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It has been almost five (5) years since the ZANU-PF government has been in power under the rule of President Emmerson Mnangagwa. In February 2019, we (SIVIO Institute) published the first baseline survey for the Citizens’ Perceptions and Expectations (CPE) survey with two (2) objectives; (i) “to investigate the extent to which the government’s actions were informed by the interconnected social, economic and political crises that impact on daily life; and (ii) to understand how the Government’s priorities and responses match citizens’ expectations” (SIVIO, 2019).

As President Mnangagwa’s first term in office comes to an end and with harmonised elections anticipated for August 2023, we have conducted our fourth CPE survey. This report seeks to develop a comprehensive understanding of the state of public opinion regarding the performance of the government. It will, challenge ZANU-PF on its own performance and hopefully, influence the content of political campaigns and voting decisions in 2023. The subject matter of CPE surveys and reports has always been to examine the extent to which citizens are satisfied with government performance and to further probe what they think the government should be doing.

In the process, the survey seeks to find out what the citizens perceive to be the factors impeding or constraining government performance.

The country has been facing a multifaceted crisis and over the years, citizens’ expectations of what government should do has remained the same. In the previous surveys, we learnt that citizens would prefer that the government focus on creating employment, dealing with corruption, and stabilising prices. These three (3) top priorities speak to the context that has defined the last five (5) years (possibly for decades) for Zimbabwean citizens. The government has been doing well in infrastructure development projects as shown on our Zim Citizens Watch policy tracker. However, from the previous CPE reports, Zimbabwean citizens have never identified these as the top priority areas of focus for the central government.

The CPE surveys play an important role in assessing the mood of citizens on the ground. It provides what one can call a reading on the ‘pulse of the nation’. This report, therefore, seeks to also provide insight to the contesting political parties as they embark on final campaigns and manifesto development. This will, hopefully, help them to focus on those areas that are a priority to citizens.

2. 2021 Citizens’ Perceptions and Expectations Survey Report
3. Dancing on the same spot: Survey report on citizens’ perceptions and expectations (2020)
The study was undertaken across all of Zimbabwe’s 10 provinces. The sample was made up of the adult population aged 18 years and above at the time of data collection. We interviewed 1,354 respondents, a figure considered to be representative of the Zimbabwe adult population. We used the random sampling method. There was an emphasis on trying to ensure that there was gender parity in respondent selection to attain a 50:50 ratio of male and female respondents. In addition, the sample was drawn from both rural and urban areas. According to the preliminary 2022 census data, 67% of Zimbabwe’s population resides in rural areas. Due to the nature of the study and difficulty in access, we have previously struggled to achieve our targets in accessing rural respondents, as a result, the target for rural respondents was set at 53%. The survey responses were collected by 20 enumerators (2 per province) and the participants were randomly selected but within the gender and location parameters outlined above. The enumerators from Harare and Bulawayo provinces only collected responses from urban areas.

The data was collected over 15 days in February 2023 and enumerators collected a total of 1,354 responses. From this sample, 1,200 responses were resampled to give an even provincial distribution while maintaining the gender balance. The subset of 1,200 responses was used to generate the results in this report.
Description of Sample

3.1 Gender, Location, Age and Marital Status

We interviewed a total number of 1,200 respondents across all 10 of Zimbabwe’s provinces. In terms of gender breakdown, there was an even split of the sample by men and women.

TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Bulawayo</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mashonaland Central</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mashonaland East</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mashonaland West</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matabeleland North</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matabeleland South</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peri-urban</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We ensured our sample was also representative of the distribution of Zimbabwe’s population by location - i.e. rural, urban and peri-urban. Forty-five per cent (45%) of the sample was located in urban areas; 47% in rural areas and 8% in peri-urban areas.

The majority of those sampled (56%) were between the ages of 18 – 35 years – who can be categorised as youth. At least 44% of the sample were aged above 36 years. The majority of respondents (n=572; 48%) were married followed by those who were single (n=412; 34%).
### TABLE 2: Age and Marital Status of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 25</td>
<td></td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 35</td>
<td></td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 – 45</td>
<td></td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 – 55</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 – 65</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 and older</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.2 Literacy and Education Levels

There were high literacy rates among the respondents as most (93%) indicated that they could read and write (see Figure 1). The majority of respondents had attained secondary education (n=566; 47%) and a significant number of respondents had attained tertiary education (n=456; 38%) (See Table 3).
3.3 Living arrangements

Most respondents (45%) in the survey indicated that they were living with friends or family; while 24% lived in their own homes which were fully paid for. The third highest category was that of respondents who rented their homes – who made up 20% of the sample. It was interesting to note that less than 2% of the sample lived in homes they owned through mortgage facilities.

3.4 Employment Status

Most respondents (60%) were employed, and this was split between 38% who said they were formally employed and 22% who indicated...
that they were self-employed. There was still a high number (40%) of respondents who indicated that they were not employed.

**Employment Status**

The top four (4) sectors of employment for respondents who indicated that they were employed (n=725) (either by another party or self-employed) were: agriculture; vending (tuckshop or flea market); education and health and social services.

**Sectors of Employment**

- Agriculture, farming, livestock, forestry, hunting and fishing: 156
- Vending (tuck-shop/flea market): 130
- Health and social services: 79
- Education: 75
- Retail, wholesale and shop attendant: 74
- Mining and quarrying: 60
- NGO, INGO, embassy: 52
- Civil service: 48
- Engineering, Construction, energy, water, and architecture: 38
- Cross border trading: 37
- Catering, bakery, butchery and culinary arts: 23
- Other: 31
- Manufacturing: 25
- Information and communication technology: 24
- Professional, consulting, scientific and technical activities: 23
- Cosmetology (hair, makeup, nails and beauty therapy): 22
- Financial services and insurance: 20
- Arts, culture, sport, events, media, and entertainment: 18
- Graphic, technical design, computer software and printing: 18
- Mechanics, automobile, fuel attendant: 16
- Logistics and transport: 16
- Religious organisation: 14
- Tourism, accommodation and restaurants: 5

**Note**
The top four sectors of employment for respondents who indicated that they were employed (n=725) (either by another party or self-employed) were: agriculture; vending (tuckshop or flea market); education and health and social services.
Most respondents’ income came from being employed full-time whether in the formal or informal sector.

**Source of Income**

![Source of Income Diagram]

- **Formal Sector**
  - Part time: 8%
  - Full time: 25%
  - Consulting: 5%

- **Informal Sector**
  - Part time: 16%
  - Full time: 22%
  - Consulting: 6%

---

Of the 725 respondents who indicated that they were employed, the average monthly income over the last three (3) months for most respondents (34%) was between US$201 – 500. This was followed by 176 respondents (24%) who indicated that their income was between US$101 – 200. Only 41 respondents (6%) indicate that their income averaged above US$1,001 over the last 3 months.

**Average Monthly Income in the Last 3 Months**

![Average Monthly Income Diagram]

- **US$ 1-50**: 6%
- **US$ 51-100**: 12%
- **US$ 101-200**: 24%
- **US$ 201-500**: 34%
- **US$ 501-1,000**: 18%
- **US$ 1,001-10,000**: 5%
- **more than US$10,000**: 1%
Levels of Participation in Public Processes

4.1 Election Participation

As 2023 is an election year, the CPE looked to, also, assess the extent to which citizens would participate in this public process. When asked if they had voted in the last general/harmonised elections in 2018 – most respondents (68%; n=811) indicated that they had voted in those elections, while 32% indicated that they had not voted.

To gauge the level of participation in the forthcoming elections, citizens were asked if they were going to vote in the upcoming elections. A large proportion of respondents 79% (n=954) indicated that they were going to vote. When further asked if they were registered to vote in for the 2023 elections – 78% (n=937) indicated that they were registered to vote; 18% (n=210) indicated that they had not registered to vote, while 53 (4%) respondents preferred not to say whether they had registered to vote or not.

Note

Three and a half times as many respondents indicated that they were registered to vote as compared to those that were not and those that preferred not to disclose. Nearly four in every five of the registered voters indicated that they were going to vote in the upcoming elections.
There was a strong relationship between those who indicated that they would vote and whether they had subsequently registered to vote when a crosstab was run of these two (2) variables. 907 of the 937 respondents who indicated that they were registered to vote also said that they would vote.

The harmonised elections are the process through which citizens get to elect their representatives at the ward level – Ward Councillors and at the national level (Parliament) in the form of Members of Parliament and Senators. The CPE also assessed the extent to which citizens were happy with the performance of their elected representatives.

The majority of the respondents indicated that their representatives at ward and parliamentary levels were from ZANU PF (across the three representatives – over 50% of the respondents indicated this), followed by the Citizens’ Coalition for Change (CCC).
We then asked citizens about their perception of the performance of the incumbent representatives between 2018 and 2022. The greater proportion of citizens (between 30 – 33%) judged the performance of officeholders (Ward Councillor, MP and Senator) as satisfactory; between 27 – 30% felt that it was poor; while 20 - 27% rated it as very poor. Only 5% of respondents regarded the performance of their Ward Councillors as very good, while 2% and 1% evaluated the performance of their MPs and Senators respectively as very good. Only 16% of respondents felt that their Ward Councillors’ performance was good while 14% and 12% of respondents felt that their MP’s and Senator’s performance, respectively, was good. Overall, at least 50% of respondents felt that the performance of their MPs and Senators since 2018 was either poor or very poor, while 47% of respondents felt that the performance of their Ward Councillors was below satisfactory.
Level of Satisfaction with Performance of Elected Representatives

Even when assessed across political lines/parties the same trends in terms of the rating of the performance of all three (3) levels of elected officials persisted – with most citizens rating the performance mostly satisfactory, followed by poor (See Figures 12a – 12c).

Note
Overall, at least 50% of respondents felt that the performance of their MPs and Senators since 2018 was either poor or very poor.
FIGURE 12B: Level of Satisfaction with Performance of Senators Across Political Parties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZANU PF</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDC Alliance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 12C: Level of Satisfaction with Performance of MPs Across Political Parties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZANU PF</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDC Alliance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 25% of citizens indicated that they would vote again for their current senator, 30% said that they would vote again for their current MP and 33% would vote again for their current Ward Councillor.
Beyond elections, healthy democracies thrive on the level of citizen engagement and participation in policymaking and implementation processes. When respondents were asked if they had ever been part of a policy formulation process – 82% (n=983) of respondents indicated that they had not been part of a policy formulation process. Only 18% (n=217) indicated that they had been involved in a policy formulation process.

Most of the 217 respondents who indicated that they had been involved in policy formulation processes had been involved in discussions on the performance of local authorities (n=96; 44%), consultations on service delivery (n=84; 39%) and COVID-19 national response (n=75; 35%). When it came to national development strategy or policy formulation, less than 25% of those who indicated that they had been part of policy formulation processes had participated in consultations on the Transitional

FIGURE 13: Re-election of Current Elected Officials

FIGURE 14: Participation by Citizens in Policy Formulation Processes

18% of the respondents indicated that had been involved in a policy formulation process
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Type of Participation by Citizens in Policy Processes (n=217)

**Figure 15:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Participation</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussions on performance of local authorities</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations on service delivery</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19 national response</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions on performance of central government</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Approval</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations on NDS1</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations on Vision 2030</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations on TSP</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across various forms or types of public processes, most citizens felt that there was no scope for participation. The highest scope for participation was in consultations on the performance of local authorities where 41% of citizens indicated they could participate, as well as in consultations on service delivery (39%).

The two with the highest scope for participation as indicated in Figure 16 correspond to the two in Figure 15 where citizens indicated they had the highest levels of participation.

**Figure 16:**

**Scope for Participation by Citizens in Policy Processes**

Yes | No
--- | ---
Budget Approval | 21% | 79%
Discussions on performance of local authorities | 41% | 59%
Discussions on performance of central government | 27% | 73%
COVID-19 national response | 38% | 62%
Consultations on service delivery | 39% | 61%
Consultations on national policy processes | 24% | 76%
Citizens’ Perception of the Main Role of Local Government

Citizens were then asked what they felt was the main role of local authorities/government. The word cloud (Figure 17 below) was generated based on the responses citizens provided and shows that citizens see the council as a service provider, specifically for water and roads and maintenance of a clean space.

5.1 Rating of Local Authority Performance

When asked how they felt about the performance of their local authorities since 2018, there was an almost even split of citizens who felt that the performance was either medium 48% (n=576) or low 48% (n=572). As was the trend in the three (3) CPEs (conducted in 2018; 2019 and 2021) very few citizens (4%; n=52) felt that the performance was high.
Citizens were then asked to rate the quality-of-service provision provided by their local authority since the last election. Across the 11 areas/levels of service provision in the survey, less than 2% of citizens felt that the service provision had increased a lot; between 6% and 16% of citizens felt that the range of services had moderately improved. The majority of citizens felt that the quality-of-service provision had either remained the same, decreased or was non-existent.
FIGURE 20: Citizen Rating of Local Authority Service Provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Improved a lot</th>
<th>Moderately improved</th>
<th>Remained the same</th>
<th>Decreased</th>
<th>Non-existent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean water and borehole provision</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage disposal</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and land allocation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road and bridge network maintenance</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare provision</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment creation</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street light maintenance</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food security</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer reticulation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip tank maintenance</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 21: Citizen Rating of Local Authority Priority Areas

- Regular supply of clean water: 60%
- Regular road network maintenance: 45%
- Functioning and well-equipped clinics: 37%
- Garbage disposal: 30%
- Affordable housing/stands: 28%
- Borehole drilling: 22%
- Jobs: 16%
- Improved provision of education: 15%
- Vocational training opportunities: 13%
- Dip tank maintenance: 10%
- Bridge maintenance: 8%
- Sewer reticulation: 7%
- Street light installation and maintenance: 7%
- Other: 1%

The top five (5) priorities that the citizens felt should be the focus of local government in Zimbabwe were the regular supply of clean water (n=719, 60%); regular road network maintenance (n=539, 45%); functioning and well-equipped clinics (n=441, 37%); garbage disposal (n=365, 30%) and the provision of affordable housing/stands (n=330, 28%).
5.3 Factors Affecting the Effective Operation of Local Authorities

The top factors identified by citizens in the survey as ones which affect the performance of local authorities are shown in Figure 22. As with the other CPE surveys done since 2018, corruption still ranks the highest with 39% (n=417) of citizens identifying this as a constraint. This is followed by incompetence of officeholders (23%; n=271) and then inadequate resources at 14% (n=172).

FIGURE 22: Citizens’ Perception of Constraints to Local Government Performance

- Corruption: 39%
- Incompetence by office holders: 23%
- Inadequately resourced: 14%
- Meddling by central government: 12%
- Lack of appropriate oversight by councillors: 7%
- Lack of appropriate oversight by residents: 3%
- Other: 2%
Citizens’ Assessment of Central Government

Citizens were then asked what they felt was the main role of the central government. The word cloud (Figure 23 below) was generated based on the responses that the citizens provided, and it shows that citizens see the government’s role as that of creating/providing opportunities, specifically employment/jobs and promoting development. Other perceptions of citizens of what the role of central government should be are around the provision of social services such as hospitals and schools.

6.1 Rating of Central Government Performance

When asked about the performance of the central government since 2018, the majority of citizens felt that the performance was low 57% (n=682). As was the trend in the three (3) CPEs (conducted in 2018; 2019 and 2021) very few citizens (4%; n=52) felt that the performance was high.
When compared across the last three (3) CPEs conducted we can see that while the majority of citizens have rated performance as low, the percentage who say this has been decreasing. In 2019, 90% of citizens surveyed said that central government performance was low, in 2021 it dropped to 63% and in 2023 it was 57%. This corresponds to the increase in the number of citizens who indicated that government performance was now medium.

Citizens were then asked to rate government performance across nine (9) areas ranging from resuscitating industry to nation-building, stability of prices and education and healthcare delivery. Less than 3% of citizens felt that government performance around these areas had increased a lot; between 4% to 17% of citizens felt that the central government performance had increased; 19% to 33% felt that it remained the same. The majority of citizens felt that the quality of service provision had decreased (e.g. 48% felt that the government’s performance when it came to stabilizing prices had decreased) or was non-existent (e.g. 40% of citizens felt that performance around the resuscitation of industry was non-existent).
6.2 Citizens’ Perception of Priority Areas for Central Government

The top five (5) priorities that citizens felt should be the focus of the central government in Zimbabwe were the creation of employment (n=639, 53%); dealing with corruption (n=493, 41%); improving health service delivery (n=477, 40%); stabilising prices (n=421, 35%) and resuscitating industry (n=408, 34%).
When analysed against the last three (3) CPE surveys conducted – the top three priorities that citizens have consistently urged the central government to focus on have revolved around (i) creating employment; (ii) dealing with corruption and (iii) stabilising prices. These have remained consistent and are probably a reflection of the lived realities and experiences of citizens on the ground. They are confronted with daily challenges of unemployment, rising inflation and cost of living and reports of grand corruption within the government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Creating employment</td>
<td>Stabilising prices</td>
<td>Creating employment</td>
<td>Creating employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stabilising prices</td>
<td>Dealing with corruption</td>
<td>Dealing with corruption</td>
<td>Dealing with corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fixing cash shortages</td>
<td>Fixing cash shortages</td>
<td>Resuscitating industry</td>
<td>Improved health delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dealing with corruption</td>
<td>Resuscitating industry</td>
<td>Stabilising prices</td>
<td>Stabilising prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Resuscitating industry</td>
<td>Int’l re-engagement</td>
<td>Improved health delivery</td>
<td>Resuscitating industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Int’l re-engagement</td>
<td>Improved health delivery</td>
<td>Int’l re-engagement</td>
<td>Improved infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Improved health delivery</td>
<td>Working with other political parties</td>
<td>Ensuring food security</td>
<td>Improved education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Improved infrastructure</td>
<td>Ensuring food security</td>
<td>Improved infrastructure</td>
<td>Improved local government service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ensuring food security</td>
<td>Improved infrastructure</td>
<td>Fixing cash shortages</td>
<td>Fixing cash shortages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked if the government has adequate resources to implement the identified priority areas, the majority of citizens (76%; n=917) felt that government did have adequate resources. Only 24% felt that there were not sufficient resources to implement the priority areas.

**Perceptions of Adequate Resources for Central Government**

76% felt that government had adequate resources to implement the priority areas.
6.3 Factors Affecting the Effective Operation of Central Government

The top factors identified by citizens in the survey as the ones which affect or constrain the performance of the central government are shown in Table 5. As with the other CPE surveys done since 2018, corruption still ranks the highest with 49% (n=589) of citizens identifying it as a major constraint. Corruption is followed by ineffective leadership (13%; n=152) and then incompetence at 13% (n=151). While the government has indicated that sanctions are a major factor hindering its efforts to address the crises affecting the country, only 6% of the respondents felt that this was a constraint.

While corruption continues to be identified as the top constraint by citizens in the last CPE surveys – we do note that there is a decrease in the number of citizens who consider it as the top constraint – from 81% in 2019 to 49% in 2023 – (see Figure 29) and this could be an acknowledgement of some of the actions taken by the government in attempts to fight corruption including setting up the Zimbabwe Anti-Corruption Commission (ZACC) and the arrests of public officials – some high ranking, around allegations of corruption and subsequent conviction of some of them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective leadership</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompetence</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited financial resources</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctions</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of political will</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of integrity</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External political pressures</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 29: Corruption as a Constraint for Central Government
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Citizens in the survey were asked to provide their insights on what would be indicators that the government was performing well, and that the country was on a positive trajectory. The top four (4) indicators for citizens that the government was doing well would be:

- Many citizens would be in well-paying jobs
- Industries are open and exporting
- Stable and affordable prices of goods
- Clinics and hospitals save lives, and they have drugs and medication

**FIGURE 30:** Picture of Success for Zimbabwe
These indicators are a reflection of the top four (4) priority areas identified by citizens that they want the central government to focus on (see Figure 27), and speak to the everyday challenges and lived experiences around unemployment, expensive goods and services and rising inflation and poor public health service delivery system.

The table below provides an analysis of citizens’ perceptions of success across some of the different demographics studied in this report, and while the order may be different essentially their ideas of success are made up of the above four (4) indicators. It was important to note that for those older than 66 years, food security became an important indicator of success.

**Citizens’ Perceptions of What a Successful Zimbabwe Looks Like Across Various Dimensions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Idea of Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total respondents (n=1200)</td>
<td>Many of us are in well-paying jobs (n=243, 20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men (n=600)</td>
<td>Industries are open and exporting (n=118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Many of us are in well-paying jobs (n=115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stable and affordable prices of goods (n=107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women (n=600)</td>
<td>Many of us are in well-paying jobs (n=128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Our clinics/hospitals can save lives (n=106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stable and affordable prices of goods (n=105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban (n=541)</td>
<td>Many of us are in well-paying jobs (n=108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Our clinics can save lives (n=93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Industry is open (n=92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Peri-urban (n=99)</td>
<td>Stable and affordable prices (n=26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Many of us are in well-paying jobs (n=21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Our clinics can save lives (n=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural (n=560)</td>
<td>Many of us are in well-paying jobs (n=114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Industry is open (n=108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stable and affordable prices (n=101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18 – 25 (n=296)</td>
<td>26 – 35 (n=371)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Many of us are in well-paying jobs (n=75)</td>
<td>Many of us are in well-paying jobs (n=73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stable and affordable prices (n=61)</td>
<td>Stable and affordable prices (n=42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry is open (n=51)</td>
<td>Industry is open (n=72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>No formal education (n=82)</td>
<td>Primary (n=96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our clinics can save lives (n=20)</td>
<td>Our clinics can save lives (n=24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stable and affordable prices (n=16)</td>
<td>Many of us in well-paying jobs (n=15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry is open (n=12)</td>
<td>Stable and affordable prices (n=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>Employed (n=461)</td>
<td>Self-employed (n=264)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Many of us in well-paying jobs (n=101)</td>
<td>Many of us in well-paying jobs (n=51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry is open (n=95)</td>
<td>Industry is open (n=47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stable and affordable prices (n=75)</td>
<td>Stable and affordable prices (n=47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion – What does this all mean?

A major indicator or yardstick for democracy has been perceived as the holding of free and fair elections. However, to whose benefit is it if, at the end of a government’s term of office, those who have been elected by citizens as their representatives to run the affairs of a country and of a local authority have left their constituents dissatisfied? This survey found out that 48% of respondents felt that the performance of local government since 2018 was low and 57% felt the same about central government. Despite these levels of dissatisfaction, 79% of citizens indicated that they would be voting in the 2023 elections.

As SIVIO Institute, we subscribe to the idea that the real work of democracy starts the day after elections. We recognise that “elections are a necessary but not sufficient condition for the attainment of democracy” (Murisa, 2022). Citizens need to be at the forefront of policy and development decisions to ensure an inclusive participatory form of governance. The survey highlights that post-election citizens’ participation in public processes is very limited. In this survey, only 18% indicated that they had participated in a policy formulation process – and for most of the 18% it had been discussions on local government performance and around service delivery. These low levels of participation have been characteristic across all other previous CPE surveys conducted. Over 60% of citizens surveyed in the 2023 CPE felt that there was no scope to participate in public processes. As a result of this, there is often a misalignment between what citizens see as priority or focus areas for local and central governments and what local and central governments decide to make areas of focus for themselves.

As the country enters another election cycle and political parties’ step onto the campaign trail, we encourage that the focus of their manifestos and campaign promises be aligned with the expectations of citizens. Once the electorate makes its decision, representatives should seek to work together with citizens to fulfil those promises. In both local and central government, citizens continue to see corruption and incompetence by officeholders as major constraints to performance. Elected officials should seriously consider how they are going to address these challenges raised by working together with the citizens who raised them. As shown in the previous CPEs in 2018, 2019 and 2021, this has been a long-standing concern for citizens when it comes to government performance. It cannot continue to be business as usual after elections if the government (both local and central) continues to ignore these concerns. Perhaps the biggest challenge that Zimbabwe faces, together with many others, is the fact that citizens have been reduced to voters and that they are not adequately investing in processes that promote public participation for co-production and co-creation.
The challenges that the country faces cannot be adequately resolved by the government alone. There is a need for a shift in mind-sets. The problems at hand require an investment in public trust and the creation of confidence, both of which require a multi-stakeholder approach to accomplish. The real work of democracy commences once the elections are concluded.
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