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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Zimbabwe Coalition on Debt and Development (ZIMCODD) in Partnership with USAID Zimbabwe engaged a consultant to conduct a baseline survey on Strengthening Institutions and Youth Agency in Accountability Narratives (SIYA) programme. The purpose of this baseline survey was to provide a benchmark through an in-depth analysis of the programme objectives and performance indicators from which to measure the progress and impact of the programme. The consultant conducted the baseline survey within 30 days, spread in November and December 2023.

The SIYA programme seeks to address inefficiencies in the supply side of governance and accountability through tailor-made capacity strengthening of sub-national governance institutions in all ten provinces of Zimbabwe. On the other hand, the program seeks to simultaneously strengthen capacities of Community Based Organizations (CBOs) to coalesce, participate and build demand for accountability from below. Citizens’ capacity to hold solution holders accountable using various accountability tools which include the public expenditure monitoring, citizen scorecard, open budget survey, and the fiscal transparency index. Baseline survey data was collected from 6 districts sampled from 6 provinces only. The sampled provinces are Harare, Bulawayo, Matabeleland North, Matabeleland South, Midlands and Manicaland. Subsequently, data was collected from Chitungwiza, Hwange, Matobo, Gokwe South and Mutasa which represented the 6 sampled districts. The study adopted a participatory mixed-method research design, which was characterized by combining qualitative and quantitative research methods to collect primary data from sampled districts, including a comprehensive literature review done for the SIYA program documents provided to us by ZIMCODD and its partners. Thus, this baseline survey interviewed 404 (189 male and 215 female) youth respondents. In addition, primary data was collected from 20 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) of which 11 FGDs were for youths (separated male and female) and 9 FGDs for adult members (separated male and female). Furthermore, the baseline survey collected data from 11 key informants, namely 1 Traditional leader, 5 councilors and 5 Youths focused organizations and Community Based Organizations (CBOs) from the 6 sampled districts. In addition, the consultant interviewed SIYA program partners, namely Youth Empowerment and Transformation Trust (YETT), ZIMCODD, Transparency International Zimbabwe (TI-Z), and Southern African Parliamentary Support Trust (SAPST) in Harare. Quantitative data was analyzed using STATA for descriptive and inferential statistics. NVivo
11.0 was used to analyze qualitative data for common themes, trends and challenges identified by participants.

Demographic results were that 17.58% of the participants were from Bulawayo, 16.58% were from Matabeleland North, 16.58% from Manicaland, 16.58% Midlands, 16.58% Matabeleland South, and 16.58% of the respondents were from Harare Province of which 53% of the respondents were female while 47% were male. Age distribution was 38.37% were aged between 18-24 years, 32.43% were aged between 25-30 years while 29.21% were aged between 31-35 years. The average household size was 4.77 or 5 people.

On assessing the Zimbabwean youth’s current knowledge, attitude and perceptions about corruption in Zimbabwe, results showed that 37.39% of the respondents have very high knowledge levels about corruption in Zimbabwe while 27% have moderate knowledge levels, 25.22% have high knowledge levels while 10.39% have low knowledge levels. The Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with both male and female youth in the Mutasa district showed that the youths understand what corruption is. The definitions from youths during discussions aligned with the World Bank (2020), which defined corruption as the abuse of public office for private gain, and Transparency International which views corruption as the abuse of entrusted power for private gain. One of the male youths in Mutasa districts when asked what they understand by the term corruption stated that:

This was also corroborated by one of the female youths who stated:

Furthermore, examples of corruption cited by male and female youths during discussions include bribes, extortion, sexual favours in exchange for privileges (sextortion), and unequal distribution of inputs from the government (nepotism). Further analysis, showed that 80% of the respondents noted that there are corruption activities happening in their area while 20.18% pointed out that they are not aware of any corruption activities happening in their area. In terms of attitude, 28.78% have moderate positive attitude levels about anti-corruption in Zimbabwe, 25.22% have low levels, 24.63% have high positive attitude levels while 21.36 have very high positive attitude levels.
about anti-corruption agenda in Zimbabwe. Asked about their perception about anti-corruption in Zimbabwe, 34% have moderate perception levels, 25% have high perceptions levels, 25% have low levels, while 16% have very high perception levels about anti-corruption in Zimbabwe. About 49% of respondents use whistleblowing as an initiative to combat corruption, 43% online campaigns, 41% petitions, 33% letters, 11% marches, 3.7% other, 2.58% community meetings, and 1% social media.

Pursuant to these results, about 36% of the youths do not know if there are duty bearers supporting youth initiatives to address corruption. 35% claimed that there are No Duty bearers who support, while 29% indicated they are duty bearers supporting youth initiatives to address corruption. Male youth in FGDs indicated that corruption has denied youth opportunities to access employment. This was brought to light in a focus group discussion when youth indicated that securing employment required greasing the palms of the top officials. One of the male youths has this say:

It's like when you go to look for a job, you are asked to bring a certain amount of money but when you are seeking employment it means you do not have money.

This was also reiterated by one of the male youths who stated:

Corruption is pressurizing us so much, for example I have a university level qualification when I look for employment the bosses will take their relatives who do not even have ordinary level certificates.

This compromises the credibility of the education system by weakening work ethics and professionalism. As a result, the essence of meritocracy is lost and hard work is undervalued, breeding a culture of laziness through bribing. 47% of the survey respondents do not know, rather unsure if there are any anti-corruption trainings happening in their area for sub-national, 37% suggested that there are no anti-corruption trainings happening in their area for sub-national while 17% cited that there are indeed anti-corruption trainings happening in their area for sub-national.

The results from quantitative research indicated that SIYA program has the potential to achieve three of its program objectives. The performance indicators outlined in the MEL Plan are relevant for measuring the intended results. Some key recommendations were that encouraging youth to take leadership positions and spearhead initiatives is key to sustaining their engagement. The program should provide opportunities for young people to lead projects, make decisions, and advocate for change. This empowers them, fosters ownership, and develops their leadership skills for long-term anti-corruption efforts. The second recommendation is Exchange visits to
facilitate the creation of a strong network of young anti-corruption activists across regions. Building connections with like-minded peers opens doors to collaboration, resource sharing, and mutual support. This network can amplify voices, advocate for larger-scale change, and launch joint campaigns with wider reach and impact.
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

In recent years, there has been a concerning youth’s lack of technical skills, capacity and knowledge of corruption abatement measures in Zimbabwe indicating a significant challenge in the youth social development sector. It was therefore crucial to assess the Zimbabwean youth’s current knowledge, attitude and perceptions about corruption in Zimbabwe. Thus, the activity has the task to benchmark the knowledge levels; understand the varying attitudes and perceptions existing among youths on the subject of corruption before the start of the activity. By understanding these factors and elements, we can then develop practical recommendations to improve youth's knowledge, attitude and perceptions about corruption in Zimbabwe. The youth’s
knowledge, attitude and perceptions about corruption is a complex issue that requires a comprehensive analysis.

**BACKGROUND TO BASELINE SURVEY**

This baseline survey was commissioned for a 5-year programme titled “Strengthening Institutions and Youths Agency in Accountability Narratives (#SIYA) in Zimbabwe implemented by the Zimbabwe Coalition on Debt and Development (ZIMCODD)”. This is a nation-wide programme that will be implemented in six provinces in the first year, namely Harare, Bulawayo, Matabeleland North, Matabeleland South, Midlands, and Manicaland. The SIYA programme will adopt a two-tier sub-granting approach. For example, it targets to work with 12 youth-led and youth-focused community-based organizations (CBOs) among other programme participants and stakeholders working on relevant thematic areas and targeted beneficiaries in year 1, from the 6 provinces.

In this regard, ZIMCODD conducted a baseline survey to benchmark some project variables and indicators through consultations with project beneficiaries and stakeholders. Thus, the baseline was guided by 4 specific objectives listed in sub-section 1.2.1 below.

Ultimately, the results from the baseline survey will be used to measure the contribution and impact made by the #SIYA programme in contributing towards institutional strengthening, campaigns and movement building, policy analysis and advocacy, youth-led local accountability initiatives and research and evidence-gathering.

**PURPOSE AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH**

The purpose of this baseline survey is to provide a benchmark through an in-depth analysis of the programme objectives and performance indicators from which to measure the progress and impact of the programme.

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES**

The proposed baseline survey was guided by the following four specific objectives.

1. To conduct a comprehensive baseline survey to assess knowledge, attitudes and perceptions about corruption among Zimbabwean youths

2. To assess the level of youth agency and activism in the implementation of the national anti-corruption strategy at the sub-national level

3. To assess the level of accountability and responsiveness of sub-national institutions to effectively address corruption cases

4. To assess the strength of systems and mechanisms that support anti-corruption efforts at the sub-national level

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

With the four objectives in section 1.2.1, some design research questions were developed in line with each objective as illustrated below in Table 1
TABLE 1. RESEARCH QUESTIONS FOR EACH RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>KEY RESEARCH QUESTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To conduct a comprehensive baseline survey to assess knowledge, attitudes and perceptions about corruption among Zimbabwean youths</td>
<td>What is the youth’s current knowledge level, attitude and perceptions about corruption in Zimbabwe?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To assess the level of youth agency and activism in implementation of the national anti-corruption strategy at the sub-national level</td>
<td>What is the level of youth agency and activism in implementation of the national anti-corruption strategy at the sub-national level?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To assess the level of accountability and responsiveness of sub-national institutions to effectively address corruption cases</td>
<td>To what extent are the sub-national institutions’ accountability and responsiveness effective in addressing corruption cases?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To assess the strength of systems and mechanisms that support anti-corruption efforts at the sub-national level</td>
<td>How strong are the current systems and mechanisms in supporting anti-corruption efforts at the sub-national level?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNDERSTANDING OF THE TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

According to the Terms of Reference (ToRs) this baseline survey sought to enhance ZIMCODD and partners’ understanding of the youth’s knowledge, attitude and perceptions (KAP) about corruption in Zimbabwe. In that regard, these ToRs outlined the specific areas of investigation, such as identifying the key factors contributing to this decline and to establish the elements that contribute to youths’ current knowledge, attitude and perceptions (KAP) about corruption and understanding the underlying causes of underperformance among youths. Additionally, the ToRs have specified the expected outputs and deliverables of the research, such as providing insights into effective interventions and strategies to improve KAP on corruption. By establishing comprehensive ToRs, the baseline survey was therefore conducted with a clear focus and direction, ensuring that the findings and recommendations are relevant and valuable for addressing the challenges in the institutions and youth agencies.
METHODOLOGY

Based on the principles of inclusive and participatory inquiry, this baseline survey used a mixed-method approach which combined qualitative and quantitative research methods and techniques for collecting data from sampled households and individuals. Qualitative and quantitative research methods were used to engage the partners and communities. The approach allowed for complementarity of data sources thus ensuring reliability of the research findings and validity of the conclusions drawn using three different research approaches to collect data, namely quantitative, qualitative and document review.

Thus, guided by the TORs and our understanding of the project objectives and the purpose of the research, we designed a suite of methodological approaches that
enabled achievement of the deliverables desirable to ZIMCODD. In line with the terms of reference, the consultants adopted a participatory mixed-method research design, which is characterized by combining qualitative and quantitative research methods to collect data from the 6 Provinces sampled for the baseline survey. We will sample one district for data collection in each of the 6 provinces. The different components of the methodological framework are described in detail below, in sections 2.1 to 2.4.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND APPROACH

Qualitative and quantitative research methods were used in engaging the youths, adult citizenry and partners. Qualitative methods included mainly Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with selected youths and adult community members as well as Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with selected local and district project stakeholders, NGOs and private sector partners already working in the targeted communities. In addition, some national project stakeholders and SIYA partners were engaged in the baseline study as key informants to gather pertinent data viewed from policy and regulatory perspective. The quantitative research method mainly focussed on the youths.

Quantitative and qualitative data was collected from male adults, female adults, male youths, female youths, representatives from local authorities, community-based organizations, and partner organizations. The data was collected using focus group discussions and key informant interviews. The participants were selected from Hwange, Gokwe South, Chitungwiza, Matobo, Nkulumane, and Mutasa. The geographic distribution of sampled districts is illustrated in Figure 1 below.

Figure SEQ Figure 1. Geographic Distribution of Sampled District
Cluster sampling was used followed by purposive sampling of youths and adults from the sampled 6 districts. ZIMCODD’s community volunteers known as the Social and Economic Justice Ambassadors (SEJAs) were engaged to mobilize the male and female youth, and the men and women who they engaged and articulated their opinions in a conversation or interview. Primarily cluster sampling was involved clustering provinces into “Urban” and “Rural” categories. Thus, cluster sampling was adopted for sampling the provinces, and later the districts from which youths and elderly men and women survey respondents were sampled using the purposive sampling approach. The sampling approach adopted for the FGDs and KII is illustrated in Tables 2 and 3 below, respectively. In addition, Table 4 illustrates the sampling approach adopted for the survey respondents. Details of the sampling approach adopted for the 20 FGDs is shown in Table 2 below.

**TABLE 2: CLUSTER PURPOSES SAMPLING FOR FGDs PARTICIPANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUSTER</th>
<th>PROVINCES</th>
<th>SAMPLED DISTRICT</th>
<th>NUMBER OF FGDs AND TYPE OF PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulawayo</td>
<td>Nkulumane</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female Youth x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>Chitungwiza</td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth x 2, Adult members x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matabeleland North</td>
<td>Hwange</td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth x 2, Adult members x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matabeleland South</td>
<td>Matobo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth x 2, Adult members x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>Gokwe South</td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth x 2, Adult members x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>Mutasa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth x 2, Adult members x 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, we conducted 20 FGDs from the 6 districts, based on this sampling approach. Similar to sampling for FGDs, we used purposive sampling to select a total of 11 key informants, namely 1 Traditional leader, 5 councillors and 5 Youths focused organizations and Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) from the 6 sampled districts. Furthermore,
we interviewed SIYA program partners, namely YETT, ZIMCODD, TIZ, and SAPST in Harare. In line with #SIYA program thrust and focus, interviewed informants from Community/Traditional leaders, Councillors, Youth-led CBOs, and Youth serving organizations.

Details of the number and category of KII s are shown in Table 3 below.

**TABLE 3: KEY INFORMANTS FOR THE BASELINE SURVEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUSTER</th>
<th>PROVINCES</th>
<th>SAMPLED DISTRICT</th>
<th>KII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Bulawayo</td>
<td>Nkulumane</td>
<td>Local Authority x 1, Youth-led CBO x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>Chitungwiza</td>
<td>Councillor x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matabeleland North</td>
<td>Hwange</td>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor x 1, Youth-based CBO x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matabeleland South</td>
<td>Matobo District</td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional leader x 1, Youth-serving CBO x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>Gokwe South</td>
<td>Councillor x 1, Youth-based CBO x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>Mutasa District</td>
<td>Traditional leader x 1, Youth-led CBO x 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, we interviewed 11 key informants (KII s) from the 6 sampled districts, as illustrated in Table 3 above.

As indicated earlier, purposive sampling was used to identify 404 youth to participate in field survey as respondents. ZIMCODD’s SEJAs assisted with mobilization of the 404 youth in the 6 districts. The actual surveys conducted in the districts are shown in Table 4 below showing that on average, 67 youth were interviewed per district.

**TABLE 4: SAMPLING FOR THE YOUTH TO PARTICIPATE IN BASELINE SURVEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUSTER</th>
<th>PROVINCES</th>
<th>SAMPLED DISTRICT</th>
<th>SAMPLE PER DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Bulawayo</td>
<td>Nkulumane</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>Chitungwiza</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matabeleland North</td>
<td>Hwange District</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matabeleland South</td>
<td>Matobo District</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>Gokwe South</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>Mutasa District</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1.2 SAMPLE SIZE DETERMINATION
To determine the sample size for a total population of 100,000 youth in 6 provinces of Zimbabwe, we therefore used the formula for sample size calculation this will use a confidence level (CL) of 95% and a confidence interval (CI) of 5%:

Sample Size = \( \frac{Z^2 \times p \times (1-p)}{E^2} \)

Where;

- \( Z = \) Z-score corresponding to the desired confidence level (95% confidence level corresponds to \( Z = 1.96 \))
- \( p = \) estimated proportion of the population (since we don’t have an estimate, we assume 0.5 for maximum variability)
- \( E = \) margin of error (usually set at 5%).

Using the formula, we calculated the sample size:

Sample Size = \( \frac{(1.96^2 \times 0.5 \times (1-0.5))}{(0.05^2)} \)
Sample Size = \( \frac{3.8416 \times 0.25}{0.0025} \)
Sample Size = 0.9604 / 0.0025
Sample Size = 384.16.

Therefore, the calculated sample size for a total population of 100,000 youth in 6 provinces of Zimbabwe at a confidence level of 95% is approximately 384. However, we increased this number by 5% to make the sample size 404, to cater for non-respondents and respondents that are absent during the survey visit.

2.2 DATA COLLECTION METHODS
As introduced in section 2.1 above and in line with the ToRs, a Mixed Methods Research design was adopted for the baseline survey. First, a comprehensive literature review was done for the SIYA program documents provided to us by ZIMCODD and its partners. This document review was done prior to, during and after the field data collection to capture and document secondary data already packaged or reported on the variables under inquiry. Documents reviewed were the SIYA program proposal and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan.

Thus, the baseline survey interviewed 404 (189 male and 215 female) youth respondents and elderly men and women (individuals who are not youth) through 20 FGDs, each FGD had 8 – 12 participants. The baseline survey included adult women and men in the FGDs in order to
triangulate the data generated through youths since the youths lived in the same communities that adult men and women live. Therefore, they are likely to experience similar or almost similar cases of corruption as well as observing the levels of knowledge, attitude and perceptions of youths to corruption in Zimbabwe. In addition, the baseline survey collected data from 11 key informants, namely 1 Traditional leader, 5 councillors and 5 Youths focused organizations and Community Based Organizations (CBOs) from the 6 sampled districts. Furthermore, the baseline survey interviewed SIYA program partners, namely YETT, ZIMCODD, TIZ, and SAPST in Harare.

Ultimately, triangulation was used to validate primary data generated through the FGDs and the data collected from the survey with secondary data collected from programme documents.

**DATA COLLECTION TOOLS**

The data collection process was done using specific data collection tools that enabled adequate data for answering the 4 key research questions and preparing the deliverables for the baseline survey. All data collection tools to be used are described in detail below, and shown in Annex 1 to 8. However, the specific data collection tools are described in paragraphs (a) to (c) below.

**a) Focus Group Discussion Interview**

Guides: These were constructed to facilitate data collection from each category of the FGD described above in Table 2, above. These interview guides were semi-structured with key open-ended questions which were followed by probing questions based on the key research questions being explored. In line with the research design, 2 FGD interview guides were used for the youth (male and female) and adult members of the community, respectively (Annexes 1 and 2).

**b) Key Informant Interview Guides:** In addition to the FGD interview guides, Key Informant Interview (KII) guides were used to facilitate data collection from the 11 key informants who have been listed in Table 3 above, respectively (Annexes 3 to 7).

**c) Structured Survey Questionnaires:** A structured survey questionnaire (Annex 8) was administered to the male
and female youth sampled from 6 districts, as already shown in Table 4. These questionnaires were administered to collect quantitative data using Android-based Smartphones or Tablets.

2.4 DATA ANALYSIS

In line with Mixed Methods Research designs, qualitative and quantitative data were analyzed separately. Results from the two types of data were combined to triangulate and validate each other. Therefore, the proposed data analysis procedures were described in detail under sections 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 below.

2.4.1 QUANTITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS

Data was collected using tablets and smartphones anchored on KoBo–Collect software and exported to the STATA for descriptive and inferential statistical analysis. The Field Data Collection Manager, with support from the Lead Consultant cleaned and prepared the data for analysis such as removal of duplicates and other errors. After cleaning the data for duplicates, missing values, and outliers, the data was run for frequencies to ensure further cleaning and preliminary analysis. The Lead Consultant took direct responsibility for the data cleaning and data analysis. A range of descriptive and inferential statistical techniques was used to analyze the data in order to provide answers to the research questions and achievement of objectives of the research.

Therefore, we performed Descriptive Statistics to show patterns in the demographic attributes and other variables of the respondents. These may be generalized to the population for the research.

2.4.2 QUALITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS

Qualitative Data from FGDs and KIIIs was transcribed, and coded according to themes emerging from the discussions. This data was analyzed through qualitative data analysis techniques. FGD data was entered into NVivo 11.0 and analyzed using a technique known as Thematic Analysis (TA) for common themes, trends and challenges identified by participants. Sub-themes emerged from the coding process that was integrated into broader themes, using a grouping procedure based on both similarities and differences, using the principles of internal homogeneity and external heterogeneity. In addition, KII data were analyzed manually using the Thematic Analysis technique. Results from FGD and KII data analyses was used to triangulate and further combined with
quantitative findings, in line with the tenets of mixed method research.

2.5 QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

This section outlines key data quality assurance measures and ethical considerations adopted for this baseline survey. In order to improve data quality, 6 Field Data Collection Managers, 18 enumerators and 6 Note takers were trained. The training was meant to share the vision of the study and sharpen their skills.

2.5.1 SELECTION AND TRAINING OF FGD FACILITATORS

As per the outlined FGD approach, we utilized 6 experienced Field Data Collection Managers who moderated FGDs and KIIs. These coordinators were assisted by one note taker mobilized by the volunteers (SEJAs) that work with ZIMCODD. Following this engagement, we trained these enumerators prior to conducting the actual FGDs. The training focused mainly on Facilitating a good FGD, including asking FGD questions, managing FGD participants, and recording the notes or conversations from the FGDs. Furthermore, the FGD facilitators will be trained on how to transcribe (verbatim) the recordings from FGDs so that the transcripts are ready for analysis with NVivo software.

2.5.2 SELECTION AND TRAINING ENUMERATORS

A total of 18 enumerators were engaged with support of the SEJAs from ZIMCODD’s program volunteers (SEJAs) who are located in all the districts ZIMCODD operates. The 18 enumerators were sub-grouped into three enumerators per district who were allocated to interview 67-68 youth in 3 days per sampled district from the 6 provinces.

Once identified and recruited, the 18 enumerators were trained on how to conduct a survey. Specifically, the consultants trained the enumerators for them to understand the questions and how to ask the questions in a way that is understandable to the respondent. Further training was focused on administering the questionnaire which was built in Kobo Collect and pre-loaded on Android-based smartphones or Tablets.

2.5.3. QUALITY ASSURANCE (QA)

The baseline survey team adopted and used data quality assurance methods such as training of research assistants/enumerators, sitting in interviews with enumerators and checking for consistency of responses. Checking for consistency was mostly done for
questions that have skip patterns logic and expected values. Close monitoring of the data collection process was done daily to ensure that any slight deviations by data collectors were swiftly responded to.

2.5.4 ETHICAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATION

Ethical consideration for this baseline survey was based on the definition of ethics from Bhattacharjee (2012:137) in which researchers value the moral distinction between right and wrong with particular reference to community entry and engagement with research participants. In line with this definition of ethics, the baseline survey process observed and followed all the cultural and political protocols before and during community entry while collecting data from the project area. In addition, research teams received voluntary consent from the research participants before involving them in interviews.
RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Results for the quantitative and qualitative research approaches were presented and described in combination in sections 4.1 to 4.5 below, as per the stance for Mixed Methods Research approach.

3.1 DEMOGRAPHIC ATTRIBUTES FOR THE RESPONDENTS

Figure 2. Demographic characteristics for the respondents
Figure 2 above shows demographic frequency distributions and percentages on eight variables namely Province, Sex, District, Level of Education, Age Range, Income source, Marital status and Average HH Size. Looking at the Tree Map, 17.08% of the participants were from Bulawayo, while Matabeleland North, Manicaland, Midlands, Matabeleland South, and Harare Province had 16.58% of respondents each. As shown in the Waterfall Chart, 53% of the respondents were female while 47% were male. The Tree Map on the right-hand side of the dashboard details the district demographic distributions of respondents. 17.08% of the respondents surveyed were from Nkulumane while Hwange, Gokwe, Mutasa, Matobo, Chitungwiza had 16.58% each. Still on the dashboard in Figure 2, the Gauge Chart shows the average House Household size being 4.77. Of the 404 respondents, 61% of the participants attended Secondary school, 25% attended Tertiary Education, 10% attended Primary Education, 3% attended Vocational Training while 1% do not have a formal educational background, as shown in the Area Chart. On the other hand, the Donut Chart shows the age distribution, 38.37% of the participants were aged between 18-24 years, 32.43% were aged between 25-30 years old while 29.21% were aged 31-35 years. The Stacked Bar Chart shows that 39% of the participants indicated that they had no meaningful source of income, 35% were self-employed, 16% were formally employed while 9% highlighted that they had other sources of income. According to the survey results in the Area Chart about the respondents’ marital distribution, 52% indicated that they were single and were never married, 40% highlighted that they were married, 30% were divorced/separated and 4% were widowed.
3.1.1 DISABILITY STATUS (WASHINGTON GROUP OF QUESTIONS)

Figure 3. The summary of disability status of respondents

Figure 3 above shows disability status of respondents, based on the Washington Group of questions. Based on the Donut Chart, 98.02% indicated that they do not have difficulty in communicating while 1.98% highlighted that they have difficulty in communicating or being understood. In the same vein, the Ribbon Chart shows that 92% indicated they had no difficulty at all in seeing even when wearing glasses while 6.93% indicated they did face some difficulty. In addition, the Funnel Chart shows that 390 participants out of a sample of 404 (96.53%) did not have difficulty in remembering or concentrating while 14 (3.47%) highlighted some difficulty. The Area Chart shows that 98% of the respondents had no difficulty in hearing while 1.98% indicated some difficulty. The Waterfall Chart shows that 95% of respondents had no difficulty at all in walking or climbing steps, while 4% highlighted some difficulty. The Area Chart on the bottom right-hand side of the dashboard shows that 98% of the participants did not have difficulty with self-care while 1.49% experience difficulties with self-care such as dressing and washing.

3.2 WORD FREQUENCY SUMMARIZING MAIN ISSUES RAISED FROM FGDS AND KIIS

The most frequently stated words during focus group discussions and key informant interviews are illustrated in Figure 3. The most frequent twenty-five words stated by participants during data collection was extracted from key informant interviews and
focus group discussion transcripts using NVivo 11. This word frequency provides a better sense of the main focus, ideas and themes of the text.

![Word Frequency](image.png)

Figure 4. Word Frequency (Source: NVivo 11 Output)

On the other hand, key informants shared their understanding of corruption and its different forms.
### 3.3 FORMS AND EXAMPLES OF CORRUPTION

A summary of forms and examples of corruption identified by councillors, youth-based organisations, and partner organisations during interviews is presented in Table 5.

**Table 5. Summary of forms and examples of corruption.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COUNCillORS</th>
<th>PARTNER ORGANISATIONS</th>
<th>COMMUNITY BASED ORGANISATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forms</strong></td>
<td>Bribery, Nepotism, and Sextortion,</td>
<td>Bribery, Extortion, Sextortion</td>
<td>Sextortion, Bribery, Nepotism, Fraud, and Kickbacks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Examples**     | My daughter is a laboratory technician, to get a job at Chitungwiza Hospital recruiters told her to pay $200.  
Using national resources to buy votes.  
Village heads making villagers pay to qualify for handouts.  | To get passports, one must pay bribes for easier and faster production, buy pieces of land, and even bribe for access to water.  
At the high level we have issues of illicit financial flows, extractive sector deals, procurement deals, and public sector corruption emanating from weaker systems.  | People are getting employment through bribes and nepotism and not merit.  
Criminals released after bribing police officers.  
Borehole donations are made in the community but will never get to see even half of it.  |

*Source: Key Informant Interviews*
Further analysis of the impact of corruption from the KIIIs’ perspective revealed an array of socio-economic impacts, shown in the diagram below from NVivo output.

3.4 ADDRESSING OBJECTIVES, INDICATOR REQUIREMENTS AND ANSWERING RESEARCH QUESTIONS

As per the objectives of the baseline study, the results from the analysis of data are used to address the baseline survey objectives, questions, benchmarking the SIYA program objectives and providing baseline values to the program indicators, as described below.

**Program Objective 1:** To strengthen youth agency and activism - voice and participation - in implementation of the national anti-corruption strategy at the sub-national level by 2028

**Indicator 1:** Number of initiatives undertaken by youth to combat corruption
As summarized in Figure 4 above, this section of results focuses on **Objective 1:** Which seeks to strengthen youth agency and activism - voice and participation - in implementing the national anti-corruption strategy at the sub-national level by 2028. The relevant **Indicator 1:** counts the number of initiatives undertaken by youth to combat corruption. This dashboard also presents results that address **baseline objective 1:** ‘To assess the Zimbabwean youth’s current knowledge, attitude and perceptions about corruption in Zimbabwe’. It also answers the **baseline survey research question number 5:** ‘What is the youth’s current knowledge level, attitude and perceptions about corruption in Zimbabwe?’ The Scatter Chart, on the top-left corner of the dashboard shows that **37.39%** of the participants have very high knowledge levels about corruption in Zimbabwe while **27%** have moderate knowledge levels, **25.22%** have high knowledge levels while **10.39%** have low knowledge levels. Looking at the Stacked Bar Chart, 80% of the participants noted that there are corruption activities happening in their area while **20.18%** pointed out that they are not aware of any corruption activities happening in their area. The Scatter Chart, on the top right-hand side shows that, **28.78%** have moderate positive attitude level about anti-corruption efforts in Zimbabwe, **25.22%** have low levels, 24.63% have high positive attitude levels while **21.36%** have very high positive attitude levels of anti-corruption agenda in Zimbabwe. As illustrated in the Waterfall Chart in Figure 5 above, asked about their perception about anti-corruption in Zimbabwe, **34%** have moderate perceptions levels, **25%** have high perceptions levels, **25%** have low levels, in comparison, 16% have very high perception levels about anti-corruption in Zimbabwe.
LEVEL OF YOUTH UNDERSTANDING OF CORRUPTION AND ITS IMPACT ON THEIR LIVES

DEFINING CORRUPTION: PERSPECTIVES MALE AND FEMALE YOUTHS

The Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with both male and female youth in the Mutasa district showed that the youths understand what corruption is. The definitions from youths during discussions aligned with the World Bank (2020), which defined corruption as the abuse of public office for private gain, and Transparency International which views corruption as the abuse of entrusted power for private gain. One of the male youths in Mutasa districts when asked what they understand by the term corruption stated that:

It is using your position to take bribes.

This was also corroborated by one of the female youths who stated:

I think that corruption is doing illegal things with tyranny, either you are educated or not, you have power or not, or you are not educated there is an abuse of power in corruption acts.

Furthermore, examples of corruption cited by male and female youths during discussions include bribes, extortion, sexual favours in exchange for privileges (sextortion), and unequal distribution of inputs from the government (nepotism).

DEFINING CORRUPTION: PERSPECTIVES FROM MALE AND FEMALE ADULTS

In exploring the perspectives of male adults on the definition of corruption, participants articulated nuanced views during the focus group discussions. One participant emphasised engaging in actions that deviate from the straight path, involving shortcuts for illegal gains. Another participant highlighted reciprocity, asserting that one cannot receive without giving. The consensus among participants was that corruption consists of engaging in illicit activities, utilising one’s position to obtain bribes, and participating in hidden actions that are not transparent but yield benefits. Their understanding encompassed financial aspects and
the oppressive nature of corruption, where individuals are denied their rightful entitlements, and rights are surreptitiously stolen without apparent acknowledgment.

The discussion extended to participants sharing their opinions and experiences about corruption. The facilitator prompted an exploration of diverse viewpoints, with participants emphasising the illegal and fraudulent aspects of corruption. Instances were cited where individuals in power abused their authority to extract bribes, and the broader impact of corruption on rights and time was underscored. The narratives collectively revealed a comprehensive perspective on corruption, encompassing financial transactions, abuse of power, and the insidious nature of rights being covertly eroded.

**IMPACT OF CORRUPTION AMONG YOUTH**

From the male youth’s perspective, corruption denies young people opportunities and results in impunity. In the same vein, the perspective of female youths on the impact of corruption is that it leads to sexual exploitation, misappropriation of resources, loss of investment and opportunity, and partial justice.

**IMPACT OF CORRUPTION: PERSPECTIVES FROM FEMALE ADULTS AND FEMALE YOUTHS**

**01 ECONOMIC STRUGGLES AND UNEMPLOYMENT**

Adult female and female youth participants in FGDs highlighted the profound impact of corruption on the economy, emphasising that inadequate civil service salaries drive individuals towards corrupt practices. This perpetuates a cycle of poverty, particularly for those without easy access to resources. Additionally, another participant emphasised the destructive influence of corruption on social life, linking the growing unemployment rate to the practice. The sentiment was echoed by other participants, who lamented the unfavourable employment prospects for those without connections, irrespective of qualifications.

**02 WEALTH DISPARITIES AND MORAL EROSION**

Participants collectively expressed that corruption entrenches existing wealth disparities, with those possessing financial means remaining affluent while the less privileged face
prolonged poverty. The facilitator identified the first notable effect of corruption as its contribution to poverty, a sentiment unanimously endorsed by all participants. One participant shed light on the personal motivations for engaging in corruption, describing scenarios where superiors encourage subordinate participation, fostering a culture where corruption becomes a normalised part of the workplace.

03 FINANCIAL AND SOCIAL COSTS

The detrimental impact of corruption extended beyond economic consequences, as highlighted by Participant I. The practice was recognised as a catalyst for robbing individuals of money and time. Further, the participants collectively agreed that corruption has widespread societal consequences. Participant E noted its destructive influence on both men and women. Moreover, other participants emphasised the emergence of societal issues such as prostitution, early marriages, and sexual abuse, attributing these problems to the corrosive effects of corruption.

INDICATOR 1: NUMBER OF INITIATIVES UNDERTAKEN BY YOUTH TO COMBAT CORRUPTION

The Line Chart in relation to indicator 1, shows the frequency of the main initiatives taken by youths to fight corruption as part of the national anti-corruption strategy at the sub-national level. About 49% of respondents use whistleblowing as an initiative, 43% online campaigns, 41% Petitions, 33% Letters, 11% Marches, 3.7% Other, 2.58% Community meetings, and 1% social media. These statistics show that currently, there are 7 initiatives that are undertaken by youth to combat corruption in Zimbabwe. However, the frequencies show that these initiatives are applied differently. The clustered Bar Chart shows that 83% of the participants understand what corruption is while 17% do not understand.

INDICATORS 2, 3 AND 4

The baseline results and values for these three indicators are presented below in Figure 6. Furthermore, the results have been applied in answering research question 1: What is the level of youth agency and activism in implementation of the national anti-corruption strategy at the sub-national level? Additionally, the results answered research question 2: How effective is the capacity of youth and youth-led organizations in leading the design and implementation of transparency and accountability initiatives? In the same vein, the results on indicator 3 were used to answer research question 6: What is the extent of youth’s understanding of corruption and its impact on their lives?
Figure 6. The baseline values for indicators 2, 3 and 4

This dashboard of results above focuses on Objective 1: Which seeks to strengthen youth agency and activism - voice and participation - in the implementation of the national anti-corruption strategy at the sub-national level by 2028. The relevant Indicator 2: counts the number of positive actions by duty-bearers to strengthen youth initiatives towards addressing corruption; Indicator 3: Percentage of youths with improved perception of the impact of corruption; Indicator 4: seeks to benchmark the number of youths empowered by SIYA interventions to act as agents of positive change for the improvement of governance in Zimbabwe. Looking at the Clustered Bar Chart, 36% of the participants do not know if there are duty-bearers supporting youth initiatives to address corruption. 35% claimed that there are No Duty bearers who support, while 29% indicated they are duty bearers supporting youth initiatives to address corruption.

As illustrated in the Funnel Chart, in relation to indicator 2 (Number of positive actions by duty bearers to youth initiatives towards addressing corruption), 66.39% of the participants corroborated that capacity building was one of the positive actions taken by duty bearers to youth to address corruption. 42.86% of the respondents suggested that transparent recruitment of youths (job opportunities) was one of the positive actions taken by duty-bearers to youth to address corruption. 38.66% of the participants indicated that arresting and prosecution was a positive action by duty bearers supporting youth initiatives to address corruption. 21.01% of the respondents indicated that financing was a positive action by duty bearers supporting youth
initiatives to address corruption. As shown in the Ribbon Chart, 37% of the respondents have a very high understanding of corruption and its impact on their lives. 34% have a moderate level of understanding, 17% of the participants did not proffer the extent of their understanding of corruption and its impact on their lives. 12.62% of the participants suggested that they understood corruption and its impact on their lives to a lesser extent/low level.

In relation to indicator 3 (Percentage of youths with improved perception on the impact of corruption), the Waterfall Chart shows that about 43% of the participants noted that they have improved perception on the impact of corruption. 41% of the respondents indicated that their perception of corruption had not improved while 17% were not certain or rather unsure if their perception of corruption had improved on the impact of corruption in their lives. The Pie Chart in Figure 6 presents results relating to whether youths were holding duty bearers accountable for their rights and also to combat corruption, 43% held duty bearers accountable, 41% indicated they did not while 16.58% were indeterminate if they did hold duty-bearers accountable. As illustrated by the results in the Waterfall Chart on the bottom right-hand side of the dashboard, in relation to indicator 4 (Number of youths empowered by SIYA interventions to act as agents of positive change for the improvement of governance in Zimbabwe), 60% affirmatively indicated that they were empowered to act as agents of positive change for the improvement of governance in Zimbabwe, while 40% highlighted that they were not empowered to act as agents of positive change.

The FGD participants showed a significant level of understanding and awareness of corrupt activities being committed by various economic agents. Some of the selected verbatim examples provided by both male and female youths in Chitungwiza are outlined below:

- Law enforcement agents and Judicial System
  - You can go to the police station after being raped but when it reaches the court the person who would have committed the crime will pay the judges so that the case won’t be valid.
  - Those who don’t have licenses are arrested but after a few days are released after bribing the police.
  - When a person steals, we expect to see him in jail but every time, we see those very same criminals walking around scot-free because there is corruption at Makoni and Zengeza Police stations, people are doing catch and release.

- Education Sector
  - We are seeing corruption in schools to the extent that we are seeing other children being enrolled after they have said that there are no places.
  - Teachers are no longer doing their work to their full potential those children with money to go to the extra lessons are the ones that got the teachers’ full attention.
  - There is corruption in schools through BEAM, teachers put their relatives, yet it is supposed to help the privileged.

- City Council
- There is corruption at the council offices where you want to pay a certain amount you are being told to go to the next office where you are told to pay a different figure.
- Council is giving people stands to those wetlands and after reporting we would see that the owner has an offer letter.
- The council is stealing money, and we are not getting the services even after paying.

**Community**
- UNICEF installed boreholes in the community, but some people keep the keys for themselves and if you want water, you will have to pay for access.
- We are not getting water services because we do not belong to that specific party that has personalized boreholes for one to get borehole water, he has to pay for that water, yet it was donated by UNICEF.

**Hospitals and Clinics**
- Wheelchairs and crutches are free but will find them being sold outside yet we are given them for free by donors.

**Indicators 6, 7 and 8**

**Program Objective 2:** To strengthen sub-national institutions’ accountability and responsiveness to effectively address corruption cases by 2028.

**Indicator 6:** % of Sub-National institutions trained that adopt and implement Anti-Corruption policies

**Indicator 7:** Number of people affiliated with non-governmental organizations receiving USG-supported anti-corruption training

**Indicator 8:** Number of civil society organizations (CSOs) receiving USG assistance engaged in advocacy interventions.

---

Figure 7. Summarizes results and baseline values for indicators 6, 7, 8 and DR.2.4-1
As illustrated in Figure 7, this section of results focuses on Objective 2: which seeks to strengthen sub-national institutions’ accountability and responsiveness to effectively address corruption cases by 2028. Indicator 6: measures the % of Sub-National institutions trained that adopt and implement Anti-Corruption policies; Indicator 7 counts the number of people affiliated with non-governmental organizations receiving USG-supported anti-corruption training; Indicator 8 counts the number of civil society organizations (CSOs) receiving USG assistance engaged in advocacy interventions. As shown on the Waterfall Chart, in relation to indicator 6, about 47% of the respondents do not know, or are unsure if there are any anti-corruption trainings happening in their area for sub-national governance institutions, 37% suggested that they are no anti-corruption trainings happening in their area for sub-national governance institutions while 17% cited that they are indeed anti-corruption trainings happening in their area for sub-national.

Looking at the clustered column Chart, when asked if they know or understand the national anti-corruption strategy at the sub-national level, 73% of the participants did not understand this strategy, while 27% suggested that they understood this strategy.

Looking at the Donut Chart, in relation to Indicator 8: 54.95% of the respondents do not know if there are civil society organizations (CSOs) receiving USG assistance engaged in advocacy interventions, 28.47% of the participants, maintained that there are no civil society organizations (CSOs) receiving USG assistance engaged in advocacy interventions while 16.58% of participants claimed there are indeed existing civil society organizations (CSOs) receiving USG assistance engaged in advocacy interventions.

**SOME EXAMPLES OF AWARENESS OF ANTI-CORRUPTION INSTITUTIONS AND LEGISLATION IN MATOBO DISTRICT**

The Zimbabwe Coalition on Debt and Development (ZIMCODD), Social Welfare, and the Zimbabwe Republic Police were among the anti-corruption organizations that the female youths could name. Young people in Zimbabwe are ignorant of the rules and policies that are intended to combat corruption. As discussed during the conversation, young people in Zimbabwe have a significant hurdle in the shape of a knowledge and information gap that makes it challenging for them to combat corruption. Female youngsters were asked to name as many laws and regulations as they knew that addressed corruption, but they were unable to name even one.
EXAMPLES OF REPORTING CORRUPTION CASES: VIEWS FROM FEMALE YOUTHS FROM MATOBO DISTRICT

During focus group discussions, female youths indicated that they report corruption cases to traditional leaders. One of the participants, when asked whether they have reported corruption cases stated: “We have reported to traditional leaders”. The mechanisms for reporting corruption cited by female youths include suggestion boxes, letters, social media platforms, newspapers, and council meetings.

INDICATORS 9 AND 10

**INDICATORS:**

- **Indicator 9:** % of sub-national institutions who report increased self-efficacy to identify and respond to corruption issues
- **Indicator 10:** % of the corruption cases identified and reported by sub-national institutions which has sufficient evidence to warrant prosecutions.

Illustrated in Figure 6, this section of results focuses on Objective 2: Which seeks to strengthen sub-national institutions’ accountability and responsiveness to effectively...
address corruption cases by 2028. In addition, this section presents results that were used to answer research question number 3: To what extent are the sub-national institutions’ accountability and responsiveness effective in addressing corruption cases?

**Indicator 9** measures the percentage of sub-national institutions who report increased self-efficacy to identify and respond to corruption issues. **Indicator 10** measures the % of corruption cases identified and reported by sub-national institutions which has sufficient evidence to warrant prosecutions. Looking at the Donut Chart, in relation to Indicator 9; 29.46% of the participants indicated that the sub-national institutions’ accountability and responsiveness were partially active in addressing corruption cases, 27.48% of the respondents did not know the extent of sub-national institutions efficacy, 27.48% of the participants maintained that those sub-national institutions were not effective at all, 10.64% of sampled participants responded however that the sub-national institutions were indeed effective while 4.95% of the participants claimed that the subnational institutions were very effective. Looking at the Clustered bar Chart, in relation to Indicator 10; 39% of the participants do not know if the corruption cases identified by Sub-national institutions have sufficient evidence to warrant arrest, 32% are of the view that corruption cases identified Do not warrant arrest, while 29% of the respondents are of the conviction that corruption cases identified by Sub-national institutions have sufficient evidence to warrant arrest.

Additionally, baseline results addressed research question 4: How strong are the current systems and mechanisms in supporting anti-corruption efforts at the sub-national level?, as shown below in figure 9.

**Indicator 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Objective 3.</th>
<th>To strengthen systems and mechanisms that support anti-corruption efforts at the sub-national level by 2028.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Indicator 11: # of active accountability mechanisms to address corruption in sub-national institutions established | }
This section of results focuses on Objective 3. Which seeks to strengthen systems and mechanisms that support anti-corruption efforts at the sub-national level by 2028. **Indicator 11**: Counts the # of active accountability mechanisms to address corruption in sub-national institutions established. Looking at The Donut Chart In relation to indicator 11: 79.46% of the participants maintained that they were not aware of active accountability mechanisms to address corruption in their area while 20.54% of participants posited that they were aware of active accountability mechanisms to address corruption in their area. **Looking at the Funnel Chart** 34.41% of the respondents were not sure when asked about the strength of the current systems and mechanisms in supporting anti-corruption efforts at the sub-national level, 34.16% pointed out that the current systems and mechanisms were very weak, 20.79% highlighted that the systems and mechanisms were moderate, 6.93% suggested that the mechanisms were strong while 3.71% argued that the current systems and mechanisms were very strong in supporting anti-corruption efforts at the sub-national level.
WAYS OF IMPROVING INVOLVEMENT OF THE YOUTHS IN COMBATING CORRUPTION IN ZIMBABWE

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Equipping young people with the knowledge and skills to combat corruption is crucial for building a more ethical and equitable society. By educating and training them about corruption and anti-corruption strategies, we empower them to become active agents of change, fostering a generation of responsible citizens who can hold power accountable and create a better future. One of the female FGD participants from Matobo district had this to say: “Education and training build confidence and suppress peer pressure”. Training youth in investigative techniques, data analysis, and reporting mechanisms can equip them to identify and document corruption, and safely report it to relevant authorities.

PROMOTING GENDER-INCLUSIVE ANTI-CORRUPTION INITIATIVES

To enhance the involvement of both men and women in combating corruption in Zimbabwe, it is crucial to establish targeted measures that address the unique challenges faced by each gender. One practical approach, as suggested by a female participant, involves organising meetings explicitly dedicated to addressing corruption. These gatherings can serve as platforms for dialogue, awareness campaigns, and developing collaborative strategies to tackle corruption. Ensuring the inclusion of diverse voices, including women, in these discussions is essential for a comprehensive and practical anti-corruption framework.
Another female participant emphasised the importance of reinforcing legal mechanisms to combat corruption. This entails the rigorous enforcement of existing laws that pertain to different categories of corruption. Strengthening the legal framework serves as a deterrent and establishes a foundation for accountability.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results from quantitative research indicated that SIYA program has the potential to achieve three of its program objectives. The performance indicators outlined in the MEL Plan are relevant for measuring the intended results. However, the baseline study recommends that all the indicators should have standard reference numbers which should be synchronized with their numbering in the baseline survey report.

Other recommendations proffered by FGD participants and KIIs are as follows:

Recommendations

i. Mainstreaming corruption into school curricula at the secondary school level. The analysis highlighted a lack of knowledge about corruption and legislation among youths. This shows a lack of capacity building in terms of knowledge of corruption within the schooling system. Mainstreaming corruption into secondary school curricula will build knowledge on the prevention, reporting, and combating corruption among young people. This will also ensure that they know their rights and
they are protected from powerful elders who use their positions and power to exploit young people.

ii. Whistleblower protection legal framework. To promote more reporting among young people and the public, there is a need to have a whistleblower protection law that protects whistle-blowers by guaranteeing privacy and anonymity. Findings from the FGDs highlight that young people are afraid of suffering recrimination if they report corruption.

iii. Advocacy and social marketing of anti-corruption institutions. Young people in this research seemed to have little knowledge about the institutions mandated by the government to fight corruption. There is a need for these institutions to embark on social marketing programs that promote visibility and knowledge of their work.

iv. Mechanisms to protect young women from sexual corruption. The analysis has shown that young women face twin challenges of gender and age which makes them vulnerable to sexual exploitation. Sexual corruption is rampant among young girls who are often forced to exchange sex for goods and services. The government should devise policies that protect young women from corruption-related sexual exploitation in communities, schools, and universities.

v. Organize interactive workshops and campaigns: Utilize community radio, social media, and local events to raise awareness about corruption, featuring relatable scenarios and encouraging youth participation.
vi. **Empower traditional structures:** Train traditional leaders and gatekeepers on identifying and reporting corruption, ensuring they can support and guide female youth who witness or experience it.

vii. **Establish Localized Anti-Corruption Structures:** Create community-centric anti-corruption structures at the local level to address issues effectively. This involves designating leaders within communities, ensuring coordination, and enhancing responsiveness to reported cases. A localized approach builds trust and familiarity, fostering an environment where individuals feel supported in reporting corruption.

viii. **Strengthen Community-Based Training Initiatives:** Initiate targeted training programs in local communities to educate citizens, especially the youth, about corruption, its impact, and the available avenues for reporting. This grassroots approach empowers individuals with knowledge and fosters a proactive community stance against corruption.

ix. **Leverage Technology for Reporting:** Introduce E-Governance to streamline and enhance the reporting process, providing citizens with accessible and efficient online platforms. This technological advancement transcends geographical barriers, making reporting more convenient and extending the reach of anti-corruption mechanisms.

x. **Address Socio-economic Root Causes:** Implement measures to address poverty and unemployment, recognizing them as root causes of corruption. Strategies include providing sufficient remuneration to civil servants, creating job opportunities, and implementing projects for the unemployed. Tackling socio-economic challenges aims to reduce the motivation for engaging in corrupt activities.
xi. Establishing an integrity-based culture: SIYA programme should consider implementing the corruption-related curriculum at the primary level in order to establish an integrity-based culture from that level and include it in the secondary curriculum too.

xii. Involvement of youths with involvement of youth with disabilities: Consider adopting appropriate approaches to ensure the participation of male and female youths living with disabilities in the SIYA programme. This should be done based on the understanding that the techniques for enlisting youths with disabilities may differ considerably from those of youths without disabilities.

xiii. Involvement of youths in the development of policies: It has been observed that young people are not connected to the development of policies, such as the anti-corruption strategy. Therefore SIYA programme should develop and use strategies to guarantee the youth's genuine involvement in such important issues.

More details on district-specific recommendations are provided on a separate report that accompanies this main report.
ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR YOUTHS

NB: This FGD interview guide will be administered to the Youths targeted for participating in the SIYA programme.

Note 1: Introduction by the Facilitator

Good morning/ afternoon. My name is ................................ and I am from ZIMCODD. I am here on behalf of ZIMCODD and its partners for the baseline survey for the “Strengthening Institutions and Youths Agency in Accountability Narratives (#SIYA) programme. The programme addresses inefficiencies in the supply side of governance and accountability through tailor-made capacity strengthening of sub-national governance institutions while simultaneously strengthening capacities of youths to coalesce, participate and build demand for accountability from below. Citizens’ capacity to hold solution holders accountable using various accountability tools which include public expenditure monitoring, citizen scorecard, open budget survey, and the fiscal transparency index. The programme is targeted for implementation in 6 provinces of Zimbabwe. However, the baseline survey will only collect data from 6 districts sampled from 6 provinces, namely Harare, Bulawayo, Matabeleland North, Matabeleland South, Midlands and Manicaland.

Please note, the discussion is likely to take between 40 and 60 minutes. Thus, your participation is voluntary but very important for the baseline survey exercise. Please note that there are no right or wrong answers the questions we are going to be asking, so feel free to express your thoughts and opinions.

May those who are willing to participate show by raising their hands, and those not comfortable are free to go. Note taker to record numbers below;

| Number of Youths willing to participate: | Number of Youths not willing to participate: |

Note 2 to the FGD Facilitator: Register all the participants on the register that has been provided to you by ZIMCODD. Use pseudonyms for the participants. For example, participant A 3, meaning participant number 3 of FGD A.
A. strengthening youth agency and activism

- Ask engagement questions to introduce the participants to a relaxed environment which allows them to participate in the conversations freely.
  1. Please tell us some of the examples of corruption you have heard in your community/district.
  2. What have you done as youths to combat corruption?
     i) Probe for any youths’ initiatives in combating corruption in their district/community.
     ii) Probe for petitions, online campaigns, letters, marches or any other method they have used.
     iii) Probe for how they have been involved
  3. What responses have received in your initiatives as youths to combat corruption?
     i) Probe for how they have been perceived by the duty bearers.
     ii) Or probe for positive responses by duty bearers towards youth initiative combating corruption
  4. In your own understanding, what are some of the impacts of corruption?
     5. Have you ever been involved in anti-corruption activities? If so how have you participated?
        i) Probe for anti-corruption days in the communities
        ii) Probe for role plays, drama, poetry, public speaking, debates and writing competitions.
  6. What training/information have you received under the SIYA programme to combat corruption?
        i) Probe for the presence of youths’ committees
        ii) Probe for number of youths who have hold duty bearers accountable for their rights and also to combat corruption.

B. Strengthening sub-national institutions’ accountability and responsiveness.

1. What institutions/organizations or companies do you know that deal with anti-corruption?
   i) Probe for the institutions/organizations or companies they work within their community/district.
2. What policy or policies do you know that deal with anti-corruption?
3. Have you ever reported any cases of corruption? If so, how? To who?
NB// Make them feel comfortable that this is just a baseline survey.

C. Strengthening systems and mechanisms
1. What are the reporting mechanisms in place to report corruption?
   i) Probe for toll-free numbers, mobile phones, suggestion boxes etc
2. What other means of reporting or responding mechanisms do you think can also help report corruption?
3. What do you think should be done to improve involvement of the youths in combating corruption in Zimbabwe?
ANNEX 2: FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION
INTERVIEW GUIDES FOR MEN AND WOMEN

NB: This FGD interview guide will be administered to the Men and women in the community where SIYA programme operates.

Note 1: Introduction by the Facilitator

Good morning/afternoon. My name is ……………………. and I am from ZIMCODD. I am here on behalf of ZIMCODD and its partners for the baseline survey for the “Strengthening Institutions and Men and Women Agency in Accountability Narratives (#SIYA) programme. The programme addresses inefficiencies in the supply side of governance and accountability through tailor-made capacity strengthening of sub-national governance institutions while simultaneously strengthening capacities of men and women to coalesce, participate and build demand for accountability from below. Citizens’ capacity to hold solution holders accountable using various accountability tools which include the public expenditure monitoring, citizen scorecard, open budget survey, and the fiscal transparency index. The programme is targeted for implementation in 6 provinces of Zimbabwe. Therefore, the baseline survey collected data from 6 districts sampled from 6 provinces only, namely Harare, Bulawayo, Matabeleland North, Matabeleland South, Midlands and Manicaland.

Please note, the discussion is likely to take between 40 and 60 minutes. Thus, your participation is voluntary but very important for the baseline survey exercise. Please note that there are no right or wrong answers the questions we are going to be asking, so feel free to express your thoughts and opinions.

May those who are willing to participate show by raising their hands, and those not comfortable are free to go. Note taker to record numbers below;

| Number of Men and women willing to participate: | Number of Men and women not willing to participate: |

Note 2 to the FGD Facilitator: Register all the participants on the register that has been provided to you by ZIMCODD. Use pseudonyms for the participants. For example, participant A 3, meaning participant number 3 of FGD A.

A. strengthening youth agency and activism

a. Background Information about FGD participants
• Ask engagement questions to introduce the participants into a relaxed environment which allows them to participate in the conversations freely.
  1. Please tell us some of the examples of corruption you have heard in your community/district.
  2. What have you done as men and women to combat corruption?
     i) Probe for any men and women initiatives in combating corruption in their district/community.
     ii) Probe for petitions, online campaigns, letters, marches or any other method they have used.
     iii) Probe for how they have been involved
  3. What responses have received in your in your initiatives as men and women to combat corruption.
     i) Probe for how they have been perceived by the duty bearers.
     ii) Or probe for positive responses by duty bearers towards youth initiative corruption
  4. In your own understanding, what are some of the impacts of corruption?
  5. Have you ever been involved in anti-corruption activities? If so how have you participated?
     i) Probe for anti-corruption days in the communities
     ii) Probe for role plays, drama, poetry, public speaking, debates, writing competitions.
  6. What training/information have you received under the SIYA programme to combat corruption?
     i) Probe for the presence of men and women committees
     ii) i) Probe for number of men and women who have held duty bearers accountable for their rights
     iii) and also, to combat corruption.

B. Strengthening sub-national institutions’ accountability and responsiveness.
  1. What institutions/organizations or companies do you know that deals with anti-corruption?
     i) Probe for the institutions/organizations or companies they work with in their community/district.
  2. What policy or policies do you know that deals with anti-corruption?
  3. Have ever reported any cases of corruption? If so how? To who?

NB: Make them feel comfortable that this is just a baseline survey.

C. Strengthening systems and mechanisms
1. What are the reporting mechanisms in place to report corruption?
   i) Probe for toll free numbers, mobile phones, suggestion boxes etc
2. What other means of reporting or responding mechanisms do you think can also help report corruption?
3. What do you think should be done to improve involvement of the men and women in combating corruption in Zimbabwe?

**END OF THE DISCUSSION**

Ask the participants if they have any questions or comments. Thank the participants and end the session.
ANNEX 3: KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS

INTRODUCTION
This interview guide will enable you to gather information from the different partners who supported the implementation of the “Strengthening Institutions and Community Based Organisation Agency in Accountability Narratives (#SIYA) programme. The programme addresses inefficiencies in the supply side of governance and accountability through tailor made capacity strengthening of sub-national governance institutions while simultaneously strengthening capacities of Community Based Organization to coalesce, participate and build demand for accountability from below. Citizens’ capacity to hold solution holders accountable using various accountability tools which include the public expenditure monitoring, citizen scorecard, open budget survey, and the fiscal transparency index. The programme is targeted for implementation in 6 provinces of Zimbabwe. However, the baseline survey will only collect data from 6 districts sampled from 6 provinces only, namely Harare, Bulawayo, Matabeleland North, Matabeleland South, Midlands and Manicaland.

Please note, the interview is likely to take between 40 and 60 minutes. Your participation in this interview is voluntary but very important for the baseline survey exercise. Please note that there are no right or wrong answers the questions we are going to be asking, so feel free to express your thoughts and opinions.

A. Strengthening youth agency and activism
1. What are some of the examples of corruption that you have heard in your district?
2. What have you done as a Community Based Organization to combat corruption?
   i) Probe for any advocacy initiatives in combating corruption in the district.
   ii) Probe for petitions, online campaigns, letters, marches or any other method they have used.
3. What support have you given to other departments or partners in the initiatives to combat corruption?
4. What are the effects of corruption in your work as a Community Based Organization?
i) Probe for the effects within the Community Based Organization operations.
ii) Probe for community level effects
iii) Probe for district level effects
iv) Probe for national level effects

5. How have you participated in anti-corruption activities?
   i) Probe for capacity building activities/ training
   ii) Probe for anti-corruption activities in the communities and at district level.
   iii) Probe for any type of support to youths and adult members in combating corruption.

6. What role do the youths and adult members play in combating corruption?
7. How do the Community Based Organization support the youths and youths’ groups/organizations to fight against corruption?

B. Strengthening sub-national institutions’ accountability and responsiveness.
1. What training have you received under the SIYA programme to combat corruption?
2. What other institutions/ organizations or companies do you work with in the fight against corruption?
3. What policy or policies do you know that deals with anti-corruption?
4. What role does the Community Based Organization play in reporting cases of corruption?

C. Strengthening systems and mechanisms
1. What are the reporting mechanisms in place to report corruption?
   i) Probe for toll free numbers, mobile phones, suggestion boxes etc
2. What other means of reporting or responding mechanisms do you think can also help report corruption?
3. What do you think should be done to improve involvement of the Community Based Organization in combating corruption in Zimbabwe?

END OF THE INTERVIEW
Ask the interviewee if s/he has any questions or comments. Thank the interviewee and end the interview.
ANNEX 4: KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR TRADITIONAL LEADERS

INTRODUCTION

This interview guide will enable you to gather information from the different partners who supported the implementation of the “Strengthening Institutions and Community Based Organization Agency in Accountability Narratives (#SIYA) programme. The programme addresses inefficiencies in the supply side of governance and accountability through tailor made capacity strengthening of sub-national governance institutions while simultaneously strengthening capacities of Community Based Organization to coalesce, participate and build demand for accountability from below. Citizens’ capacity to hold solution holders accountable using various accountability tools which include the public expenditure monitoring, citizen scorecard, open budget survey, and the fiscal transparency index. The programme is targeted for implementation in 6 provinces of Zimbabwe. However, the baseline survey will only collect data from 6 districts sampled from 6 provinces only, namely Harare, Bulawayo, Matabeleland North, Matabeleland South, Midlands and Manicaland.

Please note, the interview is likely to take between 40 and 60 minutes. Your participation in this interview is voluntary but very important for the baseline survey exercise. Please note that there are no right or wrong answers the questions we are going to be asking, so feel free to express your thoughts and opinions.

A. Strengthening youth agency and activism

1. What are some of the forms of corruption that you have learnt in your area?
2. What actions are being taken by the youth to address corruption?
3. As a duty bearer, what are doing to address corruption?
   i) Probe for any local community initiatives in combating corruption in the area.
   ii) Probe for petitions, online campaigns, letters, marches or any other method they have used.
4. What positive actions are taken by duty bearers to support youth initiatives towards addressing corruption?
   i) Probe for actions taken by local authorities
   ii) Probe for action taken by other local bodies to address corruption?
5. What are the effects of corruption in your area?
   i) Probe for the effects within the community.
   ii) Probe for effects among the youths
iii) Probe for district level effects  
iv) Probe for national level effects  
6. What is the approach or perception of youths toward corruption in your area?  
7. How have you participated in anti-corruption activities?  
i) Probe for advocacy initiatives  
ii) Probe for anti-corruption activities in the communities and at district level.  
iii) Probe for any type of support to youths and adult members in combating corruption.  
8. What role do the youths and adult members play in combating corruption?  

B. Strengthening sub-national institutions’ accountability and responsiveness.  

1. What training have you received to combat corruption?  
2. What other institutions/organizations or companies do you work with in the fight against corruption?  
3. What policy or policies do you know that deals with anti-corruption?  
4. What role does traditional leaders play in reporting cases of corruption?  

C. Strengthening systems and mechanisms  

1. What are the reporting mechanisms in place to report corruption?  
i) Probe for toll free numbers, mobile phones, suggestion boxes etc  
1. What other means of reporting or responding mechanisms do you think can also help report corruption?  
2. What do you think should be done to improve involvement of the local authority in combating corruption in Zimbabwe?  

END OF THE INTERVIEW  
Ask the interviewee if s/he has any questions or comments. Thank the interviewee and end the interview.
ANNEX 5: KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR YOUTH-FOCUSED/YOUTH-BASED ORGANIZATIONS

INTRODUCTION

This interview guide will enable you to gather information from the different partners who supported the implementation of the “Strengthening Institutions and Community Based Organization Agency in Accountability Narratives (#SIYA) programme. The programme addresses inefficiencies in the supply side of governance and accountability through tailor made capacity strengthening of sub-national governance institutions while simultaneously strengthening capacities of Community Based Organization to coalesce, participate and build demand for accountability from below. Citizens’ capacity to hold solution holders accountable using various accountability tools which include the public expenditure monitoring, citizen scorecard, open budget survey, and the fiscal transparency index. The programme is targeted for implementation in 6 provinces of Zimbabwe. However, the baseline survey will only collect data from 6 districts sampled from 6 provinces only, namely Harare, Bulawayo, Matabeleland North, Matabeleland South, Midlands and Manicaland.

Please note, the interview is likely to take between 40 and 60 minutes. Your participation in this interview is voluntary but very important for the baseline survey exercise. Please note that there are no right or wrong answers the questions we are going to be asking, so feel free to express your thoughts and opinions.

A. Strengthening youth agency and activism

1. What are some of the forms of corruption that you have heard in your district?
2. What have you done as a Youth Based Organization to address corruption?
   i) Probe for any advocacy initiatives in combating corruption in the district.
   ii) Probe for petitions, online campaigns, letters, marches or any other method they have used.
3. What support have you given to youths / partners in the initiatives to combat corruption?
4. What are the effects of corruption?
   i) Probe for the effects within the youths’ livelihoods.
   ii) Probe for community level effects
iii) Probe for district level effects
iv) Probe for national level effects

5. As YBO what role have you played in anti-corruption activities?
   i) Probe for capacity building activities/ training
   ii) Probe for anti-corruption activities in the communities and at district level.
   iii) Probe for any type of support to youths and adult members in combating corruption.

6. What role do the youths and adult members play in combating corruption?
7. How do the YBO Based Organization support the youths and youths’ groups/ organizations to fight against corruption?

B. Strengthening sub-national institutions’ accountability and responsiveness.
1. What training have you received to combat corruption?
2. What other institutions/ organizations or companies do you work with in the fight against corruption?
3. What policy or policies do you know that deals with anti-corruption?
4. What role does the Youth Based Organization play in reporting cases of corruption?

C. Strengthening systems and mechanisms
1. What are the reporting mechanisms in place to report corruption?
   i) Probe for toll free numbers, mobile phones, suggestion boxes etc
2. What other means of reporting or responding mechanisms do you think can also help report corruption?
3. What do you think should be done to improve involvement of the Youth Based Organisation in combating corruption in Zimbabwe?

END OF THE INTERVIEW

Ask the interviewee if s/he has any questions or comments. Thank the interviewee and end the interview.
ANNEX 6: KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR RDC OFFICIALS

Introduction

This interview guide will enable you to gather information from the different stakeholders who supported the implementation of the “Strengthening Institutions and Local authority Agency in Accountability Narratives (#SIYA) programme. The programme addresses inefficiencies in the supply side of governance and accountability through tailor made capacity strengthening of sub-national governance institutions while simultaneously strengthening capacities of local authority to coalesce, participate and build demand for accountability from below. Citizens’ capacity to hold solution holders accountable using various accountability tools which include the public expenditure monitoring, citizen scorecard, open budget survey, and the fiscal transparency index. The programme is targeted for implementation in 6 provinces of Zimbabwe. However, the baseline survey will only collect data from 6 districts sampled from 6 provinces only, namely Harare, Bulawayo, Matabeleland North, Matabeleland South, Midlands and Manicaland. Please note, the interview is likely to take between 40 and 60 minutes. Your participation in this interview is voluntary but very important for the baseline survey exercise. Please note that there are no right or wrong answers the questions we are going to be asking, so feel free to express your thoughts and opinions.

A. Strengthening youth agency and activism
1. What are some of the examples of corruption that you have heard in your district?
2. What have you done as local authority to combat corruption?
   i) Probe for any local authority initiatives in combating corruption in the district.
   ii) Probe for petitions, online campaigns, letters, marches or any other method they have used.
3. What support have you received from other departments or partners in your initiatives to combat corruption?
   4. What are the effects of corruption in your work as a local authority?
      i) Probe for the effects within the local authority operations.
      ii) Probe for community level effects
      iii) Probe for district level effects
      iv) Probe for national level effects
5. How have you participated in anti-corruption activities?
   i) Probe for advocacy initiatives
   ii) Probe for anti-corruption activities in the communities and at district level.
   iii) Probe for any type of support to youths and adult members in combating corruption.

6. What role do the youths and adult members play in combating corruption?

7. How do the local authority support the youths and youths’ groups/organizations to fight against corruption?

B. Strengthening sub-national institutions’ accountability and responsiveness.
   1. What training have you received under the SIYA programme to combat corruption?
   2. What other institutions/organizations or companies do you work with in the fight against corruption?
   3. What policy or policies do you know that deals with anti-corruption?
   4. What role does the local authority play in reporting cases of corruption?

C. Strengthening systems and mechanisms
   1. What are the reporting mechanisms in place to report corruption?
      i). Probe for toll free numbers, mobile phones, suggestion boxes etc
   2. What other means of reporting or responding mechanisms do you think can also help report corruption?
   3. What do you think should be done to improve involvement of the local authority in combating corruption in Zimbabwe?

END OF THE INTERVIEW

Ask the interviewee if s/he has any questions or comments. Thank the interviewee and end the interview.
ANNEX 7: KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW (KII)
GUIDE FOR PARTNER ORGANIZATIONS

Introduction

This interview guide will enable the gathering of information from the different partners who supported the implementation of the “Strengthening Institutions and Community Based Organization Agency in Accountability Narratives (#SIYA) programme.

The programme addresses inefficiencies in the supply side of governance and accountability through tailor made capacity strengthening of sub-national governance institutions while simultaneously strengthening capacities of Community Based Organization to coalesce, participate and build demand for accountability from below. Citizens’ capacity to hold solution holders accountable using various accountability tools which include the public expenditure monitoring, citizen scorecard, open budget survey, and the fiscal transparency index.

The programme is targeted for implementation in 6 provinces of Zimbabwe. However, the baseline survey will only collect data from 6 districts sampled from 6 provinces only, namely Harare, Bulawayo, Matabeleland North, Matabeleland South, Midlands and Manicaland.

Please note, the interview is likely to take between 40 and 60 minutes. Your participation in this interview is voluntary but very important for the baseline survey exercise. Please note that there are no right or wrong answers the questions we are going to be asking, so feel free to express your thoughts and opinions.

Preceding Questions;

What is your name and full role in this Organization?

What are the key objectives of your organization in Brief?

A. Strengthening youth agency and activism

1. What in your understanding and from the perspectives of the work objectives of ZIMCODD is Corruption?
2. What are some of the examples of corruption that you have encountered as an organization? How has this impacted your operations?
3. What have you done as a leading Organization in the wake of your mandate to combat corruption?
   i. Probe for any advocacy initiatives in combating corruption in the district.
ii. Probe for any methods they may have used e.g., petitions, online campaigns, letters, marches or any other method they have used.

1. What support have you given to partners in the initiatives to combat corruption?
2. What are the effects of corruption in your work as Organization?

i. Probe for the effects at National, Regional & International level.
ii. Probe for effects to relations with Multi-lateral institutions.

3. Have you participated in anti-corruption activities as an organisation? If yes, how?
   i. Probe for capacity building activities/ training
   ii. Probe for the age groups they have worked with.

1. Does ZIMCODD support the youths and youths’ groups/organizations to fight against corruption?

A. Strengthening sub-national institutions’ accountability and responsiveness.

1. What training programmes do you do for communities?
2. What other institutions/ organizations, Government departments or companies do you work with in the fight against corruption?
3. Have you influenced the crafting of any Policy/policies that has a direct bearing to corruption?
4. Do you play any role in reporting cases of corruption?

C. Strengthening systems and mechanisms

1. Do you have any programmes meant to strengthen and or put reporting mechanisms of corruption working with Central Government or other?
2. What in your opinion can be done to put effective structures and or means of reporting or responding mechanisms in reporting corruption?
3. What do you think should be done to improve involvement of the Partner Organizations in combating corruption in Zimbabwe?
4. Any other additional point you would want to share?

END OF THE INTERVIEW
ANNEX 8: BASELINE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR YOUTH

RESEARCH SITE AND ENUMERATOR DETAILS

Province Code: ________
District Code: ________
Ward Number ________
Suburb Name__________________________
Village Name__________________________
Questionnaire Code ____________________
Date of survey _______________________________
Enumerator’s name: ___________________
Name of Supervisor________________________
GPS Coordinates __________________________

Province codes
01 = Mat North 02= Harare 03= Matebeleland South 04= Bulawayo 05= Midlands 06= Manicaland

District codes
01 = Binga 02 = Chitungwiza 03= Matobo 04= Nkulumane 05=Gokwe South 6= Mutasa

GUIDANCE FOR INTRODUCING YOURSELF AND THE PURPOSE OF THE INTERVIEW

Good morning/ afternoon. My name is ……………………. and I am from ZIMCODD. I am here on behalf of ZIMCODD and its partners, conducting a baseline survey for the project called “Strengthening Institutions and Youth Agency in Zimbabwe’s Accountability Narratives, (#SIYA) which seeks to Strengthening capacity of young people and sub-national level institutions to improve good governance and integrity. The programme is being implemented in 6 provinces (Harare, Bulawayo, Mat North, Mat South, Midlands and Manicaland)
The information will be used for the purpose of improving the focus, relevance and potential of the work that #SIYA will implement. This, in turn, is likely to enhance the extent to which the project will Strengthen capacity of young people and sub-national level institutions to improve good governance and integrity.

Your participation is voluntary and the information that you may provide will be confidential. Would you like to participate in this survey by answering questions about your household? (Sign the consent form).

1 = Yes
2 = No

Please indicate the potential interviewee’s response. Continue with the interview process ONLY if permission is granted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1** | Sex of Respondent | 1 = Male  
| | | 2 = Female |
| **2** | Age of Respondent | ____________ years |
| **3** | Position of respondent in the family | ________________ |
| **4** | Marital Status | 1 = Married  
| | | 2 = Single  
| | | 3 = Divorced  
| | | 4 = Widow/ Widower |
| **5** | Level of Education | 1 = Primary  
| | | 2 = Secondary  
| | | 3 = Tertiary  
| | | 4 = Never attended School |
| **6** | Household Size | ____________ members |
| **7a** | Do you have difficulty seeing, even if wearing glasses? | 1. No – no difficulty  
| | | 2. Yes – some difficulty  
| | | 3. Yes – a lot of difficulty  
| | | 4. Cannot do at all  
| | | 98. Don’t know  
| | | 99. Refuse to answer |
| **7b** | Do you have difficulty hearing, even if using a hearing aid? | 1. No – no difficulty  
| | | 2. Yes – some difficulty  
| | | 3. Yes – a lot of difficulty  
| | | 4. Cannot do at all  
| | | 98. Don’t know  
| | | 99. Refuse to answer |
| **7c** | Do you have difficulty walking or climbing steps? | 1. No – no difficulty  
| | | 2. Yes – some difficulty  
| | | 3. Yes – a lot of difficulty  
| | | 4. Cannot do at all  
| | | 98. Don’t know  
| | | 99. Refuse to answer |
| **7d** | Do you have difficulty remembering or concentrating? | 1. No – no difficulty  
| | | 2. Yes – some difficulty  
| | | 3. Yes – a lot of difficulty  
| | | 4. Cannot do at all  
| | | 98. Don’t know  
| | | 99. Refuse to answer |
| **8** | What is your source of income | 1 = formal employment  
| | | 2 = self-employment  
| | | 3 = No meaningful source  
| | | 4 = Other (Specify) ________________ |
### Baseline Data

**Objective 1:** To strengthen youth agency and activism - voice and participation - in implementation of the national anti-corruption strategy at the sub-national level by 2028

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you understand what corruption is? (to explicitly define corruption)</td>
<td>1 = Yes, 2 = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your current knowledge level, attitude and perceptions about corruption in Zimbabwe?</td>
<td>1= Very High, 2= High, 3= Moderate, 4= Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any corruption activities happening in your area?</td>
<td>1 = Yes, 2 = No, If yes, what forms of corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are they initiatives that you are taking as youths to fight corruption as part of the national anti-corruption strategy at the sub national level?</td>
<td>1 = Yes, 2 = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes above, what are the main initiatives you are taking? tick where applicable</td>
<td>1 = Petitions, 2= Online campaigns, 3= letters, 4= Marches, 5= Whistle blowing Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Knowledge Attitude & Perceptions about Corruption among Zimbabwean Youths

#### Are they initiatives that you are taking as youths to fight corruption as part of the national anti-corruption strategy at the sub national level?

1 = Yes  
2 = No

#### If yes above, what are the main initiatives you are taking? (tick where applicable)

1 = Petitions,  
2 = Online campaigns,  
3 = Letters,  
4 = Marches,  
5 = Whistle blowing  
Other: ____________________________

#### Are there duty bearers supporting youth initiative to address corruption?

1 = Yes  
2 = No

#### If yes, What are the positive actions by duty bearers to youth initiatives to address corruption? (tick where applicable)

1 = Transparently recruitment of youths (job opportunities)  
2 = Financing  
3 = Capacity building to detect and report corruption  
4 = Arresting and prosecution

#### What is the extent of your understanding of corruption and its impact on your lives?

1 = Very level  
2 = Moderate level  
3 = Low level

#### Has your perception on the impact of corruption improved?

1 = Yes  
2 = No

#### Are you holding duty bearers accountable for their rights and also to combat corruption?

1 = Yes  
2 = No

#### Objective 2: To strengthen sub-national institutions’ accountability and responsiveness to effectively address corruption cases by 2028.

17a Are there any anti-corruption trainings happening in your area for sub national officials?

1 = Yes  
2 = No

17b List institutions implementing anti-Corruption policies

---

64
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Do you know or understand the national anti-corruption strategy at the sub-national level?</td>
<td>1=Yes 2=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18a</td>
<td>In your area, are they people affiliated with non-governmental organizations receiving USG-supported anti-corruption training?</td>
<td>1= Yes 2= No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18b</td>
<td>If yes above, how many</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19a</td>
<td>In your area, are they civil society organizations (CSOs) receiving USG assistance engaged in advocacy interventions?</td>
<td>1 = Yes 2 = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19b</td>
<td>If yes, name them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>In your view, how effective is the sub-national institutions’ accountability and responsiveness in addressing corruption cases?</td>
<td>1= Very effective 2= Effective 3= partially effective 4= Not affective at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20a</td>
<td>Are you aware of active accountability Mechanisms to address corruption in your area</td>
<td>1 = Yes 2 = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20b</td>
<td>If yes to above, name them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>How strong are the current systems and mechanisms in supporting anti-corruption efforts at the sub-national level?</td>
<td>1= very strong 2=strong 3=moderate 4=very weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective 3. To strengthen systems and mechanisms that support anti-corruption efforts at the sub-national level by 2028.

Thank you very much for your invaluable participation in this study.
KNOWLEDGE ATTITUDE & PERCEPTIONS ABOUT CORRUPTION AMONG ZIMBABWEAN YOUTHS