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Abstract: The paper argues that though place stewardship is largely qualitative concept and practice, it is measurable. For theoretical analysis, the paper uses Amatya Sen and Yi-Fu Tuan’s models of capability and place, respectively, frameworks through which the indicators of measurement are drawn. By an illustrative set of criterion indicators, the paper puts across a possible framework for sustainable development through the element of place stewardship. Specifically, the criteria include individual capacity in households and membership; community capacity to decide on their ends; institutional capacity to meet the demands of the individuals, communities and those of other organizations; collaborative capacity to work on areas of common interest; and, the learning capacity of individuals, communities and organizations to adopt new innovations and adapt to changes. Place references are made to peri-urban settlements of Ruwa and Epworth, satellites of Harare, the capital city of Harare. Methodologically, the paper is based on the findings from a four year study by the author of this paper in which the behaviour, attitudes, perceptions and experiences of the inhabitants of the two settlements are crystallised and analysed.
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I. INTRODUCTION

This paper attempts to provide a framework to measure the stewardship of place in Zimbabwe. It emanates from a four year (2008-2012) in-depth study of Ruwa and Epworth by the author (Chirisa, 2012), a study that was largely guided by the qualitative paradigm. For data collection, it focused on households and institutionalised organizations (both and non-state). The major idea was to investigate how peri-urban dwellers utilise, value and care for their human habitats.
This is a major area in the geography and planning of places as stewardship of place is embroiled in the attitudes, perceptions, practices and values held by the inhabitants on the place, in this case the peri-urban (cf. De Boeck, Cassiman and Van Wolputte, 2009; Swanwick 2009). Peri-urban environments are shaped by various factors including policy and institutional frameworks. A number of concepts like stewardship of place and sustainable development (which are ‘borrowed’ from international forums) are sometimes very difficult to operationalise on the ground, especially in African contexts where poverty, mismanagement of resources and misalignment of institutions, policies and priorities are common (Qviström, 2007; Briggs and Mwamfupe, 2000; Briggs and Yeboah 2001, Myers, 2010; De Boeck, Cassiman and Van Wolputte, 2009). In the four-year study, focus on housing was premised on the observation that housing is the major activity and space consumer causing ecological footprint in this globe where ecological footprint must be managed effectively to achieve sustainable development. At the centre of reference was the Stewardship Theory or Partnership Model which is shaped by five basic approaches namely biblical-religious, business, environmental, vernacular, place-based community/grassroots approaches (De Boeck, Cassiman and Van Wolputte, 2009; Murray, 2008; (Albemarle County, 2008; ARS, 2000; Bryden and Hart, 2000; Hovorka and Lee Smith 2006; Parnell and Pieterse, 2010; Blommaert, 2012).

The study was informed by the stewardship theory or partnership model. The theory is part of the broader collective theory in which actors collaborate to solve common problems (Ferguson, 2007). Novicevic, Harvey, Buckley, Wren and Pena (2007), in commemorating what they call “Follett’ model of unified pluralism” (Novicevic et al, 2007:381) assert that communities, in practice, learn and adapt to manage problems embedded in or brought about by the different interests they wield. Unified pluralism requires social trust and toleration. It is a way of conflict resolution and interests’ integration (cf. Elgåker, 2011). De Kort (2009:9) has described integration as “a way of handling complexity” in diversity. In keeping with this, it is noted that partnership and stewardship acknowledge the existence of differences among group members or even the partners.

The study combined methods hence ‘mixed methods approach’ which is about combining quantitative and qualitative methods. To a great extent it was a phenomenological inquiry into the applicability of stewardship as a concept applied in practice (Swanwick 2009). Fieldwork included observations and semi-structured interviews with households and the peri-urban dwellers. The idea was to triangulate these methods so that a better picture to the case is portrayed with each method attempting to answer those gaps that the other method cannot answer. A survey involving 291 randomly selected households (137 from Ruwa and 154 from
Epworth) was applied. The survey targeted all peri-urban households in the two areas. Key informants were purposively selected given their role in housing and environmental matters. The major tools for data collection included an extensive documentary analysis (newspaper articles and policy and legislative documents); household survey in which a semi-structured questionnaire was used; observations of the operations and housing and environmental artefacts aided with photography; and key informant interviews with officials from Ruwa Town Council (RTC), Epworth Local Board (ELB), the Ministry of National Housing and Social Amenities (MNHSA), Environmental Management Agency (EMA) and the Department of Physical Planning (DPP). Quantitative data were analysed using SPSS Version 18 while content and textual analysis applied to qualitative data. From the study, criteria for classifying actors was found important towards achieving meaningful stewardship of place, processes in housing and environmental management and creation of sustainable peri-urban environments. However, it is the qualitative-interpretative approach putting the case study and narrative (case narratology) design at the centre dominated this study.

II. THEORETICAL AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

As already pointed out, the paper attempts to set general criteria for measuring the stewardship of place (Albemarle County, 2008; ARS, 2000; Bryden and Hart, 2000). These criteria are contextualized to the Ruwa and Epworth case. Housing delivery is a complex phenomenon embracing aspects of policy, constructions and resultant artefacts and how households and institutionalized organizations ‘care’ for the environment (Mwanamakondo, 2007; Novicevic, Harvey, Buckley, Wren and Pena, 2007; Murray 2008). Such a process is difficult to achieve smoothly without the challenges of conflicts and conflict management. All the same, there has to be capacity to ensure that a measure of sustainability in attained. It is noted that human conflicts are driven by contrasting priorities and interests in this case in habitat development and maintenance (Simone, 2003; Elgåker, 2011). The conflicts are perpetuated by history of the place, income levels among the peri-urban dwellers, lack of defined and clear-cut policies and commitment by institutions responsible towards the creation of sustainable settlements (Qviström, 2007; Murray, 2008; Becker, 1990). The reality of peri-urban housing and conflicts and interests therein is a complex one but for ease of analysis, this paper makes reference to Tuan’s approaches to place and Amatya Sen’s capability model. These models are critical in understanding human attachment to place and willingness and capacity to develop or enhance it. Capacity, perception and attitude towards a place are likely to shape how
humankind is attracted to or repulsed by a place. Place, stewardship, when it takes on board these critical aspects, is value-laden and an emotive agenda.

II.1. Yi-Fu Tuan

Tuan underscores the centrality of the notion of place in human geography (Manuel-Navarrete and Redclift, 2009; Seamon and Sowers, 2008). In his terms, space symbolises hope; place symbolises achievement and stability (Tuan, 1980). Overall, space is that structure through which the physical and intangible processes flow. In most cases, this sphere is an abstract concept representing the areas of movement between places. On the other hand, place has a location which can relative (with reference to other places) or absolute (being the exact location of a place on the surface of the earth). In his humanistic approach to place Tuan uses two terms to describe the human emotions towards place, topophilia and topophobia (Tuan, 1974a; 1974b). Topophilia describes the human love for a place, the affective bond between people and place; topophobia speaks of the repulsion of place which Tuan describes a ‘landscapes of fear’ (Tuan, 1980). These aspects define the manner in which people in a given place will attach or detach from it. These emotions are critical in characterising the stewardship of place. As Myers (1996) has suggested toponymy, the naming of places, is rich in telling the story about a place. Using the case of Zanzibar, Myers illustrates how this is so. In light of this, it is clear that names can tell how people in place identify with it and how perhaps this infuses a sense of stewardship of the same. In another instance, Murray (2008), referring to post-Apartheid Johannesburg speaks of ‘disposable people’ in the urban fringe, referring to their general ‘footloose-ness’ regarding their little attachment to this place, the peri-urban.

II.2. Amartya Sen

At the centre of Amartya Sen’s career have been questions of social justice. Sen has quizzed the inequalities between women and men hence tried to locate gender justice in society (Nussbaum, 2003). Indeed, for Sen, human rights must be considered more as social goals towards which every society should progress. In addition, the dimensions of poverty are ends in themselves and not as means to a preconceived goal (Frediani, 2007). Sen defines capabilities as the freedoms people have to achieve the kinds of lives they have reason to value. ‘functionings’ are those states of doing or being which people value. To him, development is a process of expansion of people’s freedom to be and do what they may value providing them with an intrinsic worth (Frediani, 2007). Some scholars have recognised the capability approach as a formula for interpersonal comparisons of
welfare. However, this has attracted criticism from a number of scholars like Robeyns (2005) and Dietsch (2002). Iversen (2003: 93) has argued:

Amartya Sen’s capability approach provides a framework for evaluating the quality of life. This task is immensely important, especially in developing countries… The concepts of functionings and capabilities occupy central space in this endeavor. Functionings reflect the various things a person manages “to do or be in leading a life…. There are basic functionings, such as being adequately nourished, having decent shelter, and being able to read and write, as well as more complex functionings, such as achieving self-respect. A person’s capability, or well-being freedom, reflects the alternative combinations of functionings he or she can achieve. The phrase “development as freedom” is closely, but not exclusively, associated with an enhancement of well-being freedom.

The foregoing citation is of critical importance especially as one tries to define what makes people attached or detached to place. They must enjoy the freedom and have the capacity to do so. Frediani (2007) also supported by Robeyns (2003) has argued that Sen does not propose an operational guideline to select and measure capabilities a point. Yet (Tseng, 2011) has advanced that despite its shortcomings, Sen’s capability approach conveys important aspects of development and poverty reduction. It is this aspect that this paper also seeks to capitalize upon in defining and explaining place stewardship. For a place like Epworth, the pre-occupation by the Zimbabwean government alongside other developmental agencies in addressing the issue of poverty, is very fundamental in the definition of place stewardship. Apart from what agencies are doing, one may also want to check on what they people are doing themselves to drive out of the abyss of the poverty that characterizes their place.

A number of questions can be put across in trying to bring to light the stewardship of place. Is care something voluntary or obligatory? If voluntary, how ethical is the use of force to instil care? Is care or lack of it something instinctive? If not, can it be learnt and do we need institutions to teach it? If it can be taught, is there a grading system that can be applied as a measuring rod for stewardship? Do anti-littering campaigns work, for example? If education is quintessential to stewardship, at what stage and of what type should this education be (formal, non-formal or informal)? Isn’t it that there is a hidden curriculum in society in which people will always learn from what they see in the people they consider as elite of society, even if they have never opened their mouths to say, Listen now I am teaching you. What drives people to be destructive (in this case of their environment) or constructive? How maintainable is maintenance efforts? How good is infrastructure provisioning as a standard to measure stewardship? These questions provide some pointers into how stewardship can be measured. Specifically from these questions, the following indicators can be drawn:
level of voluntary initiation,
- ability to set norms, values, standards and obligations as a group or
- respect of rights and adherence to set obligations,
- ability to enforce laid down sanctions and reward set incentives (the carrot
  and stick approach in day to day conduct, especially in membership
  arrangements),
- ability to learn and continue learning (level of flexibility regarding to new
  styles of living as well as existing demands,
- presence of educational avenues that tell things to be taken care of and
  how,
- availability of leadership and champions to lead in the demonstration
  stewardship values and vision,
- presence of instinctive needs and demands,
- ability to maintain laid down values and or physical assets,
- ability to initiate processes that build beyond the foreseeable future.

In measuring the stewardship of place, there are scores of possible
approaches to it. These include, but not limited to: individual capacity, community
capacity, institutional capacity, collaborative capacity and learning capacity. Learning from literature can also be useful in defining this agenda.

II.3. Literature Review

ARS (2000:4) has loosely defined stewardship as “…the careful and
responsible management of something entrusted to our care.” It further states that
the notion, when applied to a place, combines ‘citizenship’ with ‘stewardship of
place’. On a broader scale, ARS (2000:3) defines regional stewards as:

... leaders who are committed to the long-term well-being of places....
integrators who cross boundaries of jurisdiction, sector, and discipline to address
complex issues such as sprawl, equity, education and economic development....
leaders who combine 360 degree vision with the ability to mobilise diverse
coalitions of action.

The value of stewardship is embraced in the philosophy of “…the careful
and responsible management of the things entrusted to our care” (Albemarle
County, 2008:4). Simply put by Bryden and Hart (2006:5) stewardship is the
notion of “responsible care”. Siemer’s (2001) in Powers and PEER Associates
(2009:4) defines stewardship education as “… a process designed to develop an
internalized stewardship ethic and the skills necessary to make considered choices
and take environmentally responsible actions.” The whole idea in stewardship
education is to have an approach that is integrative, holistic, collaborative and
allowing for strategic communal visioning and practical action. Describing the level of civic awareness in peri-urban Zambian settlements, Mwanamakondo (2007:3) has said:

The level of ignorance is high because civic awareness is low. The knowledge of what is expected of a good responsible citizen is often absent. This is usually revealed by the [high] levels of vandalism of public property, pollution and careless waste dumping along roadways.

Justifying the need for civic awareness and the creation of a stewardship sense in inner-city housing projects, Rubin (2010) had this to say:

It is not a matter of poverty or wealth but of social services provision, socialisation (for example learning how to flash a toilet and improving their way of living. People must be taught of how to live in certain environments. If you do not tame them and allow a laissez faire approach then there will be anarchy. People will make what is available in their environments if they are exposed...

Both Mwanamakondo and Rubin point out certain critical indicators of either good or bad stewardship. Explicitly they show that good stewardship of place will not happen by chance but must follow a deliberately laid path for it to happen. Stewardship of place entails mutual and reciprocal exchange of ideas and resources to produce a better future for a place and its inhabitants. Thus, there is a very thin line between stewardship and planning as both a futuristic, being important decisions and actions done now with a consideration of steps and outcomes in the future. Use of clear and precise qualitative indicators assists in establishing measurement of the qualitative aspect. Feuerstein (1986) has identified nine types of indicators, namely: indicators of availability, of relevance, of accessibility, of utilisation, of coverage, of quality, of effort, of efficiency, and of impact. Mulwa (2008) dichotomizes between quantitative and qualitative change indicators. Quantitative change indicators are expressed in monetary value, distance, weight, capacity (volume), length, size, area, number, proportion, percentage, amount and ratio. On the other hand, those which are qualitative are expressed in phraseology like “…level of, presence of, value of, evidence of, availability of, capacity of (ability), quality of, potential of, accessibility of, ability to, existence of, sustainability of, extent of use of, composition of, improvement of, texture of, change of, and standards of…” (Mulwa, 2008). From this categorization, one observes that it is very possible to measure qualitative subjects and objects.

It must be stressed that stewardship falls within the broader sphere of sustainable development which has been classically defined as the use of natural resources by the present generation without compromising the needs of the future generations. This is an aspect of intergenerational equity. Yet, even across the
plane and with respect to other communities in the contemporary space, care should be extended to them as well. In light of these reflections it emerges that the major killers of good stewardship hence perpetration of bad stewardship are, among other things, selfishness, bigotry and myopia, departmentalism and friction, rigidity, apathy and indifference, lack of enforcement of existing laws and rules, failure to maintain what has been laid down for a noble cause, and, the inability by certain groups, individuals and organizations to define own ‘sphere of influence’. Sometimes the laid down policies and laws are so many that they cause not only confusion among the users but also the lowering of morale among the actors. When that happens, it is a disservice; it is like someone smiling in the dark: no one notices that.

III. CHARACTERIZING THE STUDY AREAS

Ruwa and Epworth are peri-urban settlements of Harare, the capital city of Zimbabwe. They are located some 23 and 9 kilometres, respectively from the city centre of Harare. Ruwa is an ‘elitist’ settlement established as a growth point and whose evolution has largely and strictly adhered to town planning standards. On the contrary, Epworth evolved (and continues to grow) organically hence largely an informal settlement. Efforts to slum-upgrade Epworth in the late 1980s (Chirisa, 2008; 2010; 2011) have not gone very far given that the settlement continues to receive hordes of settlers, especially from Harare. In this regard, Epworth is experiencing immense uncontrolled peri-urbanisation. This trend typifies what is taking place in many African cities (Potts, 2009; Yeboah, 2005; Briggs and Mwamfupe, 2000; Briggs and Yeboah 2001; Hahn, 2010; Simone, 2003; Elgåker, 2011).

In terms of structuring, this has introduction, an analytical framework and review of related literature, approaches to stewardship for Epworth and Ruwa, applied criteria to measurement of place stewardship and conclusion. For its theoretical framework, the paper draws its grounding in Tuan and Sen’s theorisations of place and capability, respectively.

Epworth lies between 1,500 -1,600 metres in altitude. Relief consists of gently undulating ground interrupted by granite outcrops and picturesque balancing rocks that are very popular with tourists. Some of the most beautiful balancing rocks in Zimbabwe encrypted on (former) Zimbabwean bank notes are located in this local government area. Epworth covers about 3600 hectares in extent and was home to roughly 150,000 people by December 1997. Epworth is divided into 7 wards (Munzwa, Chirisa and Madzivanzira, 2007). Wards 1 and 4, that is, Muguta-Makomo and Chinamano-Zinyengere areas, respectively, have predominantly
residents linked to the early settlers and they are colloquially referred to as ‘originals’. However, this does not mean the current occupant is an original settler as some of them have inherited from their parents (second or third generation). Wards 2, 3 and 5 are mainly composed of residents who moved into Epworth prior to the inception of the Local Board in 1986 (Munzwa, Chirisa and Madzivanzira, 2007). Their areas are generally referred to as ‘extensions,’ for example; there is Muguta Extension, Makomo Extension, Chinamano Extension and so forth. These are said to have no link with the “originals” despite both of them being regularized by the local authority. Ward 7 is occupied by the largest group of illegal “settlers” including some small portions of other Wards and these areas are informally referred as ma-Gada. The word ‘gada’ is derived from a Shona ideophonic construction meaning some purposeless sitting (Chirisa, 2012).

Ruwa was proclaimed a Local Board in 1991, according to Section 14 of the Urban Councils Act and the Income and Sales Tax Act. Prior to 1991, it was jointly administered by the Goromonzi Rural District Council and the Urban Development Corporation Ruwa (Chirisa, 2009; 2011). The town enjoys a high connectivity of major roads as indicated by the town layout showing residential, commercial, industrial and open spaces. These are comprehensive elements of the townscape in terms of defining what a basic town consists. Ruwa is growing almost symmetrically along Mutare Road, a national and trunk road connecting Harare, the capital city of Zimbabwe and the border town of Mutare, in the east. However, one of the major challenges of Ruwa is its general ‘dryness’ in terms of having adequate reticulated water, which then has to be ‘imported’ from Harare (Chirisa, 2011; 2012).

Thus, the water challenges and somewhat distant location from Harare makes more of an elitist suburb than anything. Hence the predominant occupiers of the place are of the medium to low-income earners. All these factors have a bearing on the overall outlook of the town – population composition, types of houses built, and land use arrangements. In the past ten years or so, Ruwa’s outlook and townscape has increasingly changed with a large population of the place occupiers being drawn from the emerging bourgeois class (some being successful civil servants, businesspeople, and remitters in the Diaspora). The local board has always complained that its physical space for urban expansion is restraining (Chirisa, 2009). But perhaps this is also important in that the ‘greenbelt’ around the town remains undisturbed hence allowing for an eco-friendly town. Green infrastructure provision remains a pillar in the sustainable urban design and townscape management debate.
IV. DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF THE STUDY RESULTS

From the study five approaches to stewardship as informed by models by Yi-Fu Tuan on place and space and Amatya Sen’s capability and function. Capability is measured by aspects namely: individual capacity in households and membership; community capacity to decide on their ends; institutional capacity to meet the demands of the individuals, communities and those of other organizations; collaborative capacity to work on areas of common interest; and, the learning capacity of individuals, communities and organizations to adopt new innovations and adapt to changes (Ferguson, 2007; ARS, 2000; Chirisa, 2012; Bryden and Hart, 2000; ARS, 2000; Powers and Peer Associates; 2009; Mulwa, 2008; Rubin, 2010).

IV.1. Individual capacity

As in Sen’s model, individuals have the capacity to map and shape their destinies (Novicevic et al, 2007). Pressure and choices are the impulsions to the realization of the said destinies (Chirisa, 2011). They have to decide to get employment or to engage in some kind of housing coping strategy. In addition, they decide to litter the environment or pick litter from the ground. Such aspects are part of the Tuan’s topophilia and topophobia. Moreover, they make choices on what houses they want to build on the space at their disposal and where to get the materials for construction, whether to apply for a loan to build or use own savings. They must have the capacity to do so. In the Ruwa-Epworth study, this came out strongly as some households made choices to move to the peri-urban zone after they have experienced pressure of rentals from the ‘big city’ (Chirisa, 2012). A rational actor will always make choices that create some comfort for them. Essentially, capacity by an individual is based on perception, experience and choices (Swanwick 2009).

IV.2. Community capacity

Ruwa and Epworth by virtue of income grouping are distinct communities (Chirisa, 2011; 2012). Level of income by the majority of the community has a bearing on the landscape that results (Mwanamakondo, 2007). Income allows members of certain community to be in a position to afford or not to afford to meet the needs that confront them. In economics, one is a demander of a good or service as long as he or she can afford to pay for it. Ruwa has attracted a number of building societies and developers to its development while Epworth being a habitat of largely the low-income has been a recipient of donor actors. This partly explains the contrast in infrastructure developments in the two areas. Where Ruwa is
speaking of engaging in public-private partnerships (PPP), say in water infrastructure development, Epworth has not moved a greater stride in this direction. This is explained partly, by the legal constraints that apply regarding its status. Legally, in keeping with the provisions of the Urban Councils Act and the Regional, Town and Country Planning Act, as a local board, it does not have the powers to engage PPP given that it does not enjoy borrowing powers. Neither can it deal directly with land developers. Even the City of Harare has laid conditions which Epworth must meet before its incorporation into the major city (Murowe and Chirisa, 2006). Yet, developing such capacity remains bleak given the struggling by the community members to make ends meet. Community capacity is also based on the political will and leadership available. Ruwa has worked along many organizations and even piloted on new strategies for governance like participatory budgeting which aid stewardship.

IV.3. Institutional capacity

It is not only individuals or community membership that must capable of running their affairs but also the institutions that take care of their everyday needs. Institutional capacity is mainly an intrinsic virtue of an organization to be resilient to forces militating against it (Howlett and Ramesh, 1995; Chirisa, 2008; De Kort, 2009). But it must be cultivated as well. The health of an organization hinges on the ability by the same organization to hire the required skills and the ability to harness the critical mass and resources for development. Government has been described as the most resourceful institution given its large pool of resources including labour, laws, information and fiscal power to name these few (Howlett and Ramesh, 1995). Yet, the environment in which the institution is operating is of critical value as well. Zimbabwe has undergone a full cycle of challenges in which the institutional capacity was undermined. This resulted in lack of maintenance of the infrastructure in existence (roads, water utilities, schools and health facilities) in peri-urban settlements as elsewhere. In addition, many people opted out of the country. However, the contribution of remittances to peri-urban development has not been fully understood yet. Ruwa being predominantly middle to high income has tended to provide support to its local authority by payment of real estate taxes, a development quite difficult to achieve in Epworth. Critical skills including engineering and town planning are found in Ruwa whereas Epworth relies more on the central government or some private consultants in terms of shaping its environs to make it a pride to the community. This is a handicap to stewardship practices and promotion.
IV.4. Collaborative capacity

Capability can be enhanced by working in partnership. This study revealed that the capacity to collaborate is a function of trust, leadership and finances as lubricants (Novicevic, et al, 2007). Ruwa has, over the years, demonstrated good leadership as an institution. For example, the fact that it has a website shows the extent to which community members can air their views without much disturbance in the communication system. In Epworth much still depends on face-to-face interaction of the members of community with their local authority. Certain actions can be misinterpreted to the detriment of communication. In the study, it has emerged that regarding certain developments organizations or departments fail to collaborate and this perpetuates a syndrome of departmentalism in which actors function as if they do not work towards a common vision. For instance, the Harare Metropolitan Province official refusing to mention how her organisation’s link with Operation Maguta and Operation Garikayi and saying that officials responsible with these programmes can better speak for themselves. Again, an official from the Environmental Management Agency (EMA) pointing out that anything to do with sand extractions and quarrying should be managed by the Ministry of Mines. Departments and ministries tend to operate as if they were not part of one government. This perpetuates suspicion, secrecy, friction and selfishness which, in own right, militate against sound stewardship.

IV.5. Learning capacity

Inherent in most individuals, communities and institutions is their ability to respond and adapt to needs. Learning is explicitly defined in Amatya Sen’s capability model. It allows one to be functional much as income and finance do in certain instances. If institutions, individuals and communities are to survive pressure hence develop their collaborative capacity then they must cultivate their capacity to learn, hence stewardship education (Chirisa, 2011; 2012). Learning has a latent value of creating robustness for adoption and adaptation. The major problem experienced by most institutions in the country is that of resisting change hence doing things as business as usual. The world is fast changing. Peri-urbanisation is a living reality. Governments must move with lightning speed to ensure that appropriate infrastructure is in place before they are overwhelmed by pressure. From these approaches, criteria for measuring stewardship can be drawn.
V. APPLIED CRITERIA TO MEASURING PLACE STEWARDSHIP AND DISCUSSION

The criteria for stewardship herein discussed examine two basic angles to the subject: enhancers and setbacks to stewardship. Again these are pinned to the topophilia and topophobia by Tuan. A quick rundown of setbacks to stewardship as already outlined include selfishness at all levels examined (household, community and institutions which partly explains the narrowness (bigotry) and myopia in approaching critical issues in stewardship. If stewardship is about collaboration, hence breaking of walls (professional, departmental and class) then in Zimbabwe and with respect to settlement management the country is still miles away. This is explained by rivalry, departmentalism and friction between the actors. There is a lot of sticking to tradition hence rigidity in approach to fundamental issues. Apathy and indifference is rife among the stakeholders. Lack of enforcement of existing laws and rules makes stewardship even a mockery. As such there is a general failure to maintaining what has been laid down for a noble cause. Inability by certain groups, individuals and organizations to define owns ‘sphere of influence’ adds more to the paralysis hence poor stewardship practices. The following paragraphs are devoted to the analysis of stewardship enhancers.

The stewardship enhancers here discussed, namely level of voluntary initiation, ability to set norms, values, standards and obligations as a group or community, respect of others’ rights and adherence to set obligations, ability to enforce laid down sanctions and reward set incentives, ability to learn and continue learning, presence of educational avenues that tell things to be taken care, and availability of leadership and champions to lead in the demonstration stewardship values and vision.

V.1. Level of voluntary initiation

This should be looked also from the angle of the ability to initiate processes that build beyond the foreseeable future (element of sustainability). It has been noted in the study that some households, out of their own accord, have embarked on planning orchards, digging own wells and preserving indigenous trees on their plots. This was particularly observed in Zimre Park, Damofalls and Sunway City in Ruwa and greater sections of Magada in Epworth. Such an approach is part of the vernacular approach to settlement development. In Ruwa, the digging of deep wells is a direct response to the failure by the local authority to supply water to the residents. In Epworth, it is due to the fact that the larger part of the settlement has largely remained ‘ruralised’. Voluntarism should be viewed as largely a self-help initiative yet not all volunteers may be following laid down...
standards which may in turn put a serious dent on stewardship. That some households have created own employment through exploitation of natural resources (even though they may have a constitutional right to it) leaves a lot to be desired. This is because some have gone beyond the limits of what good stewardship should be, by commercializing the products they extract from the environment: sand and quarry to name these two. Again there are those who have self-allocated themselves spaces including for worship like white garment churches. This allocation is extra-legal as the necessary infrastructure to support their activities is non-existent. Again, this points to the capacity of the local authorities to provide such.

V. 2. Ability to set norms, values, standards and obligations as a group or community

The study demonstrated that in some sections of communities, groups are able to set their own standards of operation. Even, when the sector is informal and the expectation is that there is easy entry and exit, the norms and standards set will boost exclusion. This points to the fact that the length of time a family has been to a place has a strong bearing to place stewardship. Where residents feel the place is ‘theirs’ hence passable to next generations, a feeling of ‘ownership’ is enhanced. On the contrary, where they feel they are temporary dwellers, the feeling of responsibility is loose. In Epworth, for example, the fact that there are lodgers and tenants even on the ground that is deemed informally occupied has created a new class of people, the slumlords. Some of them claim that position by calling themselves the ‘originals’, that is to say, those who have been in the area for the longest time. Some even claim it is their land by ancestry. Others have got the mileage by being political adherents to the former ruling party, ZANU PF, with others in this groups saying they are veterans of the armed struggle (Second Chimurenga). When new comers arrive, it is them who must certify who gets what and where in terms of land for building houses. In this arrangement a gray area is created in which corruption and related activities prevail. This is unlike in Ruwa, where the standard to get access to land for building housing or renting is largely by cash. However cases of land speculation are also rampant. Some of the stands that have not built are believed to be owned by people who are in the Diaspora (cf. Chirisa, 2011). Such speculation is in violation of the leitmotif by government to clear the huge backlog in housing. That points to bad stewardship on the part of the speculators. Regarding illegal extractions of sand and quarry, actors also tend to exclude others so that certain portions of space belong only to a few. This brings about ‘privatization’ of the commons.
V.3. Respect of others’ rights and adherence to set obligations

One indicator of good stewardship is the respect of rights of others and also adhering to set obligations. Rights always attract responsibility and responsibility gives way to accountability. This is closely related to the ability to maintain laid down values and or physical assets hence fighting against vandalism and general abuse and neglect of property. The fact that the government has provided local boards to the running of the affairs of Ruwa and Epworth for a long time, and appointed to commissioners shows great respect to the rights of the dwellers of the two settlements just as others. However, the commissioners were largely accountable to the government itself than the people. When in 2008, it was decided that representation of people be achieved through the election of ward councilors, such was a great stride to the promotion of good governance in the two areas. However, for Epworth it is still a long road to the fullest development of the area given that the local authority has jurisdiction over the low-income groups whose obligation to taxation is hollow. As such, a vicious cycle of poverty persists in the area unlike Ruwa which is chiefly an area of the middle-income or even the high income groups. Level of well-being has a bearing stewardship. The low-income earners will appear as if they were bad stewards while the better-off would appear otherwise. This is due to capacity to meet tax obligations upon which the state (in this case local authorities) pin service delivery. Resources are critical for stewardship enhancement.

V.4. Ability to enforce laid down sanctions and reward set incentives

In membership organizations, the ability to enforce laid down sanctions and reward set incentives is very critical. Although the study did not focus much on these types of organizations, it is clear that most government departments are facing a number of challenges in enforcing what some of them statutorily have to stand for. A gray area exists for example in environmental stewardship where EMA shifted the blame of environmental degradation through sand poaching to the Ministry of Mines. A scapegoat approach sometimes provides an opportunity by the culprits to continue assaulting the environment. Illegal sand extractions from river banks and beds are common in both Ruwa and Epworth. Most of the statutes (the Regional, Town and Country Planning Act, the Environmental Management Act, the Urban Councils Act, the Land Acquisition Act, to name these few) have clearly defined parameters and focal areas which must be addressed by set institutions. However, some of the institutions (at the time of the study) were in a state of paralysis due to the economic climate that had not been favorable for more than a decade (1997 to 2009). Enforcement is a function of austere fiscal measures
that depend on the availability of the financial resources. A study by Munzwa, Chirisa and Madzivanzira (2007) which also covered Ruwa and Epworth showed that most of the two had drastically been affected by the poor economic performance in the country. In keeping with this reality, the local authorities could not do the service delivery as is stipulated in the Urban Councils Act (Chirisa, 2009).

V.5. Ability to learn and continue learning

This is closely linked to the presence of instinctive needs and demands. Pressure at individual level yield into some distinct demands, say space of free living, space for trading in items (vending), energy for cooking and related needs, and water for domestic use. In the study, it has been unravelled that needs and demands coupled by pressure is the major input into why people migrate especially to the peri-urban areas. Needs and demands sometimes teach people to be responsible over the scarce resources that are available including management of on-plot and off-plot for peri-urban farming. Households in the study areas, as elsewhere in the country, have learnt to devise ways to live in the peri-urban areas, especially under the economic hardships in which service delivery within local government areas diminished (Chirisa, 2011). This includes sourcing of water and energy. They have also learnt to do street vending as an ‘employment creation’ strategy. However, this is mainly subsistence level of survival. Under this criterion, a vernacular style of survival in the environment is achieved. Households do not necessarily have a defined path that they follow so that they organize themselves to be with clear structures.

V.6. Presence of educational avenues that tell things to be taken care

The avenues for environmental stewardship include use of the local media including the newspaper, the radio and television, and websites. This again depends on the level of income by the households in terms of whether or not they can afford buying a newspaper or connecting to a generator when they do not have access to electricity. In Epworth in this aspect there are many limitations.

V.7. Availability of leadership and champions to lead in the demonstration stewardship values and vision

In the study, Ruwa indicates that its leadership employs much of the stewardship model of governance in which partnerships are created and investors even lured. In Epworth, efforts may be there but are not outstanding. The fact that the author once found the Secretary of Epworth at the offices of the Ministry of
Local Government and Rural and Urban Development (MLGRUD)’s offices lobbying for permission to open new space for burial of the dead (cemeteries) explains some of the hidden endeavors by the leadership to ascertain development. These are some of the untold stories by the stewards of places.

VI. CONCLUSION

Peri-urbanisation is an unavoidable reality in Africa. This paper has illustrated so by the case of Ruwa and Epworth, peri-urban Harare. Making reference to Amatya Sen and Yi-Fu Tuan has enhanced the ‘theorisation’ in this paper as stewardship of place has been unravelled possibly measurable. Measuring stewardship of place is a high possibility given the existence of qualitative indicators but according to scaling by Sen, also possible by quantitative means. However, it is not a clear-cut process as with the quantitative aspects. This paper has proffered an illustrative but not exhaustive analysis of the criteria used to show the measurement of stewardship in Ruwa and Epworth being peri-urban settlements of the capital city of Harare. It is clear from the criteria that individual, institutional and community capacities matter in the measurement of place stewardship. The analysis gives a clear indication that both internal and external factors matter in the definition and measurement of the subject of discussion. Indeed stewardship is about breaking the walls towards building a collaborative spirit to the attainment of a common vision. Yet, a number of barriers are noted in creating such a platform. As such, the promotion of place stewardship remains a mammoth task especially if the processes of creating a one-stop shop in the management of housing and environment in the peri-urban settlements.
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