

The Role of Community Share Ownership Trusts in Ensuring Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: The Case of Zimunya-Marange in Zimbabwe

CHIKOSI Vimbai Georgina^{[a],*}; KUREBWA Jeffrey^[a]

^[a]Department of Peace and Governance, Bindura University of Science Education, Zimbabwe.

*Corresponding author.

Received 16 October 2018; accepted 25 December 2018
Published online 26 January 2019

Abstract

This study analysed the role of Community Share Ownership Trusts (CSOTs) in ensuring sustainable rural livelihoods in the Zimunya-Marange community of Manicaland Province in Zimbabwe. Qualitative research methodology was used while a case study design was utilised. Data was collected through key informant interviews, Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and documentary search. The research found out that no projects had been embarked on by Zimunya-Marange CSOT since its official launch in July 2011. This was due to various reasons which included corruption, kinship challenges, lack of finances, lack of community involvement in project identification, top-down and paternalistic implementation of policies and political interferences. It also emerged from the study that full utilisation of CSOTs in the Zimunya-Marange community remains an uphill task with no projects being embarked on. The research concluded that there is need to involve communities in project identification as this will bring sustainable rural livelihoods.

Key words: Community share ownership trusts; Indigenisation; Rural communities; Economic empowerment; Community development; Sustainable rural development

Chikosi, V. G., & Kurebwa, J. (2019). The Role of Community Share Ownership Trusts in Ensuring Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: The Case of Zimunya-Marange in Zimbabwe. *Canadian Social Science*, 15(1), 36-46. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/css/article/view/10819>
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/10819>

1. INTRODUCTION

Several developed and developing countries have been pushing for the establishment of CSOTs. This has been driven by the desire to enhance financial participation by employees and local communities. Countries such as the United States of America (USA), Canada, Norway, New Zealand and Australia are some of the developed countries which have aggressively pushed for CSOTs in the mining sectors as part of economic development (Gibon, Chachange and Ericson, 2012, p.47; Musarurwa, 2012, p.29). Some countries in Africa such as Botswana, South Africa, Tanzania, and Zimbabwe have adopted CSOTs with the major objective of redistributing economic resources through broad-based ownership and participation of local communities (Martin and Taylor, 2012, p.13; Pedro, 2015, p.12). In most mining projects in Africa there have been promises of development by the mining companies in the form of job creation, infrastructure developments such as roads and improved service delivery. However, the communities surrounding mining areas have witnessed a deterioration of standards of living with negative relationships between resource abundance and development. As noted by Matyszak (2012, p.56), many mining communities in African countries have continued to live in abject poverty despite the abundance of mineral wealth.

In Zimbabwe, the boom in the mining sector after 2009 coincided with worsening inequalities as evidenced by rising poverty, pollution and direct violence in the mining communities. As noted by Mabhena and Moyo (2014, p.34), the majority of Zimbabwean people have not fully benefitted from the exploitation of natural mineral resources since independence. Mawowa (2014, p.49) argues that the developmental and wealth sharing initiatives' failure in Zimbabwe's rural communities can be attributed to the 'top-down' developmental approaches which were adopted by the government. These models distanced the benefits-sharing from the needs of the

people. This explains why conventional wealth sharing models adopted in southern Africa between mining companies and their surrounding communities have dismally failed to act as accurate vehicles for rural transformation (Martin, 2015, p.105; Mwase and Mangisi, 2013, p.44). The poorly designed top-down developmental approaches have resulted in communities not benefitting from the exploitation of minerals within their locale. According to Kanyenze, Kondo, Chitambara & Martens (2011, p.64), the Marange area has been essentially inhabited by poor people farming on poor, exhausted soils and most areas hardly accessible due to poor roads. In this regard, the government initiated the Zimunya-Marange CSOT with the objective of providing opportunities for the locals to enjoy the proceeds of the mining operations in their areas.

The CSOT's initiative is provided for under Section 14(b) of Statutory Instrument 21 of (2010). Maodza (2012, p.1) states that CSOTs have been used as a tool to harness mineral resources for social and economic empowerment in Zimbabwe in general and Zimunya-Marange area in particular. Under the CSOT initiative, companies operating in the area cede a 10% stake to the community and the money generated from the shareholding is then used to fund development projects such as building clinics, schools, roads and bridges (Maodza, 2012, p.3; Musarurwa, 2012, p.16). CSOTs in Zimbabwe have been used as vehicles for broad-based community social and economic empowerment and harnessing mineral resources for social and economic empowerment. The main objectives of these Trusts are to see communities fully benefiting from the natural resources extracted from their areas through provision of social amenities such as schools, hospitals, health care services; development projects such as building of dams, drilling of boreholes and construction of roads as well as establishment of income generating projects for communities (Tsvakanyi, 2012, p.66). The purpose of this study is to determine the role of CSOTs in ensuring sustainable rural livelihoods with particular reference to Zimunya-Marange community in Manicaland Province of Zimbabwe.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In an attempt to evaluate the role of community share ownership trusts in ensuring sustainable rural livelihoods, the study will focus on two normative theories as debated by different scholars and practitioners. The theories discussed in this section will include the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (SLA) and Stakeholder Theory.

2.1 The Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (SLA)

The SLA has been used by development practitioners and researchers since the late 1990s. The theory puts the

livelihoods of poor people at the centre of development (Kollmair & Gamper, 2012, p.6). The theory seeks to draw on main factors that affect poor people's livelihoods and the typical relationships between these factors. People rather than the resources they use or the governments that serve them are the priority concern. The theory serves as an analytical tool for identifying development priorities and new activities prior to any development initiative. In particular, the SLA places the main focus on the poor people themselves by involving them in all the planning processes and by respecting their opinions. Furthermore, the SLA can be applied in the form of a livelihood analysis to assess how development activities 'fit' in the livelihoods of the poor (Kollmair et al., 2006, p.14).

The SLA places rural poor people at the centre of a web of inter-related influences that affect how they create a livelihood for themselves and households (Green & Olio, 2014, p.102). According to the SLA, poor people themselves define their strength, potential and goals through adopting a holistic view to encompass all the aspects of poor people's livelihoods (De Stag , Holloway, Mullins, Nchabaleng & Ward, 2012, p.13). The theory also focuses explicitly on short and long-term changes and allows pointing out the various processes that permanently influence one another. By directly linking problem causes, for example political programmes at a government level, with their effects on individuals, the SLA tries to connect the macro and micro level (Carney, Drinkwater & Singh, 2014, p.63). Therefore, the SLA provides a clear and practical perspective on how to reduce poverty. It has generated a good way of integrating the four pillars of development (economic, social, institutional and environmental). These resources and livelihood assets are at the centre of the framework and also include natural resources, technologies, skills, knowledge and capacity, health, access to education, sources of credit or networks of social support (Bryceson & Mwaipopo, 2011, p.78). In the case of mining companies, the SLA seeks to identify the main constraints and opportunities which are faced by poor rural dwellers. In particular, it seeks to support poor people through local capacity empowerment. According to Bryan & Hofmann (2013, p.69), rural people have the capacity to take advantage of capacity empowerment avenues such as building local capability, promoting social capital and social entrepreneurial promotion in order to enhance their livelihoods. The theory is therefore people-centred as it seeks to analyse their livelihoods and how they change over time.

2.2 Stakeholder Theory

The stakeholder theory was first propounded by Freeman (1984, p.8). It has become very relevant in the mainstream management literature. According to Freeman (1984, p.7), stakeholders can be described as any group which is affected or can be affected by the achievement of an organisations' objectives. Further studies by He &

Li, 2011, p.79; Mitchell, Agle & Wood, 1997, p.42; & Obusubiri, 2010, p.19, further developed the theory in a descriptive way. The concept of stakeholder includes shareowners, employees, customers, suppliers, lenders and society (Lepineux, 2008, p.11). These stakeholders are linked to an organisation in many different ways while some linkages will be more important than others. The Stakeholder Theory is used as a strategic management method based on ethical principles to fulfil stakeholder expectations and avoid possible pressures from the stakeholder in order to create a better society. It therefore posits that in order to encourage the stakeholders to be committed to the organisation, there is need to address their expectations. From Friedman's (1984) perspective, the one and only social responsibility of business is to use its resources and engage in activities designed to increase profits and the wealth of its owners. According to Post et al. (2002, p.9), an organisation's capacity that generates sustainable wealth over time and its long-term value are determined by the relationship with both internal and external stakeholders. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) contributes to enhancing organisational value. This becomes an appropriate corporate strategy as the stakeholder theory suggests.

In the case of mining companies, CSR is focused towards all stakeholders and the environmental footprint would be obstructed if such a company fails to meet the needs of its major stakeholders. From the point of view of organisations, stakeholders are limited to parties that are directly influencing its inputs and outputs such as employees, investors, suppliers and customers (Hu, Kandampully & Juwaheer, 2009, p.8). As such, organisations are obliged to report their financial information which is associated with these parties. Freeman (1984, p.7) argued that not only the owners of an organization have a genuine concern about it, but also groups of persons that might be affected by its operations. As argued by Chiou & Droge (2011, p.56), stakeholder groups have a right not to be treated as a means to some end. In support of this notion, Malmelin & Hakala (2009, p.3), argued that the main goal of any organisation should be the flourishing of business as well as its main stakeholders. Lichtenstein, Drumwright & Braig (2014, p.33) also agreed that the main features of CSR are to serve all parties involved. Accordingly, the need to disclose organisational information for public organisations has emerged as one of CSR management tools. More significantly, the stakeholder theory is based on the view that there are numerous agents with an interest in the actions and decisions of companies (Carvalho, Sen, Mota & de Lima, 2010, p.32; Swaen & Chumpitaz, 2010, p.19). For the purposes of this study shared value calls for the communities near mining operations to the sharing of mining benefits. This means that mining companies work with these communities to ensure extraction of minerals. This becomes a catalyst for sustainable economic

empowerment that can lead to improved services in the local communities and beyond (Porter and Kramer 2011, p.62).

2.3 The Concept of CSR and Community Development

CSR is one of the most important policy initiatives advocated by mining companies. It is aimed at contributing to the wider development objectives. CSR entails consultative interactions with the local communities involved in the projects to be implemented. This is to ensure active participation of the communities (Porter & Kramer, 2011, p.62). Generally, mining operations invoke prospects for better living to host communities. This is commonly championed through CSR practices. The fact that CSR goes beyond a company's legal obligations means that community development pursued under CSR is often regarded as philanthropic. However, Martin & Taylor (2012, p.47) noted that in most cases the consultative process is non-existent and not guaranteed as mining companies will be in charge of their own development programmes. This is corroborated by O'Connell & Lindsay (2011, p.48) who argued that CSR policies by mining companies usually exclude marginalised groups such as the poor and women. Consequently, this tends to compromise effective participation of these people. Development programmes are therefore deemed to fail due to limited participation of the communities involved and in turn living conditions of the poor are not improved. As noted by Gibon, Chachange & Ericson (2012, p.53), most development initiatives under CSR have a short life span due to minimal local participation. In this regard, if CSOTs are effectively managed, they have the potential to foster community development and community participation as the foundation and underlying principle for rural development.

Of importance to note is that mining in Africa should centre on empowering local communities in the mining regions to achieve sustainable development (Pedro, 2005, p.12). One of the reasons for this is that growth in Africa is commodity based, as African governments are increasingly focusing on the extractive and agricultural sectors as key drivers of their economic development. Wise & Shtylla (2007, p.14) indicated that inclusive business models such as those by British Petroleum in Trinidad and Tobago have been building local supply chains and complex capabilities. In Nigeria, a scheme was introduced by the government as a way of building good relations between the oil and gas companies (Oguntadeet, 2011, p.9). Through the scheme, community participation and community-based initiatives were encouraged. According to Oguntadeet (2011, p.9), the Niger Delta received 2.05 Billion Naira from the oil and gas companies for community development, health service delivery, education and religious bodies.

Hasefeld (2011, p.67) argued that most oil companies frequently abuse the concept of CSR because of their superior economic power. In most cases these companies pass non-existent or incomplete or abandoned community development projects as a way of presenting good image of themselves to state authorities. According to Gibon, Chachange & Ericson (2012, p.86) the subtle exclusion of mining communities from actively participating in the development processes of their communities under CSR has often resulted in failure to address issues pertinent to community needs since some of these projects are done just to present good image to the corporate world. Moreover, Matyszak (2012, p.36) also contends that processes of community development pursued under CSR are often imposed on local communities with no significant community participation. Such development initiatives therefore are not context-specific because of the minimum levels of participation of local communities. It is not surprising that these CSR programmes ultimately fail to transform the living conditions of the rural poor in mining communities. As a result, mineral resource extraction has been failing to produce the perceived socio-economic benefits such as clean water, improved housing, health and greater employment opportunities, which are some of the main socio-economic challenges persistently encountered by resource-rich communities (Mabhena & Moyo, 2014, p.60). Due to lack of full participation of local communities, development under CSR has dismally failed to last beyond the life span of the mines. As an alternative, Perrini & Vurro, 2010, p.85; & Tshuma, 2016, p.24, argued that mining companies should conceive development initiatives that hinge on the participation of community members to stimulate development that is context specific and people-driven. Local community participation at all levels of community development helps to articulate genuine needs and formulate measures that can be taken to meet those needs. Furthermore, Mandla (2006,p.73), noted that in order for participation to realise the creative energies of the local people in problem identification and problem solving, it must be much more than just the mobilisation of labour or the convening of meetings where the poor are told about pre-determined plans. Local capacity building should work with poor and marginalised people and identify capacity needed for self-reliance and enhanced skills for rural livelihoods.

2.4 Public Participation in CSOTs

It should be noted that mining requires large tracts of land and this usually has profound implications for local communities farming this land. As noted by Perrini & Vurro (2010, p.52) many African economies are agriculture-based and most smallholder farmers produce about 80% of food consumed within rural households. As such, land is critical for the survival of communal areas. Communities however, have been losing access to land previously used for agriculture and that has

impacted negatively on food security and income. Worse still, the effects of environmental damage has also been undermining their capacity to provide adequate food and clean water as they may have to walk longer distances to access water, fuel/wood, forest products and land to plant food crops (Martin, 2015, p.14; Pedro, 2015, p.50). Despite the fact that they benefit the least, communities rarely participate in decisions made about mining investments. According to Saunders (2007, p.62), exclusion of host communities from crucial decisions which affect their land and livelihoods frequently lead to conflicts with companies around the social, economic and environmental costs of mining. In the same vein, Musarurwa (2012, p.19) argued that this contravenes Resolution 224 of the African Commission on Human and People's Rights which calls on all governments to take necessary measures that ensure participation and informed consent of communities in decision-making related to natural resources governance.

From a social justice point of view, mineral resource extraction should be a stimulant to socio-economic transformation of host communities. Ironically, Martin (2015, p.29), noted that most mining operations are located in communities with low levels of socio-economic development. As such, there has been growing concerns over the adverse effects of resource extraction activities on the livelihoods of local communities. In Latin America, when mining operations were established, there were no formal relationships between companies and the local communities (Hagen, 2012, p.86).

Concerns have also been raised about the weak and ineffective communication between central and local government and communities with regard to mining policy. The absence of strong and effective communication between central and local government and communities expose community empowerment programmes through community ownership trusts to political manipulation by local elites (Mate, 2012, p.89). This is described by Makore & Zano (2014, p.52), as elite capture. This involves manipulating the decision-making process so as to usurp the benefits intended for the less privileged in society. In this regard, Kanyenze, Kondo, Chitambara & Martens (2011, p.30), contend that the politicised nature of indigenisation programmes makes them susceptible to manipulation and abuse by political and local elites. Moreover, most cases of participation have been too often limited to village meetings where the project is explained and few people are asked to give comments or suggestions in a language unintelligible to the majority (Madebwe & Madebwe, 2015, p.70). On a similar note, Martin & Taylor (2012, p.73) argues that these meetings are only transitory and short-lived as they lack permanent structures for group action generated in beneficiary communities. Therefore, this form of participation disempowers mostly the poor people in local communities.

Furthermore, the implementation of the CSOTs is top-down, paternalistic and there is no sense of ownership of the Trust among community residents. According to Mawowa (2013, p.32), the sense of exclusion emanates from the way the Trusts have been formed and structured. In most cases, communities question why governments do not provide for community involvement of pre-existing community organisations in an area. McKenzie (2012, p.43), argues that in most parts of Southern Africa, mining has become a source of conflict, reflecting the often irreconcilable claims of different groups for control over wealth. As such, it is of profound importance to strengthen the people's capacity to engage in development through CSOTs (Andreasson, 2008, p.6). Kariuki (2010, p.18), also contends that the raw material for community building empowerment is to consider local people as partners in the development discourse. This is because community empowerment and development require systematic and participatory capacity assessment which translates to improved rural livelihoods. Kariuki (2010, p.23) indicated that participation not only enables communities to have greater capacity to work together to solve problems but also enhance rural livelihoods. It also builds confidence and solidarity among rural dwellers since it responds to local needs and changing circumstances. As a community empowerment process, participation presupposes the building up of influence or involvement from the bottom up (Sawyer & Gomez, 2012, p33). Sirolli (2009) and Stiglitz (2012), suggest that local capacity empowerment should encompass capacity building and start at individual level. Individual level capacity includes skills, knowledge, consciousness and awareness, hope, action, and beliefs that affect changes in wider social structures and processes that result in increased rural resources, livelihoods and opportunities.

2.5 Challenges Faced by Communities in Participating in CSOTs

Understanding different livelihood objectives of rural households and managing different assets are very important. Rural livelihoods focus on agriculture and small farming systems but the need for farm household diversification into non-farm activities is seen as crucial too. This is so because the breakdown of traditional coping strategies has rendered many people vulnerable to crisis associated with their incorporation into the market economy (Elliot, 2006). The starting point in CSOTs is to give local people more resources and authority to use these flexibly. This process cannot depend forever on emergency funds but must be embedded in a permanent institutional structure. However, top-down plans by mining companies have been less successful. Studies by Lund & Treue (2008) revealed that a lack of empowering approaches have left a legacy of people and communities feeling disillusioned, cynical, apathetic, disinterested, angry, confrontational and never consulted. The other key

challenges facing CSOTs has been the failure by financial institutions to embrace the programme and finance the requirements of local investors. Without a transformed banking and financial services sector, the plan to shift the levers of economic power in favour of indigenous people has remained an illusion. Furthermore, other key challenges with regards CSOTs initiatives have been liquidating the gains made through major transactions like deals. The majority of communal areas have been crying in vain for immediate tangible benefits from mega transactions made by mining companies (Andres Mejia, 2011, p.66; Sitando, 2012, p.73).

There is also lack of adequate legal backing for CSOT as there are no legal requirements for mining companies to dispose shares to communities. For instance, in Zimbabwe CSOTs were established at the sole discretion of the Minister of Youth Development, Indigenisation and Empowerment (Mukwakwami, 2013, p.70). Consequently, some mining companies instead of selling shares, have been surrendering, thus creating confusion as to what government means when it pronounces that companies are complying (Katsaura, 2010; Mtisi et al 2011). Indeed, the top-down and paternalistic implementation of policies has been criticised by the selected Board of Trustees complaining of having no sense of ownership as the Minister has sweeping powers over the establishment and management of the CSOTs. In addition, there has been lack of adequate community representation as structures of the CSOTs are largely dominated by adult males, further marginalising women, youth and the disabled (Davis & Franks, 2014, p.55). It is becoming evident among policy-makers that incorporating the participation of local communities in decisions concerning their lives as well as in resource utilisation will lead to greater protection and empowerment of indigenous communities, thus achieving greater social justice (Sawyer & Gomez, 2012).

A number of mining companies have operated as an enclave sector with minimal development impact on poor host communities. CSOTs were created to ensure that affected communities benefit. Since most Trustees on the CSOT are appointed by the Government, not elected, there has been little accountability from the Trust to the community, leading to a high level of dissatisfaction among community members. As noted by Maodza (2012, p.67), information relating to finance is rarely shared and community members do not know how the funds are being used. In this regard, there has been lack of a participatory, democratic and engagement process. In addition, studies in South Africa by Manson (2013, p.112), have shown that there has been minimal community involvement in all areas of service delivery from policy, planning, implementation, to monitoring and evaluation of CSOT activities. In corroboration, Robertson (2012, p.64) indicated that community members are not consulted or properly informed of the Trust's functions and operations, and rarely received any feedback on projects. It appears

that since local people do not participate in the CSOT, their specific needs would not be taken into account. The adverse effects communities experience as a result of mining seem to outweigh the benefits and these include environmental degradation, water and air pollution, loss of pastures and other assets and social changes, among others (Makwiramiti, 2011; Sirolli, 2009). Studies by Sawyer & Gomez (2012, p.42) in Ghana revealed that communities living around mines faced livelihood challenges like unemployment, increasing poverty, shortages of money to educate children, a lack of income to start projects targeting women and water shortages.

2.6 Indigenisation Policies and Community Development in African Countries

Indigenisation policies, especially in Southern African countries are meant to both correct colonial injustices and seeks to empower marginalised communities. The essence of indigenisation policies lies in expanding economic growth to the majority as well as making economic growth which is premised on inclusion (Muzoroza, 2010, p.13). In this way, indigenisation programmes are meant to benefit from economic transformation and empowerment for the previously disadvantaged people through interventions rooted in addressing ownership and control skewness (Machinya, 2014, p.24). Article 21 of The African Charter on Human and People's Rights also provides that all people should be able to dispose of their wealth and natural resources freely with no one being deprived. Furthermore, Article 2 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights also indicates that all citizens within a country must benefit from a state using its natural resources to guarantee socio-economic rights. As such, most indigenisation policies have been meant to fuel the development of previously underdeveloped areas.

In Zimbabwe, the Indigenisation and Economic Empowerment Act (Chapter 14, p.33) of 2007, was enacted in order to involve indigenous Zimbabweans in economic activities of the country where they had no access (Chowa, 2013; Kurebwa, 2014). The Indigenisation and Economic Empowerment Act also mandates the Zimbabwe government to take legislative measures to indigenise its economy and to provide support for the economic empowerment of indigenous Zimbabweans and set the 51% indigenous quota as minimum. The policy also demanded that every existing foreign-owned business with an asset value of or above US\$500,000 should cede or dispose of a controlling stake of not less than 51 per cent of the shares to indigenous Zimbabweans (Machinya, 2014, p.6). The 51% is then divided among four groups of indigenous Zimbabweans, namely ordinary citizens, the government, communities and employees. Indigenous individuals were eligible for 15% of the shares. The government, through the National Indigenisation and Economic Empowerment Fund

(NIEEF), would get 16% of the shares. The remaining 10% was controlled by members of the relevant firm's workforce through Employee Share Ownership Trusts (ESOTs). As noted by the National Indigenisation and Economic Empowerment Board (NIEEB) the programme was indeed noble, it gave Zimbabweans from all walks of life the opportunity to participate in socio-economic transformation (Mabhena & Moyo, 2014, p.62). According to Zhou & Zvoushe (2012, p.11), the indigenisation drive in Zimbabwe sought to deliver critical infrastructure such as the construction of roads, dams, or public buildings, social and economic equality, prevent exploitation and large-scale labour layoffs, control monopolies and keep the means of generating wealth in public control. To buttress this, Section 14 of Chapter 4 of the Constitution of Zimbabwe also provides that all institutions and agencies of government at every level must endeavour to facilitate and take measures to empower, through appropriate, transparent, fair and just affirmative action, all marginalised persons, groups and communities in Zimbabwe (Constitution of Zimbabwe, 2013). Therefore the Constitution of Zimbabwe provides for socio-economic rights that had been missing in the old Lancaster House Constitution (1979). For instance it provides specifically for the right to education, health-care, shelter, among others, using the country's available natural resources.

In South Africa, the government sought to reverse racial imbalances through the Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) policy. It is this BEE policy that led to the establishment of different Community Trusts in South Africa among them being the Impala Bafokeng Trust funded by Anglo American and Implats mining companies with the view of supporting the empowerment of the black majority communities. According to Beer and Swanepoel (2006, p.64), the Bafokeng Trust has been playing a pivotal role in South African communities through promoting education and health systems and facilitating capacity building among communities. South African communities have also benefited through the establishment of the Zimele Trust whereby infrastructural development such as road networks, health and educational facilities were developed to higher standards (African Development Bank Group, 2013, p.5). The Zimele Trust also promoted inclusive business models that integrated local Small to Medium Enterprises (SMEs) into their value chain, thereby fostering local entrepreneurs (IBT Annual Report, 2011, p.5).

In Tanzania, De Beers has partnered with government, communities and development organisations to establish the Mwadini Community Diamond Partnership (Wise & Shtylla, 2007, p.12). The aim of the initiative had been to produce viable and potentially transferable model for improving qualities of life in mining-based rural populations and exploring alternative livelihoods projects. All these indigenisation policies can be seen as tools for

fighting neo-imperialism since it gives a large share of economic power to the local people. At the same time, ownership of the country's natural resources becomes 'democratised' as more people contribute to developing the country's economy and improving livelihoods hands-on (Chowa, 2013, p.5). Moreover, the policy also inspires a steady increase in aggregate demand for locally produced commodities.

3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Qualitative research methodology was used in the study. A case study of Zimunya-Marange CSOT was utilised since it allowed key social processes to be examined. Yin (2014, p.12) describes a case study design as a distinctive means of empirical enquiry particularly suitable for exploring the how and why of contemporary phenomena within a real-life context. Primary data was gathered through key informant interviews and three FGDs with members of the community while documentary search was used to analyse key documents. The key participants for the study 3 Board of Trustees' members, one chief from Marange, the District Administrator for Mutare, one headman from Mukwada village.

4. DISCUSSION

The section presents responses relating to the objectives of Zimunya -Marange CSOTs programmes, the main role players in the Zimunya- Marange CSOT, involvement of members as a stakeholders in the CSOTs programmes and the extent to which sustainable rural development programmes have been implemented through the CSOTs.

4.1 Involvement of Community Members as Stakeholders in CSOTs

The study participants were asked about their involvement as stakeholders in the CSOTs programmes. During the FGDs, one unemployed member of the community indicated that:

"We don't even know what the CSOTs is all about. What we only know is that people were relocated due to the mining of diamonds and we are not happy at all."

The above sentiments were also echoed by a woman from the group who mentioned that:

"Maybe the chiefs and headmen have the knowledge. We ordinary people rarely know what's going on. May be it's a programme for the rich."

A board member of the CSOT however, stated otherwise:

"We make sure that everyone is involved in the activities of the CSOT. The chiefs, headmen, councillors and management from the mines play a part in the development of the Zimunya Marange".

From the FGDs, it can be argued that the local

communities have been rarely participating in decisions made about CSOT as they professed ignorance. According to Saunders (2007,p.62), exclusion of host communities from crucial decisions which affect their land and livelihoods frequently leads to conflicts with companies around social, economic and environmental costs of mining. As such, there has been growing concerns over the adverse effects of resource extraction activities on the livelihoods of these local communities. The findings also show concerns about the weak communication between the CSOT and communities with regard to development. The absence of effective communication exposes community empowerment programmes through CSOTs to manipulation by local elites (Mate, 2012, p.89). This is described by Makore & Zano (2014, p.52) as elite capture and this involves manipulating the decision making process so as to usurp the benefits intended for the less privileged in society. Moreover, most cases of participation have been limited to village meetings where the project is explained and few people are asked to give comments or suggestions in a language unintelligible to the majority (Madebwe & Madebwe, 2015, p.70). On a similar note, Martin & Taylor (2012, p.73) argued that these meetings are only transitory and short-lived as they lack permanent structures for group action generated in beneficiary communities. Therefore, this lack of participation disempowers mostly the poor people in local communities.

4.2 The Major Objectives of the Zimunya-Marange CSOT

From the interviews with board members of Zimunya-Marange CSOT and the local chief, it was indicated that the major objectives of the CSOT include creating jobs, rural development of bridges, roads, schools, clinics, dip-tanks. The Zimunya- Marange CSOT was premised to improve the lives of the local community. The local chief mentioned that:

"This CSOT is meant to improve the welfare of everyone living near the diamonds fields through self-subsistence, solar electrification, water rehabilitation, borehole drilling, recreational and infrastructure development and educational scholarships. Most Board members are very corrupt, there is no development at all and there is also lack of transparency and accountability."

In addition to the above, another board member from one of the mining companies stated that the objective of the CSOT was to spearhead developmental projects in the community as well as ploughing back to the community for development.

From the interviews held with the stakeholders, it can be argued that the main objective of CSOTs is to spearhead developmental projects, employment creation as well as giving back to the community. Martin & Taylor (2012) further indicated that mining has a huge potential to either contribute significantly to poverty reduction

and social and economic empowerment. Therefore the Zimunya-Marange CSOT was arguably set to ensure that mineral wealth is used for broad development purposes that improve the lives of citizens. The findings revealed that the main objectives of the Trust were not being considered as shown by lack of job creation and non-developmental of projects for rural sustainability. Lack of transparency and accountability also contributed significantly to non-attainment of these objectives.

4.3 Implementation of Sustainable Rural Development Through the CSOT

The study participants were asked on the extent to which sustainable rural development programmes have been implemented through the CSOT. From the FGDs, negative sentiments were raised. One member of the group mentioned that:

“Our main road to Mutare is in a sorry state, schools, roads and bridges are not maintained and our clinic is dilapidated and not functioning. Our largest local clinic which was built in 1940 is deteriorating day by day with no repairs to the infrastructure. Equipment is out-dated and dilapidated. There is no mortuary nor drugs despite the abundance of minerals. Am hurt for sure.”

The above views were also supported by an unemployed youth who mentioned that:

“We are not seeing any development they talk about. There is no transparency and accountability. Some of these board members are corrupt, locals are not employed by these companies. Why is the case when we are the owners of these minerals?”

Another member of the FGD also supported the above sentiments by mentioning that:

“There is nothing like sustainable development here. We have been victims of dust, noise from the mines. We face constant harassment from the mine security. Our children walk as far as 20 km to and from schools daily. There is no more Early Childhood Development Center (ECDC) for our children.”

A member of the Board of Trustees however, mentioned that:

“We are in the process seeking to upgrade Marange Clinic to be a referral hospital in Mutare west constituency. We have also received \$5 million from the government which we want to disburse to the 36 wards in Zimunya- Marange community for development projects.”

From the findings, the top-down and paternalistic implementation of policies was criticised by the locals who complained that they had no sense of ownership of the Trust. In addition, there is no adequate community representation. It is becoming evident that policy-makers should incorporate the participation of local communities in decisions concerning their lives as well as in resource utilisation will lead to greater protection and empowerment of indigenous communities, thus achieving greater social justice (Sawyer & Gomez, 2012). Community members are not consulted or properly informed of the Trust’s functions and operations, and rarely received any feedback on project implementation.

Since local people are not participating in the CSOT, their specific needs are not being addressed. The adverse effects of the mining activities seem to outweigh the benefits to the community.

4.4 Contribution of the Zimunya-Marange CSOT to Sustainable Rural Development

The study also sought to evaluate the contribution of the Zimunya- Marange CSOT to sustainable rural development. A female respondent from one of the FGDs pointed out the following:

“We do not have jobs and yet we are educated and degreed. They do prioritise not taking local people for jobs including those which do not require any qualifications even like making a cup of tea. I am so much devastated.”

Another participant echoed the following sentiments:

“There is poor road network, no district hospital, and some projects have since been abandoned such as the Matiza and Matanga clinics. They only say there are no resources”.

A key informant from one of the former mining companies indicated that:

“We are making efforts to have locals prioritised when the mining companies are making recruitments. We have made a database for all people to be employed from each village. We would have expected to have a diamond polishing industry in Mutare that will help in creation of employment”.

From the findings, it can be argued that Zimunya-Marange CSOT seeks to deliver critical infrastructure such as the construction of roads, dams, or public buildings, social and economic equality, prevent exploitation and large-scale labour layoffs, and control monopolies and keep the means of generating wealth in public control. To buttress this, Section 14 of Chapter 4 of the Constitution of Zimbabwe also provides that all institutions and agencies of government at every level must endeavour to facilitate and take measures to empower, through appropriate, transparent, fair and just affirmative action, all marginalised persons, groups and communities in Zimbabwe (Constitution of Zimbabwe, 2013). The Constitution of Zimbabwe provides specifically for the right to education, healthcare, shelter, among others, using the country’s available natural resources. However, the main challenge has been to fully include the local communities in decision making activities.

4.5 Challenges Facing the Zimunya-Marange CSOT

From the FGDs and interviews held, a number of challenges facing the CSOT were raised. One female respondent mentioned that:

“We are not clear about the role of this CSOT to this community. It’s not serving any purpose to us as a community. We have some schools, shops and dip tanks which were destroyed due to mining activities and have not been replaced or repaired.”

Another female respondent supported the above

sentiments by indicating that:

“If the Zimunya- Marange CSOT cannot create jobs for our desperate children this will remain a challenge for us. Most of the employees are from other towns as far as Zvishavane. It’s just a game of politics.”

A male respondent pointed out the following:

“People were relocated to Arda Transau from Marange. People are not allowed to have many live stocks here. We don’t have electricity and we use water from Odzi River for domestic consumption.”

A member of the CSOT also noted the following challenge:

“The funding only comes from the mining companies but these companies had been facing operational challenges for the past four years”.

In line with the above, another participant from the mining companies stated the following:

“There have been challenges of weak coordination between relevant authorities, trustees, and mining companies to see through the successful implementation of the Trust fund. As mining companies, we suggest that our contributions towards CSOTs be spread over smaller payments rather than being paid at once. We are still in our infancy stages”.

The interviews with the Chief revealed that there was confusion on the operations of the CSOT. The Chief indicated that:

“There is so much confusion surrounding the Trust and very few meetings have been held since it was formed. The mining companies have not been invited to these meetings and few of them know the exact amount to be contributed into this Trust. Some companies have been asked to contribute \$5 million and some to contribute \$1.5 million only”.

From the interviews carried out, it can be argued that challenges include lack of job creation, lack of community participation in project decision making and lack of funding from the mining companies. These challenges have compromised the achievement of sustainable rural livelihoods of the Zimunya-Marange community. Although the companies were facing a number of operational challenges, they have failed to fulfil their promises. Martin & Taylor (2012) argued that mineral resources, in particular are highly capable of addressing issues of poverty and enhances social and economic empowerment.

CONCLUSIONS

From the study, it can be concluded that there are no tangible development initiatives that have been introduced by the Zimunya-Marange CSOT. This is evidenced by the poor infrastructure in the community. The majority of the participants from the community expressed dismay in the lack of proper and tangible development initiatives in the district. The study also concluded that that the CSOT was dismally failing to protect the local people

from environmental degradation, dust, noise from the mine and constant harassment from security personnel protecting the mining fields. From the findings, it was noted that environmental degradation was not uncommon and that was negatively affecting the rearing of livestock. These resources and livelihood assets are at the centre of the framework and also include natural resources, technologies, skills, knowledge and capacity, health, access to education, sources of credit or networks of social support (Bryceson & Mwaipopo, 2011, p.78). The SLA provides a clear and practical perspective on how to reduce poverty and has generated a good way of integrating the four pillars of development (economic, social, institutional and environmental).

The involvement of community members as stakeholders in the CSOT programmes has been very minimal. Most of the community members who participated in the study did not have an appreciation of the role played by the CSOT except their relocation from diamond mining fields. The study also found that only the Chiefs and Headmen had the knowledge about how the CSOT had been operating. The study also concluded that there had been the top-down implementation of policies where locals felt sidelined. It is becoming evident that the CSOT did not incorporate the participation of local communities in decisions concerning their lives as well as in resource utilisation leading to greater protection and empowerment of indigenous communities, thus achieving greater social justice. Despite the fact that they benefit the least, communities rarely participate in decisions made about mining investments. According to Saunders (2007,p.62) exclusion of host communities from crucial decisions which affect their land and livelihoods frequently leads to conflicts with companies around the social, economic and environmental costs of mining. In the same vein, Musarurwa (2012, p.19) argued that this also contravenes Resolution 224 of the African Commission on Human and People’s Rights (2012, p.15). The study concluded that the CSOT was viewed by the community as major strategy for sharing mineral revenue between mining companies and the local Zimunya-Marange community.

REFERENCES

- African Development Bank Group. (2013). *Zimbabwe country brief 2013 - 2015*. Harare: African Development Bank Group.
- Al-Habil, W. I. (2011). Positivist and Phenomenological Research. *American Public Administration*, 34(14), 946-953.
- Andreasson, S. (2008). Indigenisation and transformation in southern Africa. A Paper prepared for the *British International Studies Association Annual Conference*, University of Exeter, 15-17th of December 2008.
- Beer, F, & Swanepoel, H. (2006). *Community development:*

- Breaking the cycle of poverty*. Lansdowne: Juta and Company Limited.
- Berg, L. L. (2011). *Writing ethnographic field- notes*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bryan, S., & Hofmann, B. (2013). *Transparency and accountability in Africa's extractive industries: The role of the legislature*. Washington DC: National Democratic Institute for International Affairs.
- Carvalho, S., W., Sen, S., de Oliveira Mota, M. & de Lima, R., C. (2010). Consumer reactions to CSR: A Brazilian perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 91(2), 291-310.
- Chiou, T., & Droge, R. O. (2011). Mainstreaming mineral wealth in growth and poverty reduction strategies. *ECA Policy Paper No 1*. Addis Ababa: Economic Commission for Africa.
- Chowa, T. (2013). An analysis of Zimbabwe's indigenisation and economic empowerment programme (IEEP). An Economic Development Approach, *Journal of Economics*, 1(2), 2-18.
- Dube, C. F. (2013). *Zimbabwe's indigenous programme: The Process, the benefits and the challenges*. Institute of Chartered Accountants of Zimbabwe, Winter School, Victoria Falls.
- Gibon, P., Chachange, C. L. S., & Ericson, M. (2012). *Mining and structural adjustment*. Sweden: Motala Grafiska.
- Green, C., & Olio, L. (2014). *Resource abundance in Mozambique: Avoiding conflict, ensuring prosperity. Governance of Africa's Resources Programme*. Johannesburg: South African Institute of International Affairs.
- He, H., & Li, Y. (2011). CSR and service brand: The mediating effect of brand identification and moderating effect of service quality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100(4), 673-688.
- Kandampully, J., Juwaheerm T., D., & Hu, H. H. (2009). Mining and traditional communities in south Africa's platinum belt: Contestations over land, leadership and asserts in north west province, *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 39(2), 409-423.
- Kanyenze, G. (2013). Unlocking economic development from mineral resources: Problems and solutions. Paper presented at the *Zimbabwe Alternative Mining Indaba: Community rights, the Key to Empowerment*, 10-11 September. Harare: Zimbabwe.
- Kanyenze, G., Kondo, T., Chitambara, P., & Martens, J. (2011). *Beyond the enclave towards a pro- poor and inclusive development strategy for Zimbabwe*. Harare: Zimbabwe Publishing House.
- Katsaura, O. (2010). Socio-cultural dynamics of informal diamond mining in Chiadzwa, Zimbabwe, *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 12(6), 12-25.
- Kock, N., & Lynn, G. S. (2012). Lateral collinearity and misleading results in variance-based SEM: *An illustration and recommendations*, 13(7), 546-580.
- Lepineux, K. (2008). *Fighting for the rain forest: War, youth and resources in Sierra Leone*. London: James Currey.
- Lichtenstein, D. R., Drumwright, M. E., & Braig, B. M. (2014). The effect of corporate social responsibility on customer donations to corporate-supported nonprofits. *Journal of Marketing*, 68, 16-32.
- Mabhena, C., & Moyo, F. (2014). Community share ownership scheme and empowerment: The case of Gwanda rural district, Matabeleland south province in Zimbabwe. *IOSR. JHSS*, 19, 1.
- Machinya, J. (2014). *The role of the indigenisation policy in community development*. Johannesburg: University of Witwatersrand.
- Madebwe, V., & Madebwe, C. (2015). An exploratory analysis of the social, economic and environmental impacts on wetlands: The case of Shurugwi district, Midlands Province, Zimbabwe, 1(2), 228-233.
- Makore, G., & Zano, V. (2014). *Mining within Zimbabwe's great dyke: Extent, impacts and opportunities*. Harare: ZELA.
- Malmelin, H., & Hakala, J. (2009). Guided by the brand: From brand management to integrative corporate communications, *Business Strategy Series*, 10(5), 248-258.
- Manson, A. (2013). Mining and traditional communities in south Africa's platinum belt. *Contestations over Land, Leadership and Assets in North West Province*, 39(2), 409-423.
- Maodza, T. (2012, June). Community share ownership Trusts Harare: *The Herald* p.16.
- Martin, A., & Taylor, B. (2012). *Reap what you sow: Greed and corruption in Zimbabwe's Marange diamond fields*. Canada: Partnership Africa Canada.
- Martin, D. F. (2015). Rethinking Aboriginal community governance. In P. Smyth., T. Reddel & A. Jones (Eds.). *Community and Local Governance in Australia*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.
- Matyzak, D. (2012). *Digging up the truth: The legal and political realities of Zimplats Saga*. Harare: Research and Advocacy Unit.
- Mawowa, S. (2013). *Community share ownership trusts (CSOTs) in Zimbabwe's mining sector: The case of Mhondoro_Ngezi*. Harare: Zimbabwe Environmental Law Association (ZELA).
- Mtisi, S., Dhliwayo, M., & Makore, G. S. M. (2011). *Analysis of the key issues in Zimbabwe's mining sector. Case study of the plight of Marange and Mutoko Mining Communities*. Zimbabwe Environmental Law Association (ZELA).
- Musarurwa, T. (2012, May). Indigenisation boom for workers. Harare. *The Herald*, p 5.
- Mwase, E. & Mangisi, D. (2013). *Community share ownership trusts transforming rural lives*. www.chronicles.co.zw. (Accessed: 20 March 2018).
- O'Connell, A. S., & Lindsay, D. (2011). *Development and AID in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Rome: Swathmore College.
- Oguntade, H., Davis, R., & Franks, D. M. (2011). Community conflict in the extractive sector. *Corporate Social Responsibility Report*, No. 66. Cambridge: Harvard Kennedy School.
- Pedro, A. M. A. (2005). Mainstreaming mineral wealth in growth and poverty reduction strategies. *ECA Policy Paper No 1*. Addis Ababa: Economic Commission for Africa.
- Perrini, F., & Vurro, C. (2010). Collaborative social entrepreneurship. In A. Tencati, & L. Zsolnai (Eds.). *The*

- collaborative enterprise: Creating values for a sustainable world* (pp.351-371). Oxford: Peter Lang AG International Academic Publishers.
- Saunders, R. (2007). *Mining and crisis in Zimbabwe*. Cape Town: Fatal Transactions Campaign and Netherlands Institute for Southern Africa.
- Sawyer, S., & Gomez, E. T. (2012). *The politics of resource extraction: Indigenous peoples, multinational corporations and the state*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tsvakanyi, G. (2012). *Share ownership trust, the right way to go*. Online www.sunday mail.co.zw (Accessed: 21 March 2018).
- Wise, M., & Shtylla, B. E. (2007). Inequality, democracy, and the environment: a cross-national analysis, *Ecological Economics*, 131, 139-151.
- Zhou, G., & Zvoushe, H. (2012). *Public policy making in Zimbabwe. A three decade perspective*. 2(8), 1-34.