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Abstract

Youths face a number of constraints in accessing livelihood opportunities and livelihoods studies have largely pointed to technical and capacity gaps such as skills training and targeted financial support as the hindrance to youth livelihood outcomes. Although this is true, this thesis shows that governance also matters and that attempting to address youth livelihood outcomes without addressing governance issues is likely to fail. This study links an analysis of governance and livelihoods focusing on youth in a gender differentiated way with the aim of exploring perceptions of governance constraints on livelihood outcomes, and identify practical and policy options for the future. Contrasting male and female perceptions of constraints to livelihood opportunities across 3 farming districts in Zimbabwe, I present results from Wondedzo, Mvurwi and Chikombedzi involving secondary school students using Q Methodology. The Q sorts yielded different perspectives on constraints to livelihood outcomes for youth which I interpreted using a governance lens. I found that different combinations of governance factors are perceived to influence livelihood outcomes for different groups and that governance is not a singular factor, but highly differentiated. It depends on who you are (male or female) and what you do (such as high level professional jobs, or low level casual jobs, business, or farming). It should not be viewed from the macro-level as the relationship between a centralised state and citizens but should encompass the relationships between such dimensions and micro or local level factors.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

This thesis asks: ‘What are the governance factors that influence youth perceptions of livelihood outcomes after land reform in Zimbabwe?’

Why is this important? 77 percent of Zimbabwe’s population is under the age of 34 while youth (aged 15-34) constitute 36 percent of the population and 84 percent of the unemployed population (GoZ, 2014), which presents a challenge for policy makers and development organisations alike. The downturn of the Zimbabwean economy has also compounded problems, which has seen low capacity utilisation in agriculture and many industries shutting down leaving young people with limited opportunities to gain livelihoods. Youths living in farming and marginalised communities have been the hardest hit. All this has put a lot of pressure on the government and development organisations to come up with solutions to this pressing problem.

However, limited research on young people’s livelihood realities has constrained the effectiveness of interventions by these development players, resulting in poor targeting of resources and failed interventions. Many development interventions assume that skills training or targeted business support to create young entrepreneurs is required (Sumberg et al., 2017), yet there are often deeper, structural governance constraints that limit possibilities, and undermine the success of such interventions.

To address this gap, this study explores what governance factors influence youth (male and female) perceptions of livelihood outcomes in resettlement areas in Zimbabwe, examining gendered perceptions of governance constraints. The study is focused on rural youth in three resettlement areas in different parts of the country. A focus on rural youth is important, given that 67 percent of the population lives in the rural areas with more than half in communal lands and resettlement areas (Census National Report, 2012). The 3 areas chosen for this study have undergone substantial changes because of the land reform program including the political economy that mediate livelihood access by the youth. Land reform was supposed to create opportunities across generations, and it is important to explore what has happened from young people’s perspectives.

By governance, I mean the social, institutional, and political arrangements that assist or constrain livelihood opportunities. In this study, I differentiate between those governance
factors linked to the state provisioning, functioning and capacity; those linked to local politics and leaders; those linked to institutional arrangements for gaining access to livelihood resources, notably land; and those linked to kin and family networks and relations (see next chapter).

In this thesis, I make use of data generated by a Q study (see below), exploring perceptions of both livelihood options and constraints, conducted with secondary school students from 3 farming communities, established following the land reform in 2000. These are in Wondedzo situated in Masvingo district, Chikombedzi in Chiredzi South and Mvurwi, Mashonaland Central, representing contrasting agroecological/geographic areas.

Contrasting male and female perceptions of constraints to livelihood opportunities across the 3 sites, the Q results show several different ‘factors’, each defining a perspective about youth livelihoods outcomes and associated with certain groups of participants, differentiated by gender. As I discuss below, the results point to the importance of taking a differentiated perspective on youth livelihoods and governance, with a range of potential responses in policy and development programming.

1.1 Overview of the dissertation

The next chapter will give brief background information on youth and livelihoods in Zimbabwe and how land reform impacted on access to livelihoods and how youth have interacted with this process. This is followed by a discussion of the literature on youth, livelihoods and governance to bring out the different perspectives within which governance can be viewed. In chapter 4, the research methods used in this thesis are explained in detail to show how data was generated and indicate how it will be analysed. The results are presented and analysed in chapter 4 and policy recommendations are given thereafter and ends with conclusions in the last chapter. A gendered analysis of results follows, to bring out the different governance factors that affect livelihood opportunities for youth. Policy and practical implications for supporting youth livelihoods are given in the following section and conclusions shared in chapter 7.
Chapter 2: Background

Zimbabwe has a young population with 77 percent of the 13 million population under the age of 35 (Zimstats, 2012) and a high unemployment rate where 94.5 percent of the population is informally employed (Zimstats, 2012). Sixty-eight percent of the population, (Zimstats, Census, 2012) lives in the rural areas, with a third being rural youth (Zimstats, 2015). The Commonwealth Youth Development Index ranks Zimbabwe at 127 out of 170 countries on youth development (Commonwealth, 2013). The Zimbabwean constitution (2013) and the African Youth Charter (AYC) 2006, defines youth as the age group between 15-35 years. To address disparities and shortcoming of previous policy frameworks, a new window of opportunity arose in 2013 when a new constitution was enacted which, under section 20, obliges all state agencies and institutions to come up with affirmative action programmes that promote livelihoods for the youth. Section 27 also advocates for greater access to economic resources for women including land. The constitution, is also supported by the AYC (2006) and the National Youth Policy (NYP) 2013, which compels the state to build the capacity of the youth to participate in the economic development of the country and outlines a range of programs that include youth employment and sustainable livelihoods.

Restless Development (2012) notes that youth in rural Zimbabwe face difficulties in accessing basic education and particularly face challenges in developing their personal and vocational skills. It cites a weak education system coupled with scarce employment opportunities as a constraint to youth realising their potential.

Bennell (2007) adds that the transition from childhood to adulthood has been changing over the years and it has been difficult for rural youth to experience that transitional phase as young people because their transition from school to work happens at an early age and in short space of time. The effect is much more pronounced for poor rural young women who get married and bear children at a very young age. He argues that youth as a transitional age, barely exists for most of the rural youth and that the youth also lack economic independence or autonomy as the set-up of the rural household is such that it is a joint-venture while gender division of labour in productive areas, discriminates against women.

Regarding employment, Bennell (2007) notes that many rural youth are under-employed, and work in low productive, mostly household based activities but because of this low-paying hard work on the land, most rural youth have become highly mobile seeking employment opportunities in towns and cities and at times across borders.
In 2000, the Government of Zimbabwe embarked on a Fast Track Land Reform Programme (FTLRP) that transferred around 10 million hectares of land from predominantly white commercial farmers to black Zimbabweans. Nearly 150,000 households were resettled as smallholder (A1) farmers and a further 30,000 under the medium scale (A2) farms (Scoones et al, 2011, Moyo, 2011). This resulted in significant changes in farming and livelihoods (Scoones et al, 2010). The narrative of the youth’s involvement in the land reform has largely been that of violence and theft which characterised the way the process was conducted. During the land invasions, many young people were recruited to perpetrate violence against white commercial farmers, farm workers and ordinary citizens as a way of instilling fear against resistance to the program (Chaumba et al, 2003) However, beyond the slogans and violence of the invasions of the 2000s, there was no youth presence at the formulation of agrarian policies and allocation of land, which was dominated by black elites who had the power to allocate land (Moyo, 2011).

One aim of the land reform was to provide opportunities for the next generation, but with the Zimbabwean economy suffering a major downturn, young people have been hugely affected. It has been 17 years since the land reform was instituted, and a lot of socio-political and economic changes have occurred which have significantly affected livelihood opportunities and outcomes for the resettled farmers including young people. This research is interested in the perceptions of those in secondary school now, who were born around the time of land reform (mostly aged 16-18), and are now living in land reform areas. What shapes young people’s livelihood opportunities? What social arrangements, networks, institutions, organisations and political processes affect livelihood outcomes? What are the perceptions of the barriers or factors that affect ‘livelihood pathways’ for both younger men and women (Scoones, 2015).

This study will link an analysis of governance – as defined above, and discussed more below - and livelihoods, focusing on youth in a gender differentiated way. The aim will be to explore perceptions of governance constraints on livelihood outcomes, and identify practical and policy options for the future, given the major livelihood challenges faced by youth in Zimbabwe today.
Chapter 3: Understanding youth, livelihoods, and governance: A conceptual framework

In order to answer my question, what governance factors influence youth (male and female) perceptions of livelihood outcomes in resettlement areas in Zimbabwe?, I need to connect three strands of literature: a focus on governance, a focus on understanding livelihoods, especially outcomes, and the factors that constrain or enable livelihood opportunities; and a focus on youth – differentiated by gender – and the particular livelihood challenges of young people, in rural, agricultural contexts. The following sections introduce these literatures briefly.

3.1 Young people and farming livelihoods

In Zimbabwe, youth programming in rural areas tends to focus on vocational skills training and various crop production and livestock rearing programmes (National Youth Policy, 2013, Muranda et al, 2014). This often assumes that the problems faced by the youth are simply ones of technical skills and assets, rather than wider governance issues. In this thesis, I interrogate this assumption by looking at a range of governance factors, as discussed above, asking whether these may in fact – from young people’s points of view – be even more important to realising desirable livelihoods, as suggested by the sustainable livelihoods framework.

Asciutti et al (2016) provide a useful definition of youth or young people, to refer to ‘people who are planning or taking initial steps into livelihood building. In this research, I shall also use the terms youth or young people interchangeably guided by the definition above. In Zimbabwe ‘youth’ are defined by the Constitution as being between 15 and 35 years (Constitution of Zimbabwe, 2013), but this static view of the category does not highlight the importance of transition. White (2012) argues that, it is important to find out how youth is constructed in the areas under research and how it is experienced by young people for us to be able to understand their livelihoods. In his study, he found out that young people faces a number of constraints to attain livelihoods such as difficulties in accessing land for youth in rural areas, which is usually characterised by a “long waiting period” or complete shut out of the land.

White (2012) notes that youth struggle to realise livelihoods also because they are embedded in patriarchal structures where they are not able to exercise agency. Yeboah et al (2016) presenting findings from their study with students and parents in rural Ghana found that youth desired formal, salaried and professional jobs as compared to low skilled jobs but argued that
to achieve this, there must be an alignment of futures imagined by young people with those imagined for them by policy makers. This notion is also supported by Sumberg et al (2016) study, which revealed that youth would rather opt to pursue livelihoods options related to their level of education and avoid hard and less rewarding work associated with farming for instance.

Sumberg (2016) identified chains of factors that affect livelihood pathways for young people; constraints to structural transformation such as low investments in agriculture, limited technology, low productivity, and poor rural institutions. He also identified education and connectivity, mindset, and lack of skills as having an impact to livelihoods opportunities for youth. Sumberg et al (2000) found out that besides land, other social issues such as lack of respect for farmers, poverty and hard work related to farming inhibit them from taking up farming as a source of livelihoods. White (2012) notes that the youth today have better opportunities to attain education as compared to their parents, but the increased educational capacity has not been matched by expanded employment opportunities. In fact, he paints a grim picture, suggesting that young people see themselves in a process of ‘transition to nowhere’.

3.2 Livelihoods

Work on sustainable livelihoods has grown extensively since the early 90s particularly with the publication of Chambers and Conway’s (1992) paper, which focused on enhancing capabilities, improving equity, and increasing social sustainability. The paper provoked debate and further research from academics and influenced the work of several international development organisations such as DFID (1999) who came up with a sustainable livelihoods framework and other organisations like the Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO) (2008). Bebbington’s (1999) work focusing on capitals and capabilities and Scoones (1998) framework on sustainable livelihoods among others, provided greater scope of analysing livelihoods. Conway and Chambers (1992) provides us with a useful definition of livelihoods, as concerning capabilities, assets, and their ability to cope with stresses and shocks. It has 5 key elements, creation of working days, poverty reduction, wellbeing and capabilities, livelihood adaptation, vulnerability, and resilience and natural resource sustainability (Scoones, 1998).

However, although a flurry of research and papers have been published on sustainable livelihoods, there has been little that has been written on how governance and related relationships influence the attainment of sustainable livelihoods. DFID (1999) attempts to
address this by ‘transforming structures and processes’ which is very important but it looked more at the macro level processes while the UNDP framework does not recognise the influence of governance institutions and processes. Chambers and Conway (1992) gave us a strong foundation to analyse livelihoods but they didn’t mention the role of governance in influencing livelihoods. Following up on his earlier work, Scoones (2015) gave us an extended livelihoods approach and highlighted the importance of institutions, social relations, and politics in mediating livelihood access. It is these aspects that are central to my understanding of governance.

3.3 Governance

The study of governance is a very contentious research area which has provoked debate among scholars regarding how to best define it or at least describe how it looks like. The fact that there are hundreds of definitions that have been put forward to explain governance means that there are a variety of ways within which it can be viewed. Some definitions have focused mainly at the macro-level understanding of governance from the central state perspective. For example, DFID (2016) describes governance as the relationship between citizens and the state. But there are many other sites of governance, informal institutions, family arrangements and more. In this thesis, I take a broad understanding of governance, looking at the range of social, institutional, and political factors that influence livelihood outcomes, both formal and informal and both macro and micro.

In this research, I intend to look at the governance factors that are linked to livelihoods, and day-to-day lived realities. This research seeks explore and explain what kind of arrangements – social, institutional, and political - result in what livelihood outcomes under what conditions from the perspective of youth in land reform areas. As Lund (2006) acknowledges, the study of governance is not homogenous, it differs in time and space and it is therefore important to look at such governance determinants that are unique to the realisation of livelihoods by young people in Zimbabwe relative to the conditions that are peculiar to them. One of the problems with defining governance has been regarding the perspectives within which it can be viewed and analysed. Mann (1993) argues that it is useful to look at governance from the institutional (what it looks like) and the functional (what it does) angles, while Lund (2006) notes that in the study of governance, it may be important to view the state as both a system and an idea.
For the purposes of this research, it will be very unhelpful to look at governance from an idealist perspective, but rather on how it manifests itself in the daily lives of people.

Below, I look at literature that tries to explain what governance means and I use these characterisations to come up with a working definition for my thesis:

i) **Governance as state provisioning, functioning and capacity**

Some scholars and commentators have suggested that governance can be viewed from the perspective of the state’s ability to deliver services (Fukuyama, 2013, Stoker 1998) which Sardan (2011) termed the ‘delivery state’, a term he used to explain the organisation of public services delivery by the state. This view is generally looking at the top to bottom approach of the relationship between the agents and the principals, focusing on goods and services delivery. Rotberg (2014) refers to this as the output approach to governance which puts specific emphasis on drawing a distinction between states that produces abundant political goods and those that fail to do so, while Mann (1993) refers to this as the infrastructural power of the state, which is the capacity of the state to reach out to civil society and discharge its political duties.

ii) **Governance as institutional arrangements for gaining access to livelihood resources**

This strand of literature views governance as a network of institutions that work together to deliver services or regulate behaviour. These may be formal or informal, and often a combination of the two Rhodes (1996). Cammack (2011) argues that governance is associated with specific institutional configurations that determine how citizens interact with their leaders and how the later motivate and exercise power and draws a link between these configurations and public goods and services delivery. In support of this, Kooiman (1999) defines governance as interactive arrangements, where public and private actors participate in society to create opportunities and solve societal problems while Lund (2006) notes that there is need to look at how state and traditional institutions compete for public authority.
iii) Governance as leadership and politics

Another school of thought posits that one cannot discuss governance by omitting the role that politics and leaders at various levels play as instruments of governance. Scholars such as Sikor and Lund (2009) note that access to livelihood resources is closely related to exercise of power and authority. Stepputat (2001) classifies this as the state’s ability to provide a space where it interacts with citizens that they also use to control citizens and allocate resources. This is also supported by Rose (1999) who understands governance as some sort of a social system that is a result of ‘complex negotiations and exchanges’ between citizens and the state.

iv) Governance as kin, family networks and relations

Berry (1993) argues that people’s ability to gain access to livelihood resources is linked to their membership to social networks and how they relate with formal and informal political processes. In agreement, Mann (1993) argues that societies are made up of ‘socio-spatial networks’ of power referred to by Putnam (2001) as ‘social capital’ to describe the influence of social networks, norms and social values that interact to produce public goods and services.

From the above four areas of literature, it is evident that governance is not a straightforward concept. It ranges from macro and formal politics and institutions to micro and informal institutions and social relations. Governance systems cut across these, and in order to understand how governance affects livelihood outcomes, we must look at all aspects of governance and not be constrained by formal state-centric definitions.

My study will try and identify areas where governance and livelihoods intersect to understand if these influence perceptions of livelihood opportunity for young people. Making use of these three areas of literature, I hypothesise that young men/women will face different constraints, and there will be different governance factors impinging.

In the next section, I will discuss my research methodology where I show how the research data was collected and analysed in using gendered lenses and present results showing how different governance factors affect young people, both male and female.
Chapter 4: Research Design and Methodology

4.1 Introduction

This thesis interrogates youth’s perceptions of constraints to their livelihood choices. To explore this, I employ Q methodology, a rigorous way of analysing subjective viewpoints from different groups of people. As explained in the previous section, I made use of data generated as part of a wider study on livelihoods after land reform. This study is being led by Ian Scoones, Blasio Mavedzenge and Felix Murimbimbarimba, and the data was generated by Q sorts from secondary school students from 3 communities, Wondedzo in Masvingo district which is close to an urban setting, Chikombedzi in Chiredzi South, also under Masvingo Province but further down near the border with South Africa and Mvurwi, a high potential area in Mashonaland Central Province.

4.2 Q methodology

Q methodology is a method that is used to analyse subjective viewpoints using both qualitative and quantitative methods. Qualitative methods are used to explore subjectivity while statistical techniques are used to reveal the structure of views (Akhtar-Danesh et al, 2008). Q methodology is interested in establishing patterns within and across individuals as compared to individual traits like gender, age, class etc. It attempts to bring out a variety of accounts or discourses about or around a particular discourse, theme, issue or topic but able to avoid chaotic multiplication at the same time (Barry and Proops, 1999).

The key feature of the Q Method is that participants are asked to rank their opinions along a continuum from agree to disagree against a set of statements about a subject. It is a ‘self-directing process’ usually consisting of between 10-100 statements known as ‘the Q set’ and the process of arranging them called ‘Q sorting’. The Q method has been used in several other studies on youth and agriculture, such as perspectives on desirable work in conducted in Ghana (Yeboah et al, 2016) and young people’s perspective on farming, also in Ghana (Sumberg et al, 2016).
4.3 Q set design and content

The study from which the data I analyse below is drawn, went through the following steps:

The first step was to identify the core questions. Two were identified:

- What do you think you will be doing in 20 years’ time?
- What are the constraints to getting there?

This thesis does not report on Q sorts related to the first question, and only focuses on the second question. For this question, a range of possible answers were generated through discussions with young people, both male and female. Through several iterations, 36 statements were chosen (Appendix 1). These statements define the Q set for this study. These statements derive directly from young people’s views, to ensure that the research is focused on issues which are raised by the participants and not the researcher (Barry and Proops, 1999)

A Q sort was carried out with Form Four students in each of the schools. The sort was introduced by researchers and with teachers present. They explained the process to the students and emphasised that it was not in any way a form of academic examination to ensure greater and free participation.

The 36 statement cards were placed on a continuum from ‘Strongly Agree’ to ‘Strongly Disagree’ designed as an inverted pyramid. Students were given grid sheets where they affixed statement numbers against the horizontal axis which represented their feelings towards the 36 statements, involving a process of deliberation and ranking. On the sheets, they also wrote down their names, school, age, and gender. After all information was clearly captured, photos were taken of the grid sheets.

After the Q sort exercise, the participants were separated into four groups (separated by gender) for a 30-minute discussion where detailed notes were taken, which Watts and Stenner (2012) calls the ‘post-sorting interview’. Much of the information gathered at this stage serves to increase the richness and quality of the data (Gallager and Porock, 2010 quoted in Watts and Stenner, 2012).

The data was analysed combining all 3 schools and differentiating by male and female participants. 61 Q sorts were retained, as others had various errors. 22 Q sorts were from females and 39 Q sorts were from males.
The data was recorded on the grids, and was transferred to the UK, where I started my analysis. I used the PQ Method which is specifically designed to run this type of data. I entered each Q sort from the study as data and then correlated with every other sort. The Q sorts were then run using the PQ Method to extract those factors that are significant, to come up with different viewpoints from the factor analysis.

The PQ Method extracted all the significant factors representing the best estimate of the Q sorts. The factors therefore present an “ideal type” around which those Q sorts which come closest to this ideal are listed’ (Barry and Proops, 1999). The eigenvalue criterion was used to statistically determine the significance of a factor, such factors with an eigenvalue greater than 1.0 were considered significant. Finally, the factor arrays were then interpreted using the “crib sheet” method (Watts and Turner, 2005), which ensures that nothing obvious gets missed or overlooked providing a wider system of organisation for the interpretative process and allows the researcher to engage with every item in a factor array.

The statements generated in discussions with students cover a wide range of potential constraints (see Appendix 1) that link to the areas of literature I identified above encompassing a broad definition of governance. For example, corruption (S32), poor and incompetent government (S18) relate to issues of state provisioning, functioning and capacity. Equally, chiefs and local leaders do not support the youth (S8), lack of links to party in power (S24) relate to local politics and leaders while, women don’t get land (S25) and no land redistribution for youth (S16) link to institutional arrangements for gaining access to livelihood resources, notably land. No rich relatives to help out (S14) and parents fail to pay school fees (S29), are linked to kin and family networks and relations. There are of course other factors not directly linked to ‘governance’ but mentioned in the sort, such as climate change and frequent droughts (S34) as well as not having a bank account (S13).

As discussed above, the Q sorts generate a series of ‘factors’ for male and female sorters. These combine a series of statements into a short composite statement on each factor. These are discussed in the following section. In my analysis, I was interested in finding out which factors that are linked to a broad definition of governance are present in different ‘factors’ that define a particular viewpoint on the question of what are the constraints to imagined livelihoods in 20 years.
Chapter 5: What do young people think constrains future livelihoods? Results of the Q analysis

5.1 Introduction

In this section, I develop the Q factor analysis for male and female sorters. The Q method identified 4 factors each for male and female sorters. Table 4.1 below shows the distribution of sorters per area disaggregated by gender.

Table 5.1: Distribution of participants disaggregated by gender per district

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mvurwi</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wondedzo</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chikombedzi</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the ‘crib sheet’ method (see previous section), the following present the factor statements first for male sorters, and second for female. The value of the highest ranking which represents the most desirable viewpoint is +5 and the lowest ranking is -5.
5.2 Perspectives from Male Q Sort

i) Lack of support from parents and local leaders

From this viewpoint, the inability of youth to access their desired livelihoods is centred on the local support from kin networks and leaders. This perspective shows that there is an expectation from the youth for a more supportive role from their family members, but this support is not there because of parents’ failure to pay school fees (S29) ranked highly at +5. This perspective also shows that parents’ reluctance to hand on land to their children (S35) +3, deprives the youth access to land as a vital livelihood asset which they can use to earn a living. This not only leads to delayed adulthood, but makes it difficult for the youth to earn a living as farmers and constrains their capacity to establish their own homes and start their own families and confines them to working for their parents without any benefit. This viewpoint also highlights the importance of networks and connections as an important factor in determining livelihood pathways for the youth, which means the failure of parents to have these connections, has a huge bearing on the type of livelihoods that they are likely to pursue.

The importance of local institutions that hold power in the local communities such as chiefs, headmen or local councillors in influencing livelihoods for young people is strongly emphasised here, with the statements that chiefs and local leaders do not support the youth (S8) being rated highly at +3. This may be explained by the fact that these local leaders have the political agency to make opportunities available for the youth, which may be through giving out land to the youth, linking them with other opportunities in the public service or opportunities to further their education. Lack of support from these leaders, is a significant constraint the young people identified in their quest to attain livelihoods assets and shape their livelihood pathways.

The male youth were neutral when it came to gendered distribution of land and did not see women’s inability to get land (S25) or not having a bank account (S13) as significant constraints to livelihoods pathways, both were ranked at +0. This sort also did not project not having access to computers and internet (S6) having any effect on livelihoods as well as not having good command of English (S36) ranked lowly at -4. The male youth did not see lack of vocational training skills as a constraint either (S31), ranked lowly at -3.
ii) Lack of state support

This perspective identifies the general lack of state support as a major constraint to accessing livelihoods by the youth. Ranking highly at +5, the male youth identified corruption of officials which makes business difficult (S32) as a big problem and thereby limiting their ability to pursue their desired livelihoods. This links with some aspects of the first perspective in that the lack of connections and absence of support from local leaders F1(S8, +3), may be because of clientelistic systems that constrains youth from attaining livelihoods.

As with the first viewpoint, failure to redistribute land to the youth (S16), linked to both state and local leadership, was cited again as a hindrance to access land as a livelihood asset, thereby affecting their ability to earn a living from land, which leaves them to look for options beyond the farm, ranked at +3. The unavailability of markets (S7) to sell produce from the farm is another factor that this group of male youth identified as hindering them from taking up livelihoods as farmers ranked at +2. This can be attributed to the general theme in this viewpoint of an incompetent government which in this case, is not able to correct market failures.

Expensive university education (S30) ranked at +4, is another critical constraint which explains why some livelihoods options that require tertiary education may be out of reach for many young people thereby shaping their livelihoods choices towards those livelihoods assets that they can access. The youth see lack of adequate training in farming business (S3) as an essential part of their decision making that influence them to fail to take up farming as a source of livelihood +3 and interestingly, they also identify poor English (S36) as another constraint to the pursuit of livelihoods pathways of their choice at +2, each linked to lack of state support in training and education.

However, this perspective was neutral relating to access to cash for investment (S12) ranked at +0, which signifies that the youth are not necessarily interested in running their own businesses but would rather have a functional government that provides opportunities for formal employment. The roles of parents (S29), the church (S2) were ranked lowly at -5 and support from local leaders (S8) are not seen as significant in influencing livelihoods by the youth, ranked at -1.
iii) Absence of social networks and relations

The general perspective embodied in this factor array is that the absence of social networks and relations negatively affects male youth’s ability to pursue their desired livelihoods. The notion that parents do not have connections to get jobs (S10) for their children +3 and absence of rich relatives to help out (S14) +3, underlies the value that youth attach to family as a social pillar of support to make it in life. In this viewpoint, a new factor, which has not been pointed out in the first two factor arrays emerges as a key constraint, which is the problem of early marriages due to poverty (S9). Surprisingly, this view is coming from a Q sort of males only and it ranks highly at +5.

Another factor that is closely linked to the second viewpoint of ineffective and corrupt state resurfaces here but expressed as lack of investment in the country (S17) ranking highly at +4. They identified this as a major problem for the lack of an array of opportunities, such as jobs outside farming, from which they could choose their desired livelihood pathways. Connected to this are the high taxes that are charged by the state or local council which makes businesses difficult (S26) ranked highly at +4 makes this pathway unattractive for young people. This may explain why the youth are unwilling to rely on land as a livelihood asset because the market remains highly regulated and heavily taxed which even makes it difficult for the youth to straddle livelihoods.

The importance of kin and family as important factors in the realisation of livelihoods by the youth also comes out strongly in this viewpoint citing inability of rich relatives to help-out (S14) as a constraint, ranked at +3. However, these male youth do not believe that the absence of credit or loan facilities (S11) -4 has any bearing on their livelihood pathways, which may indicate that they are not interested in being “their own bosses” but prefer to get employment to earn livelihoods, which is possible in a properly functioning economy. They also totally dismiss the notion that sanctions by international investors on the country (S1) is a constraint to attaining livelihoods, ranked lowly at -5, indicating that it is rather bad governance not the former that is a challenge as evidenced in perspective 2.

The issue of land as a vital livelihood capital is irrelevant in this factor as evidenced by the low ranking of statements such as women don’t get land (S25) at -4 and parents don’t hand on land to their children (S35) at -3, the youth do not see this as a constraint to earning a living. This shows that in this perspective, male youth do not have interest in farming related livelihoods, and social networks are aimed at getting them into non-farm businesses.
iv) Lack of access to key assets/skills

This viewpoint generally identifies the lack of critical skills or assets as a major constraint to accessing livelihoods by the youth and land emerges as a key livelihood asset essential for young people’s livelihoods outcomes. This is because there is no land redistribution for youth (S16), which makes it difficult for them to pursue farming or agricultural related livelihoods, ranked highly at +5. These male youth are keen to take up low-end skilled jobs such as working as drivers but they cannot pursue these livelihoods because either they do not have driving licence or it is too expensive to do driving lessons (S5, +4).

These male youth values access to computer or internet connectivity (S6), which they can sue to connect with their peers, and get access to a wide array of job and education opportunities they can be able to pursue, ranked at +3. The lack of these IT connections can also be linked with the second factor array (F2, S32) on corrupt and incompetent government which is failing to provide vital infrastructure to the youths. In addition, lack of markets (S7) is another statement that can also be linked to corrupt, poor and incompetent government (F2, S32) is a prominent feature of this factor array.

Surprisingly, the youth do not think that lack of training in farming business (S3) is essential to youth’s livelihoods outcomes. However, they do regard land access and so farming as essential. Poor educational qualifications and few O Level passes (S28), ranking at -1, is also not regarded as a significant constraint to the attainment of livelihoods, this may be because of the jobs they aspire to do in life such as that of being a driver for example (S5, +4), do not need academic ability to accomplish. This perspective overall draws a link between key assets and skills and the wider economic environment characterised by lack of investment, sanctions by international donors and the poor and incompetent government.

For female sorters, a different set of factor narratives emerged from the analysis but there are significant trends and similarities that can be drawn between the two Q sorts.
5.3 Perspectives from female Q Sort

i) Poverty

The general theme in this perspective is that poverty is a challenge faced by female youths in their pursuit of livelihood opportunities. Because they have nothing to do, as there are no jobs in the country (S27), highly ranked at +5, or alternative livelihood assets that they can access, they end up trapped in early marriages due to poverty (S9) ranked at +4. This may partly explain why they fail to follow their desired pathways because they would have to deal with new challenges of motherhood and family. This may lead them to pursue other livelihood options, which may not necessarily be those that they desire but those that fit with their household duties.

This perspective also reinforces the same view by their male counterparts in the third factor array above, which identified early marriages as a significant constraint. This factor array also stresses the importance of kin and family networks by identifying the lack of support from rich relatives (S14) at +1, as a significant constraint to the youth’s attainment of livelihoods.

In this perspective, young women are hampered from establishing a farming livelihood at home because there is not enough land for young people (S33), ranked at +3. The lack of land also ties with lack of support from family and local leaders that featured prominently in the male Q sort. These female youth think that with a better education, they may be able to follow other livelihood pathways with better outcomes but poor educational qualifications and few O Level passes (S28) +1, keeps them in the cycle of poverty. This perspective is neutral about the absence of markets for products (S7) +0, indicating that the female youths do not aspire to engage in commercial farming or that they are not interested in farming at all.

Since the young women are not interested in commercial farming, they do not see taxes or charges by government/council which makes business difficult (S26), ranked at -2, as having any impact on their livelihood choices. They also do not think that bias against women in jobs (S20) -2, affects their livelihoods choices or outcomes, and neither does poor command of English (S36), ranked lowly at -3. For this perspective, general poverty is holding them back, whether from land-based livelihoods or non-farm options.
ii) Lack of educational opportunities

In this viewpoint, the lack of educational opportunities is cited as the major reason young women are not able to attain their desired livelihoods. Because they are not educated, the youths are not able to find employment due to the general lack of jobs in the country (S27), ranked highly at +5. The reason may be that available opportunities are only within the reach of those that are highly skilled or are well connected. This lack of education is tied with the failure by parents to pay for their education (S29), which also reiterates the importance of the family system as an important factor in determining the quality of livelihoods available at young women’s disposal. This is also made worse by expensive university education at (S30) also ranked highly at +4, which is beyond the reach of their parents or kin networks and absence of child care for the young mothers (S21) +3, which hampers their ability to study and fulfil their potential.

This viewpoint is tied closely to the first factor array in that the lack of educational opportunities leads the young women into poverty and into early marriages (S9, +4) as well as to abandon their career aspirations. Although climate change (S34) ranked at +3, lack of land for young people (S33) at -5, absence of land redistribution targeted at the youth (S16) -3 or that parents do not hand on land to their children (S35) also at -3 were all factors linked to land related livelihoods, they were cited as insignificant factors determining young women’s livelihood pathways. This shows that in this perspective, the youths are not interested in farming livelihoods but would prefer pathways carved by educational qualifications that see them leave farming areas, but they currently are being hampered by lack of jobs and investment in the country and limited educational opportunities.

iii) Absence of social networks and relations

This viewpoint is overall about the importance of networks for young women to attain livelihoods and their desire to make a living outside the farm set-up. They identified the lack of links to the political party in power (S24) as a significant constraint to the attainment of livelihoods by young people, with a high ranking of +5, as this may be an easier way to access opportunities that may be connected to the public service or government resources such as scholarships or entry into training programs. This is generally about the connections that were also prominent in the male Q sort. The young women also identified community support as
integral to the shaping their livelihood pathways by attributing the lack of support from the church (S2) ranked highly at +4, as a key contributory factor. Although the issue of connectivity is neutral in this perspective at +0, having no access to computer or internet connection (S6) at their disposal, is significantly highly ranked across all the factor arrays also highlighting information technology as a constraint to their ability to explore other available opportunities online.

Young mothers also face challenges with child care (S21), but they do not necessarily view it as a notable constraint to accessing livelihood opportunities, this statement is ranked at -3. This perspective also shows that youth are not keen to gain livelihoods as farmers given their low ranking of the absence of markets for products (S7) at -5, neither are they concerned with climate change induced droughts (S34) -1 as a determinant factor in youth’s livelihoods pathways. This viewpoint emphasises the importance of connections outside the family such as links to the party in power (S24) and getting help from the church (S2) but is neutral on the family level connections, such as parents’ inability to pay school fees (S29) ranked at +0. In general, this factor array is pointing to government failure driven by corruption which makes it difficult for one to succeed without connections in the party, lack of investment which can be linked to the lack of infrastructures and high taxes by the state which frustrate alternative livelihood pathways outside the farm.

iv) Gender inequalities

This factor array is largely centred on land as a key livelihood asset and dominating this perspective is the gendered inequalities associated with land distribution and use such as women don’t get land (S25), ranked highly at +4. The inability of female youth to access vital livelihoods assets such as land makes it difficult for them to earn livelihoods out of farming, which may be traced to local customs and traditions in Zimbabwe where parents mostly parcel out land to the male children. This perspective also views parents’ reluctance to hand on land to their children (S35) ranked at +3, which was also cited by their male counterparts as a constraint but for young women, the impact may be much greater considering structural inequalities against women in general. This may also be partly attributed to why female youth prefer education related livelihoods as depicted in factor array two, compared to farming linked livelihoods.
In addition to that, the failure by the state to redistribute land to the youth (S16) also ranked at +3, is perceived as a hindrance to young females’ ownership of land as livelihoods capital and significantly undermine their agency to earn a living out of farming. Although land is central in this view point, making a living out of farming is not regarded as a viable option because of lack of markets, high state taxes and so on. Lack of training in farming as a business (S3) at -3, is regarded as an insignificant factor in determining livelihoods pathways for young people, also indicating their dislike of farming as a source of employment. It is the same with poor and infertile soils (S19) ranked at -4, which the young women do not see as a constraint to their attainment of livelihoods outcomes, perhaps because of their lack of interest in farming. These female youth also do not think that external measures, such as sanctions by international investors (S1) on the country has any relevance regarding their livelihoods. Instead, direct access to land assets is seen as the major constraints.

Male and female sorters came up with different factor arrays, but each emphasised governance factors in different ways. Some focused on the macro factors of state incapacity and corruption, linking in turn to provision of services, including most notably education. Others focused on more local institutions and social relations hampering their livelihoods, whether the reluctance of families to transfer land, or the limited connections and networks offered.

Table 5.2: Summary of the Q Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of support from local leaders and parents</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Lack of state support</td>
<td>Lack of educational opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>Absence of social networks and relations</td>
<td>Absence of social networks and relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>Lack of access to key assets or skills</td>
<td>Gender inequalities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next section analyses these results linking to the framework introduced earlier, aiming to answer the question: what are the perceptions of governance constraints to attaining livelihoods outcomes for young people, and how are these differentiated by gender?

5.4 What governance factors are perceived to influence livelihood outcomes?

From my literature review, I identified four dimensions of governance. These were:

- Governance as state provisioning, functioning and capacity
- Governance as institutional arrangements for gaining access to livelihood resources
- Governance as leadership and politics
- Governance as kin, family networks and relations

Which aspects of these appeared in the four factor arrays that defined male and female youth views across the three schools?

MF1 (male factor array 1) focused on governance constraints centred on local leadership and politics and family relations which impact of male youth’s livelihoods outcomes at different levels. For example, the inability of parents to pay school fees and parents’ reluctance to hand on land to their children is more of an inward constraint at the kin and family level, while lack of support from chiefs and local leadership is an outward constraint. MF2 emphasised state provision, functioning and capacity, holding the state accountable land redistribution policies and practice that do not prioritise youth, failing to stimulate market growth and high costs of education. These are all constraints that are within the state’s control. Unlike MF2, MF3 focused more kin networks such as absence of rich relatives to help-out and micro level governance constraints at the family level like parents’ lack of connections to get jobs for their children.

Finally, MF4 emphasised lack of skills and asset, with the underlying cause being institutional constraints combined with poor state policy. The skills identified here are not related to farming but low-level type of skills that can take the male youth to other livelihoods sources such as being drivers and more modern assets like computers which they can easily claim ownership as compared to land.

By contrast, for female sorters (FF1), highlighted generic poverty, with governance factors such as lack of state provisioning, services, and poor economic policy (and so lack of jobs)
highlighted. Here governance related mostly to state failure, corruption and the lack of effective economic policy. FF2 focused on the failure of the state to provide cheap/free education, and the failure of parents to pay for existing options. Here governance failures were seen very much in terms of service provision. FF3 by contrast identified the constraints less at state level, but more in relation to local social relations and networks that were limiting opportunity. Notably, the female sorters were more concerned about relationships at organisational level such as the church or ruling political party and not at kin or family level as opposed to MF3 which identified latter as constraints. For this group of female youth, governance was very much about local networks and relations, and the way they were functioning to gain access to jobs in particular.

Finally, FF4 focused on lack of assets but the overriding theme of this perspective is on gendered inequalities that mediate the processes of assets accumulation for female youth which is linked to local politics, norms and customs that discriminate them from owning assets, related. This related to gender and women empowerment together with a mix of government policy around youth provision of land, and local factors that impeded access, including parents, chiefs, and local institutions.

Although there are patterns of similarities in the between the male and female Q sorts, the latter perceived constraints to livelihoods outcomes in relation to the structural gender inequalities related to access to assets and services and those that mediate relationships and influence laws, policies, and customs. The skills and assets that male sorters imagined, differed with the female sorters in that they identified movable assets such as computers and low skilled jobs like being drivers. In contrast, female sorters identified land as a vital livelihood asset they do not have access to and their have higher standards for livelihoods pursued through good education.

However, there were similarities in some factor arrays which emphasised the state in terms of provisioning, service supply or state failure in terms of capacity and corruption. This was either directly mentioned as the driving factor, or indirectly causing lack of educational opportunity or poverty and lack of opportunity. Among both male and female youth, local institutions were frequently mentioned – relationships, networks and access to resources were all seen as linked. So, whether this was chiefs, headmen (traditional leadership) or party leaders or churches or families, relationships and networks were seen as central. In this sense governance constraints were seen as embedded in local society and not external, nor necessarily state-related.
Overall, for both male and female youth factor arrays pointed to diverse forms of governance affecting opportunities, with in each case two focused on wider, more macro factors impinging on local circumstances and opportunities, while two focused on local embedded institutions and social relations and gender. Different factors had different influences on opportunities. For jobs and moving away from the rural areas, macro, state-level competence and capacity was seen as important. The collapsed economy, endemic levels of corruption and the failure of the state to provide services were seen as particularly affecting job opportunities. By contrast, local factors were more largely tied up with immediate access to assets locally, whether on or off farm but gendered constraints tended to be evident at both micro and macro levels. Social forces operating at the local level for instance were seen as preventing access to land, but also markets and other aspects crucial to making a livelihood.
Chapter 6: Policy and practical implications: supporting youth livelihoods in rural Zimbabwe

6.1 Introduction

Summarising the factor analysis carried out above, Table 6.1, highlights the key features of each factor for male and female Q sort participants. Each of these focuses on different dimensions of governance, as discussed above. In terms of policy response and practical intervention at the local level by development agencies and the state, the analysis suggests quite different responses for different groups of men and women, depending on their situation and their desired livelihood trajectory.

What responses then might respond to these perceptions of governance constraints for men and women? The following table outlines potential response to each factor array discourse, as presented by both male and female youth.

Table 6.1: Implications for male youth interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>For development actors</th>
<th>For the state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Lack of support from local leaders and parents</td>
<td>• Facilitate dialogue meetings and engagements between youth and their local leaders&lt;br&gt;• Engage in constitutional and cross-generational literacy to educate local leaders on their roles and functions&lt;br&gt;• Train local level institutions to deal with affirmative action programs for youth</td>
<td>• Establish community level contact centres or offices for local leaders&lt;br&gt;• Develop action plans for youth centred social policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2: Lack of state support | • Support engagement platforms between youth and local state institutions  
• Promote good governance and anti-corruption programs aimed at increasing accessibility to state led programmes (e.g. the Youth Fund) by the youth  
• Train youth in social accountability programs such as participatory budget and planning to ensure transparent allocation of resources | • Equip anti-corruption agencies to combat corruption at all levels  
• Promote transparency of government programmes at the grassroots level  
• Invest more in social services and social protection programs targeted at the youth  
• Prioritise economic recovery programmes that stimulate growth and create employment for youth |
|---|---|---|
| 3: Absence of social networks and relations | • Support stakeholder meetings between youth, local leaders, community level bureaucrats, and opinion leaders etc.  
• Support innovation on existing social engagement platforms in farming communities to respond to changing youth needs. | • Establish youth centres in rural communities that provide information and networking platforms for youth  
• Increase transparency in government programmes to provide a fair chance for youth to access livelihood opportunities |
| 4: Lack of access to key assets or skills | • Support youth skills building programs that respond to their chosen livelihood pathways  
• Train youth on the use of information, | • Roll out skills development programs targeted at youth, providing training in the various disciplines of their |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication technologies</th>
<th>choice (e.g. driving and computer skills)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Invest in information and communication technology infrastructure in marginalised communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Establish youth economic empowerment programmes that address different livelihood pathways based on the needs of specific youth groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.2: Implications for female youth interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>For development actors</th>
<th>For the state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Poverty</td>
<td>• Support economic empowerment programmes for young women</td>
<td>• Stimulating economic growth and create employment opportunities for young women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase funding to support in-school and out of school girls to continue with education</td>
<td>• Implement social protection programmes for the poor to cushion them against poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Roll out economic empowerment programs targeted at female youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of educational opportunities</td>
<td>• Educate parents about the importance of getting female children to school</td>
<td>• Subsidise or provide free education to vulnerable female youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide support for out of school female youth to get back to school</td>
<td>• Adequately fund social welfare services to enable the state to pay for female youth who cannot afford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide career guidance and support for girls to</td>
<td>• Develop social policies (e.g. on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Absence of social networks and relations</td>
<td>• Support community meetings between young women, politicians, and government officials.</td>
<td>• Establish community level information centres for easy access to information and networks • Promote interface meetings between elected officials and female youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gender and young women empowerment</td>
<td>• Support policy review on laws that undermine young women empowerment (e.g., customary law) • Promote interface between young women and local power holders on equitable allocation of livelihood assets such as land • Support skills training for young women in selected disciplines</td>
<td>• Mainstream young women empowerment in policy formulation and implementation • Relax conditions and revise laws on land ownership to make it easier for young women to own land • Roll out land based economic empowerment programs targeting female youth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As these tables show, a potentially huge range of governance responses are required, ranging from policy advocacy, anti-corruption lobbying to capacity building training and local level community facilitation. This reinforces the point that governance means more than just national level institutional responses involving the state (see chapter 5) and needs to cut across all scales and address in a more targeted fashion the aspirations, perceptions and felt needs of different groups. More importantly, it also shows that responses should be targeted to meet the needs of youth depending on their situation, needs and aspirations.
Chapter 7: Conclusion

Pathways to attaining livelihoods are not a neatly defined trajectory, they are influenced by various factors that mediate these processes across scales – from national politics and economy to what happens within a community or homestead. In this thesis, governance has been defined as the social, institutional, and political arrangements that assist or constrain livelihood opportunities, and through the literature review four contrasting approaches have been identified which defined governance as:

- state provisioning, functioning and capacity
- institutional arrangements for gaining access to livelihood resources
- leadership and politics
- kin, family networks and relations

A Q sort analysis involving young people (aged 16-18) from three sites in Zimbabwe identified four ‘factor arrays’ for male and female participants, representing different ‘discourses’ on constraints on livelihoods. While the factor analysis is of course based only on a limited number of respondents, and a constrained set of statements, it nevertheless exposed a wide range of constraints to young people realising their livelihood ambitions. The factor analysis exposed the range of governance factors that young people identify as important. These went beyond the standard youth development programming efforts in rural areas that focus on skill development or business capacity. Instead, young people identified a range of governance factors that they perceive to impinge on livelihood opportunities.

For different groups, therefore, the governance factors that are perceived to constrain future livelihoods varied. Although there were patterns of similarities in perception between males and females, what was distinctly clear were the gender dimension that was associated with female responses and the anti-farming based livelihoods and ‘freedom’ to straddle other livelihoods options outside the farm. There were also differences between those who perceived macro factors (such as lack of state support and service provision, corruption of officials, and failure of economic policy) to be important as against those who focused more on local dynamics (such as limited social networks and relations, lack of support from parents or local leaders).

In other words, different combinations of governance factors are perceived to influence livelihood outcomes for different groups. Governance is not a singular factor, but highly
differentiated. It depends on who you are (male and female) and what you want to do (such as high level professional jobs vs local business and farming). Governance thus, should not only be viewed from the macro-level as the relationship between a centralised state and citizens, but should encompass the relationships between such dimensions and micro or local level factors. For it is at the local level that youth interact with governance – social, institutional, and political aspects that influence access to resources and livelihood opportunities - on a daily basis.

However, the findings of this research should not be taken as a complete diagnosis of governance factors that constrain young people’s ability to pursue their livelihood pathways in Zimbabwe. This is a study of perceptions, and from a sample from only three districts all located in farm-based resettlement communities. Rather, it should be treated as a case study that provides important hints for thinking about governance responses to youth challenges in a more nuanced way, particularly for rural, farming communities. However, this thesis may not necessarily provide useful insight to youth interventions in other communities such as mining, peri-urban and urban communities, and should be replicated to explore contrasts and differences.

What must be taken from this research is that youth livelihoods programming should not be a one-size fits all approach. Standard approaches based on training or youth empowerment through small businesses are highly constrained by governance factors, as described here. Because each youth group is different – indeed in this study there were 8 arrays, each with different characterisations of the problem, even from similar rural areas. It is therefore important to group young people according to their specific needs and not treat them as a homogenous group as the divergent perspectives highlighted in this study have shown. Some are interested in pursuing education driven alternatives and leaving the area, while others imagine themselves working on the land but in a much more productive fashion. Most importantly, results from this research provide field based evidence that can influence and inform programming based on young people’s experiences as opposed to policy and programmes imagined for them by policy makers.

Diverse livelihood pathways are therefore influenced by governance factors in different ways, meaning that simple interventions or responses are impossible. This suggests a more ambitious but also more targeted approach to youth development in rural areas in Zimbabwe.
Appendices

Table 1: Q Sort statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Sanctions by international investors on country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>My church doesn’t help me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Lack of training in farming businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Illness or disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>No driving licence/too expensive to do lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>No access to computer or internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>No markets for products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>Chiefs and local leaders do not support the youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>Early marriage due to poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>Parents don’t have connections to get jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>No credit or loans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>No cash to invest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>Don’t have a bank account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>No rich relatives to help out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>Expensive inputs for agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>No land redistribution for youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>Lack of investment in the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>Poor incompetent government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>Soil is poor and infertile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>Bias against women in jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>No help with childcare, so cannot study or work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>Too poor to get married and establish a family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>Too poor to build home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td>Lack of links to party in power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td>Women don’t get land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S26</td>
<td>Taxes by government or council makes business difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S27</td>
<td>Lack of jobs in the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S28</td>
<td>Poor educational qualifications-few O Level passes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S29</td>
<td>Parents fail to pay school fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S30</td>
<td>University education too expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S31</td>
<td>Lack of vocational training to learn skills for jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S32</td>
<td>Corruption of officials makes business difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S33</td>
<td>Not enough land for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S34</td>
<td>Climate change and frequent droughts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S35</td>
<td>Parents don’t hand on land to their children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S36</td>
<td>English is poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Male Perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Question: What are the constraints faced by young people as they grow up and try to make a living?</th>
<th>Percentage Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perspective 1</td>
<td>Lack of support from parents and local leaders</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective 2</td>
<td>Lack of state support</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective 3</td>
<td>Absence of social networks and relations</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective 4</td>
<td>Lack of access to key assets/skills</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage variation among the individual sorts within a study accounted for by this perspective. The perspective accounting for the most variation is referred to as the dominant perspective (Sumberg et al, 2017)

Table 3: Female Perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Question: What are the constraints faced by young people as they grow up and try to make a living?</th>
<th>Percentage Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perspective 1</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective 2</td>
<td>Lack of educational opportunities</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective 3</td>
<td>Absence of social networks and relations</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective 4</td>
<td>Gender inequalities</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage variation among the individual sorts within a study accounted for by this perspective. The perspective accounting for the most variation is referred to as the dominant perspective (Sumberg et al, 2017)
Figure 1: A completed Q sort
References


