

The Nexus of Globalisation and Global South Social Policy Crafting: Some Zimbabwean Perspectives

by

Takudzwa Leonard Mathende
tmathende@yahoo.co.uk

&

Tatenda Goodman Nhapi
nhapaz@yahoo.com

Takudzwa Leonard Mathende holds a Bachelor of Social Work Honours Degree from the University of Zimbabwe and an MA in Social Impact Assessment from the University of Johannesburg, South Africa. He is currently practicing as a Social Worker with a UK local authority. Previously, he worked in the child protection and social development sector both in Zimbabwe and City of Johannesburg, South Africa. Having worked for Africa's largest municipality, Takudzwa has developed tested research interests and experience in social impact assessment, social development policy and environmental social work.

Tatenda Goodman Nhapi holds a Bachelor of Science Social Work Honours Degree from the University of Zimbabwe. In 2015 he was awarded an Erasmus Mundus Masters in Advanced Development Social Work, a five European universities study consortium programme. Tatenda is an academic and practitioner. Currently he practices Social Work with a UK local authority. His research interests include social policy and administration, environmental social justice and sustainable development approaches. To his credit, he has published 10 journal articles and book chapters in these domains.

Abstract

This article is an exploration of the impact of globalisation as a key social policy driver in global South contexts as Zimbabwe. The aim of the article is to illumine centrality of globalisation as a key social policy driver for desired outcomes of development of pro-poor social safety nets. Using the qualitative methodology of desk review, the paper dissects secondary data like peer reviewed journals articles, policy documents and newspaper articles. The article also describes and explains social policy and administration dynamics in Zimbabwe. Recommendations are proposed of how globalisation as a key driver can be harnessed to enrich Zimbabwean social policy to be incrementally enhancing the social functioning of the indigent in Zimbabwe.

Keywords: globalisation, global South, Zimbabwe, social policy

Introduction and Background

This article's objective is to explore the nuances between globalisation and global south social policy crafting using Zimbabwean perspectives. This paper is an attempt to outline some concepts and discourses which can point towards a research agenda in the global South. While there are many possible points of entry in this complex field, the article focuses on the environmental transformations generated by globalisation and social policy administration in Global South. The 2008 global financial and economic crisis reshaped pro-poor public policies and reinforced social protection interest. The economic crisis has been interpreted as testimony that markets are not always self-regulating, and when unregulated, they become unworkable and unsustainable in the long-run (Chikozho, 2015). For colonial legacy and abject poverty in the 1960s African governments drew up development plans and programmes to improve the cumulative process of underdevelopment (African Union, 2008). African Union notes there was considerable infrastructural investment and some economic growth but no trickle-down effect to the grassroots level. Despite evidence of considerable economic growth across Africa, poverty and vulnerability continue to persist. In fact Ake (1996), argued that development in post-independent Africa actually never took place. Chikozho (2015) further elaborates thus by stating political independence advent provided the majority of African countries with appropriate mix of public policies enabling rapid socio-economic development achievement. However, experiences across the continent have so far yielded mixed results and the search for an effective political economy model in the face of a rapidly globalizing world (Chikozho, 2015). From a political economy perspective, African poor economic development results from lack of appropriate policies/reforms, overreliance on natural resources, absence of an original economic development model, poor implementation, numerous social problems making development intractable (Gumede, n.d).

The 2006 Zambian Government hosted Livingstone Social Protection meeting is noted by Southern African Social Policy Experts Network (2015) as one of the several continental initiatives seeking the deepening social security.

Socio Economic Overview

Zimbabwe is predominantly an agro-based economy with about 79% of its population residing in rural areas and earning a living largely from subsistence agriculture (Mushunje 2009). Zimbabwe has a total population of 13,061,239 people divided into 48% males and 52% females where 67% of the population lives in the rural areas (Zimbabwe Statistical Agency(ZIMSTATS), 2012).Over the past decade the Zimbabwean economy has been mired in a severe vicious cycle of economic regression and paralysis.

From a peak of 9.7 percent in 1996 economic growth slumped to a record -14.8 percent in 2008, some economic regression and paralysis precipitating increased poverty and social and economic marginalisation of already disadvantaged groups. By 2003, 72 percent of the population was below the poverty line, up from 55 percent in 1995 (Chitambara, 2010).

The 2011/2012 Poverty Income and Consumption Survey (PICES), a Zimbabwe Statistical Agency survey based on 32,248 nationally representative households estimated that 76% of rural households are poor with 23% deemed extremely poor. The contested fast-track land redistribution programme implementation starting year 2000 led to the withdrawal of aid by most donors, including the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, impacted negatively on the economy (Kaseke, 2003). Zimbabwe has experienced two major – and markedly different – phases in its land reform efforts. The first was carefully planned and implemented with support from a broad group of international donor agencies; the second, which began in 2000, was motivated primarily by political considerations and was implemented in a chaotic and non-transparent fashion that has done severe damage to the economy and harmed international relations (Leiden African Studies Centre, 2018). The 2010-2011 Global Competitiveness Report compiled by the World Economic Forum (WEF) has ranked Zimbabwe 136 out of 139 countries. In the 2009-2010 rankings Zimbabwe was ranked 132 out of 134 countries. According to the report a combination of dilapidated infrastructure, limited healthcare and education services and poor institutional frameworks have conspired to render Zimbabwe less competitive in the global marketplace (Chitambara, 2010). There has been signs of recovery, the Zimbabwean economy remains fragile due to a combination of factors that include deteriorated social and economic infrastructure and low Official Development Assistance (ODA) (approximately US\$650 million mostly in humanitarian aid) (United Nations Development Programme-UNDP, 2011). There is strong Government acknowledgement of the constraints of poverty and it is comprehensively addressed within the Zimbabwe Agenda for Sustainable Socio-Economic Transformation (ZIMASSET). The first two (2) components of the economic blueprint (Food Security and Nutrition and Social Services and Poverty Eradication) specifically focus on addressing the immediate needs of citizens that have been affected by poverty (Regional Psychosocial Support Initiative (REPSSI) , 2012).

Conceptualisation of Globalisation and Social Policy

The dominant narrative in conception of globalisation, is its extensive network of economic, cultural, social and political interconnectedness and human processes routinely transcend national boundaries (Hay and Watson 1999). While social policy refers to organised efforts of government designed to improve human welfare/wellbeing. Therefore, “global social policy is a practice of supranational actors embodies global social redistribution, global social regulation and global social provision and or empowerment and includes the way in which supranational organisations shape national social policy” (Deacon et al 1997:195). The global village has neutralised politics, culture between nations and within regions and continents and has become the major factor in the development of social policy. Clarke (2000: 201), notes that globalisation disrupts “national” focus of attention and forces us to “think globally”.

The social policy approach is its macro-focus on the nation state and particularly the so-called 'welfare state'. International comparisons of social security policies and programmes have generally used the nation state as a unit of analysis, and social protection activities at the household or community level have received relatively little attention (Midgley, 2013). The *supranationalisation* of social policy has become a business of the international community. Individual nations have to cross refer to other nations in what they are doing in social policy before formulating their own and if nations do not do this, they become isolated on the global map. This is because the individual states may make policies which might not be appreciated internationally. It has become a responsibility and obligation for every government to understand that it is a member of the global family/village and failure to do this the individual state/player may face detrimental consequences that is, being excluded from global activities. However, Melber (2017) laments SDGs adoption, noting "are more technical than normative, giving insufficient attention to the UN's own norms and standards". This is underlined by the fact that as late as March 2017 a total of 244 indicators were added to the 17 goals and 169 targets. According to Melber, this reinforces not only a management problem, but creates the misleading impression that a proper and detailed check list would be sufficient to deal with the major challenges our world and the dominant lifestyle is facing.

Globalisation has become a major topic of discussion and concern in economic circles since the mid-1990s. It is clear that the trend toward more integrated world markets has opened a wide potential for greater growth, and presents an unparalleled opportunity for developing countries to raise their living standards (Quatarra, 1997).

Methodology/Approach

This article is more a piece of a critical reflective think based on a critical review of literature, drawing attention to problematic and contradictory issues underlying globalisation. The article expands the debates on globalisation and policy making by focusing on aspects as neoliberalism and adjustment, poverty reduction, NGOs and aid.

Conceptualisation of Social Policy and Zimbabwean Social Policy Overview

Hall and Midgley (2004, p. 3) make a point, however, that 'defining social policy is not a straightforward task...the term [social policy] is fraught with potential ambiguities and confusion.'. Global South social policy and programme innovations have attracted widespread international attention and interesting questions have arisen regarding the emergence, nature and effectiveness of recent social policy pathways (Plagerson, et al., 2013). Social policy is well-placed to realise sustainable human development, at both the local and regional levels, because of its philosophical orientation which, among other things, hinges on the promotion of social justice and the meeting of people's needs (Ndagwa, 2013).

According to CODESRIA (2017),

Social policy has always been shaped by two broad contending forces. On the one hand, we have those who see its objectives as mopping up the diswelfares that emerge from market and institutional failure. On the other hand, are those who see social policy as having an encompassing reach and coverage, integrated with economic policy, and driven by norms of equality and solidarity. The former takes a residual approach, with market as the first port of call in social provisioning and public welfare as port of last resort focused on the deserving poor who are not able to meet their own social provisioning. The latter addresses diswelfares in both the ways we pursue development and design production activities, and respond to needs at various stages of the life-cycle.

In Global South, social assistance carries a social stigma in that recipients are often regarded as societal failures. Many African governments' attitudes tend to regard social assistance as a privilege and not as a right further worsening social protection provision. Because of the scarcity of resources in developing countries not every destitute person can receive assistance (Kaseke 1988). Also, several regional and international scholars have decried missing presence of social security systems in Africa and called for state and non-state actors concerted efforts to crystallize African social security (Southern African Social Policy Experts Network, 2015).

Global North Social Policy Conceptualisation An Overview

Table 1 Welfare regimes principles

	UK	Germany and the Netherlands	Spain
Welfare regime type	Anglophone	Continental	Southern
Core values	Equality of opportunity (needs based social support)	Status preservation (equivalence principle)	Status preservation and differentiation
Objective	Poverty alleviation	Income maintenance	Income maintenance
Social rights	Residual entitlements	Employment based entitlements	Insider biased entitlements
Employment	Liberal work ethic (self-reliance) Full employment	Ambiguous work ethic (differences between Catholicism, Lutheranism and Calvinism)	Weak work ethic
Gender	Family servicing as private matter (neutral)	Nuclear family as cornerstone of society	Extended family as core provider
Basis of entitlement	Need	Work/family needs	Insider/family needs
Responsibility	Individual	Collective	Collective

Source: Hemerjick in Hemerjick et. al., (2013, p. 8).

Zimbabwean social policy targets social protection and welfare of indigents, rather than the haves. In the same vein, social policy proponents like Titmus were not much concerned with technical aspects of social service management but on the conceptual and normative issues legitimising collective welfare provision (Midgley, 2013). Also, instead of just being a palliative intervention social policy should be seen as working in tandem with economic policy in order to attain a holistic national development process (Ndagwa, 2013). Also, concept of social exclusion/inclusion has become topical in social policy study as a result of the realization that some citizens do not benefit from national development efforts (Kaseke, 2003). The Government of Zimbabwe (GoZ) has had comprehensive social protection programmes for several decades but are disjointed and lack funding and coherent social protection framework to address a broad spectrum of risk and vulnerability factors (United Nations Country Team (UNCT), 2014) Zimbabwe's social policy is influenced by self-reliance, on the economic front, indigenisation and empowerment, politically, it is embedded in the 'territorial integrity and sovereignty' castigating the unavoidable notion of globalisation or international community.

The GoZ's preference for an agrarian welfare regime—that is, one that addressed risks of poverty primarily through agricultural production. Zimbabwe's constitution revealingly imposes a duty on citizens to produce for themselves, whilst imposing vague obligations on the state to provide for the destitute (Chinyoka, 2017) .

Zimbabwe has an elaborate Social Protection Policy Framework which was approved in 2016. The policy emphasizes Social Protection as an integral component in reducing the risks of socio-economic insecurities resulting from unemployment and poverty to individuals and society, helping target households to better manage risks such as economic crisis and natural disasters that affect large segments of the population or idiosyncratic shocks such as retirement or illness that affect individual households. The policy includes five pillars, as follows:

social safety nets (SSN), such as cash transfers, public works programmes, or fee waivers for basic services;

social insurance, including old-age and disability pensions, health insurance and unemployment insurance;

labor market programs, such as skills-building programmes, job-search and matching programs and improved labor regulations;

livelihoods support; and

social support and care services, such as assistive devices and community or residential care, along with legislation and policy reforms which ensure equity and non-discrimination in access to services and economic opportunities.

However, less than 20% of the labour force is covered by social security. These social insurance schemes are largely run by the National Social Security Authority. Other forms of social protection offered by the Government under its Social Assistance programmes include the Basic Education Assistance Module (BEAM), War Victims Compensation, Assisted Medical Treatment Order (AMTO), the Food Mitigation Programme, child protection services, support to people living with disabilities, drought relief, public works and other livelihood support programmes (United Nations Country Team (UNCT), 2014).

Key Globalisation Actors and Zimbabwean Social Policy Administration

The growing interest in social protection and social security in social development is welcome but somewhat surprising (Midgley 2005). The following section of the article unpacks key Zimbabwean social policy design and implementation drivers.

International Institutions

Global institutions are central to Zimbabwean social policy making. The International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank (WB) and United Nations (UN), as observed by Yeates (2001) have central role in facilitating Global South nations' access to financial resources for public/social purposes. Brazil, Mexico creation of conditional cash transfer schemes, South Africa's social assistance redesign and expansion, Botswana, Lesotho and Namibia universal old-age pensions introduction and India's National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme launch have all contributed to the new interest in social protection in development circles (Midgley, 2013). IMF is the key international creditor as well as a monetary institution and it provides loans to countries to resolve balance of payments difficulties for example the IMF gave Zimbabwe soft loans to implement the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) which was an externally driven economic strategy. Imposed by the Bretton Woods institutions—the IMF and the World Bank to assist African development, Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) provided “conditional lending” (Thomson, 2010: 197), – conditional, in that governments receiving debt relief were obliged to adjust their economic policy. In general, ‘adjustment’ meant liberalising and privatising, although SAPs were wider in scope in that their developmental aims were highly political.

According to Thomson (2010: 194), the strategy behind SAPs “backfired,” leaving Africa “crippled” by debts. For Fatton (1992: 130) SAPs lead to “overall economic failure” and had “destructive social consequences”. To cushion the poor from the effects of SAPs, the Zimbabwean government introduced the Social Dimensions Fund. As a result of policy misfeasance, SAPs increased Africa's dependency on international aid, which had certain conditions e.g. social and economic policy direction. Chabal and Daloz (1999: 119) galvanise this discourse by arguing that it cannot be shown “convincingly” that SAPs “lessened Africa's dependence.” Through SAPs, Zimbabwe diverted to neo liberalism from its socialist social policy ideology adopted in 1980. Again, Chabal and Daloz (1999: 119-120) equally place the most blame for SAP-ineffectiveness on the “foundations of power” within African states—patrimonialism, clientelism and corruption—which caused SAPs to fail to reach their “political aims”.

The GoZ agreed the conditionalities attached to this facility and IMF advised Social Dimensions Fund (SDF) implementation for cushioning ESAP casualties. Various poverty and vulnerability studies carried out in different African countries have documented powerlessness, deprivation and insecurity feelings that accompanied the neo-liberal approach. This policy created a social cost of adjustment for example unemployment, retrenchment and SDF was to assist the so called “new poor” not the old poor. There was the food, school fees and health programme and additionally government introduced social services user fees (a contribution towards the cost). The roles of Bretton Woods institutions is to influence policy making for individual countries/recipients conformity to global standards or global village demands. Thus, globalisation has been described as an indirect way of colonisation and Hay and Watson (1999) described it as a tyrannical rule of peoples by totalitarian global economic regime.

Non State Actors

A survey of non-contributory social protection programmes across Africa found that 40% of programmes are implemented with the financial or technical support of external agencies or NGOs (Cirillo & Tebaldi, 2016). The Supranational agencies like United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) also play their role in influencing social policy. They catalyse the shaping social policy for example the Sustainable Development Goals(SDGs). Melber (2017) has critiqued SDGs as continuing to reinforce a silo approach sub-divided into economic, social and environmental pillars. Cross-cutting issues (such as gender and human rights, racism, xenophobia, homophobia, migration and displacement, to mention only some more obvious ones) remain confined to a specified goal – if at all deliberately considered in any specific detail.

In terms of SDGs, Zimbabwe has prioritised SDG 1: No Poverty: GoZ has prioritised ending poverty. In December 2016 the National Social Protection Policy Framework (NSPPF) was launching seeking to strengthen mechanisms for reducing poverty and vulnerability by improving the coverage and effectiveness of the various social protection programmes in place.

Additionally, United Nations Convention on the Rights of Child (UNCRC) Nations (1989) stipulates that all children have the right to a core minimum level of well-being, including nutrition, basic education, survival, protection and the right to grow up in a family. Children are often at a higher risk of poverty and deprivation, which rob them of their fundamental human rights (Manjengwa et al 2016). The GoZ has aligned its Children's Act to match this because Zimbabwe is a member state of the "UN family" hence it has to conform to the UN value system vision. Importantly to note is that the National Plan of Action for Orphans and Vulnerable children (NPA/OVC) which seems to be a government's initiative, in real case it is the brainchild of UNICEF and Save the Children-Norway. Additionally, Zimbabwe's constitution provides the basis for child protection especially as recognizing the rights of children is one of the founding values and principles. In addition, the new constitution compels the state and other non-state actors to adopt policies and measures that ensure the rights of children and youths are upheld (Section 19 and 20).

Social Policy Dynamics and Globalisation Influences-Some Zimbabwean Critical Perspectives

Being tied to Global North, World Bank (WB), as a development institute given its economic and social development promotion mission as far as Global South, coupled with its financial institution role has contentious conditionalities countries and banks (Kahler 1992). Loan conditionalities include recipient government agreeing to pursue economic and social reform programmes for "structural rigidities" removal, and foreign investment climate enhancement and stable macro-economic environment assurance conducive to loan repayment (Bakker 1996, Kahler 1992).

Notably, Ghana and Tanzania receive about 45% of its budget from donors meaning their socio economic policies must subscribe to IMF and WB and arguably externally driven. According to World Bank (1997a), Official Development Assistance (ODA) is key and sometimes only development finance source for many countries, otherwise excluded from global finance. In some cases, humanitarian aid along with public donations may be the only form of inward capital for example in Mozambique aid represents more than 100% of its Gross National Product GNP. In other words the international institutions are social policy actors in their own right.

Supranational bodies like the European Union (EU), United Nations (UN), African Union (AU), and Southern African Development Community (SADC) have also caused governments to align their policies to their declarations, conventions, goals, charters and body's decisions. Also other international non-governmental organisations (INGO) have taken a supranational character in influencing social policy in the developing countries. These policies are adapted by developing states and they represent the views of developed countries. Academics have argued that Information Technology (IT) has become the facilitating agent/means of globalisation as it is used to quickly, effectively and efficiently disseminate information globally.

National social policy is influencing by social politics and policies of state and non-state agencies and supranational and international levels results in global social policy. Strange (1996) alluded that strong globalisation theory holds that there has been a dramatic shift in structural power and authority away from states towards non state agencies and from national Political systems to global economic systems. This involves transnationalisation and regionalisation. He also argued that it is now important to recognise the influence of international institutions over social policy and welfare because the classical concern with equality, rights, justice between individuals has become the quest for justice between states not within the states alone. Thus, social policy making is framed by the perception of the logics and realities of the global economy and by beliefs, values and assumption about national competitiveness in the global economy.

Additional Influential Global South Social Policy Development Key Drivers

Ideology and Politics

Political ideologies shape public policy debates and the social policy strategies developed to address “social problems.” The clashes among long-standing political traditions—conservatism, liberalism, radicalism, and feminism—reflect fundamental and often irreconcilable differences regarding social, economic, and political life. Addressing inequalities formed the core component of a national poverty reduction strategy in independent Zimbabwe and the country pursued a development path that was centred on equitable distribution of income and wealth, as well as growth (Riddell, 2012). conservatism, liberalism, radicalism, and feminism as Abramovitz (2008) notes provides varied perspectives underpinning social welfare provision, including human nature, need, the general welfare, social problems, racial inequality, and the role of government.

Marxism, socialism, social democracy, conservatism, Christian democracy, liberal individualism, populism and fascism are the ideologies influencing social policy are. Again, political ideas influencing social policies are solidarity, rights, welfare and equality, justice, freedom and democracy (Spicker, 2017).

The table below shows two political views and their differences:

THE LEFT WING	THE RIGHT WING
For Welfare	Against welfare
For public provision	Against public provision
Collectivist	Individualist
For Institutional welfare	For residual welfare

Source: Spicker (2017).

From these political views, there are political positions that influence social policy like Marxism, conservatism, liberal individualism, socialism, social democracy and fascism.

Global South governments have for a long time known for formulating social policies that are attractive to the electorate (populism) in order to stay in power. These policies have a political than economic motivation. Rights based approaches have also become dominant in African social policy thinking. The affirmation of the right to social security imposes on legislators a duty to act, and on citizens a legitimate expectation to receive access to basic social security. Several countries are promoting social protection as a nationally legislated entitlement in line with agreements reached by the African Union. In Zimbabwe, social protection is a vague right under the constitution, but is not enshrined in legislation. Article 30 of the 2013 constitution provides for social welfare and requires the state to ‘provide social security and social care to those who are in need’. Article 19(1) of the constitution requires the state to adopt policies and measures ‘to ensure that in matters relating to children, the best interests of the children concerned are paramount’. The state first and foremost protects children by protecting the family, i.e. by providing care and assistance to caregivers (Article 25(a) (Chinyoka, 2017).

Resources

Resources availability is a social policy determinant as limited resources restrict the options become restricted. Many Global South countries, Zimbabwe included have consumptive social policy, which is a liability rather than a social investment on the population. Countries with very limited resources often have less effective social policies, and it is in these circumstances that multilateral in situations (that are agents of globalisation) come in and dictate on what should be done, because normally they have the financial and technocratic way withal.

Programs of social welfare in such cases are means tested, meaning they are designed for the poorest of the poor, which comes with stigma and dependence. In Zimbabwe, the mandate for Social and Child protection falls under the Ministry of Public Service, Labour and Social Welfare (MoPSLSW). The Ministry's mandate is to promote a conducive labour market environment for higher productivity and provision of decent work; and strengthen households' economy and enhance provision of child care and protection services. The major programmes under social services includes: the Basic Education Assistance Module (BEAM) and the Harmonised Social Cash Transfers (HSCT), which accounts for a combined share of 60.9% of the Social Welfare budget. BEAM was allocated US\$10 million in 2017, same as in 2016, whilst there was a 250% increase in the HSCT allocation to US\$7 million in 2017(UNICEF 2017).

However, most of these interventions have been criticized for being either ineffective or inadequate. Some of the major reasons for this criticism include:

- Fragmented application of the instruments without a proper guiding structure;
- Inadequacy and exclusionary nature of available systems;
- Lack of predictability, consistency, transparency and durability in most of the instruments;
- Lack of proper centralized coordination leading to incoherent and sectoralization of social protection under and within various ministries such as Ministries of Labour and Social Services (MoLSW), Primary and Secondary Education, Health and Child Care, Youth and Gender, Agriculture, etc.;
- Lack of mutually supportive and clear policy objectives leading to disjointed approaches; and Governance by various pieces of Zimbabwean laws and policy statements that may not be mutually supportive of each other, among others (UNICEF, 2018).

Norms and Beliefs

Zimbabwe has had the *Zunde raMambo* (Chief's Granary) traditional practice enduring centuries old community based safety net. It is designed to feed the indigent as older persons, orphans and widows in times of drought or famine or when these groups experience food insecurity. Community-based mutual aid arrangements remain to function as a protective function. This has the hallmarks of a social assistance scheme (Kaseke, 2013) .

Again, human beings are products of their own cultural and social environment, acting according to their values, norms and beliefs. Social Policy actors always try to harmonise policy responses with the society and its culture and people accept a policy if it does not violate their culture. As an illustration, in the dominantly patriarchal Zimbabwean societies, the 2006 enacted Domestic Violence Act (2006) was contested as women must be subordinate to their husbands.

This contradicts with the Act's outcomes of cushioning mostly women from spousal/partner abuse. Contenders would argue these as Western norms in the African context violating African tradition of women submitting to their husbands who are household heads. Resultantly, such a legislative policy framework is subject to resisted by its intended beneficiaries whereas domestic violence free public and social spaces is a pre-requisite for enriching social policy in contexts as Zimbabwe. When the social policy is in harmony with cultural values then it will work as an agent of social control because it has a national appeal, accepted and defended by people. With forces of globalisation, culture must conform to new realities of life and so should social policy reviews be made periodically in order for it to be robust in line cultural changes in society.

The Zimbabwean Diaspora

The Zimbabwean diaspora refers to the diaspora of immigrants from the nation of Zimbabwe. The diaspora phenomenon is also one of the emerging determinants of social policy in Zimbabwe. It is difficult to get accurate statistical figures of Zimbabweans in the diaspora as migrants left the country without proper documentation. South Africa hosts a large number of Zimbabweans due to its proximity to Zimbabwe as well as its economic power in Africa that enables it to offer a vast number of employment opportunities. Estimation shows that up to 2 million Zimbabweans are living in neighbouring South Africa. The UK is thought to have the highest numbers after South Africa, with over 200, 000 Zimbabwean nationals. The USA has about 50, 000; Australia has in excess of 30, 000 Zimbabweans while Botswana's numbers were over 100, 000 and Canada's were estimated at around 50, 000. Countries like New Zealand, Namibia, and some Asian countries are increasingly becoming preferred destinations.

Zimbabweans are playing a major role, by contributing to the social and economic development of their home country's economy. It is reported that in 2015, Zimbabwe received in excess of US\$1 billion from the diaspora in terms of remittances. Going to work abroad has also contributed to socio-economic development through remittances which provides social benefits to the families at micro level, and also contributes to the national fiscas at macro level. Family-level remittances from the diaspora are very important, as they keep families in Zimbabwe afloat and mean the difference between survival and starvation for many. In 2017 Prosper Chitambara, an economist at the Labour and Economic Development Research Institute of Zimbabwe (LEDRIZ), said remittances from the Diaspora are only mitigating extreme poverty, serving as social protection rather than financing development (Newsday 2017). Going to work abroad for many Zimbabweans has also come at a price as the home country has suffered from severe brain drain and breakage of families which creates a social policy gap.

The GoZ unveiled the Diaspora Policy that sets mechanisms and an institutional framework to facilitate the reception of remittances and investment from diaspora population. This bears testimony to the major role being played by Zimbabweans abroad in the socio-economic development of their home country.

The International Organisation for Migration (IOM) together with GoZ launched the Zimbabwe National Diaspora Directorate to enhance engagement and participation of the Zimbabwe diaspora on national development. A skills transfer programme has been put in place, where Zimbabwean experts abroad can come back home on short-term assignments to build the capacity and skills of local professionals in the health and education sector. IOM has also been assisting irregular Zimbabwean migrants in foreign countries to return home with dignity under IOM's Assisted Voluntary Return and Reintegration programme. They are supported to start small businesses of their choice to help them reintegrate into society. In addition, IOM aided the government to formulate its National Diaspora Policy and action plan for the 2017 to 2022 period. Support is being provided to government through the Ministry of Public Service Labour and Social Welfare (MoPSLSW) formulate the National Labour Policy which will ensure protection of the rights of Zimbabwean migrant workers abroad.

The diaspora phenomenon can also be narrowed down to the migration of social workers to the Global North. Interestingly, for example Zimbabwe, has a child-focused social work model, saw its numbers of HCPC registrants soar from nine in 2015 to 68 in 2016 – making it the largest nation that year. Before this period Zimbabwean social workers exceeding 300 were registered and working in the UK. The migration of Zimbabwean social workers from Zimbabwe creates skills shortage in Zimbabwe impacting on the implementation of social policy programmes. Zimbabweans who have settled in the United Kingdom have created professional associations, aiming also to influence the development of social work and social policy in Zimbabwe among other causes. It will be good if the National Association of Social Workers Zimbabwe creates synergies with these associations to exchange practice knowledge. The Diaspora policy should also look at how it can tap into diaspora social work pool for the benefit of the country's social development. Zimbabwean social workers in the diaspora should not be left out in the skills transfer programme being championed by the MoLSW and IOM as part of human capitalisation. In general, the Government of Zimbabwe should engage people in the diaspora on how they can best work together for the socio-economic development in the country.

Social Workers

Social and Child protection plays a pivotal role in strengthening the resilience of children, families and communities, achieving greater equity, and supporting national human and economic development (UNICEF Zimbabwe Country Office, 2017). Robust lobbying and advocacy by the social workers fraternity is cardinal for the realisation of these outcomes. Social workers are developers and advocates of social policy and their interventions are the reality of social policy for the people they work with. For service users, all the policies in the world are little use unless they are put into practice the reality of policy is made by everyday practice – by the way laws and procedures are interpreted and applied, through routines and shortcuts, rule-breaking, strict action sometimes and leniency at others, doing extra work in some cases and not in others.

There is widespread advocacy for indigenised social work practice in Africa. This has a bearing on the kind of social policy that the government institutionalise. One should not lose sight to the fact that global social work bodies like the International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW), International Council on Social Welfare (ICSW) and the International Association of Schools of Social Work (IASSW) have an international influence on social policies.

Conclusion

The foregoing article sought to examine globalisation's influence to Global South countries as Zimbabwe's social policy making. Global South social policy actors must reflect on critical perspectives of social policy where it is shaped by globalisation for the objectives of cooperation, multisectoral approach. However structural/integrated approach to social policy has been regarded as an indirect agent of neo colonialism and tyrannical rule by global economic regimes. However, globalisation does not stand alone to influence social policies in Global South , it only acts at a macro level but at mezzo and micro level –politics, resource availability; cultural and social issues also have an effort/influence on social policy actions of Global South policy making.

Bibliography

- African Union, 2008. *First Session of the AU Conference of Ministers in Charge of Social Development*. Windhoek, African Union.
- Ake, C., 1996. *Democracy and Development in Africa*. Maryland: Brookings Institute.
- Chabal, P. & Daloz, J. (1999) *Africa Works: Disorder as Political Instrument*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chikozho, C., 2015. *Re-visiting Africa's Political Economy Landscape: Comparatively Articulating the National Macro-Economic Policy and Institutional Trajectories of Botswana, South Africa and Zimbabwe* By CLAUDIOUS CHIKOZHO. Johannesburg, United Nations Commission for Africa.
- Chinyoka, I., 2017. *Poverty, changing political regimes, and social cash transfers in Zimbabwe, 1980–2016*, Helsinki: The United Nations University World Institute for Development Economics Research.
- Chitambara, P., 2010. *Labour and Economic Development Institute of Zimbabwe*. [Online] Available at: http://www.ledriz.co.zw/index.php?option=com_phocadownload& [Accessed 6 June 2014].

Cirillo, C. & Tebaldi, R., 2016. *Social Protection in Africa: An inventory of social protection programmes in Africa*. [Online] Available at: http://www.ipc-undp.org/pub/eng/Social_Protection_in_Africa.pdf [Accessed 10 May 2018].

Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa, 2017. *2017 Social Policy in Africa Conference*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.codesria.org/spip.php?article2747&lang=en>

Deacon, B, Hulse, M, Subbs, P .1997. *Global Social Policy: International Organisations and the future of welfare*.

Gumede, V., n.d. *Social Policy for Inclusive Development in Africa: Revisiting Development Discourse*, Johannesburg: Vusi Gumede Institute Professional Network.

Hall, A. & Midgley, J., 2004. *Social Policy for Development*. London: SAGE.

Hemerijck, A. C., Palm, T. P. & van Hooren, F. J., 2013. *Changing European Welfare States and the Evolution of Migrant Incorporation Regimes*. [Online] Available at: https://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/fileadmin/files/Publications/Research_projects/Welfare/IMPA_CIM/. [Accessed 15 April 2015].

Kaseke, E., 2003. Social Exclusion in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Social Development in Africa*, pp. 33-48.

Kaseke, E., 2013. *Informal social security in southern africa*. [Online] Available at: http://www.saspen.org/conferences/informal2013/Paper_Kaseke_FES-SASPEN-16SEP2013-INT-CONF-SP4IE.pdf [Accessed 12 June 2014].

Leiden African Studies Centre, 2018. *Space and Time: A Long-term Perspective on Land Reform from Zimbabwe's Experience*. Leiden: University of Leiden.

Melber, H., 2017. *Development Studies and the SDGs studies agenda*, Bonn: European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes (EADI).

Midgley, J., 2013. Social development and social protection: New opportunities and challenges. *Development Southern Africa*, , p. 2–12.

Ndagwa, N., 2013. *Regional Social Policy for Sustainable Human Development: A Southern African Option*, Bamberg: Farafina Institute.

Newsday, 2017. Available at: [https://www.newsday.co.zw/2017/10/zims-diaspora-help-
revive-ailing-economy/](https://www.newsday.co.zw/2017/10/zims-diaspora-help-revive-ailing-economy/)

Plagerson, S., Ulriksen, M., Patel, L. & Hochfield, T., 2013. *Social Policy Development in South Africa: A Shift towards a Redistributive Paradigm? Research Proposal*, Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.

Powell, M. & Barrientos, A., 2004. Welfare regimes and the welfare mix. *European Journal of Political Research*, Volume 43, pp. 83-105.

Quatarra, A., 1997. *The Challenges of Globalization for Africa. International Monetary Fund at the Southern Africa Economic Summit. World Economic Forum, Harare Harare, 21 May.* Harare, World Economic Forum.

Regional Psychosocial Support Initiative (REPSSI) , 2012. *Zimbabwe Country Strategy 2014-2016*, Harare: REPSSI.

Spicker, P. 2017. The Politics of Welfare, An introduction to Social Policy, Available at: <http://spicker.uk/social-policy/politics.htm>, Accessed on 17 May 2017

Southern African Social Policy Experts Network, 2015. *Indigenous Social Security Systems and Government Policies: Perspectives from Southern and West Africa A concept Note.* [Online]

Available at: <http://www.saspen.org/home/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Concept-note-on-Indigenous-Social-Security-Systems-and-Government-Policies-III.pdf> [Accessed 3 May 2016].

Thomson, A. 2010. *An Introduction to African Politics*, 3rd Edition. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Yeates, N. 2001. *Globalisation and Social Policy*. London: Sage Publications
UNICEF Zimbabwe Country Office, 2017. *Zimbabwe Social Protection 2017 Budget Brief*, Harare: UNICEF Zimbabwe Country Office.

UNICEF, 2018. *UNICEF Zimbabwe is inviting proposals from individual international consultants to provide technical support in Social Protection.* [Online]

Available at: <https://www.unicef.org/about/employ/?job=513016> [Accessed 11 May 2018].

United Nations Country Team (UNCT), 2014. *Zimbabwe country analysis working document final draft - Information.* [Online]

Available at: <https://ims.undg.org/.../7e40fe82fedfcf6fb92306b459a8c1bdd0d13cc9ea8e9a18cadb> [Accessed 12 May 2016].

Zimbabwe Stastical Agency(ZIMSTATS), 2012. *Cnesus Report* , Harare: Zimstats.