

# **BIDPA Working Paper 70**

**March 2019**

## **Youth Employment in Botswana: Comparative Analysis of 2009/10 and 2015/16**

**Tshepiso Gaetsewe**



**Botswana Institute for Development Policy Analysis**

## **BIDPA**

The Botswana Institute for Development Policy Analysis (BIDPA) is an independent trust, which started operations in 1995 as a non-governmental policy research institution. BIDPA's mission is to inform policy and build capacity through research and consultancy services.

BIDPA is part-funded by the Government of Botswana.

## **BIDPA WORKING PAPER SERIES**

The series comprises of papers which reflect work in progress or limited research efforts, which may be of interest to researchers and policy makers, or of a public education character. Working papers may already have been published elsewhere or may appear in other publications.

**Tshepiso Gaetsewe** is an Associate Researcher at the Botswana Institute for Development Policy Analysis

**ISBN: 99912-65-77-5**

© Botswana Institute for Development Policy Analysis, 2019

## **DISCLAIMER**

The views expressed in this document are entirely those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official position of BIDPA.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables .....	iv
Abstract .....	v
1. Introduction .....	1
2. Review of Literature .....	5
2.1. Empirical Literature .....	5
2.1.1. Individuals Characteristics .....	5
2.1.2. Household Characteristics .....	6
2.1.3. Regional Dimensions .....	6
3. Methodology .....	7
3.1. Empirical Model Specification .....	7
3.1. Data Sources and Variables used in the Model .....	7
3.2. Descriptive Statistics .....	9
4. Empirical Results .....	10
5. Conclusions and Policy Recommendations .....	13
References .....	15

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Description of variables in the model .....	7
Table 2: Descriptive statistics of variables .....	9
Table 3: Probit estimates for Youth employment for BCWIS 2009/10 and BMTHS 2015/16 .....	12

## ABSTRACT

The study examines determinants of youth unemployment in Botswana by comparing two different datasets- (2009/10 Botswana Core Welfare Indicator Survey (BCWIS) and 2015/16 Botswana Multi-Topic Household Survey (BMTHS)). The main objective of the study is to identify the factors that determine the employment probabilities of the youth. Using a probit model we find that gender, age, marital status and education level have an impact on the employment probabilities in both 2009/10 and 2015/16 time periods. Males had a higher chance of employability compared to females. The government and private sector need to develop programmes that will increase women participation in the labour market. Results also indicate that youth with post-secondary education have a better chance of employment. Individuals dwelling in rural and urban areas are less likely to get employment. Government needs to boost business activity in rural areas by identifying and investing in economic activities located there.

**Keywords:** Youth, unemployment, employability, Botswana, job creation, probit.





# 1. INTRODUCTION

Unemployment is a global problem with many countries, especially in the developing world, unable to provide enough employment opportunities for the job seekers. This is particularly true in countries where there is growing youth population entering the labour market. According to the World Bank (2014) more than half the population in Africa is under the age of 25 years, compared to the rest of the world whose population seems to be aging (majority of older people). This means that Africa's population consists mostly of the youth who enter the labour market in large numbers.

Economic growth is considered a pre-requisite for job creation, and therefore it is expected that Africa would be able to create jobs for its people, especially since it has been found to be the second fastest growing continent in the world after Asia. However, this has not been the case as unemployment remains a huge problem, especially amongst the youth. Between the years 2000-2012 GDP was estimated to have increased by 4.8 percent. In addition, there were huge improvements in terms of political stability, business landscape and macroeconomic developments (Fine et al., 2012). Estimates also suggest that Africa's labour force increased by 91 million workers in the past decade, yet only 37 million out of these got paid employment (Fine et al., 2012). This shows that the labour force is increasing rapidly and job creation has not kept pace with it leading to high unemployment rates. With limited employment opportunities being created, this has led to high unemployment, particularly among the youth.

Botswana is an upper middle income country which has maintained a stable economic growth over the years. Despite the remarkable economic growth, Botswana still faces challenges of rising unemployment rates, especially amongst the youth (Mogomotsi and Madigele, 2017). National unemployment in Botswana stood at 17.6 percent, while youth unemployment was estimated at 25.1 percent in 2016 (Statistics Botswana, 2018). According to Hope (1996) unemployment in the country has consistently been highest amongst the age group of 15-39 years. Furthermore, unemployment rates of graduates have been on the rise and were estimated at 16.6 percent in 2016 (Statistics Botswana, 2018).

High youth unemployment in Botswana is mainly due to a labour force that does not have correct skills for the job market, a lack of proper work experience and jobless growth (whereby GDP continues to grow without resultant growth in jobs). Jobless growth arises because economic growth has been spearheaded by the mineral sector, which is capital intensive and hence does not create enough jobs (Nthomang and Diraditsile, 2016).

The Government of Botswana has made efforts to address the unemployment problem and to balance the economic growth with the creation of sufficient jobs in the country. Policies and programmes have been adopted to try and curb the persistent problem of youth unemployment. In 1996 the National Youth Policy was formulated and revised in 2010. Some of the objectives of the Revised National Youth Policy are to create youth employment

in order to achieve economic sustainable livelihoods (Government of Botswana, 2010). Some of the most recent programmes introduced were; i) the Youth Development Fund of 2009, which is aimed at empowering youth through promoting participation in the socio-economic development of the nation. ii) the National Internship Program also implemented in 2009, which assists in placing graduates in organisations (both public and private) in order for them to gain the required labour market skills, iii) Youth Empowerment Scheme of 2012 an initiative that promotes change of behaviour, poverty eradication, youth empowerment and skills development. Other programmes are the Botswana National Service Program implemented in 2014 and the Graduate Volunteer Program implemented in 2015, which aim to transfer and develop skills of youth by placing them in the necessary organisations. However, these initiatives have had very little impact on job creation (Government of Botswana, 2009). According to Nthomang and Diraditsile (2016), one of the reasons why the programmes implemented by government (mentioned above) are not very successful is the lack of empirical research on issues surrounding unemployment and the youth.

Several studies (Vasilescu and Cristescu, 2017; Batu, 2016; Dagume and Gyekye, 2016; Kipasha and Msigwa, 2013; Mlatsheni and Rospabe, 2002; Isengard, 2002) have been undertaken on the determinants of youth employment, which is the focus of this paper. A few empirical studies (Hope, 1996; Siphambe, 2003; Pheko and Molefhe, 2017; Diraditsile and Ontetse, 2017) have been undertaken on un/employment in Botswana.

The shortcomings of the studies mentioned above are that, some (Siphambe, 2003) are old and hence relied on dated data that might have changed since then, while others (Pheko and Molefhe, 2017 and Diraditsile and Ontetse, 2017) although relatively new, used qualitative data and conducted desktop review of already existing literature. In addition, the past studies did not specifically analyse the determinants of youth unemployment, but rather looked at the problem of unemployment as a whole. This paper therefore, tries to fill this gap by conducting an econometric analysis of the determinants of youth unemployment using the 2009/10 Botswana Core Welfare Indicator Survey (BCWIS) and 2015/2016 Botswana Multi-Topic Household Survey (BMTHS). To our knowledge no study in Botswana has employed empirical modelling of youth unemployment by comparing two datasets. The justification for identifying the determinants of youth unemployment using the two datasets is that with passage of time, these might have changed due to several reasons such as government programmes introduced to reduce unemployment.

The main objective of the study is therefore, to identify factors that contribute to youth employment in Botswana. In analysing youth unemployment, it is important that we define the concept of youth and the theory of unemployment. Literature has identified different definitions of youth<sup>1</sup> and unemployment<sup>2</sup>. This paper defines youth as individuals

1 United Nations (UN) defines the youth as individuals aged between 15-24 year.

2 The International Labour Organization (ILO) definition of unemployment is the most widely used definition of unemployment. ILO defines an unemployed individual as a person who has not worked for more than one hour during a short reference period, but who is available and actively seeking a job.

that are between the ages of 18 and 35 years which corresponds to Botswana's Revised National Youth Policy of 2010 (Government of Botswana, 2010). Unemployment is a difficult and multidimensional concept to define as different countries usually have their own definitions depending on their cultural, social, economic and educational situations (Kipsha and Msigwa, 2013). This paper uses the definition adopted by Statistics Botswana who define the unemployed as individuals that were not employed in the past 7 days of the survey period, but are available and actively looking for a job. This is the definition used to collect data for both the 2009/10 BCWIS and 2015/16 BMTHS.

## 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

### 2.1. EMPIRICAL LITERATURE

The review of the literature classifies the determinants of youth unemployment into three categories; individual's characteristics, household characteristics and regional dimensions.

#### 2.1.1. *Individuals Characteristics*

Individual characteristics such as gender, age, citizenship, marital status and education level have been found to have an impact on youth unemployment. Gender was found to have a significant impact on youth employment in Tanzania (Kipsha and Msigwa, 2013), Botswana (Siphambe, 2003), Germany (Isengard, 2002) and South Africa (Mlatsheni and Rospabe, 2002). All the above studies found that being male increases the chances of being employed compared to being female. Diraditsile (2017) concurs with this finding and argues that unemployment is brought about by male dominance and female subordination culture which are rooted in the Botswana labour market. Isengard (2002) found that women have lower labour market chances compared to their male counterparts. Okojie (2003) studied gender dimensions for employment creation amongst the youth and found that in every African country the labour force participation rates were lower for women compared to men. He concluded that women tend to focus more on economic activities that are household or family based. Most of these activities are not reflected in official statistics.

Age has been found to have a negative influence on youth unemployment in Eastern Europe (Vasilescu and Cristescu, 2017), Botswana (Siphambe, 2003) and South Africa (Mlatsheni and Rospabe, 2002). This is because knowledge increases with age, and an individual who is just entering the labour market is more likely to be unemployed as opposed to someone who is above 30 years who has knowledge and experience in the labour market.

Citizenship also affect youth unemployment, with youth who are citizens of a specific country being less likely to be unemployed compared to non-citizens. In Germany (Isengard, 2002) found that citizenship decreases chances of being unemployed and this may be due to language difficulties as well as discrimination towards foreigners.

The relationship between unemployment and marital status has produced mixed results. Several studies (Kipasha and Msigwa, 2013) in Malawi, and (Isengard, 2002) in Germany found a positive link between marital status and unemployment. Married youth are more affected by unemployment compared to young singles. This may be due to the fact that single individuals are more flexible and mobile in looking for a job. However, Siphambe (2003) found opposite results and concluded that in Botswana being married significantly decreases the chances of being unemployed. The reasoning behind this finding is that employers are more likely to hire a married individual as they view them as more stable compared to a single youth.

Education level was found have a strong positive link with employment in Eastern Europe (Vasilescu and Cristescu, 2017), Ethiopia (Batu, 2016), Botswana (Siphambe, 2003), Germany (Isengard, 2002) and South Africa (Mlatsheni and Rospabe, 2002). As expected these studies found that the more educated an individual youth is, the greater the probability of he/she getting employment. Mlatsheni and Rospabe (2002), found that young people with degrees have a higher chance of finding paid employment, but no significant impact on those seeking self-employment.

### 2.1.2. *Household Characteristics*

Household characteristics have also been found to have an impact on youth unemployment. In Ethiopia (Batu, 2016) and South Africa (Mlatsheni and Rospabe 2002) household size and structure have been found to have an impact on youth employment. It was found that a household head that has more individuals to take care of (especially children) is less flexible and therefore less likely to find paid employment.

There are many other household characteristics that have been found to affect youth employment, but have not been included in this study due to data unavailability. One of these variables is the presence of an individual in paid employment. According to Mlatsheni and Rospabe (2002), having a paid employed individual in the household can be used as a proxy for social networking. An employed person becomes an informant for someone that is not employed and can alert them on job opportunities or any labour market changes that may arise. Having this individual as the household head also increases employment probabilities of the unemployed members of the household. Other household characteristics that have influence on youth employment include; parents' occupation and education status; distance from the nearest telephone, which proxy's isolation of community, house tenure and house ownership.

### 2.1.3. *Regional Dimensions*

Location is a very vital factor in employability options of a young individual. Studies in Ethiopia (Dagume and Gyekye, 2016), Tanzania (Kipasha and Msigwa, 2013), Botswana (Siphambe, 2003), Germany (Isengard, 2002) and South Africa (Mlatsheni and Rospabe,

2002) found that location impacts youth employment. The effect of location on youth employment has produced mixed results, with some studies (Siphambe, 2003; Kipesha and Msigwa, 2013) concluding that youth residing in urban areas are more likely to be unemployed compared to those who dwell in a rural area. However, in Ethiopia (Batu, 2016) found that youth residing in urban areas and cities are less likely to be unemployed as there are more job opportunities in these locations.

### 3. METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1. EMPIRICAL MODEL SPECIFICATION

To identify the determinants of youth employment in Botswana a probit model was used to analyse two data sets, the 2009/10 BCWIS and 2015/16 BMTHS. Many studies have used this approach to model youth employment (Siphambe, 2003; Mlatsheni and Rospabe, 2002, Muthen, 1979). The estimating equation is specified as follows:

$$P(Emp = 1) = \Phi(\beta_1 + \beta_2 Gender + \beta_3 Age + \beta_4 Citizenship + \beta_5 Education + \beta_6 Marital + \beta_7 HHSize + \beta_8 Region)$$

The dependent variable, employment is a dummy variable taking the value of 1 if youth (18-35 years) is employed (wage employed and self-employed) and 0 otherwise. The probit model results will be interpreted using the marginal effects. Marginal effects show how a change in response associated with a change in a covariate, and provides an insight on how the explanatory variables shift the probability of the dependent variable (Anderson and Newell, 2003). As indicated in the estimating equation, there are seven explanatory variables used in the model namely; gender, age, education level, marital status, region (all at individual level) and household size. Empirical literature on youth employment guided the selection of independent variables used in this study as well as availability of data.

#### 3.1. DATA SOURCES AND VARIABLES USED IN THE MODEL

Data sources for this study are the 2015/16 BMTHS and the 2009/2010 BCWIS. Both datasets are derived from household level nationwide surveys conducted to provide a complete and thorough data as a basis for establishing poverty profiles for Botswana. The BMTHS was conducted from November 2015 to November 2016, and it is a multi-modular survey that follows the BCWIS data set. The main objective of BMTHS was to provide a broader set of indicators for poverty and the labour market. The surveys have modules on household consumption and expenditure, education, employment, access to health amenities, community activities and other information on school and health facilities, as well as household characteristics. Both surveys gathered household's information from cities/towns, urban villages and rural villages.

This study is based on information for individuals between the ages of 18-35 years (youth) who were employed (paid employed and self-employed) and unemployed. The sample has been reduced to 2,275 individuals in BCWIS from 2,7301 and in BMTHS from 24,720 to 4,921 mainly due selecting only youth, those in the labour force and data cleaning and missing observations.

Table 1 provides description of the variables used in the study. The variables are both categorical and continuous. The independent variables are classified into 2 categories namely; household and regional characteristics.

**Table 1: Description of variables in the model**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Description of Variables</b>
<b>Dependent variable</b>	
Employment Status	Employment Status of Individual (1= employed, 0=unemployed)
<b>Independent variables</b>	
Age	Age of individual (in years)
Gender	Gender of individual (1=male, 0=female)
Citizenship	Citizenship of individual (1= citizen, 0=non-citizen)
Household Size	Number of people in the household
<b>Education Status</b>	
Primary level	1= Individuals highest education is primary level, 0=otherwise
Secondary level	1= Individuals highest education is secondary level, 0=otherwise
Post-secondary level	1= Individuals highest education is above secondary level, 0=otherwise
<b>Marital status</b>	
Married	1= Individual is married, 0=otherwise
Cohabiting	1= Individual is cohabiting, 0=otherwise
Separated	1= Individual is separated, 0=otherwise
Divorced	1= Individual is divorced, 0=otherwise
Widowed	1= Individual is widowed, 0=otherwise
Never married	1= Individual is never married 0=otherwise
<b>Regional Characteristics</b>	
City/Town	1=Individual dwells in a city/town, 0=otherwise
Urban village	1=Individual dwells in an urban village, 0=otherwise
Rural village	1=Individual dwells in a rural village, 0=otherwise

### 3.2. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Descriptive statistics for the variables used in the model from the two data sets are presented in Table 2. In the 2009/10 sample, around 76 percent of the youth were employed and 24 percent were unemployed, while in 2015/16 sample there was a slight decline in those that were employed to 74 percent. The mean age of individuals for 2009/10 was 27 years, while in 2015/16 it was 28 years. In both data sets we observe that more males were sampled than females, in 2009/10 around 54 percent were males while 46 percent were females, in 2015/16 around 51 percent were males and 49 percent were females. In 2009/10 around 93 percent of the sample consisted of citizens, while in 2015/16 there was a slight increase to 96 percent.

Majority of individuals sampled for both datasets had their highest education level being secondary level with 68 percent (67 percent) in 2009/10 (2015/16), and there was an increase in those who had their highest level of education being above secondary school (post-secondary) from 19 percent in 2009/10 to 26 percent in 2015/16. A large percentage of our sample were never married, accounting for 65 percent (59 percent) in 2009/10 (2015/16).

Household size is the only household characteristic used in the model and we observe an increase in the average household size between the two periods. The average household size for our sample was 2 (5) members in 2009/10 (2015/16). Region was classified into three categories namely; cities/towns, urban villages, and rural villages. Majority of the sample consisted of those who dwelled in urban villages. Our sample shows that in 2009/10, 31 percent, 36 percent and 33 percent were from cities/towns, urban villages and rural villages, respectively. While in 2015/16, 29 percent, 41 percent and 30 percent were from cities/towns, urban villages and rural villages, respectively.

**Table 2: Descriptive statistics of variables**

Variable	BCWIS 2009/10			BMTHS 2015/16		
	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Employment Status	0.761	0	1	0.746	0	1
Gender	0.537	0	1	0.514	0	1
Citizenship	0.933	0	1	0.963	0	1
Age	27	18	35	28	18	35
Household Size	2.3	1	18	4.7	1	23
<i>Education level</i>						
Primary level	0.132	0	1	0.078	0	1
Secondary level	0.678	0	1	0.666	0	1
Post-secondary level	0.190	0	1	0.256	0	1
<i>Marital Status of HH</i>						
Married	0.100	0	1	0.073	0	1
Cohabiting	0.240	0	1	0.328	0	1
Separated	0.005	0	1	0.008	0	1
Divorced/widowed	0.004	0	1	0.003	0	1
Never Married	0.651	0	1	0.588	0	1
<i>Region</i>						
Cities/towns	0.313	0	1	0.288	0	1
Urban village	0.355	0	1	0.415	0	1
Rural village	0.332	0	1	0.297	0	1

#### 4. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

The results for the probit models are presented in Table 3 and show the coefficients, corresponding p-values and marginal effects for both 2009/10 and 2015/16 datasets. The log-likelihood ratio test shows that both models have significant relationships between the probability of being employed and the independent variables as  $p < 0.001$ . A multicollinearity test called the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) was conducted for both models, and low VIFs were produced (VIFs  $< 10$ ). We can therefore conclude that multicollinearity is not a serious problem for both models (Stock and Watson, 2003).

The relationship between gender and employment is significant and positive in both 2009/10 and 2015/16. This shows that being male increases the probability of being employed by 3.9 (3.6) percentage points in 2009/10 (2015/16) compared to someone who is female. According to Siphambe (2003) in Botswana there are more employment opportunities for males compared to females and this is due to the past division of

labour where males were the ones who went out and worked, while females took care of household chores. These results are consistent with those of Kipesha and Msigwa (2013); Isengard (2002) and Mlatsheni and Rospabe (2002). Mlatsheni and Rospabe (2002) who found that there is a pre-market gender discrimination in the educational system where boys are treated differently from girls when entering the labour market. It has also been found that there is hiring discrimination by employers which hinders females from entering the labour market.

Citizenship did not have any significant influence in determining employment amongst youth in 2009/10, but in 2015/16 it was significant and negatively related with employment. Being a young citizen decreased the probability of finding employment by around 8 percentage points in 2015/16.

The results show that age increased the chances of being employed in both 2009/10 and 2015/16. An increase in age by one year increases the probability of employment by 0.4 (1.6) percentage points in 2009/10 (2015/16). Job experience and accumulation of skill tend to increase with age and these are positively related to employment. These results are consistent with literature which found that an older individual is more likely to be employed than someone who is younger (Vasilescu and Cristescu, 2017; Siphambe, 2003; and Mlatsheni and Rospabe, 2002).

Level of education has a positive influence on chances of youth employment. Post-secondary level education was used as the base category for the education variables. Having primary school education as the highest educational attainment was found to decrease the probability of employment by 3.6 (6.3) percentage points in 2009/10 (2015/16) compared to someone who has post-secondary education. Secondary level education was not significant in determining employment in 2015/16, but in 2009/10 having secondary education as highest level of education decreased probability of employment by 2.2 percentage points as compared to someone that has post-secondary education as their highest educational attainment. Due to Government financing tertiary education you find that very few youths end their education at secondary level and that maybe the reason why secondary education had no impact on determining employment in 2016. These are expected results from literature as it was found that having a higher level of education means that you qualify for more wage paying jobs (Vasilescu and Cristescu, 2017; Batu, 2016; Siphambe, 2003; Isengard, 2002 and Mlatsheni and Rospabe, 2002). However, in Botswana graduate unemployment is on the rise with many graduates still unable to secure wage paying jobs. This is attributed to the skills mismatch between what is taught in the educational system and the skills the employers require (Pheko and Molefhe, 2017).

For marital status, the base category was never married. Results show that being married or cohabiting has a positive impact on employment in both 2009/10 and 2015/16. Someone who is cohabiting has a greater probability of getting employment by 2.9 (5.3)

percentage points in 2009/10 (2015/16) respectively, compared to an individual that has never been married. Being married increases the probability of getting employment by 4.1 (6.3) percentage points in 2009/10 (2015/16) respectively, compared to an individual that has never been married. These results concur with those of Siphambe (2003) who found that married individuals have a higher probability of getting employment compared to those that are not married. According to Siphambe employers are more likely to hire a married individual as they view them as more stable compared to a single youth. This leaves those that are not married quite vulnerable in not securing employment. A working individual in a marriage or cohabiting relationship is also most likely to be an informant to their spouse on job opportunities in the market unlike someone who is not married. Having more platforms where announcements of job opportunities are made available would help inform those that are not married about job opportunities in the market.

The coefficient for household size is significant and negative in both 2009/10 and 2015/16. The results indicate that an increase in the household size by 1 person decreases the probability of finding employment by 1.4 (2.4) percentage points in 2009/10 (2015/16), respectively. These results are consistent with past studies (Batu, 2016 and Mlatsheni & Rospabe, 2002), that found that if there are more individuals to take care of (especially children) the individual becomes less flexible and therefore less likely to find paid employment.

Residing in cities and towns was used as the base category for region. The results show that residing in an urban village has a significant influence on employment. However, the sign is negative implying that youth who stay in urban areas have a decreased probability of getting employment by 6.3 (4.2) percentage points in 2009/10 (2015/16), respectively as compared to an individual who stays in the city/town. Youth residing in rural areas were found to have a negative impact on getting employment in 2009/10 as compared to those dwelling in cities/towns, but in 2015/16 dwelling in a rural village showed an insignificant result. Therefore, an individual dwelling in a rural village has a decreased probability of 4.2 percentage points to be employed compared to someone who dwells in a city/town. This result are inconsistent with that of Siphambe (2003) and; Kipesha and Msigwa (2013) who found that youth residing in urban areas are more likely to be unemployed, than those who reside in rural areas. Mlatsheni and Rospabe (2002) also found that these results reflect that labour supply is concentrated in urban areas which is caused by the youth migrating from rural areas to urban cities in search of better job opportunities.

**Table 3: Probit estimates for Youth employment for BCWIS 2009/10 and BMTHS 2015/16**

Variable	BCWIS 2009/10			BMTHS 2015/16		
	Coefficients	P-value	Marginal Effects	Coefficients	P-value	Marginal Effects
Gender	0.3395	0.000***	0.0389	0.1179	0.005***	0.0361
Citizenship	-0.2856	0.142	-0.0273	-0.2887	0.033**	-0.0795
Age	0.0302	0.003***	0.0035	0.0522	0.000***	0.0159
Household Size	-0.1207	0.000***	-0.0138	-0.0782	0.000***	-0.0239
<i>Education level (Post-secondary level omitted)</i>						
Primary level	-0.2676	0.069*	-0.0361	-0.1936	0.022**	-0.0627
Secondary level	-0.1947	0.053*	-0.0218	-0.0483	0.333	-0.0147
<i>Marital Status (Never-Married omitted)</i>						
Married	0.4817	0.009***	0.0414	0.2206	0.022**	0.0628
Cohabiting	0.2748	0.005***	0.0291	0.1761	0.000***	0.0527
Separated	-0.3044	0.446	-0.0439	0.0677	0.763	0.0202
Divorced/Widowed	-0.4291	0.267	-0.0676	0.1129	0.776	0.0332
<i>Region (Cities/towns omitted)</i>						
Urban Villages	-0.4732	0.000***	-0.0633	-0.1373	0.007***	-0.0424
Rural villages	-0.3298	0.002***	-0.0422	0.0146	0.796	0.0045
Constant	1.9641	0.000		0.1366	0.487	
Pseudo R-Square	0.1072			0.0952		
Log Likelihood	-544.13977			-2524.1363		
LR Chi-Square	130.67	0.0000***		531.36	0.0000***	
No. of Observations	2275			4921		

## 5. CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The study examines the determinants of youth employment in Botswana using two different datasets (2009/10 and 2015/16) in order to see whether the factors that increase employment probabilities of youth have changed over the years. The results show that gender dynamics have not changed over the years as males still have a higher chance of being employed as compared to females. The government together with the private sector need to develop programmes that will encourage the increase of women in the labour market and empower them with the necessary skills to increase their chances of finding paid employment.

In the years 2009/10 being a citizen did not have an impact on employment probabilities, but in 2015/16 being a citizen was found to decrease employment probabilities. This shows that Government's efforts to increase citizen employment through policies such as the Revised National Policy on Incomes, Employment, Prices and Profits of 2005, which highlights issues of localisation are not effective. Perhaps, stricter measures should be put in place by government to push employers to hire more locals so that they get both job and development opportunities, especially young graduates.

This shows the Government's efforts in adopting policies such as the Revised National Policy on Incomes, Employment, Prices and Profits of 2005 which highlights issues of localisation in order to increase the ratio of Batswana in paid employment opportunities. This is also attributed to the fact that programmes and policies that are in place to curb youth unemployment focus only on citizens. Perhaps, interventions that are meant to curb youth unemployment should also engage non-citizens as they may be able to transfer skills to locals and make them more marketable.

An increase in age increases the probability of getting employment. This is a result that has not changed between the two periods and shows the importance of job experience in securing a job. Therefore, better and more sustainable work placement opportunities need to be made available, especially to graduates, hence Government should intensify its internship programmes.

Results show that an individual who has primary school education as their highest educational attainment has decreased the probability of employment compared to someone that had post-secondary education for both time periods. While secondary level was not significant in determining employment in 2015/16, but in 2009/10 having secondary education as highest attainment decreased probability of employment as compared to someone that had post-secondary education as highest educational attainment. This shows that as the years have evolved a post-secondary qualification is vital in securing employment. Therefore, government should continue with its aim of educating its youth, but it should also find other means of making sure that more graduates are absorbed by the workforce as unemployment still remains high. A lot of dependence has been on the public sector to create employment and not enough has been done by the private sector, so more collaborations need to be done with the private sector so that this partnership is able to create jobs and absorb graduates.

Youth in rural and urban areas have a smaller probability of finding employment compared to someone that dwells in cities or towns. Job opportunities are mostly situated in cities/towns. The state and private sector need to boost business activity in rural areas by identifying and investing in economic activities in rural areas to encourage the growth of businesses, thereby creating job opportunities.

## 6. REFERENCES

- Anderson, S. and Newell, R.G. (2003). Simplified Marginal Effects in Discrete Choice Models. *Economics Letters*, 81(3).
- Batu, M. (2016). Determinants of Youth Unemployment in Urban Areas of Ethiopia Muhdin. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 6(5).
- Dagume, M. A. and Gyekye, A. (2016). Determinants of Youth Unemployment in South Africa: Evidence from the Vhembe district of Limpopo Province. *Environmental Economics*, 7(4), 59-67.
- Diraditsile, K. and Ontetse, M.A. (2017). Lived Experiences and Consequences of Unemployment on Women: An Empirical Study of Unemployed Young Women in Mahalapye, Botswana. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 18(4), 131-143.
- Fine, D., Wamelen, A.V., Lund, S., Cabral, A., Taoufiki, M., Dorr, N., Leke, A., Roxburgh, C., Schubert, J. and Cook, P. (2012). *Africa at work: Job Creation and Inclusive Growth*. Mckinsey Global Institute, Washington D.C.
- Government of Botswana (2009). *SNational Development Plan: NDP 2009-2016*. Ministry of Finance and Economic Development. Gaborone, Botswana.
- Government of Botswana (2010). *Revised National Youth Policy 2010*. Ministry of Youth, Sports and Culture. Gaborone, Botswana.
- Hope, R. (1996). Growth, Unemployment and Poverty in Botswana. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 14(1), 53-67.
- Isengard, B. (2002). *Youth Unemployment: Individual Risk Factors and Institutional Determinants: A case study of Germany and the United Kingdom*. DIW Discussion Papers, No.284.
- Kawaguchi, D. and Murao, T. (2014). *Labor Market Institutions and Long Term Effects of Youth Unemployment*. Discussion Paper No. 8156.
- Kipasha, E. and Msigwa, R.E. (2013). Determinants of Youth Unemployment in Developing Countries: Evidences from Tanzania. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 4(14).
- Lekorwe, M. Moseki, K. and Mokaloba, M. (2018). Unemployment mars favourable assessment of Batswana Government performance. *Afrobarometer Dispatch* No.184.

Mlatsheni, C. and Rospabe, S. (2002). Why is Youth Unemployment so high and unequally spread in South Africa? Working Paper 02/65. Cape town, South Africa

Mogomotsi, G.E.J. and Madigele, P.F. (2017). A Cursory Discussion of Policy Alternatives for addressing Youth Unemployment in Botswana. Cogent Social Sciences.

Muthen, B. (1979). A Structural Probit Model with Latent Variables. Journal of the American Statistical Association.

Nthomang, K. and Diraditsile, K. (2016). Improving Youth Employment in Botswana: The need for Evidence-Based Policy and Programme Development. *Mosenodi Journal*, 19(1),45-55.

O'Higgins, N. (2001). Youth Unemployment and Employment Policy: A Global Perspective. International Labour Organisation. Geneva.

Okojie, E.E. (2003). Employment Creation for Youth in Africa: The Gender Dimension. Presentation on National Strategies for Employment Promotion. Geneva, Switzerland.

Pheko, M.M. and Molefhe, K. (2017). Addressing employability challenges: a framework for improving the employability of graduates in Botswana. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 22(4), 455-469.

Siphambe, H.K. (2003). Understanding Unemployment in Botswana. The South African Journal of Economics, 71(3).

Statistics Botswana (2018). Botswana Multi-Topic Household Survey Report 2015-2016. Gaborone, Botswana.

Stock, J. and Watson, M. (2003). Introduction to Econometrics. Third Edition Updated. Pearson.

United Nations Population Fund (2018). Opportunities and Policy Actions to Maximise the Demographic Dividends in Botswana. Demographic Dividends Study Report.

Vasilescu, M.D. and Cristescu, A. (2017). The Determinants of Youth Integration in the Romanian Labour Market. *Journal of Eastern Europe Research in Business and Economics*, Romania.

World Bank (2014). Youth Employment in Sub-Saharan Africa. Washington D.C.

World Bank (2015). Botswana Poverty Assessment. Report No.88473-BW. Washington D.C.

## OTHER BIDPA WORKING PAPERS

- **Working Paper No. 69:** Marumo Omotoye (2019). *Gender and Corruption in Botswana: Perceptions, Participation and Considerations for Anti-Corruption Policy.*
- **Working Paper No. 68:** Masedi K. Tshukudu (2019). *Impacts of access to ICTs on Employment Status in Botswana.*
- **Working Paper No. 67:** Kedibonye Sekakela (2019). *The Impact of Business Regulatory Quality on Private Sector Investment in Botswana*
- **Working Paper No. 66:** Mpho Raboloko (2019). *The Impact of Infrastructure on Economic Growth in Botswana.*
- **Working Paper No. 65:** Lillian Mookodi (2019). *Consumption Inequality in Botswana: The Decomposition of the Gini Coefficient of Consumer Expenditures.*
- **Working Paper No. 64:** Johane Moilwa Motsatsi (2019). *Unemployment in the SADC Region.*
- **Working Paper No. 63:** Kelesego Mmolainyane (2019). *Structural Transformation and Fiscal Policy in Botswana.*
- **Working Paper No. 62:** Koketso Molefhi (2019). *The Impact of Macroeconomic Variables on Capital Market Development in Botswana's Economy.*
- **Working Paper No. 61:** Goitseone Khanie (2019). *Education and Labour Market Activity of Women in Botswana.*
- **Working Paper No. 60:** Koketso Molefhi (2019). *Financial Inclusion and its Impact on Employment Creation in Botswana.*
- **Working Paper No. 59:** Thabile A. Samboma (2019). *Challenges of Project Implementation in Local Government: The Case of Francistown City Council and Kweneng District Council.*
- **Working Paper No. 58:** Goitseone Khanie (2018). *Impact of Internationalization on Firm Performance in Botswana.*
- **Working Paper No. 57:** Kedibonye Sekakela (2018). *Financial Development and Economic Growth in Botswana.*

- **Working Paper No. 56:** Mpho Raboloko. (2018). *Determinants of Service Sector Growth in Botswana.*
- **Working Paper No. 55:** Tebogo B. Seleka and Thula S. Dlamini. (2018). *Competitiveness of ACP Sugar Exports in the Global Market.*
- **Working Paper No. 54:** Tebogo B. Seleka and David Mmopelwa. (2018). *Effects of Input Subsidies on Subsistence Crop Acreage Diversity in Botswana.*
- **Working Paper No. 53:** Johane Moilwa Motsatsi. (2018). *Determinants of Tourism Demand in the SADC Region.*
- **Working Paper No. 52:** Johane Moilwa Motsatsi. (2018). *Analysis of Tax Performance in Botswana: Tax Effort Index Approach*
- **Working Paper No. 51:** Tebogo B. Seleka and Ajuruchukwu Obi. (2018). *Revealed Comparative Advantage in the Global Citrus Market and Implications for South Africa.*
- **Working Paper No. 50:** Goitseone Khanie. (2018). *Financing SMEs In Botswana: Factors Influencing Access to Credit*
- **Working Paper No. 49:** Marumo Omotoye. (2018). *Public Policy Implementation Prospects and Challenges in Botswana: Case of the National Policy on Care for People with Disabilities*
- **Working Paper No. 48:** Masedi Tshukudu. (2018). *The Relationship Between Electronic-Money Penetration and Household Consumption: VECM Granger Causality Analysis*
- **Working Paper No. 47:** Tshepiso Gaetsewe. (2018). *Determinants of Informal Sector Business Success in Botswana*
- **Working Paper No. 46:** Tshepiso Gaetsewe. (2018). *Determinants of Self-Employment in Botswana*
- **Working Paper No. 45:** Molefe B. Phirinyane. (2016). *Technology and the Nature of Active Citizenship: The Case of Botswana*
- **Working Paper No. 44:** Madala, Naledi C. and Phirinyane, Molefe B. (2016). *Strengthening Local Government Service Delivery Systems Through the Open Government Initiative: The Case of Botswana*

- **Working Paper No. 43:** Lekobane, Khaufelo R. and Mooketsane, Keneilwe S. (2015). *Examining Evidence of Feminization of Poverty in Botswana*.
- **Working Paper No. 42:** Seleka, Tebogo B. and Kebakile Pinkie G. (2015). *Export Competitiveness of Botswana's Beef Industry*.
- **Working Paper No. 41:** Kaboyakgosi, Gape and Mookodi, Lillian. (2014). *Integrated Results Based Management in Botswana: Institutions, documentation and progress to date*.
- **Working Paper No. 40:** Sekakela, Kedibonye. (2014). *The Impact of Trading with China on Botswana's Economy*.
- **Working Paper No. 39:** Sengwaketse, Margaret. (2014). *Towards a Diversified Economy: A preliminary assessment of the potential, prospects and challenges for electricity exports from Botswana*.
- **Working Paper No. 38:** Lekobane, Khaufelo R. and Seleka, Tebogo B. (2014). *Determinants of Household Welfare and Poverty in Botswana, 2002/03 and 2009/10*.
- **Working Paper No. 37:** Seleka, Tebogo B. and Lekobane, Khaufelo R. (2014). *Public Transfers and Subsistence Producer Disincentives in Botswana*.
- **Working Paper No. 36:** Taye, Haile K. (2013). *Inflation Dynamics in Botswana and Bank of Botswana's Medium-Term Objective Range*.
- **Working Paper No. 35:** Grynberg, Roman and Sekakela, Kedibonye. (2013). *Water Pricing and Policy in Botswana*.
- **Working Paper No. 34:** Motswapong, Masedi and Grynberg, Roman. (2013). *Key Issues in the Textile and Clothing Sector in Botswana*.
- **Working Paper No. 33:** Taye, Haile K. (2013). *Is the Botswana Pula misaligned?*
- **Working Paper No. 32:** Grynberg, Roman and Motswapong, Masedi. (2012). *SACU Revenue Sharing Formula: Towards a Development Agreement*.
- **Working Paper No. 31:** Motswapong, Masedi and Grynberg, Roman. (2011). *Competition and Trade Policy: The case of the Botswana poultry industry*.

- **Working Paper No. 30:** Mmopelwa, David and Seleka, Tebogo. (2011). *Factors Underlying Communal Beef Cattle Marketing Decisions in Botswana: The role of public and private transfers.*