COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND PARTICIPATION IN TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN TANZANIA

**A CASE STUDY OF LOCAL COMMUNITIES IN BARABARANI VILLAGE,
MTO WA MBU, ARUSHA-TANZANIA**

by

Muganda Michael

A thesis

submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Tourism Management

Victoria University of Wellington

2009

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Although my name is on the cover of this thesis, I certainly could not have completed this large endeavour without the help of wonderful and talented people. First, I would like to thank my supervisors Prof Douglas Pearce, Dr Karen Smith and Dr Mondher Sahli for their timely and knowledgeable efforts, guidance, encouragement and inspiration. Second, I would like to thank the Tourism group at Victoria University of Wellington for supporting this endeavour. Third, I would like to extend my appreciation to Carole Dryburgh for proof reading my work.

I would like to recognize the advice from my colleagues Prof Songorwa A.N and Dr Mbeyale Gimbage. I would also like to thank Rose Kichereri and Agness Sirima for their help in this thesis. Finally, It might not out of place to mention here that the research grant from the Victoria Management School and NZAID scholarship helped to a considerable extent in carrying out my fieldwork.

On a personal level, I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge some key people in my life who provided unyielding and overwhelming love and support: my wife (Elizabeth Kazimoto), my daughter (Nyanjiga Muganda) and my best friend Alan and Morgan.

ABSTRACT

This thesis discusses the involvement and participation of local communities in tourism development in Tanzania using a case study of local communities in Barabarani village, Mto wa Mbu, Arusha. To explore this research topic, the thesis examines three key concepts: community participation in the tourism development decision-making process; community participation in the sharing of tourism benefits; and the contribution of tourism development to poverty alleviation. To achieve these systematically, the research is guided by five inter-related research questions: (1) what are the views of local people towards community involvement in tourism development; (2) what are appropriate roles of local people in tourism development; (3) to what extent do local people participate in the tourism development decision-making process; (4) to what extent have tourism businesses developed benefit-sharing schemes; and (5) what are the views of the local people on the contribution of tourism development towards poverty reduction.

To gain a rich understanding of the context of the research, the thesis employs a case study approach, which enables: investigation at the community level to bring together perspectives from the grass-root level, where little research on this topic has been done; involvement of multiple stakeholders that explores perspectives from a range of stakeholders (ordinary members of the community, decision-makers within the community, tourism professionals, tourism businesses and NGOs); and the use of multiple methods (household survey, interviews, field observations, document analysis, and informal discussions). Such an approach improves the validity of the findings and successfully addresses the central research questions. Both quantitative and qualitative

data generated from these techniques are analysed, integrated and compared, and are used to complement each other.

Based on the findings obtained from multiple methods, this research concludes that local people wish to play a role in the tourism development decision-making process. In general, local people want to see decisions about tourism development in their area made jointly by government officials and local leaders in consultation with the local community. They also want to be involved in the sharing of tourism benefits. Tourism businesses have developed benefit-sharing schemes that favour local people to access tourism benefits. These schemes include local employment, local capacity building, and sharing tourism profits with the wider community. Tourism development is contributing positively towards poverty alleviation, and has made improvement on accessibility, prices of goods and services, employment, entrepreneurial training, income-generating projects, household incomes and general quality of life though the extent of contribution vary from one aspect to another.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xii

CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND AND FOCUS OF THE THESIS.....	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Overview of Tourism in Least Developed Countries	1
1.3 Tourism in Tanzania	7
1.3.1 Introduction to Tanzania	7
1.3.2 Tourism Institutional Framework	8
1.3.3 Tourism trends in Tanzania	11
1.4 Problem statement and justification.....	17
1.5 Research objectives.....	18
1.6 Structure of this thesis.....	20
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	22
2.1 Introduction.....	22
2.2 Community participation and development initiatives	22
2.3 Typologies of Community participation.....	23
2.4 Factors influencing community participation	27
2.4.1 Tourism benefits-sharing schemes.....	30
2.5 The theoretical linkage between tourism and poverty alleviation	39
2.6 Tourism anti-poverty framework.....	45
2.7 Community involvement and participation in the tourism development process...	47
2.8 Barriers to community participation in tourism in developing countries	49
2.9 Conclusion	51
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	54

3.1 Introduction.....	54
3.2 The research strategy	54
3.2.1 Case study area profile.....	58
3.3 Types of study data collected.....	63
3.3.1 Secondary data.....	63
3.3.2 Primary data	64
3.4 In-depth semi-structured interviews	65
3.4.1 Profiles of interviewees.....	66
3.4.2 Interviewees affiliation	67
3.4.2.1 Village government.....	67
3.4.2.2 Lake Manyara National Park	69
3.4.2.3 Mto wa Mbu cultural tourism programme.....	70
3.4.2.4 Non-governmental organization (NGO)	71
3.4.2.5 Tourist Campsites	71
3.4.2.6 Formal and informal tourism groups	73
3.4.3 Structure of the interviews	74
3.4.4 Strengths and limitations of the in-depth semi-structured interviews	75
3.5 Household questionnaire survey	76
3.5.1 Questionnaire design, structure and administering.....	77
3.5.2 Pre-testing survey instruments and piloting the survey	78
3.5.3 Recruitment and selection of respondents	79
3.5.4 Profiles of survey respondents	82
3.5.5 Strengths and limitations of the household survey	85
3.6 Field observations	86
3.7 Document analysis.....	86
3.8 The multiple-method approach and the research questions.....	87
3.9 Data analysis and presentation.....	89
3.10 An analytical framework.....	92
3.11 Study limitations and strengths.....	93
3.12 Conclusion	95

CHAPTER FOUR: COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND PARTICIPATION IN TOURISM.....	97
4.1 Introduction.....	97
4.2 Local communities’ knowledge of the positive impacts of tourism.....	97
4.3 Involvement of local community in tourism development.....	102
4.4 Community participation in tourism development.....	108
4.4.1 Local people’s reasons for their ratings.....	112
4.5 Conclusion	123
CHAPTER FIVE: COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN TOURISM DEVELOPMENT	126
5.1 Introduction.....	126
5.2 Community participation in the tourism decision-making process	126
5.2.1 Community participation in the decision-making process regarding development of tourism establishments.....	128
5.2.2 Community participation in the decision-making process of the Community Conservation Service (CCS) project.....	133
5.2.3 Local people’s views about who is best placed to make decisions regarding tourism establishments and the CCS project	136
5.2.4 Local people’s reasons for their ratings.....	138
5.2.5 Community involvement in the current tourism decision-making process ...	145
5.2.5.1 Local people’s reasons for their ratings.....	152
5.3 Community participation in the sharing of tourism benefits	156
5.4 Conclusion	168
CHAPTER SIX: CONTRIBUTION OF TOURISM TO POVERTY ALLEVIATION	171
6.1 Introduction.....	171
6.2 Views of local people on the contribution of tourism development on poverty alleviation.....	171
6.2.1 Local people’s reasons for their ratings.....	176
6.3 Conclusion	189
CHAPTER SEVEN: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	192
7.1 Introduction.....	192

7.2 Discussion	193
7.3 Recommendations	199
7.4 Avenues for future research	201
7.5 Conclusion	203
REFERENCES	205
APPENDICES	211

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Market share and growth of international tourism receipts in LDCs	3
Table 2. International tourism receipts in selected LDCs	4
Table 3. Market share and growth of international tourism arrivals in LDCs	5
Table 4. International tourism arrivals in selected LDCs	6
Table 5. Tourism trends in Tanzania 1998-2007	13
Table 6. Visits by non-residents to Tanzania national parks 1995-2000	16
Table 7. Examples of conservation programmes in protected area management in Sub-Saharan Africa with benefit sharing schemes	33
Table 8. Breakdown of interviewees	67
Table 9. Profiles of survey respondents (N=139)	84
Table 10. Relationship between data collection techniques and research questions	88
Table 11. Relationship between participant/respondent groups and the main research themes	91
Table 12. Local communities' knowledge of the positive impacts of tourism (N= 139)..	98
Table 13. Knowledge of the positive impacts of tourism by categories of respondents (N=139)	101
Table 14. Local people's view on means of involving them in tourism (N= 139)	103
Table 15. Views by categories of local people on means of involving the local community in tourism development (N= 139)	107
Table 16. Local people's view on their role in tourism development (N= 139)	108
Table 17. Views by categories of local people on the role of the local community in tourism development (N= 139)	111
Table 18. Local people's views about who should make decisions on development of tourism establishments (N= 139)	129

Table 19. Views by categories of local people about who should make decisions on development of tourism establishments (N= 139)	131
Table 20. Local people's views about who should make decisions in general matters about the Community Conservation Service (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu (N= 139)..	133
Table 21. Views by categories of local people about who should make decisions in general matters about the Community Conservation Service (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu (N= 139)	135
Table 22. Who should make decisions on tourism development in Mto wa Mbu (N=139)	138
Table 23. Local people's views about the level of local people's involvement in the current tourism decision-making process (N= 139)	146
Table 24. Views by categories of local people about the level of community involvement in the current tourism decision-making process (N= 139)	147
Table 25. Local people's feeling about their involvement in the current tourism decision-making and development processes (N= 139)	148
Table 26. Local people's feeling about their involvement in the current tourism decision-making and development processes by categories of respondents (N= 139)	150
Table 27. Local people's views on the contribution of tourism development on poverty alleviation (N= 139)	173
Table 28. Views by categories of respondents on the contribution of tourism development on poverty alleviation (N= 139)	175

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Normative typologies of community participation	24
Figure 2. Potential linkages between the accommodation sector and the local community	36
Figure.3: Relationship between income and poverty rate	41
Figure 4. An integrative framework for anti-poverty tourism (APT) research	45
Figure 5. Map of Tanzania showing the location of Mto wa Mbu within the northern tourism circuit	57
Figure 6. Map of Mto wa Mbu ward showing location of the study area, Barabarani village and its sub-villages	59
Figure 7. Study area (Mto wa Mbu ward) administration structure	68
Figure 8. An analytical framework for assessing local community involvement and participation in the tourism industry	93

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CCS = Community Conservation Service

CTP = Cultural Tourism Programme

ICA = Institute of Cultural Affairs

GDP = Gross Domestic Product

LDCs = Least Developed Countries

LMNP = Lake Manyara National Park

MNEs = Multinational Enterprises

MNRT = Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism of Tanzania

NGOs = Non-governmental organizations

PADEP = Participatory Agricultural Development and Empowerment Project

SACCOS = Savings and Credit Co-operative Society

SMEs = Small and Medium Enterprises

SMMEs = Small, Medium and Micro enterprises

SNV = Netherlands Development Agency

TANAPA = Tanzania National Parks Authorities

TASAF = Tanzania Social Action Fund

TCT = Tourism Confederation of Tanzania

TIC = Tanzania Investment Centre

TNCs = Transnational Corporations

TNP = Tarangire National Park

TRS = Tourism Revenue Sharing

TTB = Tanzania Tourist Board

TTC = Tanzania Tourist Corporation

UN = United Nations

UNCTAD = United Nations Conference in Trade and Development

UNDP = United Nations Development Programme

UN-ORLLS = United Nations, Office of the High Representative for the Least developed countries, Landlocked developing countries and Small island developing states

URT = United Republic of Tanzania

VEO = Village Executive Officer

WEF = World Economic Forum

WEO = Ward Executive Officer

CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND AND FOCUS OF THE THESIS

1.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an introduction to the research thesis titled *Community Involvement and Participation in the Tanzanian Tourism Industry: a case study of local communities in Barabarani village, Mto wa Mbu, Arusha-Tanzania*. The chapter starts by introducing a brief discussion of tourism in Least Developed Countries, a global component to which the country of study-Tanzania belongs, with a view to providing the big picture of the industry at the large scale level. It then narrows the research focus down to a country level by drawing attention to tourism in Tanzania before it introduces a more extensive discussion of the nature of the research problem while providing a rationale for the choice of topic. The chapter concludes by briefly introducing the case study area (Barabarani-Mto wa Mbu) this thesis focuses on along with the research questions it determines to examine.

1.2 Overview of Tourism in Least Developed Countries

Tourism is the world's largest industry and one of the fastest growing industries worldwide (UNCTAD, 2007). Today, tourism is increasingly becoming an important economic sector in many Least Developed Countries (LDCs), including Tanzania, (Honeck, 2008; UNCTAD, 2007). The United Nations currently classifies 50 nations as LDCs due to their low GDP per capita, weak human assets and high economic vulnerability (Spenceley, 2008; UN-OHRLLS, 2007). The tourism sector has proved continued and strong growth in most of these countries characterized with high levels of widespread poverty (Honeck, 2008; UNCTAD, 2007). Tourism growth in these countries

has been strongly associated, among other factors, with adoption of economic reforms that continue to take place in these countries (UNCTAD, 2007). Some other factors that contribute to this growth, include a growing demand from developed-country tourists along with abundant tourist assets available, both the natural environment and culture (Scheyvens, 2007; UNCTAD, 2007). The industry's economic potential in LDCs is favourably reflected in its importance as a source of foreign exchange earnings and its contribution to national economies (Honeck, 2008; UNCTAD, 2007). In many of these countries, tourism has become one of the main contributors of their GDP. In addition, the growth of tourism in LDCs, today, is impressive in terms of tourist arrivals, foreign exchange revenues, and jobs.

The tourism receipts specifically for LDCs have more than doubled over the last ten years, from US\$ 2,257 million in 1995 to US\$ 5,955 in 2006 (Table 1). Consequently, the annual growth of international tourism receipts in LDCs has doubled over the same period and their overall market share has increased impressively (Table 1).

Table 1. Market share and growth of international tourism receipts in LDCs

	International tourism receipts (US\$, million)						
	1995	2000	2004	2005	2006		
World	404,992	475,311	633,174	679,638	742,069		
Developing countries	91,965	121,791	179,238	198,550	224,611		
50 LDCs	2,257	2,983	4,731	5,234	5,955		
	Market share (%)			Growth rate (%)		Average annual growth (%)	
	1995	2000	2006	05/04	06/05	1995-2000	2000-2006
World	100	100	100	7.3	9.2	3.3	7.7
Developing countries	22.8	25.6	30.3	10.8	13.1	5.8	10.7
50 LDCs	0.6	0.6	0.8	10.6	13.8	5.7	12.2

Source: United Nations World Tourism Organization (2008)

The trends of international tourism receipts within individual LDCs have been promising over time, with many of these countries accruing relatively significant revenue from the industry. At the same time, over the last ten years, tourism has become the leading export sector and the main source of foreign exchange revenues for the 50 LDCs, excluding the oil industry, which is concentrated in only six of these countries. Oil-exporting LDCs include Angola, Equatorial Guinea, Sudan, Yemen, Chad, and Mauritania, with the first four being the largest oil-producers in the list (Frangialli, 2002; Honeck, 2008; UN-

OHRLLS, 2007). Table 2 shows tourism trends in terms of international tourism receipts in the top ten LDCs in 2006. Interesting to note is that on a national basis, for example, Tanzania was ranked the second among the 50 LDCs in terms of tourism exports in 2006, with tourism receipts amounting to US\$ 950 million, just after Cambodia, with US\$ 963 million in receipts (Table 2).

Table 2. International tourism receipts in selected LDCs

	International tourism receipts (US\$, million)				
Country	1995	2000	2004	2005	2006
Cambodia	53	304	604	840	963
Tanzania	502	377	746	824	950
Maldives	211	321	471	287	434
Uganda	78	165	267	380	309
Sudan	8	5	21	89	252
Senegal	168	144	212	242	250
Madagascar	58	121	157	183	237
Cape Verde	10	41	99	127	228
Yemen	50	73	139	181	181
Mali	25	40	140	148	175

Source: United Nations World Tourism Organization (2008)

As the annual growth of international tourist arrivals in LDCs becomes higher than the world average over the last ten years (period between 1995 and 2006), the market share occupied by these countries has nearly doubled over the same period (Table 3). LDCs' tourism market share and growth in terms of international tourist arrivals gained over time is presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Market share and growth of international tourism arrivals in LDCs

	Market share (%)			Growth rate (%)		Average annual growth (%)	
	1995	2000	2006	05/04	06/05	1995-2000	2000-2006
World	100	100	100	5.5	5.5	5.0	3.6
Developing countries	33.3	34.1	39.5	7.3	5.5	5.5	6.2
50 LDCs	0.8	0.8	1.4	13.3	15.8	7.3	12.8

Source: United Nations World Tourism Organization (2008)

Further statistics from the United Nations World Tourism Organization indicate that nine LDCs already receive over 500,000 international tourists annually, and more receiving over 200,000 annually. Table 4 presents the trends of international tourism arrivals in the top ten LDC tourism exporters in 2006. Surprising from this table is that Tanzania is ranked seventh in this aspect despite being the second in terms of tourism receipts, whereas Cambodia remains the leading country in the list.

Table 4. International tourism arrivals in selected LDCs

	International tourism arrivals (thousand)				
Country	1995	2000	2004	2005	2006
Cambodia	220	*	987	1,333	1,591
Senegal	280	389	667	769	866
Lao P.D.R	60	191	407	672	842
Zambia	163	457	515	669	757
Mozambique	*	*	470	578	664
Malawi	192	228	427	438	638
Tanzania	285	459	566	590	628
Maldives	315	467	617	395	602
Uganda	160	193	512	468	539
Nepal	363	464	385	375	384

*= no data was available

Source: United Nations World Tourism Organization (2008)

While these figures reveal the substantial position tourism already occupies and the encouraging high growth rates currently recorded in LDCs that suffer from widespread poverty, the central question remains whether tourism's potential to contribute to poverty alleviation in these countries can be realized. Indeed, there is an increasing recognition that tourism is one of the best placed powerful tools for poverty alleviation in LDCs

(Honeck, 2008; Wilkerson, 1996; Chok and Macbeth, 2007; Zhao, 2007; Scheyvens, 2007; Scheyvens, 2008).

1.3 Tourism in Tanzania

1.3.1 Introduction to Tanzania

Tanzania is one of the world's poorest nations-Least Developed Countries (LDCs), whose national budget is still 46 per cent donor-supported (URT, 2008). It is located in East Africa, and bordered by Kenya and Uganda on the north, Rwanda, Burundi, and the Democratic Republic of Congo on the west, and Zambia, Malawi, and Mozambique on the south. It borders the Indian Ocean to the east.

Tanzania was formed in 1964 after the union of two countries: Tanganyika, which is the large mainland territory; and the Islands of Zanzibar, which consist of Unguja and Pemba islands. With an area of approximately 945,087 square kilometres and an estimated population of 35 million, Tanzania is the 11th largest and the 6th most populated country in Africa. Between 2003 and 2008, life expectancy increased by 7 years from 44 to 51 while infant mortality slumped from 103 to 70 (per 100,000 births) (UNDP, 2008). The active population has risen to 20.6 million in 2006 from 17.8 million in 2002, with further results revealing that 2.3 million people (11 percent) of the active population were unemployed compared to 12.9 percent over the same period (URT, 2007). About 36 percent of the population is estimated to be living below the UN poverty line of one US dollar a day (UNDP, 2008).

Tanzania's economy depends heavily on agriculture, which accounts for half the GDP and employs 76.5 percent of the workforce. Other major economic sectors include tourism, textiles, mining, fisheries, and energy. The country has made significant measures to liberalize its economy along market lines and encourage both foreign and domestic private investments (UNDP, 2008). Today, it has emerged as one of Africa's growing economies. Between 2000 and 2006 for example, annual GDP growth rate averaged around 6%, making Tanzania's economy one of the best performers in sub-Saharan Africa (UNDP, 2008).

1.3.2 Tourism Institutional Framework

In the first decade after independence (1961-1971), the government of Tanzania did not view tourism as a priority sector through which it could achieve economic development (Kweka *et al*, 2003). The emphasis of the government was only on wildlife conservation and not on actual utilization and promotion of the country's tourism attractions (Luvanga and Shitundu, 2003). As a result Tanzania did not have any definite tourism policy until 1991 (Luvanga and Shitundu, 2003; Mwandosya, 2007). In the absence of a tourism policy, it implies that tourism administrative functions by that time were only undertaken in accordance with the Tanganyika Tourism Board Act of 1962 (amended in 1992 to reflect the tourism policy of 1991), which was enacted a year after independence.

However, in 1971, the government established the Tanzania Tourist Corporation (TTC), which continued to operate as per the same Tanganyika Tourism Board Act. The main objective of TTC, which, today, is called Tanzania Tourist Board (TTB), was to promote

and market tourism within and outside the country. With TTC in place, a significant number of tourists (199,200 international tourists) visited Tanzania in 1972 against 68,400 tourists recorded in 1971 (Luvanga and Shitundu, 2003). As a common salient weakness of the tourism database in many developing countries (Wells, 1982), it was difficult to obtain data in Tanzania on tourism arrivals on a year-to-a year basis particularly during the 1970/80s. The available statistics from Tanzania National Bureau of Statistics and Tourism Department, however, indicate that between 1970 and 1979 there were 131,117 international tourists to Tanzania as compared to 74,522 recorded in 5 years, between 1980 and 1985. Between 1986 and 1990, however, the country received a total of 131,089 international tourists.

During the 1990s, the government started to view tourism as an important economic sector (Kweka *et al*, 2003). This was attributed to the country's decision to adopt economic reforms that witnessed the emergence of a number of economic policies that were not in place before (Kweka *et al*, 2003). Economic reforms emphasized, among other things, participation of the private sector across various sectors of the country's economy, including the tourism industry (Mwandosya, 2007). Since then, the government gradually pulled out of its full control of the industry, thereby paving the way for major institutional changes that invited significant participation by the private sector (Kweka *et al*, 2003; Luvanga and Shitundu, 2003). It is probably important to note that the decision by the government to adopt such economic policies and its efforts to support tourism were realized after recognition of the following key facts. First, Tanzania is endowed with various natural resources that form a mainstay of tourist attractions, with 40 percent

of its land area (886,039 square kilometers) designated as protected natural areas (Mwandosya, 2007; Kweka *et al*, 2003). Second, tourism is a source of diversified foreign exchange earnings for a country economy like Tanzania, which traditionally depend on a few agricultural exports (UNCTAD, 2007; Kweka *et al*, 2003). Third, tourism stimulates the growth of many other economic sectors and provides incomes, employment, and tax revenue, both within the sector and through linkages with other sectors (Kweka *et al*, 2003).

One of the outcomes of such reforms for the tourism industry in Tanzania was the formulation of the Tourism Master Plan of 1996 (revised in 2002), which lays down the strategy and action plans necessary for the development of the industry. Furthermore, the Tanzania Investment Centre (TIC) was established in 1997 to provide investment incentives across various sectors, including tourism. In addition, the tourism policy of 1991 was revised in 1999 to ensure promotion of private sector investment, environmental conservation and consumer protection. According to this document, the major objectives of the tourism sector are to:

maximize tourism's contribution to the development of the country through increased foreign exchange earnings, employment creation, human resources development, and rural development; and ensure conservation of tourism attractions, preservation of the environment and sustainable development of the tourism industry.

Individual components of these two documents (the National Tourism Policy of 1999 and the Tourism Master Plan of 2002) continue to be implemented. Since then there have been considerable development achievements in the Tanzanian tourism industry, including institutional reorganization that has taken place, in particular the setting up of the Tourism Confederation of Tanzania (TCT) in 2000 to represent the interests of the private sector- the private business sector involved in the travel and tourism industry in Tanzania (Tanzania Tourism Master Plan, 2002; Mwandosya, 2007). There have been new investments in accommodation, restaurants, and other facilities of international standard. In addition, considerable emphasis has been given to tourism development planning and conservation, human resources development and training, improved visitor facilitation, and the establishment of a national tourism website (Tanzania Tourism Master Plan, 2002). As a result of these and other developments realized from the joint efforts by the government and the private sector, tourism has become the fastest growing industry in Tanzania (Tanzania Tourism Master Plan, 2002; UNCTAD, 2007).

1.3.3 Tourism trends in Tanzania

As mentioned, since the 1990s, Tanzania adopted economic reforms aimed at establishing a market-based and private-sector-driven economy that marked significant growth in many sectors of the country's economy. Such reforms for example, helped to improve the performance of the country's tourism industry and enhanced growth of the sector through improved marketing and promotional campaigns, improved tourism services, improved air access to Tanzania, accommodation facilities, and other tourism-supporting infrastructures. More specifically, growth in the Tanzania tourism industry

can be measured by looking at the trends in tourism receipts, tourist arrivals, tourism annual growth, number of hotels and hotel rooms, contribution of the sector to country's GDP, and direct jobs created by the industry. To give a clear picture of the performance of the tourism industry in Tanzania and to be able to gauge the achievements already realized by the industry, trends of some of these aspects recorded over a 10-year period are clearly indicated in Table 5 and 6 below.

Over the last seven years, tourism in Tanzania has recorded significant growth potential, with the industry's contribution to the country's GDP growing at a steady rate (Mwandosya, 2007). Resulting from the joint efforts by the government and the private sector in promoting the tourism industry as one of the country's key drivers of economy and marketing the country as the quality nature destination, the industry's contribution to national output (GDP) has shown a steady increase from 7.5 percent in 1995 to 17.2 percent in 2007 (Tanzania Tourist Board, 2007; eTN, 2008). The industry has proved to be an important export industry representing some 40 percent of total foreign exchange from the export of goods and services compared with 25 percent in 1995 (Tanzania Tourism Master Plan, 2002; eTN, 2008). According to recently released figures, the industry today is the number one foreign exchange earner for Tanzania, overtaking agriculture, formerly the country's leading export sector (eTN, 2008; Tanzania Tourist Board, 2008). Such figures show that export earnings from tourism have exceeded those of gold and have nearly tripled the amount the agriculture industry has contributed to Tanzania's economy (eTN, 2008; UNCTAD, 2007). Recent statistics, released in June 2008 by the government about the economic survey of the country, indicate that in 2007

the industry has employed 250,000 people as compared with 132,000 recorded ten years earlier (eTN, 2008; URT, 2008). Table 5, among other things, presents the number of people employed in the Tanzanian tourism sector over the last ten years.

Table 5. Tourism trends in Tanzania 1998-2007

Year	Number of tourists	Foreign exchange earnings (US\$ million)	Number of employees in the tourism sector	Number of hotels	Number of hotel rooms
1998	482,331	570.00	132,000	215	7,500
1999	627,325	733.30	148,000	321	9,575
2000	501,669	739.10	156,050	326	10,025
2001	525,122	725.00	156,500	329	10,325
2002	575,000	730.00	160,200	465	25,300
2003	576,000	731.00	160,500	469	30,600
2004	582,000	746.08	198,050	474	30,840
2005	612,754	823.05	199,000	495	31,365
2006	644,124	950.20	199,300	503	31,689
2007	719,031	1,037.30	250,000	515	31,870

Source: Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, National Bureau of Statistics (2008)

Through its entrusted agencies the government of Tanzania collects foreign exchange revenues from tourists each year (Ministry of Natural Resources & Tourism, 1990).

Although tourist earnings were relatively low back in the 1990s mainly due to few tourist

arrivals in the country, there has been a significant increase in recent years (Table 5). In the year ended December 2005 for example, the country earned about US\$ 823.05 million in foreign exchange from international tourism as compared to US\$ 570 million in 1998 (Table 5). In addition, earnings from tourism activities increased to US\$ 1037.30 million in 2007 from US\$ 950.20 million in 2006, equivalent to an increase of 9 percent, making the sector the leading foreign exchange earner (Table 5). The industry anticipates bringing in more than US\$1 billion for the year 2008 (Tanzania Tourist Board, 2008).

While the tourism industry continues to be one of the key foreign exchange earners in Tanzania, the industry depends primarily on the flow of international tourists to the country (Tanzania Tourism Master Plan, 2002). The country's main source markets are Britain, Germany, the United States, Italy, France, Spain, and Scandinavian countries with some new markets emerging around Africa in countries like South Africa, Namibia, Kenya, and Uganda (Tanzania Tourist Board, 2007). Within Europe such markets together often account for over 70 percent of the total European arrivals (Tanzania Tourism Master Plan, 2002). The majority of international tourists come to Tanzania to visit wildlife protected areas and enjoy the country's beautiful and exceptional wildlife. More recently, the World Travel and Competitiveness report indicates that Tanzania is number one worldwide in terms of nature-based tourism resources (WEF, 2008). Other tourism forms available in the country include archaeological, historical, cultural, adventure, and beach resort tourism all together making Tanzania a quality nature destination (Tourism policy and strategies in Tanzania, 2003).

According to Tourism Statistics in Tanzania, the number of international visitors from the main source markets to the country has been growing steadily, though overall tourism visitation is still very low relative to the country's massive tourism potential. In 1999, for instance, about 627,325 international tourists (a growth of 30.2 percent over 1-year period) (Table 5), predominantly from Europe and North America, visited the country of which about 60 percent had booked package tours organized by various tour operators based in Arusha, the city nearest to the famous northern tourism circuit (Tanzania Tourist Board, 2007). The rest were backpackers and others who could organize their trips independently (Tanzania Tourist Board, 2007). In the year 2007 the industry attracted 719,031 tourists in the country and was expecting over 800,000 tourists for 2008 (Tanzania Tourist Board, 2007). The country target is to attract one million international tourists by the year 2010 (Mwandosya, 2007).

Although there is a lack of domestic tourism statistics, the number of domestic tourists is small and dominated by non-resident visitors mainly due to financial limitations, lack of knowledge coupled with few programmes that enable citizens to participate in domestic tourism, and because many residents see tourism attractions as solely for foreign visitors (Tanzania Tourism Master Plan, 2002; Tanzania Tourism Policy, 1999). In 2000 for example, there were 200,597 non-residents who took wildlife tours during their stay in the country compared to 121,743 in 1995 (Table 6). However, it is important to note that park visits are not synonymous with visitor numbers since more than one national park may be visited during a stay (Tanzania Tourism Master Plan, 2002). This means, there

are chances that a person may be counted more than once since it is possible for that particular person to visit more than one national park at a time or in a year.

Table 6. Visits by non-residents to Tanzania national parks 1995-2000

Year	Visits by Non-residents
1995	121,743
1996	175,162
1997	200,830
1998	193,795
1999	238,123
2000	200,597

Source: Tanzania National Parks Authority, TANAPA (2002)

It is, however, interesting to note from the above statistics that, in Tanzania, earnings from international tourism have grown more rapidly than tourist arrivals in nominal terms due to the country's strategy to promote low-density, high quality and high-priced tourism, policy measures to attract high spending tourists (Kweka *et al*, 2003). Arguably, the increasing tourist numbers to Tanzania may be a convincing indication of increasing opportunities for local communities to earn revenue from tourism and these revenue opportunities could eventually contribute significantly to greater local interest in the development of the industry (Victurine, 2000).

1.4 Problem statement and justification

As mentioned earlier, tourism is one of the major sectors in many countries, including Tanzania, with the highest growth potential. It is the world's largest employer and one among the major sources of substantial foreign exchange earnings (Blank, 1991; Richards, 2003; Mwandosya, 2007). It is through this observation that many people believe that the industry is well placed as one of the major means through which development of local communities can be achieved (Scheyvens, 2002; Beeton, 2006). One approach to enhance this development through tourism is to involve local communities and ensure that their potential role is tapped and maintained through active participation in the industry (Beeton, 2006). It is imperative to note that involvement and participation of these communities is central to the sustainable development of the industry not only because tourism has had a close connection with the local communities, particularly as hosts and guides (Scheyvens, 2002), but also because "the destinations of tourists are communities and it is in the community that tourism happens" (Blank, 1989 p.115).

Participation is a process through which stakeholders, among them the local communities who are often the intended beneficiaries of community tourism, influence and share control over development initiatives and the decisions and resources which affect them (Havel, 1996). Participation, therefore, seeks collaboration or partnerships and the commitment necessary to ensure sustainability of tourism development initiatives (Wolfensohn, 1996). Paradoxically, the outcomes of participation are usually a reflection of a certain level of involvement of relevant stakeholders in the decision-making process which in turn enables people to make informed commitments to a particular tourism project (Havel, 1996). According to Akama (1999) as cited in Manyara and Jones (2007,

p.629), “local communities are hardly involved in tourism development” and they are usually without a voice in the development process (Havel, 1996). This situation according to Mbaiwa (2005) is contrary to the principles of sustainable tourism development which, among other things, emphasize the involvement and participation of local communities.

In their discourse on community-based tourism, many scholars have argued that local community involvement in tourism activities not only leads to getting local community support for the industry but also acts as a crucial component to achieving sustainable development of the industry (Kibicho, 2003; Cole, 2006). While the government of Tanzania views tourism as a significant industry in terms of poverty alleviation among other things (Mwandosya, 2007), little is known about local communities’ involvement and participation in the industry.

1.5 Research objectives

This study generally seeks to determine how the local communities in Tanzania are being integrated into the country’s tourism industry with a view to examine lessons to be learnt not only by tourism managers, planners and other local destinations within the country but indeed by all tourism destinations with similar characteristics as the ones in this research study. The research aims to study the local communities in a small active tourism centre, Barabarani village-Mto wa Mbu, which is located nearest to the well-developed and famous northern tourism circuit in Arusha-Tanzania. Moreover, this area has a number of on-going community-based tourism organizations, private individuals and tours operators (Brochure, 2000; personal communication, 2008), which all together

make this study useful in the wider context of community tourism. The research, through a study of these local communities, endeavors:

- to assess the extent of local people's involvement in tourism development in their local areas;
- to assess the role of local people in tourism development
- to assess the extent of local people's participation in the tourism development decision-making process
- to assess if tourism businesses in the area have developed benefit-sharing schemes; and
- to examine local people's views about the contribution of tourism towards poverty reduction.

In order to achieve this systematically, the study specifically addresses the following research questions.

- What are the views of local people towards community involvement in tourism development?
- What are appropriate roles of local people in tourism development?
- To what extent do local people participate in Mto wa Mbu tourism development decision-making process?
- To what extent have tourism businesses in Mto wa Mbu developed benefit-sharing schemes?

- What are the views of the local people on the contribution of tourism development towards poverty reduction?

1.6 Structure of this thesis

This thesis is presented in seven chapters. The first chapter has introduced an overview of tourism in Least Developed Countries to give a general picture of tourism on a global scale, especially by looking from the global context in which the study country-Tanzania belongs. The chapter has defined the scope of the thesis by a brief discussion of tourism in Tanzania. The research context of Barabarani village-Mto wa Mbu was briefly introduced. The nature of the research problem, research objectives and specific research questions were clearly stated.

The second chapter is a review of the literature. This chapter begins by introducing the wider concept of community participation and its adoption in tourism. The chapter also includes a discussion of various factors, which influence community participation in tourism. In particular, a number of tourism benefits-sharing schemes and the linkage between tourism and poverty alleviation are discussed. A tourism anti-poverty framework is introduced and discussed in detail.

Chapter three outlines the methodology used for data collection for this thesis. It outlines the underpinning reasons towards adopting a micro case study approach and employing a combination of techniques of data collection. A brief description of various participants involved in the study is provided. The analytical framework that defines patterns of data

analysis is introduced. A critical discussion of the study limitations and strengths is presented.

The findings of this thesis are presented and discussed in details in Chapters four to six. Chapter four is based on the research questions 1 and 2, which focus on the means of involving the local people and their appropriate roles in tourism development. Chapter five addresses research questions 3 and 4, which examine community participation in the tourism development decision-making process and in the sharing of tourism benefits. Chapter six focuses on research question 5, which tries to investigate local people's views about the contribution of tourism development towards poverty alleviation.

The final chapter, chapter seven, provides a concluding discussion of the findings of this study in relation to the five research questions, which the previous three chapters have attempted to explore. This discussion will provide a summary of the key findings of this research project, and bring together the three chapters of the findings discussed above. The discussion will also identify implications of the findings, present key lessons learnt from this research work, and suggest possible ways of improving community involvement and participation in tourism in Tanzania.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter seeks to address a number of issues related to community involvement and participation in the tourism industry by examining some key points emerging from various studies, reports and other sources of information. It starts with a discussion about the importance of community participation and its adoption in today's many development initiatives. It examines various levels of community participation available, and commences with a discussion of the whole idea of community participation in the context of the tourism industry. The chapter also identifies factors which influence local communities and attract their participation in the tourism industry. It also discusses some examples of the common benefit sharing systems widely applied in the industry across various parts of the globe. It continues with a discussion that provides a linkage between community involvement and participation, tourism development, and how the latter is linked to poverty alleviation. The chapter concludes by highlighting key issues raised by the literature that form the basis of this research.

2.2 Community participation and development initiatives

Community participation has become a common element in many development initiatives, such as community-based programmes, which assume participatory methods and has been promoted by development organizations, notably the World Bank, to address the inefficiency of highly centralized development approaches particularly in the developing world (Baral and Heinen, 2007).

Today, many development initiatives solicit the participation of all concerned stakeholders, at the relevant level, not only for the sake of efficiency and equity of the programmes, leverage of donors and demands of local communities, but also for sustainability of these initiatives (Ribot, 2004). Consequently, the real outcome for soliciting such community participation is to create and produce an enabling environment needed by these stakeholders, especially local communities who have been vulnerable to negative impacts of tourism attributed partly to the fact that many tourism resources occur in their areas, to have a real stake in development activities (Havel, 1996; Songorwa, 1999). This requires involving local communities in decision-making and strengthening their ability to act for themselves. One approach to achieve this is “through investments in human capital, such as education and health, investments in social capital such as local-level institutions and participatory processes, and support for community-based development efforts planned and implemented from bottom up” (Havel, 1996, p.145). However, given the fact that the central point underlying people’s participation may be the degree of power distribution, these efforts are less likely to succeed unless responsive institutions and the legal and policy framework that facilitate and support local participation are in place (Havel, 1996; Tosun, 2004; Wang and Wall, 2005).

2.3 Typologies of Community participation

Various scholars have attempted to develop useful models that conceptualize community participation in the context of development studies in general, but not related particularly to any economic sector (Arnstein, 1969 as cited in Tosun, 2004; Pretty, 1995; Tosun, 1999). Simply put, their studies focused mostly on participatory development approaches in development studies though they offer a useful tool towards a more authentic and

interactive community participation (Tosun, 2006). However, Tosun (1999), after reviewing these studies, examined community participation in the tourism industry and designed a model that can be applied specifically to the tourism industry. His model suggested three forms (typologies) of participation which “contextualizes community participation as a categorical term that allows participation of people, citizens or a host community in their affairs at different levels: local, regional or national” (p.494). These are: spontaneous community participation, coercive community participation and induced community participation (Figure 1). Tosun (2006) compares his three forms of community participation to those proposed by Pretty (1995) and Arnstein (1971). Each of his levels of community participation in the tourism industry is discussed separately in detail in the following paragraphs.

Figure 1. Normative typologies of community participation

7. Self-mobilization	←	8. Citizen control	Degrees of Citizen Power	→	<u>Spontaneous Participation</u> Bottom-up; active par.; direct participation; par. in decision making, authentic participation; self planning;
6. Interactive participation	←	7. Delegated power			
	←	6. Partnership			
5. Functional participation	←	5. Placation	Degrees of Citizen Tokenism	→	<u>Induced Participation</u> Top-down; passive; formal; mostly indirect; degree of tokenism, manipulation; pseudo-participation; participation in implementation and sharing benefits; choice between proposed alternatives and feedback.
4. Participation for material incentives	←	4. Consultation			
3. Participation by consultation	←	3. Informing			
2. Passive participation	←	2. Therapy	Non-participation	→	<u>Coercive Participation</u> Top-down, passive; mostly indirect, formal; participation in implementation, but not necessarily sharing benefits; choice between proposed limited alternatives or no choice; paternalism, non-participation, high degree of tokenism and manipulation.
1. Manipulative participation	←	1. Manipulation			
Pretty's (1995) typology of community participation	Arnstein's (1971) typology of community participation			Tosun's (1999a) typology of community participation	

Keys: Corresponding categories in each typology

Source: Tosun (2006)

From Figure 1, spontaneous community participation in Tosun's model, which emphasizes provision of full managerial responsibility and authority to the host community, suggests an ideal mode of community participation in tourism which is similar to degrees of citizen power in Arnstein's model and to self-mobilization and interactive participation in Pretty's model. Induced community tourism in Tosun's model, in which the host community has a voice regarding tourism development process through an opportunity to hear and to be heard, is similar to the degree of citizen tokenism in Arnstein's model and to functional participation by consultation or participation for material incentives in Pretty's typology. In this type of participation the community is often involved partly in the decision-making process and has no power to ensure that their views are considered for implementation, especially by other powerful interest groups such as government bodies, multinational companies, and international tour operators, among others, thereby enforcing a certain level of degree of tokenism as identified in Arnstein's typology. It is a top-down approach, a passive and indirect form of community participation most commonly found in developing countries in which host communities only endorse and may participate in implementation of tourism development issues or decisions made for them rather than by them.

In coercive community participation the host community is not as fully involved in the decision-making process as it is in induced participation. However, some decisions are made specifically "to meet basic needs of host communities so as to avoid potential socio-political risks for tourists and tourism development" (Tosun, 2006, p.495). While this kind of participation is viewed by many people as a substitute for genuine

participation and an approach to enable power holders to foster tourism development primarily to meet the desire of decision makers, tourism operators and tourists, it is similar to manipulation and therapy in Arnstein's model and passive and manipulative in Pretty's typology (Tosun, 2006).

While the literature tends to suggest that community tourism has evolved from various models of community participation in development, arguably, coercive community probably refers to what Kibicho (2003) found when examining the extent to which local communities participate in Kenya's coastal tourism. His study, among other things, identified that there is a linkage between local community involvement in tourism activities and their support for its development.

It is probably important to insist from here that a key consideration in tourism development is sustainability, which cannot be achieved without community support (Vincent and Thompson, 2002). This implies that community participation, a Western ideology which emerged after the failures of social and political theories about how societies should be organized and how development should take place (Li, 2005; Tosun, 2000), seeks to address sustainability for tourism industry development, among other things. While sustainability is the core objective of community participation (Vincent and Thompson, 2002; Johannesen and Skonhoft, 2005), proponents of community tourism further argue that community participation seeks to improve the welfare of the local community and, perhaps most importantly, win their support in conservation of tourism resources (Songorwa, 1999). This means community participation is inevitable and imperative for tourism development because most tourist attractions lie within local

communities or in their vicinities and in most cases co-exist side by side with the communities, for instance, in wildlife areas.

In addition, tourism happens in local communities and they are the ones who often bear the tourism damage and in most cases they form part of the tourist products and experience that visitors seek (Kibicho, 2003; Havel, 1996; Wolfensohn, 1996; Blank, 1989; Scheyvens, 2002; Beeton, 2006; Li, 2005; Tosun, 2000). It is for these reasons that community involvement and participation in the tourism industry serve to ensure the protection of these tourist products and services through effective collaborative management of the industry centred towards a more community-driven planning approach that guarantees strong community support for successful tourism development (Tanzania Tourism Policy, 1999; Tosun, 2000). It is probably within this context that sustainable tourism and community participation are being increasingly linked.

2.4 Factors influencing community participation

There are various ways through which communities can be involved in the tourism industry so as to attract their support and participation which in turn enhance development of the industry. This section will focus on and compare two factors: involvement in the tourism decision-making process; and employment opportunities.

Communities can participate in the decision-making process (Zhao and Ritchie, 2007; Li, 2005; Li, 2004; Tosun, 2000; Chok and Macbeth, 2007). One of the key underlying principles of pro-poor tourism clearly declares that local communities “must participate in tourism decisions if their livelihood priorities are to be reflected in the way tourism is

developed” (Chok and Macbeth, 2007, p. 147). According to Zhao and Ritchie (2007) this can be achieved through engaging local communities as members in the public and tourism related decision making bodies.

Community participation via decision-making is a crucial determinant to ensure that the benefits local communities get from tourism are guaranteed, and their lifestyles and values are respected. However, this approach is rarely found in developing countries (Tosun, 2000; Li, 2005). Building on the same argument, Kibicho (2003) in his study about community tourism in Kenya, further noted that local communities had the feeling that they were not fully involved in their country’s coastal tourism, especially in decisions regarding its development, despite the fact that the industry has impacts on their well-being. In his study about the nature of community participation expected by the local community in Turkey, Tosun (2006) observed that the local community needs to be part and parcel of the decision making body through consultation by elected and appointed local government agencies or by a committee elected by the public specifically for developing and managing tourism issues.

It is, however, important to note that community participation in decision making is not only desirable but also necessary so as to maximize the socio-economic benefits of tourism for the community. It is perhaps one of the most important elements of tourism management to enable communities who often serve as tourist destinations and for that matter suffer from the negative impacts of tourism, to get involved and eventually participate in planning decisions regarding tourism development. This is important in order to create better handling of the negative impacts of tourism development (Li, 2004;

Tosun, 2000). Much of the literature seems to support the idea that if local communities want to benefit from tourism they must be integrated into the decision-making process. However, Li (2005), while studying community decision-making participation in tourism development in Sichuan Province, China, pointed out that there was weak local participation in the decision-making process yet local communities received satisfactory benefits from tourism. It is equally important to note, therefore, that integration of local communities into the decision-making process is “not a final goal itself” but only one of the many ways through which community participation can be achieved (Li, 2005, p.133).

Another way to involve and attract community participation and ultimately their support in tourism development is through local job creation (Zhao and Ritchie, 2007). Since tourism offers better labour-intensive and small scale opportunities (Chok and Macbeth, 2007; Scheyvens, 2007) and since it happens in the community, arguably, it is thought to be one of the best placed potential sources of employment opportunities for local communities, inclusive of women and the informal sector (Blank, 1989; Li, 2005; Johannesen and Skonhoft, 2005; Scheyvens, 2007). Community participation via employment opportunities, as workers or as small business operators, can be a catalyst to the development of tourism products and services, arts, crafts and cultural values, especially through taking advantage of abundant natural and cultural assets available in communities in developing countries (Scheyvens, 2007). Tosun (2000) stressed that community participation through working in the tourism industry has been recognized to help local communities not only to support development of the industry but also to receive more than economic benefits.

Apart from participation in the decision making process, or simply, apart from the high need by local people to be consulted about local tourism development issues, Kibicho (2003) further identified that 88.6% of 236 members of the local community who participated in his study stated that encouraging local people to invest in, operate small scale businesses, and work for the tourism industry is a suitable means for community participation. This is in line with Tosun (2000) who underlined that in many developing countries community participation through employment as workers in the industry or through encouraging them to operate small scale business, “has been recognized to help local communities get more economic benefits rather than creating opportunities for them to have a say in decision making process of tourism development” (p. 626). Zhao and Ritchie (2007) added that communities, as a way of participation and as the input of the local workforce, may pursue tourism-related economic activities as paid or self-employed workers. While participation through employment has more direct impacts on the lives of poor households, it is arguably a useful way to curb poverty at the household level since it diverts economic benefits tourism brings directly to the family level (Zhao and Ritchie, 2007).

2.4.1 Tourism benefits-sharing schemes

Sharing tourism benefits with local communities has always been seen as one of the various modes of community participation in the industry. In other words, participation of local communities through sharing the benefits of tourism is one of the major viewpoints for community participation in tourism (Timothy, 1999; Tosun, 2000; Li, 2005; Li, 2004). Various studies and numerous different international development agencies have established that tourism is one of the powerful tools for poverty alleviation, especially

due to its associated potential economic gains and due to the fact that tourism is a significant or growing economic sector in most countries with high levels of widespread poverty (Wilkerson, 1996; Chok and Macbeth, 2007; Zhao and Ritchie, 2007; Scheyvens, 2007). Although there is no standard method for assessing the adequacy of community participation levels (Li, 2005), the way benefits from the tourism industry are shared has been argued to be the focus of community participation. This, however, simply implies that communities can be involved or attracted to participate in the tourism industry through sharing with them the benefits obtained from the industry, and one precondition for a successful community tourism programme, according to Songorwa (1999), is that equitable benefits of tourism “must remain in the hands of the majority community members in an open and easily understood manner” (p. 2062).

An example of community participation in the benefits of tourism can probably be seen in the Uganda Wildlife Authority, especially through its outreach programme, the Tourism Revenue-Sharing (TRS) programmes. While the underlying reason for sharing tourism benefits with local communities in a bid to attract their participation is to ensure sustainability at the same time promoting human welfare through tourism, TRS usually donates a portion of revenue accrued from wildlife-based tourism to assist local communities living adjacent to national parks in the construction of schools, dispensaries, water supply etc (Archabald and Naughton-Treves, 2001). Essentially, tourism revenue-sharing (TRS) programmes promote tourism development and ensure that local communities enjoy tangible benefits from the industry while participating in wildlife conservation (Archabald and Naughton-Treves, 2001). A similar scheme, the Community

Conservation Services (CCS), exists in Tanzania under the Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA), and will be discussed in chapters three and five.

There are many other similar programmes in various protected areas in Africa that aim to benefit local people through development projects. Many of these programmes have a well stipulated tourism benefit-sharing mechanism with ‘poor’ neighbouring communities. As from 2002 for example, 29 percent of tourist revenue at Jozani National Park in Zanzibar goes to community development projects such as schools, health services, safe water supply and many others (Makame and Boon, 2008). Table 7 presents some of these conservation programmes from various countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. One of the similarities with these programmes is that apart from being established in wildlife protected areas, their authorities, through benefit-sharing approaches seek to address resource issues in areas beyond park boundaries over which they have no jurisdiction.

Table 7. Examples of conservation programmes in protected area management in Sub-Saharan Africa with benefit sharing schemes

<i>Name of Conservation Project</i>	<i>Country</i>
Amboseli Park/Wildlife Extension Project	Kenya
Aire-Tenere Park	Niger
Mountain Gorilla Project	Rwanda
Ngorongoro Conservation Area	Tanzania
Community Conservation Service	Tanzania
Lupande Development Project	Zambia
Luangwa Integrated Rural Development Project	Zambia
CAMPFIRE Program	Zimbabwe

Source: World Bank (1997)

It is, however, important to realize that while there is a well-established tourism literature on tourism benefit-sharing from the perspective of wildlife protected areas and adjacent local communities, little emphasis has so far been given as to how tourism benefits accrued from community tourism activities are being shared among local communities themselves. Furthermore, there is little or no empirical study so far within the general literature on tourism and development on how tourism businesses such as accommodation providers in the destinations share their tourism benefits with adjacent local communities.

An exception is Meyer (2007) who devised a workable conceptual framework of linkages between the accommodation sector and the ‘poor’ neighbouring communities in developing countries. Her motivation to focus on the accommodation sector was that the sector is considered to be more at the forefront of the tourism industry in the destinations than tour operators based in tourist generating countries. As a result it is believed to have strong responsibilities towards members of the local communities who are potential employees and suppliers to the sector’s businesses. The application of this linkage framework, however, may establish useful systems through which tourism benefits could be shared between local communities and tourism businesses in a particular destination. Meyer’s framework provides four broad linkage opportunities that accommodation providers could share with adjacent communities in order to ensure the sector provides the most obvious benefits to members of the local community. These are namely: employment; sourcing and procurement; small and medium-sized enterprise sector (SMMEs) development and outsourcing; and other types of partnerships (Figure 2).

According to this framework, there should be a mechanism to ensure members of the local community have access to employment opportunities arising from the accommodation facilities in their area. On top of this, employers have to provide better employment conditions, wages, and in-house training. Secondly, accommodation providers should establish sourcing and procurement linkages between local suppliers, in particular SMMEs in the destination. This could include obtaining locally products that are part of the core business such as food supplies, building materials, decoration, entertainment, fuel and so forth. Thirdly, accommodation providers should support

emerging SMMEs and the informal sector not by sourcing produce from them but by opening opportunities for them to take over part of non-core business by the accommodation sector. This could include for example, outsourcing catering, cleaning and laundry services. The fourth linkage encourages the need to generate positive publicity, improve the company's reputation and establish good relationships with neighbouring communities. This seems to be moving to a new point as, recently, there has been a growing pressure on companies to demonstrate social and environmentally sound operational strategies. A focus for many companies has been to move from philanthropy and donations to building corporate social responsibility by contributing to more complex issues of the community such as poverty alleviation. To achieve this, companies have to engage in community development initiatives. Although, the outcome from this approach is often to make the community a better place to live in and conduct business with, the argument that today's consumers are more socially, culturally and environmentally sensitive and expect service providers to adopt responsible role somewhat forces such companies to build supportive partnerships with local communities (Meyer, 2007).

Figure 2. Potential linkages between the accommodation sector and the local community

Source: Meyer (2007)

While tour operators in tourist generating countries are virtually far from the reach of local communities in destinations, reports have revealed that their counterparts operating in the destinations contribute significantly to community development initiatives through a wide range of community outreach. In Tanzania, for example, apart from the earlier mentioned park community outreach, Community Conservation Service (CCS) that operates in all 14 national parks, tour operators also seem to support community development in the areas in which they conduct their business. In Tarangire National Park (TNP) in Tanzania, tour operators through their approach to benefit sharing

programme allocate to the respective village a collected fee of USD\$ 6 per visitor (World Bank, 1997).

However, it is important to understand that in some cases community participation is seen as a way of getting people to carry out activities or share their costs while the benefits are not clear to those expected to participate (Havel, 1996). This implies that a key factor to the success of any community-based tourism project is the incentive to benefit sharing which is usually attractive enough to make people highly motivated to participate. As Havel (1996) asserted “people will not participate unless they believe it is their interest to do so” (p. 147).

In summary, while scholars have identified that community participation can be viewed from at least two dimensions: in the decision-making process and in the benefits of tourism development (Timothy, 1999; Tosun, 2000; Li, 2005; Li, 2004), one may argue that participation by working in the industry and the empowerment of local communities ensure those communities with a more sustainable and direct flow of tourism benefits (Tosun, 2000; Zhao and Ritchie, 2007). Studies have documented that community tourism, however, depends highly on active involvement and participation of the local community not only in effective distribution of tourism benefits but also in tourism problem identification, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation (Simmons, 1994; Songorwa, 1999; Zhao and Ritchie, 2007). In their study about sharing the benefits of tourism in Hainan, China, Wang and Wall (2005) observed that community participation is not only a tool for balancing power when making decisions in tourism-related issues but also the tool through which the benefits of tourism can fairly be spread

to communities. In fact, the concept of involvement and participation of local communities in the tourism decision-making process primarily aims to empower and provide room for local communities to determine their own development goals, set their livelihood priorities and consult them with a view to understand and take into consideration their desires and concerns for tourism (Timothy, 1999).

Involvement and participation of the community in decision-making is advocated so that communities can have some control over tourism resources, initiatives and decisions that affect their livelihood (Wang, and Wall, 2005). On the other hand, the idea of involvement and participation of local communities in the tourism benefits is easily reflected in increasing incomes, employment, and education of local communities about tourism and entrepreneurship (Timothy, 1999). One way to accomplish this is to increase public awareness of tourism through education campaigns and train local communities for employment in the industry. While increased public awareness creates a more hospitable environment for tourists and improves the image of the destination, providing entrepreneurial training empowers local communities and ultimately increases their capacity to receive significant benefits from tourism (Timothy, 1999). To ensure community involvement and participation in the tourism industry, Timothy (1999) while studying the participation of locals in the benefits of tourism in Indonesia, further identified that the country's tourism department offers regular entrepreneurial training in English courses, hygiene, accounting, and hospitality. This enables tourism-oriented businesses and locals such as taxi drivers, guesthouse managers, restaurant owners, and street vendors, the opportunity to work successfully and efficiently in the industry.

2.5 The theoretical linkage between tourism and poverty alleviation

To be able to demonstrate systematically the contribution of tourism to poverty reduction, it is undoubtedly crucial to show how the industry is linked to the wider context of poverty reduction. However, in order to realize the linkage between tourism and poverty alleviation it is important to first understand the dimensions of poverty. This will then shed light on specific key points in the vicious circle of poverty that may determine and reflect the relationship between tourism development and poverty reduction. The World Bank through its document, World Development Report 2000/2001, views poverty primarily as an outcome of economic, social, and political processes that interact with and reinforce each other in deprived ways that can be easily reflected in people's life:

Poverty is lack of income and assets to attain basic necessities of life such as food, shelter, clothing and acceptable levels of health and education (p.34).

Jamieson *et al* (2004) describe this lack of assets as lack of good health, skills necessary for employment, land/housing, access to basic infrastructure, savings or access to credit, social assets such as network of contacts and reciprocal obligations, which can be called on in time of need.

Poverty is a sense of being voicelessness (unheard) and powerless in various institutions of state and society (p.34). These concerns include unfair sociological conditions where the poor are faced with inhuman treatment, lack of protection against violence, intimidation and lack of civility and predictability in their interactions with public officials (Jamieson *et al*, 2004; Havel, 1996).

Poverty is vulnerability to adverse shocks, linked to an inability to cope with them (p.34). The poor are susceptible to various risks of health, natural or human made hazards and are incapable of recovering speedily from these shocks economically, socially, physically and emotionally (Jamieson *et al*, 2004).

It is, however, important to note that these are just primary causes of poverty, which are often realized at community and individual levels. There are more causes, which can be observed at national and regional levels, in issues such as economic growth, inequality of income distribution and instability in governance. While at the national level poverty can be measured in terms of GDP, at the local level poverty manifests itself in the income, informal employment, lack of freedom to choose a desired quality of life, lack of land tenure for housing, lack of basic infrastructure, and so forth.

While the root causes of poverty have been clearly underlined in previous paragraphs, a framework for action is certainly needed to effectively alleviate poverty in all its dimensions. The World Bank (2001) emphasized the framework for action, which, among other things, declares that national economic development is central to success in poverty alleviation, and therefore, a fundamental focus in all efforts by the destinations to attain sustainable poverty reduction. This is based on the notion that as destinations grow richer, it is more likely that overall incomes of people in those countries also increase and consequently poverty falls, particularly income poverty (World Bank, 2001; Jamieson *et al*, 2004). The reverse is therefore true, that with economic deterioration, income poverty rises (Figure 3). This means the effectiveness of economic growth to alleviate poverty

highly depends on good governance and on the initial level of inequality in the distribution of income and how that distribution changes over time (Blake *et al*, 2008). To ensure poor people gain a substantial share from that growth, mechanisms to fight against socio-economic inequalities and establishing sound institution framework need to be in place.

Figure.3: Relationship between income and poverty rate

Source: World Development Report 2000/2001 (World Bank, 2001)

While economic growth is consistently associated with poverty reduction, it is imperative to remember that poverty is an outcome of more than economic processes. This implies that economic growth alone is not enough to guarantee economic achievements accruing

to the nations to 'trickle down' to the poor (Jamieson *et al*, 2004). This is especially true if there is limited opportunity, empowerment and security to the poor (Jamieson *et al*, 2004; Van der Duim *et al*, 2006; Zhao, 2007). It also follows that attacking poverty requires promoting opportunity, facilitating empowerment, and enhancing security alongside actions at local, national, and global levels (Word Bank, 2001; Zhao and Ritchie, 2007). Therefore, with the poverty framework for actions in place, the challenge that remains is to see how and where tourism can intervene in providing better opportunities, empowerment and security to the poor at the local level and boost economic growth at national and regional levels.

Tourism is theoretically linked to poverty reduction because of its contribution to the economic development of the destinations (Blake *et al*, 2008; Luvanga and Shitundu, 2003). Its contribution to the economic growth of a particular destination is usually reflected in three major points of view:

First, as tourists (consumers) arrive at the destination, they provide local communities, including the poor, with the opportunities for producing and selling additional goods and services for their visitors, the tourists. This means tourism may raise local production of additional goods and services such as agricultural products (fruits and vegetables), livestock (beef, lamb, and pork), poultry (chicken and eggs), fisheries (fish and seafood), manufacturing (equipment and furniture), non-perishable foods and dry goods (flour, rice, sugar etc), ground transport (tour operator transfers and packages, and local taxis), dairy and handicrafts (Honeck, 2008; Luvanga and Shitundu, 2003). The obvious outcomes

from such activities are income and employment opportunities. The accrued income and the generated employment can be essential tools that may help to mitigate poverty levels, particularly income poverty among locals, including the poor. This can be realized if the earnings from tourism are wisely spent to support their well-being and capabilities, and improve key poverty indicators such as health and education services, among others.

Second, tourism is an important opportunity to diversify local economies. This is attributed to the fact that tourism can develop in poor and marginal areas with limited export and diversification options (Luvanga and Shitundu, 2003). Remote areas particularly, attract tourists because of their naturalness, culture, wildlife and landscape value. This means tourism can create employment opportunities and income generating projects in poor and marginal areas in the same way it does in other areas. In turn, earnings from tourism can be used to establish or improve social service facilities and infrastructure in those particular areas. The outcomes from such facilities are not only improved incomes for the poor but also their social well-being and capabilities.

Third, tourism offers labour-intensive and small-scale opportunities compared to other non-agricultural activities (Chok and Macbeth, 2007; Scheyens, 2007; UNCTAD, 2007; Luvanga and Shitundu, 2003). It employs a high proportion of women, semi-skilled labour, and values natural resources and culture, which may feature among the few assets belonging to the poor (Blank, 1989; Li, 2005; Johannesen and Skonhøft, 2005; Luvanga and Shitundu, 2003; UNCTAD, 2007). This means tourism, through employment creation and income generation, offers a relatively wider range of poverty reduction

opportunities to many members of the society, including vulnerable groups such as women. Tourism arguably contributes to poverty alleviation if it creates new jobs and provides incomes. This is probably one of the factors that make many people believe that tourism is better placed to contribute towards poverty alleviation, with many of them expecting tourism-related jobs in developing countries to target the poor rather than local elites, international and expatriate companies (Blake *et al*, 2008; ODI, 2006; Scheyvens, 2007; Tosun, 2000; Zhao and Ritchie, 2007). Other factors that make the tourism industry a better placed sector for poverty reduction include its capacity to absorb a wide diversity of players ranging from multinational enterprises (MNEs) to small and medium enterprises (SMEs), including extremely small-scale domestic entrepreneurship.

Tourism is theoretically seen as a useful tool that, if properly managed, can improve the well-being of the poor. However, it is important to acknowledge the fact that the industry is often driven by the private sector, often by Transnational Corporations (TNCs) that may have little or no interest in ensuring that poverty is reduced among locals. In addition, the influence of globalization, information technology, and leakages may also impact negatively on tourism's potential as a means of achieving poverty alleviation (Jamieson *et al*, 2004; Luvanga and Shitundu, 2003; ODI, 2006). Therefore, what remains important from the poverty point of view is how long do visitors (tourists) stay in a particular destination and whether they spend much on the goods and services provided by the poor. These points have been regarded as some of the key aspects of tourism that often give some indication of how much (in terms of revenue) remains in the destinations, and

eventually how much could potentially be a means of poverty reduction (Luvanga and Shitundu, 2003).

2.6 Tourism anti-poverty framework

After reviewing a range of related literature in combination with personal thoughts and theoretical constructs, Zhao and Ritchie (2007) developed an integrative framework which identifies the process and mechanisms through which tourism development can be viewed as a vital tool for poverty alleviation (Figure 4).

Figure 4. An integrative framework for anti-poverty tourism (APT) research

Source: Zhao and Ritchie (2007)

This anti-poverty tourism model identifies the poor, who are in most cases the local communities in poor countries (Chok and Macbeth, 2007), as one of the key stakeholders that play a significant role in tourism planning, development and management. In order for tourism development to successfully contribute to poverty reduction, the model

suggests three interrelated factors that should be taken seriously. The first factor is to ensure that there is active local participation in the tourism development process. The second factor is to make the destination competitive so that it is able to attract a sufficient number of tourists. This reflects the argument that tourists are not drawn to the area simply to stay with local communities but because of the attraction base available which would provide the types of experiences that satisfy their desires (Gartner, 1996). And the third factor is to ensure that the destination is sustainable to promise viable tourism business.

In their anti-poverty framework, Zhao and Ritchie underline the fact that lack of any one of these factors or deficiency in any aspect of these factors may consequently limit the positive impacts of tourism from reaching the poor. Having all these three factors in place, the framework further identifies three determinants which together with the previous factors may lead to poverty alleviation. The first determinant is the need to create economic opportunities which local communities must have access to and can take advantage of to change their life. The second determinant is empowerment of local communities. This means strengthening the community's ability to act for themselves and to have voice in the local decision-making process. It also aims to enhance their capacity to influence their interests and engage, pursue and benefit from any economic opportunity.

In particular, empowerment involves getting rid of the barriers that work against the local communities and building their capacity to engage effectively in markets (Zhao and Ritchie, 2007). However, since the poor have limited financial capacity and therefore

limited capacity to tackle various risks such as ill health, economic shocks and natural disasters, creating opportunities and empowerment is not enough (Zhao and Ritchie, 2007). In this case, the third component - security - is fundamental to make the two determinants, opportunity and empowerment, accomplish the desired objective of poverty alleviation (Zhao and Ritchie, 2007). In simple terms, a social security system is needed to enable empowered local communities to alleviate poverty through tourism while protecting them against such risks (Zhao and Ritchie, 2007). In Uganda for example, until 2001, a tenth of adults was infected by HIV/AIDS (World Bank, 2001). This meant any effort by local communities in Uganda to reduce poverty, especially income poverty could be slowed down by the prevalence of this disease. Therefore, in such a country, any tourism anti-poverty framework should include a social security component with a programme that aims to stop the spread of the disease, thereby reducing people's vulnerability to risks of ill health.

2.7 Community involvement and participation in the tourism development process

Numerous studies have examined the involvement of community participation in the tourism development process (Tosun, 2000; Tosun, 2006; Li, 2005; Li, 2004; Timothy, 1999). The process of tourism development as pointed out in the works of Doxey (1976); Butler (1976); Butler (1980); Keller (1984) as cited in Simmons (1994) and Tosun (2000), appears to suggest that there is a high degree of dependence on residents for their acceptance of the industry before it starts in a particular destination. This is to say, initial adequate involvement of local communities is fundamental to enable the initial stage of tourism development (Simmons, 1994; Tosun, 2000), which Butler (1980) called the

exploration stage. Implicitly, the above argument about the relationship between tourism development and community participation indicates that community involvement is, indeed, crucial in order to avoid more likely uncertainties and misunderstandings about tourism development in the area (Simmons, 1994).

While community participation in the tourism development process is highly desirable as an element of development, it is important to note that active involvement and participation of the local community in tourism especially at the exploration stage is crucial because at this initial stage of tourism development there is normally little or no tourism infrastructure in the area and therefore local people, after accepting the idea of introduction of tourism in their area, usually start, own and operate small scale guest-houses, economy class hotels or souvenir shops, and supply the workforce for the industry especially in many developing countries (Tosun, 2000). More importantly, providing local communities with the opportunities to own and operate tourism facilities is thought to increase their tolerance to tourist activities in the area (D'Amore, 1983 as cited in Timothy, 1999) and eventually creates a sense of ownership, feeling of responsibility and practical involvement in tourism (Simpson, 2008).

The literature seems to acknowledge the fact that local community participation is vital in the tourism development process. However, Tosun (2000) while exploring limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries, further observed that “opportunities for local communities to participate may vary over time with the type and scale of tourism developed, thresholds of entry, and the market served” (p.627). His study viewed the relationship between local community participation

and tourism development process in the context of Butler's tourist area cycle of evolution model. According to him, such variations are due to the reality that as the destination becomes more popular and attractive after considerable development (or as a result of growing commercialized tourism), more investors, especially large capital owners, are attracted to the destination making competition stiffer than before. In this regard, local communities are likely to lose control over tourism development since they often have limited financial resources (Zhao and Ritchie, 2007) and therefore it gradually becomes more difficult for them to open large scale businesses (Tosun, 2000). To avoid this situation, Tosun (2000) suggests that there is a deliberate need to empower local communities at the initial stage of tourism development to enable them to keep control over tourism development in their area. One way to achieve this is through removing barriers that hinder local communities' effective participation in markets (Zhao and Ritchie, 2007).

2.8 Barriers to community participation in tourism in developing countries

Various researchers have examined community participation and identified a number of inter-related barriers that prevent effective local communities' involvement and participation in the tourism industry (Tosun, 2000; Manyara and Jones, 2007; Cole, 2006). The overall outcome of such barriers is often the communities' limited enthusiasm towards the industry thereby resulting in little benefits that trickle down to the grass-roots, the local community (Manyara and Jones, 2007).

Tosun (2000) identified a wide range of obstacles to community participation in the context of developing countries. He categorised these obstacles into operational, cultural and structural limitations. Those categorized as operational limitations include the centralization of public administration of tourism development, lack of co-ordination between involved parties and lack of information made available to the local people of the tourist destination as attributed to, but not limited to, insufficient data and poor dissemination of information. Under these conditions, low public involvement in the tourism development process is obvious as people are not well-informed. Those categorised as structural impediments include institutional, power structure, legislative, and economic systems. They mostly impact negatively on the emergence and implementation of the participatory tourism development approach. And those identified as cultural limitations include limited capacity of the poor to effectively handle development.

The fact that the majority of people in developing countries struggle to meet their basic and felt needs and that mere survival occupies all their time and consumes their energy, implies that getting closely involved in issues of community concern such as community participation in the tourism development process which often demands time and energy, may be a luxury that they cannot afford. On the other side of the coin, apathy and a low level of awareness in the local community is generally accepted. While a low level of interest in taking part in matters beyond their immediate family domain (apathy) can be partly attributed to many years or centuries of exclusion from socio-cultural, economic and political affairs that impact their dignity, a low level of awareness of such issues

stops the poor from demanding that their needs be accommodated by the institutions which serve them.

Cole (2006), while focusing on spontaneous community participation, which is the highest level of community participation (Figure 1), identified a number of barriers that make active local community participation hard to achieve in the tourism industry. Lack of ownership, capital, skills, knowledge and resources all constrain the ability of communities to fully control their participation in tourism development. In addition to lack of skills, knowledge, ownership of tourism resources, Manyara and Jones (2007) further identified that elitism, empowerment and involvement, leakage of revenue, partnerships, access to tourists, transparency in benefit-sharing, and lack of an appropriate policy framework to support the development of community initiatives have significant impacts on community participation in the industry. These obstacles all together, which are in fact similar to but presented differently in Tosun's work, collectively make it difficult for the local community to participate in the tourism development process. Nonetheless, one approach to ensure that local communities can overcome those barriers and ultimately participate actively in tourism development is to empower them (Van der Duim *et al*, 2006; Zhao and Ritchie, 2007; Tosun, 2000).

2.9 Conclusion

The literature has revealed that community participation has become a key element in many development projects and that the concept has its roots in development studies. Furthermore, it has underlined that tourism is a well-placed poverty reduction tool that if

used properly can contribute significantly in efforts towards poverty alleviation, especially in developing countries. While involvement and participation of communities in the tourism industry can be viewed in the decision-making process and in the sharing of tourism benefits, community participation through employment brings more economic benefits directly to the household level which, in turn, can be used to alleviate widespread poverty. To achieve this, the literature has suggested that an 'enabling environment' that encourages and empowers community participation is required. This research examines these key aspects of community participation by using a case study of local communities in Barabarani village-Mto wa Mbu, Arusha, Tanzania.

It is worth acknowledging the fact that the literature is not clear about what it really means by community participation. Several attempts to define community participation are subject to great debate arising, first, due to the different contexts of interpretations of the terms 'community' and 'participation' and second, due to the notion that the real existence and the practicality of the whole idea is complicated, especially given the reality that the community is never homogenous (Cole, 2006). It is imperative therefore to consider that defining who in the community should be involved in community participation involves making decisions about who should be in and who should be out; who is local based on territoriality or place and who is included based on particular factors (Cole, 2006). Therefore, for the purpose of this research, community is regarded as something locational within which there are divisions which express its diversity and heterogeneity.

On the other hand, participation is also open to a variety of interpretations arising from the fact that a ladder encompassing different levels of participation exists which often range from ‘only being told of’ to being able to influence or determine every aspect of the tourism development (Cole, 2006). The underlying complexity surrounding this paradigm arises due to the reality that all communities participate in one way or another, for example, through sharing a despoiled environment, receiving menial jobs or getting a percentage of gate fees to a National Park (Cole, 2006). Taking all these aspects into account and the fact that involvement and participation in the tourism decision-making process and sharing the benefits of tourism development are central to community involvement and participation in the industry, an operational definition for community participation in the context of this research is needed. Therefore, for the purpose of this research, community participation is defined as a situation whereby a member of the community who lives in a particular area directly or indirectly participates in tourism decision-making, and/or operates a tourism-related business or works in tourism as an individual or in a group.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the methodology used for data collection for this thesis. It starts by linking the literature review to the research strategy before discussing it. The chapter then provides a detailed discussion of the research strategy adopted and the reasons for choosing it. It highlights the underpinning reasons towards adopting a community case study approach and the reasons for employing a combination of techniques of data collection. The chapter continues with a description of the case study area profile, which provides background information of the research context and establishes the context of generality of findings. A brief description of various participants involved in the study is provided. The analytical framework that outlines the patterns of data analysis is introduced. A critical discussion of the study limitations and strengths is presented.

3.2 The research strategy

As revealed in the previous chapter, involvement and participation of local residents in the tourism industry can be reflected in the tourism decision-making process and in the sharing of tourism benefits. In turn, these two key aspects of community tourism determine the extent to which tourism contributes towards alleviation of widespread poverty, especially amongst local communities in developing countries. This research topic, community involvement and participation in the tourism industry in Tanzania, is indeed, derived from these key aspects.

While this research project has its roots in a wide range of previous researchers' work as outlined in the literature review, it is a more complex study, in the sense that it tries to

bring together and examine empirically both aspects of community participation (decision-making process and benefit sharing) along with tourism's importance as a tool for poverty reduction. With this complexity, the research project is therefore designed to use a combination of multiple techniques of data collection in order to successfully address the central research questions.

To gain a sharpened understanding of the key themes the research questions aim to address (see Table 10), the research project employs a case study approach. This approach was chosen because of its considerable ability to explore and generate a holistic, in-depth investigation, and intensive knowledge about a particular community (Saunders et al, 2000). In other words, the case study enables one to collect detailed information about a community and gain a rich understanding of that particular community within the research context. Furthermore, this approach was chosen because the study seeks to investigate community participation in tourism, which implies that conducting a case study at the community level is an appropriate research strategy.

The study is strengthened through the triangulation of both quantitative and qualitative data which were obtained by means of the questionnaire survey and the interviews respectively. It is, thus, a combined quantitative-qualitative study whose respondents were drawn from amongst members of the local communities in Barabarani village, Mto wa Mbu. Such respondents were identified by the use of systematic random sampling, especially for the household survey. The whole process of recruitment and selection of survey respondents is discussed in more detail in section 3.5.3.

Another strength of the study is that it brings together perspectives from key tourism stakeholders (ordinary members of the community, decision-makers within the community, tourism businesses and NGOs) at the micro level, where little tourism research on this topic has been done. A further strength is the researcher's two-month period of field observations and experience in the micro case study area, which created an opportunity for in-depth fieldwork while exploring insights into the whole process of data collection and the research context. It allowed the researcher to compare his firsthand observation with the results obtained through other methods of this research (see section 3.3.1). The extended period in the field enabled the researcher to get to know the community and to engage and interact with the local people. This enabled the researcher to identify other important issues that were not initially included in the profile of the analysis. For example, it is through this engagement and interaction when it became apparent that local people had a general feeling that the tarmac road in their area influences their tourism activities (see section 3.9).

Figure 5. Map of Tanzania showing the location of Mto wa Mbu within the northern tourism circuit

Source: TANAPA website 2009

3.2.1 Case study area profile

The research study area, Barabarani-Mto wa Mbu, is found in Monduli district which is one of the five districts of Arusha region. Arusha, the regional capital and largest city, is one of Tanzania's 26 administrative regions (Briggs, 2002). Mto wa Mbu, which in English means: the *River of Mosquitoes* or *mosquito creek*, is one of the 20 administratively divided wards of the Monduli district. The ward comprises three villages, namely Migombani, Majengo and Barabarani. In these villages various forms of tourism take place, with a cultural tourism being prominent since the tourism attractions in the area are chiefly of cultural aspect (Brochure, 2000). But, it is worth noting that many tourism activities in Mto wa Mbu ward are concentrated in Barabarani village. Field observations, for example, revealed that all 15 guest houses and all 8 campsites available in Mto wa Mbu ward, including many restaurants whose number was not easily identified, are located in Barabarani village which has a population of 9270 people in an area of 1544 hectares. It is worth noting that a village is similar to a town while a sub-village is similar to a suburb. Usually the village comprises several sub-villages, just as a particular town contains several suburbs (Figure 6). It is also important to note that, in Tanzania, there are many villages by the name Barabarani, which in English means *along the road*. As the research aim to study local people who live in a place where there were tourism activities going on, the choice of Barabarani was appropriate for this study.

Figure 6. Map of Mto wa Mbu ward showing location of the study area, Barabarani village and its sub-villages

(R)= sub-villages close to the road

(F)=sub-villages far from the road

Source: Village office, June-August 2008

Mto wa Mbu ward, a small most popular town found in the northern tourism circuit, is located 130 kilometres-a 2 hour drive, west of Arusha town. The area is situated under the Great East African Rift Valley escarpment (Brochure, 2000). It is the host town at an entry-point and close to the entrance gate to the Lake Manyara National Park which

contributes significantly to making this study area also popular for wildlife-based tourism (Norton, 1991). Arguably, its position within a short distance to the entrance to the Lake Manyara National Park tends to link it up with and/or make Mto wa Mbu easily connected to wildlife safari tourism activities (Van der Duim *et al*, 2006). It is also conveniently located on the way to the two world-renowned tourism attractions: the Ngorongoro Crater and the great Serengeti National Park, which together make Mto wa Mbu an ideal rest place for most safari travelers. It is a common stop for many safari operators to enable their clients, the tourists, to buy local products, food and drinks and to visit the area's huge curio market located in Barabarani village. This market usually sells locally made traditional products such as carvings, Maasai spears and trinkets to the increasing number of tourists (Norton, 1991).

The study area, Mto wa Mbu, which often sees a lot of tourist traffic and most organized tour safaris passing through, has long been a trading centre where many different people have settled, notably the Mbugwe, Iraqw, Gorowa, Irangi, Totoga, Chagga and Maasai (Briggs, 2002). The area is, in fact, the most linguistically diverse and complex in Africa. It is the only place in the African continent where the four major African language families -Bantu, Khoisan, Cushitic and Nilotic -occur together (Amin *et al*, 1984). Today, the area has a multi-ethnic community composed of 120 tribes out of about 126 ethnic communities in Tanzania (Arens, 1972). While vernacular languages, traditions and customs associated with these ethnic communities often have great tourist appeal, various modes of production and prominence of cultural tourism are some of the examples of this culture diversity (Arens, 1972).

According to the National Bureau of Statistics Tanzania (2006), in 2002 the population of the Monduli District as a whole was 185,237, with Mto wa Mbu serving as home to more than 28,000 people. However, it is probably important to note here that, according to census records obtained from the ward office, the population of Mto wa Mbu ward by the year 2007 stands at 15,969 people, with Barabarani village alone contributing 58 percent of the population. The other two villages, Majengo and Migombani, contribute about 19 and 23 percent respectively. As it can be noted, the decrease in population as compared to that recorded in 2002 was due to the fact that the government, in the year 2005, decided to take off one village (Losirwa village) from Mto wa Mbu ward and joined it to a newly established ward, Makuyuni ward, which is closer to this village.

The tourism resources available in this area, in particular the unique nature of the community, make this area more popular than any other place in Tanzania with the Maasai people making the cultural content of the area complicated and fascinating to visitors. It is important to note that central to Mto wa Mbu is the presence of Maasai communities who have been, over the years, described “as a unique and esoteric community that represents the essence of real Africa; people who have managed to resist Western influence and have retained their culture” (Van der Duim *et al*, 2006, p.105). Overseas tour operators and travel agents and most of the cultural tourism projects in Tanzania are often marketed and promoted using the powerful Maasai images (Van der Duim *et al*, 2006). Because of this nature of community, Arens (1972), while doing fieldwork about his study on the frontier of change in Mto wa Mbu, observed that the

population in this area usually tends to be receptive to innovations, which is perhaps an important element requirement for development of community tourism in any tourism destination.

By taking advantage of this kind of multi-ethnicity the government of Tanzania has managed successfully to introduce many innovations into this community which today contribute to the success of this area (Arens, 1972). It is probably through the same line of thinking that made the Netherlands Development Organization initiate the Mto wa Mbu cultural tourism programme in the area in the year 1996 (Brochure, 2000). This cultural tourism programme is a community-based tourism organization which operates in the three villages of Mto wa Mbu (Brochure, 2000) (see section 3.4.2.3).

The decision to undertake this study in Barabarani village, Mto wa Mbu is largely based on a combination of four major factors, which together made the community case study area suitable for this research. First, the area's location supports tourism activities in the sense that it is found within the tourism nodes of the well-established and famous northern tourism circuit. Second, it is close to Lake Manyara National Park. This makes Mto wa Mbu one of those areas in which the park outreach programme, Community Conservation Service (CCS), operates. Although CCS is described in detail in section 3.4.2.5, it is important to note here that the outreach seeks to involve the local community in tourism by sharing tourism benefits with them. The way tourism benefits are shared, is one component this research tries to address. Third, the area's history behind its emergence and the available local ethnic communities supports cultural tourism. Fourth,

the background information about this area and the evidence that there are already some tourism activities going on in the area-Barabarani village, are clear enough to make this research useful in the area. For example, the area has a number of on-going community-based tourism activities such as Mto wa Mbu Cultural Tourism Programme and various tourism working groups (see sections 3.4.2.1 and 3.4.2.3). It also has a number of tourism establishments such as tourist hotels, lodges, and campsites whose staff were needed to participate in this study. However, what is not clear, and what remains the focus of this research, is whether local communities in Barabarani village, Mto wa Mbu participate in the area's tourism industry, and to what extent, if any.

3.3 Types of study data collected

This research project is enriched by the use of both secondary data and primary data. Primary data are the new data or original data generated by this research, whereas secondary data are existing data or information collected for a purpose other than that of the researcher (Finn *et al*, 2000). Various techniques of data collection were employed to gather both primary data and secondary data.

3.3.1 Secondary data

In order to successfully address the research questions (see section 1.5), the research required some secondary data collection. The main purpose was to better understand the background of key issues the research is trying to examine. As argued by Veal (1997), secondary data, though meant for another purpose, is considered useful in providing the basis for the research project. Secondary data used in this research, which is mostly

quantitative in nature collected for administrative records or management data, was obtained from various sources including the village local government office and the community-based tourism organization office available in the study area. Other sources of secondary data were local newspapers, brochures, books such as Lake Manyara Management Plan, reports such as the financial reports from Mto wa Mbu cultural programme and Lake Manyara National Park. These reports were useful as they outline the distribution of tourism benefits, which is one of the key issues this research is examining.

Government publications also formed an important source of secondary data. A number of published government documents such as the National Tourism Policy of 1999, Tourism Master Plan of 2002, Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper of 2000, National Economic Survey of 2008, and National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty of 2005 were accessed from relevant government offices in different ministries. Analysis of these documents provided a wider picture about tourism, community participation, and poverty alleviation in Tanzania, thereby providing context and some important insights of the situation in the study area.

3.3.2 Primary data

Primary data was collected by using four major techniques of data collection. These were in-depth semi-structured interviews, household surveys, field observation and document analysis. While each of these techniques is discussed in detail in the subsequent sections, document analysis also served as a source of secondary data.

3.4 In-depth semi-structured interviews

Data for this study was collected through in-depth semi-structured one-to-one interviews with various tourism stakeholders available in the study area. These included:

- tourism entrepreneurs operating in the study area such as tour operators and private individuals;
- some village government leaders who are normally local politicians;
- managers who work with the community-based tourism organizations;
- a tourism park warden who works with one busy national park bordering the study area to the south- the Lake Manyara National park; and
- key informants such as the ward executive officer and non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

These people were chosen because of their extensive knowledge, experience, expertise, and involvement with the tourism sector in the study area. In other words, they were selected based on their ability to contribute to the overall research objectives. The snowball sampling technique was used as an identification tool for the in-depth semi-structured interviews, whereby during the interviews, some of the participants offered names of their counterparts in the study area. The structure of the interviews is discussed in more detail below.

Semi-structured interviews were preferred because the approach allows greater standardization and control while enabling easy comparison of responses to a question (Burton and Cherry, 1970; Finn *et al*, 2000). In addition, despite having specific questions, semi-structured interviews allow more probing to seek clarification and elaboration of the participant's own ideas, aspirations, and feelings while generating

detailed, ‘rich’ context, qualitative data (Long, 2007). This flexibility allowed an extension of the interviews into other issues that were not originally included in the interview checklists, but nonetheless helped towards addressing the study research questions. For example, if a participant (an interviewee) raises an interesting point during the interview that was not initially included in the checklist of topics to be explored, the interviewer may accommodate it providing it helps to clarify or address clearly the research questions. A typical example is when one government official led to a discussion of the main road as one of the factors that facilitate tourism activities in the study area, but was not included in the original interview guide (see section 3.9).

3.4.1 Profiles of interviewees

A breakdown of the sample size of the interviewees is presented in Table 8. A total of 28 in-depth interviews were conducted. Of those who were interviewed, 11 were village government officials, and 9 were tourism establishments’ representatives, of which 8 were from tourist campsites and one was from a national park, Lake Manyara National Park (LMNP). There was one interviewee from the only community-based tourism organization (Mto wa Mbu Cultural Tourism Programme) and another from the only NGO operating in the study area. The rest of the interviewees were leaders of the informal and formal tourism groups available in the study area (Table 8).

Table 8. Breakdown of interviewees

Name of organization, agency and tourism establishment interviewed	Interview code	Total number of interviewees
Village government	Government 1-11	11
Lake Manyara National Park	Park 1-1	1
Mto wa Mbu Cultural Tourism Programme	Organization 1-1	1
NGO	NGO 1-1	1
Tourist Campsites	Manager 1-8	8
Formal and informal tourism groups	Leader 1-6	6
Total		28

Source: Field interviews for the study, June-August 2008

3.4.2 Interviewees affiliation

As mentioned, interviewees for this study came from different organizations, agencies and tourism establishments, which were, at the period of data collection, based in the study area. These included Mto wa Mbu cultural tourism programme, tourist campsites, formal and informal local tourism groups, non-governmental organization, and government agencies. In order to understand the interviewees' perspectives and how they fit into the research context and the wider community, each of these is described in more detail in the subsequent sections.

3.4.2.1 Village government

The administration structure of Mto wa Mbu ward, like any other ward in Tanzania, is composed of the following officials: the ward executive officer (WEO), who is appointed by the government and usually there is one in each ward; several village executive officers (VEOs), normally each village has one VEO, who is also appointed by the

government; village chairpersons together with their secretaries, usually there is one in each village elected by the villagers; sub-village chairpersons and their secretaries. Usually there is only one sub-village chairperson elected by sub-villagers together with his/her secretary in each sub-village (Figure 7). It is, however, important to note that the sub-village chairperson is normally the first contact person in all issues that involve the government and the villagers. Thus, based on the area administration structure in Figure 6, the sub-village chairperson is the person well-placed to help organizing villagers to achieve a particular development goal.

Figure 7. Study area (Mto wa Mbu ward) administration structure

Source: Field interviews for the study, June-August 2008

While Figure 7 gives, among other things, an impression of the flow of information and commands in relation to communication to and from the grassroots, it clearly indicates

potential local leaders in as far as administration of the ward is concerned. It also helps to clarify different positions of responsibility each of the local government officials interviewed, was involved or engaged with. Therefore, since the study was conducted in a village composed of eight sub-villages, of the 11 local government officials interviewed, 9 were elected officials, which included one from the village level and one from each sub-village. The rest, two interviewees, were appointed officers at the village and ward levels, represented by one from each level.

Of the eleven village local government officials involved in the interviews, there were two appointed members of the local government including the ward executive officer (WEO) and the village executive officer (VEO), and nine elected members of the local government who were the village chairperson and eight sub-village chairpersons or secretaries. Both elected and appointed members of the village government interviewed were also members of the village executive committee (VEC), which is responsible to the village general assembly. One of the key tasks of VEC is to prepare agenda and make recommendations on various issues that require consideration and approval of the general assembly, the decision-making organ at the grass-root level, which is responsible for general matters for which the village is involved.

3.4.2.2 Lake Manyara National Park

The Lake Manyara National Park (LMNP) staff, park warden Community Conservation Service (CCS), interviewed was working with the CCS project, the project which seeks to involve local communities in the conservation and management of wildlife-based tourism resources through benefit-sharing. The CCS, whose mission statement among other

things promises to enter into active dialogue with local communities and create awareness and understanding of tourism resources conservation and its benefits, is available in all national parks in Tanzania. CCS is a long-established programme that started in 1988 as a pilot project in Serengeti National Park before it grew to cover more national parks in early 1991.

3.4.2.3 Mto wa Mbu cultural tourism programme

The Mto wa Mbu Cultural tourism programme (CTP Mto wa Mbu) is a community-based tourism programme that aims to alleviate poverty amongst Mto wa Mbu communities through tourism. The programme was established in 1996, with financial and technical assistance from the Dutch government through its organization, the Netherlands Development Agency (SNV).

The major reasons for establishing the CTP were: to mitigate environmental degradation by encouraging community participation in different environment activities; to alleviate poverty amongst societies; and to eliminate gender discrimination along with an increasing number of people (both male and female) engaged in the production of goods and services such as the Maasai Boma, curio shops, wood carvings, fishing, and farming of vegetables and fruits for the tourist market. In support of these efforts, CTP uses proceeds from its cultural activities to improve the lives of these communities in the villages it operates, of which three are in Mto wa Mbu ward (Barabarani, Majengo and Migombani villages) and one is in Manyara ward (Losirwa village).

The programme offers a combination of both cultural and wildlife-based tourism products. Cultural tourism products include wood carvings, paintings, traditional lunch, traditional banana beer, rice farms and banana plantation walking safaris, village walk safaris, and bicycling. Wildlife-based tourism products include bird-watching, game viewing, and bush walk safaris.

CTP operates by involving various groups of local communities, each with its specific tourism product offered in a combination with those from other groups. It engages local communities in the production of such goods and services, including Maasai Boma, curio shops, wood carvings, fishing, and farming of vegetables and fruits for the tourist market. The programme currently has 27 full-time employees including one programme coordinator, and 26 tour guides, of which 15 were males and 11 were females.

3.4.2.4 Non-governmental organization (NGO)

The study interviews involved one non-governmental organization known as the institute of cultural affairs (ICA). This NGO is based and operates in the study area since 1998. The NGO's main objectives focus on alleviating poverty amongst local communities in Mto wa Mbu through the provision of basic business education, loan management, legal advice, and awareness to HIV/AIDS.

3.4.2.5 Tourist Campsites

Tourist campsites occupy an important segment of the accommodation sector within the tourism industry, both from a supply as well as a demand point of view. These are tourism establishments, local private-sector businesses that provide both lodging and

camping accommodation for the tourists. Normally, such accommodation is provided for a limited period of time, particularly for holiday or tourism purposes. Usually a campsite has at least two categories of establishments: a pitch or duly delimited land space used for camping; and a bungalow or a fixed constructed building within the campsite used as an accommodation unit. This building is habitually a lodge within the campsite. The campsite therefore provides people, after the payment of the stipulated price, with a place to stay indoors (in this case, in the lodge) or outdoors (in this case, on a pitch) using a mobile homes, caravans, tents or other similar easily transportable elements. Campsites are often well appointed and equipped with camping gear although in most cases guests are allowed to come in with their own camping equipment.

The study interviews involved all eight campsites available in the study area, each employing less than 10 people. All these campsites were specialized in the provision of a place to stay (accommodation) as their major service to tourists. They also sell food and drinks to their guests. However, many tour transport operators who bring guests to these campsites sometimes bring their own food and drinks, and this reduces the chance of additional profits for the campsite operators. These campsites often provide, among other things, a room for cooking and some catering facilities. Only one campsite in the sample was owned by a foreign investor, and the rest were owned by domestic entrepreneurs from either within the study area or elsewhere in Tanzania. The tourist campsites staff interviewed were either a manager, assistant manager or operations manager.

3.4.2.6 Formal and informal tourism groups

These are various created social working groups whose activities rely much on tourism. Each of these groups is formed by a particular number of people (usually less than 15) who are engaged in similar tourist related activities. This means the activities of one group are different from those of another though occasionally there can be more than one group doing similar activities but in different locations of the village. There were several of these groups categorized on the basis of the specialized tourism activities each one undertakes. These groups, described as formal and informal tourism groups, included curio shops operators, hand craft, cultural/music entertainment, artists, and vendors. The interviews involved six leaders of these formal and informal tourism groups.

Access to the tourist market and financial loans are the two fundamental reasons towards the formation of such groups. With the exception of one, the rest of these groups were not officially registered thereby posing one of the barriers for them to access loans from financial institutions. Although two of these groups had promotional materials and websites, their market relies heavily on Mto wa Mbu Cultural Tourism Programme (CTP) marketing and promotional strategies since, with the exception of one, the rest of the groups (five of them) were operating under the umbrella of the CTP. In other words, their success and survival in business is highly determined by the success, survival, and coordination of the CTP, and how closely a particular group is linked to this CTP. This is illustrated by the fact that the potential customers for these groups are actually those tourists who come to visit the village under CTP. On the other hand, the survival of the CTP also depends much on these groups because they form an important component of the village tour for the tourists who come under CTP the programmes. In other words,

these groups are one of the key points that tourists visit in the course of village tour organized by the CTP Mto wa Mbu.

3.4.3 Structure of the interviews

To minimize any language and translation problems, all interviews were conducted by the researcher himself in the same way as Tosun (2006) observed when studying the expected nature of community participation in tourism development in Hatay, Turkey. Those who participated in the interviews were encouraged to give expression to their views, thoughts and intentions. All interviews were conducted in Swahili, the national language of Tanzania, which all interviewees were familiar with and in which the researcher is fluent. However, with the consent of interviewees all interviews were tape recorded and transcribed, and notes were taken. Each interview lasted between 45 minutes and one hour.

Each interview was conducted at a mutually convenient time and place and covered questions about community participation in tourism, particularly in the decision-making process, benefit-sharing and tourism's contribution to development and poverty reduction. Interviews were guided by a set of two interview checklists: one for the community-based tourism organizations (see appendix 3) and another for the government agencies (see appendix 2), with open questions which identified such key topics and issues to explore. The interview checklists were designed to provide a framework of gathering information from respondents. Both checklists contained introductory questions that aimed to identify the background information of a particular government agency, community-based tourism organization, NGO, or a private tourism-related establishment,

followed by questions designed to identify and explore key topics and issues that were central to this study.

3.4.4 Strengths and limitations of the in-depth semi-structured interviews

As mentioned in section 3.4, the strengths of the in-depth semi-structured interviews adopted in this research study include its flexibility to allow more probing, greater standardization and control of responses, and its ability to include a range of tourism stakeholders from across the community at the grass-root level.

However, the limitations of the in-depth semi-structured interviews are probably those inherent to any research involving interviews. As argued by Veal (1997), it is important to remember that interviews are usually affected by a general tendency and desire of interviewees to be helpful and friendly towards the interviewer. The outcome of this notion is often an attempt by interviewees to try to reveal only what they think the researcher would like to hear. The complexity of the whole idea, which could be a possible source of bias for this study, is practically vested in the way such interviewees attempt to cover or exaggerate their interest in and involvement into a particular issue which they think the researcher is trying to investigate (Veal, 1997). However, the researcher did not notice the tendency observed by Veal (1997). This could be because the researcher is also a Tanzanian, though from another part of the country, and generally shared the same culture, such as language, with the participants and the community at large.

3.5 Household questionnaire survey

To allow a meaningful comparison of responses and in order to complement and verify the information obtained from the in-depth semi structured interviews, a household questionnaire survey involving local residents in the study area was also conducted. While the value of this mixed method approach is reflected in its ability to combine both qualitative and quantitative methods examining the same research questions but from different perspectives, it also allows the findings of one investigation to be checked against the findings of the other type (Long, 2007). Furthermore, the household survey was preferred (against street survey, telephone survey, mail survey, site or user survey, and captive group survey) because of three major reasons: first, it is generally representative of the community; second, it is one of the most appropriate research methods designed to provide information of the community as a whole; and third, it generally represents a complete geographical area (Veal, 1997). Since the study sought to collect the views of local people, then a technique that would lead to representation of the community was crucial for this study.

Taking into account the fact that more than 13.6 million Tanzanians, mostly from rural areas, equivalent to 36 per cent of the 39.4 million country's population, can neither read nor write, and that out of the total population, 29.5 million (about 75 per cent) live in rural areas (Kisembo, 2008; Thomas, 2008), data for this study was collected through a structured researcher-completed questionnaire survey. This kind of questionnaire administering was preferred because it is arguably more accurate, generates higher response rates and provides fuller and more complete answers than the respondent-completed questionnaire (Veal, 2006). Indeed, the interviewer-completed questionnaire

approach allows ‘room for manoeuvre’ in ensuring respondents understand the question in the same way, not just being presented with the same wording as an attempt to maintain the same stimulus to all sampled respondents (Long, 2007). For example, it was necessary to clarify the questions about market forces (see appendix 1) to some respondents to ensure they understood.

While paying special attention to the possible low literacy rate in the study area, questionnaires for this study were written in English, but were translated and asked in Swahili, the language all respondents were familiar with and, as mentioned, the researcher is fluent. To ensure that the same meaning is retained, both the translated version in Swahili and the original version in English were proof read by two experienced researchers who were acquainted with both Swahili and English languages. These researchers did not have any major concerns about the Swahili questionnaire, but they provided some suggestions on minor changes in wording, which were then incorporated into the revised questionnaire.

3.5.1 Questionnaire design, structure and administering

The household questionnaire contained both closed and open-ended questions (see appendix 1). While closed-format questions were used to enable the researcher to examine people’s response on specific pre-coded aspects, open questions were particularly useful for identifying the reasons why a particular respondent held such a point of view on a particular aspect (Long, 2007). The questionnaire was organized around the research questions. In line with what Long (2007) further advised, all questions were sequentially framed while avoiding long and convoluted, leading,

ambiguous, and hypothetical questions. The questionnaire consisted of introductory questions set purposely to gauge whether respondents had some ideas or knowledge about tourism in general. These were followed by questions to identify and explore the benefit-sharing systems employed to distribute among local communities the benefits from tourism activities available in the study area.

Many of the survey questions included a category with closed-style items requiring the respondents to rank their rate of agreement with a particular item. Responses from such closed-style items together with that from open questions, in turn, determined the level of local communities' involvement and participation in the tourism industry and identified their views on the contribution of tourism towards poverty alleviation, which were central to the household survey. This was done by indicating their response on a rating scale which varied according to the question. The last section included a series of questions aimed to collect information about the demographic characteristics of the respondents. Such characteristics were requested to enable analysis of the information or data according to key groups of respondents. It should be noted that the questions asked about tourism in Mto wa Mbu in general, but responses were likely to focus on Barabarani village because that is where all the respondents live and where tourism is. In fact, because of tourism development in the study area, participants/respondents sometimes mentioned Mto wa Mbu even when referring to Barabarani village (see 4.2).

3.5.2 Pre-testing survey instruments and piloting the survey

Before administering the questionnaires, a pilot survey was conducted with five randomly selected households, all from within the study area. The aim of this study test was not

only to pre-test the questionnaire with the view to ensure that respondents would understand the questions and provide appropriate responses, but also to check whether administration of the survey procedure as a whole would run smoothly (Finn *et al*, 2000). Experience from the survey procedure and feedback from respondents regarding the questionnaire did not have any major concerns, but respondents provided some suggestions on minor changes to some Swahili words, mainly the need to replace these with the ones most commonly used by the local community to refer to the same thing.

The final revised Swahili questionnaire was then prepared in multiple copies ready for use as a study instrument to elicit the required information from respondents. Such questionnaires were then distributed to randomly selected households across the eight sub-villages (Kisutu, Korea, National Housing, Jangwani, Magadini, Migungani 'A', Migungani 'B' and Kigongoni) available in the study area, with the view to assess who participates in, and benefits from community-based tourism and its contribution towards poverty alleviation.

3.5.3 Recruitment and selection of respondents

The researcher surveyed 139 households out of 2480, which was the number of households available in the study area, Barabarani village, by the time of this research. The sample size was influenced by a range of factors, including the desire to sample a range of households in each sub-villages but this was also constrained by the available budget. This study sample represents approximately 6% of the population size. As it can be noted, the 6% sample size for this study is slightly above the minimum sample size (5%) required for a homogenous population to provide enough accurate data that can be

used to address the research questions, and would therefore be well representative of the research population (Moser and Kalton, 1993).

A list of the entire households in the village was obtained from the respective village government office and was the basis for recruitment of the target study population who then responded to the survey questionnaires. The list indicated a total of 2480 households from a population of 9270 as of December 2007. Since the study village had eight sub-villages as of August 2008-the time for data collection for this study, it was thought random sampling be conducted in each sub-village. This was so to ensure that every sub-village is well represented in the study while each household's equal chance of being selected is maintained. In addition, the decision to randomly sample from the sub-village level aimed to make sure that even newly or recently established households as of August 2008 that might not have been timely incorporated into the main list in the village office, which is yearly updated, were included. Conversely, the approach ensured that those households that might have emerged or disappeared as a result of various reasons such as death or emigration, but for some reasons still appear in the main list in the village office, were excluded from the study. As can be noted, these arguments were supported by the fact that the total number of households by adding up all sub-totals from the eight sub-villages was 2487 while the main list from the village office indicated 2480 households.

However, in order to obtain an unbiased study sample, one which is representative of the population, or to ensure representativeness-that all households have an equal chance of inclusion in the study sample, the approach to respondents recruitment was basically similar to the one used by Tosun (2006) in his study about the expected nature of

community participation in tourism development in Turkey. Each household was given a unique code written on a piece of paper and mixed in a box and then five per cent of the pieces of paper, each containing a house code, was randomly drawn from the box. The same procedure was utilized in each sub-village to obtain a five per cent of its households which all together contributed to make a 139 households study population.

The survey was then carried out with adult family members who are community residents and who were able to answer relevant questions effectively. In Tanzania each village has its own electoral register which is regularly updated. Any one appearing in this document must be an adult-a person who is 18 years or above, and must be a citizen or a resident who lives in a particular community. The register therefore served as a useful source of information to double-check and ensure that a particular respondent was actually a member of the community. As mentioned, respondents were met in their homes and asked to willingly participate in the study. Only one adult per household was included in the study. If there was more than one adult in a particular household, they were asked to decide who among themselves should be involved in the study. This approach did not negatively impact on respondent representation, but rather led towards getting varied respondent profiles (see Table 9). If no knowledgeable adult person was found in the selected household, it was skipped and replaced by the next with a suitable respondent. However, with the consent of respondents all survey responses were tape recorded and transcribed, and notes were taken. It is probably important to note here that one village government official accompanied the researcher during the survey, but did not interfere with the selection process as he left as soon as he introduced the researcher to a particular household.

The research was conducted in conformity with the ethical standards outlined by the Victoria University of Wellington Ethics Committee. Every bit of information collected was treated as strictly confidential. All respondents were pre-notified before the date and time for either the interview or the house-to-house survey as this is also considered ethical (Finn *et al*, 2000).

3.5.4 Profiles of survey respondents

Table 9 lists the characteristics of the members of the local community in Barabarani village, Mto wa Mbu who responded to the household survey. The study population comprised a total of 139 respondents from households in eight sub-villages of the study area. Of these respondents, 14.4% (21) were from Kigongoni sub-village, 11.5% (16) were from Korea, National Housing and Janganwani sub-villages each with the same number while Magadini and Migungani ‘A’ sub-villages contributed 13.7% (16) each. Kisutu sub-village had the highest representation of 15.1% (20), due to its comparatively high household population, whereas Migungani ‘B’ had the lowest representation of 8.6% (12). It is, however, important to remember that the representation of households of a particular sub-village was determined by the household population size of that particular sub-village.

Among the 139 respondents, 54.7% (76), slightly more than half of them were males, and females were 45.3% (63). As a whole, 59% (82) of respondents had a primary school education, 29.5% (41) had a secondary school education and a very small percentage of respondents, 1.4% (2), had a college or university education. The rest, 10.1% (14), had no

formal education. It is, however, clear that a large majority of respondents had a low level of education in a formal sense, which could impact on their level of involvement and participation in tourism development. Interestingly, the respondents were highly diverse in terms of their ages with age groups 25-34 years, 35-44 years and 45-59 years being equally represented by 27.3% (38) each. Some 9.45% (13) had their ages between 16 and 24 years old while 7.9% (11) were 60 years or above (Table 9).

As noted, the respondents were generally well spread across age, gender and places of residence. They had varying periods of living and experience in the study area, Barabarani village. The majority of them, 59%, had lived in the village since they were born while 32.4% had lived there longer than 10 years. Only 8.6% had lived in that area for less than 10 years. This implies that the respondents were long-time members of the local community. Of all the respondents, 64% were peasants or small-scale farmers while 6.5% were employed full-time in the formal sector and 21.6% were doing small-scale business activities. The rest, 7.9%, were unemployed, which partly gives an indication of the quality of life of Tanzanians given the country's high rate of unemployment (Kweka and Ngowi, 2007).

Table 9. Profiles of survey respondents (N=139)

Respondent characteristics	Number of respondents	Percentage
Gender		
Male	76	54.7
Female	63	45.3
Education		
Primary school education	82	59
Secondary school education	41	29.5
College/university education	2	1.4
Without formal education	14	10.1
Age		
16-24 years old	14	9.4
25-34 years old	38	27.3
35-44 years old	38	27.3
45-59 years old	38	27.3
60 + years old	11	7.9
Period of living		
Lived less than 10 years	12	8.6
Lived longer than 10 years stay	45	32.4
Born in the study area	82	59
Occupation		
Peasants	89	64
Business	30	21.6
Employed full-time	9	6.5
Unemployed	11	7.9
Sub-village		
Kisutu sub-village (R)	21	15.1
Korea (R)	16	11.5
National Housing (R)	16	11.5
Magadini (F)	19	13.7
Jangwani (F)	16	11.5
Migungani 'A'	19	13.7
Migungani 'B' (F)	12	8.6
Kigongoni (R)	20	14.4
Location		
Zone (R) sub-villages	92	66.2
Zone (F) sub-villages	47	33.8

(R)= sub-villages close to the road

(F)=sub-villages far from the road

Source: Field survey, June-August 2008

3.5.5 Strengths and limitations of the household survey

The questionnaire administration technique adopted in this study, researcher-completed questionnaire survey, was chosen because of its key strengths in relation to the commonly used, the respondent-completed questionnaire survey. First, it is more accurate in the sense that the filling in or writing is done by the researcher. Second, it generates higher response rate. Third, it allows clarification of the questions. And fourth, it provides fuller and more complete answers than the respondent-completed questionnaire (see section 3.5).

However, one of the limitations of this study was that some respondents showed partial participation in the study in the sense that they completely withdrew after responding to some of the survey questions simply because they were in hurry with other obligations. While in such circumstances a particular questionnaire was either discarded or considered depending on how many questions remained unanswered in relation to the total number of questions in that questionnaire, limitations arise from two sources. First, in the case where a particular questionnaire was discarded, the whole exercise became costly in terms of time and financial resources. Second, in the case where the incompletely-filled questionnaires were included in the analysis, there is a possibility that the incomplete ones might have impacted on the representation and relationships of some key variables of the study.

While every respondent was encouraged to speak to ensure that the researcher gets the most out of this approach, interviewer-completed survey questionnaire, the fact that questionnaire surveys rely on information from respondents, implies that what

respondents say would normally depend on their own power of recall, and on their honesty (Veal, 1997). However, the researcher did not notice any of the problems observed by Veal.

3.6 Field observations

Other sources of primary data included personal observations of the community-based tourism activities available in the study area, especially whenever an opportunity arose. The researcher visited all the eight sub-villages in the study area and was involved three times in a village tour, with the intention to physically see, among other things, the community tourism activities going on there. This day-by-day observation provided the researcher with an opportunity to participate in various community-based tourism activities together with two differently scheduled groups of tourists who visited the study area. Additionally, personal observation not only allowed the researcher to witness various tourism activities conducted by the local communities, but also provided him with a better understanding of what happens in the study area in relation to tourism, a realistic situation, rather than just relying on reported information. While “the good researcher is all eyes”, careful observation often aids in interpreting data (Veal, 1997, p.127).

3.7 Document analysis

Document analysis, especially for programme reports, Tanzania government documents, Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA) publications and other documents relevant to community-based tourism in the study area and in Tanzania in general, formed an important tool for the collection of secondary data for this study. Although,

such documents often provide data primarily for administrative use and research is only a secondary use, they provided useful insights or information that helped to answer the research questions. A number of relevant documents from interviewees' offices were also accessed. As mentioned, it is worth noting that some of the information or data obtained from document analysis such as that showing how tourism benefits were distributed was treated as primary data. This is because some participants provided such documents for an answer to the question that asked them to state how they distribute the benefits that they get from their tourism activities.

3.8 The multiple-method approach and the research questions

It is, however, imperative to note that data collection techniques employed in this thesis (in-depth semi-structured interviews, household survey, field observation, and document analysis) complemented each other and ensured comparison while enabling crosschecking of the findings from one technique with those of another. This means, the research questions would be well addressed by using a multiple method approach bearing in mind the nature of survey respondents and interview participants involved in this study. As it will be revealed in the chapters 4-7, field observations allowed the researcher to cross-check survey and interview data. In addition, analysis of the qualitative data from the survey revealed that the location of a particular sub-village in relation to the main road was one of the factors that determined local people's access to tourism benefits. But analysis of the quantitative data showed that location was not a distinguishing factor.

Table 10 indicates how each of these four techniques of data collection is linked to each research question in terms of providing data that was used to addressing that particular question. In other words, it shows where data for a particular research question came from. As it can be clearly noted from Table 10, one may argue that in-depth semi-structured interviews were the main technique of data collection for this study as they provided data that was relevant to address all of the research questions. On the other hand, research question 5 was addressed by data from all four techniques of data collection used in this study.

Table 10. Relationship between data collection techniques and research questions

Research question	Techniques of data collection employed			
	In-depth interviews	Household surveys	Field observations	Document analysis
1. What are the views of local people towards community involvement in tourism development?	√	√	√	
2. What are appropriate roles of local people in tourism development?	√	√		
3. To what extent do local people participate in Mto wa Mbu tourism development decision-making process	√	√	√	
4. To what extent have tourism businesses in Mto wa Mbu developed benefit-sharing schemes?	√		√	√
5. What are the views of local people on the contribution of tourism development towards poverty reduction?	√	√	√	√

Source: Field data, June-August 2008

3.9 Data analysis and presentation

The completed questionnaires were coded and the quantitative data was analysed by using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) - computer software. Qualitative data or more specifically, free responses arising from open-ended questions that respondents answered using their own words, were coded into a set of categories developed from identified commonalities. In other words, repeated themes were recorded together and categories of themes identified as they emerged. However, in some cases responses from such open-questions were treated purely as qualitative data, in the same way as data emanating from the other technique of the study data collection methodology- the in-depth semi-structured interviews, with an approach that focused on meaning drawn from the content of the data and considered in a particular context (Finn *et al*, 2000). For all the qualitative data, paraphrasing while remaining faithful to the original meaning as it was given by the respondent and/or selecting illustrative quotes that have been applied in a particular context, were the two approaches used to display qualitative data collected by the in-depth interviews. It also important to note that all the qualitative data had to be translated from Swahili back to English.

Respondents were asked to rate their quantitative survey responses on a 5-point Likert scale where 1 = strongly disagree/significantly worse/very poor; 2 = disagree/worse/poor; 3 = make no difference; 4 = agree/improved/good; and 5 = strongly agree/significantly improved/very good, depending on a particular question (see appendix 1). The analysis of such responses (quantitative data) from the survey by SPSS produced frequencies, percentages, means and cross-tabulations of responses on each aspect. Calculation of frequency distribution and the mean and standard deviation provided descriptive

statistical analysis of quantitative data collected by the questionnaire survey. Quantitative responses were also categorized, analyzed, and examined based on various respondent groups such as gender, occupation, education, and the location of the sub-villages they come from (far from the main road or close to the road). It should be further noted that the question of how far from the road are the sub-villages grouped as ‘far from the road’ is arbitrarily not the actual distance that matters as all sub-villages are roughly within 10-20 minutes drive depending on where one starts. What really counts in this context is whether someone who lives nearer to the road in such a way that has an advantage over the others in terms of access to the tourist market. This ‘location advantage’ matters because the similarity in tourism products is mainly determined by the tourism resources available in the study area. With this similarity in mind, in practice, it is sensible to those who bring tourists to Mto wa Mbu to conveniently take their guests to areas located close to the road, thereby creating the notion of tourism being for those living along the road.

The main themes of this study were then examined across such respondent groups. This enabled perceptual differences between respondent categories to be explored, relationships between variables to be established, and allowed a move from purely descriptive to explanatory analysis. It is important to acknowledge that while it was necessary to split respondents into such categories so as to carry out a detailed analysis, some small sized categories were created that might have impacted on the representation and relationships of some key variables of the study (see Table 9). Table 11 indicates how each of the respondent groups and interviewees are linked to the main themes of the research study.

Table 11. Relationship between participant/respondent groups and the main research themes

Research theme	Respondent characteristics				Interviewees		
	Location	Gender	Occupation	Education	Village government officials	Tourism businesses	NGOs
1. Knowledge of the positive impacts of tourism development	√	√	√	√	√		
2. Means of involving the local community in tourism development	√	√	√	√	√		
3. The role of the local community in tourism development	√	√	√	√	√		
4. Who should make decisions on tourism development	√	√	√	√	√		
5. Tourism benefit-sharing schemes					√	√	√
6. The contribution of tourism development on poverty alleviation	√	√	√	√	√		

In presenting the findings from the quantitative data of the survey, the thesis has adopted two basic approaches to reporting results from the survey research: indices of central tendency- the use of means and standard deviations in this case; and indices of response patterns-the use of frequencies and percentages (Kusluvan and Kusluvan, 2000; Rogelberg, 2002). Whereas means and standard deviations have useful statistical properties and are simple yet powerful measures, frequencies and percentages are thought to simplify and improve communicability of the data results (Rogelberg, 2002). It is noteworthy to remember that these two approaches have been used separately or in combination depending on the nature of the question asked and the key point the research

project aims to stress so as to fully address a particular research question. The results obtained are presented in tables.

The quantitative findings arising from the questionnaires were reinforced by the results of qualitative data emanating from respondents' comments on the household survey questionnaires and from interviews with local government agencies, community-based tourism organizations, NGOs and the private sector. In addition, the findings from the interviews and survey are integrated and compared with those from field observations and document analysis.

3.10 An analytical framework

To ensure effective overall conclusions from this research project, it was necessary to develop a coherent analytical framework through which the analysis and findings could be structured and compared. The framework outlines patterns of analysis at the same time acting as a foundation for understanding the relationships between various issues the research project seeks to address. The analytical framework developed to address this study's research questions is summarized in Figure 8. This framework suggests that local community's knowledge about the positive impacts of tourism has a bearing on their perceptions of community involvement and participation in tourism development, their participation in tourism development decision-making process, and their participation in the sharing of the benefits that tourism development has on certain key aspects of their life examined in this study such as employment, entrepreneurship, income, and accessibility. This in turn influences their participation in the industry and eventually their views on the contribution of the industry towards poverty alleviation (Figure 8). On

the other hand, the framework suggests that local community's views on the contribution of tourism on poverty alleviation can be a reflection of their participation in tourism development and the benefits they get from the industry.

Figure 8. An analytical framework for assessing local community involvement and participation in the tourism industry

3.11 Study limitations and strengths

Having looked at the limitations of the main techniques used to collect primary data for this study, it is worth noting that the limitations outlined in this study should not

invalidate the findings of this study but rather be taken as a basis for improvement in future studies. In other words, the study still serve as an indication of what is likely to be the reality despite such identified limitations, which, in most cases, aim to indicate the context through which the results may be understood.

One of the strengths of this study lies in the quality of data used. As mentioned, study data were collected using a combination of multiple techniques, whereby data from one technique were integrated and compared with those from other techniques. This helped to verify and strengthen the results of the research study. The results are also strengthened through the triangulation of both quantitative and qualitative data. In this study, both the quantitative and qualitative results have been complementing each other. In addition, the study is also strengthened by the fact that it brings together perspectives from tourism stakeholders at the community level, where, because of various reasons including language and cultural barriers-among others, many researchers have not been able to explore this topic. While most studies have focused on public or community tourism businesses to address tourism benefit sharing, this research has taken a further step, in that it examines both public or community-based tourism businesses as well as private businesses. Furthermore, the results are strengthened by the researcher's two-month period of field observations and experience in the micro case study area, coupled with the researcher's experience with the wider community in the study country, Tanzania. Indeed, the study sheds light and acts as a starting-point for future studies and is a useful source of information regarding local communities' involvement and participation in the tourism industry in Tanzania and elsewhere.

3.12 Conclusion

This chapter has outlined four major reasons to justify why the study was carried out in Mto wa Mbu: its location; the presence of CCS programme; the presence of on-going community-based tourism activities; and the presence of tourism establishments. It has also described various tourism stakeholders who were involved in this study: ordinary local people; village local government officials (decision-makers); tourism businesses; and NGOs.

The chapter has also considered the whole process of data collection, from the designing of the research instruments used in this study (questionnaire and interview checklists) to using those instruments in the field. It has described four techniques of data collection employed in this study (household survey, interviews, field observations and document analysis) and considered a number of limitations associate with each technique.

It is important to note, however, that the use of a combination of multiple methods in this study was adopted because of the need to address the same research questions from different angles and the need to improve the validity of the results while complementing and comparing the findings of one method with that of another. While each method significantly contributed to the success of this research, the approach of examining something in different ways indeed increased the chances of understanding it (Long, 2007).

The findings of this study are presented in three chapters to address five research questions. The following chapter presents and discusses the findings of the research

questions 1 and 2: what are the views of local people towards community involvement in tourism development, and what are appropriate roles of local people in tourism development? Chapter five addresses research questions 3 and 4: to what extent do local people participate in the Mto wa Mbu tourism development decision-making process, and to what extent have tourism businesses in Mto wa Mbu developed benefit-sharing schemes? Chapter six addresses research question 5: what are the views of the local community on the contribution of community tourism towards poverty reduction?

CHAPTER FOUR: COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND PARTICIPATION IN TOURISM

4.1 Introduction

The findings of this research project are presented in this and the next two chapters. This chapter discusses the extent of local communities' involvement and participation in the study area's tourism industry. The chapter begins by analysing the answers given to closed-ended survey questions that aimed to assess respondents' knowledge of the positive impacts of tourism. Open-ended responses are used to explain the quantitative results. The findings from such analysis are integrated and compared with those from field observations and interviews. This will verify and strengthen the survey findings while drawing and bringing together views from key tourism stakeholders available in the study area (Barabarani village, Mto wa Mbu): the wider community and the decision-makers within the community. The chapter continues with a more detailed discussion of how local communities in the study area are involved in the tourism industry, how they participate in the industry, and how they view their current level of involvement and participation in tourism. It concludes with a summary of the results that brings together key points and issues raised in this chapter.

4.2 Local communities' knowledge of the positive impacts of tourism

As mentioned in the methodology chapter (see section 3.5.1), the questionnaire included questions that aimed to gauge whether respondents had knowledge about the positive impacts of tourism. This was useful from two perspectives. First, to be able to understand the study sample population, particularly in terms of their basic knowledge about tourism in economic, social, and cultural contexts. Second, to enable the researcher to assess

their responses and arguments in relation to the questions asked that helped gauge whether the respondents involved understood the questions and provided relevant responses.

In order to assess local communities' knowledge about tourism, respondents from among the local people were asked to rate their level of agreement or disagreement with a series of statements, using a 5-point Likert scale (see section 3.8). Table 12 presents the results of responses for each of these statements, ordered from the highest to the lowest mean. When the results are carefully examined, it is clear that the mean scores of all variables are above 4, which implies that overall responses spread between agree and strongly agree. It can also be observed that the difference between the mean scores is small, indicating broadly similar opinions about the impacts suggested by the statements.

Table 12. Local communities' knowledge of the positive impacts of tourism (N= 139)

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about tourism?	Mean ^a	SD
Tourism generates income	4.31	0.60
Meeting tourists promotes cross-cultural exchange (greater mutual understanding and respect one another's culture)	4.31	0.87
Tourism provides many worthwhile employment opportunities	4.15	0.81
Tourism encourages a variety of cultural activities by the local population	4.14	0.92

^aThe higher the mean score, the stronger is the agreement

Based on both mean and standard deviation scores, it appears that there was strongest agreement to the statement that tourism generates income. This statement gained the highest scores (mean 4.31, SD 0.6). These results suggest that local people understand and appreciate the contribution of tourism as a source of income. Analysis of the

interviews with decision-makers supported this. For example, one elected village government official commented,

“Believe me! All sources of people’s income you see in Mto wa Mbu come from tourism either directly or indirectly. If you want to prove this come back here during the low season (April and May) and you will note that everybody feels the pinch”. (Government 2)

The statement that ‘meeting tourists promotes cross-cultural exchange (greater mutual understanding and respect one another’s culture)’ had the second highest score (mean 4.31, SD 0.87). While this exchange can be positive or negative or both, overall, the findings imply that local people were aware of the fact that tourism presents an opportunity for cultural exchange between them and the tourists. In this aspect the survey results are congruent with some interviewees who agreed that tourism in Mto wa Mbu has allowed Black and White people the opportunity to interact. One interviewed local government leader said,

“I don’t know why, but some tourists really like to be so close with local people so we normally chat, eat, drink, and dance together. To us this is a great opportunity to learn different cultures! In addition, through meeting tourists, others (including my son) have established strong friendship with some of them”. (Government 5)

The statement that ‘tourism provides many worthwhile employment opportunities’ had the third highest scores (mean 4.15, SD 0.81). The results suggest that local communities in Mto wa Mbu are aware of the positive impacts tourism development has on issues like employment. It was also highlighted by interviewees that many members of the community are formally or informally employed in the tourism industry either directly or indirectly. For example, some members were employed by tourism establishments

(restaurants, hotels, campsites etc), whereas others had their own vegetable gardens that sell their produce to tourism establishments.

Finally, the statement that ‘tourism encourages a variety of cultural activities by the local population’ had the fourth highest ranking. This was represented by a mean of 4.14 (SD 0.92). It implies that local communities had some positive views of the direct impact tourism has on cultural activities. This matches with personal observations by the researcher that many tourism activities going on in the study area such as Maasai Boma, curio shops, wood carvings, painting, fishing, and farming were linked to the community’s culture.

In order to explore perceptual differences between respondents, establish relationships between variables, and to mark the move from purely descriptive to explanatory analysis, responses were categorized, analyzed, and examined across various respondent groups. Table 13 presents a breakdown of mean scores of each variable by respondent groups (location, gender, occupation, and education). Based on the mean scores of each variable, the results appear to suggest that overall all respondents involved in this study survey had high levels of awareness of positive impacts of tourism despite their differences in terms of the location of sub-villages they came from, gender, occupation, and education. A closer look of the results reveals that even including group categories with very small numbers of respondents, the lowest mean was still only 3.38 and the highest was 5.00, though this was in a category of only 2 respondents. Interestingly, even respondents who described themselves as peasants had some knowledge about positive economic and

socio-cultural impacts of tourism. Understanding of the consequences of tourism could also suggest that public awareness of tourism among local communities in Barabarani village, Mto wa Mbu has been demonstrated. This may be interpreted as a reflection of their attitudes and receptiveness to tourist and the sector itself, which are important issues to consider when planning for tourism development.

Table 13. Knowledge of the positive impacts of tourism by categories of respondents (N=139)

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about tourism?	Respo ndents	Cultural activities		Employment opportunities		Income		Cross-cultural exchange	
Variable	N	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Location									
Zone (R) sub-villages	92	4.15	0.95	4.16	0.82	4.41	0.58	4.32	0.89
Zone (F) sub-villages	47	4.13	0.88	4.13	0.80	4.11	0.60	4.30	0.83
Gender									
Males	76	4.08	0.95	4.21	0.70	4.29	0.56	4.26	0.93
Females	63	4.22	0.89	4.08	0.92	4.33	0.65	4.37	0.79
Occupation									
Peasants	89	4.09	0.97	4.07	0.92	4.27	0.64	4.26	0.87
Businessmen/women	30	4.17	0.83	4.30	0.54	4.20	0.41	4.27	1.02
Employed full-time	9	4.33	1.00	4.56	0.53	4.56	0.73	4.44	0.53
Unemployed	11	4.36	0.67	4.09	0.54	4.73	0.47	4.73	0.47
Education									
Primary education	82	4.30	0.81	4.12	0.87	4.33	0.63	4.39	0.81
Secondary education	41	3.88	1.05	4.27	0.71	4.32	0.61	4.27	0.71
College/university education	2	4.50	0.71	4.50	0.71	4.50	0.71	5.00	0.00
No formal education	14	3.93	1.00	3.93	0.73	4.14	0.36	3.86	1.41
Overall mean		4.14		4.15		4.31		4.31	

(R)= sub-villages close to the road

(F)=sub-villages far from the road

The results from the above knowledge assessment suggest that local communities in the study area are aware that tourism can be a means of preserving local cultures as it encourages a variety of cultural activities. They show appreciation of the employment benefits generated by tourism. They also seem to acknowledge that tourism generates income, and meeting tourists promotes cross-cultural exchange. Overall, the findings build an impression that the study sample population had some knowledge about the positive economic and socio-cultural impacts of tourism. The following section provides a detailed discussion of the main findings of the research questions 1, which is about views of local people towards community involvement in tourism development.

4.3 Involvement of local community in tourism development

As pointed out in the section 2.7, community participation in the tourism industry often depends on the involvement of local people in the tourism development process. In order to understand the extent of local community involvement in tourism in the study area, it is perhaps important to assess how these communities in this area like to be involved in tourism and to what extent. One approach to address this is to examine local people's perceptions over a variety of ways of involving the local community in tourism, and indicate the ways that local people consider to be suitable for involving them in tourism development. In turn, this provides a wider picture of the nature of community involvement local people expect, and establishes the basis through which the current applied ways, if any, in the study area could be compared and contrasted.

Thus, in order to determine the extent of local community involvement in the study area's tourism industry, through the household survey questionnaire, respondents were asked on

a 5-point Likert scale how strongly they agree or disagree with a series of six statements regarding varying ways of involving local community in tourism. The mean scores of each statement are ordered from the highest to the lowest mean. The results of each variable are presented in Table 14 below. Overall, local people viewed all these six ways as appropriate for involving them in tourism development. The mean scores for all variables are above 4, suggesting strong agreement with these statements. In fact, when prompted by an open-ended question, respondents did not provide any other possibilities that they considered being appropriate ways of involving them in tourism. One respondent for example, said,

“I don’t see any other possibilities, I think we could consider which one is best among these [suggested by the statements]”

Table 14. Local people’s view on means of involving them in tourism (N= 139)

In your views, what are suitable means of involving local residents in tourism development?	Mean	SD
Taking part actively in the tourism decision-making process	4.44	0.58
Responding to a tourism survey	4.38	0.85
Attending tourism related seminar, conference, workshops	4.36	0.73
Encouraging local people to work for the tourism sector	4.21	0.77
Encouraging local people to invest in the tourism sector	4.18	0.83
Sharing tourism benefits	4.04	1.04

According to Table 14, the respondents had a tendency to support the idea that they should take part actively in the tourism decision-making process. In fact, this was the most popularly accepted option (mean 4.44, SD 0.58). However, it is interesting and

perhaps surprising to see that respondents regarded ‘responding to a tourism survey’ (mean 4.38, SD 0.85) and ‘attending tourism related seminar, conference or workshops’ (mean 4.36, SD 0.73) as appropriate means by which they could be involved in tourism development. These results contrast with those from a household survey carried out in Turkey by Tosun in 2006, which found out that only a small portion of the study population regarded ‘attending tourism related seminar, conference or workshops’ (45%) and ‘responding to a tourism survey’ (23%) as appropriate ways of community involvement in tourism development. It should be noted here that the researcher, after doing some data entry for the closed-ended questions while in the field and running some trial frequencies, found that there was an emerging tendency among respondents to react more positively to these two options (‘attending tourism related seminar, conference or workshops’ and ‘responding to a tourism survey’) than previous studies suggest. Since there was not an option in the questionnaire for comments on this question, the researcher decided to question some respondents on these two variables in the middle of the survey so as to probe more as to why they held such a view point.

These responses established two factors that could have influenced the respondents’ tendency to support the idea that local people should attend tourism related seminars, conferences or workshops as a suitable way of involving them in tourism development. These were namely, the desire to learn more and the desire to get money. It should be noted that in Tanzania seminars, conferences, and workshops are in most cases associated with sitting allowances or per diems. One survey respondent for example, underlined in open-ended responses that,

“We also need to attend these [seminars, conferences, and workshops] so we can get something [money] and learn at the same time. Every time we hear about seminar is for our leaders, why not for us as well!”

However, regarding the respondents’ tendency to support the idea that local people should respond to the tourism survey as a suitable way for community involvement in tourism, some respondents stated that responding to any survey (not necessarily a tourism survey) is an opportunity for them to express their views. In addition, they mentioned that surveys tend to give them more freedom of expression than airing their concerns in the presence of their leaders, something they think could create hostility as they feel some of their problems are caused by some of their leaders. Furthermore, respondents also had the feeling that their involvement in a survey gives them the opportunity to express their concerns and to be heard by outsiders.

The statement, ‘encouraging local people to work for the tourism sector’ is a suitable means for community involvement in tourism, had the fourth highest score (mean 4.21, SD 0.77) while the statement that ‘encouraging local people to invest in the tourism sector’ is an appropriate way to involve local community in tourism development was ranked the fifth (mean 4.18, SD 0.83).

The idea that ‘sharing tourism benefits’ with the local community is a suitable way of involving local people in tourism development, had the lowest mean (mean 4.04, SD 1.04). However, based on standard deviation scores, it is surprising that responses for this statement were more widely dispersed from the mean, suggesting that there were

relatively more respondents who strongly opposed the idea and who strongly supported it. This could be attributed to what interviewees described as ‘a selfish nature of human beings’ in the sense that people are always reluctant to share the benefits they get with others. Emphasizing this point, one tourism group leader said,

“Sharing tourism benefits is a little tricky, because in essence it means you toil by yourself but at the end of the day you share what you get [profit] with someone who was just sitting!”. (Leader 2)

Further examination into the above quantitative data revealed that, based on the mean scores presented in Table 15 below, overall it appears that all respondents, regardless of the location of the sub-villages they live in, gender, occupation, and education, agreed with a series of six statements provided about varying ways of involving the local community in tourism development. However, some slightly perceptual differences exist between respondent groups as can be observed from the variations in the mean scores.

Table 15. Views by categories of local people on means of involving the local community in tourism development (N= 139)

In your views, what are suitable means of involving local residents in tourism development?	Respondents	Invest in tourism	Work in tourism	Decision-making	Sharing benefits	Tourism survey	Tourism seminar
Location	N	M	M	M		M	M
Zone (R) sub-villages	92	4.18	4.25	4.45	4.07	4.53	4.49
Zone (F) sub-villages	47	4.17	4.13	4.43	4.00	4.09	4.11
Gender							
Males	76	4.18	4.20	4.38	4.08	4.37	4.34
Females	63	4.17	4.22	4.52	4.00	4.40	4.38
Occupation							
Peasants	89	4.20	4.22	4.44	3.92	4.40	4.37
Businessmen/women	30	4.13	4.10	4.47	4.07	4.40	4.33
Employed full-time	9	4.11	4.33	4.56	4.22	4.44	4.33
Unemployed	11	4.18	4.27	4.27	4.82	4.09	4.36
Education							
Primary education	82	4.29	4.37	4.46	3.93	4.44	4.38
Secondary education	41	4.10	4.05	4.49	4.07	4.41	4.39
College/university education	2	4.00	5.00	4.50	5.00	4.50	4.50
No formal education	14	3.79	3.64	4.21	4.50	3.93	4.14
Overall mean		4.18	4.21	4.44	4.04	4.38	4.36

(R)= sub-villages close to the road

(F)=sub-villages far from the road

The following section discusses the main findings of the research questions 2, which is about appropriate roles of local people in tourism development.

4.4 Community participation in tourism development

Having examined local people's perceptions of different ways of involving local communities in tourism development, it is important now to assess their views about what should be an appropriate role of the local community in tourism development. As noted throughout this thesis, one of the core elements of tourism development is to encourage local communities' participation in the industry. A common argument seeking to encourage this is that the role of the local people in tourism development is crucial. Thus, one approach towards gauging the extent of local community participation in the study area's tourism industry is to assess their views regarding the role they have in tourism development. To achieve this, respondents were asked on a 5-point Likert scale how strongly they agree or disagree with seven statements regarding varying types of community participation. Each statement had an option for comments to support the respondent's level of agreement or disagreement. Table 16 below presents the quantitative results for each of these statements.

Table 16. Local people's view on their role in tourism development (N= 139)

In your views, what should be an appropriate role of local people in tourism development?	Mean	SD
Local people should be consulted when tourism policies are being made	4.47	0.72
Local people should have a voice in the decision-making process of local tourism development	3.92	0.87
Local people should be financially supported to invest in tourism development	3.78	1.23
Local people should take the leading role as entrepreneurs	3.75	0.94
Local people should be consulted but the final decision on the tourism development should be made by formal bodies	3.29	1.27
Local people should take the leading role as workers at all levels	2.92	1.32
Local people should not participate by any means	1.32	0.67

Overall, the respondents viewed five out of seven options as appropriate roles of local people in tourism development. The mean scores for top five statements in Table 16 are above 3, suggesting generally that respondents tended to support these ideas, but showed strongest support to the idea that local people should be consulted when tourism policies are being made (mean 4.47, SD 0.58). The second most accepted option was the idea that local people should have a voice in the decision-making process of local tourism development (mean 3.92, SD 0.87). The idea, 'should be financially supported to invest in tourism development' (mean 3.78, SD 1.23), had the third highest ranking followed by the statement that local people should take the leading role as entrepreneurs (mean 3.75, SD 0.94). The statement, 'local people should be consulted, but the final decision on the tourism development should be made by formal bodies', was the last among the five options that were supported (mean 3.29, SD 1.27).

On the other extreme, the respondents overall rejected the statement that the 'local people should not participate in tourism development by any means' (mean 1.32, SD 0.72). This was the only negatively worded statement in the series. The remaining statement, 'local people should take the leading role as workers at all levels' (mean 2.92, SD 1.32), is positively worded but still respondents disagreed with it. However, based on standard deviations, it seems there was a broader range of responses to three statements: local people should be consulted but the final decision on the tourism development should be made by formal bodies; local people should take the leading role as workers at all levels; and local people should be financially supported to invest in tourism development. This

suggests that there were relatively more respondents who seemed to favour extreme responses (strongly agree and strongly disagree) when responding to these statements.

Further analysis of the responses across the profile variables revealed that overall respondents, regardless of their location, gender, occupation, and education, embraced five out of seven statements, but showed mixed views about two statements: local people should be consulted but the final decision on the tourism development should be made by formal bodies; and local people should take the leading role as workers at all levels (Table 17).

Table 17. Views by categories of local people on the role of the local community in tourism development (N= 139)

In your views, what should be an appropriate role of local people in tourism development?	Respondents	Entrepreneurs	Workers	Voice	Policies	Consulted	Not participate	Financially supported
Variable	Number	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Location								
Zone (R) sub-villages	92	3.79	2.72	3.96	4.46	3.39	1.29	3.68
Zone (F) sub-villages	47	3.66	3.32	3.85	4.51	3.09	1.36	3.98
Gender								
Males	76	3.70	2.97	3.91	4.49	3.28	1.33	3.95
Females	63	3.81	2.86	3.94	4.46	3.30	1.30	3.59
Occupation								
Peasants	89	3.73	2.85	3.82	4.40	3.22	1.30	3.71
Businessmen/women	30	3.87	3.17	4.03	4.53	3.40	1.30	3.77
Employed full-time	9	3.56	2.56	4.11	4.67	3.11	1.22	4.11
Unemployed	11	3.73	3.09	4.27	4.73	3.64	1.55	4.18
Education								
Primary education	82	3.80	2.77	3.86	4.46	3.22	1.29	3.71
Secondary education	41	3.63	3.12	4.10	4.71	3.51	1.24	3.98
College/university education	2	3.50	2.50	4.50	4.50	2.50	1.00	3.50
No formal education	14	3.79	3.29	3.79	3.86	3.14	1.71	3.71
Overall mean		3.75	2.92	3.92	4.47	3.29	1.32	3.78

(R)= sub-villages close to the road

(F)=sub-villages far from the road

The results suggest that respondents from sub-villages located far from the road supported the idea of local people taking the leading role as workers at all levels while those from sub-villages close to the road were against this idea. It is however, important to note here that there was a general perception among members of the local community

that the presence of this tarmac road facilitates tourism activities among communities living close to it (see section 3.9). Though slight differences exist in the mean scores, up to this point the quantitative findings have not established clearly whether this perception was a reality. One respondent for example, noted when asked to give comments to one question,

“Tourism is for those living along the road. They block them [tourists] there and give them everything, so we never see them in our area”.

The results also revealed that there were both male and female respondents who disagreed with the idea of local people taking the leading role as workers at all levels. In addition, respondents who described themselves as peasants, full-time employees in the public or private sectors, and primary school or college/university education holders also tended to disagree with this statement. Respondents who possessed college or university education were also against the idea that local people should be consulted but the final decision on the tourism development should be made by formal bodies. Overall, the results appear to suggest that all respondents rejected the statement that the ‘local people should not participate in tourism development by any means’ despite their differences in terms of gender, education, occupation, and the location of sub-villages they came from.

4.4.1 Local people’s reasons for their ratings

Analysis of respondents’ comments revealed that a number of reasons were given by the survey respondents to support their ratings in the above quantitative research results. Such reasons are discussed in the following paragraphs under each of the statements given to respondents, arranged in order of importance based on mean scores. They are

integrated and compared with the results from the interviews and field observations in order to strengthen and provide a more integrated understanding of the survey results.

Whether local people should be consulted when tourism policies are being made (mean 4.47, SD 0.72)

Regarding the statement that ‘local people should be consulted when tourism policies are being made’, which was the first most accepted option based on quantitative results (see Table 16), the respondents raised various points in favour of their arguments. Supporters for example, argued that the statement suggests an important idea that would ensure local people have an opportunity to express their views to policymakers. It also ensures policymakers get views from stakeholders so they can prepare a policy that meets stakeholders’ needs and addresses their concerns. The outcome from this would be the participation of more stakeholders, including local people, in the industry, motivated by the feeling of being committed through their involvement in policy design. The respondents also felt that the idea would help to ensure policymakers hear, and probably consider, local people’s views, needs, priorities, and concerns. It would help to avoid policymakers’ tendency to favour government interest at the expense of the local community. However, this has a bearing on one of the issues that most concerns the local communities living adjacent to wildlife-based tourism resources (such as national parks, forestry and game reserves, and other wildlife areas) in Tanzania, i.e. that they have been denied access to arable land in these areas. The perception of these local communities is that the government, without involving them, designed policies that protect tourism resources and deny local people access to land in these areas, which is considered naturally fertile. For instance, one respondent said,

“Look! Wild animals seem to be more valued and protected than our lives. They [policy-makers] deny us land [for agriculture] and set it for animals”.

In contrast, respondents who did not believe in the idea of consulting local people when tourism policies are being made gave two major reasons. First, they emphasized that the government has got plenty of professionals and experts who can design and formulate good policies for the industry, even without consulting local communities who definitely know little as far as tourism is concerned. Second, their feeling is that the problem with the tourism sector, like any other sector in Tanzania, is about the implementation of the policies and not the question of whether local people should be consulted or not as there are already concrete policies in place, but the problem remains poor implementation. Highlighting this, one respondent argued,

“The problem here is not consultation. We have good policies already, but look at what is happening! I am saying the problem is implementation! Officials just put forward their personal interest and leave aside what is stipulated in the policy”.

Whether local people should have a voice in the decision-making process of tourism development (mean 3.92, SD 0.87)

Regarding whether local people should have a voice in the decision-making process of local tourism development, which was the second most accepted option, respondents who supported this statement said that the idea is likely to speed up tourism development in their area since local people know their area (in which tourism takes place) better than any one else. They further underscored that allowing local people to have a voice in development issues (not necessarily tourism development), could help to protect the community interests, and increase transparency and accountability, and wipe out embezzlements and abuse of offices, which are rampant acts amongst decision-makers. In

addition, they were of the feeling that the current level of tourism development is lower than could it be if local people had a voice in tourism development issues. This situation, according to them, is somehow caused by their leaders' reluctance to involve the rest of the community in tourism decision-making process creating 'a blue sky' among community members of what is going on. One respondent for example, said,

“We are left behind, our leaders put forward their interests, but if we had power we could be blocking their dirty deals”.

However, it does seem to some members of the local community in the study area, who opposed the statement, that allowing them to have a voice is likely to undermine efforts to develop the industry as many local people have no formal education so it will be difficult for them to contribute in tourism development issues. They also observed that local people are likely to put forward their interests leaving behind those of the nation because their interests are, in most cases, unjustifiable and often conflict with future generations and the survival of tourism resources. For example, while tourism authorities strive to conserve tourism resources such as wildlife and forestry available in protected areas, local communities living adjacent to these areas have been demanding access to these areas so they could collect firewood and timber, and undertake farming, mining, fishing, and hunting. These are all illegal activities, not allowed in any national park in Tanzania. According to the village government officials interviewed (who were mostly decision-makers), the local community claim that denying local people access to these activities is like denying them enjoyment of the fruits of having tourism resources in their area. For example, there are emerald gemstone deposits located at the boundary between the Lake Manyara National Park and Moya-Mayoka village (not included in this study).

There have been conflicts between the park management and villagers regarding extracting such minerals, with the former denying mining activities because of conservation point of view whereby local people consider such a restriction as a barrier towards their efforts on poverty alleviation. Therefore, local people are likely to allow these activities if they were allowed to have a voice in tourism decisions. In fact, these activities have been the main source of many conflicts between tourism authorities and local communities, and remain challenges to managing national parks and other protected areas in Tanzania. One local government official for example, underlined during field observations,

“Tomorrow I will take you to Jangwani [a sub-village far from the road, but close to Lake Manyara National Park-LMNP]. There you will realize how people are against the idea of conservation of tourism resources! In fact, many poachers arrested in Mto wa Mbu come from this sub-village. They illegally fish in Lake Manyara [which is part of the LMNP], hunt wild animals, and cut down tree from the park for timbers and firewood”.
(Government 3)

In addition, there were some fears among the respondents that giving local people a voice in tourism development is likely to lead to making uninformed decisions because they lack expertise. Yet others had the view that tourism development issues are too hard for the local people to make sound decisions, thus they urged the need for them to have a voice in only such issues that they are capable of.

Whether local people should be financially supported to invest in tourism development (mean 3.78, SD 1.23)

Respondents also provided various views regarding the idea of local people being financially supported to invest in tourism development. Those who supported this idea, which had the third highest ranking, raised five major reasons for their stand. First, they believe the idea will lead to more and improved tourism facilities (hotels, campsites, restaurants, etc), tourism products and services in their area. Second, more employment opportunities will be created by the increased number of investments in their area. Third, the idea will also increase and improve local people's capacity to invest as entrepreneurs since currently lack of financial capital remains their greatest hindrance towards investing in the industry. Fourth, it aims to increase and improve tourism products and services for the tourists as many people will get into the business, thereby increasing competition. Lastly, the idea is likely to motivate many people to bring in their talents and passions, and consequently speed up tourism development in their area. One survey respondent said,

“As you know, you need financial capital to set up an income-generating project. This is why most of us are unable to invest in tourism, it's not that we don't like!”

On the other side, the respondents who rejected the idea expressed their fears about tourism business being not profitable any more as more people will engage in the same business. According to them, the idea also tends to bring in more tourism investments than required by the market. This will, in turn, make many of these investments unviable and redundant as so far there are few tourists who visit their area. In addition, the idea may lead to the loss of valuable financial resources as not all people prefer to invest in tourism. This can happen through various ways. Within the local community for example,

the idea may create ‘a pseudo desire’ to invest in the industry so that they could gain financial assistance, which would certainly end up being fruitless. Furthermore, the respondents emphasized the fact that the idea is likely to cause overpopulation as many people from elsewhere in Tanzania will migrate to their area. It should be noted that the survey questions that respondents were asked, focused on tourism development in the study area (Mto wa Mbu) and not on tourism development in general. This is why respondents’ comments assume that such a scheme (of supporting local people financially) would only apply in their village, rather than commenting on tourism development in general. For example, one survey respondent observed,

“It is obvious many people will leave their area and come to live in Mto wa Mbu. You know, some people just hear about tourism, have never tasted it! [referring to money obtained from tourism], so they will now come!”

Whether local people should take the leading role as entrepreneurs in tourism development (mean 3.75, SD 0.94)

The respondents gave various answers regarding whether local people should take the leading role as entrepreneurs in tourism development. Those who supported this fourth highest ranked statement provided four major reasons. First, that enabling local people to take the leading role as entrepreneurs creates more employment opportunities for them. Second, the idea helps them to accrue more income and consequently improve their poor lives. Third, it helps to cultivate a development spirit amongst local people as opposed to the current situation in which migrants are taking the leading role as entrepreneurs. And lastly, the idea helps to ensure that more money is left in the hands of local people who are more likely to transform it into other investments that enhance the growth of their area, as apparently most migrants (the leading entrepreneurs) collect money in Mto wa

Mbu and invest elsewhere. One survey respondent for instance, highlighted when airing comments on this,

“Our town would have grown more if big entrepreneurs here could be local people. You know, they [migrants] just come here to collect money and go! None has even a plan to set up a nice building so our town could look beautiful!”

However, those who opposed the idea of local people taking the leading role as entrepreneurs argued that many of them have no entrepreneurial spirit and therefore it would be difficult for them to be successful entrepreneurs. They also stated that not all local people prefer to put their entrepreneurial skills into tourism as some of them would inevitably go for other livelihood activities such as agriculture or livestock keeping. In addition, there will be little competition and creativity if only local people are allowed to take the leading role as entrepreneurs. Furthermore, many local people have limited financial capacity to enable them take the leading role as entrepreneurs. One respondent said when asked to comment on this,

“You know our lives and you know our financial situation and how hard it is to us to make a living, so how can we be entrepreneurs then! If I had money, I would have owned a tourism business instead”

Whether local people should be consulted but the final decision on the tourism development should be made by formal bodies (mean 3.29, SD 1.27)

Respondents identified various reasons for their rating regarding the statement that ‘local people should be consulted but the final decision on the tourism development should be made by formal bodies’, which was ranking the fifth most accepted option. Those who supported the statement argued that the idea is appropriate because in most cases formal bodies make concrete decisions that balance the needs of the present and future

generations as they often consist of people with wide knowledge and expertise. In addition, local people have little knowledge about tourism and it is not enough to enable them to make tourism related-decisions on their own. Others had the feeling that the decisions made by formal bodies should be final and conclusive as local people alone might fail to make informed decisions due to limited capacity of analysing issues attributed to lack of education. They also observed that even a mere consultation with the local people is by itself enough and appropriate as it makes formal bodies hear, for consideration, views from the local community. One respondent for example, said when giving comments to this question,

“...they [decision-makers] always bypass us, we know it’s because we haven’t gone to school like them, so they think we have nothing to contribute!”

However, respondents who did not like the idea of local people being consulted but the final decisions made by formal bodies, stressed the need to include local people’s involvement in the final decisions as well. This could help them become ‘watchdogs’ amid public outcry in the study area that many members of the formal bodies are not trustworthy as they are often involved in corruption, embezzlement of public funds, and abuse of office. Indeed, this would also ensure that their interests are taken into account, and not by-passed. They also added that formal bodies normally disregard local people’s interests, needs, and priorities, and often come up with decisions that favour only a few individuals, leaving the majority suffering. However, it should be noted here that, for local communities in Mto wa Mbu, much of what respondents describe as community interests are those which involve illegal activities (gathering firewood, timbering, mining,

fishing, hunting and farming in Lake Manyara National Park) mentioned in previous paragraphs.

Whether local people should take the leading role as workers at all levels (mean 2.92, SD 1.32)

The villagers surveyed gave various reasons regarding whether local people should take the leading role as workers at all levels. This is one of the two statements, which gained low scores and were overall rejected by the respondents. Those who supported the idea believe that by doing so could increase local people's access to employment opportunities and consequently improve their poor lives. Indeed, the idea will help to reduce conflicts between the local community and tourism authorities. It also creates room for local people to access high ranked jobs [referring to those in tourist hotels], which are normally given to migrants and foreigners. Moreover, the idea recognizes the fact that local people should be given first priority since tourism happens in their areas. On the other hand, respondents who rejected the idea raised five major points. First, they established that many local people have no formal education to enable them work professionally and successfully at all levels. Second, promoting this idea implies that people from outside Mto wa Mbu, who could bring in new ideas, will be denied an opportunity to work in the area. Third, allowing only local people to work at all levels could reduce work competition thereby jeopardizing efficiency. Fourth, denying people from outside Mto wa Mbu the chance to work in the area's tourism industry might fuel tribalism at work thereby inviting unnecessary conflicts. And fifth, the idea is likely to deprive other people's right to access employment opportunities. One survey respondent for example, put it clearly,

“If only Mto wa Mbu people are allowed to work, do you think other people will be happy? This will be considered as purely tribalism, the start of conflicts as everyone has the right to access job opportunities”

Whether local people should not participate by any means (mean 1.32, SD 0.67)

Regarding the statement that local people should not participate by any means, which had the lowest score, few respondents who supported it believed that local people would concentrate more and use much of their time on other sectors such as agriculture if they are denied participation in tourism. However, it is important to bear in mind that this argument might be a result of a growing tendency amongst local people in the study area to ‘rush at tourism businesses’, thereby leaving little manpower for other crucial sectors. Contributing to this, one respondent commented,

“Everyone dreams about tourism, they waste much of their valuable time doing tourism things, we don’t see them going to farm! So who will be left doing other life sustaining activities [referring to agriculture]... My opinion is that let the whole issue of tourism development in Mto wa Mbu in the hands of our leaders”.

In contrast, the respondents who opposed this idea observed that it would deny local people an opportunity to participate in their area’s development issues. Also, it would be hard for tourism planners to attain their development goals as implementation of activities to achieve their goals highly depends on local people as the main actors. Indeed, the idea is likely to invite conflicts between local people and whoever makes such a decision as it will be hard for local people to access tourism benefits if they won’t participate in any way. In addition, tourism development would decline due to the lack of local people’s support and this would threaten cultural tourism, which is mostly conducted by the local community. The industry, according to them, is also likely to

witness severe sabotage on its resources, increased illegal activities such as poaching, encroachment of conservation areas, environmental destruction, and insecurity to tourists. For example, with consolidated efforts of supporting conservation of tourism resources from the government, private sector, and non-governmental organizations through encouraging local community's participation in tourism, Tanzania is still losing 50,000 wild animals annually due to poaching (Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, 2008). This could mean, when such efforts are no longer in place as the idea suggests, poaching is likely to increase tremendously, thereby threatening the sustainability of the country's tourism resources. One respondent for example, noted,

“Sometimes people just don't want to acknowledge, but the fact is we get something [money] from tourism, and that's why even poaching intensity in LMNP has declined. We know surely without wild animals..., no tourist will come to bring money in our area. But if you stop us from participating, you will note the outcome through poaching”.

Furthermore, the respondents believed that the introduction of this idea (denial of local people's participation in tourism) could rather make tourism planners not consider local community's needs, interests, and priorities anymore. According to them, planners are sometimes forced to consider the community welfare because they would want to attract people's participation in order to achieve their goals.

4.5 Conclusion

This chapter has examined local communities' knowledge of the positive impacts of tourism, involvement of local community in tourism, and community participation in tourism in an attempt to addressing research questions one and two. The chapter has identified a number of key points in relation to community involvement and participation

in the tourism industry that may have important implications for tourism policy design, and to policymakers. The findings have revealed that the respondents involved in this study had basic knowledge about tourism in economic and socio-cultural contexts. According to the results, there was a general agreement among respondents that tourism encourages a variety of cultural activities, and that meeting tourists promotes cross-cultural exchange. They also acknowledge that tourism creates employment opportunities and generates income.

The chapter, through a series of statements given to the respondents, has identified a variety of ways that local people consider to be suitable for involving them in tourism development. The results suggest that the respondents supported all, from ‘taking part actively in the tourism decision-making process’ (mean 4.44) through ‘sharing tourism benefits with the local people’ (mean 4.04), in order of importance based on percentage scores of levels of agreement (Table 14). The results also show that there was a tendency from respondents to respond more positively to two statements: ‘attending tourism related seminar, conferences or workshops’ and ‘responding to a tourism survey’ than previous studies, such as Tosun (2006), suggest.

The chapter has also examined local people’s views regarding the role of the local community in tourism development suggested by a series of seven statements. The results show that respondents while giving a wide range of reasons supported five statements, from ‘local people should be consulted when tourism policies are being made’ (mean 4.47) through ‘local people should be consulted but final decision on the tourism development should be made by formal bodies’ (mean 3.29), in order of importance

based on percentage scores of levels of agreement (Table 16). But they rejected two statements: ‘local people should take the leading role as workers at all levels’ (mean 2.92) and ‘local people should not participate by any means’ (mean 1.32).

The following chapter provides detailed discussion of the findings of this study about local people’s participation in the tourism decision-making process and in the sharing of tourism benefits. The discussion aims to address research questions three and four.

CHAPTER FIVE: COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN TOURISM DEVELOPMENT

5.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the extent of local communities' participation in the tourism decision-making process and in the sharing of tourism benefits. The chapter starts with the analysis of responses given to both closed and open-ended survey questions that assess how local people participate in the decision-making process of tourism development in the study area. The results from the survey analysis are integrated and compared with those from the interviews, thereby verifying and strengthening the survey results. This also helps to draw and bring together perspectives from two categories of people: ordinary members of the local community (survey) and the decision-makers within the community (interviews). The chapter continues with the analysis of interviews to assess how local communities in the study area participate in the sharing of tourism benefits. The analysis of interviews brings together views from a range of decision-makers within the community: local government officials, tourism professionals, tourism businesses, and non-governmental organizations. The findings from the interviews are verified, strengthened, integrated and compared with those from field observations and document analysis. The chapter concludes with a summary that brings together key results from this chapter.

5.2 Community participation in the tourism decision-making process

One of the main arguments in Chapter Two is that participation of local people in the tourism decision-making process and in the sharing of tourism benefits are central to community participation in tourism. This section focuses mainly on one component of

the argument: community participation in the tourism decision-making process. The second component: community participation in the sharing of tourism benefits is discussed in detail in the next section (section 5.3). Thus, in order to provide a broader outlook on the extent of participation of local people in the decision-making process of tourism development, it is important to pinpoint who local communities consider to be well placed to make decisions about tourism development in their area. This will then help to lay out a community perspective in terms of what local people really want against what is currently happening in the tourism decision-making process.

To be able to determine this, respondents were asked on a 5-point Likert scale how strongly they agree or disagree with six statements regarding who should make decisions about tourism development in their area such as the establishment of tourist hotels, camp sites, lodges etc, and who should make decisions in general matters about the Community Conservation Service (CCS) project in their area. Each of these statements had an option for comments to support the respondent's level of agreement or disagreement. It is imperative to note here that such tourism establishments and CCS project were chosen as illustrative examples only since asking respondents about who should make decisions on tourism development in their area without referring to anything could be too hypothetical and vague and respondents may not understand what was meant by 'tourism development'. Thus, the questions were framed around these examples but responses, particularly comments from respondents, were not limited to these. The quantitative data for the two examples (tourism establishments and CCS project) will be presented separately but the qualitative comments will be compared and discussed together as they

are similar. CCS is described briefly in the Methodology Chapter (see section 3.4.2.5). It is an outreach programme developed around all National Parks under the Tanzania National Park Authorities (TANAPA). It is funded with income generated through tourism.

5.2.1 Community participation in the decision-making process regarding development of tourism establishments

Table 18 depicts the quantitative findings of the statements that gauge local people's views regarding who should make decisions about tourism development such as the establishment of tourist hotels, camp sites, and lodges in their area. The results of each of these statements are ranked in order of importance based on mean scores of respondents' levels of agreement to a particular statement. According to the results, the overall mean scores of five out of six statements examined are above 3, indicating that the respondents' level of agreement with the ideas suggested by such statements was overall, above average. The overall mean for one statement, 'market forces should make decisions on tourism development' is 2.84, suggesting that the respondents' level of agreement with this idea was, overall, below average. In other words, the idea was not supported by the respondents.

Table 18. Local people's views about who should make decisions on development of tourism establishments (N= 139)

In your views, who should make decisions on tourism development in Mto wa Mbu such as establishment of tourist hotels, lodges or camp sites etc?	Mean	SD
Appointed and elected local government agencies should jointly make decisions on tourism development in Mto wa Mbu by consulting local people [Appointed & elected officials by consulting locals]	4.29	1.03
A committee elected by public (local people) for specially developing, managing and controlling tourism should make decisions on tourism development in Mto wa Mbu [An elected committee]	3.70	1.01
Elected local government should make decisions on tourism development in Mto wa Mbu [Elected officials]	3.42	1.24
Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism or Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA) should make decisions on tourism development in Mto wa Mbu [MNRT/TANAPA]	3.31	1.06
Appointed local government agencies (who are normally representatives of central government) should make decisions on tourism development in Mto wa Mbu [Appointed officials]	3.14	1.19
Market forces should make decisions on tourism development in Mto wa Mbu [Market forces]	2.84	1.28

When Table 18 is examined based on the ranking of the mean scores of each variable, the results indicate that there was a central tendency among the respondents to support the statement that 'appointed and elected local government agencies should jointly make decisions on tourism development by consulting local people' (mean 4.29, SD 1.03). This statement gained the highest mean score. As mentioned in section 3.4.2.5, appointed local government agencies such as the division secretary, ward executive officer, and village executive officers are representatives of central government, whereas the ward councilors, village chairpersons and secretaries, and sub-villages chairpersons and secretaries are elected by local people from among themselves.

The second was ‘a committee elected by the local people should decide upon tourism development issues’ (mean 3.70, SD 1.01). The statement that ‘the elected local government should decide on tourism development issues’ had the third highest mean score (mean 3.42, SD 1.24). The statement that ‘the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT) or Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA) should make decisions on tourism development issues’ had the fourth highest ranking (mean 3.31, SD 1.06). It should be noted that TANAPA is a parastatal organization currently managing all 14 national parks in Tanzania, including the one in the study area-Lake Manyara National Parks (LMNP). TANAPA operates under the MNRT. The statement that ‘appointed local government should decide on tourism development issues’ had the fifth highest mean score, and the idea of ‘market forces’ had the lowest mean score (mean 2.84, SD 1.28).

However, the standard deviation scores show that the responses were overall spread far from the mean, with a broader range noted to three statements (SD of 1.19 and above): market forces should make decisions on tourism development; MNRT or TANAPA should make decisions on tourism development; and appointed local government agencies should make decisions on tourism development. This suggests that there were relatively more respondents who favoured the extremities (strongly agree and strongly disagree) when responding to these statements.

Further analysis of the means across the profile variables indicate that there were mixed views between and within various respondent groups regarding the suggested forms of

decision-making. Table 19 presents the mean scores of each variable across various groups of respondents.

Table 19. Views by categories of local people about who should make decisions on the development of tourism establishments (N= 139)

In your views, who should make decisions on tourism development in Mto wa Mbu such as establishment of tourist hotels, lodges or camp sites etc?	Respondents	FORM OF DECISION-MAKING					
		Appointed & elected officials by consulting locals	An elected committee	MNRT or TANAPA	Elected officials	Appointed officials	Market forces
Variable	Number	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Location							
Zone (R) sub-villages	92	4.34	3.72	3.34	3.42	3.20	2.76
Zone (F) sub-villages	47	4.21	3.66	3.26	3.40	3.02	3.00
Gender							
Males	76	4.22	3.68	3.39	3.54	3.13	2.78
Females	63	4.38	3.71	3.21	3.27	3.14	2.92
Occupation							
Peasants	89	4.44	3.69	3.31	3.42	3.00	2.79
Businessmen/women	30	3.90	3.87	3.43	3.43	3.47	2.90
Employed full-time	9	4.78	3.56	3.56	3.33	3.11	3.33
Unemployed	11	3.82	3.45	2.73	3.45	3.36	2.73
Education							
Primary education	82	4.32	3.61	3.26	3.28	3.05	2.84
Secondary education	41	4.46	4.07	3.51	3.71	3.27	2.90
College/university education	2	3.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.50	4.00
No formal education	14	3.86	3.36	2.93	3.43	3.21	2.50
Overall mean		4.29	3.70	3.31	3.42	3.14	2.84

(R)= sub-villages close to the road

(F)=sub-villages far from the road

The results suggest that overall the respondents from Zone (F) sub-villages (sub-villages far from the road) tended to agree with the idea of market forces making the decisions of tourism establishments, which was generally rejected by those living close to the road. Although, the mean scores of the rest of the variables are above 3, suggesting favourable responses, those of Zone (F) sub-villages are generally lower than those of Zone (R) sub-villages in all five statements. In comparison, this indicates that the respondents from sub-villages far from the road showed a greater degree of overall agreement to such statements than those from sub-villages close to the road. Overall, male and female respondents had similar views about who should make decisions on the development of tourism establishments in the study area, though slight differences exist across each form of decision-making.

In sharp contrast with the other occupations (peasants, businessmen, and unemployed), full-time employed respondents were of the view that market forces should make the decisions on tourism development in the study area. In particular, the respondents with college or university education (though few in number) rejected the idea of an elected committee, the second popularly accepted idea based on overall mean scores, but embraced the idea of market forces. In contrast, those with secondary, primary or no formal education supported the former idea and rejected the latter. Furthermore, the results also show that the respondents who had no formal education generally did not like the idea that the MNRT/TANAPA should make decisions on tourism development in the study area.

5.2.2 Community participation in the decision-making process of the Community Conservation Service (CCS) project

Respondents were also asked to state their views about who should make decisions in general matters about the Community Conservation Service (CCS) project in their area.

The local people's answers were again examined by assigning ranks based on the mean scores of each variable (Table 20). Similar to the results in Table 18 about who should decide on tourism establishments, the overall mean scores of five out of six statements examined were above 3, indicating that the respondents' level of agreement with the ideas suggested was overall, above average. Similarly, the overall mean score for the statement, 'market forces' was below 3, suggesting that the respondents' level of agreement with this idea was, overall, below average. In other words, the idea was not supported by the respondents.

Table 20. Local people's views about who should make decisions in general matters about the Community Conservation Service (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu (N= 139)

In your views, who should make decisions in general matters about the Community Conservation Service (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu?	Mean	SD
Appointed and elected local government agencies should jointly make decisions about the Community Conservation Service (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu by consulting local people [Appointed & elected officials by consulting locals]	4.36	0.97
Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism or Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA) should make decisions about the Community Conservation Service (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu [MNRT/TANAPA]	3.55	1.02
A committee elected by public (local people) for specially developing, managing and controlling tourism should make decisions about the Community Conservation Service (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu [An elected committee]	3.45	1.13
Elected local government should make decisions about the Community Conservation Service (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu [Elected officials]	3.40	1.05
Appointed local government agencies (who are normally representatives of central government) should make decisions about the Community Conservation Service (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu [Appointed officials]	3.06	1.20
Market forces should make decisions about the Community Conservation Service (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu [Market forces]	2.54	1.26

Similar to the previous results regarding tourism establishments, the results indicate that there was a central tendency among the respondents to support the idea of ‘appointed and elected officials by consulting locals’ (mean 4.36, SD 0.97). This statement again gained the highest mean score. The second was ‘the MNRT/TANAPA should decide on CCS programme in the study area’ (mean 3.55, SD 1.02). Although the respondents’ comments to support their ratings are discussed separately in section 5.2.4, it is important to note that this idea had the fourth highest ranking in the previous results. The third highest scores belonged to the idea of an elected committee (mean 3.45, SD 1.13), which was ranked the second in the previous results. The idea of elected officials had the fourth highest ranking (mean 3.40, SD 1.05), which is one place down when compared with the previous results. The ideas of ‘appointed officials’ (mean 3.06, SD 1.20) and ‘market forces’ (mean 2.54, SD 1.26) ranked fifth and sixth respectively, same positions as in previous results for tourism establishments.

Digging more into the data, particularly by examining and comparing mean scores of various respondents groups, revealed that there were different views across various forms of decision-making. Table 21 presents the results of responses on each form of decision-making for each of the respondent groups.

Table 21. Views by categories of local people about who should make decisions in general matters about the Community Conservation Service (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu (N= 139)

In your views, who should make decisions in general matters about the Community Conservation Service (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu?	Respondents	FORM OF DECISION-MAKING					
		Appointed & elected officials by consulting locals	An elected committee	MNRT or TANAPA	Elected officials	Appointed officials	Market forces
Variable	Number	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Location							
Zone (R) sub-villages	92	4.32	3.49	3.53	3.39	3.05	2.43
Zone (F) sub-villages	47	4.43	3.36	3.57	3.40	3.06	2.74
Gender							
Males	76	4.36	3.43	3.51	3.36	3.12	2.53
Females	63	4.35	3.47	3.59	3.44	2.98	2.55
Occupation							
Peasants	89	4.44	3.46	3.49	3.36	2.93	2.43
Businessmen/women	30	4.27	3.57	3.77	3.43	3.23	2.80
Employed full-time	9	4.62	3.75	3.67	3.89	3.00	3.12
Unemployed	11	3.73	2.82	3.27	3.18	3.64	2.27
Education							
Primary education	82	4.38	3.33	3.48	3.33	3.02	2.51
Secondary education	41	4.58	3.75	3.68	3.54	2.98	2.72
College/university education	2	3.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	4.50	2.50
No formal education	14	3.79	3.50	3.71	3.50	3.29	2.14
Overall mean		4.36	3.45	3.55	3.40	3.06	2.54

(R)= sub-villages close to the road

(F)=sub-villages far from the road

Overall, there were similar views between respondents in sub-villages far from the road and those in sub-villages close to the road regarding who should make decisions about the CCS project though some slight differences exist between their mean scores. However, in terms of gender, female respondents seemed to oppose the idea of appointed officials while males were in favour. Respondents who described themselves as peasants also rejected this idea, whereas businessmen/women, employed full-time and employed respondents embraced it. Similarly, respondents who had secondary education also opposed this idea of appointed officials while those who had primary education, college or university education and those who had no formal education generally supported it. The results further suggest that unemployed respondents and those who had college or university education did not generally support the idea of an elected committee, which was supported by the rest of the respondent groups. In addition, holders of college/university educations rejected two more ideas: that of MNRT/TANAPA; and elected officials. These ideas were supported by other groups of respondents. Only respondents who were employed full-time supported the idea, 'market forces should make decisions about the CCS project'. The rest of respondent groups rejected this idea.

5.2.3 Local people's views about who is best placed to make decisions regarding tourism establishments and the CCS project

By comparing the responses to decision-making for the two examples (tourism establishments and CCS project), based on mean scores, it is clear that respondents supported five out of six options, only rejecting market forces (Tables 18 and 20). Such results however, indicate that local people have multiple choices regarding who should make decisions on tourism development in their area. Furthermore, such results suggest

that there is a need to establish which one among the given options was considered by the local people to be the best placed to make decisions on both tourism establishments and the CCS project. To examine this, respondents were asked which one option was best placed to make decisions on both tourism establishments and the CCS project, tourism development examples in their area. Their answers were examined by assigning ranks based on the percentage scores of each variable with the highest percentage ranked 1.

The results show that respondents had multiple choices regarding who is the best placed to make decisions about each of the two examples (tourism establishments and CCS project), but their choices in each case were similar despite the fact that the two examples were different (Table 22). Similar to Tosun's study (2006), an overwhelming majority of the respondents stated that appointed and elected local government officials should jointly make decisions on tourism development in Mto wa Mbu by consulting local people. About 75 percent of the respondents chose 'appointed and elected official in consultation with locals' for tourism establishments and 69.1 percent for the CCS project. Some supported the idea of MNRT/TANAPA. Elected officials and an elected committee ranked next, with minimal or no support for appointed officials and market forces. Broadly, the two examples (tourism establishments and the CCS projects) showed similar results but slightly more support for elected officials in the case of CCS.

Table 22. Who should make decisions on tourism development in Mto wa Mbu (N=139)

In your view, which of the following is best placed to make decisions on tourism development in Mto wa Mbu such as establishment of tourist hotels, lodges, camp sites etc?	Tourism establishments		In your view, which of the following is best placed to make decisions about the CCS project in Mto wa Mbu?	CCS project	
	Ranking	Percentage		Ranking	Percentage
Appointed & elected officials by consulting locals	1	74.8	Appointed & elected officials by consulting locals	1	69.1
MNRT/TANAPA	2	17.3	MNRT/TANAPA	2	15.8
Elected officials	4	2.9	Elected officials	3	7.2
An elected committee	3	5.0	An elected committee	4	5.0
Appointed officials		0	Appointed officials	5	2.2
Market forces		0	Market forces		0

5.2.4 Local people's reasons for their ratings

Various reasons were given by the survey respondents to support their ratings in the above quantitative results. Many reasons were similar for the tourism establishments and the CCS project for a particular form of decision-making. To avoid unnecessary repetition, such reasons are thus presented and discussed together in the following paragraphs under each of the statements given to respondents.

Appointed and elected officials in consultation with local people should jointly make decisions about the development of tourism establishments and the CCS project

As shown in Table 22, this was regarded as the best form of decision-making, which most local people in the study area desired (74.8% for tourism establishment and 69.1% for CCS). Those who supported this idea, 'appointed and elected officials in consultation with local people', believed that the presence of elected leaders would help to ensure the

community's interests. This would increase transparency and accountability, improve efficiency and wipe out embezzlements and abuse of offices, which are rampant acts amongst decision-makers. In fact, these were also the main reasons why many respondents rejected the idea of appointed officials. This perception arises from the fact that elected officials, as opposed to appointed officials, are usually trustworthy people elected by local people from amongst members of the local community. Indeed, the idea would help to erode corruption while ensuring fair decisions are made. The overall result is that tourism would gain more support from local people as they would be motivated to participate.

Although the quantitative results indicate that there were some respondents (though very few) who disagreed with this idea by choosing other options (see Table 22), analysis of comments suggest that all respondents supported it. Those who seemed to reject it by preferring other options particularly TANAPA thought that TANAPA officials were not included in the category of appointed government agencies when in fact they were. The idea of appointed officials was also rejected on this basis, among other reasons. One survey respondent for example, commented,

“I don't support it, unless TANAPA are involved!”

It should be noted that in Tanzania MNRT/TANAPA officials are often considered to be tourism professionals and experts. This is not only because they manage all national parks in the country, where most of the wildlife safari tours are conducted, but also because they have much experience of dealing with tourism. In addition, they have been working closely with local communities surrounding the national parks through the CCS

project. In fact, this is the main reason why respondents ranked MNRT/TANAPA as the second best placed to make decisions about the development of tourism establishments and the CCS project in the study area (see Table 22).

MNRT/TANAPA should make decisions about the development of tourism establishments and the CCS project

As mentioned above, respondents who supported this idea believe that both the ministry and TANAPA have appropriate knowledge and expertise needed for tourism development in their area. In addition, the two government agencies have a legal mandate on all tourism resources in the country, so they are better placed to push the industry forward. Furthermore, both of them have professional knowledge and financial resources needed to support community initiated projects. In fact, respondents had the feeling that TANAPA is closely involved with the local community, especially through its CCS programme, which often funds village development projects such as the construction of classrooms, dispensaries, health centres, village roads, water projects etc. One survey respondent noted,

Do you see that school out there! They [TANAPA] have built I think one or two classrooms for our children. So I think they have the capacity to do things. I just doubt if others have such capacity, anyway!

From the respondents' point of view, it does seem to some members of the local community in the study area that financial resources and professional knowledge are powerful tools towards achieving tourism development. A similar observation is noted in the literature, particularly as barriers to tourism development, especially in developing countries (see section 2.8).

However, those who did not support the idea argued that the two agencies are far from the reach of the local people and therefore it would be difficult for them to successfully attract local people to participate in the industry. Also, there were concerns that the two agencies have failed to involve local communities in tourism, and to successfully make the industry contribute towards poverty alleviation as stipulated in the tourism policy. Those who opposed the idea were also of the view that such agencies often come up with decisions that favour government interests and disregard those of the local community.

It is however, imperative to note that such views (from respondents who opposed the idea) somewhat reflect the inefficiency of highly centralized development approaches particularly in the developing world observed by Baral and Heinen (2007). According to the literature (see section 2.2), such views reflect some of the factors that make development practitioners adopt and advocate bottom-up approaches in order to emphasize community participation in development initiatives.

Elected officials or an elected committee should make decisions about development of tourism establishments and the CCS project

Respondents who supported this statement argued that elected leaders should make such decisions since tourism happens in their area of jurisdiction. Second, elected leaders know better people's needs, concerns, and priorities since they are usually close to the people who elected them. Similar reasons were given by respondents who supported the idea of an elected committee. One respondent commented,

“We have elected them so they know our concerns and problems. They always carry people’s views with them”

However, those who rejected this idea (elected officials) along with that of an elected committee argued that it will be difficult for elected officials to make wise decisions for tourism development issues since they lack tourism professionalism and expertise, and some of them have no formal education at all. For this reason, they were considered not suitable for making such decisions by themselves, unless they jointly make such decisions with other professional people. One survey respondent for example, said,

“Some of our leaders have no education! They have been elected because of their political affiliation, but no education. So what kind of decisions do you expect from them, anyway?”

From this comment, it seems the respondents had some feeling that elected officials are likely to come up with unpromising decisions because they lack education. The same reason was given by those who did not like the idea of an elected committee. In addition, elected officials were considered as political leaders, who would promote political interests while undermining efforts to develop tourism in their area. The outcome of this, according to respondents, is a slow realization and recognition of the major role that tourism development plays in job creation and improving the local economy. One survey respondent said,

“These are political leaders, and you know how politicians are! They will start talking politics but not working... I don’t like it! ...Let professionals make decisions on profession issues and let them [politicians] continue talking politics”

Appointed officials should make decisions about the development of tourism establishments and the CCS project

As mentioned previously, respondents who supported this idea argued that appointed officials are government experts who have the professional knowledge needed to develop tourism. Unlike politicians, they often make their decisions professionally. One respondent commented,

“To me, these are relevant people [appointed officials]. You know, they are experts in tourism and they know a lot of issues, which I am sure local people are unable to do ... because of lack of education”

However, respondents who opposed this idea argued that many appointed officials are not transparent, especially when making decisions and are not accountable enough. In addition, respondents were of the view that corruption such as the embezzlement of public funds and abuse of public offices would increase if only appointed officials are allowed to make such decisions. One respondent for example, said,

“If these people [appointed officials] are left to make decisions by themselves, the situation will be worse! ...because it is like the government wants to legalize corruption”

Market forces should make decisions about development of tourism establishments and the CCS project

Respondents who supported this idea observed that the idea is likely to attract more private participation and devolve them power to decide on tourism development. This would further tourism development in the area because tourism charges, particularly park

fees would reflect the market situation rather than being set by the state (through TANAPA) as is the case now. One respondent for example, said,

“This would help to lower park fees and consequently bring in more tourists in our area”

It is important to acknowledge that many comments about this question were related to park fees, which was considered by many respondents as one of the limitations that scared many tourists away from Mto wa Mbu. This has long been a concern of many tourism players, especially tour operators and the surrounding communities who have often felt that park fees in Tanzania’s national parks were very high and were enough to deter tourists who could have injected money into the local economy. Many tourists come to Tanzania primarily to enjoy wildlife safari tours, which are often conducted in the wildlife protected areas. This implies that village tours to experience cultural tourism products were ‘add on tours’ to wildlife safaris, and can thus be easily foregone if park fees keep rising. Therefore park fees have a direct impact on the number of tourists who would go for village tours, which often bring money directly into the local economy, at the grass-root level.

On the other side, those who did not like the idea argued that with market forces it is likely there would be price fluctuations between high and low seasons. This implies that local people would earn little from a particular number of tourists during the low season as prices would go down due to low demand. Such fears are built on the fact that the low season (April and May) in Tanzania is caused by natural phenomenon, heavy rainfall, which makes game-viewing in many wildlife areas less successful as most animals hide and become inactive during bad weather. Heavy rainfall also makes accessibility to the

wildlife areas difficult and costly especially access roads within these areas as there are often no good standard or tarmac roads due to conservation reasons. This is why some respondents felt market forces would impact negatively on pricing during the low season but will not increase the number of tourists in their area. Usually accommodation providers offer cheaper prices during the low season but park fees remain the same.

5.2.5 Community involvement in the current tourism decision-making process

Having established local people's perceptions about who they consider should be involved in the tourism decision-making process, it is now imperative to assess their views about the current level of local people's involvement and ultimately their participation in the tourism decision-making process in their area. To be able to determine this, respondents were asked to rate how involved the local people are in the decision-making process for the tourism establishments and the CCS project. The results are presented in Table 23.

About 76 percent of respondents stated that the level of local people's involvement in the decision-making process about tourism establishments in their area is very poor or poor. The same feeling was reported by the majority of the respondents (77.7%) in relation to the CCS project.

Table 23. Local people's views about the level of local people's involvement in the current tourism decision-making process (N= 139)

In your view, how do you generally rate the level of local people's involvement in the decision-making process regarding....	Mean	SD	Good and Very good (%)	Did not make any difference (%)	Poor and Very poor (%)
Tourism establishments in Mto wa Mbu such as hotels, lodges, camp sites etc?	2.09	1.08	18.0	6.5	75.5
Community conservation service (CCS project) in Mto wa Mbu?	2.14	1.02	16.5	5.8	77.7

A breakdown of mean scores of each variable by respondent groups suggests that all respondents, despite their differences in terms of gender, education, occupation, and location of the sub-villages they came from, had the same feeling that the level of local people's involvement in the current tourism decision-making processes about development of tourism establishments and CCS project in their area is poor (Table 24).

Table 24. Views by categories of local people about the level of community involvement in the current tourism decision-making process (N= 139)

In your view, how do you generally rate the level of local people's involvement in the decision-making process regarding....	Tourism establishments		Community conservation service (CCS) project		Respondents
Variable	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	N
Location					
Zone (R) sub-villages	2.01	1.04	2.18	1.08	92
Zone (F) sub-villages	2.26	1.13	2.04	0.91	47
Gender					
Males	2.11	1.03	2.13	1.02	76
Females	2.08	1.14	2.14	1.03	63
Occupation					
Peasants	1.94	1.02	2.08	1.01	89
Businessmen/women	2.37	1.13	2.23	1.10	30
Employed full-time	2.67	1.00	2.33	1.00	9
Unemployed	2.09	1.30	2.18	0.98	11
Education					
Primary education	1.95	0.98	1.96	0.95	82
Secondary education	2.44	1.18	2.39	1.00	41
College/university education	1.50	0.71	2.50	2.12	2
No formal education	2.00	1.18	2.36	1.28	14
Overall mean	2.09		2.14		

(R)= sub-villages close to the road

(F)=sub-villages far from the road

As mentioned in section 5.2, tourism establishments and the CCS project were chosen as references only to ensure respondents did not get confused with the term ‘tourism development process’, a fundamental line of thinking for this study. While recognizing the complexity behind this concept, it was alluring to learn how local people would

respond to it, at least in general terms. Thus, as a concluding question, respondents were asked to state if they felt personally involved in the tourism development process in their area. Responses for this question were analyzed and examined together with other related responses.

The results indicate that the respondents were fairly evenly distributed between those who felt personally involved and those who did not feel personally involved (Table 25). In general, 48.9 percent of the respondents felt that they were personally involved in the decision-making process regarding tourism establishments, compared to 43.9 percent for the CCS project. However, 53.2 percent of the respondents felt that they were involved in the tourism development process, which is often reflected in the tourism decision-making process and in the sharing of tourism benefits, according to the literature (see section 2.4, 2.7 and 2.9).

Table 25. Local people's feeling about their involvement in the current tourism decision-making and development processes (N= 139)

In general, do you feel personally involved in:	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
The decision-making process of tourism development in Mto wa Mbu such as establishment of tourist hotels, lodges, camp sites etc?	68	48.9	71	51.1
The decision-making process of the Community Conservation Service (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu?	61	43.9	78	56.1
The tourism development process in Mto wa Mbu?	74	53.2	65	46.8

Cross tabulation of the responses revealed that the respondents' general feeling of involvement in the current decision-making process regarding tourism establishment and

the CCS project and in the tourism development process differed between and within respondent groups though there is no great variation between ‘yes’ and ‘no’ responses in most categories (Table 26). The results for example, indicate that both sub-villages far from and close to the road had the same proportion of respondents (48.9%) who felt that they were personally involved in the decision-making process about tourism establishments. However, more residents in sub-villages located far from the road had a general feeling of being involved in decision-making process about the CCS project (55.3%) than those located close to the road (38%). Although, reasons for such a feeling are discussed in section 5.2.4.1, it is important to recognize the fact that, by virtue of location, villages far from the road are more likely to be involved in this project since they are located close to either Lake Manyara National Park (LMNP), migratory routes or a corridor, or buffer zones. Usually CCS targets working with communities living around such areas as a strategy to avoid pressure from human beings, which is likely to block or interfere with the survival of wildlife.

Table 26. Local people's feeling about their involvement in the current tourism decision-making and development processes by categories of respondents (N= 139)

In general, do you feel personally involved in:	Decision making about Tourism establishments				Decision making about CCS project				Tourism development process				Respondents
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No		
Variable	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Location													
Zone (R) sub-villages	45	48.9	47	51.1	35	38.0	57	62.0	47	51.1	45	48.9	92
Zone (F) sub-villages	23	48.9	24	51.1	26	55.3	21	44.7	27	57.4	20	42.6	47
Gender													
Males	41	53.9	35	46.1	38	50.0	38	50.0	43	56.6	33	43.4	76
Females	27	42.9	36	57.1	23	36.5	40	63.5	31	49.2	32	50.8	63
Occupation													
Peasants	40	44.9	49	55.1	37	41.6	52	58.4	44	49.4	45	50.6	89
Businessmen/women	16	53.3	14	46.7	14	46.7	16	53.3	17	56.7	13	43.3	30
Employed full-time	5	55.6	4	44.4	6	66.7	3	33.3	6	66.7	3	33.3	9
Unemployed	7	63.6	4	36.4	4	36.4	7	63.6	7	63.6	4	36.4	11
Education													
Primary education	39	47.6	43	52.4	36	43.9	46	56.1	44	53.7	38	46.3	82
Secondary education	25	61.0	16	39.0	20	48.8	21	51.2	23	56.1	18	43.9	41
College/university education	0	0.0	2	100	1	50.0	1	50.0	2	100	0	0	2
No formal education	4	28.6	10	71.4	4	28.6	10	71.4	5	35.7	9	64.3	14
Overall scores	68	48.9	71	51.1	61	43.9	78	56.1	74	53.2	65	46.8	

(R)= sub-villages close to the road

(F)=sub-villages far from the road

The results further indicate that there were slightly more males than females who felt that they were involved in the decision-making processes regarding tourism establishments and CCS project and regarding the tourism development process. This was shown by the

slightly more males who said 'yes' to the question, 'in general, do you feel personally involved in ...': decision-making process regarding tourism establishments (53.9%); decision-making process about the CCS project (50.0%); and tourism development process (56.6%).

Across different occupational groups, it seems that 44.9 percent of peasant respondents felt that they were involved in decisions regarding tourism establishments in their area and 41.6 percent felt that they were involved in decisions about the CCS project while almost half of them (49.4%) felt that they were involved in the tourism development process. Interestingly, there were more unemployed respondents (63.6%) who felt involved in decision-making regarding tourism establishments and in tourism development process than the rest of the respondents. On the other hand, there were more employed full-time respondents (66.7%) who felt involved in decision-making about the CCS project than the rest in the group.

In terms of education, the results show that there were more secondary education respondents who felt involved in decision-making regarding tourism establishments in Mto wa Mbu while only a few of the respondents with no formal education (35.7%) felt involved in the tourism development process. The rest in the category had slightly more than half of respondents who felt involved.

5.2.5.1 Local people's reasons for their ratings

Various reasons were given by respondents to support why they held such feelings. For example, respondents who felt involved in the decision-making process regarding tourism establishments and the CCS project pointed out two major reasons. First, they felt involved through their local leaders who have been elected by them, and who are often the first point of contact with the park warden CCS and with investors when they come into their area to look for a place to build a tourist hotel, camp site , lodge etc, according to interview results. One survey respondent for instance, said,

“I feel personally involved because our leaders, who have been elected by us, are involved so it's like I am involved too!”

Second, they felt involved through the village natural resources committee which, among other obligations, is responsible for all matters related to tourism. Committee members usually come from amongst villagers, all elected by the villagers themselves. It should be noted that in Tanzania, such committees exist in all villages adjacent to forestry or wildlife areas.

The results of the interviews with local leaders support the above survey results. For example, one local leader (elected) added that usually, villagers have the opportunity to air their views and get feedback or briefing from leaders or a particular committee about any development issues (not necessarily tourism issues) during village general meetings, which are scheduled every three months. So it is through these meetings (four in a year) that the general public gets involved in the decision-making process. According to the literature (see section 2.4), engaging local communities as members in the public and

tourism-related decision-making bodies like this, is one way through which community participation in tourism can be achieved. One survey respondent commented,

“I feel personally involved because one time I attended a meeting, which made a decision regarding allocating a plot to an investor who wanted to start a tourist camp site in Migungani ‘A’”.

However, those who felt they were not involved argued that there was no clear mechanism to involve the general public as currently only leaders were involved. In addition, some of them said that they were not involved with decision-making because they were not involved with tourism. They also stated that their leaders were not close enough to them so it was difficult for them to know what is going on. For example, one survey respondent said,

“Our leaders don’t want to involve us, so it’s hard for me to feel I am involved”.

One cause of this feeling as identified from interviews with local government officials in relation to the whole issue of community involvement and participation in any sector (not necessarily tourism) is that most local people do not turn up for the general meetings. As a result, most of them are often unaware of what is going on their areas, and consequently, it is hard to involve them in development issues. One local leader for example, stated,

“...I think this is the main problem with our people. They keep on complaining about this and that. But the reality is, they are the source of all these. If you call them for a meeting, they don’t attend..., so it’s true that they don’t know what is going on!” (Government 6)

This problem was also identified during an informal interview with one chairperson of a village located approximately 820 kilometres away from the study area. The interview

aimed to verify the arguments by local leaders in the study area about people's reluctance to attend village meetings. When commenting on the problem, the chairperson said,

“You know, the problem with many people here is that they don't know the importance of having a village general meeting! This is why they don't even think about it. I am telling you, if you just ask someone to mention at least one development project we have in our village, you will hardly get one! Indeed, it is a very frustrating problem!”

Building on the same issue, some respondents admitted that local leaders try to involve them in many development issues. But there are two problems similar to those identified by the literature (see section 2.8) that prove leaders' efforts are fruitless. First, many people are busy with their own activities and do not like to follow up issues. Consequently, this makes them unaware of what is happening in their village. Second, many people may not know that an invitation to attend the village general meeting is one way through which public involvement in the decision-making process is achieved. One respondent commented,

“Honestly, we are involved ... but the problem is that most people, including me, don't attend the village general meeting. I don't think to have attended any! Yeah, I'm busy with my own activities. But I know it is there. ...So we normally think we are not involved!”

Regarding the tourism development process, those who felt involved in it argued that their feeling was attributed to the increasing financial and material support and aids from industry players to various schools in their area. For example, it has been a long established culture for some tourists to donate text books to nursery, primary and secondary schools, and provide medicine to health centres during their visits to the area. Tourism businesses such as Lake Manyara National Park (through CCS project), tourist

hotels, and camp sites have been, and still continue to support village development projects in the area such as building classrooms in primary schools (Mto wa Mbu and Jangwani primary schools) and in one secondary school (Rift valley secondary school). According to them, such feeling is also attributed to increased public awareness of tourism, the presence of CCS project in their area, a number of tourist establishments (hotels and camp sites), and involvement (through their leaders) to discuss various tourism development issues, and the fact that their youths are employed by the industry. One survey respondent for example, noted,

“It is just a culture of refusing to admit that good things need to be recognized! The fact is, we get something [benefits] each year...and this, to me, just means, we are moving with tourism development”

On the other hand, those who felt they are not involved argued that tourism is benefiting only a few people, especially leaders, migrants, and those who have education and money. One respondent commented,

I have no education! I am just a mere peasant, so no one would want to involve me in tourism”

Responses given to this question suggest that there was a general perception among local people that those who had no education or who were doing non-tourism related activities (e.g. peasant) should not be involved in the tourism development process. Behind this probably lies the notion that one must be engaged in tourist-related activities or must have qualifications or education in order to achieve the sense of being involved in the tourism development process.

It is worth noting that when the quantitative results to the questions, ‘how do you generally rate the level of local people involvement in ...’ (see Table 22 and 23) and ‘in general, do you feel personally involved in ...’ (see Table 24 and 25), are carefully examined, it seems respondents felt poorly involved as a community but felt more personally involved. Although these questions were asked in different ways (Likert; Yes/No), comments from respondents were similar.

5.3 Community participation in the sharing of tourism benefits

As mentioned in section 5.2, participation of local people in the sharing of tourism benefits is central to community participation in the tourism industry alongside participation in the tourism decision-making process. Based on the literature, the extent to which local people in Mto wa Mbu participate in the sharing of tourism benefits can be assessed by looking at three critical ways in which tourism operators (tourism businesses) can embrace the local communities. These are:

- local employment creation- providing job opportunities specifically for local people (see section 2.4),
- capacity building for local people- empowering local people to access tourism benefits through the provision of work experience opportunities, training, advice, loans or aid to enable local people to work for tourism or invest in tourism as local entrepreneurs (see section 2.7), and
- sharing the tourism profits with the local community- using part of the business income to support community initiatives, purchase locally, incorporate opportunities for tourists to support local businesses, events or organizations,

sponsor local charities or community based organizations, sponsor local events or sporting teams (see section 2.9).

These three factors formed the structure of the interview questions. Analysis of the interviews sought to identify if a particular tourism business had any scheme related to any of the three factors. The ultimate aim of such analysis was to establish if tourism businesses in Mto wa Mbu had developed schemes of sharing benefits with the wider community.

Thus, the extent to which local people participate in the sharing of tourism benefits was determined by conducting interviews with: tourism businesses (tourist campsites, Lake Manyara National Park (LMNP), Cultural Tourism Programme (CTP) Mto wa Mbu, and local tourism groups); village local government officials; and NGOs (see section 3.4). During the interviews, tourism businesses were asked to provide information regarding the three key items (local employment creation, local capacity building, and profit sharing). The results are discussed in subsequent sections under each of the three key themes. The interview results are integrated and compared with those from field observations, informal discussions and document analysis. This verifies and strengthens the interview results.

Before going into a detailed discussion of the results on each theme separately, it is worth noting that the extent to which a particular tourism business has developed its scheme of benefit sharing, differed from one tourism business to another depending on the nature of business, ownership, and why the business was established. This implies that the level of

the commitment of tourism businesses to creating local employment, building local capacity, and sharing their business profits with the local community is determined by those three factors.

Local employment creation

All tourism operators interviewed have a scheme that considered local people for job opportunities, at least for certain categories of jobs. However, the scheme differed from one tourism business to another depending on the three factors mentioned above (nature of the business, ownership, and why the business was established). CTP Mto wa Mbu, which is a tourism business that offers organized village tours with a combination of both cultural and nature-based tourism experiences, has a relatively well established system that aims to employ local people. CTP had 27 employees, of which 15 were males and 12 were females, and all of them were local people from Mto wa Mbu. The programme is a community-based tourism organization, and brings tourists into the village to experience mostly cultural activities run by different groups of local people (see section 3.4.2.1). The interviewee from CTP Mto wa Mbu said,

“We recruit our guides from this community. This is our tradition since this programme [CTP Mto wa Mbu] was established in 1996. You know, one of reasons for establishing this programme is to help to reduce poverty among people, so if we employ anyone else then the whole idea is meaningless. ... Both males and females are equally considered [for jobs]. Yeah, they both earn a substantial income”.

Based on informal discussions, views of various members of the local community about the contribution of CTP on local job creation were positive. Other interviewees also showed appreciation of this. One government participant said,

“... These people [CTP] are doing a great job. They have created employment for our youths, who used to roam around doing nothing! We sincerely appreciate their help”.
(Government 6)

It is important to take into account that one of the goals for establishing CTP is to curb pervasive poverty through local job creation. It is a community-based programme established by the Dutch government to serve the wider community (see section 3.4.2.1). This implies that although local employment creation seemed to be a culture of the CTP, ownership and nature of its business appeared to be the major underlying reasons that reinforced this culture.

Lake Manyara National Park (LMNP), which manages wildlife-based tourism resources, also has a system of employing local people. However, this is limited to casual jobs such as cleaning operation services, which do not require approval from head office, TANAPA, the government agency that manages all national parks in Tanzania. The rest of the jobs follow TANAPA employment policy, which does not attach any special consideration to employing local people. This is to avoid tribalism while ensuring qualifications and fairness prevail when employing new staff. The LMNP interviewee for example, narrated,

“We know villagers complain a lot that their children are not given priority for TANAPA jobs despite having these resources [national parks] in their area and contributing their efforts to conserve them [national parks]...We always encourage them to apply just like any other Tanzanians. But you know, they want us to simply give their children employment even if they don't qualify...just on the grounds that they live close to national park. I always say no to this, and that would be unfair to be honest! ... So what about those who don't have national parks in their area? You mean they should not dream about being employed by TANAPA? That's tribalism straight away!”

Local tourism groups (curio shop operators, hand craft, cultural/music entertainment, artists and vendors) also have a mechanism of creating job opportunities for local people only. To achieve this, one of the requirements to become a member of any of such groups is that a person must be from Mto wa Mbu. However, based on the nature of their businesses, all members in these groups were self-employed. They drew income from businesses they operated personally. They did not have the capacity to employ others (see section 3.4.2.3). While these groups have fundamental importance in creating self employment opportunities for local people, it should be noted that the Youth Development Policy 2007, among other things, emphasizes the formation of such groups as a vehicle to addressing the challenges of unemployment in the country. Such groups have been used as a way to access credit from commercial banks, which would otherwise have not been given to them because of lack of collaterals. They are also avenues for promotion, advertising and accessing the tourist market.

Unlike the above schemes, in the 8 tourist campsites there was no special consideration for employment at all cadres for local people. One campsite manager for example, said,

“When we want to employ someone, we just invite applications. Then we take whoever has the qualities that we need. We cannot employ someone just because he/she lives in Mto wa Mbu! No! No! We can’t do that!” (Manager 7)

However, even without local job creation schemes, it was realized that all the watchmen in these campsites were local people, mostly Maasai men. But it was established by the interviewees that they were employed not because they are local people from the study area, but because they are traditionally suited to these jobs. This tallied with Ihucha’s observation in his article in one of the national newspapers, the Sunday Observer (2007)

about the watchman role and the Maasai. According to this article, there has been a massive migration of Maasai men to urban centres in recent years in Tanzania where many of them are employed as night watchmen, the role described to mostly suit them as they are said to be ferocious, honest and hardy. Interviewees said the lack of a scheme to employ local people in campsites was attributed to their being small-scale businesses which needed only a few employees. Each campsite employed less than 10 people. However, the fact that these are purely privately owned businesses could also be another reason.

Local capacity building

All the tourism businesses interviewed had some form of capacity building programme, which specifically target local people. But the extent to which this is achieved differed among businesses depending on their policy objectives. Most of the capacity building programmes aim to empower local people to access tourism benefits through the provision of work experience opportunities, training, advice, loans or aid which would enable local people to work for tourism or prepare them to invest in tourism as local entrepreneurs.

CTP Mto wa Mbu contributes to local capacity building in two ways. First, it recruits and trains its tour guides locally. It also offers free work experience, especially to youths who wish to develop their careers and capture tour guide job opportunities in various tour companies. During the data collection, there were four trainees (two males and two females) on their three-month training period. Second, the programme has women empowerment projects as one of its fundamental objectives to help find solutions to

gender inequality within society. Field observations identified 36 women working as part of 4 groups from different families positioned in four different parts of the village to offer local cuisine to tourists visiting the Mto wa Mbu community through CTP. Through its micro-finance programme, CTP has established other women entrepreneur groups (comprising 24 women) which make local products such as mats, lunch boxes and other souvenirs from local materials such as banana fibres and coconut leaves. CTP arranges to sell these products in tourist lodges and campsites in the village.

Lake Manyara National Park (LMNP) also contributes to build local capacity in two ways. First, through CCS outreach, Income Generating Projects (IGPs), which supports individual efforts on poverty alleviation by providing loans to small scale entrepreneurs and organized groups. Such loans help to build their capacity to reduce poverty through improving the economic well-being of individuals. However, the interviewees identified the limited financial capacity as a major barrier to their efforts towards building local capacity through provision of loans that would meet people's diverse needs. The LMNP interviewee said,

“Yeah, we have various groups of local communities in different villages doing various small scale projects like farm products, crafts, curios shops etc. We are trying to improve their lives though it's a long way to go...because they have diverse needs and we don't have enough [money] to give each one of them”.

The park also encourages tourist hotels to buy the products from local people. Second, through CCS outreach, the park provides training to communities in order to build their capacity on various issues such as project management and accounting, and the use of appropriate technology. Document analysis revealed that in 2001 for example, the park

introduced fuel efficient stoves in the study area and trained people how to use them. This project aimed to build people's capacity to contribute actively to the conservation of their natural heritage by reducing dependence on firewood, which threatens the survival of trees in the national parks and forestry reserves. It has also introduced tree planting projects to enable local people to earn substantial incomes while conserving the environment.

Unlike CTP and LMNP, tourist campsites contribute to local capacity building in a different way. They offered unpaid three-month work experience to local people who wished to become porters. Such experience is normally offered to those who have no porter training but would like to have, and those who have such training but lacked working experience. Previously the campsites took applicants for work experience from anywhere, but there were problems with stealing which were traced back to on-training porters who came from outside Mto wa Mbu. To control this problem, campsites owners decided to offer work experience only to local people in Mto wa Mbu. One campsite manager for example, commented,

“...we decided to stop offering experience to outsiders after realizing a lot of complaints from our guests about the loss of their valuable items. We conducted investigation and noted that thieves were among those outsiders. So we stopped them! Nowadays, we need first to know his [applicant for work experience] parents and where he lives before we accept him”. (Manager 3)

So although building local capacity was not the objective of campsites, this has occurred as a by-product of their decision towards controlling the problem of stealing, and has now become part of their culture.

The only NGO available in the study area, the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA) also has programmes that build local capacity through offering training in different areas such as basic business skills, loan management and to provide legal advice and awareness of HIV/AIDS (see section 3.4.2.4). Such training helped to build and strengthen the capacity of local people to capture various opportunities that can help to alleviate widespread poverty. The ICA interviewee asserted,

“We are trying to build the capacity of local people in various areas that stop them progressing. There is this issue of HIV/AIDS, I’m sure you are quite aware of.... Worse enough, people don’t have basic business education-so it’s hard for them to do even those small businesses! They don’t know even how to make the most out of the loans they get from the government, banks and other agencies. We see everything here, we talk to them, and it’s really a big problem! So we are trying to build their capacity in these areas and many more...”

It should be noted that ICA is a non-profit organization whose main objective is to build local capacity. Furthermore, it is not a tourism business and therefore its contribution to local job creation and profit sharing either could not be established or was non-existent.

The contribution of local tourism groups to increase the ability of local people to access tourism benefits can be viewed in terms of building group members’ capacity to access the tourism market. For example, two of these groups have established their websites which were used to promote and market their products. Group members have also increased their capacity to access financial aid and loans, though there were complaints of insufficient funds to enable them expand their business. One group leader for example, said,

“We were told to form various groups so we can be provided with loans. But we don’t see enough of that happening...we would appreciate it if they could help us!” (Leader 4)

Sharing tourism profits with the local community

All the tourism businesses interviewed have schemes of sharing their profits with the local community, but have different approaches to the implementation of these. Interviewees' responses to this question referred to improved social services, particularly in various community development initiatives such as classrooms, teachers' houses, dispensary and water projects. The results show that CTP Mto wa Mbu and LMNP seemed to have a well established mechanism of sharing their profits with local people. For example, CTP each year set aside 11.5 percent of its revenue for the Village Development Fund (VDF), which is spent on various development activities across the four villages it operates. Document analysis revealed that in 2007 the programme spent approximately USD \$8,000 on village development activities, including a contribution to the construction of the Rift Valley Secondary School (in Migombani village); payment of school fees for orphan students at Moita secondary school (in Losirwa village); contribution to the construction of Migombani village office; and other projects. Local government officials acknowledged CTP's contribution, with one of them saying,

“If owners of hotels and campsites could do like them [CTP] then our village would have really advanced in terms of development. They [CTP] contribute regularly! ... You see there is not problem of water here! We have our water here, it flows naturally and no one pays for the service. This is because part of the money to install water pipeline for the whole village came from them [CTP], so the government feels shy to charge us water bills. We are proud of having them here”. (Government 9)

LMNP has a benefit-sharing mechanism similar to that of CTP in the sense that has a predefined proportion of the amount to share with the neighbouring communities. Currently each national park set aside 7.5 percent of its budget for Support for Community Initiated Projects (SCIP), a programme implemented by each national park

under the Community Conservation Service (CCS). Through the SCIP programme, LMNP have managed to contribute to various community initiatives in many villages surrounding the national park. In the study area for example, LMNP contributed USD 28,600 for the construction of the fence around the Mto wa Mbu primary school in 2006. In 2007 the park contributed USD 3,400 for the construction of teachers' houses at Jangwani primary school and another USD 27,000 for the construction of four classrooms at Mto wa Mbu primary school. One government interviewee spoke favourably,

“Ohoo! These are just recent developments. One time, I can't exactly remember the year, they renovated our public health dispensary in Kigongoni and constructed teachers' house at Majengo primary school. ...They also purchased a number of bicycles to enable village officials go around their area of jurisdiction. ...They also constructed two teachers' house at Migombani primary school, and two classrooms and teachers' office at Kigongoni primary school. All these are in Mto wa Mbu ward!” (Government 1)

Analysis of documents from the village office revealed all these activities were carried out by LMNP between 1996 and 2001.

Tourist campsites also share part of their profits with the local community by contributing to similar village projects. However, unlike CTP and LMNP, campsites have no established mechanism to ensure that part of their revenue goes to assist village development initiatives. Instead, local government officials often write a letter requesting a contribution when planning for a particular village development project. The main reason identified was that campsites pay taxes directly to central government in the same way other business operators did. The government should therefore bring back part of

those taxes to assist in development projects in such villages. One campsite manager for example, narrated,

“We are doing business and we pay taxes like any other private individuals elsewhere, so why should we commit ourselves by setting a specific amount? ...But we often contribute depending on how much we have to offer. You know Jangwani primary school? We received a request from the village officials and ... yeah, we contributed a couple of cement bags there”. (Manager 7)

Although feedback from interviewees with village local government officials with regard to the support from campsites has been positive, there were concerns that the support was not guaranteed. Commenting, one government interviewee said,

“Yeah, they help us when we are in need. But the problem is that it is not guarantee! It's such annoying, anyway! Today you go to ask for this; tomorrow you go to ask for that...after some days you go to ask for that again... You know, we have many village projects that need money...so we keep going, going and going! We think the government should do something on this!” (Government 9)

In local tourism groups, there was no scheme for sharing their profits with the local community but they do share within the members of the group. Interviews with group leaders revealed that the lack of a scheme for the sharing of the profits with the community was due to the fact that their businesses are small scale, so even the profit was small. Each group has its own scheme of distributing profits among its members. Basically, one of two schemes was applied in a particular group, and selection of the system depended on the nature of the products each group was dealing with. If the group sells only one product, cultural dancing for example, the revenue is equally distributed among group members at the end of the show. But if the group sells various products, handicraft for example, the revenue is normally distributed depending to how much one

has made and how much as been sold. In both systems, a certain amount of money is often deposited in the saving bank account of the group.

5.4 Conclusion

This chapter has examined community participation in tourism development in the context of the tourism decision-making process and in the sharing of tourism benefits. The chapter has explored these core areas in order to address the research questions three and four. Two illustrative examples (tourism establishments and the CCS project) have been used as references to gauge the extent to which local people participate in the decision-making process regarding tourism development in the study area.

The results suggest that while local people recognize and acknowledge the need to involve tourism professionals and experts when making decisions about tourism development process is crucial, they themselves also wish to be involved in the decision-making process. This has been revealed by the results in Table 22, which shows that an overwhelming majority of respondents stated that appointed and elected local government officials should jointly make decisions on tourism development in their area by consulting local people. In general, local people would like to see the decision-making body for tourism development made up of both elected officials, who represent the local community to ensure community needs, priority, and interests are not by-passed, and appointed officials, who often bring in their expertise and professional knowledge. But in the course of exercising their duties, they (elected and appointed officials) should first consult the local people in order to collect public views.

The chapter has also identified a number of obstacles to community involvement and participation in tourism development in the study area. Such obstacles are similar to those identified by the literature on community participation in tourism in developing countries (see section 2.8). They include: low levels of interest showed by local people in following up issues beyond their immediate family domain (apathy); poor co-ordination between involved parties (ordinary members of the local community and their leaders); low levels of awareness of the whole idea of community involvement coupled with lack of education.

This chapter has also investigated the extent to which tourism operators in the study area embrace the local community in the sharing of tourism benefits. Three critical success factors (local employment creation, local capacity building, and sharing the tourism profits with the local community) have been discussed.

The results have revealed that tourism businesses apply various approaches that favour local people in the study area to benefit from tourism. Specific jobs opportunities for local people have been and continue to be created. In terms of local capacity building, there are various training programmes specifically for locals, and the provision of financial aid, loans and advice mostly to disadvantaged groups of the local community such as youths and women. To build win-win partnerships with the broader community, tourism operators often use part of their profits to support community development initiatives such as building classrooms, dispensaries, water projects etc in an attempt to

improve social services and ensure mutual benefits to visitors who use such services (e.g water) on their visits and the local community. However, the operators' level of commitment to fulfilling such approaches is determined by a number of factors such as the nature of the business, ownership and the reasons or objectives for starting such businesses. Understanding these issues is crucial for proper planning and managing of tourism development while ensuring mutual benefits to business operators, visitors and the local community.

All three approaches of sharing tourism benefits (local employment creation, local capacity building, and profit sharing) appear to occur even though tourism businesses have different approaches driven by their objectives. Some business operators have no benefit-sharing scheme, but sometimes such a scheme is automatically created as a by-product of particular decisions they make. Other businesses have deliberate benefit-sharing schemes. But all in all, public or community-based businesses have more systematic benefit-sharing schemes than private businesses. This could be because the objectives of public or community-based businesses often target to benefit the wider community while private businesses are normally motivated by the owners' mission. The following chapter explores the contribution of tourism development in the study area to poverty alleviation.

CHAPTER SIX: CONTRIBUTION OF TOURISM TO POVERTY ALLEVIATION

6.1 Introduction

This chapter examines local people's views on the contribution of tourism development to poverty alleviation. Similar to previous chapters of the findings, this chapter starts with the analysis of responses given to both closed and open-ended survey questions that assess local people's views on the contribution of the industry towards poverty alleviation in their area. The results from the survey analysis are integrated and compared with those from the interviews, field observations and document analysis, thereby verifying and strengthening the survey results. This also helps to draw and bring together perspectives from two categories of people: ordinary members of the local community (survey) and the decision-makers within the community (interviews). The chapter continues with the analysis of interviews, thus bringing together views from a range of decision-makers within the community: local government officials, tourism professionals, tourism businesses, and non-governmental organizations. It concludes with a summary that brings together key results from this chapter.

6.2 Views of local people on the contribution of tourism development on poverty alleviation

The literature has clearly pointed out that tourism may be a well placed economic sector which, if carefully planned, can help towards efforts to alleviate poverty among local communities in developing countries (see sections 2.5 and 2.6). With this in mind, respondents were asked to state their views about the contribution of tourism towards poverty alleviation. This was assessed in three ways. First, respondents were asked to

indicate their level of perceptions on seven different statements by rating their responses on a five-point Likert scale, where 1 = significantly worse; 2 = worse; 3 = did not make any difference; 4 = improved; and 5 = significantly improved. Second, the respondents were also asked to provide some reasons or comments for their responses on each of the seven variables. This provided more insights into what the respondents thought, and why they rated their responses in the way they did. And third, the same question was also asked to another category of the study participants, the interviewees.

However, the quantitative responses were then examined based on the overall results of the mean scores, standard deviations and percentages of each variable. But rather than presenting a complete list of percentages of all response options on the scale, this report displays collapsed percentages, a summarized set of findings grouped together into a positive response category (percent favourable), the mid-point category (neutral response), and a negative response category (percent unfavourable).

Table 27 depicts the results of the mean scores of each of the seven variables that, for the purpose of this study, were considered to be useful aspects of life for reference when assessing views of local communities about the contribution of community tourism on poverty reduction (see sections 2.4 and 2.5). When the results are closely examined, it is clear that the mean scores of all variables are above 3. Thus, based on mean scores, it may be argued that overall respondents had the feeling that all seven variables examined in this table have improved as a result of tourism development in the study area. But it is important to note that the mean scores for the two variables (general quality of life and

household incomes) are relatively low, indicating a lesser degree of overall improvement. Based on standard deviations, it appears that there was a broader range of responses regarding the same variables. This suggests that respondents seemed to favour extreme response categories (significantly improved and significantly worse) when responding to these two variables. This is also reflected in the collapsed percentage scores of the two variables, which are spread between improved and worsened, with some at the mid-point.

Table 27. Local people's views on the contribution of tourism development on poverty alleviation (N= 139)

From your experience in Mto wa Mbu, what impact has tourism development in the past five years had on the following?	Mean	SD	Improved and Significantly improved (%)	Did not make any difference (%)	Worse and significantly worse (%)
Prices of goods and services in general	4.39	0.62	96.4	2.9	0.7
Accessibility (transport and communication)	4.06	0.39	97.2	2.2	0.7
Entrepreneurial training (general entrepreneurial spirit and development amongst local people)	3.85	0.77	72.7	23.0	4.3
Income-generating projects for local people in general	3.78	0.63	80.6	15.8	3.6
Employment opportunities for local people	3.68	0.85	68.4	22.3	9.4
General quality of life of local people	3.12	1.17	49.6	14.4	36.0
Household income of local people in general	3.04	1.04	46.1	15.1	38.8

Based on percentage scores, the respondents observed that tourism development has improved five out of seven items asked, with an overwhelming majorities (97.2%) feeling that tourism development in their area has improved accessibility (transport and communication) and prices of goods and services in general (96.4%). Nearly 81 percent

felt that income-generating projects for local people have increased in number and 72.7 percent felt that tourism has developed entrepreneurial training (general entrepreneurial spirit and development amongst local people) in their area. About 68 percent felt employment opportunities had improved while nearly half (49.6%) observed that the general quality of life of local people had grown better. Only 46.1 percent felt that household incomes of local people in general had increased due to tourism development in their area. Looking closely at the results, especially based on percentage scores, nearly one third of respondents stated that tourism development had worsened the general quality of life (36.0%) and the household incomes of local people in general (38.8%). In comparison with other variables, a large proportion of respondents observed that tourism did not make any difference to entrepreneurial training (23.0%) or employment opportunities (22.3%).

A comparison of responses across various respondent groups also revealed that all respondent groups observed the improvement tourism development has made on five out of seven items, but had mixed views regarding its contribution to improving the general quality of life and household incomes of local people in the study area (Table 28).

Table 28. Views by categories of respondents on the contribution of tourism development on poverty alleviation (N= 139)

From your experience in Mto wa Mbu, what impact has tourism development in the past five years had on the following?	Respondents	Accessibility	Prices of goods and services	Income generating projects	Entrepreneurial training	Employment opportunities	General quality of life	Household incomes
Variable	Number	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Location								
Zone (R) sub-villages	92	4.09	4.45	3.78	3.99	3.71	3.23	3.14
Zone (F) sub-villages	47	4.02	4.28	3.79	3.57	3.62	2.91	2.85
Gender								
Males	76	4.07	4.34	3.84	3.86	3.67	2.89	2.95
Females	63	4.06	4.44	3.71	3.84	3.68	3.40	3.16
Occupation								
Peasants	89	4.09	4.43	3.76	3.87	3.60	3.06	2.96
Businessmen/women	30	3.90	4.23	3.77	3.77	3.73	2.97	3.13
Employed full-time	9	4.11	4.44	3.89	3.89	3.78	3.33	3.11
Unemployed	11	4.27	4.45	3.91	3.91	4.09	3.91	3.45
Education								
Primary education	82	4.05	4.40	3.79	4.00	3.65	3.20	3.05
Secondary education	41	4.10	4.34	3.88	3.54	3.78	3.07	3.05
College/university education	2	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.00
No formal education	14	4.00	4.50	3.43	3.79	3.50	2.71	2.86
Overall mean		4.06	4.39	3.78	3.85	3.68	3.12	3.04

(R)= sub-villages close to the road

(F)=sub-villages far from the road

According to the results, overall local people from sub-villages far from the road, Zone (F) sub-villages, had the feeling that tourism development in Mto wa Mbu has not improved household incomes and the general quality of life of local people. Although, the mean scores of the rest of the variables are above 3, those of Zone (F) sub-villages are

generally lower than those of Zone (R) sub-villages. This suggests that the contribution of tourism on improving these variables was more felt by respondents in Zone (R) sub-villages than those in Zone (F) sub-villages. This seems to qualify the notion that tourism is for those located close to the road. Similar observation on these two issues, the general quality of life of local people and the household incomes of local people in general, was also made by males and respondents who had no formal education. The results further suggest that overall respondents who described themselves as business people (not necessarily in tourism businesses) did not feel that tourism development had improved the general quality of life of local people, while peasants' views were similar in relation to household incomes of local people in general.

6.2.1 Local people's reasons for their ratings

Analysis of comments from the survey revealed that respondents gave a number of reasons to support their ratings in Tables 27 and 28. However, many reasons pointed out were cross-cutting, and a particular reason was given to more than one question. Such reasons are discussed in the following paragraphs under each question given to respondents, and are presented in order of scores based on their overall means. However, to avoid unnecessary repetition, questions with similar reasons are presented and discussed together. The results from such analysis are integrated and compared with those from the interviews, field observations, and informal discussions.

Prices of goods and services

Analysis of respondents' comments regarding the impact of tourism development on prices of goods and services revealed two categories of viewpoint: a producer perspective

and a consumer perspective. Many respondents felt there was some increase in the prices of goods and services because their responses were based on real life experience in the marketplace where food prices had dramatically climbed due to supply shortages and a growing tendency by suppliers to target the tourist market. To some extent this may sound good from a producer perspective, especially given the fact that the majority of local people were peasants. Field observations and informal interviews with sellers suggest that almost all the food consumed in hotels, campsites, restaurants is sourced from the local market in the study area and the suppliers to this market are overwhelmingly local small-holder-farmers. Nonetheless, some respondents raised concerns over the increased prices of goods and services arguing from a consumer perspective that the downside of this tendency was that the cost of living was mercilessly getting higher, with no signs of recovery in the near future since tourist numbers kept on growing year after year. Commenting on this aspect, one survey respondent for example, argued,

“...It is because of some few money hungry individuals. They [businessmen] keep on milking us unnecessarily ...thinking we are all tourists! Indeed, they make our life difficult”

However, the respondents who observed that tourism did not make any difference on prices of goods and services associated their perception over the rising prices with a combination of factors such as increasing costs of doing business, changing life styles, increased government taxes, and the influence of the global economy. Commenting on this question, one respondent for example, said,

“...it is obvious! What do you expect if the government keeps on raising taxes? It is definitely prices will be higher”

Field observations also revealed that prices of many items in the study area were as high as in the main tourist city of the northern tourism circuit, Arusha, which is considered to be the most expensive city in Tanzania. This was also supported by the interviewees, with one local government official commenting,

“You see! Banana plantations are everywhere in Mto wa Mbu. But my friend, we just see them [banana] going as we can’t afford the price, too high! Yes, occasionally you can buy one, but then you have got to go far away until you find the plantation so you can buy from the farmer before they [banana] are brought here at the market. Otherwise, if you wait for them here, then be ready to buy at a tourist price!” (Government 8)

The results also suggest that the respondents realized the advantages of high prices of goods and services from the producer perspective, but also recognized the downside from the consumer perspective.

Accessibility (transport and communication)

Almost all comments about accessibility referred to four major infrastructure developments available in the study area: the tarmac road, street roads, telecommunication, and internet provision. First, respondents believed that without tourism there would be no tarmac road in their area. In fact, this was the main reference to this question, and was also supported by the results from the interviews with decision-makers. Although it is true that tourism led to the presence of such a road in Mto wa Mbu, the interview with a park official revealed that much of the idea originated from the pressing need to boost tourism development not in the study area but in the major tourist attractions of the country, especially those available in the famous northern tourism circuit, namely Tarangire National Park, Lake Manyara national park, Ngorongoro

Conservation Area, and Serengeti National Park. The study area is located between Tarangire National Park and Lake Manyara National Park (see section 3.2).

The second reason was based on the perception that tourism has improved street roads in their area so as to smoothen tourist driving, riding, and cycling during village tours. Field observations also confirmed the presence of such roads, which were upgraded to a gravel standard. It was also observed that roads commonly used by tourists as driving or cycling routes were reasonably well maintained, and a number of tourists were seen on them doing village tours. Stressing this improvement, one survey respondent noted,

“If you want to realize that it is tourism, which is bringing all you see here [street roads], just pay a visit to another rural area in our country. Don’t go to town places instead, go to any rural area located far from township like our one. I’m sure you will note the difference!”

It is however, worth noting that whereas many interviewees observed the same, some were of the view that the decision to upgrade such roads to a gravel standard was politically motivated, especially by one member of parliament whose underlying agenda was to win votes in the forthcoming election. Emphasizing this, one local government official for example, commented,

“...tourism has done nothing on street roads, may be that tarmac road there. All you see here [reasonably well maintained gravel street roads] is just because of [name of one Member of Parliament] who wants to maintain his position as a member of parliament for our constituency. He solicited funds to set up a reliable water supply system too! Yeah, because he knows the area has many people and therefore many votes for him”.
(Government 2)

The other reason was based on a general perception that tourism has improved telecommunication in their area. This perception arose from the fact that whereas many

rural areas in Tanzania have no access to a mobile network service, the study area enjoyed a level of service just like or even more than urban areas. In fact, the area was even far ahead as it was covered by mobile networks from all five mobile network providers (Vodacom, Tigo, Zantel, Zain, and TTCL) currently operating in Tanzania. It was really an uncommon situation to find this even in some cities in Tanzania, according to the researcher's experience. Such networks tend to concentrate in big cities where life is more vibrant, particularly in terms of expenditures. Therefore the presence of such a wide range of network coverage in a rural area like Mto wa Mbu was attributed to tourism development in the area. One local government official while giving comments for example, said,

“Mto wa Mbu is a hot place because of tourism. Look, all mobile companies are here! ...If it is because of agriculture, why are they not in other rural area too given the fact that agriculture is everywhere in rural area? It is true they can't go to invest in a rural area like ours, unless they are sure there is money”. (Government 10)

The fourth reason that respondents referred to was internet service. There were three internet cafés operating during the time of data collection for this study, and plans were underway to establish one more. A number of tourists were seen browsing the internet, and informal interviews with owners of the three cafés revealed that they were mostly targeting the tourist market. Emphasizing this point one local government official said,

“...you see, now we have things like internet cafés here. I'm told it is so costly in terms of start-up capital, but they [owners] are sure of getting their money back because of tourists. You see that nice building out there [pointing to it], next week one bank, I forgot its name, is going to install an ATM machine there. Frankly speaking, we get all these in our area because of tourism” (Government 10)

It is however, important to acknowledge the fact that all the examples cited above by respondents are tangible in the sense that they are highly visible, and hence easily noticed by ordinary people.

Entrepreneurial training, income-generating projects, and employment opportunities

Respondents who noted some improvement to these interlinked variables argued that tourism development had created more business opportunities which many people had taken advantage of and started their own income-generating projects. This, in turn, had helped to create employment opportunities for others. In addition, there was a growing spirit of entrepreneurship among local people influenced by the desire to lift themselves out of poverty. Emphasizing this point, one interviewee said,

“Many people here are now entrepreneurs, and they like to do their own activities [projects] rather than being employed by someone. You know why? It’s because they know they can get more money from their own activities than from paid jobs. This is why even those working in restaurants you see here are mostly migrants!” (Government 11)

Examples cited by respondents as references to explain improvements made by tourism in their area, included an increasing number of tourist hotels, campsites, restaurants, bars, shops and various tourism groups, which were dealing with a variety of cultural goods and services such as souvenirs, cultural dancing, craft shops, tour guides, cycling etc. Interview results echoed similar observations. One local government official for example, noted,

“We didn’t know that one can make money out of tourism by simply having hired bicycles for tourists.... We didn’t have such kind of business before....” (Government 11)

There was a general appreciation that tourism has created many employment opportunities, especially self-employed opportunities such as petty trading businesses (street vendors), involving mostly youths. This kind of business has been growing rapidly in the area reflecting the country's Youth Development Policy of 2007, which estimates that 75 percent of the total number of youths (around 11 million) are now employed themselves in petty trading businesses. Expressing his appreciation one government official for example, said,

“... At least now our children [youths] can do something to make a living. You know young people of the new generation don't like farming activities and there were no options. So they used to roam around doing nothing whole day! Today, at least they have got some options, though what they get is still very little, but you know something is better than [nothing]” (Government 5)

Respondents also noted that tourism has increased local people's awareness of business opportunities. As tourist numbers grow, demand for more goods and services is created and this creates employment opportunities through engaging in various income-generating projects. One survey respondent while giving comments to explain why she thought employment opportunities were improving, said,

“I think it is because the number of tourists who come to our area is increasing every year”

Income-generating projects were also a result of increasing financial aids and loans from different sources that provide essential start-up capital for local people's ventures. Respondents frequently referred to three financial sources which were operating in the study area during the period of data collection. These were Participatory Agricultural Development and Empowerment Project (PADEP), Savings and Credit Co-operative Society (SACCOS), and Tanzania Social Action Fund (TASAF). They were all

government initiatives that aimed to provide local communities with loans and financial aid for different purposes. In addition, there was one NGO, Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA), which offered entrepreneurial training, basic business education, loan management, legal advice, and awareness about HIV/AIDS. The presence of such institutions was also considered a strong catalyst towards cultivating an entrepreneurial spirit and enhancing the participation of local people through capacity building. Although provision of financial aid and loans may not be directly related to tourism, respondents believed that without tourism they would not be considered for such financial assistance since payback would be more uncertain.

However, those who thought tourism has made no difference on the three items (income-generating projects, entrepreneurial training, and employment opportunities) cited five barriers. First, there was lack of capital among local people and access to financial loans was limited in the sense that many of them were associated with difficult requirements such as pledging valuable assets (a car, property) as collateral for the loan. Second, there was lack of education, including insufficient entrepreneurial training among local people, which together limit their capacity to start income-generating projects. Business education was also perceived to be insufficient as there were some people who did not like to take a loan because of ignorance and their tendency to capitalize on risks. Third, there were also concerns among respondents that entrepreneurial training was only given to those living close to the road, just as tourism provided opportunities for starting income-generating projects to people who lived close to the main road. While commenting, one respondent for example, said,

“If you want to see such projects go and see those who live in town [near the road]. We have nothing here!”

Fourth, there were concerns that migrants and those with education were the ones enjoying many of these advantages (income-generating projects, entrepreneurial training, and employment opportunities), but not the common local people, who are, indeed, the majority. Lack of education and the fact that the majority of respondents had basic education only (primary school education) can better explain why the quantitative results (see Table 27) show that a large proportion of respondents felt that the industry ‘did not make any difference’ in their life, in terms of income-generating projects, entrepreneurial training, employment opportunities, household income, and the general quality of life of local people. This also reflects Mwaisumbe’s article in the Guardian (2009) national newspaper about employment in the field of hospitality. According to this article, current statistics indicate that tourism employs about 300,000 in direct jobs or indirect vacancies in Tanzania, although, most senior positions in the field of hospitality business, such as chief cooks, are held by foreigners. One of the contributing factors to this situation (also raised by respondents) is lack of an aggressive policy of educating more nationals in this field, coupled with people’s unwillingness to pursue a career in the hospitality sector. One interviewee for example, said,

“Local people are holding casual jobs [referring to jobs in hotels]. During the low season, they are set jobless! ...Top positions are for migrants and elites” (Government 1)

Fifth, there were also concerns that tourism in the study area is associated with small-scale investments which did not create enough employment opportunities. Field observations revealed that the study area had 8 campsites at the time of data collection (June-August 2008), each employing less than 10 people. By virtue of geographical

boundaries, there were no tourist hotels in the study area, though there were 4 of them in the nearby wards, within commuting distance. Such small investments were a reflection of two major factors. First, local people had no capital to start extensive tourism investments. Second, even outside investors did not like to make large investments since tourists stayed a small amount of time in Mto wa Mbu, normally some hours or a day or two. Instead, they use the area as a gateway to Lake Manyara National Park, Ngorongoro Crater, and Serengeti National Park. One respondent for example, put it,

“I can say there is no difference. We see the same hotels everyday, nothing new! It is the same people we see working there for a long time. So how can I say there is some improvement, any way?”

Such observation together with others discussed suggest that local people in the study area identified key barriers for them to access entrepreneurial training, income-generating projects, and employment opportunities created by tourism development in their area. These are: the number and scale of tourism investments-as a reflection of employment opportunities created; location of the sub-village in relation to the main road; lack of start-up capital; migrants; and lack of education.

Household incomes and the general quality of life

Respondents again gave three categories of views: some observed some improvement; others did not see any difference; while there were those who felt these (household incomes and general quality of life) have rather worsened due to tourism development in their area. Respondents, who felt some improvement in household incomes and the general quality of life, interestingly noted such improvement in terms of employment creation. Tourism created more direct employment opportunities such as tour guides, taxi

drivers, and various roles in tourist hotels, lodges, campsites, guesthouses, bar and restaurants, shops, the provision of cultural goods and services, and the ever growing numbers of street vendors (petty traders). For the indirect created employment opportunities, improvement was seen in terms of increasing income-generating projects such as vegetable gardens. More women and youths benefited from such activities. One local government official for example, said,

“Tourism has changed women’s life completely. Before, they used to sit at home doing nothing, but now they are beating many men [in terms of having money]. Just walk around the area and see who mostly do tourism activities! You will definitely find that it is women and youths! These days many of them [women] can support their own lives, they don’t even need men [marriage] as was before!” (Government 4)

Improvement was also noted in terms of public services especially education. This was noted in three dimensions. First, there has been an increase in the number of children who have access to primary and secondary school education following the availability of additional classrooms at Mto wa Mbu primary school and the introduction of the newly constructed Jangwani primary school and the Rift Valley secondary school. Currently, Mto wa Mbu has two primary schools and one secondary school. Funds for school building and renovation works often come from tourism mainly as contributions from tourism businesses, tourists, Lake Manyara National Park (LMNP), and NGOs. Second, schools aids such as early child education sponsorship, and donations of text books and other school materials from tourists have been increasing. It should be noted that tourist visits to the community include visits to these schools, health centres, and orphanage centres. Third, the education spirit among youths has grown rapidly due to increasing awareness of tourism. Many of them have realized that without education there are

limited chances for someone to access tourism opportunities such as tour guides, which is viewed by many youths in the study area as a stepping stone towards establishing good relationships with tourists. One young boy for example, noted during an informal discussion with him,

“Being a tour guide is advantageous. A lot of youths here get sponsorship from tourists. Me too have one...he [American tourist] paid all my school fees, from O-level to A-level education [equivalent to college education in New Zealand]. He has now told me to find admission at any university here [Tanzania] or in Kenya so he can pay for me that one too!”

Social services delivery such as water supply and health services have been and are being improved in the study area because of the increasing number of tourists and development of tourism establishments such as hotels, lodges and campsites. These services also benefit the local communities.

However, those who felt that household incomes and the general quality of life have worsened or significantly worsened due to tourism development in their area cited a number of examples to explain their feelings. First, there was a concern that tourism has not provided employment opportunities to local people. Many such opportunities are taken by migrants and those with education as mentioned in previous paragraphs. Second, there was concern from a consumer perspective that tourism development has raised the prices of goods and services, and consequently the cost of living was getting higher than before. Third, there were concerns that tourism put many people in the study area at considerable risk of contracting the pandemic HIV/AIDS by contributing to the spread of the killer disease. This has led to an increasing number of street children and orphans. At

the time of data collection, there were four centres in the study area established in order to care for the increasing number of street children and orphans.

On the other side, the respondents who felt that tourism did not make any difference to household incomes and the general quality of life viewed tourism development in relation to agriculture, but from a producer perspective. Their main argument was that tourism in the study area did not seem to improve local people's main life-supporting activity, agriculture. Implicitly, the respondents expressed their concern that although prices of agricultural produce were higher at the marketplace, little reached the peasants who were the suppliers to the market. The survey revealed that one of the factors that meant peasants got little despite such an increase in prices was the nature of the supply chain, which was mainly dominated by middlemen. These middlemen would strategically go to peasants to buy such produce at cheaper prices, particularly during harvesting season. At this time, peasants have no option as, after spending their money on farming, they would need money to make a living. The middlemen would then keep those crops for a while, especially rice, so as to create a supply shortage and then resell the same at higher prices that target mainly the tourist market. If the peasants sold out everything to middlemen without leaving some for the household as is often the case in Tanzania, then the only option left is to go back to the middlemen and purchase the same at higher prices. This is the reason why a few respondents felt that tourism, instead of improving, has rather worsened the prices of goods and services in their area because the industry allows middlemen to realize profits at the expense of the poor peasants. One peasant respondent for example, commented,

“We peasants don’t get anything from tourism! They [middlemen] buy our crops at lower prices and sell them [to tourist hotels] at higher prices. We know we are being exploited but we don’t have another option”

In fact, this was the dominant argument behind those who felt tourism had rather worsened the household incomes and the general quality of life of local people (see Table 27 and 28). The basis behind this argument is that the majority of people in the study area, and even the majority of the respondents (64%) were peasants (see Table 9). It is thus important to note that the quantitative results discussed above, have been influenced by a combination of factors emanating from respondents comments. These together influenced one third of the total respondents to believe that tourism development had not improved the general quality of life of local people and the household incomes of local people in general, but rather has worsened them.

6.3 Conclusion

The focus in this chapter has been on the contribution of tourism to poverty alleviation, which is research question number four. This has been examined using views from two different perspectives: ordinary members of the local community and the decision-makers within the community. Seven aspects of life have been used as references to gauge the extent to which tourism has contributed towards poverty alleviation in the study area.

The findings suggest that there are some convincing indications that tourism is contributing positively towards poverty alleviation. This has been revealed by the results in Table 27, which show that, based on mean scores, overall the respondents had the feeling that all variables examined in this study, from ‘accessibility’ (mean 4.06) through

‘household incomes of local people in general’ (mean 3.04), have been improved as a result of tourism development in the area. Despite these positive achievements, there are a number of barriers that limit the ability of local communities in the study area to capture tourism created opportunities, such as income-generating projects, entrepreneurial training, and employment opportunities. These include lack of education, lack of capital, migrants, location of a particular sub-village, and number and scale of tourism investments.

However, looking closely at these quantitative results, the situation is more complex. Based on percentage scores for example, it appears that nearly one third of respondents felt that tourism development has made the general quality of life and household incomes of local people in general worse rather than better. This view has been influenced by a combination of factors identified in this chapter, including the lack of education, migration, HIV/AIDS, and an unfair supply chain of agricultural produce have been identified as bottlenecks towards local people’s access to tourism benefits that would have improved their lives. This not only indicates disharmony between agriculture and tourism development, but also pinpoints one of the reasons why the tourism industry might not seem to offer a means for local communities in developing countries to escape the confines of widespread poverty. This argument may be stronger and even more vivid if one views it in the context of rural areas where much of the widespread poverty exists and where the majorities are peasants.

Nevertheless, the findings in this chapter suggest that more research work is required to clearly understand the relationship between tourism development and agriculture in the study area and Tanzania in particular, especially where agriculture is characterized by small-holder-farmers (peasants). This would be a stepping stone to establishing if the two sectors are mutually beneficial in the sense that agriculture supplies basic products to meet the needs of growing tourism development, and tourism provides peasants with funding to optimize and continue agricultural activities.

The following chapter provides a concluding discussion of the findings of this study in relation to the five research questions, which this and the previous two chapters have attempted to explore. This discussion will provide a summary of the key findings of this research project, and bring together the three chapters of the findings discussed above. The discussion will also present key lessons learnt from this research work.

CHAPTER SEVEN: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

7.1 Introduction

The objective of this research was to investigate the involvement and participation of local communities in tourism development in Tanzania using a case study of local communities in Barabarani village, Mto wa Mbu, Arusha. To achieve this systematically, the research was guided by five inter-related research questions: (1) what are the views of local people towards community involvement in tourism development; (2) what are appropriate roles of local people in tourism development; (3) to what extent do local people participate in the tourism development decision-making process; (4) to what extent have tourism businesses developed benefit-sharing schemes; and (5) what are the views of the local people on the contribution of tourism development towards poverty reduction.

The research findings on each of these questions have been presented and discussed in detail in the previous three chapters. It is important to remember that the findings of this study were strengthened by its research strategy, a case study approach, which enabled: the investigation at the community level which has brought together perspectives from the grass-root level, where little research on this topic has been done; the involvement of multiple stakeholders which has explored perspectives from a range of stakeholders (ordinary members of the community, decision-makers within the community, tourism professionals, tourism businesses and NGOs); and the use of multiple methods (household survey, interviews, field observations, document analysis, and informal discussions). Such an approach has improved the validity of the findings and successfully

addressed the central research questions. Both quantitative and qualitative data generated from such techniques were analysed, integrated and compared, and were used to complement each other.

This chapter draws conclusions from the key findings of the research (chapters 4-6). It brings together a summary of the major findings of the research in the context of the research questions. It starts by a discussion of the key findings with the view to drawing out key lessons of the research. It then continues by pointing out recommendations and avenues for future research. The chapter finishes with the conclusion.

7.2 Discussion

The nature of community participation expected by local people

In an attempt to establish the nature of participation expected by local people, the study has examined a variety of ways of involving the local community in tourism development. Local people in Barabarani village-Mto wa Mbu considered involvement in the decision-making process as a suitable way of involving the local community in tourism development (see section 4.3). While the literature recognizes that the inclusion of the local community in tourism development is considerable, there is debate about the degree of inclusion in the decision-making process to be exercised by local communities, ranging from passive participation (in which people participate by being told what has been decided or has already happened) to active participation (in which people get involved to reach the final decision) (see section 2.3). The findings of this study have revealed that local people themselves wish to take part actively in the decision-making process and wish to have a voice when decisions are made (they want active

participation). They want to be actively involved in this way to ensure the community's pressing needs, priorities and interests are considered when decisions about tourism development in their area are made. Local people overwhelmingly stated that 'taking part actively in the tourism decision-making process' is an appropriate way of involving the local community in tourism development (Table 14). This was overall the most accepted option by all local people despite their differences in terms of the location of the sub-villages they came from, their gender, occupation, and education. The desired way of involving the local community in tourism development by the local people appears to represent "spontaneous participation" in Tosun (2006)'s typology (Figure 1), which advocates bottom-up, active participation by local people.

Local people also recognize and acknowledge the need to involve tourism experts and local government officials when making such decisions. However, they do not want appointed officials alone to decide on tourism development issues because of the general feeling that some of them are corrupt. Also they do not want elected officials or the local committee alone to decide because they lack tourism expertise and some of them have little education. According to local people, a suitable form of decision-making would be one that involves both elected officials (who represent the local people to ensure the community's interests are considered when making decisions) and appointed officials (who would bring in their expertise and professional knowledge). But before making such decisions, they (elected and appointed officials) should first consult the local people so as to collect public views (Table 22). The need to be consulted may signal that the desired participation by local people is similar to participation by consultation in Pretty's

typology, in which decision-makers have no obligation to take on board people's views (Figure 1). However, the difference in this research lies in the fact that local people wish the actual participation or the decision-making body to involve elected officials, who are representatives elected by the local people from among themselves. In other words, the local people through their representatives would in essence be among the decision-makers.

The nature and extent of community participation in the current tourism decision-making process

Although the nature and extent of community participation in the current tourism development decision-making process in the study area is similar to the one expected by local people, the findings have revealed that local people, regardless of the location of the sub-villages they came from, their gender, occupation, and education, generally did not feel involved in the current decision-making process (Table 23). However, in line with their desired form of participation as discussed in the previous paragraph, local people did admit that their leaders are involved. The leaders agreed that they were involved on behalf of the village in many decision-making bodies which often include officials from various government authorities and professions depending on the matter to be decided on. In addition, the leaders claimed that they also involve local people not only in tourism-related decisions but also in decisions related to other sectors in which the village is involved. They further claimed that they involve local people before decisions are made and give them feedback after decisions are made, even though the local people still felt uninvolved.

Here there seems to be two issues arising from local people's and leaders' points of view. First, there are differing views regarding the degrees of involvement expected by the two groups. While leaders consider collecting views from the public before making a particular decision and giving them feedback regarding what they jointly agreed as a way to involve the public in the decision-making process, local people seem to expect more than that. It should be noted here that, since it is impractical to involve all members of the local community in the decision-making body, involving local leaders is in line with the recommendation by Zhao and Ritchie (2007) on how to involve local communities in the decision-making process. Second, the approach used by leaders to involve people in the decision-making process does not seem to be working well as local people do not feel involved. One barrier to this is that while leaders use village general meetings as venues for communication, receive feedback, and to collect people's views on a particular issue, their attendance of ordinary people at such meetings is poor and erratic. This in turn, created 'communication breakdown' between the two groups so that it becomes hard for the people to air their views, get feedback from their leaders, and know what development issues there are in their area. This eventually creates poor coordination and a negative perception of generally, 'not feeling involved'. Therefore, while local people want to be involved in the decision-making process, they are reluctant to attend village general meetings due to low level interest showed by local people in following up issues beyond their immediate family domain (apathy), and low level of awareness of the whole idea of community involvement, coupled with lack of education. The outcome here is that people not only miss the opportunity to give their views, but are also unaware of

development issues in their area. Tosun (2000) and Cole (2006) identified similar obstacles when studying community participation in tourism in developing countries.

The nature and extent of community participation in the sharing of tourism benefits

Local people in the study area also considered involvement in the sharing of tourism benefits as a suitable way to involve the local community in tourism development. Both private and public tourism businesses operating in the study area have schemes that favourably benefit local people through approaches such as employing locally, building local capacity, and contributions to village development initiatives (see section 5.3). However, analysis of the qualitative data from the survey showed that there was a general perception among local people that those living in sub-villages close to the main road have access to more tourism benefits than those in sub-villages far from the road (Figure 6). But it is important to note here that quantitative survey data showed that location of the sub-village was not a distinguishing factor towards involvement of local people in the tourism development decision-making process (Table 24). As much as such approaches exist in all tourism businesses involved in this study, the extent to which a particular tourism business has developed its scheme of benefit sharing differed from one business to another depending on the nature of business, ownership, and the objectives of the business. In general, public or community-based businesses have more systematic benefit-sharing schemes than private businesses. There was no guarantee the local community would receive benefits from private businesses, and if there were any benefit-sharing schemes, they were executed on an ad hoc basis. The area has one large scale public tourism business (LMNP) and one small scale community-based tourism business (CTP), but has many small scale private tourism businesses which, as mentioned, do not

have systematic benefit-sharing schemes. This ultimately results in fewer opportunities for local people and impacts on local people's efforts to alleviate poverty. The lack of systematic benefit-sharing schemes in private tourism businesses in Barabarani village reinforces the argument that the private sector may have little or no interest in ensuring poverty is reduced among local people (Jamieson *et al*, 2004). It also reflects a situation observed in the literature on benefit sharing, in which most studies focused on public or community-based tourism businesses (see section 2.4.1).

The contribution of tourism development to poverty alleviation

The findings have revealed that tourism development in Barabarani village is contributing positively towards poverty alleviation. However, local people in the study area generally observed significant contributions to accessibility (transport and communication) and the prices of goods and services, but noted little contribution of tourism development to the general quality of life and household incomes (Table 27). Again, analysis of the qualitative data from the survey showed that there was a general feeling among local people that tourism development in the study area contributes significantly towards improving the livelihood of those living in sub-villages close to the main road but contributes less to improving the livelihood of those in sub-villages far from the road. It is, however, important to note that local people have complex views influenced by a combination of overlapping factors, especially regarding the contribution of tourism development towards improving the general quality of life and household incomes. The contribution of tourism on accessibility and on prices of goods and services for example, was easily noticed by local people because both of them are tangible. Additionally, it was unlikely for them to associate such improvement with any other

sector given that tourism is regarded as a very important economic activity in Barabarani village particularly in activities such as tour operations, curio shops, and handcraft sales. On the other hand, tourism did not seem to improve incomes and the general life of peasants, who are the majority in the study area and also constituted the largest proportion of survey respondents. In addition, local people mainly based their assessment of the contribution of tourism development to the general quality of life and household incomes on one factor, employment creation. This reflects one of the other study findings that local people have some knowledge of the positive impact of tourism development (see section 4.2), and also reinforces the argument by Luvanga and Shitundu (2003) that tourism will contribute to poverty reduction if it creates new jobs and provides incomes.

7.3 Recommendations

Using the findings, the study has established that there are policy issues, which need to be addressed for the effective involvement of local people in the tourism decision-making process, in the sharing of tourism benefits, and in tourism's contribution towards poverty alleviation:

- Cultural tourism, which requires relatively low investment capital, is the major tourist attraction in the study area. Given that in most parts of rural Tanzania the majority of the population have little education and lack capital, this type of tourism needs to be encouraged and promoted in Tanzania. This is of crucial importance to ensuring that tourism contributes towards poverty alleviation, especially given that this type of tourism is associated with activities such as

cultural shows, curio shops, and handcraft sales which do not require high education. In addition, the incomes accrued go directly to the community involved.

- Lack of education has been identified as a bar to efforts by local people accessing tourism employment opportunities. In order to increase the contribution of tourism to poverty alleviation, there is a need to institute training programmes at the community level that will ultimately provide opportunities for the local people to be employed in various tourism businesses.
- Although the results have established that local communities participate in the tourism decision-making process through their leaders who are members of the decision-making bodies, overall the local people in Barabarani village-Mto wa Mbu felt they were generally not involved. This was in part caused by people's reluctance to attend village general meetings, which eventually posed barriers to communicate outcomes. This suggests the need to raise people's awareness of the importance of village general meetings as important avenues through which public opinion can be collected and feedback from leaders can be communicated.
- The findings have revealed that tourism businesses have different approaches to sharing tourism benefits with the wider community. Public or community-based businesses have more systematic benefit-sharing schemes than private businesses, whose schemes are executed on an ad hoc basis. This suggests the need to have a

policy in place which would ensure private businesses also have more systematic schemes of benefit sharing. This would ultimately create opportunities for local people and alleviate poverty while contributing to achieving sustainability in tourism development.

- There are some constraints (lack of education, migration, HIV/AIDS, and lack of start-up capital) that need to be dealt with in order to foster the positive impacts of tourism. Thus, policies directed at addressing the constraints which inhibit people from accessing opportunities created by tourism development could be enhanced.

7.4 Avenues for future research

Future research work arising from this study could examine the following issues:

- Although the findings suggest that there are some indications that tourism is contributing positively towards poverty alleviation, more research work is required to analyse and quantify the extent of such contribution in economic terms, especially at the household level. This would shed light on how local people could increase their earnings from tourism and subsequently alleviate poverty, especially income poverty at the household level.
- There are concerns that the in-migration of foreigners and people from other parts of Tanzania pose a barrier towards local people's access to tourism benefits. This suggests the need to investigate the magnitude of migration and how it is related

to tourism to find out how it can be minimized in order that local people can increase their earnings from tourism and subsequently alleviate poverty.

- Although tourism has strong linkages to other sectors, this research has revealed some concerns, especially from peasants involved in this study, that tourism development in the study area has not improved their quality of life. This suggests that more research work is required to clearly understand the relationship between tourism development and agriculture in the study area and Tanzania in particular, especially where agriculture is characterized by small-holder-farmers (peasants). This would be a stepping stone to establishing if the two sectors are mutually beneficial in the sense that agriculture supplies basic products to meet the needs of growing tourism development, and tourism provides peasants with funding to optimize and continue agricultural activities.
- Since this research focused only on local communities in Barabarani village-Mto wa Mbu, there is a need to conduct similar studies in various parts of Tanzania and in other developing countries. Such studies would provide the basis for comparison and offer grounds for establishing the generality of the findings in the context of a particular country or region.
- More research studies on tourism and poverty alleviation are needed and these should focus at the grass-root level, where little has been done.

7.5 Conclusion

Using this case study, the research has made an important practical contribution to understanding tourism in Tanzania, particularly in relation to the three key concepts discussed in this research: community participation in the tourism development decision-making process; community participation in the sharing of tourism benefits; and the contribution of tourism development to poverty alleviation. The findings of this research are expected to be useful to policy-makers, academicians, and other key players in the tourism industry and community development sector.

The research findings established that local people wish to play a role in the tourism development decision-making process. The findings have suggested that while local people recognize and acknowledge the need to involve tourism professionals and experts when making decisions about tourism development, they themselves wish to be involved in the decision-making process. In general, local people want to see decisions about tourism development in their area made jointly by government officials and local leaders in consultation with the local community.

The research findings have also established that local people wish to be involved in the sharing of tourism benefits. The findings have revealed that tourism businesses in the study area have developed some benefit-sharing schemes that favour local people to access tourism benefits. These schemes include local employment, local capacity building, and sharing tourism profits with the wider community.

Tourism development in Barabarani village-Mto wa Mbu has made some improvement on accessibility, prices of goods and services, employment, entrepreneurial training, income-generating projects, household incomes and the general quality of life though the extent of the contribution varies from one aspect to another. This overall indicates that tourism development in the study area is contributing positively towards poverty alleviation.

REFERENCES

- Amin, M., D. Willetts and P. Marshall (1984). Journey through Tanzania. Available: <http://www.ntz.info/gen/n00419.html>
- Archabald, K. and Naughton-Treves, L. (2001). Tourism revenue-sharing around national parks in Western Uganda: early efforts to identify and reward local communities, *Environmental Conservation*, 28 (2) 135-149
- Arens, W. (1972). Mto wa Mbu: a multi-ethnic community in northern Tanzania. Available: <http://www.popline.org/docs/0410/726259.html>
- Baral, N. and Heinen, J. T. (2007). Decentralization and people's participation in conservation: a comparative study from the Western Trail of Nepal, *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology*, 14 (5) 520-531
- Beeton, S. (2006). Community development through tourism, Landlink Press, Australia
- Benavides, D. D and Perez-Ducy, E. (2001). Tourism in the Least Developed Countries, Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, Brussels
- Blake, A., J. S. Arbache, M. T. Sinclair and V. Teles (2008). Tourism and poverty relief, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35 (1) 107-126
- Briggs, P. (2002). Guide to Tanzania. Available: <http://www.ntz.info/gen/n00419.html>
- Brochure (2000) Mto wa Mbu cultural tourism programme. Available: http://infojep.com/culturaltours/mto_wa_mbu_brochure.htm
- Burton, T. L. and Cherry, E. G. (1970). Social research techniques for planners. George Allen and Unwin Ltd, London.
- Chok, S. and Macbeth, J. (2007). Tourism as a tool for poverty alleviation: a critical analysis of 'pro-poor tourism' and implications for sustainability, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10 (2&3) 144-164
- Cole, S. (2006). Cultural tourism, community participation and empowerment. In M. K. Smith and M. Robson (eds) *Cultural tourism in a changing world: politics, participation and (re)presentation*, Cleveland-UK, Channel View Publications.
- eTN (2008). Tourism leads Tanzania's economy. Available: <http://www.travelwirenews.com/editions/17APR2008.htm>
- Finn, M., M. Elliott-White and M. Walton (2000). Tourism & leisure research methods; data collection, analysis and interpretation, Harlow, Longman.

- Gartner, W. C. (1996). *Tourism development: principles, processes, and policies*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Havel, V. (1996). Reflections-what is participation. In Havel, V. (1996) *The World Bank Participation Sourcebook*, The World Bank.
Available: <http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/sourcebook/sb0100.htm>
- Honeck, D. (2008). LDC poverty alleviation and the Doha development agenda: is tourism being neglected? World Trade Organization, Manuscript dated 12 August 2008
- Jamieson, W., H. Goodwin and C. Edmunds (2004). Contribution of tourism to poverty alleviation: pro-poor tourism and the challenge of measuring impacts, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, UN ESCAP
- Johannesen, A. B. and Skonhott, A. (2005). Tourism, poaching and wildlife conservation: what can integrate conservation and development projects accomplish? *Resource and Energy Economics*, vol.27, 208-226
- Kibicho, W. (2003). Community tourism: a lesson from Kenya's coastal region, *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 10 (1) 33-42
- Kisembo, P. (2008). Rises of illiteracy levels worry govt, the Guardian, issue 3, date 10/01/2008, 09:53:22. Available: www.ippmedia.com
- Koster, R. and Randall, J. E. (2005). Indicators of community economic development through mural-based tourism, *The Canadian Geographer*, 49 (1) 42-60
- Kweka, J. and Ngowi, D. (2007). The development dimension of tourism foreign direct investment in Tanzania, a report for the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), Geneva
- Li, W. (2005). Community decision-making: participation in development, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33 (1) 132-143
- Li, Y. (2004). Exploring community tourism in China: the case of Nanshan tourism zone, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 12 (3) 175-193
- Long, J. (2007). *Researching leisure, sport and tourism: the essential guide*, SAGE Publication Ltd, London.
- Luvanga, N. and Shitundu, J. (2003). The role of tourism in poverty alleviation in Tanzania, Research Report No. 03.4, Research on Poverty Alleviation (REPOA), Mkuki na Nyota Publishers Ltd, Dar es salaam, Tanzania

- Makame, M. K. and Boon, E. K. (2008). Sustainable tourism and benefit-sharing in Zanzibar: the case of Kiwengwa-Pongwe Forest Reserve, *Journal of Human Ecology*, 24 (2) 93-109
- Manyara, G., Jones, E. (2007). Community-based tourism enterprises development in Kenya: an exploration of their potential as avenues of poverty reduction, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15 (6) 628-644
- Mbaiwa, J. (2005). The problems and prospects of sustainable tourism development in the Okago Delta, Botswana, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 13 (3) 203-227
- Meyer, D. (2007). Pro-poor tourism: from leakages to linkages. a conceptual framework for creating linkages between the accommodation sector and 'poor' neighbouring communities, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10 (6) 558-583
- Moser and Kalton, (1993). Survey methods in social investigation 2nd ed, Heinemann, London
- Mwaisumbe, F. (2009). Like olive oil, tourism now is too sweet for the economy. Available: <http://www.ippmedia.com/ipp/guardian/2009/01/01/128983.html>
- Mwandosya, M. J. (2007). Tourism, human welfare and climate concerns: the case of Tanzania, presented by Prof. Mark J. Mwandosya (MP), Minister of State, Vice President's Office (Environment), to the international conference on secure and sustainable living: social and economic benefit of weather, climate change and water services, Madrid, Spain, 20/3/2007
- National Bureau of Statistics Tanzania (2006). Analytical report volume X, Ministry of Planning, Economy and Empowerment, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
- National Youth Development Policy (2007), Ministry of Labour, Employment and Youth Development, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
- Norton, B. (1991). The African elephant: last days of Eden. Available: <http://www.ntz.info/gen/n00419.html>
- ODI (2006). Can tourism help reduce poverty in Africa?, Overseas Development Institute Briefing Paper, March 2006, London
- Ribot, J. (2004). From exclusion to participation: turning Senegal's forestry policy around? *World Development*, 23 (9) 1587-1599
- Richards, G. (2003). Tourism and labour mobility in the European Union, *Tourism Recreational Research*, 28 (1) 77-86

- Rogelberg, S. G. (2002). Handbook of research methods in industrial and organizational psychology, Blackwell publishing, USA
- Saunders, M., P. Lewis, and A. Thornhill (2000). Research methods for business students, 2nd edition, Pearson Education Limited, England
- Scheyvens, R. (2002). Tourism for development: empowering communities, Prentice Hall, England
- Scheyvens, R. (2008). Tourism and poverty reduction: issues for Small Island States, *Tourism Geographies*, 10 (1) 22-41
- Scheyvens, R. (2007). Exploring the tourism-poverty nexus, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10 (2&3) 231-254
- Simmons, D. G. (1994). Community participation in tourism planning, *Tourism Management*, 15 (2) 98-108
- Simpson, M. C. (2008). Community benefit tourism initiatives: a conceptual oxymoron?, *Tourism Management*, 29 (1) 1-18
- Sitikarn, B. (2007). Public participation: is it a means of achieving sustainable tourism? Available: <http://resource.mfu.ac.th/upload/789.pdf>
- Songorwa, A. N. (1999). Community-based wildlife management (CWM) in Tanzania: are communities interested? *World Development*, 27 (12) 2061-2079
- Spenceley, A. (2008). Responsible tourism in Southern Africa. In A. Spenceley (ed) *Responsible tourism: critical issues for conservation and development*, Earthscan UK & USA
- Tanzania Tourist Board (2007). Tourism expected to blossom next year-tourism annual report. Available: <http://www.tanzaniatouristboard.com/>
- Thomas, J. (2008). Population of Tanzania now 39 million, the Guardian, issue 3, date 01/03/2008, 12:04 AM BT. Available: http://www.safarilands.org/index.php/technology/more/population_of_tanzania_now_39_million/
- Timothy, D. J. (1999). Participatory planning: a view of tourism in Indonesia, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26 (2) 371-391
- Tosun, C. (2000). Limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries, *Tourism Management*, vol. 21. 613-633

- Tosun, C. (2006). Expected nature of community participation in tourism development, *Tourism Management*, 27 (3) 493-504
- Tourism Master Plan (2002). Strategy and actions, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Tanzania. Available: www.chl.ie
- UNCTAD (2007). FDI in tourism: the development dimension, UNCTAD current studies on FDI and development No.4, New York and Geneva, United Nations
- UN-OHRLLS (2007). Facts about Least Developed Countries (LDCs), UN office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Development States, New York, USA, available: <http://www.unohrlls.org/UserFiles/File/Publications/Factsheet.pdf>
- Van der Duim, V. R and Caalders, J. (2008). Tourism chains and pro-poor tourism development: an actor-network analysis of a pilot project in Costa Rica, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 11 (2) 109-125
- Van der Duim, R., P. Karin and A. John (2006). Cultural tourism in African communities: a comparison between cultural Manyattas in Kenya and the cultural tourism project in Tanzania. In M. K. Smith and M. Robson (eds) *Cultural tourism in a changing world: politics, participation and (re)presentation*, Cleveland-UK, Channel View Publications.
- Veal, A. J. (2006). Research methods for leisure and tourism: a practical guide, 3rd edition, Pitman Publishing, UK
- Veal, A. J. (1997). Research methods for leisure and tourism: a practical guide, 2nd edition, Pitman Publishing, UK.
- Vincent, V. C. and Thompson, W. (2002). Assessing community support and sustainability for ecotourism development, *Journal of Travel Research*, 41 (2) 153-160
- Victurine, R. (2000). Building tourism excellence at the community level: capacity building for community-based entrepreneurs in Uganda, *Journal of Travel Research*, 38 (3) 221-229
- Wang, Y. and Wall, G. (2005). Sharing the benefits of tourism: a case study in Hainan, China, *Environments Journal*, 33 (1) 41-59
- Wilkerson, M. L. (1996). Information for developers: developing a rural tourism plan, *Economic Development Review*, 14 (2) 79

- Wolfensohn, J. D. (1996). Foreword. In Havel, V. (1996) The World Bank Participation Sourcebook. Available <http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/sourcebook/sb0100.htm>
- World Bank (1997). Benefit sharing in protected area management : the case of Tarangire National Park, Tanzania,
Available : <http://www.worldbank.org/afr/findings/english/find88.htm>
- World Economic Forum (2008). Highlights of the travel & tourism competitiveness report. Available : <http://www.weforum.org/en/media/publications/CompetitivenessReports/index.htm>
- Zhao, W. and Ritchie J.R. (2007). Tourism and poverty alleviation: an integrative research framework, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10 (2&3) 119-143

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Interviewer-complete Household Survey Questionnaire

Local community involvement and participation in the tourism industry in Mto wa Mbu, Arusha-Tanzania

- 1) How long have you been living in Mto wa Mbu?
- ☐ Less than 10 years ☐ longer than 10 years ☐ since I was born
- 2) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement about tourism
- a) Tourism encourages a variety of cultural activities by the local population
- Strongly disagree strongly agree
- ☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5
- b) Tourism provides many worthwhile employment opportunities
- Strongly disagree strongly agree
- ☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5
- c) Tourism generates income
- Strongly disagree strongly agree
- ☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5
- d) Meeting tourists promotes cross-cultural exchange (greater mutual understanding and respect one another's culture)
- Strongly disagree strongly agree
- ☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5
- 3) From your experience in Mto wa Mbu, what impact has tourism development in Mto wa Mbu in the past five years had on;
- a) General quality of life of local people
- Significantly worse significantly improved
- ☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5

Comments:

b) Employment opportunities for local people

Significantly worse

significantly improved

☐1

☐2

☐3

☐4

☐5

Comments:

c) Household income of local people in general

Significantly worse

significantly improved

☐1

☐2

☐3

☐4

☐5

Comments:

d) Quality of goods and services in general

Significantly worse

significantly improved

☐1

☐2

☐3

☐4

☐5

Comments:

e) Income-generating projects for local people in general

Significantly worse

significantly improved

☐1

☐2

☐3

☐4

☐5

Comments:

f) Entrepreneurial training (general entrepreneurial spirit and development amongst local people)

Significantly worse

significantly improved

☐1

☐2

☐3

☐4

☐5

Comments:

g) Accessibility (transport and communication)

Significantly worse

significantly improved

☐1

☐2

☐3

☐4

☐5

Comments:

4) In your views, what are suitable means of involving local people in tourism development?

a) Encouraging local people to invest in the tourism sector

- c) Local people should have a voice in decision-making process of local tourism development

Strongly disagree

strongly agree

☐ 1

☐ 2

☐ 3

☐ 4

☐ 5

Comments:

- d) Local people should be consulted when tourism policies are being made

Strongly disagree

strongly agree

☐ 1

☐ 2

☐ 3

☐ 4

☐ 5

Comments:

- e) Local people should be consulted but the final decision on the tourism development should be made by formal bodies

Strongly disagree

strongly agree

☐ 1

☐ 2

☐ 3

☐ 4

☐ 5

Comments:

- f) Local people should not participate by any means

Strongly disagree

strongly agree

☐ 1

☐ 2

☐ 3

☐ 4

☐ 5

Comments:

- g) Local people should be financially supported to invest in tourism development

Strongly disagree

strongly agree

☐ 1

☐ 2

☐ 3

☐ 4

☐ 5

Comments:

- 6) What is your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements regarding who should make decisions on tourism development in Mto wa Mbu such as establishment of tourist hotel, lodges or camp sites etc?

- a) Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism/ Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA) should make decisions on tourism development in Mto wa Mbu

7) In your view, which of the following is **best** placed to make decisions on tourism development in Mto wa Mbu such as establishment of tourist hotel, lodges or camp sites etc?

- 8) Do you feel personally involved in the decision-making process regarding tourism development in Mto wa Mbu such as establishment of tourist hotel, lodges or camp sites etc?

Comments:

Comments:

Comments:

☐ Yes (*please go to question 12*) ☐ No (*please comment why?*)

12) What is your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements regarding who should make decisions in general matters about the Community Conservation Services (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu?

- a) Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism/ Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA) should make decisions about the Community Conservation Services (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu

Strongly disagree

strongly agree

☐1

☐2

☐3

☐4

☐5

Comments:

- b) Elected local government should make decisions about the Community Conservation Services (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu

Strongly disagree

strongly agree

☐1

☐2

☐3

☐4

☐5

Comments:

- c) Appointed local government agencies (who are normally representative of central government) should make decisions about the Community Conservation Services (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu

Strongly disagree

strongly agree

☐1

☐2

☐3

☐4

☐5

Comments:

- d) Appointed and elected local government agencies should jointly make decisions about the Community Conservation Services (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu by consulting local people

Strongly disagree

strongly agree

☐1

☐2

☐3

☐4

☐5

Comments:

- e) A committee elected by public (local people) for specially developing, managing and controlling tourism should make decisions about the Community Conservation Services (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu

Strongly disagree

strongly agree

☐1

☐2

☐3

☐4

☐5

Comments:

- f) Market forces should make decisions about the Community Conservation Services (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu

Strongly disagree

strongly agree

☐ 1

☐ 2

☐ 3

☐ 4

☐ 5

Comments:

- g) Are there any other appropriate ways through which decisions regarding the Community Conservation Services (CCS) project could be made?

(Please

specify)

- 13) In your view, who is best placed to make decisions in general matters about the Community Conservation Services (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu? (please tick one)

☐ Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism/ Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA)

☐ Elected local government

☐ Appointed local government agencies

☐ Appointed and elected local government agencies in consultation with local people

☐ A committee elected by local people

☐ Market forces

☐ Other (please specify)

- 14) Do you feel personally involved in the decision-making process of the Community Conservation Services (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu?

☐ Yes (please comment how?)

☐ No (please comment why?)

Comments:

- 15) In your view, how do you generally rate the level of local people's involvement in the decision-making process of the Community Conservation Services (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu?

Very poor

very good

☐ 1

☐ 2

☐ 3

☐ 4

☐ 5

Comments:

- 16) Are there any ways in which the current decision-making process about the Community Conservation Services (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu could be improved?

☐ Yes (please comment how?)

☐ No (please comment why?)

Comments:

17) In general, do you feel personally involved in the tourism development process in Mto wa Mbu?

☐ Yes (*please comment how?*) ☐ No (*please comment why?*)

Comments:

Demographic characteristics of Respondent

Which village do you come from?

Which sub village do you come from?

What is your level of education?

☐ primary school ☐ secondary school ☐ high school
☐ college ☐ university ☐ no formal education

Gender of Participant: ☐ Male ☐ Female

What is your occupation

How old are you?

☐ 16-24 yrs ☐ 25-34 yrs ☐ 35-44 yrs ☐ 45-59 yrs ☐ 60+ yrs

Thank you for participating in this survey

APPENDIX 2

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCY INTERVIEW GUIDE / CHECKLIST

Introduction

This section is about the general questions regarding the government agency's history, activities and roles in relation to tourism development.

- 1) When was this agency established?
- 2) Why was this agency established?
- 3) What kind of activities does your agency deal with?
- 4) What role(s) does this agency undertake in relation to tourism development in Mto wa Mbu?
- 5) What role(s) do you undertake in this agency?

Jobs

The following section includes questions about tourism jobs in Mto wa Mbu.

- 6) From your experience, where do people who work in tourism in Mto wa Mbu come from?
- 7) Do residents/members of the local community work in tourism?
- 8) What kind of jobs do they work for?
- 9) What categories of people (in terms of gender and age groups) work most in tourism?

- 10) Are there any barriers that stop local communities (residents) from working in tourism?
- 11) Do residents/members of the local community own/operate tourism business?
- 12) What kind of business do they own/operate?
- 13) Are there any barriers that stop local communities (residents) from owning/operating tourism business?
- 14) Do residents/members of the local community provide any entertainments (e.g perform tourist show, dance, etc) to tourists?
- 15) Are there any barriers that stop local communities (residents) from entertaining tourists?

Decision-making

This section includes questions regarding the tourism decision-making process in Mto wa Mbu.

- 16) Who markets Mto wa Mbu as a tourist area?
- 17) Who makes decision about how Mto wa Mbu is marketed both domestically and internationally?
- 18) Who makes decisions in general matters related to tourism development in Mto wa Mbu?
- 19) Who makes decisions about establishment of tourism development structures in Mto wa Mbu such as establishment of tourist hotel, lodges or camp sites etc?
- 20) What is the structure of this/these decision-making body(ies)?
- 21) How are decision-making body members selected/appointed?
- 22) Are residents involved in the decision-making process that leads to establishment of such projects in Mto wa Mbu? If 'no', please go to question 23. If 'yes', please go to question 24.
- 23) If no, why are residents not involved in such decision-making process?
- 24) If yes, how are residents involved in such decision-making process?

- 25) Who make(s) decisions in general matters regarding the Community Conservation Services (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu?
- 26) What is the structure of the Community Conservation Services (CCS) decision-making body?
- 27) How are decision-making body members selected/appointed?
- 28) Does the Community Conservation Services (CCS) decision-making body includes of member(s) of the local community (residents)? If 'no', please go to question 29. If 'yes', please go to question 30.
- 29) If no, why are there no residents/members from the local community?
- 30) If yes, how are local members from the local community (residents) selected/appointed?
- 31) Are residents involved in the decision-making process of the Community Conservation Services (CCS)?
- 32) If no, why are residents not involved in the decision-making process?
- 33) If yes, how are residents involved in the decision-making process?
- 34) Is any improvement needed in the whole decision-making process in the Community Conservation Services (CCS) project?

Benefit-sharing

This section includes questions about the distribution of tourism benefits in Mto wa Mbu.

- 35) From your experience, could you comment on who generally has benefited from the development of tourism in Mto wa Mbu in the past five years?
- 36) In what ways have local people (local residents) benefited from tourism?
- 37) Why do such people benefit from tourism?
- 38) Who has benefited from the Community Conservation Services (CCS) project in Mto wa Mbu in the past five years?
- 39) In what ways have such people benefited from this project?

- 40) Does the Community Conservation Services (CCS) project have a specific benefit distribution policy/practice?
- 41) How do benefits from the Community Conservation Services (CCS) project reach the intended people?
- 42) How are such benefits distributed among the target people?
- 43) Are any improvements needed to make the benefit distribution of the Community Conservation Services (CCS) project more successful?
- 44) From your own experience, what is your impression of the overall system of benefits distribution in the Community Conservation Services (CCS) project?
- 45) Who has benefited from the tourism developments (tourist hotels, lodges, camp sites etc.) in Mto wa Mbu?
- 46) In what ways have such people benefited from these developments?
- 47) Do such developments have specific benefit distribution policies/practices?
- 48) Are any improvements needed to make the benefit distribution of these developments more successful?

Tourism and poverty reduction

The following section includes questions about the contribution of tourism development in poverty reduction in Mto wa Mbu.

- 49) From your own experience, what impact has tourism development in Mto wa Mbu in the past five years had on;
 - h) Quality of life
 - i) Employment opportunities
 - j) Awareness of tourism
 - k) Household income
 - l) Prices of goods and services
 - m) Income-generating projects
 - n) Entrepreneurial training

o) Accessibility

p) Other areas (*be specified*)

50) In your view, can the way in which tourism in Mto wa Mbu contributes to poverty reduction be improved?

51) Are there any other related matters you would like to comment on which I have not raised?

Thank you for participating in this interview

APPENDIX 3

COMMUNITY TOURISM ORGANIZATIONS' INTERVIEW GUIDE / CHECKLIST

Introduction

This section is about the general questions regarding the organization's history, activities and goals.

- 1) When was this organization established?
- 2) Why was this organization established?
- 3) What kind of activities does your organization deal with?
- 4) What is/are the goal(s) of this organization?

Decision-making

This section includes questions regarding tourism organizations in Mto wa Mbu and their decision-making process.

- 5) Who made the first decision to establish it?
- 6) What is the structure of the organization's decision-making body?
- 7) How are decision-making body members selected/appointed?
- 8) Does the organization's decision-making body include member(s) of the local community (residents)? If 'no', please go to question 9. If 'yes', please go to question 10.
- 9) Why are there no local residents/member(s) of the local community?
- 10) How are local member(s) from the local community (residents) selected/appointed?

- 11) Does your organization involve residents/the local community in the decision-making process? If 'no', please go to question 12. If 'yes', please go to question 13.
- 12) If no, why are local residents not involved in the decision-making process of your organization?
- 13) If yes, how does your organization involve residents/the local community in the decision-making process?
- 14) How could the whole decision-making process in your organization be improved?

Jobs

The following section includes questions about jobs in the organizations in Mto wa Mbu.

- 15) What is the employment structure of your organization?
- 16) What types of jobs do you have in your organization?
- 17) How many employees do you have in your organization? (Hints: gender, residents, village, sub village, and migrants)

Jobs	Number of employees	Gender (M/F)	Local, migrant or expert	Full-time/part-time

- 18) What factors influence your employment policies/practices? (If any, how is it implemented? Does it aim to recruit locals? e.g whom do you train?)
- 19) Does your organization have a particular on-job training policy/practice for its staff? (Hints: Staff recruitment and development how and what -e.g on the job, courses national or international; expenses on training-regular budget or hoc? Where did your staff acquire education and experience?)
- 20) Are there any barriers that stop local residents from working in your organization?

Benefit-sharing

This section includes questions about the distribution of organizations' benefits in Mto wa Mbu.

- 21) Does the organization have a specific benefit distribution policy/practice?
- 22) Who benefit(s) from your organization
- 23) In what ways do such people benefit from your project/activities?
- 24) Why do such people benefit with your organization?
- 25) How do you ensure such benefits reach the intended people?
- 26) How do you distribute such benefits among the target people?
- 27) Is there any improvement needed to make the benefit distribution system more successful?

Tourism and poverty reduction

The following section includes questions about the contribution of tourism development in poverty reduction in Mto wa Mbu.

- 28) From your own experience, what impact has tourism development in Mto wa Mbu in the past five years had on;
 - q) Quality of life
 - r) Employment opportunities
 - s) Awareness of tourism
 - t) Household income
 - u) Prices of goods and services
 - v) Income-generating projects
 - w) Entrepreneurial training
 - x) Accessibility
 - y) Other areas (*be specified*)

29) In your view, can the way in which tourism in Mto wa Mbu contributes to poverty reduction be improved?

30) Are there any other related matters you would like to comment on which I have not raised?

Thank you for participating in this interview