy beneficiaries of land reform programme in Zimbabwe to use political structures to seek for political interventions in order to get help which might lead to improvement on the performance of model A1 farms and subsequently to the improved food security in the country. This also explains why there was need for this study to consider involving the Ward counsellor, the traditional leaders and even the political party leaders in its quest to get a deeper understanding of the role played by policy implementers in their bid to improve model A1 farms' performance to enhance food security sustainability in the country.

Howlett, et al. (2009, p.161), believes that while politicians have an active role to play in making decisions leading to policy implementation process, the actual implementation of public policies lies with the civil servants who are tasked by the government with the duty on the ground. These are the people who make policies achieve objectives they are intended to achieve. This is one major reason why this study also targeted Agricultural Extension officers because together with the elected and appointed leaders, they are the custodians of the land reform policies, which should determine the success or failure of the land reform programme in the country. In other words, the views of the top-down and the bottom-up perspectives that decision makers provide policy implementers with clear goals and direction needs to be challenged because government decisions in policy process are influenced by many factors, of which some of those factors might not been on the government agenda. Therefore, based on the latter, although policy implementers get directives from senior politicians, they are the ones who play that final role that might translate policies to meet the objectives of policy government. This explains how significant the policy implementers are in transforming model A1 into an agricultural productive sector which might prove to be the solution to the country's problem of the shortage of staple food.

According to May (1990) in Birkland (2011, p.269), some public policies can be categorised as "policies without publics". This means that some public policies are designed and implemented with little or no involvement of the public. This scenario often happens when such policies are highly political as is with the land reform policies in Zimbabwe. Therefore, an understanding of the design of the land reform policies in Zimbabwe might also lead to a better understanding of how the implementation of the land reform policies is being carried out. This was crucial for this study as a yard stick to base its findings. However, while it could be acknowledged that the top-down and bottom-up approaches to policy implementation have shortcomings, it is equally important to acknowledge the contribution they have made to the knowledge of the researchers in the field of policy implementation in various sectors such as the land reform programme in Zimbabwe.

2.1.4. The 5-C protocol for policy implementation

There are many factors which determine the success or failure of policy implementation. According to Cloete and De Coning (2011, pp.145-153), the success or failure of policy implementation lies on what they call the 5-C protocol for policy implementation, namely; the content, context, commitment, capacity and clients or coalitions. An understanding of the 5-C protocol for policy implementation might broaden the knowledge of policy practitioners and enhance their skills of assessing the role played by policy implementers in their bid to help policy beneficiaries to be productive in their sectors of economy.

2.1.4.1. Content

The content of the policy characterises the function of that policy as distributive, regulatory or redistributive. Thus, distributive policies create public goods for the general welfare, whereas regulatory policies are for specifying rules of conduct for the public. Failure to adhere to rules regulated by such policies may lead to the offender being sanctioned. On the other hand, redistributive policies are meant to transfer wealth or power to some groups "in the expense of others" (Lowi, 1963, in Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.146). This information is crucial for policy making process as is to land reform policy implementers in Zimbabwe to understand that the policies were formulated to empower those who were disadvantaged prior to Zimbabwe's independence in 1980. This understanding is significant to the policy implementers so that they could push the agenda of the policies to try to help the land reform programme beneficiaries, especially those who are on the model A1 farms to accelerate their performance to alleviate poverty and hunger in the country.

2.1.4.2. Context

Public policies are designed for particular contexts; thus, they focus mainly on socio-economic, political and legal matters. However, O' Toole (1986) believes that the field of implementation has a challenge with regard to policy contextuality (Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.146-147). This could mean that policy implementation at the present moment is failing to address for example, what it is exactly that should be tackled that is of social or political concern. If this

assumption has anything to do with the implementation of the land reform policies in Zimbabwe, then the role played by policy implementers in their bid to improve total agricultural output on model A1 farms might be compromised. However, it is important for land reform policy implementers to understand that the context of the policies they implement is political in nature and hence for such policies to achieve their objectives, the implementation process should recognise political institutions of the policy environment.

2.1.4.3. Commitment

The success of the policy depends on the commitment of the policy implementers because they are the ones who are responsible for carrying it out and are the final link with the policy beneficiaries (Warwick, 1982, in Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.147). Thus, commitment of the implementers plays a major role in policy implementation, whether the implementation follows the top-down or bottom-up perspective. Equally important is to realise that commitment is not only crucial at implementation level, but throughout the policy process. It is therefore important to understand that, for land reform policies to achieve the set objectives there should be synergy among the five critical variables, the 5-C. Thus, commitment should influence and be influenced by the other four variables (Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.147). In a bid to enhance high performance on model A1 farms, policy implementers should be motivated in order for them to motivate new farmers on the model A1 farms to be productive in their new pieces of land so that Zimbabwe might regain its status as the food basket of the SADC countries.

2.1.4.4. Capacity

One of the factors which influence the success of policy implementation is the availability of both tangible and intangible resources. Tangible resources include among others; structural, functional, cultural, human, financial, materials, technological as well as logistical ones (Grindle and Hildebrand, 1995, in Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p. 148). Amongst the intangible resources, there is often need for leadership, motivation, commitment, willingness and courage; if implementation of policies is to produce the intended results which the policy was designed for. The same range of resources may be needed in the implementation of the land

reform policies in Zimbabwe's model A1 farms if policy implementers are to come up with strategies which could improve this sector so that the country's food security could be sustained.

2.1.4.5. Clients/Coalitions

Implementation, because it is affected by individuals who are also affected by the policy, may not be carried out in a linear manner where plans are predetermined; rather, as a process where implementers can manage the process and try to channel it towards a more effective outcome. This requires commitment to strategise to try to fix issues which the implementers have some direct or indirect influence to "induce changes in the ones over which one does not have such influence" (Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.153). This point of view was significant in this study in trying to get a deeper understanding of the role played by land reform policy implementers.

2.2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.2.1. Indigenisation policy framework

This section reviews literature on the implementation of indigenisation policy framework on model A1 smallholder farming sector. It examines the relevance of the model A1 farming sector to the national economy as compared to other agricultural sectors. Moyo (2006) postulates that, the fast track land reform programme created two models of resettlement namely; the model A1 and model A2. Prior to these models, there were the Commercial, the Old resettled and the Communal farming schemes. The indigenisation process then combined the model A1 with the Old resettled and the Communal farmers to constitute what is known as the smallholder farming sector. Model A2 and the Commercial farming sector were amalgamated to constitute the commercial sector.

In model A1, each farmer or household is allocated between 3-5 hectares of arable land. In this model, as Moyo (2006) asserts, all farmers share unlimited grazing land. This means that there is no restriction on the size of the grazing land, making it a huge potential investment for farmers on this model to practice ranching farming. The smallholder farming sector constitutes

the largest population of farmers with the largest farming area. According to Moyo (2006), in a population of 11 million in Zimbabwe, smallholder farmers constitute 1.1 million of which 887000 are Communal farmers; 72000 Old resettled farmers and 141000 model A1 farmers. The Smallholder scheme alone has 98% of the total population with 75.6% of farming area and a total of 1.3 million farmers (Anseeuw, et al, 2012, p. 24). From this scheme, the land remains the property of the government, although the farmers on the model A1 are paying annual levies.

Moyo (2006) further posits that the other scheme is the model A2 with 99-year leases from the government. This model embraces the small to medium-scale commercial farmers; the large-scale commercial farmers and the corporate estates. Farmers from model A2 largely constitute urban and rural elites and politicians (Moyo, 2004). This category of farmers constitutes 2% of the total population, 24.4% of farming area and a total of 22000 farmers. These figures explain the need for policy implementers to implement policies based on improving smallholder farming sector, especially the model A1 who arguably occupied the most productive farming land. This sector has the potential to contribute in the mainstream economy and improve the country's food security sustainability.

Literature reveals that Zimbabwe had no reliable agricultural policy for the first 32 years of independence. According to Anseeuw et al (2012, pp. 25-26), the country relied on draft agricultural policies mainly because of the political instability within the Zimbabwe African National Union Patriotic Front (ZANU PF) led-government. Since 1980, this department had been changing ministers before policies had been adopted. The agricultural policies had been "developed on an ad hoc basis" (Anseeuw, et al 2012, p. 26). The absence of formal agricultural policy until the year 2012 implies that agricultural projects have largely been implemented on political grounds. This could also explain why since the land reform programme took place, the country has poorly performed in agriculture. The new farmers seem to have been striving on their own without policy guidelines on how they could enhance productivity, especially on model A1 farming sector. There seems to be reluctance on new farmers as no one seems to realise that, as new farmers they have an obligation to feed the whole nation. Until the policy

implementers engage with these farmers and explain the farmers' roles in the national economy, the country may not see real productivity from the resettled farmers. Such lack of coordination amongst smallholder farmers hampers developmental projects on the smallholder farming sector, especially on model A1 scheme. Policy implementers need to sensitise model A1 farmers about indigenisation policies as well as what it means to be an indigenous farmer in relation to the economy and the food security sustainability in the country. There is a dire need to formalise the model A1 farming sector by implementing a regulatory policy framework. This framework could guide farming activities and ensure that people who are willing to do farming to boost the country's food security sustainability, retain their pockets of farming lands.

2.2.2. The need to shift to smallholder farmers

Narman (1991, p.4) believes that agriculture plays one of the most important roles in the development of Zimbabwe's economy as it is with other African countries. This is corroborated by Anseeuw, Kapuya and Saruchera (2012) who assert that economic stability and growth of Zimbabwe has always been Agro-based. They posit that the performance of the agricultural sector impacts directly to the country's gross domestic product (GDP). This sector also forms the basis of the livelihoods of about 70% of the total population of the country through subsistence farming (Anseeuw, et al, 2012, p. 8). Robertson (2011) asserts that despite the fall of the country's GDP to 12%, the agricultural sector would remain vital in the revival of the country's economy. In supporting this view, Kapuya (2010) points out that despite all the negativity in the country's economy, the agricultural sector has of late created about 30% of formal employment, in the process becoming the largest source of export earnings. To consolidate this achievement by the sector, policy implementers need to engage with model A1 farmers to help them play a major role in improving the country's food security.

Literature reveals that Zimbabwe's real GDP is taking a downward trend. This means that a number of issues should be dealt with to improve the agricultural sector. There is need for all stakeholders to revitalize model A1 farming sector to help farmers in this sector to increase productivity. This is one sector which has the vast potential to compliment the commercial farming sector with maize; the staple crop since the latter sector's main focus is on cash crops.

This would help the country move out of hunger and starvation, thereby, reducing poverty and inequality at the same time creating employment in the agricultural sector. The country has performed poorly since the fast track land reform programme started in the year 2000 with low productivity due to lack of financial injection into the sector. Poor investment in the sector has resulted in the use of poor and outdated methods of farming (Anseeuw, et al, 2012, p.9; ZimVac, 2009). Some scholars further argue that lack of coordination remained the biggest impediment to productivity in this sector. This shows that the implementation of the land reform programme has been compromised somehow, most probably for political reasons since the land reform programme is highly politicised in Zimbabwe.

The prevailing scenario seems to point out that, if Zimbabwe is to improve its economy and its food security sustainability, the country has to increase productivity levels based on model A1 farming sector. Investing on model A1 farming would be a good idea since this sector does not require huge sums of money to be revitalized. Research reveals that the majority of the farmers in Zimbabwe are in the smallholder farming scheme which also includes the model A1 farms. The model A1 farmers are resettled in fertile lands formerly occupied by the white commercial farmers. This is also where the second largest portion of the agricultural land is found. If priority is given to this sector, Zimbabwe's agricultural revitalization process may perhaps lead to better yields than the current situation (Anseeuw, et al, 2012) and hence improving the country's food security sustainability. Despite the potential on the model A1, the donor community seems to have deliberately ignored the implementation of projects on the newly resettled sector. They have opted for old resettled areas and communal lands. This leaves government as the sole investor on model A1 farms (Anseeuw, et al, 2012). The lack of interest on model A1 by the donor community is open for further investigation. If the withdrawal is politically motivated, then both the government and the donor community should operate beyond political intolerance levels and engage each other for nation building so that the country's food security sustainability could be improved.

Kapuya (2010), points out that there is no relevance in the country's land reform policies and that the institutional framework lacks direction. As a result of this, the country seems to find

itself using wrong strategies of development. It is suspected that strategies applied in the agricultural sector systematically exclude the model A1 farming scheme from full participation in the national economy and the country's food security related issues. Contrary to the functionality of the land reform policies, the model A1 farmers were resettled in fertile lands which were productively utilized by former white farmers with the view that the new model was also going to step in and continue improving the country's food security sustainability.

Kapuya (2010) also believes that lack of productivity on the agricultural sector is as a result of inefficiency and non-committal to agriculture by relevant stakeholders. Kapuya believes that existing research does not offer technological perspectives needed to help farmers with technical skills to enhance productivity, especially on smallholder farming scheme (Kapuya et al, 2010). This view point explains why there was need for this research study to investigate the implementation of the land reform policies on model A1 farms with a view of getting a deeper understanding of the role played by policy implementers in their bid to improve the country's food security sustainability.

To improve the country's food security sustainability, the Zimbabwean government could learn from the Post-Crisis Reconstruction model. According to this model, the government should consider restructuring. Such restructuring could strengthen consensus in the agricultural sector. Policy reforms could also stimulate economic revitalisation (Anseeuw, et al., 2012, p. 12). Thus, effective governance could facilitate efficiency, stability as well as developmental oriented programmes. Agricultural programmes implemented in resettlement areas should be viewed as national programmes for national economy rather than programmes initiated for political mileage. Thus, for that transformation to be fully realised, there should be inclusivity in the implementation of the land reform policies in Zimbabwe.

The government should also provide adequate technical as well as the financial support services to model A1 farms to enhance productivity and hence improve the country's food security sustainability (Kudejira, 2014, p. 12). Zimbabwe had invested highly by training Extension Officers in the department of Agriculture, Technical and Extension Services (AGRITEX). The mandate of these officers is to offer technical support to farmers. However,

owing to the increased number of farmers who emerged after the fast track land reform programme, the highly trained personnel could not meet demand. According to Moyo (2004), the government was then forced to recruit and then trained about 8000 new officers who did not get sufficient training and as such, failed to deliver on model A1farms. Some non-governmental organisations (NGOs) tried to assist smallholder farmers with technical support skills but lack of adequate finance hindered the process. Kudejira (2014) asserts that since the fast track land reform programme in Zimbabwe, the Department of Agriculture, Mechanisation and Irrigation Development is still struggling to cope with numbers of farmers on the smallholder agricultural sector and therefore, model A1 farmers still face challenges accessing technical, veterinary and research support (Kudejira, 2014, p. 12). These factors are necessary if model A1 farmers are to contribute adequately in the development of the country's GDP and to improve the country's food security sustainability. Interestingly though is that, while the number of farmers has plummeted in recent years of indigenisation, the crop production levels in the farms have drastically dropped. This prevailing scenario calls for an urgent intervention to avert the situation, hence the need to investigate the implementation of land reform policies on model A1 farming sector.

2.2.3. Land reform programme

The political conflict in Zimbabwe has always been based on the land which was seized by white minority government. The white Rhodesians took control of the largest productive agricultural land, thereby forcing the majority of the black people to be crowded into what was referred to as the tribal reserves. The white minority rule in Zimbabwe came to an end when Britain negotiated for a settlement which came to be known as the Lancaster House Agreement. The agreement had special clauses which protected white Zimbabweans for the first 10 years of independence. Thus, the new government of Zimbabwe under the agreement was prevented from compulsory acquisition of land. Land purchases were to be done on a willing seller willing buyer agreement. This made it difficult to resettle the indigenous Zimbabweans up until the Lancaster House Agreement expired in 1990 (Moyo, 2010, p.3).

Since independence in Zimbabwe, the country's strategies and developmental goals have been tailor made towards food security. This is the reason why the fast track land reform programme in the country has always been linked to household food security. However, such goals and strategies may only be realised through diversification of the economy and entrepreneurial policies. The application of such policies may lead to model A1 farms being able to supplement commercial farms with food during droughts (Able et al. 2014, p. 1.). This may also improve the country's Growth Domestic Product (GDP) since there is going to be disposable income for model A1 farmers to buy farming implements, subsequently enhancing the country's food security sustainability.

Land reform has always been a major theme in the world history whereby food security is one of the main goals to enhance agricultural productivity. The pursuit of this goal often leads to sustainable development in the country, especially in the agricultural sector (Dalabe et al. 2014, p. 1). Land reform has been seen around the globe, it occurred in Mexico in 1917, in China in 1952, in Bolivia in 2006 and in Zimbabwe in the year 2000 (Dabale et al. 2014, p. 1). According to Moyo (2010), land reform has been a means to decolonise struggles in Africa, where it was used as the programme for African socialism as well as in the Arab countries where it became Arab nationalism (Dabale et al. 2014, p.1).

Land reform processes, according to Chitsike (2003) focus on three areas, namely; restitution, land tenure and land redistribution. Under restitution process, the government is obliged to compensate those who would have been forcefully removed from their land. However, this process failed in Zimbabwe due to the ambiguity surrounding the willing-buyer willing-seller (WBWS) Lancaster House Agreement. The other two are the land tenure and land redistribution. In the former, the government has to recognise people's right to own land and to have control of such land while in the latter; the government has to deal with the historical imbalances by compulsorily taking land and sharing it with the landless people for empowerment purposes (Dabale et al. 2014, p. 2) and Zimbabwe finally took this direction after the failure of the restitution process. However, of late the Zimbabwean government has made a surprise move by compensating the former white farmers who were forcefully removed from

their farms. This move by the government of Zimbabwe explains the confusion surrounding the implementation of the land reform policies from the highest office.

2.2.3.1. Fast track land reform programme (FTLRP) in Zimbabwe

After the failure of the willing-buyer willing-seller approach in Zimbabwe, the ZANU PF led government resorted in the forceful seizure of the land mostly owned by commercial white farmers. This process was spear-headed by war veterans associated with the ruling party (Scoones, et al. 2011). In Moyo's (2006) assertion, the fast track land reform programme was a fundamental departure from the previous philosophy, practices and procedures of acquiring land and resettling people (Dabale et al. 2014, p.3).

Despite high acceleration of land redistribution through the FTLRP, there are problems with this process. Thus, large numbers of landless farm workers lost their jobs and most of them did not benefit from the land reform programme because they were not a target group since most of them were seen to be siding with their former masters, the white farmers (Scoones, et al. 2011 in Dabale, et al. 2014, p.3). This scenario worsened the plight of the former farm labourers, creating a group of destitute people who are homeless since they have been living in the farms ever since.

Household food security was another serious setback of the FTLRP in Zimbabwe. Scoones et al (2011) posit that this programme reduced agricultural productivity as commercial farmers lost almost 20% of the national commercial herd and commercial maize planting was reduced from 150 000 hectares to about 45 000 hectares by year 1999 and 2000 (Napoli, 2011 in Dabale et al, 2014, p.3). This disruption of commercial farming explains how Zimbabwe moved from being the food basket of the southern Africa to depend almost entirely on international donor assistance. The alarming food shortage in the country is also an indication of the need to enhance productivity in model A1 farming sector, a sector which occupies the second largest farming area.

In Zikhali's (2008) views, the FTLRP replaced mostly experienced farmers with inexperienced ones who were subsistence oriented. This therefore means that the beneficiaries of the FTLRP

lacked the necessary agricultural skills meant to help them achieve meaningful production and that the necessary extension services required were limited due to capacity challenges faced by the country (Dabale, et al., 2014, p.4). Thus, based on Zikhali's view point, the continued failure of the country's agricultural sector could mean that policy implementers are not doing enough to capacitate the inexperienced farmers on the model A1 farming sector. If this scenario continues unabated, then it is highly likely that model A1 agricultural sector would continue performing poorly, a situation the country would not want to remain in for any further. The fact is, the majority of the black people now own land in Zimbabwe, but the country continues to experience severe hunger and starvation. This may mean that land is being underutilised or the methods used by the new farmers are outdated. Either way, policy implementers are vital to improve the situation on the ground so that model A1 could participate in the country's food security sustainability.

2.2.3.2. Effects of FTLFP on household food security

It is arguable that the FTLRP in Zimbabwe have addressed, to some extent, the country's worrisome legacy of historic land injustice, social and radical inequalities and broadened the base of economics participation (Moyo, 2006 in Dabble et al., 2014, p.4). According to Marongwe, et al.,(2003), access to land leads to access to other critical resources. Thus, land reform in Zimbabwe may be viewed as a critical strategy that will facilitate not only access to land by the landless but also access to food. Land, land tenure and food security are linked. These three aspects form a dynamic system in which decisions about production, marketing, consumption and investment generation are driven by structural changes over time in the distribution of land (Dabble, et al., 2014, p.4). However, the majority of Zimbabweans have benefited from the FTLRP but access to other benefits which come as a result of accessing land have not yet been realised. This has raised a lot of questions as to where the actual problem lies; hence the reason why this study investigated the implementation and effects of land reform policies on model A1 farms with the aim of getting a deeper understanding of the role played by policy implementers on model A1 farms in their bid to improve the country's food security sustainability.

The shortcomings of the FTLRP in Zimbabwe are that; the process violated rights to equal protection of the law, non-discrimination and due process (Human Rights Watch, 2002 in Dabale, et al., 2014, p.4). Thus, the violence witnessed during land occupation in Zimbabwe created fear and insecurity on white-owned commercial farms and destabilised food security of the entire country (Dabale, et al., 2014, p.4). Unfortunately though, after more than fifteen years of land redistribution, the problem of shortages of food in rural areas is worsening. There seems to be lack of productivity by new farmers, especially those on the model A1 farming sector where people were resettled in the land without being given leases for such land. It might be argued that these farmers are not seriously committing themselves in agricultural activities because they fear that the government could still remove them from such land or that the majority of the resettled people have no farming background. Such a dire situation may be improved if policy implementers may come in with their technical support by training and motivating model A1 farmers to be productive on their pieces of land in order to contribute to the national food security sustainability.

2.2.3.2. Post- Fast track land reform programme

Global organisations and African leaders were of the view that in order for Africa to come out of poverty and inequality, there was need to distribute resources more equally; in the process, creating employment in the agricultural sector. However, instead of economically elevating the poor landless in the country, the fast-paced policies adopted by the ZANU PF-led government in Zimbabwe seemed to bring more poverty, inequality and unemployment (Musemwa, 2011, p.28). Thus, since year 2000, Zimbabwe has been experiencing serious economic hardships. The country's economy shrank faster than any other country that is not at war (Richardson, 2006 in Musemwa 2011, p.28). According to Jill (2005), the FTLRP destroyed property rights; the foundation of the economy and led to a chain reaction, which was exacerbated by additional actions of the government (Musemwa, 2011, p. 28). Since year 2000, from being a regional food basket, Zimbabwe has become a food importer. Recently, the government of Zimbabwe declared a state of emergency as the country experiences severe shortage of food for 2015-2016 agricultural seasons. The country with such historic background as the region's food

basket should really be having food reserves to avert situations like this. This clearly shows that there is a vacuum created in the productivity levels after the removal of the white commercial farmers and subsequently the resettlement of the black inexperienced farmers (Musemwa, 2011, p.30). This explains why there is need for an urgent intervention to drastically turn around the production levels on model A1 farms to boost the country's food security sustainability.

2.2.3.4. Proponents of land reform

Proponents of land reform claim that the opponents of this reform do not focus on the demerits of not distributing land and they do not see the continued hunger, food shortages and unequal distribution of income but only draw backs related to loses in output and reduction in foreign currency earnings from exports (Musemwa, 2011, p.38). According to Van Zyl, et al., (1996), the failure to execute a major land reform or the delayed implementation of such reforms and continued neglect of rural sector seems to have far more adverse consequences than the relatively minor risks associated with the process of land reform in countries with highly dualistic farm size structures like Zimbabwe (Musemwa, 2011, p.38). The proponents of land reform argue that if land redistribution does not take place, the problem of land ownership skewed towards race remains, racial tensions may occur and this may trigger racial conflicts, which according to Joireman (1996), are more costly and harmful to the civilians (Musemwa, 2011, p.38).

The proponents of land reform also advocate that most commercial farmers underutilised their land. Moyo (2004) asserts that the commercial farmers only utilised 10% of the prime land for cropping. If this assertion is true, then there was substantial amount of land available for the land redistribution without necessarily affecting the national output. However, the manner in which the land reform programme was conducted could be the major reason why the country's economy nose-dived since the implementation of this reform in Zimbabwe (Musemwa, 2011, p.39).

2.2.3.5. Opponents of land reform in Zimbabwe

One of the most interesting arguments raised by the opponents of land reform is that Zimbabwe does not have enough land to make all potential farmers to have land. They believe that land redistribution is therefore impractical (Putzel and Cunnington, 1989 in Musemwa, 2011, p.40). This argument by the opponents of land reform seems to undermine the scenario in rural areas of the country where the majority black people were crowded in an unproductive land while the minority whites had vast underutilised fertile land. Therefore, land reform seeks to redistribute land in order to enhance both the productive potential of the existing smallholder farmers and that of the land underutilised. However, for this to be realised, there is a need for a complete package of the needs of smallholder farmers. Policy implementers should engage with smallholder farmers and map the way forward in order to enhance productivity on model A1 farming sector; thereby improving the country's food security sustainability.

2.2.4. Barriers of poverty reduction

Under unfavourable conditions, agricultural productivity growth could bring untold suffering to the poor. In Zimbabwe, according to agricultural experts and politicians, the collapse of productivity in agricultural sector is blamed on the politics of the country. It is however true that politics has a share in this collapse but there could be a number of other factors that could have deterred the smallholder farmers in model A1 sector in Zimbabwe to increase agricultural productivity to alleviate poverty.

2.2.4.1. The unplanned and chaotic land reform

The land reform in Zimbabwe has been largely blamed for the shortage of food in the country since year 2000. According to Dr. Gwarazimba, (2011, p.1), such a notion may not be true because before the FTLRP in the country, 80% of the maize was produced by smallholder rural farmers. The question now remains unanswered as to what could have happened to the same farmers who are now resettled in productive lands who used to produce enough of maize to sustain the sector while they had poor soils. The commercial farmers hardly grew maize; they concentrated in growing cash crops such as wheat and tobacco. For this reason, lack of

productivity with regard to maize, the staple crop should be blamed on government policy on agriculture. For the past 10 years, the government has announced a number of policy frameworks which were politically motivated and enacted on emotional grounds. Such policies had very little impact in the sector because they lacked content, were not investment oriented and equally lacked the role of parastatals in guidance for the need to increase productivity in agriculture (Dr. Gwarazimba, 2011, p.1).

The policy frameworks as asserted by Dr. Gwarazimba, (2011, p.1), also lacked technical support, processes as well as systems to support implementation. This was influenced by government actions which led to the resettlement of the new farmers without a guiding policy. The retrospective implementation of the resettlement policy failed to yield results, hence lack of productivity in the farming sector. Such policy frameworks also lacked alternatives and the provisions for climate change as well as weather patterns necessitated by such climate changes. Thus, for the last two rain seasons, including the current season, Zimbabwe has experienced the worst droughts with no solution in place mainly because of lack of alternatives to curb change in weather patterns.

2.2.4.2. Lack of agricultural experts

Zimbabwe at one point had undoubtedly the best organised agricultural extension and research services in the continent. Unfortunately, such an institution collapsed mainly because of political interference. According to Dr. Gwarazimba, (2011, p.1), the belief that giving the new farmers free inputs would resuscitate the agricultural sector is wrong assumption because free inputs are unsustainable.

2.2.4.3. Asset and income distribution

Generally, increased productivity leads to poverty reduction. However, if there are discrepancies in the land distribution as well as income and asset distribution, most benefits would go to the elites. This means that the poor would continue suffering. This may be one reason why Zimbabwe's FTLRP is still failing to yield positive results after over 15 years of its existence (Thirtle, et. al., 2001, in Schneider and Gugerty, 2011, p.13).

2.2.5. Sustainable solutions to resuscitate the sector

2.2.5.1. Policy

To resuscitate the agricultural sector in Zimbabwe, the government policy should focus mainly on increasing productivity in smallholder farming sector, be well organised and be specific on service delivery. Such a policy should also be supportive of sectorial systems. This could be possible if the government could create an environment that enables, develops and support local investors. There is need for the government to gather data on a number of factors associated with the new farmer if these resettled farmers are to take responsibilities to supply the nation with food (Dr. Gwarazimba, 2011, p.2). In other words, the government should have adequate information about the interests of the smallholder farmer, that is, the forces behind the smallholder farmer, the motivation, the expectations and even the internal and external constraints of the smallholder farmer. Such information is crucial if both the government and the smallholder farmers are to operate within the same vision. This could also enable the government to formulate policy frameworks that are tailor-made to support smallholder farming in every possible aspect to enhance the country's food security sustainability.

2.2.5.2. Capacity building of rural farming communities

Dr.Gwarazimba, (2011, p.2) believes that the strategy adopted by the Zimbabwean government of giving farm inputs to the smallholder farmers through the Grain Marketing Board does not constitute to capacity building because such is not sustainable. Rather, Dr.Gwarazimba is of the opinion that the solution lies with the empowerment of the agricultural sector itself. There is need for government to consider providing the smallholder farmers with investment tool in the form of transferable certificate of ownership on land. Such a move could create value for the land as farmers would appreciate land as theirs for future generations. According to Dr.Gwarazimba, (2011), land should be transferable, exchangeable as well as protectable so that it becomes a source of investment. At this point in time, smallholder farmers have no ownership of the land they are resettled on. Only model A2 farmers have the 99-year leases which are also not good enough to protect farmers and to instil on them a sense of ownership of the land they are resettled on.

2.2.5.3. Technical support for model A1 farmers

Technical support is essential for model A1 farmers if agricultural productivity is to be sustained. Zimbabwe's Department of Agricultural Extension Services (AGRITEX) was vibrant before the FTLRP as it enabled farmer training programmes which motivated farmers to be productive. Currently, with this department weakened by existing policies, the new and young farmers on model A1 farming sector being untrained and technically unqualified to manage agricultural operations; the agricultural sector is unsustainable. Therefore, there is need for the government to invest heavily in training of the model A1 farmers and this could be achieved by providing resources to AGRITEX to provide that much needed support to the new farmers, (Dr.Gwarazimba, 2011, p.2).

2.2.5.4. Farmer responsibility to the nation

In Dr.Gwarazimba's, (2011, p.3) assertion, model A1 farmers' mentality is self-enrichment at the expense of the nation. This explains why there is lack of productivity in the maize crop as most model A1 farmers have turned into growing cash crops they have no experience at and worse still without money to sustain such crops. The resultant is the failure of the sector in both the staple crop and cash crop productivity. However, this does not mean that these farmers should not venture into cash crops. Farming is business and must always be viewed as such, but farmers on model A1 sector should be assisted by policy implementers in order to make informed decisions which would enhance productivity and sustain the country's food security.

2.2.5.5. Lack of adequate and suitable infrastructure

Lack of infrastructure continues to be a major setback in the revitalization of the agricultural sector in Zimbabwe, especially in the smallholder farming sector. Despite the fact that this sector is central in the food production, most farmers in this sector are inaccessible because of lack of and/or dilapidated infrastructure. There are no proper roads to connect such farmers with the business community and this is a serious cause for concern since these farmers hardly receive any assistance from AGRITEX officials who have no access to the majority of the smallholder farmers in the country (Dr.Gwarazimba, 2011, p.3). The government should

prioritise road infrastructure to enable farmers in the smallholder sector equal opportunities with their counter paths on model A2 sector. The worst scenario with regards to the infrastructure concern is lack of water on model A1 farms. Thus, model A1 farmers only plant their crops seasonal; that is, only when rains come because there are no irrigation facilities on model A1 farms (Dr.Gwarazimba, 2011, p.3). This is a serious situation indeed, especially if model A1 farms are to be expected to contribute to the country's food security sustainability.

2.2.5.6. Supporting and training of technical staff

The smallholder farmers, especially those on model A1 sector may not impact any meaningful contribution into the country's economic mainstream if researchers and AGRITEX officials do not offer these farmers with technical support. In order for these farmers to get this support from the technical team; the technical staff itself needs support and motivation so that they also do the same to the farmers for the country to realise high productivity in these farms. AGRITEX officials, like in the past, need to have access to loans to buy cars or to be provided with motor bikes to make it easier for them to access those remote areas where farmers lack access to technical support. Such a move may also enhance the frequency visits of new farmers by the technical team (Dr.Gwarazimba, 2011, p.4).

2.2.4. Agricultural productivity

Literature defines agricultural productivity in many different ways, which include a general output per unit of input, farm yield by crop or total output per hectare and output per worker (Schneider and Gugerty, 2011, p.1). Regardless of which measure is utilised, empirical studies are of the idea that improvements in agricultural productivity are important for poverty reduction and food security sustainability (Mellor, 1999, in Schneider and Gugerty, 2011, p.1). However, according to Schneider and Gugerty (2011, p.1), the appropriate way of measuring agricultural productivity is still a subject of debate. Nonetheless, Timmer, (1997) is of the view that using output per worker is a better measure of agricultural productivity. This view point is echoed by Mellor, (1999) who believes that output per worker as a measure of productivity can be used to identify linkages to non-agricultural growth since it encapsulates the additional ways through which farm households earn income (Schneider and Gugerty, 2011, p. 1). It is of

significance to note that output and productivity do not necessarily have similar impacts; however, the literature is not always clear on the distinction between the two. Thus, there may be productivity gains in agriculture but this may not translate into poverty reduction as long as the decline in output prices outweighs the gain from increased productivity (Thirtle, et al., 2001, in Schneider and Gugerty, 2011, p.2). However, an understanding of agricultural productivity with relation to food security sustainability in the country is of significance on this study.

2.2.5. Agriculture and economic growth

According to Irz et al., (2001), the most direct contribution of agricultural growth is through generating higher incomes for farmers. On the other hand, Thirtle et al., (2001) is of the view that agricultural productivity growth can drive rural growth and catalyse a pro-poor development process (Schneider and Gugerty, 2011, p.4). This is the belief many people hold about smallholder farmers on model A1 farming sector which is meant to change the fortunes of the majority of black farmers who are the beneficiaries of the FTLRP in Zimbabwe. Thus, the higher the yields the farmers on model A1 produce, the better the position of the country on food security sustainability.

2.3. REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

2.3.1. Indigenisation as an international phenomenon

Indigenisation has been implemented worldwide. This is the programme that countries such as the United States of America (USA), China, France, South Korea, Australia and even South Africa implemented to empower their citizens. Zimbabwe follows the footsteps of such countries (Dube, 2013, p.6). However, the concept of indigenisation in some sections seems to have a different meaning altogether. Some countries which are said to have indigenised have only done import substitution. They make sub-standard goods locally and thereafter claim to have indigenised. Again, in some parts of the world, it is difficult to tell who the indigenous people areas it is not so easy to point who really were the first people to settle in such a country or

continent. This is the contentious issue in South Africa. Fortunately, in Zimbabwe, an indigenous Zimbabwean is described on historical background prior to 18 April 1980.

2.3.2. Zimbabwe's indigenisation programme (ZIP)

Dube (2013, p.6) says that ZIP is a legally binding programme in Zimbabwe because it is constituted by (a) the Constitution of Zimbabwe (Amendment no. 20) No. 1 of 2013 ("the new Constitution"); (b) the Zimbabwe Government Policy Framework for Indigenisation of the Economy and (c) the Indigenisation and Economic Empowerment Act, Chapter 14:33 ("Cap14:33"). Cap 14:33 defines indigenisation as "…a deliberate involvement of indigenous Zimbabweans in the economic activities of the country, to which hitherto they had no access, so as to have an equitable ownership of the nation's resources".

Cap 14:33 says an indigenous Zimbabwean is, "… any person who, before 18 April 1980, was disadvantaged by unfair discrimination on the grounds of his or her race and any descendant of such a person and includes any company, association, syndicate or partnership of which indigenous Zimbabweans form the majority of members or hold the controlling interest".

These definitions outline the two purposes of indigenisation in Zimbabwe as economic empowerment of all Zimbabweans to participate in the resuscitation of the economy of the country. The second definition portrays indigenisation as mainly meant to enrich the black majority in the country by correcting the historical imbalances. This means that, the newly resettled farmers on the model A1 scheme deserve to be given the chance to contribute on the development of the national economy by enhancing the country's food security sustainability.

Cap 14: 33 further defines Economic Empowerment as the "…creation of an environment which enhances the performance of the economic activities of indigenous Zimbabweans into which they would have been introduced or involved through indigenisation".

In these definitions policy implementers are mandated to create conducive environment for model A1 farms to help them contribute to the sustainability of the country's food security.

2.3.3. The need for indigenisation in Zimbabwe

The reasons for indigenisation in Zimbabwe include the correction of the imbalances of the past (Dube, 2013, p.10) by increasing indigenous people's access to natural resources, quality education and health, among others. The assumption is that if the economy is opened to many players it has the likelihood to develop to sustainable levels. The implementation of the land reform programme which led to the resettling of the model A1 farmers was a means to redress these imbalances (Dube, 2013, p.12).

2.3.4. International Covenants and Human Rights Charters (ICHRC)

Zimbabwe's indigenisation is based on the International Covenants and Human Rights Charters which seeks to promote rights of indigenous people to their resources (Dube (2013, p. 13). The cause for indigenisation in Zimbabwe is therefore supported by international statutes and conventions. Policy implementers should embrace the participation of model A1 farmers in the national economy to help farmers in this sector to be productive in order to sustain the country's agricultural sector, create employment in the sector and above all, improve the country's food security sustainability.

2.3.5. Zimbabwean law

The laws of the country mandate government, its agencies and institutions to play a major role to empower indigenous Zimbabweans (Dube, 2013, p.14). The law invites the donor communities to partake in empowering the marginalised Zimbabweans. However, empirical literature reveals that donor communities are not involved in the empowerment of marginalised Zimbabweans on model A1 farming sector citing ambiguities on the land reform policy implementation.

2.3.6. Zimbabwe Agricultural Policy Framework (2012-2032)

According to the comprehensive Agricultural Policy Framework (2012-2032, p.7), agriculture in Zimbabwe contributes 15-18% of GDP, 40% of national earnings and 60% of raw materials to

agro-industries. This policy framework also asserts that over 70% of the Zimbabweans depend on agricultural sector for survival hence a third of the formal labour force strives on this sector.

2.3.7. Vision of the agricultural sector

The vision of this policy framework envisages a prosperous, diverse and competitive agricultural sector which will enable the country to have sufficient food which is meant to play a role in the development of the nation (Zimbabwe Agricultural Policy Framework, 2012-2032, p.8). This vision promises a better agricultural sector, but since the formulation of this policy framework, the vision remains a dream. The country's food security reserves continue to be dry; subjecting Zimbabweans to serious hunger and starvation.

2.3.8. Productivity and growth thrust

The agricultural policy's main thrust is on productivity (Zimbabwe Agricultural Policy Framework, 2012-2032, p.9). This is the agricultural sector's main objective which has proved to be elusive since the FTLRP. Interestingly, the policy acknowledges the challenges the sector faces. These include among others; low productivity, low level of farming skills among farmers, lack of clearly defined agricultural input support policy and poor roads and infrastructure to transport produce to markets (Zimbabwe Agricultural Policy Framework, 2012-2032, p.15). To increase crop productivity and production, the policy alludes to government's commitment in promoting research into integrated crop management practices as well as promoting sustainable agricultural production which includes conservation agricultural techniques. Thus, the agricultural policy framework (2012-2032, p. 24-25) highlights that the government would set up an adequately resourced agricultural research system which would strengthen research and service delivery. If such developments become practical, then the country is likely to overcome its low productivity challenges on the model A1 farming sector since policy implementers would benefit from such systems, leading to improved farming techniques. Equally important is the policy's assertion of resourcing agricultural extension services by increasing budgetary allocation to these services in order to improve the effectiveness of agricultural sector.

2.3.9. Agricultural education and training

The agricultural policy asserts that the government would promote demand driven agricultural education and farmer system that produce knowledge and skilled agricultural practitioners (Zimbabwe Agricultural Policy Framework, 2012-2032, p. 27-28). This, according to the policy would be done through the promotion of agricultural training of all farmers. The feasibility of this would be enhanced by providing farmers with agricultural training manuals compiled in all local languages to improve access to knowledge. If policy implementers could provide this service to the newly resettled farmers on model A1 sector, an improved productivity levels could soon be realised; hence improvement in the country's food security sustainability.

2.4. SUMMARY

The conceptual literature and the theoretical framework of this study revealed some gaps in the field. Currently, literature showed that there was no harmony between the government and the civic organisation groups due to the ambiguity of the indigenisation policy. However, analysis of the theories and regulatory framework showed how vital the area of this study was. Analysis of literature revealed that the land redistribution was a political ploy; meant to further the agenda of politicians and hence land reform policies were politically administered. Empirical literature also showed that the ruling government did not have a plan in place which pivoted the development of the sector since the indigenisation programme was carried out without a policy to guide the land redistribution process. Thus, people were given pockets of land which they were not prepared for. As a result, the land had remained idle with no meaningful farming taking place. More so, the sudden increase in the number of farmers, which had not been planned for, had overstretched the available human and capital resources, thereby compromising effective policy implementation to the disadvantage of policy beneficiaries, especially those on the model A1 farming sector because of their inexperience in farming. Literature also revealed that there was no meaningful funding for the farming projects so as to revitalise the ailing agricultural sector. If policy actors could realise the importance of this study, there was hope that Zimbabwe's model A1 agricultural sector may improve significantly. There was hope that the engagement of various policy players, especially the policy implementers

through this study might bring consensus and motivate a coordinated approach to policy implementation to improve the country's food security.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0. INTRODUCTION

The research methodology was meant to provide answers to the main research question: How do policy implementers participate on model A1 farms to improve food security sustainability in the country? The investigation was at the implementation stage of the Indigenisation policy on model A1 smallholder farming sector, a sector born out of the land reform programme (LRP) in Zimbabwe. The chapter also explained how the qualitative study paradigm as well as procedures and techniques were explored as a means of gathering data. Furthermore, the preference of a qualitative research paradigm over a quantitative study was explained. Finally, ethical issues together with limitation and delimitation aspects of this study were also considered.

A qualitative study was applied in the study mainly because this paradigm searches for contextual meaning. Thus, this paradigm searches for meanings based on one's experiences and the context in which such meanings are based (Shank, 2002, p. 5). In order to fully understand farmers' perceptions of policy implementers' role, vice versa in the implementation of the land reform policies to enhance food security in the country, the farmers' and the policy implementers' interpretation of their reality was vital in the study. Qualitative study was also vital for this purpose because it compelled the researcher to understand the model A1 farmers and their socio-cultural diversity as well as how the policy implementers related with the farmers who were mandated by the policy to improve the country's food security. Such a context provided opportunities for the researcher to develop descriptive and rich understanding into the individual's beliefs and preferences (Priest, 1996).

The qualitative research paradigm uses social actions as raw materials for analysis purposes (Meyer, cited in Lindloff 1995, p. 21).The use of this methodology was presumably going to lead to an in-depth understanding of the whole essence as to what factors contributed to lack of food security sustainability in the country since the land which was used by white farmers was

redistributed to the black indigenous farmers as model A1farms.This also enabled the researcher to explore the strategies in place for improving this sector. The social actions combined with raw materials enabled the researcher to understand the current trends of productivity as well as to find out how policy actors were involved in model A1 farms in their bid to maximise agricultural productivity in this model. Qualitative research paradigm was believed to have the potential to enable the researcher to exploit political issues such as the highly contested Indigenisation policy in Zimbabwe (Conger, 1998; Bryman, eta l, 1988; Alvesson, 1996).

3.1. RESEARCH DESIGN

The research was case study based. Babbie (2007, p. 298) defines a case study as the "in-depth examination of a single instance of some social phenomenon..." A case study deals with a part of a whole where representation has no significance. Because indigenisation policy is meant to empower and transform the society, this study used the critical or transformative paradigm which befitted the objective of the study; to gather information that could lead to transformation of the model A1 farms, to empower the communities and sustain the country's food security.

Ncube (2009) views a case study as an in-depth investigation into a person's life. The rigorous element of a case study explains its significance in this study. By focusing in a single case of Nkenyane, the study provided the researcher with a detailed examination of this case leading to reliability in terms of the quality information obtained about the role of policy implementers in their bid to help model A1 farms enhance the country's food security. The focus on Nkenyane as a single case was based on a number of reasons. Nkenyane area is one of the most fertile prime lands in the Bubi district. The area usually receives moderate to high rain fall every rainy season and there is sufficient road network around the area. Another important reason which led to choosing Nkenyane as the single case was its closeness to Bulawayo, the second capital city of the country. All these factors explain how important Nkenyane could be on agricultural activities.

However, the case study methodology has been criticised for being subjective. Some critics of qualitative paradigm believe there is too much flexibility in this methodology since the researcher is involved in the interpretation of the data obtained. Their argument is that, the involvement by the researcher compromises validity of the study. There is fear that the research may generate biased and contaminated results of the study. The land issue in Zimbabwe is already said to be polarised and this is highly a subjective appraisal of the land redistribution programme. It would be a disservice for this research to be entangled in the controversy by being subjective.

3.2. RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Two research instruments, namely; archival material and documents and semi-structured individual interviews were used for the purposes of data collection.

3.2.1. Archival material and documents

The study analysed both secondary sources and archival documents as means of collecting data. The focal point of analysis was the Indigenisation Act and the ZIM-ASSET blue print because the two are the nucleus of the indigenisation policy. Both the state and privately owned newspapers were analysed to minimize polarization envisaged in Zimbabwe media. Thus, the choice of archival research method was crucial for this study so that the researcher could obtain information from the state news papers which are pro-government in the manner they report issues related to the land reform policies and from the independent news papers are experiencing less censorship from the state. Thus, the analysis of news papers with different interests and intentions as well as other documents, strengthened the reliability of the data and on the other hand reduced the element of biasness on the research outcome. Another important reason for adopting the archival method of obtaining data was based on the fact that most views found in news papers were contributed by academics and research institutes who are highly literate on land reform issues. Therefore, access to news papers and other documents was convenient to the researcher since there were no rigorous formal procedures to undergo to access information.

3.2.2. In-depth interviews

The study employed semi-structured interviews to gather as much data to answer the primary question of the study. Semi-structured interviews were preferred based on the political sensitivity of the study. This helped the researcher to handle any issue blown out of proportion and/or probed for those themes deliberately avoided by individuals for political reasons. Thus, through interviews the researcher was in a position to observe and effectively interpret people's emotions, their inner thoughts about the surrounding as well as what they perceived correct or incorrect (Kyale, 1996; Schroder, 2003). Individual interviews were the best method for this study because of the political sensitivity of the issues involved on indigenisation policy in Zimbabwe. The interviews afforded the opportunity to probe and challenge misconceptions while interviewees were able to clarify issues. This assisted in a large way, to limit the contamination of results. The views of the interviewees were clearly captured and clarifications sought to ensure there was objectivity.

3.3. SAMPLING OF RESPONDENTS

Purposive sampling was used for sampling purposes since this method is considered "the most useful type of non-probability sampling" (Wagner, C. eta l, 2012, p.93). Unlike in other forms of non-probability sampling, purposive sampling has specific criteria to identify suitable respondents. It fulfils the criteria of representativeness. According to Babbie (2007, p. 184), in purposive or judgemental sampling, "units to be observed are selected on the basis of the researcher's judgement..." This means that the researcher's experiences of both the case study and the political environment of the indigenisation policy were used as means to find participants. This was an important attribute to this study because not every individual in the study population understood issues of land reform policy implementation that the study intended to investigate because of low literacy levels among model A1 farmers. For this reason, the researcher believed purposive sampling was the best method to use to select units of analysis based on their knowledge of land reform policies and their implementation.

3.3.1. Overview of Respondents

All the respondents in this research were chosen from Nkenyane in Ward 14. There were twenty interviewees, ten were policy implementers and the other ten were policy beneficiaries. It should be noted that some of the policy implementers were also policy beneficiaries but none the less, they were interviewed in their capacity as policy implementers. Out of the ten policy implementers, there were two AGRITEX officers from the Ministry of Lands and Rural Resettlement; one Councillor of Ward 14; six from local leadership serving in various portfolios and one political party chairperson. On the other hand, all the ten policy beneficiaries were model A1 farmers. In other words, the study utilised twenty respondents who all happened to be involved in the activities of model A1 farms in various different ways. Thus, the researcher felt that obtaining data from twenty units was enough for a Case Study to make generalisations even though the inclusion of legislators and senior government officials in the study could have added more value to the outcome of the study. However, given that the thrust of the study was to investigate policy implementation and participation of policy implementers in the A1 model, the inclusion of such policy actors could have negatively impacted the collection of data and the research outcome due to the politicisation of the Land Reform Programme. Therefore, there is still room for further research on the sensitive implementation of land reform policies on model A1 farms in Zimbabwe in particular and in Africa in general.

3.4. DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

Interpretive techniques were used in the analysis of the collected data. Data analysis was an on-going process during data collection to check if the sample was big enough and to also avoid repeating data. Amongst the techniques used was the thematic or coding and textual analysis. Through coding, data was organized and interpreted under the themes underlying the variables obtained from emerging data. Textual analysis was used to enhance validity of the study (Wagner,C. eta l, 2012, p. 89).

The methodology section gave direction as to how the research questions were to be utilised on the field to generate data that was used as summative measures to the study. Qualitative research paradigm as well as research instruments discussed in this section were presumed to

be ideal to obtain the best possible results and deal with issues of validity, reliability and sensitivity.

3.5. IMPLEMENTATION OF RESEARCH METHODS

The policy implementers in the implementation of the land reform programme policies at district level comprised the lands officers, the Agricultural Extension officers and the district administrator. These were officials appointed by Government as civil servants. The elected officials included the ward councillor, chairpersons of the political parties and the ward development committee. Finally, there were the traditional leaders comprising the chief and the headman.

For the convenience of this study, the first sample utilised the key informants comprising the traditional leaders, the ward councillor, and agricultural extension officers at the district level and the ward development committee and the chairpersons of the political parties at ward level. These policy implementers were conveniently accessible for interviewing. The other reason for the utilisation of the politically elected officials and the traditional leaders was based on political grounds. Thus, the indigenisation policy is highly politicised in Zimbabwe and therefore, the exclusion of these actors in the study would have led to withdrawal by other participants for fear of victimisation. Equally important about the choice of this sample was that, these were the people who were knowledgeable about the policies guiding the implementation of the land reform programme on model A1 farms.

Since the study utilised purposive sampling, which is a non-probability sampling technique, for the purposes of having balanced information, the second sample was the model A1 policy beneficiaries, the farmers. Farmers who were conveniently available to the researcher in the Nkenyane community were interviewed. The farmers may not have offered the land reform policies expertise, but they had the on-field experience of the policy implementation. Overall, the sample utilised people with indigenisation policy knowledge, political policy environment influence, farming technical expertise and those who had practical experience on the implementation of the land reform policies.

3.6. ETHICS

The main ethical issue the study interrogated was that the researcher was also a beneficiary of the FTLRP in the same area the research was carried out. This meant that the researcher had some vested interests on the outcome of the study. Such interests could have led to biasness, however, to minimise such biasness, the researcher exercised the guidelines of ethical issues which comprised, among others informed consent, respect for anonymity, confidentiality, respect for privacy as well as researcher's impact on the participants and vice-versa. Thus, the researcher completely informed the participants of different aspects of the research in their preferred languages. Issues which needed clarity were fully explained. Also, interviews were conducted in the participants' preferred languages. Finally, all interviewed participants were informed that the purpose of the research study was solemnly for academic purposes, as such, information was voluntarily shared in a professional manner although some participants reserved some comments they thought might lead them to victimisation.

3.7. LIMITATIONS / DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The first limiting factor of this study was the sensitivity of the implementation of the indigenisation policies which is highly politicised in the country, and this study investigated such an implementation. There was, therefore, some reluctance in giving out information by the units in fear of political victimisation. That reluctance was also exacerbated by the presence of the researcher who was also a beneficiary of the FTLRP in the same community. To counter that reluctance and potential contamination of the results thereafter, the researcher emphasised to the units that the research study was solemnly for academic purposes and that the presence of the researcher in his own community was only for that purpose. The researcher also informed the units of the study that the information acquired through this study was only to be accessed through the permission of Wits University. As means of encouraging the units of this study to give valid information, the researcher informed every unit before the interviews that their names and anything that might compromise their identity would not be mentioned in the study. Equally important as a limiting factor was the fact that the researcher had some interests on the outcome of this research since what was under study here had direct bearing to him as a

policy beneficiary. However, the feasibility of the study was enhanced by the fact that the researcher was aware of the political environment of the policy as well as its socio-economic environment. Another limiting factor was the polarisation of the media since the study analysed the newspapers for information related to the indigenisation policies. However, this problem was countered by the analysis of both the state and the privately owned newspapers. The serious limitation was brought by the analysis of the Zimbabwe Agenda for Socio-Economic Transformation (ZIM-ASSET) blue print, which was the ruling party manifesto on national policy implementation.

3.8. SUMMARY

The research methodology used in the study provided answers on how policy implementers participated on model A1 farms to help improve food security sustainability in the country. That was achieved by the use of the qualitative methods to collect data. This chapter also explained why the study preferred the qualitative research paradigm over the quantitative one. Thus, the qualitative paradigm was preferred collecting data since the research was based on a case study. The chapter also explained how ethical issues were handled by the researcher in order to enable the participants to freely give out information needed to answer the question on how policy implementers participated on model A1 farms to improve food security sustainability in the country. Limitation and/or delimitation aspects were also explored and that help the researcher to explain why the study was only confined to policy beneficiaries and policy implementers at lower level to find answers as to how do the policy implanters participate on model A1 to improve food security sustainability in the country. Thus, the study did not directly involve some critical actors such as academics and legislators since their views were easily captured from archival materials and other documents without necessarily going through rigorous formal procedures of interviewing such high profile individuals. Their exclusion from the sample also minimised direct political interference in the process of data collection, considering the sensitivity of the research on the implementation of land reform policies in Zimbabwe. Finally, the use of thematic and textual analysis techniques to analyse date utilised

enabled the researcher to deal with issues of polarisation and as such, enhanced validity of the study.

CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH RESULTS

4.0. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presented and discussed research results collected from respondents using qualitative research techniques as discussed in Chapter 3. The data was collected through the use of semi-structured interviews in order to gather as much data to answer the primary question of the study as was also outlined in chapter 3. The in-depth interviews were preferred to enable the researcher to handle any issues that could have been blown out of proportion and also to probe for those themes deliberately avoided by interviewees for political reasons since the study was based on politically sensitive issues. The use of interviews also positioned the researcher to observe the interviewees' emotions as well as their inner-thoughts about what they perceived correct or incorrect with the way policy implementers played their role in the implementation of the controversial land reform policies (Kayle, 1996; Schroder, 2003). The researcher conducted the interviews at times convenient for the interviewees. That was done to create a good relationship between the researcher and his interviewees so that the respondents could freely and voluntarily share their experiences on how far the policy implementers were involved in the implementation of land reform policies on model A1 farms. During the in-depth interviews, there were common themes and variances which were identified.

The presentation and discussion of the findings of the study were based on the objectives of the study as well as on the conceptual and theoretical frameworks that informed the study as detailed in chapter 1 and 2. Thus, the study aimed at getting a deeper understanding of the role played by policy implementers on model A1 farms in their bid to improve national food security sustainability. In simple terms, the main objectives of the study as discussed in Chapter 1 were to investigate factors which inhibited model A1 farms from improving the country's food security; to find the current food productivity trends on model A1 farms as well as to recommend strategies for consideration on model A1 farms to improve national food security. The study utilised the case-study method as was discussed in Chapter 3 of this research. This

helped the researcher to rigorously examine the case of Nkenyane leading to reliability in terms of quality information obtained about the role of policy implementers in their bid to help model A1 farms enhance the country's food security.

4.1. RESEARCH FINDINGS: AN OVERVIEW

Both policy implementers and policy beneficiaries agreed that the land reform programme was an inevitable process as there was need to correct the imbalances in the ownership of land as means of production as discussed in earlier chapters. Both groups, the policy implementers and policy beneficiaries shared the same view that there was lack of implementation of the land reform policy on model A1 farms as was evidenced by poor production on model A1 farms.

4.1.1. Role of model A1 farmers on national food security

On the response to the question on the role played by model A1 farmers in their bid to contribute to national food security one farmer said; "Without assistance from government or NGOs, farmers are doing their best to have enough food for their families" (Ncube, 2016.07.01). This response by a farmer whose mandate was to contribute to the national food security showed that farmers on model A1 farms are far from fulfilling their role in bringing the country back to its status as the food basket of the Southern Africa. It also explained that land reform policy implementers had not done enough to explain the model A1 farmers' role with regards to the national food security. In other words, the model A1 farmers perceived they were given the land in order to sustain their families, yet the farmers' main role was to improve the country's food security sustainability. This could also explain the failure of the land reform policy due to lack of policy implementers' involvement on the activities of model A1 farms.

The officers from the Ministry of Lands and Rural Resettlement shared the same sentiments expressed by model A1 farmers that some of the farmers were producing too little that some were even failing to sustain their families. Thus, according to one AGRITEX officer, model A1 farmers "... have not reached a level to sell surplus to GMB due to lack of financial and material resources" (Davie, 2016.07.01). This view-point from a policy implementer suggested that model A1 farmers were not recognised as potential farmers who could turn around the

country's food insecurity status back to the food basket of the whole region, hence the lack of funding by the government. Such sentiments uttered by a government official whose mandate was to help model A1 farms improve their yields was a clear testimony that policy implementers were not doing enough to help model A1 farms to achieve their main goal of improving national food security sustainability. Thus, the lack of commitment by government and its agencies to the land reform policy implementation on model A1 farms provided answers to the primary research question as well as to the objectives of the study.

The response by one of the AGRITEX officers from the Ministry of Lands and Rural Resettlement, who shared the same sentiments expressed by A1 farmers that "... farmers have not reached a level to sell surplus to GMB due to lack of financial and material resources" (Davie, 2016.07.01), was crucial in showing how bad the situation was on model A1 farms. Lack of both financial and material resources as factors which inhibited model A1 farms from improving the country's food security could mean that the implementation of (or lack thereof) land reform policy was missing the basics of the conceptual and theoretical frameworks that informed the study as discussed in Chapter 2. Lack of funding on model A1 farms as revealed by the research results however, concurred with the ZIM-ASSET. The blue print acknowledges that the agricultural sector experiences "... severe systemic challenges within its entire value chain ranging from lack of agricultural financing to lack of affordable inputs" (ZIM-ASSET, 2013-2018, p.20). This failure by the government to financially and materially sustain the agricultural sector seemed to have impacted negatively on the role of the land reform policy implementers in their bid to help model A1 farms to improve food security sustainability in the country. The failure by the policy implementers as the government agencies to engage NGOs and other civic society organisations to assist model A1 farms with financial and material resources could also explain how the sensitivity of the land reform programme could hinder progress on model A1 farms and hamper development in the country at large.

One of the local leaders interviewed acknowledged the potential the model A1 farms had in contributing to the national food security if there were sustainable water sources. However, at the present moment, model A1 farms depended only on rain fall as source of water. Thus, the

respondent said, "... with adequate rain fall, model A1 farmers sell little surplus to GMB" (Mrs Dube, 2016.07.03). This sentiment was shared by policy beneficiaries who acknowledged their failure to contribute towards the country's food security sustainability. Citing the challenge of water shortage, one of the farmers pointed out that model A1 farmers were not contributing towards national food security because "... farmers only plant during rain seasons" (Mafumo, 2016.07.02). However, on emphasising the role of model A1 farms, The Chronicle News reported that all the beneficiaries of the land reform programme were committed to use the infinity resource to improve, "... not only the livelihood of their families but the nation as a whole" (The Chronicle; 11 September, 2015, p.2). The commitment envisaged by the State newspaper however was not the reflection of what the farmers currently produced and it did not justify why the government recently repossessed a huge number of model A1 farms if the farms were contributing to the country's food security sustainability. Thus, according to The Standard newspaper, (The Standard; March 27-April 2, 2016, p.1), the government repossessed "... at least 1449 A1 model farms country wide where no production was taking place." Based on the current productivity trends on model A1 farms, one may therefore conclude that the State newspaper might have reported positively only for political reasons so that the land reform policy could be seen as a success. Most importantly was that, the fact that the same farms on a good rain season could produce an extra to sell to the GMB was an indication that, with the use of irrigation systems on model A1 farms, the country's food security system could improve immensely.

According to The Chronicle News, (The Chronicle; 11 September, 2015, p.2), the nation looked up to the beneficiaries of the land reform programme for "... not only its food security but the revival of the ailing industry given the fact Zimbabwe industry is agro-based." While what the newspaper reported was the true mandate of model A1 farms in Zimbabwe, this ambition could be achieved only if there was full participation by policy implementers on model A1 farms. However, the current situation on model A1 farms as depicted by information from interviewees at Nkenyane was far from fulfilling this obligation. There seemed to be inadequate involvement of land reform policy implementers on this model, hence ineffective of policy implementation. The information shared by the interviewees thus, provided answers to the

conceptual and theoretical frameworks as well as to the primary research question of the study. This also explained why the country had lost its status as the food basket of the Southern Africa since the land redistribution in Zimbabwe. The variances noted on the reporting by the state and the privately owned media showed how polarised the Zimbabwe media was, especially on the politically sensitive land reform policy. However, the use of both the state and privately owned media minimized such polarization envisaged in the Zimbabwe media.

4.1.2. Factors hindering productivity on model A1 farms

Activities of model A1 farms and lack thereof were affected by a combination of factors. Policy implementers seemed to point on lack of funding as the main cause of poor performance by mode A1 farms. One local leader, the Ward Councillor believed that all problems faced by model A1 farms were rooted on lack of financial and material resources to train farmers. Thus, in her view, most farmers lacked knowledge of farming "due to lack of funding for trainings" (Ward 14 Councillor, 2016. 07.05). The interviewee alluded to two important factors namely; the lack of funding and lack of farmer training as factors which hindered good performance of model A1 farms. It was important to note that the two factors raised by the councillor were their responsibility as policy implementers. Thus, one of the major roles of the local leadership was to source funds to help improve the welfare of the model A1 farms. According to the conceptual and theoretical frameworks of the study as discussed in Chapter 2, policy implementation of politically oriented programmes like the land reform programme are to be carried out by the government through its agencies. Based on this view point, then it should be the role of the Ward Councillor together with other policy implementers to source funding which could be used to train the model A1 farmers. The problem of lack of support by the government was also highlighted by The Daily News which reported that provincial governors acknowledged lack of productivity on model A1 farms saying "Lack of State financial and material support incapacitated beneficiaries" (The Daily News; 11 July 2016, p.4).May be the fact that both the local and government leadership acknowledged that the government was not funding model A1 farms was a testimony that the land reform policy had failed hence policy implementers could have lacked policy direction to steer model A1 farms to contribute to the

country's food security sustainability. While it might be difficult to involve NGOs and other civic groups on politically sensitive issues like the land reform programme in Zimbabwe, local leadership could involve such organisations to a less extent in such a way that such NGOs and civic society organisations may not have a direct impact on the implementation of the land reform policies.

Another important factor which both policy beneficiaries and policy implementers alluded to as a hindrance to model A1 farms' contribution on the national food security was the serious shortage of water on model A1 farms. Some policy implementers together with policy beneficiaries believed that the main factor scaling down the activities of A1 farms was the lack of water. Thus, one respondent, Ndumiso (2016.07.03) said that lack of resources, "especially water and finance" was making it difficult for farmers on model A1 to produce, while a local leader also concurred with this farmer. He pointed out that the main factor that made it to be difficult for model A1 farms to produce was "...lack of water since model A1 farms' only source of water was rain fall" (Farai, 2016.07. 10).Based on these sentiments, one would believe that while it was important to redistribute land to the landless black Zimbabweans, it was equally important to give people land which had at least irrigation systems in place if model A1 farms were to be expected to contribute to the national food security sustainability. However, since land reform was fast-tracked for political reasons, one would then have expected that policy implementers at grass root levels would have prioritised irrigation systems on model A1 farms so these farms could contribute meaningfully to the country's food security as the displaced white commercial farmers used to. However, sixteen years of the land reform policy existence, model A1 farms still had no irrigation systems, an indication that policy implementers were not involved in the welfares of model A1 farms. As long as policy implementers failed to source irrigation equipment for model A1 farms, not only new farmers would suffer but the whole nation would continue starving as national food security reserves would continue running dry.

Another serious challenge for model A1 farms cited by the interviewees was the lack of farming implements. Model A1 farmers were not provided with tractors to till their pieces of land. Most farmers complained that the District Development Fund (DDF) which used to provide them with

tractors had long back stopped doing so. Nduduzo (2016.07.10), who was one of the model A1 farmer interviewees said that, "... most farmers are relying on oxen-drawn ploughing, of which the majority of the farmers have no livestock." From what the interviewee said, the conditions on which model A1 farmers operated on did not reflect that there was any long-term plan to transform agriculture on model A1 farms into productive business. The failure by policy implementers to have strategies to turn around the fortunes of model A1 farms into business could also be an indication that policy implementers were not fully participating on model A1 farms. Such could be the reason why model A1 farmers believed that their mandate as farmers was to sustain their families. The failure by policy implementers to help model A1 farms with tractors for land tillage could suggest policy implementers' non-involvement on the activities of model A1 farms. This may also point to the failure of the land reform policy because the conditions on which model A1 farms operated from indicated that these farms were far from reaching a level where they would fully contribute to the national food security.

The information obtained from across all the respondents was that, model A1 farms received seeds and fertilisers for free from the government through local leadership initiatives. However, farmers complained that such inputs often "... come late when planting season is almost over" (Mlotshwa, 2016.07.03).Thus, the involvement of policy implementers in this regard was noted as positive endeavour although giving farming inputs to farmers who did not have farming implements was highly likely to fail to solve challenges faced by model A1 farms. In fact, giving inputs to farmers when such farmers had no farming implements could lead to those farmers passing the inputs to other farmers who have farming implements in exchange for land tillage as alluded by one local leader. Thus, one traditional leader respondent said that, "Some farmers sell inputs given to them for free by the government in order to pay for the services rendered to them by other farmers who have farming implements" (Masuku, 2016.07.18). In other words, those few farmers with farming implements were the ones benefiting from the government programme. This scenario explained the conceptual framework of the study as discussed in Chapter 2, that giving inputs to model A1 farms by the government was not a sustainable move. Therefore, the implementation of the land reform policy on model A1 farms by policy implementers revealed how poor strategies used by policy implementers on model A1

farms were. This could also explain how top-down decisions on policy implementation of a politically sensitive issue could affect the implementation of the land reform policies on the ground as was discussed on the theoretical framework in Chapter 2.

Another local leader believed that some problems faced by A1 farms resulted from the background of some of the farmers on model A1. This respondent believed that there was lack of innovativeness from some farmers since most of the farmers were farm former labourers who "... used to be given instructions by their former white employers" (Ward 14 Councillor, 2016.07.05). This assertion was supported by one of the AGRITEX officers (Davie, 2016.07.01), who said that most of A1 farmers lacked farming knowledge "... because the majority of them were not in crop farming, rather, in livestock production."However, since the indigenisation policy compels every model A1 farmer to do both crop and livestock production, it was therefore the duty of the policy implementers to make sure that every farmer was acquainted with both crop and livestock production. The current position of most farmers on model A1 showed that the farmers lacked training and that proved that policy implementers had not done enough in their bid to help model A1 farms contribute to the country's food security sustainability. The serious challenge raised by the interviewees was the question of how model A1 farmers were selected to occupy those pieces of land without the necessary skills if the aim of the programme was to empower the disadvantaged citizens at the same time maintaining the country's history on agriculture. This also hits back on the issue concerning lack of farming implements by model A1 farms. There were no policy clarifications on criteria of selecting and recruitment of beneficiaries. Absence of policy guidelines as discussed in Chapter 2, could have led to the allocation of land strategic to the socio-economic needs of the nation to people who were not qualified.

Thus, if the government through its agencies was not prepared to help model A1 farms with financial and material resources, then the policy beneficiaries were supposed to be farmers who were financially stable and who also had the capacity and skills to take the farming to the next level so as to contribute to the national food security sustainability. The prevailing situation could be showing that the criteria used to place farmers on model A1 was politically

motivated, hence the group of model A1 farmers who lacked some important credentials of deserving farmers. Whatever the case may be now, what the interviewees said was that, model A1 farmers were faced with debilitating impediments to their national obligations to produce enough to contribute to the country's food security sustainability. Therefore, based on the current situation on model A1 farms, the scenario gives answers to the primary research question and the objectives of the study as it explained that policy implementers were not fully participating on model A1 farms.

4.1.3. Current production levels on model A1 farms

On the question on what the model A1 farms currently produce, both the land reform beneficiaries and policy implementers said the production was low on model A1 farms. One of the local leaders said that while the farmers usually produced a bit of surplus in some years, in 2015-2016 seasons "... the production was too low due to erratic rain fall" (Khumalo, 2016.06.30). Another local leader expressed the same view that there was low production on model A1 farms but was quick to point out that, "... if there was adequate water for farmers to practise irrigation, no farmer was going to produce less than 10 tonnes of maize in a season" (Local Traditional leader, 2016.07.01).However, fewer farmers and the majority of policy implementers attributed the low produce on model A1 farms to climate changes. They suggested that the unpredictable weather patterns had made it difficult for model A1 farmers to produce enough crops because they solely relied on rainfall as the only source of water for their plants. When pressed to explain what measures were in place to curb the prevailing situation, the policy implementer interviewees reluctantly said there was little if any they could do to control weather phenomenon. The respondents' reluctance depicted a sense of hopelessness on the part of the policy implementers. Such reaction however, helped the study get a deeper understanding of the role played by policy implementers on model A1 farms in Zimbabwe in their bid to improve food security sustainability in the country. It also helped the study to make conclusions based on the objectives of the study as well as on the conceptual and theoretical frameworks that informed the study as was discussed in Chapters 1 and 2.

The Nkenyane community's situation, said the interviewees, was worsened by the fact that generally, Matabeleland North region often had low rain fall and therefore the El Nino weather phenomenon "... makes the rainy season too short" (Farai, 2016.07.10). In expressing how low the produce was on model A1 farms, an AGRITEX officer said there was "... very low production, actually there was nothing in as far as what a farmer was expected to produce" (Joseph, 2016.06.28).Some local leadership also concurred with the AGRITEX officer on the low productivity on model A1 farms and they believed that was due to lack of farming implements. Due to lack of farming implements, most farmers were said to have shifted to conservational agriculture to try to increase production. While conservational agriculture could be ideal in subsistence farming, it could not be implemented on farms where farmers were mandated to contribute on the national food security sustainability of the country. Thus, the practice could be good but not ideal when implemented on large scale farming where it would require much labour, of which model A1 farmers lacked financial muscle to address labour needs. This concern was further highlighted by one farmer respondent who acknowledged receiving knowledge on conservational agricultural methods from the AGRITEX officers, but she said that to put such methods into practice "needed more labour force of which the A1 farmers lacked financial means to hire such labour" (Mrs Moyo, 2016.07.20).

Based on what both the policy implementers and the policy beneficiaries said, then the participation by policy implementers on model A1 farms showed that their objective was to help the farmers sustain their families rather than the broader goal of sustaining the national food security. However, instead of the government to empower its agencies with skills necessary to help model A1 farms with farming implements, according to The Standard newspaper, the government had "... repossessed at least 1449 model A1 farms country wide" where no production was taking place (The Standard, March 27 April 2, 2016, p.1). It could be of significance that the government realise that repossession of farms may not solve the problem of shortage of food in the country; rather, farmer assistance in both financial and material resources could be the answer. Such a goal may only be achieved if there was collective purpose on the farms where various stakeholders, from both the government and the private sector work together in the implementation of the land reform policies.

The government might be addressing the symptoms of the challenges facing the vital sector. There are no monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to assist in data collection. It is the availability of such data from the farmers which is crucial in informing the drafting and development of policy that responds to the realities and such was the role of policy implementers.

There appeared to be no policy to drive the redressing and resolution of challenges faced by new farmers. In the event of repossessed pieces of land, there were no guidelines to help avert original errors. Without policy guidelines implementation, repossession strategies only served as means of change of ownership of land.

4.1.4. Model A1 farmer capacitation levels

On the question of whether model A1 farmers received training or not, both policy implementers and policy beneficiaries agreed that the farmers were being trained but only by the AGRITEX officers. One policy beneficiary acknowledged being trained by AGRITEX officers but he lamented the quality of such trainings as he felt that, "... the quality of training was compromised due to lack of financial resources" (Hlabangani 2016.07.05). To emphasise on the issue of poor training services, another farmer, visibly dejected pointed out that "farmers only got theory from AGRITEX officers since there was a challenge of funding and infrastructure" (Mrs Dube, 2016.07.03). The researcher could also be of the opinion that the officers lacked adequate knowledge and experience in agricultural activities. The land was available to ensure that practical lessons were carried out on it. In fact the land is the laboratory in which all experimental learning should take place. There is no sophisticated machinery and technology which is required during training to effectively transfer knowledge. It should also be taken into cognisance that Zimbabwe experienced devastating brain drain in the critical skills. Agriculture was also undeniable affected as experienced and well educated personnel left for greener pastures beyond the borders. As alluded in the literature review, the government also fast-tracked the training of most of the current AGRITEX officers. A lot of compromise in recruitment and period of training was made. It is suspected again that some of the officers

might be opposed to the highly polarized land reform programme and hence they were reluctant to work competently to achieve the goals.

According to these interviewees, the training that model A1 farmers received was far from equipping the new farmers with skills necessary to help them contribute to the national food security sustainability. On the other hand, The Daily News, (15 July 2015, p.2), reported that the shortage of transport for AGRITEX workers was slowing down training programmes in Bubi district because the team had "... only 3 vehicles yet 2 more vehicles are needed." Given the fact that only one government agency, the AGRITEX which also had transport challenges gave training to model A1 farmers could suggest that, in addition to poor participation by policy implementers on model A1 farms, there was lack of diversification on model A1 farms as a result of only one participant, yet those farmers needed broader perspective of farming understanding. Lack of such diversification on model A1 farms could lead to poor making decisions by the farmers and as such, resulting in failure to contribute to the country's food security sustainability.

The revelation by both policy implementers and policy beneficiaries that training of model A1 farmers was done only by the AGRITEX officers helped to give answers to the study's primary research question as was discussed in Chapter 1 and also led to the deeper understanding of the conceptual and theoretical frameworks of the study as discussed in Chapter 2. Also, the fact that land reform programme which was supposed to be a national programme was only confined to government agencies, served to show that, apart from the top-down land reform policy implementation, the whole issue was politically motivated. Thus, the politicisation of the land reform policy implementation excluded other policy implementers who could have played a major role which could have helped model A1 farms to contribute significantly to the national food security sustainability. To further highlight how challenged model A1 farms were, one policy implementer said that AGRITEX officers had challenges in their bid to train farmers because some farmers did not avail themselves for training "... since they would be at their work places" (Khumalo, 2016.06.30).

The absence of farmers at training sessions was also emphasised by an AGRITEX official who asserted that farmers who had no farming background "rarely attended trainings" (Davie, 2016.07.01). Only one farmer said he had since stopped attending farmer training sessions because "farmers are subjected to partisan politics rather than being trained on farming methods" (Tshabalala, 2016.07.08). When asked to elaborate, the angry farmer threatened to quit the interviews. While model A1 farmer absenteeism from trainings were a serious challenge on the quest to help model A1 farms contribute to national food security sustainability, the reasons for some of the farmers to pull out of the training sessions conducted by government agencies might lead to an understanding that model A1 activities were carried out as means of consolidating the ruling party's political mileage as also discussed on the conceptual framework of the study in Chapter 2 and hence the frustration revealed by some farmer interviewees on why they were not attending to farmer trainings which could help them to be effective in farming. The politicisation of the programme had adverse effect of dampening the motivation of farmers who wanted to remain apolitical but focused on the farming business. The fact that one of the interviewee was not prepared to give details of political interference could imply it was not safe to be on the farms. The farmers came to view the land distribution programme as a ploy to recruit masses for political reasons.

4.1.5. Role of local leadership on subsidised inputs

There were contrasting views from policy implementers and policy beneficiaries about the role played by the local leadership to help model A1 farmers get subsidised agricultural inputs from government or NGOs. Local leadership interviewees were of the opinion that together with the AGRITEX officers, they played a role which resulted in model A1 farms getting free inputs from government. On the other hand, the farmers believed that local leadership and NGOs had not helped them with either free inputs or subsidised agricultural inputs. While giving farmers agricultural inputs for free was not sustainable, the claim by policy implementers that they had a role in the process of helping model A1 farms get those inputs could not be ascertained either. What was significant though was that, giving farmers agricultural inputs when those farmers had no farming implements was a futile exercise. In other words, if it was true that the

policy implementers were actually involved on sourcing free agricultural inputs for model A1 farms, then such strategy may need to be reviewed so that farmers may first get farming implements ahead of inputs. This could result in more land being utilised, leading to model A1 farms contributing on the national food security sustainability.

Equally important was that, all the interviewees, both the policy implementers and the policy beneficiaries, actually agreed that there was no visibility of NGOs on model A1 farms, a scenario that answered some concerns of the conceptual framework of the study as discussed in Chapter 2 of this study. However, the exclusion of important policy actors such as NGOs on the implementation of the land reform policies in the country placed a burdensome of responsibility to local leadership to help model A1 farms to produce more than enough so as to sell the excess to GMB. On the other hand, one policy implementer respondent suggested that the local leadership of Nkenyane usually organised farmers into groups and then bought agricultural inputs in bulk at subsidised prices (Sibindi, 2016.07.05). Local leadership was effective in playing its political and administrative roles. Such an initiative by the policy implementers was recommendable as the project was sustainable and that move could help farmers improve productivity on model A1 farms. The farmers would take advantage of the opportunity to buy seeds specifically suitable for their particular environment. Unfortunately, there was not even one farmer who acknowledged that kind of support, rather, quite a number of interviewees shared the same sentiment with one farmer who said that, “Local leadership and NGOs had not helped model A1 farms with any means of getting inputs” (Mlotshwa, 2016.07.03). There was a general consensus though that local leadership used to arrange with the District Development Fund (DDF) to help model A1 farms with tractors. However, due to the economic challenges the country was facing, DDF was no longer providing model A1 farms with any form of assistance. The non-participation of policy implementers in helping model A1 farms get subsidised agricultural inputs also gave answers to the primary research question of this study. It also helped the study get a deeper understanding of the role played by policy implementers on model A1 farms in Zimbabwe in their bid to improve food security sustainability in the country.

4.1.6. Role of AGRITEX on farmer skills development

According to both policy implementers and policy beneficiaries, AGRITEX officers seemed to be playing an effective role in their bid to help model A1 farmers acquire farming skills. Thus, all interviewees concurred with each other that the AGRITEX officers were always visiting farms to share knowledge with farmers on how to produce better yields. The interviewees also highlighted that AGRITEX officers updated farmers about weather patterns and advised the farmers on "...how best they can prepare for climate changes" (Masuku, 2016.07.18). Another activity put in place by AGRITEX officers was the adoption of "zero-tillage conservation farming method" which was said to have been embraced by most model A1 farmers who had no farming implements (Mrs Dube, 2016.07.03). At policy level, adopting a strategy of this nature indicated lack of commitment to the objectives of model A1 farming. The strategy was inappropriate to a large-scale farming.

All the respondents confirmed that the AGRITEX officers also offered Master Farmer trainings and demonstrations and then issued the trained farmers with Master Farmer certificates as means of acknowledgement and confirming the acquisition of the farming skills. From what the interviewees said about model A1 farmer skills development, one may ascertain that there was evidence of policy implementers' participation on model A1 farms in their bid to help the sector to improve the country's food security sustainability. The fact that, farmers were said to have acquired farming skills from AGRITEX officers but were still failing to contribute to the country's food security sustainability could suggest that the quality of such skills development programmes were of sub-standard. This could also suggest that the problem did not lie with the farmers, but with how the land reform policy was being implemented. This scenario however, further helped understand the conceptual and theoretical frameworks of the study as discussed in Chapter 2.

4.1.7. Model A1 farmer benefits from AGRITEX activities

From the activities of the AGRITEX officers, according to Ward 14 Councillor, the model A1 farmers had come to realise that agriculture was business "not just a way of sustaining one's family, but also to provide the whole nation with food" (Ward Councillor, 2017.07.05).

According to this assertion by one policy implementer, model A1 farmers had come to realise their obligation of contributing to the national food security. However, the activities on the farms were nowhere nearer to prove this assertion. Most model A1 interviewees seemed to be content with the little food they produced because they said it enabled them to sustain their families. The point raised by one of the policy implementers who happened to be the local leader may be suggesting that both policy implementers and policy beneficiaries were still far from understanding that model A1 farms' obligation was not only to contribute to the national food security but also "to revive the ailing industry given the fact that the Zimbabwe industry is agro-based" (The Chronicle; 11 September, 2015, p.2). However, the current scenario on the farms could be an explanation that the intervention by policy implementers who also happened not to understand the true nature of the obligation of model A1 farms on national food security may be detrimental to lack of production in the farms.

The study also found out that there was no orientation programme to equip the farmers with knowledge of their mandate. Lack of orientation of the farmers hampered their planning and preparation for their enhanced roles.

Another respondent believed that zero-tillage method introduced by AGRITEX officers had helped most farmers, "... especially those who have no farming implements to produce better yields" (Masuku, 2016.07.18). While zero-tillage method of farming could be a good substitution for tillage farming, the former could be effectively used on subsistence farming by communal farmers rather than by model A1 farms whose mandate was far much broader than that of the communal farmers. However, farmer training, according to another farmer interviewee, had created sustainability in model A1 farms because "...some trained farmers, with the support of AGRITEX officers, helped untrained farmers with knowledge and support" (Hlabangani, 2016.07.05). Based on the views of both policy implementers and policy beneficiaries, one could conclude that the AGRITEX officers as policy implementers, had contributed so much on model A1 farms, but their contribution might not be well complimented by other policy implementers' participation on the activities of model A1 farms.

4.1.8. Roles of local leadership and AGRITEX officers on cereal and small grains crop

According to land reform policy, model A1 farms were supposed to dedicate a quota system to cereal and small grains production. Thus, according to both farmer and policy implementer interviewees, there was huge resistance from farmers to comply with that policy. One farmer respondent said that "... each farmer decides what to plant, where and when" (Ndlovu, 2016.07.03). Another interviewee expressed the same sentiment but added that AGRITEX officers tried to advise farmers on the significance of practising the quota system to no avail. Thus, the interviewee said that, "Advice to grow cereal and small grain crops was always given by AGRITEX officers but very few farmers heeded such advice" (Mrs Dube, 2016.07.03). The AGRITEX officers also shared the same views with the farmers. They acknowledged that there was a challenge on growing cereal and small grain crops on model A1 farms because "most farmers on model A1 had knowledge in only planting maize", but with inadequate rain fall in Matabeleland North, maize crop was not ideal (Davie, 2016.07.01). Another AGRITEX officer interviewee also acknowledged that there was a sequence pattern that model A1 farmers were encouraged to follow "which the farmers resisted"(Joseph, 2016.06.28). According to another AGRITEX officer, some farmers resisted the quota system in which farmers were also to plant small grains crops like sorghum and millet because of the challenge of birds because "... most farmers were not full time farmers hence their attendance to the farms to control birds was a challenge" (Davie, 2016.07.01). The Herald newspaper also reported on the same issue of farmer absenteeism on model A1 farms. According to this state media newspaper, many farmers were on their farms on paper "when in actual fact they rarely set foot on their allocated land" (The Herald; 14 June, 2015, p.6). Thus, farmer absenteeism was a serious challenge contributing to lack of productivity on model A1 farms. The root cause of such a practise needed to be understood if the problem of unproductivity on model A1 could be solved. There were no convincing reasons for absent land owners. This might be an indication of policy gaps and inadequacy. There were no clear guidelines on corrective measures on the farmer absenteeism from farms.

The resistance by farmers to comply with land reform quota system might be a reflection that there was lack of dialogue between policy implementers and policy beneficiaries on model A1 farms. Lack of engagement by policy implementers further provide answers to the primary research question of the study as well as to the objectives of the study. This also helped in the understanding of the conceptual and theoretical frameworks on which this study was based on. The failure by the land reform policy implementers to enforce the land reform policy on model A1 farms could also be an indication of the failure of the land reform programme itself which could result in the prolonged hunger and starvation in Zimbabwe. The policy implementers were not adequately prepared and supported to initiate the programme of model A1 magnitude.

4.1.9. Solutions to model A1 farms

On how the factors leading to model A1 farms problems could be solved, the majority of the interviewees believed that the solution was to provide A1 farms with irrigation systems. The interviewees felt that water was a major problem on model A1 farms; hence the Ward 14 Councillor said, instead of the government giving seeds and fertilisers to farmers, the"...government should provide farms with irrigation scheme facilities" (Ward Councillor, 2016.07.05). The suggestion to provide model A1 farms with sustainable water facilities could solve a number of challenges that model A1 farms and the country at large currently experienced. There is need for model A1 farms to produce at medium to large scale level if the country's food security sustainability could be achieved. One farmer interviewee suggested that to solve problems faced by A1 farms "there was supposed to be funding from government and NGOs to help farmers buy farming implements and also receive quality trainings" (Maphosa, 2016.07.01). While some interviewees believed that the challenges faced by model A1 farms in their bid to improve national food security sustainability could be resolved by government funding, the prevailing conditions in the country may not make this possible since the government was alleged to be financially challenged to sustain its own programmes. It could not be by coincidence that the Ward Councillor was said to have failed to get irrigation equipment from the Ministry of Agriculture, Mechanisation and Irrigation Development to help

model A1 farms since the government was the only player on model A1 developmental programmes. The interviewees concurred that government had to create an environment enabling diverse stakeholder participation. Funding for the programme could be attainable from local and international donors if the political climate was accommodative.

The interviewees concurred that the challenges facing the resettlement programme were complex. The onus was on the government of the day to depoliticise the programme so that it reached consensus with other stakeholders. Funding from local and international agencies could be availed if there was policy clarity and resolution of contestation related to property rights issues. Every Zimbabwean should be obliged to have ownership of the programme. In a nutshell, there is need for an all-stakeholders conference to be convened to re-orientate the resettlement programme. The relevant ministry has to develop policies specific to the model A1 sector and provide funding to meet the costs of an effective agricultural programme.

4.2. SUMMARY

The research results presented in Chapter 4 revealed that there was ineffective implementation of the land reform policy on model A1 farms as was evidenced by poor produce in the farms. Thus, the lack of the implementation of the land reform policy on model A1 farms revealed the lack of participation by policy implementers on model A1 farms. The research results also showed that both policy implementers and policy beneficiaries lacked in-depth understanding of their mandates, hence the failure of the former to fully participate on model A1 farms to help improve the country's food security sustainability. On the other hand, farmers also did not understand their role, which led to their focus on sustaining their families instead of improving the country's food security and help revitalise the country's ailing economy which is agro-based. The farmers were not adequately orientated to their roles and mandates and the indiscriminate recruitment of beneficiaries of the land reform programme was a huge impediment. The model A1 sector is a specialised programme which required some marked levels of understanding of animal and crop husbandry. It also required newly settled farmers to have access to financial resources to execute their mandate of contributing to the national food basket. While the programme had a national focus on food security, individual farmers viewed

it as a strategy to alleviate poverty at family level. Such kind of conception by both policy implementers and policy beneficiaries apparently showed that land reform policy had failed to enhance production. In other words, lack of information to the farmers by policy implementers could be one of the factors which inhibited model A1 farms from improving the country's food security sustainability. Results of the study also showed that model A1 farms had serious shortage of reliable sources of water as farmers entirely depended on rain fall. Therefore, an urgent intervention by the national government through its agencies at policy implementation level could be part of a sustainable solution to identified challenges if model A1 farms were to effectively contribute to the national food security sustainability.

CHAPTER 5

GENERAL ANALYSIS OF THE STUDY

5.0. INTRODUCTION

Chapter 5 gave a general analysis of the study, juxtaposing research findings with literature review. The analysis focused mainly on the general meaning of the study's findings in terms of the research questions and the underlying theoretical concepts. The primary objective of the analysis was to give the raw data meaning so that conclusions could be made as to how the findings of the research contributed to the literature. That objective was achieved through the analysis of the ZIM-ASSET's implementation of key success factors and key strategies for land reform policies. The purpose for that analysis was also to help address issues raised in the literature review so that their relevance to the study could be validated.

5.1. KEY SUCCESS FACTORS FOR LAND REFORM POLICIES

5.1.1. Political commitment and leadership from highest level

The empirical findings of the study showed that there was lack of political will and leadership in the implementation of the land reform policies on model A1 farms in Zimbabwe. This was despite what the ZIM-ASSET blue print (2013-2018, pp31-32) envisaged on its Key success factors. The lack of political will and leadership on model A1 farms was attributed to the conflict of interest between the top-down and bottom-up policy implementation processes adopted by government leadership. Thus, the confusion as to which policy actors were the most relevant on the implementation of the land reform policy seemed to have paralysed model A1 policy implementers in their bid to improve food security sustainability in the country.

The analysis of the findings presented in Chapter 4, showed that policy implementers seemed to lack authority on the implementation of the land reform policies because they believed that it was the role of the government to implement such political sensitive land reform policies on model A1 farms. Such understanding by the policy implementers explained issues raised in the literature review that public policy implementation process was not just a managerial or

administration issue, but a political process concerned about who gets what, when, how, where and from whom (Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p. 142). Since the implementation of the land reform policies in Zimbabwe are highly politicised, implementation of policies meant to benefit model A1 farms had been compromised because policy implementation has to follow a bureaucratic top-down process. However, if policy implementers were to play a positive role on model A1 farms in improving food security sustainability in the country, both top-down and bottom-up processes should co-exist for the benefit of the country's food security as is envisaged in the theoretical literature. The government had failed to empower farmers and policy implementers. Both actors are systematically excluded from decision-making and participating in the planning processes. This had made newly settled farmers to be too dependent on government. Both policy implementers and model A1 farmers had failed to be resourceful so that they could source funding from other development agencies to finance model A 1 farms activities.

5.1.2. Strong collaborative partnerships

The evidence gathered from both policy implementers and policy beneficiaries of land reform policies as presented in Chapter 4, showed that government's involvement on the affairs of model A1 farms was minimal and that there was no collaborative partnerships on model A1 farms. That was contrary to what the ZIM-ASSET blue print envisaged. The ZIM-ASSET strategic plan was leveraged on strong collaborative partnerships. Key local, national and international institutions, without limitation, were to be part of the driving force to achieve the objectives of this national strategy. Collaboration is crucial, as a result it was emphasised in the agricultural sector because it was a key sector in the economy of the country. By implication, policy implementers were mandated to ensure collaborative partnerships were realised on model A1 farms (ZIM-ASSET, 2013-2018, pp. 31-32).

However, such collaborative partnerships were non-existing on model A1 farms, leaving model A1 farmers vulnerable and poorly resourced. The findings of the study as presented in Chapter 4 also revealed that such lack of partnerships on model A1 farms was due to the highly politicisation of the land reform policies in which only the top-down implementation process

was adopted instead of the combination of the two perspectives of top-down and bottom-up processes. That caused key partners to shun the programme due to its partisan outlook which could expose other institutions to risk. As a result there was no funding for model A1 farms. The government which became the sole participant on model A1 farms was financially challenged due to the poor performance of the country's economy.

The policy implementation approach adopted on model A1 farms as depicted by the findings of the study seemed to reflect lack of understanding of policy implementation models by both policy makers and policy implementers. Thus, the inactivity by policy implementers on model A1 as was reflected by the findings of the study showed that policy implementation on model A1 farms was only based on the Classical model approach which assumed that policy implementation happens automatically once appropriate policies have been authoritatively proclaimed (Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.138). The reliance on hierarchical policy implementation approach by both policy implementers and policy beneficiaries resulted on policy implementers not being effective in the implementation of land reform policies on model A1 farms and that seemed to have contributed to the poor performance of model A1 farms in their bid to contribute in the country's food security sustainability.

In a way, the Classical model approach which was the point of reference on the implementation of the land reform policies on model A1 was somehow relevant in understanding the implementation of the land reform policies on model A1 farms. The findings of the study showed that the whole process was politicised and, therefore, solutions to problems affecting model A1 needed political interventions. In other words, the findings of the study showed that there was need for political will and leadership from the highest level if there was to be strong collaborative partnerships which could help model A1 farms to be well productive to contribute to the country's food security sustainability. Viewed from such perspective, the findings of the research study therefore contributed in understanding how relevant the second and third generations as policy implementation models were in the implementation of the land reform policies on model A1 farms in Zimbabwe. Thus, policy implementers on model A1 farms should have understood that implementation of public policies was far more complex and political

than they had assumed that proclamation of a policy would automatically result in implementation. The findings reflected that policy implementers would have played an active role in channelling the implementation of the land reform policies on model A1 into effective outcomes which could have improved food security sustainability in the country.

While the first two generation models share the same view that implementation process of public policies is highly political and complex, the third generation gives more substance to the research findings of the study. Thus, the third generation, the Analytical model as opposed to the Classical and the Complexity models, assumes that policy implementation is bottom-up rather than top-down (Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.139). While this assumption may reflect the opposite of what the research findings depicted, it makes more sense in explaining how the land reform policies on model A1 farms should have been implemented if those farms were to fully contribute to the country's food security sustainability. Therefore, the findings of the study contributed to the literature by clearly showing that policy implementation of the land reform policies was more complex and political than the policy actors would have thought. This could mean that the land reform policy implementers should first have to understand the political environment of the policies they were to implement and then after that take an active role on activities of model A1 farms to try to help policy beneficiaries to fully participate in the country's food security sustainability.

It could also be seen that lack of specific policies was a major cause for the failure of this sector to contribute to the country's food security sustainability. In the analysis of literature, the researcher found out that the Department of Agriculture never developed a policy specific for the sector. This implies that their programmes were not well coordinated. Dr. Gwarazimba (2011) corroborates to the fact that Zimbabwe's land reform programme was a failure because of lack of policy and policy clarity. Relying on the ZIM-ASSET agenda was not going to guide the policy implementers to specifics of their mandate. ZIM-ASSET was just too broad and too generalised even if it addressed the agricultural sector. Dr. Gwarazimba (2011) posits that the policy framework was inflated with political overtones and unnecessary vengeful emotions. The policy framework, as a result, was difficult to implement and it hampered the successful

translation of goals into results. This implies that government did not treat fast track land reform programme as a business strategy to alleviate socio-economic woes the country was facing.

On the other hand, the failure by the land reform policy implementers to fully participate on model A1 farms was a reflection that top-down policy implementation on model A1 farms was not working at all. Rather, that implementation approach had disincentivised all participants and interested parties. It is also likely that some of the landowners sabotaged government because they were opposed to divisive and partisan policy and its implementation. In the literature analysis it was pointed out that some farmers were conspicuously absence from farms continuously.

However, there was need to consider the assumptions of all the three generation models by both policy makers and policy implementers on the implementation of the land reform policies and then apply both top-down and bottom-up approaches in order to improve productivity on model A1 farms. The bottom-up approach has the merits of increasing participation of all stakeholders in policy making processes. It also facilitates the empowerment of participants and strengthens accountability. As inferred from the data collected, it is realised that both policy implementers and farmers did not hold themselves accountable for the outcomes of farming in this sector. Such abdication of responsibility and sense of ownership had the adverse effect of dampening the spirits and motivation levels of both the policy implementers and farmers. Added to that was the fact that the policy implementers were poorly remunerated and had to augment their poor salaries by conducting private jobs. This diverted human and other resources to private jobs and thereby depriving beneficiaries. Such acts of corruption were a product of lack of effective monitoring and evaluation systems in government departments. Once again, this showed there was no requirement of accountability from government employees and the new land owners.

The bottom-up approach could also facilitate strong collaborative partnerships which could lead to funding of programmes on model A1 farms. Thus, lack of funding on model A1 farms

was, according to the research findings, one of the main contributory factors to the poor performance of model A1 farms.

5.1.3. Rehabilitation, upgrading and development of key infrastructure

The research findings on model A1 farms as presented in Chapter 4 showed that there was lack of rehabilitation, upgrading and development of key infrastructure. Thus, infrastructural development of utilities comprising power generation, roads and water on model A1 farms is envisaged on the ZIM-ASSET policy document (2013-2018, pp.31-2), but the findings of the study showed that there was no implementation of irrigation projects and roads on model A1 farms were dilapidated. However, implementation of irrigation projects and the rehabilitation of roads would be crucial if model A1 farms were to contribute in the country's food security sustainability. Such findings concur with the conceptual framework in the literature review of the study and also help to understand why model A1 farms were failing to contribute in the country's food security sustainability. The failure to implement land reform policies on infrastructural developmental projects on model A1 farms was an indication of lack of political will and leadership from the highest level as well as lack of involvement on model A1 farms by policy implementers.

Literature revealed that the fast-track land reform programme was chaotic, spontaneous and highly emotional. There were no plans developed to facilitate the transformation of concept of model A1 farming into a key economic player. Model A1 remained a poorly planned resettlement programme with an over-fetched mandate of producing enough crops for the national silo. Dr. Gwarazimba (2011) posits the view that 80% of crops were produced by peasant farmers from the arid land. This could have given the government an over-simplified view that when people were settled in the fertile land they would produce more. This resulted from emotionalising and over generalising the benefits of the resettlement programme. If government had committed itself to informed, inclusive and consultative planning, it could have identified some of the dynamics that were likely to adversely jeopardise the realisation of the objectives of model A1 farming. Such planning would have enabled the policy implementers

to have a baseline for the implementation of the land reform policies on model A1 farms to enhance food security in the country.

Lack of infrastructural development on model A1 farms also explained the relevance of the 5-C protocol for policy implementation as discussed in the theoretical framework in the literature review. Thus, understanding of the 5-C; the content, context, commitment, capacity and clients/coalitions in terms of policy implementation was significant if land reform policy implementers were to play a role in helping model A1 farms contribute in the country's food security sustainability.

The question of context was very vital and had to be considered by government. Zimbabwe was a member of the global village. The resettlement programme had to be implemented in a manner as to limit contestations and disgruntlement. The adverse effects of the programme cascaded into other countries hence the opposition the programme faced.

5.2. THE RELEVANCE OF THE 5-C PROTOCOL FOR POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

5.2.1. Content

The content of the land reform policies is redistributive as was discussed in the literature review of the study. The research findings as they were also discussed in Chapter 4 showed that there was lack of infrastructural development on model A1 farms, which subsequently led to lack of productivity on the farms. Those findings were significant as they showed lack of understanding of redistributive function of the land reform policies as also discussed in the literature review. Thus, the failure to empower the land reform policy beneficiaries by the policy makers and policy implementers was the main reason why model A1 farms had failed to be productive and hence the failure to contribute to the country's food security sustainability. In other words, the findings of the study were significant as they contributed to the understanding of the content of the land reform policy in particular and the theoretical framework of the study in general.

It could be implied that lacking of planning was a clear sign that Government was not committed to the welfare of the beneficiaries of the land resettlement programme. If the

programme was for public good, policy pronouncements of effective infrastructure could have been implemented. The policy documents became just an unattainable monument of words. There was no budget for infrastructural development. In fact, the land earmarked for resettlement was not surveyed. Some landowners were settled in rocky and unproductive areas which were worse that their arid pieces of land. Lack of road infrastructure, schools, electricity and other amenities was a huge disincentive to resettle in the new area. This hampered the development of the farms as the new owners had little interest to live in unattractive areas with their families and hence the continuous absence by some model A1 farms in their new farms.

5.2.2. Context

The context of the land reform policies in Zimbabwe is political in nature with a social obligation to alleviate poverty to those who were disadvantaged before 18 April 1980. However, the findings of the study as presented in Chapter 4 showed that the beneficiaries of the land reform programme were struggling even to feed their own families despite owning huge arable pieces of land. Such findings showed failure of the land reform policy implementation due to failure by policy implementers to understand that the context of the land reform policies was political in nature and that the success in the implementation of such policies needed recognition of political institutions of the political environment. There was need for policy implementers to involve all political stakeholders and civic organisation groups if model A1 farms were to be adequately funded and have necessary infrastructural developments which could have enhanced productivity on model A1 farms. Policies to drive land reform programme were expected to be developed by all interested parties so as to enhance inclusivity in the programme. The fact that the governing party saw it its prerogative to design and develop policies, it failed to accede to the diversified nature of the Zimbabwean population. The exclusion of divergent sections of society in this national agenda increased resistance to the programme. Respecting divergence of views and various political institutions through policy development could have acted a huge buy-in by government into the land reform programme which could have been a vital success factor that could have driven the model A1 sector into

success. Therefore, the findings of the study were relevant to the literature as they contributed to the understanding of policy implementation in terms of the context of the policy as envisaged in the literature review of this study.

5.2.3. Commitment

The findings of the study as discussed in Chapter 4 also showed that there was lack of political commitment and leadership from the highest level. On the other hand, literature review showed that the implementation of the land reform policies in Zimbabwe was hierarchical in nature and hence the need to observe the bureaucratic structures. However, the theoretical framework of the literature review as discussed in Chapter 2 showed that no matter how viable the bureaucratic structures could be, the success of the policy implementation only depended on the commitment of the policy implementers. This means that the failure by model A1 farms to fully participate on the country's food security sustainability was due to lack of commitment by the policy implementers who happened to be the final link with the model A1 farmers (Warwick, 1982, in Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.147). This also means that it is the commitment of the policy implementers which could determine the successes or failures on model A1 farms.

Therefore, based on the literature and the research findings, it could be concluded that there was minimal involvement of policy implementers on the activities of model A1 farms in Zimbabwe and hence the poor performance of that sector in its bid to participate in the food security sustainability of the country. Another important contribution to literature by the study's findings was that, from this analysis it could be concluded that even though there was lack of commitment by the leadership from the highest level, if the land reform policy implementers were fully committed to empower model A1 farms to sustain themselves, there was going to be productivity on model A1 farms. This knowledge was crucial to the literature as it contributed by bringing a new dimension to the understanding of the implementation of the land reform policies on model A1 farms.

From extrapolation of the data, it could be said that commitment from the land owners was also questionable. Literature reveals that as peasant farmers, the model A1 farmers produced

more than enough crops to feed the nation. With the ownership of the arable and fertile land, it was expected that they would excel. Due to different dynamics emanating from policy disagreements, the farmers were suspected to lack commitment. Some farmers were alleged to have failed to take ownership of their pieces of land. Lack of creativity in sourcing funding may also underline the issue of commitment. It would appear that all role players colluded in hampering the success of land reform programme, particularly model A1 farming.

5.2.4. Capacity

Literature review shows that success of policy implementation is influenced by the availability of both tangible and intangible resources (Grindle and Hildebrand, 1995, in Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.148). However, the findings of the study showed that there was lack of both tangible and intangible resources on model A1 farms. Thus, if the success of policy implementation was influenced by the availability of such resources which were not available on model A1 farms, then there was need for policy implementers to involve all interested parties to fund the model A1 farms. The findings showed that there was serious shortage of both the financial resources and farming implements to help model A1 farms to carry out normal farming activities. That means that without the capacity to implement land reform policies on model A1 farms, there would be no productivity on farms and that would result in lack of participation of model A1 farms on food security sustainability in the country. This knowledge was also critical to the study as it contributed to the literature by enhancing understanding of how the unavailability of both the tangible and the intangible resources influenced the implementation of the land reform policies in Zimbabwe.

The haphazard allocation of prime land to new farmers was indicative of lack of capacity to plan by Government. The pieces of land were allocated without any criteria aligned to the objectives of this model of farming. Beneficiaries were not assessed on knowledge, experience and readiness to partake in such a massive national programme. The failure by new farmers to effectively utilise prime land pointed out to lack of capacity.

The government was incapacitated in many ways. It failed to use its strategic position to mobilise diverse participation and resources for the programme. Also, the Department of

Agriculture was unable to understand the impact of climate change on farming. The programme has had to be a trial and error even though weather patterns call for agricultural approaches responsive to the climate change. Teaching zero-tillage to farmers of the magnitude of model A1 was akin to clapping an elephant. This policy implementation by policy implementers displayed how detached from reality the policy implementers were. With such kind of support, farmers were not expected to increase their produce.

5.2.5. Clients/Coalitions

Through understanding the role of coalitions in policy implementation as discussed in the literature review, policy actors in the implementation of the land reform policies could realise the diversity and complexity of implementation of the policies. Policy implementers could also realise that the implementation of policies, whether top-down or bottom-up could not always be carried out in a linear manner because any implementation process is affected by the individuals who are also affected by the same policies they are implementing (Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.153). Thus, the land reform policies on model A1 farms in Zimbabwe are affected in the similar manner. Therefore, based on the findings of the study, it is clear that this dimension of policy implementation was not considered. The findings of the study seemed to portray a trend where policy implementers routinely implemented land reform policies with predetermined outcomes as if other policy actors were not affected by such policies. Therefore, an understanding of the significance of coalitions in policy implementation juxtaposed with the research findings of the study was crucial in making conclusions as to where the policy implementers failed in their bid to help model A1 farms to contribute to the country's food security sustainability. There is need for policy implementers on model A1 farms to realise that policy implementation is a process and as such, plans to improve productivity on model A1 farms could not be predetermined but rather, the implementation should be channelled towards a more effective outcome by involving all those who affect and are affected by the policies which are being implemented (Cloete and De Coning, eds. 2011, p.153).

Another significant contribution of the findings of the study to the literature was the importance of the 5-C protocol for policy implementation. Through the analysis of the research

findings, conclusions were made that the 5-C protocol made sense in explaining how policy implementers on model A1 farms failed in the implementation of the land reform policies on model A1 farms in their bid to improve the country's food security sustainability. Therefore, this contribution to literature by the findings of the study helped provide answers to both the primary research and the supplementary research questions. The understanding of the policy implementation models and the 5-C protocol for policy implementation led to conclusions that there was lack of participation by the land reform policy implementers on model A1 farms, hence the poor performance by the sector in its bid to improve Zimbabwe's food security sustainability.

5.3. KEY STRATEGIES FOR LAND REFORM POLICIES

5.3.1. Investing on sustainable and robust solutions to address challenges of food insecurity

One of the key policy strategies to address challenges of food insecurity in Zimbabwe is to invest on sustainable and robust solutions on model A1 farms (ZIM-ASSET, 2013-2018, pp.33-8). However, the findings of the study showed that model A1 farms were faced with a lot of challenges from financial to material resources. The sector was faced with lack of irrigation mechanisms to mitigate effects of drought and there were no provisions in place to minimise impacts of climate change conditions on model A1 farms. Therefore, lack of these provisions on model A1 farms as was revealed by the findings of the study proved that land reform policy implementers failed to implement this policy strategy. The failure to implement key strategies of land reform policies by policy implementers as revealed by the research findings explained why the country was faced with food shortages.

On the other hand, empirical literature shows that fertile pieces of land were given to the majority of the black people who used to produce enough for their families on unfertile lands. The failure to invest on sustainable and robust solutions to address challenges of food insecurity in the country by the land reform policy implementers helped provide answers to the study's research questions. The failure by policy implementers to enforce policies the way literature envisages could also mean that land reform policy implementers lacked capacity. The policy implementers appeared to be incompetent in implementing key policy strategies of the

land reform programmes. It is also suspected that the top-down policy implementation process adopted by the government had not been effective. Therefore, in order to achieve the objectives of model A1 farms there was a need for policy implementers of the land reform policies to engage with political institutions and civic organisation groups if the implementation of this strategy was to become a reality on model A1 farms.

5.3.2. Subsidised agricultural inputs

The findings of the study showed that model A1 farms were provided with agricultural inputs. The findings revealed that policy implementers fully participated on the implementation of this policy although they faced a plethora of challenges. According to the literature review as discussed in Chapter 2, the provision of giving free seeds and fertilisers to model A1 farms by the government was not sustainable as long as model A1 farms lacked financial support and farming implements to till the land. Thus, the findings of the study indicated lack of coordination in the policy implementation process because of the non-participation of policy beneficiaries who were affected by the policies being implemented. This means that the primary needs and expectations of the model A1 farmers were not taken into consideration within the policy implementation process. This implies that there was a dire need for both policy makers and policy implementers of the land reform policies to understand how necessary it was to utilise the policy implementation models. The 5-C protocol for policy implementation was also to be considered in order to effectively channel land reform policy implementation processes to effective outcomes.

The absence of a monitoring mechanism was also a huge disservice to the model A1 farms. Study findings indicated that implements from government were sometimes diverted to other uses not originally intended for. This defeated the purpose of the input scheme and inevitably hampered the realisation of a good produce on the model A1 farming sector. It is for this reason that the researcher posits that policy implementation should be augmented by robust monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. The monitoring and evaluation should not exist nominally but have a designated officer to oversee. This will enhance service delivery and act as a conduit for farmers to give feedback to the government. This way, the bottom-up approach

would be utilised to facilitate the participation of farmers in policy and strategy formulation and resultantly empower farmers.

5.3.3. Sequence pattern for cereal and small grain crops

According to the ZIM-ASSET policy document, model A1 farms should dedicate a certain quota to cereal crops and small grain crops (ZIM-ASSET, 2013-2018, pp.33-8). However, the research findings of this study showed that there was no sequence pattern followed by model A1 farmers. The failure to implement this important policy strategy by the land reform policy implementers could mean that the failure by model A1 farms to fully participate in contributing to the country's food security sustainability was due to lack of proper guidance by the land reform policy implementers.

As such, the lack of adherence to the policy by model A1 farmers could be an indication that land reform policies on model A1 farms were implemented from top-down without any consultation with the policy beneficiaries, leading to resistance by farmers. Consultation with policy stakeholders is part of policy implementation process; therefore the failure to consult with policy beneficiaries on model A1 farms could also explain the lack of participation by the land reform policy implementers on model A1 activities, thereby providing this study with answers to the research questions. It could be extrapolated that policy implementers had little knowledge about the entire agricultural value chain. They did not understand the value and relevance of small grains to the value chain. This serves to indicate that the unavailability of policies specific to model A1 programme was a huge impediment. Policy implementers might have struggled to give detailed and convincing information relating to this quota system. The lessons provided by the findings of the study could also contribute to the literature by adding new knowledge which might be of help on future studies based on policy implementation.

5.4. SUMMARY

The general analysis of the findings of this study highlighted the importance of understanding the implications of policy implementation models in the process of implementing the land reform policies on model A1 farms. The relevance of the 5-C protocol of policy implementation

to the findings of the study and how those findings contributed to the literature was also discussed. The in-depth analysis of the findings of the study showed that there was either lack of participation on model A1 by the land reform policy implementers or that there was failure by the policy implementers to properly implement land reform policies due to lack of knowledge of the relevance of theoretical literature on policy implementation processes. Finally, the analysis of the study showed that land reform policy implementers failed to implement the key success factors and key success strategies of land reform policies on model A1 as envisaged by the ZIM-ASSET blue print. The Department of Agriculture was complicit to these challenges by failing to draw up policies specific to the model A1 programmes. The failure to implement those key success factors and the key success strategies led to conclusions that there was lack of participation by policy implementers on model A1 farms in their bid to improve food security sustainability in the country. This defeated the whole purpose of allocating prime land to indigenous farmers as it inevitably contributed to the collapse of the once prosperous agricultural sector. The mandate to farmers to contribute to the national granary would remain elusive if the policy processes glaringly disenfranchise and systematically exclude key role players in the agricultural sector. A committed Government should take responsibility to depoliticise the land issue and craft an inclusive programme to facilitate buy-in from local and international funders. Based on these conclusions, there was need for the government to create a conducive environment for inclusive participation in policy formulation and enforcement if the country is to revitalise the ailing model A1 programme.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.0. INTRODUCTION

This chapter discussed and concluded the focus of the study as they were discussed in Chapter 5. Conclusions and recommendations were based on the objectives of the study as well as on the conceptual and theoretical frameworks that informed the study as was discussed in Chapters1 and 5 respectively. Respondents' views as well as the textual analysis of secondary sources on how policy implementers participated on model A1 farms in their bid to improve national food security were also vital in making the conclusions and recommendations of this study. Finally, the study highlighted areas that needed further research as the researcher felt that the study was restricted in its endeavour to unlock on what really contributed to the failure of model A1 farms in their bid to improve the country's food security sustainability.

The first three chapters of the study focused on the background of the study, literature review and research methodology respectively. The background of the study was based mainly on what constituted the need for this research study, hence primary research question and the objectives were discussed. The literature review discussed theoretical and conceptual frameworks that informed the study. Chapter 3 discussed the research methodology and its main thrust was to discuss the research design, research instruments, sampling of respondents as well as the data analysis procedures. Limitations and/or delimitations of the study were also highlighted on Chapter 3.Chapter 4 presented and discussed the research results which gave answers to the primary research question and the objectives of the study. The presentation of results discussed on Chapter 4 were based on the thematic and textual analysis techniques which utilised respondents' views obtained through in-depth interviews as well as from the textual analysis of secondary sources. Chapter 5 then gave general analysis of the research, explaining the meaning of data presented on Chapter 4 in relation to the research questions and the underlying theoretical concepts as discussed on Chapter 2.

6.1. SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

The main purpose of the research study was to get a deeper understanding of the role played by policy implementers on model A1 farms in Zimbabwe in their bid to improve food security sustainability in the country. The research was necessitated by lack of food security which had been on-going since year 2000 when commercial land owned by white farmers was redistributed to the black Zimbabweans.

The study utilised the qualitative research method as means of obtaining answers to the primary research question and then made informed conclusions and recommendations based on the objectives of the study as well as on the theoretical and conceptual frameworks that informed the study. The study highlighted that there was lack of participation of land reform policy implementers on issues affecting model A1 farms in Zimbabwe. The results of the study revealed that the major problem affecting model A1 farms from contributing to the country's food security sustainability was the unavailability of reliable water sources. Thus, the study showed that model A1 farms had no irrigation systems in place. As a result of this, the sector entirely depended on rain fall as the only source of water. According to the ZIM-ASSET blue print, the Ministry of Agriculture, Mechanisation and Irrigation Development was responsible for putting irrigation systems in all farms (ZIM-ASSET, 2013-2018, pp.31-32). The blue print also advocated for the development of key infrastructure and utilities which included the rehabilitation and expansion of irrigation projects and increased construction of dams (ZIM-ASSET, 2013-2018, pp.33-38). However, the study showed that policy implementers had failed to push for the implementation of these key strategies on model A1 farms. The study highlighted that, without adequate water on the farms, model A1 farms would not fulfil their mandate of improving the country's food security sustainability as well as the revitalisation of the ailing industry since Zimbabwe's economy was agro-based. The study also revealed that model A1 farms had no access to affordable farming implements. The unavailability of farming implements on model A1 was blamed on the lack of participation by policy implementers, who were mandated by the government to source funding for model A1 farms. However, despite the failure by policy implementers to source funding from within government, there was no

effort to get funding elsewhere given the fact that Zimbabwe's land reform programme was politically sensitive.

Another concern the study pointed out was the poor training on model A1 farmers. According to ZIM-ASSET implementation of key success factors for land reform policies, there were supposed to be "human capital development programmes to enhance acquisition of requisite skills" (ZIM-ASSET, 2013-2018, pp.31-32). However, the study revealed that the farmers on model A1 farms were only trained by the AGRITEX officers, who offered poor quality trainings, given the fact that this institution lacked both financial and material resources as well as infrastructure. The study showed that the policy implementers failed to implement almost all the ZIM-ASSET policies, which could suggest that the land reform programme has failed in Zimbabwe.

Another crucial challenge limiting effectiveness of policy implementation was the polarisation of the land resettlement programme. This created impasse and contestations over the programme. The unfavourable political atmosphere resulted in the shunning of the programme by key stakeholders and potential funders. The ailing economy of the country created budgetary constraints that hampered effective policy implementation. There was despondency among policy implementers resulting in serious brain drain and lack of motivation by civil servants and the farmers. The entire farming industry was punctuated by a debilitating and demoralising atmosphere which further influenced lack of commitment to national goals. Civil servants and the farmers engaged in corrupt tendencies to pursue individual survival agendas over national goals.

6.2. CONCLUSIONS

Overall conclusion of the study was that, the evidence provided by the study portrayed that there was minimal role played by policy implementers on model A1 farms. There was also lack of the implementation of key success factors and key strategies for land reform policies on model A1 farms as envisaged by the ZIM-ASSET blue print. The lack of policy implementers' participation on model A1 farms had resulted on the sector failing to fulfil its mandate of improving the country's food security sustainability. The study also revealed that the sector was

poorly resourced both financially and materially. Thus, the current situation on model A1 farms needed urgent intervention if the sector had to strengthen the country's food security sustainability.

6.3. RECOMMENDATIONS

The analysis of the research results as informed by the theoretical and conceptual frameworks of the study revealed some concerns that needed attention. The study therefore recommended that the following issues should be considered:

i. Policy implementers should prioritise irrigation systems on model A1 farms to enable farmers to plant crops throughout the year.
ii. Policy implementers should advocate for dialogue with model A1 farmers to sensitise farmers on the importance of the quota system policy.
iii. Policy implementers should encourage all policy actors to work together on the implementation of the land reform policy so that farmers could benefit immensely from various policy actors.
iv. Instead of the government providing model A1 farms with farming inputs, the government should rather provide the farms with farming implements.
v. Lack of productivity on model A1 farms could be alleviated by equipping policy implementers with necessary skills which would enable them to fully participate on model A1 farms.
vi. Future research on implementation of land reform policies on model A1 farms to be broadened to include policy markers, academics, farmers' unions for smallholder farmers and research institutes.

6.4. AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The researcher felt there was need for further research on the role played by policy implementers on model A1 farms in their bid to improve Zimbabwe's food security sustainability because of some political restrictions the researcher went through on the processes of collecting data.

Bibliography

African Development Bank, 2010. Infrastructure and Growth in Zimbabwe: An action plan for sustained economic growth. African Development Bank summary report. www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Generic-Documents/1.%20Standalone%20Summary%20Report.pdf

African Institute for Agrarian Studies, 2010. Statistics on Zimbabwe's agriculture.

Alden, C. and Anseeuw, W. 2008. Land, Liberation and Compromise in Southern Africa. London: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Babbie, E. 2007. The Practice of Social Research. 11th ed. Thomson Wadsworth

Birkland, T. A. 2011. An Introduction to the Policy Process: Theories, Concepts, and Models of Public Policy Making. 3rdEdition. M. E. Sharpe, Inc…

Brynard, P. 2007. The Policy Gap in South Africa. Journal of Public Administration, 42(3).

Chitsike, F. 2003. A Critical Analysis of the Land Reform Programme in Zimbabwe, Paper presented at the 2nd Fig Regional conference Marrakech, Morocco, December 2- 5, 2003

Cloete, F. and De Coning, C. (eds). 2011. Improving Public Policy: Theory, practice and results. 3rd edition. Van Schaik

Clover, J. 2005. "Land Reform in Angola: Establishing the Ground Rules." In Huggins, C. and Clover, J. eds. From the Ground Up: Land Rights, Conflicts and Peace in Sub- Saharan Africa, Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies (2005): 347- 380

Dabale, W. P., Prof. J agers, N and Chiringa, C., 2014. Empirical Study on the Fast Track Land Reform Programme (FTLRP) and Household Food Security in Zimbabwe: Vol. 2 No. 2. ISBN 2056-5992

Dlamini, S.R.A. 2006. "Taking Land Reform Seriously: From Willing-Seller Willing-Buyer to Expropriation." Unpublished dissertation

Deininger, K. 1999. “Making Negotiated Land Reform: Initial Experience From Colombia, Brazil and South Africa.” World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 2040, January 1999

Dr.Gwarazimba, V. 2011. Strategies for Resuscitating Zimbabwe’s Agriculture. Entrepreneurship Africa

Elmore, R.F. 1985. Forward & Backward Mapping: Reversible Logic in the Analysis of Public Policy. In Half, K. &Tooten, A. J.: Policy Implementation in Federal &Unitary Systems: Questions of Analysis &Design. Dordrecht, Martinus Nijhoff, 33-70

Esterhuizen, D. 2010.Zimbabwe Corn and Wheat Update: Global Agriculture Information Network (GAIN) Report. Pretoria: GAIN. www.gain.fas.usda/recent%20Publications/Corn%20and%20wheat%20update_Pretoria_Zimbabwe_2-1-2010.pdf, accessed 10 January 2011.

Flybjerg, B. 2004. Five Misunderstandings about Case Study Research. Aalborg University.

Food and Agriculture Organisation. 2010. Zimbabwe: Transitioning Emergency into Rehabilitation and Development- Plan of Action2010-2015. Harare: FAO. www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/tc/tce/pdf/zimbabwe_planofaction2010, accessed 3 March 2011.

Hill, M. and Hupe, P. 2002. Implementing Public Policy: Governance in Theory and Practice. London.

Human Rights Watch. 2002. Fast Track Land Reform in Zimbabwe A1401 (accessed 29 April 2014). Available online at from World Wide Web: http:// www.unhc. Org/ref word/doc/3c82f4, html

Juana, J. S. 2006. “A Quantitative Analysis of Zimbabwe’s Land Reform Policy: An Application of Zimbabwe’s SAM Multipliers.” Agrekon 45 (2006): 294- 317

Kapuya, T., Saruchera, D., Jongwe, A. Mucheri,T., Mujeyi, K., Ndobongo, L. T. and Meyer, F.H.2010. The Grain Industry Value Chain in Zimbabwe. Unpublished Draft Prepared for the

Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO). www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/est/AAACP/eastafrica/UnvPretoria_GrainChaininZimbabwe_2010_1_.pdf

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

Lahiff, E., and Cousins, B. 2005. Smallholder Agriculture and land Reform in South Africa. IDS Bulletin 36 (2005): 127- 131

Lowi, T. J. 1963. American Business, Public Policy, Case Studies and Political Theory, World Politics 16

Moyo, P. 2010. Land Reform in Zimbabwe and Urban Livelihoods Transformation. Working Paper 15. Department of Sociology and Industrial Sociology. University of Fort Hare

Moyo, S. 2011. Three Decades of Agrarian Reform in Zimbabwe. The Journal of Peasant Studies, 38(3), 493- 531

Marongwe, N. 2004. 'Socio- Economic Aspects of the Fast Track Resettlement Programme,' in Masiiwa, Post-IndependenceLand Reform in Zimbabwe. Harare

Mazmanian, D. A. & Sabatier, P.A. 1981. Effective Policy Implementation. Lexington: Health

Moore, M. H. 1995. Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Govt. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Moya, J. 2002. Approaches to Policy Implementation. In MM Research Report. Education Policy Implementation in Mpumalanga. Johannesburg: Graduate School of Public and Development Management. University of the Witwatersrand, chapters 3, 27-50

Musemwa, L. and Mushunje, A. 2011. Agrarian and Life Style Change in Zimbabwe: From Colonization to the Formation of Government of National Unity. African Journal of Agricultural Research, 6(21), 4824- 4832

Napoli, M. 2011.Towards A Food Insecurity Multidimensional Index (FIMI): Master in Human Development and Food Security.

Odendaal, W. 2005. “Our Land We Farm: An Analysis of the Namibian Commercial Agricultural Land Reform Process.” Paper Prepared for the Land, Environment and Development Project. Legal Assistance Centre

O’Toole, L. J. 1986. Policy Recommendations for Multi- Actor Implementation. An Assessment of the Field. Journal of Public Policy, 6(2)

Patton, M.Q. 1990. Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods. (2nd ed.) Newbury Park.

Pressman, J. L. and Wildavsky, X. 1973. Implementation. University of California Press

Priest, S.H. 1996. Doing Media Research- An Introduction. London.

Raima, M., Mahlangu, S. and du Toit, D. 2011. Agricultural Production in South Africa: Literature Review. Economic Services Product: Production Unit

Sachikonye, L. 2003. The Situation of Commercial Farm Workers after Land Reform in Zimbabwe. Farm Community Trust of Zimbabwe. March 2003

Schneider, K. and Prof.Gugerly, M.K. 2011. Agricultural Production and Poverty Reduction: Linkages Pathways. Vol. 1, Num, 1, Spring 2011

Scoones, I., Marogwe, N., Mavedzenge, B., Murimbarimba, F., Mahenehene, J. and Sukume, C. 2011. Zimbabwe’s land reform: Myths and realities. Weaver Press: Harare

Sibanda, S. 2001. “Land reform and poverty alleviation in South Africa”. Department of land affairs, Pretoria

Tellis, W. 1997. “Introduction to case study. The Qualitative Report,” (On-line), 3(20), Available: http://www.nova.educ/sss/QR/QR3-2/

Theron, G. 2011. Land reform in Zimbabwe: Impact on food production self-sufficiency (Accessed 29 April 2014). Available online at from worldwide web: htt//www.cfuzim.org/index

Thomas, N.H. 2003. “Land Reform in Zimbabwe.” Third World Quarterly 24 (2003): 691- 712.

Tshuma, M. C. 2012. “The Land Reform Program (LRP) as a Poverty Alleviation and National Reconciliation Tool: The South African Story.” African Journal of Agricultural Research 7 (2012): 1970- 1975

O’Toole, L. J. 1986. Policy Recommendations for Multi- Actor Implementation. An Assessment of the Field. Journal of Public Policy, 6(2)

Pressman, J. L. and Wildavsky, X. 1973. Implementation. University of California Press

Van Meter, D. S. and Van Horn, C. E. 1974. The Policy Implementation Process: A Conceptual Framework. Administration and Society. February

Wagner, C; Kawulich, B.B. and Garner, M. eds. 2012. Doing Social Research- A Global Context: McGraw-Hill

Warwick, D. P. 1982. Bitter Pills: Population Policies and their Implementation in Eight Developing Countries. Cambridge University Press.

Wily, A. 2000. Land Tenure,Reform and Balance of Power in Eastern and Southern Africa. Natural Resources Perspective Number 58, June 2000

Zikhali, P. 2008. The Fast Track Land Reform and Agricultural Productivity in Zimbabwe: Environment for Development, Discussion Paper Series (accessed 10 May 2012). Available online at from worldwide web: http:// www.efd0830.pd f>c)

ZimbabweAgricultural Policy Framework. 2012. Comprehensive Agricultural Policy Framework (2012- 2032): Executive Summary

APPENDICES

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

APPENDIX 1: Policy Implementers' Questions.

1. How would you explain the role of model A1 farmers with regards to the national food security?
2. What do you think are the factors which make it difficult for farmers to produce enough food and have surpluses to sell to the Grain Marketing Board (GMB)?
3. How do you explain the situation with regards to what the farmers currently produce in their farms?
4. How far do farmers at Nkenyane receive agricultural training which could help them improve on their agricultural produce?
5. How has the local leadership helped model A1 farmers to have access to subsidized agricultural inputs from the government or any other non-governmental organisations (NGOs)?
6. What activities have been put in place by the Agricultural Extension Officers (AGRITEX) to help these farmers improve their farming skills?
7. How have the farmers benefited from such activities by Agricultural Extension Officers?
8. How far have the local leadership and the AGRITEX officers ensured that all model A1 farmers have dedicated a certain quota to cereal and small grains production?
9. Could you explain how you think the factors leading to the problems faced by model A1 farmers could be solved to help them fully contribute to the national food security

APPENDIX 2:

Policy Beneficiaries' Questions

1. How would you explain your role as a model A1 farmer with regards to the national food security?
2. What do you think are the factors which make it difficult for you as farmers to produce enough food and have surpluses to sell to the Grain Marketing Board (GMB)?
3. How do you explain your situation with regards to what you currently produce in your farm?
4. How far has your local leadership or AGRITEX officers helped you receive agricultural training which could help you improve on your farm produce?
5. How has your local leadership helped you to have access to subsidized agricultural inputs from the government or any other non-governmental organisations (NGOs)?
6. What activities have been put in place by the Agricultural Extension Officers to help you improve your farming skills?
7. How have you, as a farmer benefited from such activities by Agricultural Extension Officers?
8. How far have the local leadership and the AGRITEX officers ensured that as farmers you have dedicated a certain quota of your farm to cereal and small grains production?
9. Could you explain how you think the factors leading to the problems you face as farmers could be solved to help you fully contribute to the national food security

APPENDIX 3

POLICY IMPLEMENTERS

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

QUESTIONS	TRANSCRIBED DATA	CODE/ THEMES
1. How could you explain the role of model A1 farmers with regards to the national food security?	• With adequate rain fall, farmers sell little surplus to GMB, communities and to private millers. • According to AGRITEX officials, model A1 farmers have not reached a level to sell surplus to GMB due to lack of financial and material resources • Farmers are now able to harvest enough for their family consumption • Without assistance from government or NGOs, farmers are doing their best to have food for themselves	1. Model A1 farms are not contributing to the national food security 2. Model A1 farms have no irrigation schemes to help mitigate impacts of climate changes 3. Lack of both financial and material resources have contributed to poor yields in model A1 farms
2. What do you think are the factors which	• There is no funding from government or NGOs to adequately train farmers to produce enough to sell to GMB	1. Farmers lack financial assistance from

make it difficult for farmers to produce enough food and have surplus to sell to the Grain Marketing Board (GMB)?	• Most farmers lack knowledge of farming due to lack of training • Lack of innovation from farmers since most of them used to be given instructions as farm labourers • The main factor is the lack of water since model A1 farmers' only source of water is rain fall • Climate change also play a major role • Some farmers are employed elsewhere • Lack of financial resource • Water is a big challenge though there are boreholes around farms • No irrigation machinery for farmers • Impacts of pandemic diseases like HIV/AIDS as some farmers are sick and some have died living families headed by children • Some farmers are not on the ground yet farming is supposed to be hands- on • According to AGRITEX officers, lack of knowledge is a big challenge because the majority of the farmers were not in the crop production farming • Most farmers used to work in livestock production as farm labourers, but land reform policy compels every farmer to do both crop and livestock production	government and other stakeholders 2. Training of farmers is inadequate to change their mindset towards seeing agriculture as business 3. DDF does not provide model A1 farms with farming implements 4. There are no irrigation schemes facilities in model A1 farms 5. No provisions in place to minimize impacts of climate change conditions in model A1 farms

3. How do you explain the situation with regards to what the farmers currently produce in their farms?	• For 2015- 2016 season, the production is too low because there was too little rain fall. • On a good rain season, about half of the farmers can produce enough to sustain themselves • A small number of farmers on a good rain fall can produce surplus to sell to GMB • The Matabeleland region often has low rain fall and that affects the produce as the season becomes too short • In local leadership's view, if there was adequate water for farmers to irrigate, no farmer was going to produce less than 10 tons of maize in a season • According to AGRITEX officers, there is very low production, "actually there is nothing in as far as what a farmer is expected to produce." • Due to lack of farming implements, farmers are now shifting to conservational agriculture to try to increase production • Some farmers sell inputs given to them for free by the government to pay those who plough for them	1. Production is too low in model A1 farms 2. Model A1 farms have no irrigation mechanisms to mitigate effects of drought 3. Model A1 farms have no designated tractors for land tillage 4. Input distribution programme does not sustain model A1 farmers
4. How far do farmers at	• AGRITEX officers do train farmers • The officers are accessible at any time at their	1. Only AGRITEX officers train

Nkenyane receive agricultural training which could help them improve on their agricultural produce?	base for training and consultation purposes • Due to trainings, most farmers are now at a better stage in terms of faming knowledge • The challenge the officers have is that some farmers who have no farming background rarely attend trainings • Some farmers hardly attend trainings since there would be at their work places • Local leadership often meet with AGRITEX officers to map way forward in order to improve training strategies	model A1 Farmers 2. There are no infrastructure facilities to offer practical trainings 3. There is no funding for quality training of model A1 farmers
5. How has the local leadership helped model A1 farmers to have access to subsidised agricultural inputs from the government or any other non-governmental organisations (NGOs)?	• Local leadership arrange with the AGRITEX officials to get seeds and fertilizers for farmers at the beginning of each rain season • Local leadership used to arrange with District Development Fund (DDF) for tractors to help farmers. However, due to the economic challenges the country is facing DDF no longer provide farmers with tractors • Local leadership organise farmers to group themselves and buy inputs in large-scale at subsidised prices	1. Local leadership play a minimal role in helping farmers to get free seeds and fertilizers from government 2. Model A1 farmers are not getting subsidised farming inputs from either government or NGOs
6. What activities	• Extension officers make farm visits and help	1. They conduct

have been put in place by the Agricultural Extension Officers (AGRITEX) to help these farmers improve their farming skills?	give farmers knowledge on how to produce better yields • Field visits start from the beginning of the farming season to the end. • Extension officers update farmers about weather patterns, advising them on how best farmers can prepare for such climatic changes. • Farmers have been made to adopt zero-tillage as a conservation farming methods • Extension officers do master farmer trainings and demonstrations	field visits regularly and offer advices to farmers 2. They update farmers on climate changes and offer advices 3. They make demonstrations on how to utilise zero-tillage conservation methods 4. They offer Master Farmer trainings 5. They award competence certificates to trained farmers
7. How have the farmers benefited from such activities by AGRITEX officers?	• Farmers are now knowledgeable on crop production farming skills • One local leader said that most farmers have come to realise that agriculture is business, "not just a way of sustaining one's family, but also to provide the whole nation with food	1. Farmers have gained knowledge on conservation farming 2. Most farmers

	• Zero-tillage has helped farmers, even those who have no farming implements to produce better yields • The whole farming community benefit from the trained farmers hence enabling sustainability in the farms	now appreciate agriculture as business 3. There is sustainability in model A1 farming community as trained farmers impact the gained knowledge to the untrained farmers
8. How far have the local leadership and the AGRITEX officers ensured that all model A1 farmers have dedicated a quota to cereal and small grains production?	• There is a challenge when it comes to growing cereal and small grains crops as most farmers in model A1 believe in only planting maize • Rain fall in Matabeleland north is not adequate enough for crops like maize since maize needs a lot of water • There is also a challenge of birds when it comes to small grains crop such as sorghum since some farmers are not full time farmers, their visibility in farms to control birds is lacking • There is a sequence pattern that the farmers are encouraged to follow which the farmers resist.	1. Cereal and small grains production quota system has failed in model A1 farms 2. There is resistance from farmers to grow cereal and small grains crops 3. Almost all farmers grow maize crop which is not

		drought resistance
9. Could you explain how you think the factors leading to the problems faced by model A1 farmers could be solved to help them fully contribute to the national food security	• Instead of the government giving seeds and fertilizers to farmers, it should provide irrigation schemes • Farmers need to get funding from government and NGOs to help them buy material resources and receive quality training • Currently it is difficult for the local leadership to help farmers get funding • The input distribution programme introduced by government should be carried on • Government should target productive farmers who are able to produce so that those who are not able to produce would benefit from the productive ones • Water is need to have irrigation throughout the year	1. Government should introduce irrigation schemes in model A1 farms 2. The government and other stakeholders should work together to finance agricultural activities in model A1 farms 3. Model A1 farmers should be financially empowered to sustain themselves 4. Input distribution is unsustainable

APPENDIX 4

POLICY BENEFICIARIES

SEMI- STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

QUESTIONS	TRANSCRIBED DATA	CODE/ THEMES
1. How could you explain your role as a model A1 farmer with regards to the national food security?	• Farmers sometimes sell maize to GMB if they had good rains but they usually sell to their communities. • Good harvest only depends on availability of rain fall. • Farmers acknowledge the fertile soils in their farms and their willingness to utilise the land, but because they lack resources they produce little • Farmers have no irrigation schemes • There is lack of water so farmers only plant during rainy season • Dams not big enough for irrigation	1. Model A1 farms are not contributing to the national food security 2. There are no irrigation schemes to help farmers mitigate impacts of drought 3. Lack of both financial and material resources have contributed to poor yields in model A1 farms
2. What do you think are the factors which make it difficult for you as farmers to produce enough	• Water is the main challenge since farmers entirely depends on rain fall. • The fertilizers and seeds farmers get from government often come late when planting season is almost over	1. Farmers lack financial assistance from government and other stakeholders 2. Training of

food and have surplus to sell to the Grain Marketing Board (GMB)?	• Seeds and fertilizers are too expensive for farmers to buy as farmers lack financial resources to buy farming implements in order to plant on time • Farmers have no tractors since the District Development Fund stopped providing model A1 farmers with tractors • Farmers are relying on oxen- drawn ploughing, but the majority of the farmers have no live stock. • Farmers with live stock are under pressure of providing services to their neighbours as the rain season is also short. • Lack of resources, especially water and finance is making it difficult for farmers to in model A1 to produce	farmers is inadequate to change their mindset towards seeing agriculture as business 3. DDF does not provide model A1 farms with farming implements 4. There are no irrigation schemes facilities in model A1 farms 5. No provisions in place in model A1 farms to minimize impacts of climate changes
3. How do you explain your situation with regards to what you currently produce in your farm?	• Production is low because of climate changes. There was little rain fall this season • The farmers have a challenge of water • There is a serious problem of lack of farming implements • Most farmers sell seeds and fertilizers given	1. Production is too low in model A1 farms 2. Model A1 farms have no irrigation mechanisms to mitigate effects of

	to them for free to hire other farmers to plough for them • There is always enough to sustain families	drought 3. Model A1 farms have no designated tractors for land tillage 4. Input distribution programme does not sustain model A1 farmers
4. How far has your local leadership or AGRITEX officers helped you receive agricultural training which could help you improve on your farm produce?	• AGRITEX officers offer training to farmers but quality of training is compromised due to lack of financial resource • Farmers get only theory from AGRITEX officers since there is challenge of funding. • Training of farmers is only offered by AGRITEX officers • AGRITEX officers train farmers new methods of farming but to put such methods into practice needs more labour force but farmers lack finance to hire such labour • Officers make follow ups to what they train, but they have a challenge of lack of equipment and infrastructure to use for practical purposes to fully develop the new farmers	1. Only AGRITEX officers train model A1 Farmers 2. There are no infrastructure facilities to offer practical trainings 3. There is no funding for quality training of model A1 farmers 4. Poor training programmes are offered to model A1 farmers
5. How has your	• Local leadership and NGOs have not helped	1. Model A1 farmers

local leadership helped you to have access to subsidised agricultural inputs from the government or any other non-governmental organisations (NGOs)?	model A1 farmers with inputs • There is no visibility of NGOs in model A1 farms. • NGOs have never assisted farmers with any agricultural inputs	are not getting subsidised farming inputs from either government or NGOs 2. Model A1 farmers only get free seeds and fertilizers from government
6. What activities have been put in place by the Agricultural Extension Officers (AGRITEX) to help you improve your farming skills?	• Extension officers visit farms to give advice • Farmers get master farmer certificates after completing training as form of acknowledging that they have acquired necessary farming skills • Trained farmers, with the authority of AGRITEX officers help those farmers who were not trained with knowledge and support	1. They conduct field visits regularly and offer advices to farmers 2. They update farmers on climate changes and offer advices 3. They make demonstrations on how to utilise zero-tillage conservation methods 4. They offer Master Farmer trainings 5. They award competence

		certificates to trained farmers
7. How have you as a farmer benefited from such activities by AGRITEX officers?	• Farmers gained insight on zero-tillage conservation farming methods • Generally, farmers motivated by field visits and by getting master farmer certificates • Shared views during trainings and other meetings boost farmers' confidence to practice what they have learnt.	1. Farmers have gained knowledge on conservation farming 2. Most farmers now appreciate agriculture as business 3. There is sustainability in model A1 farming community as trained farmers impact the gained knowledge to the untrained farmers
8. How far have the local leadership and the AGRITEX officers ensured that as farmers you dedicated a certain quota of your farm to cereal and small grains production?	• Farmers resist advice to grow cereal and small grains crops • Each farmer decides what to plant, where and when • Advice to grow cereal and small grains crops is always given by AGRITEX officers but very few farmers take such advice	1. Cereal and small grains production quota system has failed in model A1 farms 2. There is resistance from farmers to grow cereal and small grains crops 3. Almost all farmers grow maize crop

		which is not drought resistance
9. Could you explain how you think the factors leading to the problems you face as farmers could be solved to help you fully contribute to the national food security	• The government should focus mainly on providing farmers with water for irrigation • Government should provide farmers with irrigation equipment • The Councillor tried to obtain irrigation equipment but nothing has materialised	1. Government should introduce irrigation schemes in model A1 farms 2. The government and other stakeholders should work together to finance agricultural activities in model A1 farms 3. Model A1 farmers should be financially empowered to sustain themselves 4. Input distribution is unsustainable

APPENDIX 5

ARCHIVAL MATERIAL AND DOCUMENTS

STATE OWNED NEWS PAPERS

NEWS PAPER TYPE	TRANSCRIBED DATA	CODE/ THEMES
The Chronicle; 12 May, 2012, p.1	• Some individuals including senior government officials are not staying in their farms • Such farmers are not producing anything in their farms	1. Lack of production in farms as farmers have not taken their land permanently.
The Financial Gazette; 28 October 2013, p.5	• Land reform has created a huge demand for extension services as more people got land • Before land reform programme, 21.5 million hectares of land were occupied by small-scale farmers • After fast track resettlement programme, small holder farmers took over 27.9 million hectares of land • As a result, a total of 11 universities, 13 colleges and 11 training centres were established for training at various levels	1. Insufficient extension services for land reform beneficiaries
The Chronicle; 11 September, 2015, p.2	• There is no doubt that all those who were allocated land are committed farmers who want to use this infinite resource to	1. Farmers have the role to boost the

	improve, not only the livelihood of their families but the nation as a whole • The nation looks up to the beneficiaries of the land reform programme for not only its food security but the revival of the ailing industry given the fact that the Zimbabwe industry is agro-based	national food security 2. Farmers can boost the economy of the country
The Herald; 14 June, 2015, p.6	• There are many farmers that are on their farms on paper when in actual fact they rarely set foot on their allocated land • Most of the farmers that are failing to fully utilise the land are cell phone farmers • There are cases of rural farmers who are always excelling each year yet such people were not given farms or even farming implements	1. Farmers are not committed to produce in their pieces of land
The Chronicle; 11 July, 2016, p.1	• The percentage of farmers fully resident on their land is small. some farmers got land but are out of the country • There should be reintroduction of the farm mechanization programme to assist both A1 and A2 farmers who do not have farming implements • The government ministers and others who were in the habit of either sub-leasing land, renting it out or holding onto the farms for prestige and using them for weekend retreats would lose them to others on the	1. Land is not fully utilised 2. Farmers have no farming implements 3. Government not supportive to farmers

	waiting list	
The Chronicle; 7 July, 2014, p.7	• While resettled farmers struggle to obtain loans from bank, in the past, commercial farmers would simply walk into banks and obtain loans using their land titles as security • If government could make agriculture self-financing, it would considerably boost farm produce while relieving Treasury the burden of having to finance farmers each season.	1. Farmers lack financial resources 2. No material resources for farmers
The Herald; 10 June, 2016, p.8	• The government has unearthed serious irregularities in the allocation of farms. The land reform policy is that, the government does not give land to a person who is less than 21 years, but there are people with 10 years, 12 years owning land and that could explain why some farms are vacant • It has also been noted that the land reform programme was marred with double allocation of farms due to mix up of names as ministry was given wrong names of farms resulting in double allocation	1. Some farms not utilised because they are vacant 2. Violation of land reform policy results in vacant farms
The Chronicle; 27 June, 2014, p.1	• More than 300 000 farmers who benefited from land reform exercise would soon start paying annual rentals for their pieces of land. The move would see A1 farmers paying $15 per annum	1. Land is not given for free to farmers

APPENDIX 6

ARCHIVAL MATERIAL AND DOCUMENTS

PRIVATELY OWNED NEWS PAPERS

NEWS PAPER TYPE	TRANSCRIBED DATA	CODE/ THEMES
The Daily News; 15 July 2015, p.2	• Shortage of transport for Agricultural Extension Services workers is slowing down training programmes in Bubi district • The AGRITEX team in the district has only 3 vehicles but the team needs 2 more if they are to meet their targets before the onset of the rains	1. There is lack of extension services for farmers
The Standard; March 27-April 2, 2016, p.1	• The government has repossessed at least 1449 A1 farms country wide where no production was taking place as part of the renewed efforts to ensure that all land is productively used • After carrying out land audits last year it emerged that there were a lot of underutilised farms that could be allocated to landless people	1. There is low productivity in farms 2. Land is not adequately utilised
The Daily News; 16 April 2014, p.5	• Model A1 farmers are facing various challenges which interfere with farm productivity and farm utilisation • Financial support to farming operations is very limited from	1. Lack of financial resources for A1 farmers 2. Low productivity 3. Lack of extension

	financial institutions • Farmers faced various challenges from inadequate extension services to poor infrastructure • The government is however, said to be working on 3 to years rolling financing plan for farmers that will do away with adhoc preparations, which have resulted in the late disbursement of inputs	services for A1 farms
The Standard; June 14-June 21, 2016, p.10	• Farming is a business and the sooner the government treats it as such the better for the country, which should regain its status as the bread basket of the region	1. Lack of financial support from government 2. Lack of material support from government
The Daily News; 11 July 2016, p.4	• The provincial governors bemoaned lack of productivity, especially on A1 farms saying lack of State financial and material support incapacitated beneficiaries	1. Lack of financial support 2. Low produce in A1 farms
The Standard; June 29-July5, 2016, p.3	• The Ministry of Lands and Rural Resettlement is failing to carry out its mandate of farm inspections due to serious financial constraints amid revelations that it owes $6.3 million to private surveyors • The Ministry was supposed carry two inspections on every farm	1. Lack of intervention strategies from government 2. Shortage of personnel for administration purposes

	annually but was failing to carry out even a single one. • They are also supposed to do title surveys but the department has no equipment and personnel to do so since government froze recruitments in the civil service	3. lack of both finance and material support
The Standard; July 10-July 15, 2015, p.4	• Land and Rural Resettlement Ministry said that they have cases of people who have been allocated land but have abandoned it. • While the ministry acknowledge that as a government they have failed to fully support the farmers and financial institutions are not keen to lend money to farmers, the government does not condone unproductivity in farms	1. Poor production in farms 2. lack of financial support for A1 farmers
The Daily News; 28 February 2015, p.10	• The High Court ruled that the beneficiaries of the land reform programme who are underutilising their land should have their offer letters withdrawn to pave way for more deserving farmers • The High Court further alluded that the government policy on land reform is not recreational, neither is it designed to accord beneficiaries some pastime. It is meant to benefit	1. Underutilisation of Farms

	those willing and able to utilise land	
The Daily News; 01 July 2016, p.5	• The farmers might have the required zeal and commitment to produce, but as long as they are not capacitated, not much can be expected from them • The white commercial farmers had specific banks that advanced loans for working capital as well as funded the purchase of their farming machinery and equipment and the government of the day was the guarantor	1. Lack of farmer capacitation 2. lack of financial resources for A1 farms 3. lack of farming implements for A1 farms
The Daily News; 10 August 2016, p.1	• Some beneficiaries of the land reform programme owe up to $60 000 each in land rentals that were introduced by the government last year, after payments were backdated to 2009, a situation that has made farmers to call for urgent policy review • A1 farmers pay $10 land rentals per year and $5 unit tax over the same period • There is confusion as to when exactly farmers were expected to pay as there were different dates in	1. Land tax is cripples farmers' performances 2. lack of financial resources 3. Land reform policy mismanagement

	police pronouncements • One policy pronouncement indicated that farmers will pay land rentals and development levies from January 2015, and other one said with effect from July 2015 • When implementing the policy, officials from the Ministry of Lands and Rural Resettlement backdated payments to 2009	

APPENDIX 7

ZIMBABWE AGENDA FOR SOCIO-ECONOMIC TRANSFORMATION (ZIM-ASSET) POLICY DOCUMENT - (2013- 2018)

IMPLEMENTATION OF KEY SUCCESS FACTORS FOR LAND REFORM POLICIES

KEY SUCCESS FACTORS, p.31- 32	POLICY IMPLEMENTATION IN A1 FARMS	NO POLICY IMPLEMENTATION IN A1 FARMS	CODE/ THEMES
i. Political commitment and leadership from the highest level		✓	1. Lack of political will and leadership
ii. Strong collaborative partnerships among agencies, the private sector, citizens, and other stakeholders		✓	1. No collaborative partnerships in A1 farms 2. Private sector not participating in A1 farms
iii. Human capital development programmes to enhance the acquisition of requisite skills	✓		1. Farmers are trained
iv. Creation of special funding vehicles such as		✓	1. Lack of funding for A1 farms 2. Government is

	acceleration of the implementation of public/private partnerships (PPPs)			participating alone in A1 farms
v.	Rehabilitation, upgrading and development of key infrastructure and utilities comprising power generation, roads and water		✓	1. No infrastructural developments in A1 farms 2. No irrigation projects for A1 farms
vi.	Continued use of multi- currency regime to consolidate macroeconomic stabilization	✓		1. Dollarized economy
vii.	Scientific research and development	✓		1. Use of conservation methods of farming

APPENDIX 8

ZIM-ASSET POLICY DOCUMENT - (2013- 2018)

IMPLEMENTATION OF KEY STRATEGIES FOR LAND REFORM POLICIES ON MODEL A1 FARMS

KEY STRATEGIES, p.33- 38	POLICY IMPLEMENTATION IN A1 FARMS	NO POLICY IMPLEMENTATION IN A1 FARMS	CODE/ THEMES
i. Investing on sustainable and robust solutions in order to address the challenges of food insecurity		✓	1. A1 farms are faced with a lot of challenges from finance to material resources
ii. To ensure food and nutrition security, government will establish financial support for agriculture so that farmers will increase production		✓	I. There is no financial support for A1 farmers
iii. Provide smallholder farmers with subsidised	✓		1. Seeds and fertilizers are given for free by government

	agricultural inputs			2. A1 farmers buy subsidised inputs from GMB
iv.	Institute measures for all the beneficiaries of land reform programme to dedicate a certain quota to cereal crops and small grains production		✓	1. No sequence pattern is followed by A1 farms
v.	To stimulate agricultural productivity and safeguard food security; the government will recapitalize and capacitate the Agricultural Rural Development Authority (ARDA): a. This will ensure that farmers timeously access affordable inputs b. Improved agricultural		✓	1. Farmers often get inputs late 2. No irrigation project facilities in A1 farms

infrastructure to mitigate against drought through rehabilitation and expansion of irrigation projects and increased construction of dams			