Wildlife Tourism and Community-Based Conservation Towards Tanzania Vision 2025

Rebecca Dick

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Master's degree in Globalization and International Development

School of International Development and Global Studies
Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Ottawa

© Rebecca Dick, Ottawa, Canada, 2021

Contents

ABSTRACT iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS v
LEGEND vi
LIST OF TABLES vii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT 1
Introduction 1
Background: Ecotourism versus natural resource-based tourism (NRBT) 2
Context: Wildlife Tourism Industry 3
Context: The Tanzania Development Vision 2025 5
Context: Tanzania's Political Landscape 6
Research Objectives 9
Theoretical Frameworks 10
Theory of Access 10
Powers of Exclusion 11
Political Ecology 13
Outline of research 14
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW 16
Pro-Poor Tourism 16
Conservation 20
Community-Based Conservation 24
Neoliberal Conservation 25
Sustainable Development 26
CBC and Sustainable Development in Tanzania 28
Revenue Sharing Models 31
Revenue Sharing in Tanzania's WMAs 33
Land Dispossession 34
CBC and Dispossession 35
The Politics of Land 36
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS AND METHODOLOGY 38
Introduction 38
Research Methods Employed 39
Qualitative Content Analysis 39
Respondent Interviews 45
Limitations 48
Location 48
Time Constraints 48
Stakeholders 49
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS 50
Introduction 50
Content Analysis 50
Code Distribution 50
Matrix Coding 55
Interview Analysis 56
Community-Based Conservation 56
Tanzanian Development 58

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION ... 61
Theory of Access ... 61
Access Denied ... 61
Powers of Exclusion ... 68
Exclusion by Regulations ... 68
Exclusion by Markets ... 69
Exclusion by Force ... 69
Exclusion by Legitimation ... 70
Political Ecology ... 72
Impact on Tanzanian Development ... 72
Impact on Wildlife Conservation ... 81
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION ... 85
Research Question and Objectives ... 85
Policy Recommendations ... 88
Potential Implications of COVID-19 ... 89
Future Research ... 90
REFERENCES ... 92
ANNEXES ... 104
ANNEX A: NVivo Codebook ... 104
ANNEX B: Coded Resources ... 105
Academic Articles and Book Chapters ... 105
Media and Online Resources (English) ... 107
Media and Online Resources (translated from Kiswahili) ... 110
Policy Documents ... 112
Reports ... 112
ANNEX C: Matrix Coding ... 114
ANNEX D: Research Respondents ... 115

ABSTRACT

This research goes beyond the traditionally studied intricacies and contentions within northern Tanzania's community-based conservation by looking at how the state's engagement, through wildlife tourism, with local communities in and around protected areas impacts the country's development and conservation of its wildlife. It draws heavily on Tanzania's Development Vision 2025 and how the wildlife tourism industry feeds into achieving its objectives. This research looks through the theoretical lens of political ecology, the theory of access, and the powers of exclusion. It applies a qualitative content analysis by coding different types of existing literature in NVivo, and includes semi-structured interviews with key respondents. The research concludes that the government's recentralization of wildlife management is working opposite to its development ambitions as per Vision 2025, and it is doing very little to address the crisis within its ecosystems and to enhance wildlife conservation. Ultimately, it is through the government's efforts to protect Tanzania's ecological uniqueness that both conservation and development have faced increased challenges in its efforts to improve.

Key words: Tanzania, community-based conservation, wildlife management areas, Tanzania Development Vision 2025, wildlife tourism

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

From tricky research permits to a global pandemic cancelling fieldwork; getting to this point was not an easy road. There are many people that I owe thanks to for helping me reach this achievement and I would like to begin with my admirable supervisor, Christopher Huggins. Your expertise and guidance throughout the entire process and the multiple refocussing's of this project has been deeply appreciated. I could not have pushed through the many setbacks without your support and your wonderful supervision.

Vanessa Wanjiru Wakaba, my excellent research assistant; thank you for supporting this research in the collection and translation of Kiswahili documents. Your diligence and thoroughness were invaluable to this project, and I so appreciate you accommodating both the tight timelines and time difference between Ottawa and Nairobi.

I am also very grateful to my committee members, Dr. Joshua Ramisch and Dr. Nathan Young. This thesis is much stronger as a result of the very specific and useful guidance that you both provided. Your knowledge and expertise were vital to this research and were much appreciated.

To my interview respondents; I cannot thank you enough for taking the time to speak with me and share your experiences and expertise. My conversation with each of you was incredibly enlightening. This research would not have been possible without each of you.

Thank you, Steven Henle and Robert Hopp, for giving me confidence in my writing abilities and for helping to shape me as a young adult. I do not think that I have expressed to either of you how impactful your presence, insight, and encouragement was and how grateful I am for it.

My friends, who provided constant encouragement and check-ins, and were completely understanding when I fell off the grid for weeks at a time. Thank you Shannon F., Vera M., Skye R., Liane L., Alyssia A., Jade B., Sydnee P., Jalal E., Amanda P., and so many more. Special thanks to Jennifer Bonti-Ankomah for not only listening to my incessant concerns, but for saving the day(s) when my laptop failed me at the eleventh hour.

Finally, the most thanks to my family, who have been my cheerleaders and biggest supporters throughout all of the ups and downs. I could not have completed this without you!

LEGEND

AWF – African Wildlife Foundation

CBC – Community-Based Conservation

CBNRM – Community-Based Natural Resource Management

CCM – Chama Cha Mapinduzi

COSTECH – Commission on Science and Technology

CSO – Civil Society Organization

FYDP – Five Year Development Plan

GDP – Gross Domestic Product

HDI – Human Development Index

LUP – Land Use Planning

MCDWC – Ministry of Community Development, Women Affairs and Children

MNRT – Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism

NCA – Ngorongoro Conservation Area

NGO – Non-Governmental Organization

NRBT – Natural Resource-Based Tourism

PA – Protected Area

PPT – Pro-Poor Tourism

RDS – Rural Development Strategy

TANAPA – Tanzania National Parks Authority

TDV – Tanzania Development Vision

UNWTO – United Nations World Tourism Organization

URT – United Republic of Tanzania

VAT – Value Added Tax

WMA – Wildlife Management Area(s)

WTTC – World Travel and Tourism Council

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Overview of all Parent and Child Nodes……………………………………. Page 55

Table 2: Overview of Parent and Child Nodes in Academic Articles and Book Chapters.. Page 55

Table 3: Overview of Parent and Child Nodes in Media and Online Resources (English)…………………………………………………………………… Page 56

Table 4: Overview of Parent and Child Nodes in Media and Online Resources (Kiswahili)………………………………………………………………….... Page 56

Table 5: Overview of Parent and Child Nodes in Policy Documents………………… Page 56

Table 6: Overview of Parent and Child Nodes in Reports……………………………. Page 56

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

Introduction

I have had a love for wildlife and conservation initiatives for as long as I can remember. I have always been fascinated by the majesty of wildlife and natural landscapes, particularly those in sub-Saharan Africa and, like many, I developed an affinity for African elephants. So, when I was told to write about anything for my final undergraduate paper in Leisure and Recreation Studies, I was immediately immersed in the research on how the use of elephants in leisure, recreation, and tourism impacted their populations around the world. Doing this research, I was drawn to the concept of community-based conservation, whereby local communities that face adverse impacts from the presence of elephants are given incentives through the tourism industry to conserve and protect them rather than retaliate against them (Di Minin, Leader-Williams, & Bradshaw, 2016). Once I finally had the opportunity to visit a few countries in sub-Saharan Africa following my undergraduate degree, the Tanzanian culture, people, and natural beauty completely enthralled me. It was these two combined experiences that made me want to focus my research on community-based conservation in Tanzania. However, it became evident early on that the framework for community-based conservation is much more convoluted than I had initially understood it to be, and the benefits are not always distributed evenly.

This research looks more closely at community-based conservation in Tanzania's northern circuit[1] and its benefits to varying stakeholder groups. The topic of community-based conservation (CBC) in Tanzania has been studied extensively over the last couple of decades (see African Wildlife Foundation (AWF), 2016; Benjaminsen and Brycen, 2012; Goldman, 2003; Keane et al., 2020; Mawi and Mashenene, 2020; etc.). Researchers have mostly looked to better understand how Tanzania has implemented CBC and how it has benefitted the communities, oftentimes through tourism initiatives and associated revenues. The goal of this research is to take a further step back to determine how CBC in Tanzania has not only impacted local communities, but also contributed to national development and wildlife conservation goals. This study questions the impacts of state engagement with local communities in and around protected conservation areas in northern Tanzania on the country's development and

[1] The northern safari circuit in Tanzania is a popular tourist destination due to its concentration of wildlife and consists primarily of Serengeti National Park, Ngorongoro Crater and Conservation Area, Lake Manyara, Tarangire National Park, and Mount Kilimanjaro.

conservation of wildlife. While many studies have picked apart the CBC programs in Tanzania, which have been implemented and expanded since the turn of the century; there has not been any notable research specifically connecting how these initiatives have contributed to the big picture development goals of Tanzania. Further, conservation in Tanzania is so intricately linked to the wildlife tourism industry and its immense revenues, as I will discuss below, that it could potentially create the perfect opportunity for development within communities living alongside wildlife.

Before providing additional context and background information, it is important to address the key term used above and throughout this thesis; community. Too often the term "community-based conservation" is used without a proper understanding of what makes a "community." Even the Tanzanian government recognizes in its Community Development Policy that defining "the community" is difficult as a result of changing lifestyles due to environmental, economic, and cultural factors (Ministry of Community Development, Women Affairs and Children (MCDWC), 1996). The policy then defines the community as "people of the same origin, living in the same area or people with similar occupations" who are then joined together by some or all of these things (MCDWC, 1996, p. 2). Similarly, Freilich (1963) considers the key ingredients for defining a community to be frequent interactions, the sharing of information, and the development and practice of culture as a result of previously shared information. For this research, I will consider the term "community" as a group of individuals living within close proximity and sharing similar cultural as well as livelihood practices.

Finally, this research began before the introduction of COVID-19 and the subsequent global pandemic, which halted tourism and adversely impacted tourism-dependent countries such as Tanzania. This research addresses the Tanzanian landscape and country development in a pre-COVID world, though I will briefly discuss notable post-COVID concerns in the conclusion.

Background: Ecotourism versus natural resource-based tourism (NRBT)

Before delving into the world of wildlife tourism and its social impacts, it is important to understand the various terms used to describe this subsector of the tourism industry. Academics have defined the commonly used term "ecotourism" in varying ways. Nature-based tourism has been understood as the umbrella term for all tourism taking place in the natural environment (Goodwin, 1996; Burton, 1997). It "involves the marketing of natural landscapes and wildlife to

tourists" (Goodwin, 1996, p. 287), whose payments (such as park entrance fees, safari tour costs, game hunting costs, etc.) can contribute to conservation. Nature-based tourism, Goodwin (1996) explains, can include a variety of activities, both consumptive, such as hunting, and non-consumptive, such as birdwatching. Fennell (2000) combines this definition of nature-based tourism with the similar concept of resource-based tourism. Resource-based tourism emphasizes the use of natural, socio-cultural, and human-made resources in tourism. With this, Fennell suggests applying the term "natural resource-based tourism" to tourist activities taking place in the natural environment. Fennell (2000) also notes that these definitions have all followed the overuse of the term "ecotourism" as an effort to differentiate how the natural environment can be used for tourism. Ecotourism, then, should be understood as tourism that is directly for the benefit of the environment. Burton (1997) describes ecotourism as primarily educative, while Goodwin (1996) adds its "contribution to the continued protection and management of natural habitats and their species" (p. 288), without causing any changes or damages. True ecotourism, Burton (1997) argues, is therefore rarely possible. Regardless, tourism companies can strive to obtain a variety of different ecotourism certifications that can then be used to market services towards responsible travelers (see, for example, Greenloons, n.d.; TIES, 2019)

The Tanzanian Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT) references ecotourism within their documents and policies. Tanzania's National Tourism Policy considers ecotourism within its specific strategies and refers to the country as being dependent on the natural environment as a primary tourist attraction (MNRT, 1999). According to the definitions discussed above, the use of this term is incorrect to describe the wildlife tourism industry in Tanzania, and would be better characterized as one of the alternative terms suggested, such as "nature-based tourism" or "natural resource-based tourism".

Context: Wildlife Tourism Industry

Wildlife tourism is a form of natural resource-based tourism and an increasingly popular segment of the global tourism industry. According to the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC, 2019), wildlife tourism directly contributed over 120 billion dollars to the 2018 global gross domestic product (GDP). Tourism that involved simply viewing animals in their natural habitat contributed 4.4% of direct tourism GDP in 2018 while employing 9.1 million individuals globally (WTTC, 2019). In Africa, the wildlife tourism market amounted to 29.3 billion dollars

and employed 3.6 million individuals, making the African continent the second largest wildlife tourism industry worldwide, not far behind Asia (WTTC, 2019).

The African wildlife tourism industry has experienced steady growth in the last couple of decades, with strong potential for continued growth. This is especially true for Sub-Saharan Africa, where wildlife watching experiences include safaris, bird watching, observing great apes, marine wildlife, and species tracking (United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), 2014). It is also the only continent that provides opportunities to witness the Big Five[2] and offers experiences such as gorilla treks; an increasingly popular attraction. In 2014, the UNWTO released a study on the "Economic Value of Wildlife Watching Tourism in Africa", basing its definition of wildlife watching tourism on the collaborative work of the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) and the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS). Wildlife watching tourism, then, refers to the non-consumptive activity to simply "view and/or encounter wildlife in a natural setting" (UNEP/CMS, 2006, p. 10), and often gets used interchangeably with "wildlife tourism". According to the UNWTO's 2014 report, the African continent experienced an average 6.1% growth rate of international tourists between 2005 to 2013, representing an increase of over 20 million tourists in any single year. Predictions for this decade estimate a total of nearly 135 million international tourists visiting Africa in 2030 (UNWTO, 2014). Among the 145 tour companies surveyed by UNWTO, 90% and 66% have wildlife tourism activities taking place in Eastern and Southern Africa, respectively, with safaris as the primary activity.

The tourism industry in Tanzania constitutes a significant portion of the country's GDP and continues to grow. According to Kolumbia (2018), tourism made up over 17% of Tanzania's GDP in 2017, and between 80% (Kideghesho, 2016) and 90% (Caro and Davenport, 2015) of the industry is wildlife-based, with safaris being a primary tourist attraction (Huggins, 2018). The Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (n.d.) notes that Tanzania's 16 National Parks cover nearly 30% of the country's territory, reflecting the importance of wildlife for the tourism industry. The government upgraded five game reserves to National Park status in February 2019, making the total 21 (Malanga, 2019), with an associated increase in land coverage.

[2] The 'Big Five' refers to elephants, rhinos, lions, buffaloes, and leopards – the most popular megafauna, stimulating tourism in Tanzania (Kideghesho, 2016).

Context: The Tanzania Development Vision 2025

At the start of the century, Tanzania's Planning Commission launched a development vision outlining where the country should be by 2025 and the methods that will be used to attain the goals set out in the vision. The motivation came from the state's realization that development strategies implemented up until that point had not sufficiently serviced the nation and were "not adequately responding to changing market and technological conditions" (United Republic of Tanzania (URT), 1999a, p. 1), both regionally and globally. The development plan is a shared vision meant to inspire and motivate individuals, groups, and the nation at large to work together towards a prosperous future for all Tanzanians (URT, 1999a).

The Tanzania Development Vision 2025 positions the country as having sustainably developed from a low-income country to middle-income, with high-quality livelihoods and an increased level of overall human development. The development plan sets out to eradicate poverty and transform the economy to be a strong, resilient, semi-industrialized economy with elevated levels of productivity (URT, 1999a). The vision has five main attributes that are to be further engrained in Tanzanian society, thus helping with its realization. These include a high quality of life, reducing levels of inequality; the sustainment of peace, stability and national unity; good governance and rule of law permeating socio-economic structures; encouragement of competitive leadership through a well-educated society, and; building a strong economy that is "capable of producing sustainable growth and shared benefits" (URT, 1999a, p. 3).

A key driver and strategy in realizing the vision includes the use of Tanzania's domestic resources, specifically referencing natural resources. It states that these resources should be used to promote a variety of economic activities that will give Tanzania a competitive advantage. Among the vision's objectives is to direct the country's natural resources "towards those core sectors that will enable us to attain our development goals" (p. v). Based on the economic importance placed on the ecotourism sector in the National Tourism Policy (written simultaneously) we can assume that this sector would find itself among the "core sectors" referenced, especially given its macroeconomic contributions.

More recently, Tanzania's Five-Year Development Plan II (FYDP-II) covers exactly what steps they will take and how various sectors of the economy will contribute to Vision 2025 over the financial years of 2016/17 – 2020/21. The plan recognizes tourism as a driver of

economic growth and poverty alleviation in Tanzania through its array of natural resources, referring to the sector's comparative advantage and the globally growing demand. The FYDP-II remains in line with the country's Tourism Policy as it lists key interventions, including a powerful marketing campaign, improved infrastructure (e.g. roads and airports), identifying and promoting tourism areas of investment, and providing training and opportunities for skills development (Ministry of Finance and Planning, 2016). The same year that this latest FYDP launched (2016), the government announced the imposition of an 18% value-added tax on tourism services that were previously exempted from this particular form of consumption tax (Vergeer, 2016). With this added 18% VAT, Tanzania's prices became 22-25% higher than those of neighbouring countries. Considering that President Magufuli stood firmly by the decision as a means to improve development projects in Tanzania (Kamati, 2016), this tax may also have been taking into account the achievement of Tanzania's Vision 2025.

Context: Tanzania's Political Landscape

Following Tanzania's (then, Tanganyika's) independence, the country maintained the capitalism-focused economy that resulted from colonialism until the late 1960s when, following the Arusha Declaration, it moved towards a more socialist political and economic structure favouring state-owned rather than privately-owned sectors (Ngowi, 2009). The Arusha Declaration was characterized by the Ujamaa, or villagization, policy discussed more in chapter two, which included the forceful relocation of rural populations towards a collective means of production and revenue (Hyden, 1975; Kjekshus, 1977; Owen, 2014). However, as will be explored further in chapter two, the state owns the land in Tanzania while the populations only have user rights and not full ownership (Snyder and Sulle, 2011). According to Neumann (1999), international conservation NGOs focused their attention on Tanzania upon its independence in an effort to help the country manage its own protected areas and parks. This was supported by the first president, Julius Nyerere, and went forward despite "widespread popular opposition" (p. 126). The colonial practices of dislocating people and tightly restricting access to resources for wildlife conservation carried on through Tanzania's socialist period in the 1970s and 1980s (Neumann, 1999). The mid-1980s saw a policy shift back to a capitalism-focused economy that invited and encouraged foreign direct investment and economic reforms, even within the wildlife conservation spheres (Ngowi, 2009).

A new approach to conservation that involved local populations and a push towards democratization occurred simultaneously in the beginning of the 1990s (Neumann, 1999). This, according to Neumann (1999), has "altered the political context of the historic conflict between neighbouring communities and conservation authorities" (p. 127) in the Serengeti specifically but, presumably, across northern Tanzania. This shift from a single-party, statist nation to a now more democratic landscape enabled the formation of new activist groups and organizations, which led to the "amplification of historically silenced voices in the struggle for customary rights of access" (Neumann, 1999, p. 127). The rise in these groups concerned with land rights related to protected areas coincided with NGOs rethinking conservation to have a more participatory approach to integrate rural development with conservation (Neumann, 1999). Several policies in the 1990s were introduced to decentralize land use planning in Tanzania, including the Village Land Act (URT, 1999b). This Act gives villages the ability to certify what constitutes village land and efficiently plan for its various uses. While decentralized in nature, the bureaucratic and complex process of village land use planning (LUP) undermines this decentralization and the villagers' agency in decision making. In their extensive review of the literature, Huggins (2018) gathers evidence of the immense technical and financial support needed for villages' successful completion of LUP, support which often leads to outcomes that do not reflect the priorities of the villages themselves. According to Ramutsindela and Noe (2012), the Tanzania Wildlife Division has had to approve all wildlife hunting since 2000, while the 2007 Wildlife Regulations further gave "the government powers to control [all] wildlife-related activities and revenues in WMAs" (p. 145). These regulations, along with other guidelines issued by the government of Tanzania following the 1999 Village Land Act, have aimed at recentralizing conservation and LUP, thus disempowering villages. In conversation with key informants from the Wildlife Division, it was suggested to Ramutsindela and Noe (2012) that the external actors supporting LUP worked in their own favour to "gain access to the land (land grabbing) and to control wildlife resources" (p. 147). In addition, LUP often does not properly account for pastoralist livelihoods and consider areas for grazing (Huggins, 2018). Therefore, while villages can certify their land through the 1999 Village Land Act; the 2007 Land Use Planning Act, which villages must abide by, "lays down procedures that require funding, expertise, and district-level oversight" that far outweigh the capacity of the villages (Huggins, 2018, p. 218). Through the 2007 Land Use Planning Act, the 2007 Wildlife Regulations, and other technical requirements issued by the government, the

attempted decentralization in the 1990s has been reversed over time as more powerful external "support" disempowers villagers.

The transition back to a neoliberal capitalist market in the 1980s did not occur without contention, specifically regarding issues of corruption and of foreign land investment and acquisitions that continue through today. Schlimmer (2018) writes about how discussions on land-grabbing have been used as a political tool in Tanzanian elections since becoming a multi-party system. The author points out that advocating for land ownership and redistribution is a tactic used by political leaders across East African countries to attract voters. Though President Magufuli also denounced corruption and land grabbing during the 2015 elections (Schlimmer, 2018), his authoritarian approach to governing was highly problematic in regards to silencing the activist groups fighting human rights violations in the country through restrictions on media and journalism (Amnesty International, 2019; Beaumont, 2019; RSF, n.d), many of which are connected to dispossession for conservation. The 2019 updates to the NGO Act in Tanzania now requires reporting from NGOs and CSOs that is significantly more bureaucratic and often beyond their capabilities, and it gives the government power to refuse registering an organization without providing a reason (Mulindwa, 2019), further repressing these organizations.

These restrictions, particularly those on media and freedom of the press, did not arise strictly under President Magufuli's leadership. Magufuli's predecessor, Kikwete, enabled these actions through media restrictions put in place ahead of the 2015 elections, including the Statistics Act and the Cybercrimes Act (Rhodes, 2015). The Statistics Act bars any publication of Tanzanian statistics without prior approval from the National Bureau of Statistics, while the Cybercrimes Act restricts the online publication of anything the government deems deceptive or inaccurate. Violation of either one would result in fines and jail time (Rhodes, 2015). Enforcement of the Cybercrimes Act, according to Rhodes (2015) included raids on opposition party and CSO offices, confiscating laptops and arresting staff.

Despite Tanzania's transition to a multi-party democratic system, the pre-democratic ruling party (Chama Cha Mapinduzi, or CCM) has continued holding onto power following each of the elections over the past quarter century. Chapter two will explore the direction of conservation in Tanzania from then onwards, particularly in the section "CBC and Sustainable Development in Tanzania." Carlitz and Manda (2016) suggest that CCM has managed to

maintain its dominance partly as a result of its journalism restrictions, referencing multiple instances of banning newspapers between 2008-2015, throughout Kikwete's presidency. They were banned for publishing suggestions that Kikwete's son was involved in illegal activity, for example, or based on accusations of "having a negative agenda against Tanzania" (Carlitz and Manda, 2016). Tanzania's road to its current authoritarian structure, then, has been building over the last many years through ongoing suppressions of civil society and media freedom. Despite its various economic reforms since independence, Tanzania's political landscape has remained virtually the same – heavily bureaucratic and centralized.

The purpose of this section is to provide an overview and to recognize the political shifts over time that have gotten Tanzania where it is today in regards to its relationship with civil society, wildlife and ecology. I do not attempt to cover all aspects and nuances of these contentions and therefore encourage the reader to conduct further research should they wish to have a more complete picture (e.g., Hirschler and Hofmeier, 2019; Maguire, 1969; Neumann, 2000; Ngowi, 2009).

Research Objectives

The question that guides this research is *what are the impacts of state engagement, through wildlife tourism, with local communities in and around protected conservation areas in northern Tanzania on the country's development and the conservation of wildlife?* As noted previously, research on this topic has looked specifically at the impacts only on local communities and the benefits, or lack thereof, as a result of CBC and wildlife tourism engagement. Although this research looks more broadly at Tanzania's national development plan, characterized by the Tanzania Development Vision 2025, the development of local communities involved with CBC is an important factor. Additionally, I have demonstrated how wildlife tourism contributes to Tanzania's GDP and overall revenues, which can then be used to meet development objectives. As such, the conservation of wildlife is critical to ensure that Tanzania is maximizing the opportunities from wildlife tourism. Therefore, the specific objectives of this research include:

- Identifying what impacts, whether direct (e.g. increased revenues/income) or indirect (e.g. reinforced public infrastructure), the wildlife tourism industry has had on local communities.

- Recognizing how the aforementioned impacts feed into Tanzania's national development through CBC.
- Identifying if and how CBC has benefitted wildlife conservation in Tanzania.
- Determining how wildlife tourism revenues have been used to benefit various stakeholders in the wildlife tourism industry (namely communities living alongside wildlife and the wildlife itself).

Theoretical Frameworks

This research topic involves several intermingled and complex issues such as wildlife tourism, wildlife conservation, community involvement through CBC, revenue distribution, and poverty. The forthcoming literature review (chapter two) will further reveal the complexity and underlying issues surrounding the research topic, which is why there is a need for multiple theoretical frameworks that can holistically frame and guide the research. These theoretical frameworks and ideas will help shape this research and the amalgamation of literature that addresses issues of access among local communities living in and around protected conservation areas in northern Tanzania. They will also help to demonstrate how the state's methods of engagement and intervention impact these communities' access to and benefits from natural resources.

Theory of Access

The theory of access (Ribot & Peluso, 2003) accounts for many broad issues in that it separates itself from theories of property rights by defining access as "the ability to benefit from things – including material objects, persons, institutions, and symbols" (p. 153). In using the term "ability" versus "right," Ribot and Peluso's theory of access brings more attention to the social relations that shape access, while incorporating the legal or more generally "acknowledged" rights-based accesses. Differing levels of power accompany these social relations and, looking specifically at natural resources, how certain individuals, groups, or institutions are positioned in relation to their access. One important distinction is between *access control* and *access maintenance,* whereby the relationships between individuals, groups, or institutions are evident by identifying those working to *maintain* access to resources that are

controlled by another entity. In their definition, the maintenance of access "requires expending resources or powers to keep a particular sort of resource access open" (p. 159).

Rights-based access is one mechanism shaping different levels of access in Ribot and Peluso's theory, which encompasses both legal and illegal access. Rights-based access implies "the involvement of a community […], state, or government that will enforce a claim" (p. 162), whereby rights derive from law, customs, or conventions. These can be contradictory frameworks in that there are frequently laws in place that give power and control to the State or a representative of the State (e.g., a President or Minister), ensuring that *access control* remains centralized, while users of resources must ensure a stable relationship with the controlling entity to ensure *maintained access*. These relationships may also lead to increased conflict, as the "meanings and values of resources are often contested among those who control and those who maintain access" (p. 159). Ribot and Peluso provide an example of illegal access whereby government officials may use their power to control access through means considered illegal or corrupt by other groups with differing laws, customs, or conventions in place. Where there is violence and any individual(s) believe theft took place, this must be "considered as rights-denied mechanisms of access" (p. 164). In many cases, groups working to maintain access offer some transfer of benefits and resources over to those controlling access as a way to ensure it remains available and that they can derive their own benefits.

Ribot and Peluso (2003) identify what they call "structural and relational mechanisms of access" which include various constraints and opportunities related to resource access. Among these mechanisms are access to capital, access to labour, access to markets, and access through social identity, which can trickle down to non-state actors who can allocate resource access among groups maintaining access. This would be especially true in situations of community-based conservation, where funds typically move through governing bodies of the implicated villages.

Powers of Exclusion

Closely related to Ribot and Peluso's theory of access is the work done by Hall, Hirsch, and Li (2011) on the powers of exclusion. Their book focuses on land dilemmas in Southeast Asia, though it offers innumerable, more broadly applicable insights on exclusion. Using an economics definition of exclusion, land is an excludable resource in that people can be prevented

from accessing it, as opposed to a resource such as air which is readily available to all. In this way, Hall et al. view exclusion as being opposite to access (rather than inclusion), referring to exclusion as “the ways in which people are *prevented* from benefiting from things” (2011, p. 7), drawing on the theory of access. They argue that there is an inherent connection between land use and access and exclusionary practices, stating that land use and access “requires exclusion of some kind [, is] structured by power relations” (p. 4), and is not a randomly implemented process. These power relations are what guide and determine the factors of exclusion, with three distinct types: maintaining existing land access by excluding others; loss of land access by previous users, and; preventing those without access from attaining future access. The powers of exclusion at play may vary or overlap at any one time, and do not refer to any specific entity or power (such as the State), but rather any power(s) preventing access to land and its potential benefits (Hall et al., 2011).

Elements of power involved in exclusion become evident when looking at the interactions between regulation, force, the market, and legitimation (Hall et al., 2011). Regulations emphasize any rules surrounding access and exclusion, including land boundaries, acceptable uses of land, and types of admissible ownership or claims to land. Failure to abide by regulations in place may have consequences that are addressed by the use of force, whether violent (forceful removal) or non-violent (implicit force, the threat of legal action). Markets can further impact access and exclusion as they determine land prices and, therefore, which actors can afford to benefit from certain pieces of land and which get excluded as a result of market prices. Finally, legitimation speaks for itself in that it “signals importance in supporting different forms of exclusion” (p. 18). Hall et al. (2011) use the term “ambient exclusions” to refer to exclusionary discourses that have become omnipresent in development plans and programs, tenurial and land use arrangements, and other widely consumed materials. The authors specifically reference conservation efforts limiting access to land in an effort to protect global goods. The general global population has become desensitized to these ambient exclusions as they have become as common as the air that we breathe, while disproportionately impacting those being excluded from the protected areas, who are at high risk of evictions and loss of livelihood practices. This is an example of exclusion enabled by incredibly unequal power distributions among stakeholders involved.

Another example of exclusion in conservation practices are community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) schemes. Although inherently inclusive by having those living nearby protected areas participate in their management, Hall et al. (2011) consider CBNRM to be self-exclusionary, in that the "communities" involved are restraining their own land use and access, as well as that of others. Finally, ambient exclusions include the work of corporations who use the notion of corporate social responsibility to achieve financial objectives alongside social development and environmental conservation. Achievement of these objectives often involves the displacement and exclusion of individuals and the upheaval of livelihoods for the "win-win" benefits of what they refer to as "corporate conservation and eco-governmentality" (Hall et al., 2011).

Political Ecology

The interactions between ecological resources and their surrounding external influences (such as economies and markets, governments, and social factors) ground both the theory of access and powers of exclusion. Political ecology, then, is among the theories that help to shape and position the foundations of both the theory of access and the powers of exclusion. Political ecology is a social science connecting a variety of human-driven factors impacting and influencing environmental changes such as social, economic, and political factors. It encompasses a broad range of intersecting concerns, namely that of ecology itself and a political economy. Political ecology studies the interactions "between society and land-based resources", which are constantly in a shifting state of change (Blaikie and Brookfield, 2015, p. 17). These interactions can go deeper to include those among individuals in the society itself, including various groupings and classes.

The role of the state is an important factor in political ecology, according to Blaikie and Brookfield (2015). The state often "lends its power to dominant groups and classes" (p. 17), which favours accumulation and abundance among these groups while further excluding and marginalizing others. This is most often prevalent through mechanisms such as taxation, tenure policies, and the selective allocation of resources. The application or enforcement of these mechanisms can further bring light to the power dynamics at play and the various actors (in terms of gender, ethnicity, cultural background, etc.) involved in negotiating to obtain or maintain access to natural resources (Paulson, Gezon and Watts, 2003). Political ecology

positions environmental forces, social change, and development as being linked together (Paulson et al., 2003), recognizing that environmental problems simultaneously pose a threat to both people and ecosystems (Walker, 2005). The theory considers aspects beyond examples outlined here, taking into account the discourses and ideologies that surround related issues of political ecology, rather than just the visible or concrete matters. Since its emergence in the 1980s, political ecology has unified tangible aspects with narratives and ideologies, making political ecology a combination of "analytical, normative and applied" since its beginning (Paulson et al., 2003, p. 206). Political ecology, then, is closely linked to issues surrounding protected areas for conservation as they involve a myriad of power dynamics brought on by the political economy, as well as environmental issues related to land-use and resource access.

Outline of research

Following the necessary background and contextual information covered in this chapter, this research will begin with a review of the relevant literature in chapter two, explaining the benefits of pro-poor tourism with a focus on wildlife tourism. It will then get into the history of conservation throughout sub-Saharan Africa, with particular emphasis on Tanzania, before looking at the current status of conservation through the CBC lens. With CBC comes the discussion of revenue sharing and the associated benefits as well as its challenges, the primary one being dispossession.

This research uses a mixed-methods qualitative approach by interviewing a few relevant stakeholders and key respondents, while also conducting a content analysis by coding existing literature using NVivo software. Qualitative content analysis is used as a method for data analysis as it helps to reduce large quantities of data down to specific themes, it applies a systematic approach, and it maintains a certain level of flexibility based on emerging themes (Schreier, 2014) This process, including the selection of participants, resources, and the translation of Kiswahili documents, will be discussed in chapter three.

Chapter four will provide an analysis of the data and results uncovered through both resource coding and interviews, followed by a discussion on key findings in chapter five. Chapter five will address the research question and objectives, before providing some concluding remarks and recommendations for further research in chapter six.

Finally, it is important to address researcher positionality before getting into the content of this thesis. As a white, Canadian woman I am conducting this research from a position of stability and privilege. Given the COVID-19 context under which this research has been carried out, I was interviewing individuals located outside of Tanzania (more information in chapter three) through a video call, which implies a certain degree of privilege and comfort for respondents as well. In most cases, though not all, myself and respondents were largely discussing the situations and realities of individuals other than ourselves, and/or working on these issues from a position of relative privilege. This made it difficult and rather sensitive for me, as an outsider, to be too critical of Tanzanian policy and the situations that many people face in Tanzania. Though I do want to bring their struggles to light and determine whether or not they are properly being addressed by government (and how), my intention is not to act or speak on anyone's behalf. The individuals who find themselves in the repressive situations discussed throughout this research have agency and their own voices, and have experiences that I will never be able to relate to nor fully understand. Over the course of this research, I try to be as sensitive to that as possible, and careful not to speak on behalf of any individual or group of individuals.

Vanessa Wanjiru Wakaba was my research assistant located in Nairobi. Vanessa played a role in collecting and translating the Kiswahili resources that will be identified in chapter three. Her role was limited to this due to financial limitations and time constraints. Given that I needed a research assistant located outside of Tanzania, Vanessa was not able to draw on personal experience living within the context to contribute further to the broader interpretation of the findings.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review will consider how wildlife tourism has successfully contributed to the national development of African countries through a pro-poor tourism approach. The historical context of wildlife conservation in Africa and its ongoing controversies are then explained, followed by examples of the "new conservation" approach of including local communities implicated in wildlife conservation and tourism. Finally, this chapter discusses the challenges associated with community-based conservation with regards to revenue and benefit-sharing, along with the long-standing struggles of land dispossession among implicated communities in Tanzania.

Pro-Poor Tourism

As seen in chapter one, the UNWTO's 2014 report on the "Economic Value of Wildlife Watching Tourism in Africa" discusses the positive impacts that tourism can have on national economies and the industry's relation to poverty eradication in Africa. Since the start of this century, governments and development agencies have identified tourism as a critical component for economic and social development in Sub-Saharan Africa (Folarin and Adeniyi, 2020). Ashley and Roe define pro-poor tourism (PPT) as "tourism that generates net benefits for the poor" (2002, p. 62), whether as direct economic benefits, or as indirect benefits such as social, environmental, cultural, or other impacts on livelihoods. They refer to PPT as a strategy that aims to maximize the benefits of the industry among poor communities and puts poverty reduction at the top of its agenda. Ashley and Roe (2002) present three particular strategies to unlock opportunities within the existing tourism industry. The first is to increase the direct economic revenues for poor communities through employment and business opportunities; the second is to acknowledge and address the negative impacts that the industry has on poor communities, such as loss of land and social exploitation; the third and final strategy is to focus on policy and processes which include poor communities. Ecotourism, then, can (and often does) have pro-poor elements to it, however, it is still not considered pro-poor tourism according to the definition provided above. PPT is designed in a way that the top priority is benefitting the poor, whereas we center the top priority in ecotourism around elements like environment, wildlife, and sustainability. PPT and ecotourism projects may contain elements of one another, but the priority approach will always be one or the other. Therefore, no matter how great the emphasis on

benefits to the poor and development initiatives, the primary environmental focus in ecotourism means that poverty reduction is only a subset and not the end goal.

In Ashley and Roe's (2002) study of six PPT organizations, three in South Africa, one in Nepal, one in Ecuador, and another in St Lucia, all organizations had an underlying ecotourism element. Strategies for poverty reduction included direct economic benefits, capacity building, employment and business opportunities, and income from collective leases and property ownership. They found the primary impacts on poor people to be financial impacts through increased earnings, and livelihood impacts, including increased education, better health, skills development, improved infrastructure, and increased access to information (Ashley and Roe, 2002). Though they did not disaggregate impacts by beneficiaries to demonstrate variances in gender, race, ethnicity, etc.; the authors demonstrate the power of pro-poor tourism in an ecotourism context nonetheless.

The majority of studies, demonstrated below, reveal that the connection between tourism development and poverty alleviation is driven mainly by the former, with poverty reduction as a result (whether intentional or not). For a long time, there has been an acceptance of the claim that tourism can lead to poverty reduction. However, Njoya and Seetaram (2018) point out that the literature is still growing and has a primary focus on individual tourism projects and their achievement of pro-poor objectives. Unfortunately, the result is that "limited evidence is available on the relationship between tourism development and poverty reduction at the macro-level" (pg. 514).

The UNWTO references a United Nations General Assembly resolution that recognizes the possibility for tourism, particularly natural resource-based tourism, to create jobs, thus increasing income, and to provide opportunities for better education, all of which contributes to a reduction in poverty levels. Tourism is a unique industry in that it "can be developed in remote areas and developing regions that do not offer other export options" (UNWTO, 2014, p. 6). UNWTO adds that developing countries often have cultural and wildlife heritage, both of which are strong tourist attractions that can be utilized for economic advancement (2014). In a northern Tanzania case study, researchers found that 28,000 local people were employed at craft and souvenir stalls; local farmers produced half of the food consumed by tourists in the northern circuit; and that 19% of the earnings from tourism in the area (about USD 100 million annually)

went to local people working for tour companies, as either wages or as tips. Although not a PPT structure by nature, this strategy does facilitate access to markets for poor individuals and communities, one of the critical issues related to PPT as identified by Ashley and Roe (2002).

Folarin and Adeniyi (2020) studied the impact of tourism on poverty reduction among 38 countries in Sub-Saharan Africa between 1996-2015, as the industry had gone through a massive expansion. Looking at World Bank data on international tourism receipts and a variety of poverty indexes, they concluded that "tourism development significantly reduces poverty in African countries" (p. 152), where natural resource-based tourism is predominant. Hill, Nel, and Trotter (2006) corroborated these results with their previous findings of nature-based, pro-poor tourism in two municipalities of South Africa. The first, Utrecht, suffered at the collapse of the coal industry in the 1990s, losing many job opportunities which resulted in poverty and migration. The town shifted its focus to market itself as a town within a game reserve, building infrastructure for tourism and making efforts to attract international tourists. The second, Matatiele, a more rural town with high unemployment and a heavy reliance on both subsistence farming and government support, is situated near the Lesotho border and the accompanying mountain range. It marketed itself as "the gateway to an innovative hiking trail through terrain with a high level of biodiversity" (p. 169). Though concerns arose in both cases of dependence on external funding, an uneven distribution of benefits, and limited employment opportunities; there were overall benefits accrued to the local impoverished populations as tourism infrastructure was further developed and marketed.

Another study by Njoya and Seetaram (2018) looked at simulated models of the relationship between tourism development and poverty reduction in Kenya, where tourism is a primary strategy in poverty reduction and creates substantial employment opportunities. They found that while increased tourism development will not help all poor households cross the poverty line, it will greatly benefit the poorest households in Kenya and will contribute to reducing the overall income gap. Therefore, their findings supported the notion that tourism development is highly capable of leading to poverty alleviation.

In their research, Pelizzo and Kinyondo (2018) discuss how tourism has already positively impacted Tanzania's development. The economic growth sustained by Tanzania over the last few years has created conditions for socioeconomic development, allowing the

distribution of increased wealth among those living in poverty. Combined with increased levels of employment as a result of an expanding tourism market, the number of individuals living in poverty defined “as a lack of basic needs” declined drastically over the first decade of this century (Pelizzo and Kinyondo, 2018, p. 19). The linkage between poverty alleviation and tourism in Tanzania extends back to Luvanga and Shitundu’s (2003) study of six Tanzanian communities. Their results indicated that tourism activities contributed in various ways to poverty reduction and that the industry provides an opportunity to be a “pro-poor growth sector” in Tanzania (p. 49). Where direct economic benefits may not be felt, such as increased income or employment opportunities, Muganda et al. (2010) found that indirect impacts, including transportation and infrastructure, were felt by even remote communities living in poverty. That said, there is an opportunity in Tanzania for the wildlife tourism industry to positively contribute to poverty reduction and national development through pro-poor tourism.

When referencing Croe and Rivera’s 2015 book on “Poverty Alleviation through Tourism Development”, Njoya and Seetaram note the authors’ assertion that tourism can have pro-poor benefits, mainly through job opportunities, but “in times of economic slowdown [poor populations] tend to suffer the most and in periods of economic growth they benefit the least” (2018, p. 514). This is likely a result of the fact that benefits often trickle down to the poor as a result of tourism development, rather than focusing directly on poverty alleviation. This rings true through the above-referenced studies as well as many others that touch on tourism’s contributions to poverty alleviation (Keane et al., 2020; Melubo, 2020; Minwary, 2009; Nelson, 2012; Snyder and Sulle, 2011). When poverty reduction is the primary agenda item for tourism initiatives, such as the research of Ashley and Roe (2002), Hill, Nel and Trotter (2006), and Njoya and Seetaram (2018); the benefits accrued by poor individuals and households were measurable and impactful through employment, income and social services (though the distribution of positive outcomes was either not measured or specific to some beneficiaries). Although the direct link to tourism of these findings may be more measurable, other studies (such as those referred to earlier in this section) identified similar results through tourism initiatives that did not have poverty alleviation as a top agenda item. In this regard, though none of these authors contest tourism’s potential and real contributions to poverty alleviation, they agree that various constraints exist (benefit inequality, policies and taxation, limited opportunities, etc.) that may limit the impacts on poor populations.

Conservation

Unsurprisingly, with a heavy reliance on the region's natural resources for tourism revenues comes a large incentive to protect them. Africa's history of wildlife conservation goes back many years and, as Frontani (2017) points out, is a highly politicized exercise as it involves determining and limiting the use of natural resources. Historically, colonizers in Africa set land aside for wildlife preservation and hunting, before determining that the populations of large predators needed to be reduced as they posed a problem for ranchers and farmers, presumably as they left the protected areas and raided colonist's crops. White settlers set aside large segments of land for paid game hunting during the colonial era in Africa, while they banned local and indigenous populations from hunting (Frontani, 2017). Independent regimes often continued these colonial conservation practices, which has led to a long history of land acquisitions by the state and forced relocations of local people and indigenous communities.

In the late 20th century, the general approach to conservation involved the use of power and violence to achieve "fortress conservation" which was characterized by fences, armed rangers, and barbed wire. Fortress conservationists believe that ecosystems are best equipped to thrive when they are completely undisturbed by human presence, as they see humans as destructive and irrational in their use of the natural environment (Doolittle, 2007). Active both before and after many African countries' independence, fortress conservation assumes that natural areas ought to be "sealed off and protected from" human encroachment (Siurua, 2006, p. 73) to ensure proper conservation of both flora and fauna. The three principles of fortress conservation, as described by Doolittle (2007), include the exclusion of local populations who rely on natural resources; enforcement through the presence of park rangers and fenced-off areas, and; limiting the use of protected areas to tourism, hunting, and research.

We base fortress conservation on Westerners' romanticized vision of how natural wilderness should be, without the invasion of "harmful" human presence (Brockington, 2015; Siurua, 2006). As Brockington (2015) points out, this conservation strategy was (and often still is) perceived as an integral policy mechanism towards achieving development goals. We achieve these through increased revenues from Western tourists impressed by the prestigious natural and wild African environments. Fortress conservation seeks to protect wildlife and their natural environment by strictly limiting access to these environments.

Creating these purely natural areas, shielded from human presence, has an exclusionary element involving the removal of communities, often forcefully. According to Doolittle (2007), local populations within areas under fortress conservation models are typically viewed as poachers, criminals, and squatters, despite often having resided on the land for centuries. The displacement of local populations and the subsequent dispossession of their previously inhabited land not only increases poverty levels but also creates the belief that the well-being and survival of wildlife is of greater value than that of these communities (Siurua, 2006). The political weakness of local populations in the face of a policy supported by local governments as well as the governments of developed nations, scientists, and conservationists is what makes forceful dispossession and displacement possible (Brockington 2015). Local people and communities carry the bulk of the costs of conservation while simultaneously being the most marginalized of the population and the most economically ill-equipped to do so.

A prominent Tanzanian example of fortress conservation took place in the 1980s within the Mkomazi Game Reserve in north-east Tanzania. Several community groups consisting of hunters and herders lived within the reserve for centuries. Colonizing wars between the British and German Empires pushed different indigenous groups in and out of the region, resulting in culturally varied groups. Communities had permission to reside only within the eastern boundaries of the reserve before drought and poor government oversight led to the unauthorized (yet unregulated) use of the western half for pastoralist livelihoods in the 1970s (Brockington, 2004). Come the 1980s and Tanzania's Department of Wildlife had concerns regarding the environmental impact of so many pastoralists and cattle residing within the boundaries of the reserve, and so began removing human settlements. The process of evicting these pastoralist communities occurred over the decade, with the final residents evicted in 1988. Throughout the following decade, the Tanzanian government turned the reserve into a tourist attraction through infrastructure projects such as roads and plane landing strips, and by instating wildlife breeding programs for several species (Brockington, 2004). While conservation efforts soared within the reserve, the livelihoods of those evicted were destroyed and cattle numbers declined. Evictions were known to have been violent and destructive, with the burning of homes and forceful removal of families from the reserve. Large fines were given to families whose cattle over-grazed, and the reduced numbers of livestock had severe impacts on household income and the region's livestock economy. According to Brockington (2004), the Tanzanian government

offered no compensation to the individuals and families affected. Despite pleading with government officials and efforts to remain on the land, "the failure to resist the evictions, or claim adequate compensation for their losses, demonstrates the power of fortress conservation and the weakness of local opposition" (Brockington, 2004, p. 419).

The more recent drivers of wildlife conservation in Africa include the lucrative illegal wildlife trade and the growing human population conflicting with wildlife. According to the World Bank (2018), habitat loss, wildlife crime (poaching), and a lack of funding for conservation efforts are among the primary threats to wildlife. Despite many years of effort on local, national, and international scales, Africa's wildlife population has faced tremendous declines. Between 1970 and 2005, "69 key African mammal species declined by 59 percent" (Roe and Mayers, 2018). Since 1960, nearly all of Africa's wildlife populations have experienced declines, some of which have reached extinction (Sebunya, 2019). While there is evidence of increasing populations among South African lions and elephants (York, 2018), the majority of species in much of the continent remain on the decline.

Tanzania has experienced mass declines in its black rhino and lion populations (Kideghesho, 2016) while also facing a 60% loss in elephant populations between 2009-2014, mainly due to poaching (Mathiesen, 2015). Under global scrutiny regarding these statistics, President Magufuli ramped up the country's response to ivory poaching (World Wildlife Fund [WWF], 2016). This led to the arrest and subsequent sentencing of Tanzania's most notorious ivory trafficker ("Tanzania's Most Wanted," 2017). WWF (2016) further notes that for every dollar invested in elephant conservation in Tanzania, a return of a dollar and seventy-eight cents can be expected. With wildlife tourism being a central component to Tanzania's national income, this return is, presumably, generated through tourism.

More recently, Tanzania's Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism has been overseeing the government's newly-instated a military force consisting of over 300 individuals to combat the illegal poaching crisis (Namkwahe and Nyakeke, 2018). The effectiveness of this fortress-like initiative is yet to be determined; however, this militarized approach has many critics. Duffy (2014) explores East Africa's "shoot to kill" policies emerging in the 1980s (whereby park rangers are encouraged to shoot poachers) and provides evidence of militarized conservation in South Africa and Kenya. She argues that its framing as a "war to save

biodiversity" justifies repression and coercion, later addressing the dichotomy of heroes versus villains and the relatively nonexistent discussion on the underlying motivations of poachers, namely poverty (Duffy, 2017; Duffy, Dickinson, Joanny, 2017). Marijnen and Verweijn (2016) add to this discussion by arguing that public media depictions of armed park rangers as heroes have romanticized and commodified militarized conservation. Contrarily, McCann (2017) defends the militarization of conservation and posits that wildlife poaching is a criminal act and should be treated as such. McCann (2017) argues that policing is required in national parks to protect wildlife from poaching, and its militarization is necessary to confront heavily-armed, well-organized, and ruthless poachers.

While we typically associate poaching with 'professional' networks, it can often involve local communities. Mariki, Svarstad, and Benjaminsen (2015) studied a situation in 2009 occurring in Northern Tanzania whereby villagers chased six elephants off a cliff to their death in what the authors coined "resistance to conservation practice" (p. 19). Local villagers' engagement in the organized poaching trade can range from a variety of motivations, such as a statement of resistance, or financial compensation. This century's increase in wildlife crime is primarily driven by extreme poverty, lack of conservation funding, political instability, and demand for illegal wildlife products (UNWTO, 2014). Many rural villagers live in poverty and therefore poach for bush meat that they then sell, either as a sole source of income or to supplement other income (Jain, 2017). In Namibia, and likely in many other African countries, wealthy businessmen recruit and pay rural villagers to poach black rhinos for their horns, which are highly profitable on the black market (Shapwanale, 2018). As a police source of Shapwanale's explains, the rural villagers that get involved in poaching for black market sales are often "uneducated and unaware of the larger implications of their actions" (2018), in terms of the international network of illegal wildlife trade, thus accepting the paid job to make ends meet in their home.

The institutional and regulatory landscape of conservation in Tanzania is an important element of this research, as it is a primary driver for government actions. As previously discussed, wildlife tourism is an important contributor to Tanzania's GDP making the conservation of wildlife a national priority. Understanding the history of conservation in

Tanzania, as well as its complications and current position, is critical to understand the complexities of engaging local communities who have long lived in tandem with wildlife.

Community-Based Conservation

For centuries, local people, often consisting of indigenous groups and other marginalized communities, have occupied much of the land in and around protected areas in Africa, resulting in tensions between local people and conservationists. Brockington (2015) points out that there has recently been a shift away from fortress conservation towards a more inclusive, community-based method. He argues that conservationists' fear and realization that isolating their neighbours, who have occupied the lands for decades, could lead to future conflicts and problems. Arguments against fortress conservation have long urged that the most successful conservation will come when local needs are considered (Doolittle, 2007).

Many community-based conservation (CBC) projects have emerged as a result of concerns around fortress conservation and the impacts of protected areas reserved for tourism on the livelihoods of the poor (Slocum and Backman, 2011). The World Bank (2018) notes that the majority of individuals living within or around protected areas are living in poverty. Therefore, they recommend the development of systems that allow local inhabitants to financially benefit from natural resource-based tourism, thus improving livelihoods. CBC is used to promote wildlife conservation and preservation while also supporting the needs of communities (Dressler et al., 2010), with the idea that conservation will only be successful when locals are drawn into the planning and conservation becomes internalized (McCarthy, 2005). In the 1990s, wildlife management schemes emerged that had more emphasis on community development and local participation (Frontani, 2017). Hulme and Murphree (1999) refer to this as the "new conservation", whereby the state becomes a less important actor in conservation and the ownership lies with local communities and market flows. As they put it, conservation having nearly always negatively impacted local communities, "new conservation" aims to reconcile with those who have consistently been at the losing end of conservation. This new approach is in stark contrast with the former dominant method of fortress conservation. The authors attribute new conservation to the emergence of neoliberalism as a market strategy, which promotes a lack of state intervention and emphasizes consumer-driven markets. Hulme and Murphree (1999) argue that to ensure conservation, species "must not be protected from the market forces as that will

place control in the hands of an inefficient state that will allow them to degrade" (p. 280), specifically referencing government rent-seekers accepting bribes from poachers.

Neoliberal Conservation

Neoliberalism removes or limits the government as a funding entity, focusing instead on increased private sector spending and foreign investment as well as "increased democracy and participation [of communities]" (Benjaminsen et al., 2013, p. 1091). Neoliberal conservation, or new conservation, operates on the basis that proper ecological conservation can reasonably lead to successful economic growth (Hansen, Faran, O'Byrne, 2015). As wildlife conservation succeeds and populations flourish, so will the market value of that wildlife, attracting more private investment which in turn contributes to economic growth. Parts of nature that may have been owned by the state or held as a communal good typically become privatized and a global commodity through value-added (Holmes, 2011).

However, Benjaminsen et al. (2013) point out that neoliberal conservation can, and often does, lead to increased dispossession and marginalization of local people. As the global value of wildlife increases, so too does the amount of protected land, thus limiting access of local people and communities to the resources within highly-valued protected areas. A neoliberal approach to wildlife conservation also increases the role of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), particularly big, internationally-based ones (BINGOs), and private sector enterprises. These organizations effectively replace the role of the government in fortress conservation, with their dominance prevalent across much of Africa (Igoe and Brockington, 2007). Holmes (2011) refers to this as a group of elites with varying experiences and expertise who "promote saving biodiversity through repositioning the state, corporations, and NGOs through market mechanisms" (p. 5).

With market-based approaches, NGOs have gained significant power as the lines between them, for-profit organizations, and governments have been blurred, further enhancing the paramount role played by NGOs in neoliberal conservation. Conservation NGOs maintain close ties with key bureaucrats to earn and maintain support from state actors (Holmes, 2011). They foster strong relationships with multilateral organizations as a means to provide and obtain diverse expertise, while also benefitting from increased funding, as community conservation schemes provide space for the merging of development and conservation initiatives. According

to Benjaminsen et al. (2013), there is a global market for community-friendly wildlife safaris, resulting in NGOs maintaining an element of "community", whether reflecting reality or just creating positive imagery (Hulme and Murphree, 1999), as it is "essential for the promotion of wildlife tourism" (Benjaminsen et al., 2013, p. 1093).

The relationship between private, for-profit enterprises and the apparent civil-society-based organizations is an important factor when understanding neoliberal conservation. For example, Africa Parks Foundation (APF), is indirectly controlled (through funding) by a Dutch gas company and American superpower Wal-Mart. APF is responsible for evictions in Ethiopia and South Africa to transform the lands into protected areas to be commodified for tourism-driven consumption and subsequent profits (Igoe and Brockington, 2007). Similarly, African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) turned a Tanzanian livestock ranch into a protected area after taking over from the state, and renowned American hedge-fund manager Paul Tudor Jones took over managing two large state-sponsored game reserves in Tanzania (Igoe and Brockington, 2007). BINGOs are often supported by private investors and for-profit companies, whose business interests may limit their reach and activities. Corporate leaders are usually invited to join the board of directors to "bring in management expertise and allow NGOs access to the corporate world" (Holmes, 2011, p. 9). Corporations are enticed by the market opportunity in nature and wildlife conservation and propose corporate solutions to conservation problems, such as ecotourism. The privatization of conservation that has come about with new market-based approaches can be problematic, by promoting capitalism in subtle ways that are marketed as corporate social responsibility (e.g., wildlife conservation) to the general public.

Sustainable Development

New conservation promotes both ideas of conserving wildlife and promoting poverty reduction, through a "sustainable development" approach. Holmes (2011) argues that the process of neoliberalization and developing an "elite structure" has occurred just as well in international development circles. Conservation NGOs, he argues, have fit well into the structures of international development, latching onto donors in the development sphere to increase their reach. Not all neoliberal conservation is considered sustainable development, which is characterized by the tensions between traditional conservation and economic growth (Hansen et al., 2015). Sustainable development aims to mitigate the commonly held understanding that

economic growth comes at the cost of the natural environment and increases inequality. Instead, sustainable development is meant to address three equally important concerns at once: an ecological component, an economic component, and a social component. It promotes the notion that economic growth can be congruent with environmental sustainability, conservation, and development. Although very difficult to successfully satisfy all three components at once, this new form of conservation appears to come close in its efforts.

Discussions of incorporating people and communities into conservation activities to reduce poverty through sustainable development and relying on market demand became widespread in the African conservation sector in the late twentieth century (Hulme and Murphree, 1999). Different strategies implemented across the continent yielded a variety of results, some much more impactful than others. In looking at Zimbabwe's CAMPFIRE program (Communal Areas Management Program for Indigenous Resources), which sought to implement revenue-sharing strategies to achieve sustainable development between wildlife and indigenous groups, researchers found that revenues did not make their way down to the local level. Rather, they remained within district-level councils who restricted and limited land uses at the local level (Hulme and Murphree, 1999). Uganda's Community Conservation policy used a centralized, top-down approach in protecting the country's diminishing population of mountain gorillas. Though some community representatives were included in the committee establishing the Community Conservation strategy, Infield and Adams (1999) reported that the communities did not feel the actual benefits promised (revenue-sharing, social infrastructure investment, participation in park management, etc.). Communities grew to resent wildlife conservation as they had no opportunity to contribute to park management and received minimal tourism revenues, which instead benefitted the Ugandan government and the tourism industry at large (Hulme and Murphree, 1999). This approach is completely contrary to the AWF's recommendations on CBC, whereby conservation has to matter to local communities and have reliable and significant benefits to deter any anti-conservation behaviour (AWF, 2016).

One of the more successful CBC schemes emerged in Namibia in the mid-1990s and continues today. The country began implementing "community conservancies", recognized by the government as distinct areas of land where the community "receives legal rights over wildlife and tourism under national legislation" (AWF, 2016). They require that conservancies have a

representative, an ability to manage their own funds, a well-defined boundary, a legal constitution, and an approved method for distributing benefits to its members in the community. Once they meet these requirements, a conservancy can formally register and can then engage in activities like signing tourism and game hunting contracts, and can use wildlife for personal benefit (respecting government quotas and regulations), with the right to keep all revenues accrued. The Namibian Ministry of Environment and Tourism offers modest periodic payments to conservancies with the idea that their income will supplement this amount, and to assist with "start-up" costs for new conservancies (AWF, 2016). In 2014, the overall benefits accrued by community conservancies in Namibia were plentiful, with related improvements in wildlife conservation. Benefits to conservancy members typically included jobs, cash payments, community projects, meat distribution, support to schools, medical treatment, support for the elderly, children, and students, and a reduction in human-wildlife conflict. However, the aggregated calculations did not take into account the differences between large conservancies with wildlife of higher value (the Big Five) and smaller conservancies with "less-impressive" wildlife. Other challenges included occasional corruption within the management and distribution of conservancy revenues as well as transparency with regards to decision making. Conservancy abilities to manage increased business opportunities were also at times a concern, as well as ensuring income distribution to conservancy members maintained its value and incentives, and; the legal barrier that conservancies had ownership over the wildlife within the conservancies but not over the land itself (AWF, 2016). Namibia's approach, however, gives community ownership over wildlife and tourism, resulting in a re-evaluation of "the relative roles of wildlife and agriculture (domestic livestock and crops) in local development" making wildlife far more valuable to communities and therefore providing additional conservation incentives (Hulme and Murphree, 1999, p. 282). Providing local communities with a portion of the revenues from natural resource-based tourism in exchange for use of their land for wildlife protection is an example of community-based conservation (Bwagalilo, 2018).

CBC and Sustainable Development in Tanzania

Some Tanzanian tour operators adapted their strategies towards the end of the 20th century when it was becoming clearer to the tourism and conservation industries that participatory approaches would prevail over fortress conservation. Safari companies would

partner directly with communities alongside protected areas, paying a bed-night fee for each tourist visiting the safari company's camp. These agreements would result in significant revenues directly for communities and local development (Benjaminsen and Brycen, 2012). In one particular case noted by Benjaminsen and Brycen, Tanzania's Wildlife Division within the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism granted a hunting permit to a private company, covering the same stretch of village land. Although the village had rights to the land and could therefore engage with non-consumptive, photographic safari tourism companies; the wildlife was (and remains to be) the property of the State and hunting permits are controlled by the Wildlife Division (Benjaminsen and Brycen, 2012). However, the agreement between the village and company was nullified since any photographic safaris occurring within a hunting block must get approval from the Director of Wildlife. This led to an ongoing legal battle, which the village ultimately lost, and was a source of conflict that the government would later address.

A set of policies released in Tanzania in the late 1990s seemed promising in promoting CBC, using win-win language for both conservationists and communities (Benjaminsen and Brycen, 2012). The early 2000s saw the development of one of the most widely-known community-based conservation projects in Tanzania; Wildlife Management Areas, or WMAs (Salerno et al., 2016; Bluwstein, Lund, and Brehony, 2018). Located near protected areas and often within wildlife migration corridors, WMAs aim to enhance "conservation and poverty alleviation through sustainable utilization of natural resources" (Tanzania Tourist Board, n.d.), similar to Namibia's CBC model. WMAs focus on habitat protection and wildlife conservation (MNRT, 2007) while incentivizing villagers to protect rather than conflict with wildlife (Caro and Davenport, 2015; Bwagalilo, 2018) through the management of the surrounding area and the accrual of benefits from tourism (Benjaminsen and Brycen, 2012). The anticipated result is a reduction in human-wildlife conflict due to communities' new-found reliance on wildlife to generate income through tourism. The design of WMAs appears to have been based on Namibia's successful community conservancies in terms of the steps required to establish a WMA and the monitoring systems used, which were directly modeled after Namibia's.

Villages need to first be made aware of the benefits of WMAs before a village council, made up of elected individuals (Snyder and Sulle, 2011), can recommend an area become a WMA to the village assembly (all villagers 18 years old and up). Once the village is mobilized,

they form a community-based organization (CBO) that consists of several villages and works with an NGO partner to develop their "Resource Management Zone", conducting Land Use Planning before submitting an application to the Director of Wildlife. If they satisfy the Director, the Director will advise the Minister of Natural Resources and Tourism on whether or not they recommend transforming this CBO into an Authorized Association managing a WMA (Goldman, 2003; Minwary, 2009; AWF, 2016). Once an area is declared a WMA by the Minister, the communities within the area can begin collecting revenues from wildlife tourism in the area. The CBO (consisting of the villages within the WMA) can enter into contracts with private tourism companies for wildlife viewing, with international organizations facilitating the initial technical and financial requirements (AWF, 2016). Villages that formerly had arrangements directly with safari tourism companies could no longer continue once a part of a WMA. Instead, the company would have to go through the CBO, which manages the WMA's business ventures, and they expect all villages located within a WMA to split the revenues accrued through tourism that occurs within the WMA (Benjaminsen and Brycen, 2012; Bluwstein, 2017).

Moyo, Ijumba, and Lund (2016) acknowledge some of the positive feedback regarding WMAs, along with the immense financial support that they received from NGOs and aid agencies. However, most academic studies demonstrate a lack of significantly positive outcomes for communities. The financial benefits are not being felt by villagers entrenched in WMAs as they are very little when dispersed among all households (Bluwstein et al., 2018) or altogether non-existent (Mwakaje et al., 2013; Moyo et al., 2016; Bwagalilo, 2018). Although WMAs should retain more than half of the revenues from wildlife tourism in their area, data on total revenues is difficult to obtain, making it unclear how much villages are truly benefitting (Sulle and Banka, 2017). Additionally, loss of land for grazing livestock is a prevalent concern for villagers within WMAs (Mwakaje et al., 2013; Moyo et al., 2016). Many researchers refer to land-grabbing (Benjaminsen, Bryceson, Maganga, and Refseth, 2011) and land appropriation (Bluwstein et al., 2018) when addressing these scarcities in grazing land. Despite immense pressures from the government, many villages are hesitant to join WMAs as they typically fall within zones that prohibit grazing livestock. Though we can perceive WMAs as allowing continued land-ownership for villages; a centralization of wildlife management remains (Benjaminsen et al., 2011), as the state maintains ownership over the wildlife and control over

land uses (Snyder and Sulle, 2011; Bluwstein, 2017). The Wildlife Division must approve all tourism contracts between companies and CBOs, and it is common for the Wildlife Division to place restrictions on land uses within the WMAs, thus limiting grazing land for livestock (Benjaminsen and Brycen, 2012). This often leaves villagers expressing desires to have access to their land back (Bwagalilo, 2018; Moyo et al., 2016). As Mariki et al. (2015) put it, "the WMAs have enabled the Wildlife Division to accrue funds from outside national parks and game reserves" (p. 26).

Revenue Sharing Models

Community-based conservation practices need to have incentives in place to ensure their effectiveness. Oftentimes, these incentives result from benefit-sharing, which can include both tangible (employment, income, infrastructure, etc.) and non-tangible benefits (skills development, capacity building, etc.). According to Spenceley, Snyman and Rylance (2019), revenue sharing refers to "a specific form of benefit-sharing that refers only to the revenue earned from tourism, through concessions, partnerships, and other revenue-sharing opportunities" (p. 721). Researchers recommend that revenue-sharing is paired with other available benefits accrued from tourism in protected areas to ensure maximum buy-in among those implicated. The tourism industry, in particular, has taken a liking to revenue-sharing approaches as a way to minimize the inequalities among the various stakeholders in the industry, most notably the discrepancies between host communities and all other groups of stakeholders (Wynberg and Hauck, 2014). Governments, NGOS, and private sector companies are generally behind the implementation of revenue-sharing models, which they often use as a means to "promote community development, reduce conflict, and improve the public image of conservation agencies and tourism operators" (Wynberg and Hauck, 2014, p. 26). Funds are most often accumulated through the collection of permit fees, levies, and taxes, before being redistributed to local people for revenue-sharing. All benefit-sharing schemes can be important and useful tools to mediate conflicts, but each one must be designed in a participatory manner to carefully address the specific issues at hand in any given situation. Depending on the implementation, benefit-sharing can impact a variety of stakeholders in very different ways, from positive and enhanced livelihoods to negative social, ecological, and economic implications (Wynberg and Hauck, 2014).

Revenue-sharing programs are particularly significant and widely implemented across Africa where protected areas make up a large portion of countries' land (Spenceley et al., 2019; Ahebwa, et al., 2012). Many of the revenue-sharing programs in Africa are designed to help off-set the negative impacts felt by local people living alongside protected areas and their wildlife. Revenues are meant to alleviate both the costs of human-wildlife conflict often experienced, and the cost "for experiencing controls on their access to natural resources" (Spenceley et al., 2019, p. 723). These authors examined a host of revenue-sharing schemes across Africa and their effectiveness, looking at those directly distributing cash to impacted communities as well as those financing community development projects. In their analysis, the authors determined four principles to consider when developing a revenue-sharing model with local people impacted by wildlife and protected areas: economic benefits must be clearly identified and communicated; the benefits must be comparative to the actual threats to biodiversity (e.g. in the case that biodiversity in the particular area is at high risk, it should reflect this through greater benefits); communities must be involved in the process from development of the revenue-sharing structure to the distribution and use of funds accrued, and finally; "sufficient regulatory, technical and institutional support [are needed] to ensure that revenue-sharing programmes have clearly allocated objectives, aims, goals and responsibilities" (2019, p. 729). An effective and combined implementation of these elements is most likely to lead to successful community-based conservation through benefit-sharing.

In Bwindi Park, Uganda, for example, Ahebwa et al. (2012) found that tourism revenue-sharing policies set in place in the late 1990s disproportionately favoured state institutions that maintained authority over the area and collected higher revenues. Although increased revenues from portions of certain tourist activities were distributed to communities, the policy was designed in a way to ensure that the most profitable activities (park entrance fees and gorilla trekking permits) provided a minimal, if any, portion of funds to communities. The authors identified significant resource imbalances between communities and park authorities, both financial and knowledge-based. In Rwanda, the Government launched a tourism revenue-sharing program in 2005 whereby 5% of the annual total tourism revenue would be shared with communities living alongside three national parks. The majority of these funds were invested in social infrastructure projects (artisan commercial complex, rainwater tanks, classrooms, healthcare centers, bridge and road repairs), while about a third of funds were invested in

community-based enterprises (distribution of livestock, beekeeping, and farming practices) in 2012 (Munanura et al., 2016). This study also found inequalities in the distribution of revenues, which resulted in the continued reliance on natural resources (rather than tourism) as a means of securing livelihoods among the poorest residents surrounding protected areas. The Rwandan example also identified that conservation had not seen improvements as a result of tourism revenue-sharing (Munanura et al., 2016).

Revenue Sharing in Tanzania's WMAs

Tanzania's WMAs offer another example of tourism revenue sharing. According to the Copenhagen Centre for Development Research, the revenue-sharing models implemented in WMAs provide little benefit to villages, while instead imposing significant costs (Homewood et al., 2015). Similar to the examples in Uganda and Rwanda, there is an unequal distribution of revenues between the state and the WMA, with additional inequality at the village level. Despite some villages facing more adverse effects from tourism and wildlife than others; the funds get distributed equally among villages and households, leaving some of the more actively involved villages at a disadvantage (Benjaminsen and Brycen, 2012; Homewood et al., 2015; Gardner, 2017). Sulle and Banka (2017) argue that the system in place in Tanzania's WMAs is designed in a way that "encourages non-compliance and conflicts" between the villages and both state and private investors (p. 3). They demonstrate how the government continues to control the tourism activities taking place within WMAs and imposes high tax rates on funds accrued, resulting in unsubstantial levels of income for villages involved. The Director of Wildlife collects the funds from tourism contracts within the WMA, and also ultimately grants permission for the activities to take place (Snyder and Sulle, 2011; Benjaminsen and Brycen, 2012). Benjaminsen and Brycen contend that this is due to "an allegedly insufficient capacity or knowledge of financial management in the CBOs" (2012, p. 343), who are then given 65% of the revenues from non-consumptive tourism (e.g., photographic safaris and not hunting) within the WMA. According to Snyder and Sulle (2011), the remaining amount gets divided between the District Council (15%) and the Wildlife Division (20%), despite AWF's assertion that "no payments go to the Wildlife Division" (2016, p. 120). As formerly mentioned, the WMA arrangement resulted in some villages, who already had simpler and direct contracts with tour operators (instead of going through the CBO and splitting revenues with government bodies and other villages), losing

significant revenue. In Tanzania's two most tourist-filled WMAs, Enduimet and Burunge, revenues were reported at about 0.6 and 3.5 USD per capita/year (in 2012-13 for Enduimet and 2013-14 for Burunge), while most other WMAs accrue even less due to lower tourism levels (Homewood et al., 2015).

Snyder and Sulle (2011) found that revenue collection and distribution in Tanzania's community-based conservation areas was cause for confusion and lacked significant clarity and accountability. A lack of transparency between the Wildlife Division within the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism and the CBOs means that member villages in WMAs do not accurately know whether they are getting their full cut. As Benjaminsen and Brycen (2012) note, the lack of accessible information on total tourism revenues for activities occurring within the WMA makes it so that the CBO receiving cheques cannot certify the amounts being provided, making it difficult to ensure that member villages are benefitting justly (Snyder and Sulle, 2011). Furthermore, funds that do make their way to the WMAs are strictly regulated in how they can be utilized, with specific allocations for resource development, member villages of the CBO, and strengthening the Authorized Association (Sulle and Banka, 2017). Bluwstein (2017) reported that at least half of the CBO's revenues are put towards administrative and securitization costs, and they divide the remaining amount among member villages.

Land Dispossession

In addition to insufficient revenue sharing, local people living alongside protected areas in Tanzania have faced decades of land dispossessions and evictions for the sake of tourism development (Charnley, 2005), which have often been fraught and characterized by great amounts of violence. In the case of WMAs, dispossession is often demonstrated through the "incremental loss of access" to valuable natural resources (Benjaminsen and Brycen, 2012, p. 344), but dispossession can also occur through evictions. British colonizers evicted many local and indigenous communities from their land to conserve an image of 'pristine nature' (Neves & Igoe, 2012). Both then and now governments and other groups have viewed local and indigenous communities as unproductive. In the 1960s and 1970s, they took action to heavily promote fortress conservation, reducing access to land for these communities (Charnley, 2005). Only in the 1990s, when Tanzania liberalized its economy, did conservation really present an opportunity for capital accumulation through its tourism industry. Much of this capital accumulation occurs

through the dispossession of land from indigenous communities, with the private sector getting involved in wildlife conservation to accrue greater tourism revenues (Zoomers, 2010).

When land becomes ‘protected’ and falls under conservation laws in Tanzania, as national parks do, it means that human activity is prohibited within half a kilometer of that land (United Republic of Tanzania, 2009), seriously limiting local people from engaging in their livelihood activities such as accessing water and grazing livestock. Neves and Igoe (2012) found that Maasai elders feared any conservation initiatives as they often result in community displacements, citing instances of evictions from four separate National Parks, including Tarangire and Serengeti. Kelly (2011), in referencing Neumann (2001), refers to a situation in 1988 whereby the government threatened individuals with guns, beat them, and burned their homes. Kelly (2011) also references a 1997 directive from the Minister of Natural Resources and Tourism to park rangers, encouraging them to shoot any “bandits” in the park, which resulted in the deaths of nearly 50 villagers in the Serengeti National Park through 1998. Latif Dahir (2018) discusses the thousands of Maasai people that were forcefully evicted from their land, had their huts burnt down, and were left homeless in 2017 in favour of private tourism companies and conservation lobbyists. Benjaminsen and Brycen (2012) cite ‘livestock overgrazing’ on land leased by a private investor as the main reason for the eviction and burning of 200 Maasai homes in 2009, a frequently used justification for evictions that leave local people dispossessed of not only their homes but also land for crops and grazing.

CBC and Dispossession

Community-based conservation arrangements still heavily favour the state and the private sector, as local people do not always benefit as much as promised. Simply imposing the name of ‘community-based conservation’ or advertising ‘community’ does not constitute proper decentralization and participatory processes (Murray Li, 2007). Instead, the term CBC in this case is used as a mechanism for continued accumulation by dispossession and land grabbing, all in the name of conservation (Benjaminsen and Brycen, 2012). WMAs, as a conservation tool, lead to a loss of access to land and resources, and the “dispossession by previous users combined with capital accumulation by some powerful actors” (p. 337). Many studies cite the apprehension or discontent of villages being encouraged to join WMAs or already part of one (Snyder and Sulle, 2011; Homewood et al., 2015; Moyo et al., 2016; Bwagalilo, 2018). According to

Homewood et al. (2015), most WMAs cause land-based conflicts between the villages within the WMA and the state, tour operators, and sometimes other villages. The restricted land available for livestock grazing deeply impacts pastoralist livelihoods that rely heavily on income generated from livestock. Land tenure and access to land has also been an issue in areas where agriculture and farmland are of utmost importance to sustain livelihoods.

The Politics of Land

In an effort to address the challenges of different land uses in Tanzania stemming from the country's colonial history, demographic changes, and varying socioeconomic levels; Tanzania released a new National Land Policy in 1997. The policy followed a handful of consultations and information gathering and was ultimately created to further advance Tanzania's development agenda by providing legislation on land-use issues including environmental protection, rural and urban development, security and title, and economic uses of land (Ministry of Lands and Human Settlements Development (MLHSD), 1997). The legislation included the Land Act (1999) and the Village Land Act (1999), which both came into law in 2001 (Snyder and Sulle, 2001). The latter gave village councils increased authority over their lands and an ability to manage their uses as desired. This led to the establishment of a land committee, which could advise the village council on productive and efficient land uses, which is then accountable to the village assembly before making decisions on land use and occupancy (URT, 1999b). Although the Village Land Act does enable the management of land by the elected village council; the state is the ultimate owner of the land. As Snyder and Sulle explain, "people cannot own the land but rather can have rights to occupy and use land" (2011, p. 939). In Tanzania, the President has the authority to sell or take the land if it is in the public interest, providing compensation to those living there. The Act requires that the government "pay full, fair and prompt compensation to any person whose right of occupancy or recognized long-standing occupation or customary use of land is revoked or otherwise interfered with to their detriment" (URT, 1999b, p. 24). A transfer of village land should, otherwise, not take place "until the type, amount, method and timing of the payment of compensation has been agreed upon" (URT, 1999b, p. 30), though the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA) notes that this compensation is meant to be a pay-out, and not a land-to-land transfer (2016).

Villages can obtain a Village Certificate of Land, which recognizes firm boundaries of village land and provides tenure over the lands which, ideally, would protect communities from dispossession and allow private contracts with tour operators (Snyder and Sulle, 2011). In 2007, however, Tanzania's Minister of Tourism and Natural Resources signed regulations stipulating that all wildlife use (including wildlife tourism) be approved by the Director of Wildlife "who will grant permission and collect fees" (p. 940). Naturally, this impacted villages' ability to manage their lands and restricted income from tourism activities, as such uses became limited to being filtered through WMAs and the Director of Wildlife. Under the guise of village land management and community-based conservation, the government has continued to control and centralize land access and land use, including wildlife tourism revenues.

Land contentions in Tanzania have a long and colonial history, though the period shortly after independence saw some challenges as well, with long-lasting affects. Tanzania's first president, Julius Nyerere, implemented the Ujamaa policy, better known as the villagization policy. This 1967 policy emphasized that people should live together in developed villages rather than being spread out in rural areas, that they should work together and collectively own the means of production within the village, and that all revenues and benefits should then be shared equally (Hyden, 1975). Although its intention was a development plan for Tanzania's rural populations through voluntary activities, a later iteration of the policy in the early 1970's led to a more forceful relocation and villagization of many rural dwellers (Hyden, 1975; Kjekshus, 1977; Owen, 2014)

These issues of dispossession and limited access to natural resources (land, water, flora, wildlife, etc.), along with inconsistent and unclear revenue-sharing models, add another important layer to the aforementioned complexities surrounding wildlife conservation in Tanzania and the State's engagement with local people.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODS AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The methods for this research went through a significant shift with the arrival of COVID-19. Initially, the plan was to conduct field interviews with stakeholders in Dar es Salaam, Dodoma, and northern Tanzania, mainly within the Arusha area. This fieldwork would have sought to include interviews with wildlife safari operators in northern Tanzania, along with conservation NGOs and human/indigenous rights NGOs in the region. I would have also approached government officials in relevant departments and agencies for interviews. Relevant government departments and agencies include, but are not limited to, Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA), Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT), Tanzania Wildlife Management Authority (TAWA), Tanzania Tourist Board (TTB). The most prominent, and arguably most important, stakeholder group was lost in switching to a desk-based approach; local people and members from villages that are situated in and around protected wildlife areas. Unfortunately, due to constraints involving technological limitations, language barriers, as well as access to these villages and the trust that can only be established and built in-person; interviews with these vital stakeholders would no longer have been possible.

The Tanzania Commission on Science and Technology (COSTECH) granted approval with modifications around the time that the COVID-19 pandemic was beginning to present itself as a real cause for concern, and travel restrictions were being put in place by both the Canadian government as well as the University of Ottawa. Therefore, I had to make a decision on whether or not I should continue to prioritize the COSTECH permit. Continuing with the COSTECH permit would allow me to virtually interview individuals in Tanzania from Ottawa. Without the permit, all research and interviews would have to take place outside of Tanzania.

Given that village stakeholders were out of the question from a virtual-interview standpoint; government officials were the only other stakeholders that could be contacted exclusively in Tanzania. Other stakeholders (tour operators and NGOs) can be found in abundance outside of Tanzania, while still working on closely related issues and having knowledge of the research areas. I hypothesized that reaching government stakeholders would have been a difficult task, even when physically visiting them in Tanzania (in addition to reaching out via e-mail and phone). Therefore, given the now virtual nature of the research and

the added difficulties involved with recruitment, I decided to forego the COSTECH research permit and amend the University of Ottawa research ethics permit (amendments approved July 2020). Moving forward without the COSTECH permit also allowed me to re-define my research more critically, whereby having the research previously approved by a Tanzanian government agency required establishing a balance of analytical research and a "censorship" of sorts in terms of research objectives; framing the research in a way that would not conflict with government priorities.

Research Methods Employed

I decided to compliment the data from interviews by also employing a qualitative content analysis, since there is now a less diversified pool of respondents within reach. I did this by coding a variety of existing resources in the data analysis software NVivo to help address the research question. Content analysis aims to provide a "detailed description of the material under analysis" (Schreier, 2014, p. 173) by pulling out a specific message from the content and applying it to a broader analysis. It is a systematic method that looks to describe the meaning of qualitative data by classifying it through coding to draw out themes (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005; Schreier, 2014). It will be made clear later in this chapter that the objective of this content analysis was to identify themes among the content in multiple types of resources that refer to specific *impacts*, as related to the research question. This process will then continue to follow Hseih and Shannon's (2005) description of qualitative content analysis by identifying relationships, or lack of, between the coding themes.

This qualitative content analysis of existing literature and documentation will be complementary to the semi-structured interviews conducted. The next sections will provide detail on both methods of interviewing and conducting a qualitative content analysis.

Qualitative Content Analysis

Identification and Selection of Resources.

Resources that I included in the coding process included academic articles, online news articles, reports, and policy documents from the government of Tanzania. I implemented a robust approach to generate a non-exhaustive, representative sample by employing a standardized sampling method through keyword searches and, where necessary, purposive sampling.

The process for sourcing academic articles, and oftentimes reports as well, involved searches on two multidisciplinary and well-stocked databases from the University of Ottawa online library; Academic Search Complete (ASC) and JSTOR. I chose these databases because of their multidisciplinary nature and the fact that they each include a wide range of journals, giving me confidence that I could collect a significant amount of highly relevant information. JSTOR provides only information from published journals (excluding the most current issues) across several disciplines, while ASC offers journals, magazines and newspapers, thus limiting these searches and potentially excluding other relevant sources (e.g., theses and dissertations). Nonetheless, these presented a sufficient and diverse selection of resources that fell within my capacity.

Searches in these databases included combinations of Boolean searches using the following key terms: Tanzania*, communit*, Maasai, villag*, conservation*, touris*, wildlife, revenue, and revenue-sharing. Parameters set included publication dates between January 1, 2000 and September 30, 2020, with the full text available. These searches generated as low as 5 hits at a time to over 30,000. Because of the high volume appearing in some searches, I limited my review to the top 100 hits to meet researcher capacity. This made it likely that I would review the most relevant hits from each search. From there, I would read the abstracts of articles to determine their relevance and save those that could potentially contribute to the coding process. Resources needed to be specific to northern Tanzania for inclusion in the coding process (e.g., articles focusing on Tanzania's southern tourism circuit were excluded). This was a decision based on the focus of the research question itself, which looks specifically at northern Tanzania. I collected additional resources since that initial process through purposive sampling; when articles or authors were referenced with information pertaining to this research or ideas that I wished to explore further I would find and read those specific articles. Many individuals contacted for interviews also had readings to recommend, which I incorporated and coded when relevant and not already identified.

I identified and selected English news articles over the course of a couple of years. I had two Tanzanian-English online news forums that I would frequently visit in search of relevant news articles. It is important to note that media freedom in Tanzania has been increasingly restricted over the last five years. President Magufuli "tolerates no criticism of himself or his

policies" (Reporters Sans Frontiers (RSF), n.d.) and reports of arrested or missing journalists have been frequent (RSF, n.d.; Amnesty International, 2019). Censorship of news in Tanzania limits the information available through journalism, by shutting down news outlets and arresting those reporting human rights violations and other criticisms of the Tanzanian government (Amnesty International, 2019). It is very possible, and even likely, that this censorship has impacted the quantity and quality of news articles available for this research.

In addition to scrolling through the headlines on both The Citizen (independent) and the Daily News (government-owned) pages, I would search specific keywords relevant to this research and scroll through those results as well, reading through new postings in search of what might be relevant for this research. These keywords included tourism, tourist, conservation, community, development, land, indigenous, Maasai, and wildlife. I stopped scrolling through the hits posted earlier than January 1, 2010 to ensure relevance, and conducted my final search in early November with a cut-off of October 31, 2020. This date is later than that for academic articles and reports as these resources were typically easier and quicker to read through and code. Once I read through the new articles, I would save those that had information relevant to this research. I also conducted broader searches on Google to try and identify other news sources, including non-Tanzanian ones, that had articles relevant to this research. I identified fewer resources through this method; however, it did often produce reports and other posts from activist organizations working in the human rights sphere and, less often, conservation. I would later cut/paste or transcribe articles into a Word document and upload them to NVivo for coding.

I also gathered Tanzanian policies and other official documents over time. I initially had done a scan through the government's page of policies and other official documents such as acts and strategies, downloading all of those that could inform elements of this research. These included the National Wildlife Policy (2007), National Tourism Policy (1999), National Land Policy (1997), National Parks Policy (1994), and Tanzania Development Vision 2025. Purposive sampling was also used for some of these documents when one not previously identified was referenced in another relevant source.

Finally, research was also conducted throughout various Tanzanian news sources and other online forums for information in Kiswahili. I was able to identify a research assistant, Vanessa, through professional contacts at the Canadian High Commission to Kenya in Nairobi.

Vanessa and I initially scheduled a call to discuss the research topic, my methods of finding resources, and what would be expected of her as a research assistant. Vanessa's first language is Kiswahili, but she had just completed her bachelor's degree in English, giving me full confidence in her ability to accurately translate the necessary documents.

Vanessa was able to search through Kiswahili online news forums, such as Habari Leo Magazine (government-owned), and other more general online platforms, such as Facebook, using the same keyword searches used for English sources (tourism, tourist, conservation, community, development, land, indigenous, Maasai, and wildlife). Similar to English searches, the parameters went back to January 1, 2010, though was later pushed back to include findings since 2000 as there was limited material available. The cut off for Kiswahili sources was November 16, 2020, which was the week in which Vanessa was expected to share her findings in full. This date is later than the others as there were difficulties identifying and engaging a research assistant, which pushed this element of the research back. Searches also led her through different links and new outlets, at times producing English articles that were referenced in Kiswahili documents. Other, more specific searches included for parliamentary discussions on community-based conservation and how tourism revenues benefit development in Tanzania, as well as a search for development projects within and around the northern tourism circuit, which brought results from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism webpage. When something that she read was of relevance to this research, she would translate the article (or relevant sections, when applicable) before sending them to me, along with citation information. Vanessa had noted that much of what she was finding was in English, and there was little published in Kiswahili that related to the topic. Often, the information in a Kiswahili article was derived from an English post. Nonetheless, she was able to identify 18 relevant Kiswahili resources, and over a dozen more English links, which she shared with me. I coded all of the resources translated, with about half producing no codes and therefore removed (for example, a resource may have discussed northern Tanzania but had more of a focus on central/southern in terms of discussing actual impacts). I incorporated a handful of English links with the rest of the English resources. Translated resources cover a variety of topics, with a primary focus on tourism and related infrastructure development. One report (not a media article) touches on human rights concerns within wildlife tourism (IPIS Research Institute, 2020), while another article addresses human-wildlife conflict within the northern circuit (Lyatuu, 2020).

See Annex B for a complete list.

NVivo Coding.

To refamiliarize myself and improve my understanding of NVivo I read through an informative NVivo webpage that covered a variety of introductory topics (QSR International, n.d.-a) and I followed a series of tutorial videos that demonstrated how to apply many of the processes and functions of the software (QSR International (n.d.-b). NVivo can also generate a sample project, providing data that can then be manipulated and experimented with. In addition to reviewing the methods of existing research that used NVivo (Araujo, Carmo & Fraga, 2019; Sirima & Backman, 2013; Zamawe, 2015), I would try to apply some of their methods with the sample project generated.

Deductive coding is an approach whereby codes are derived from the existing literature with a focus on addressing the research question (Azungah, 2018). Coding began with three deductive parent nodes; impacts on local people and communities; impacts on wildlife conservation, and; impacts on country development. These were derived directly from the research question, as it is inspired by existing literature, to ensure that codes seek to address the research question and do not fulfill any pre-existing notions or expectations from the literature review.

Reading through each resource twice, any indication or description of an impact on each of these three stakeholders/sectors (local people and communities, wildlife conservation, country development) would be coded as such. As I went along with the coding, I thought it might be interesting to also note which of these impacts directly references some form of government intervention. I, therefore, added the inductive[3] node "state intervention", which I applied only to existing codes that made direct reference to state intervention (regulation, policy, etc.). An example of an impact on local people and communities includes "recently established conservation initiatives, especially related to wildlife and coastal areas, steadily lead to local people's loss of access to land and natural resources" (Benjaminsen and Brycen, 2012), while an

[3] Inductive nodes allow for "themes to emerge from the data" (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006, p. 83) as the coding process moves along. In this research, inductive nodes were used only on existing [deductive] codes, and not to identify new material.

impact on wildlife conservation includes "wildlife numbers on Manyara Ranch have increased since its establishment as a conservation area" (Goldman, 2011).

Next, I went through each coded section under my three parent nodes for two reasons. The first was for quality assurance; ensuring that anything seemingly irrelevant was uncoded or adjusted accordingly (e.g., coded elsewhere). The second reason was to distinguish positive impacts from negative impacts. Under each of the three parent nodes, I deemed coded sections to be distinctly referring to either a positive or negative impact, or neither of these two. Unless the code clearly indicated one or the other, I would not include it as either a positive or negative impact. For example, the above-mentioned impact on local people and communities was further coded as "negative", while I coded the example of an impact on conservation as "positive". "About half of white rhinos and nearly 40% of black rhinos are on private land or land managed by communities" (Harvey, 2020) I coded as having an impact on conservation, but was neither recognized as a positive or negative impact as that could only be surmised through assumption, which I avoided in this process.

Finally, throughout this process I identified that a reoccurring negative impact on local people and communities was that of dispossession and a loss of access. Therefore, to document its prevalence, I decided to inductively code anything identified as a negative impact on local people and communities to the node of "dispossession". This node included anything with direct references to dispossession, appropriation, and/or loss of access to natural resources.

Prior (2014) explicitly notes that a content analysis can be, and often is, done in parallel with other methods, as is the case for this research. In discussing the work of Kracauer (1952), the author points to the quantitative origins of content analysis (see also Schreier, 2014), specifically the desire to code things as being positive or negative. There is a need "to interpret content as well as count items of content" (Prior, 2014, p. 4), making the use of codes to count items within the materials an essential piece to this method. I will further discuss the analysis of this data in chapters four and five; results and discussion.

Respondent Interviews

Recruitment.

I knew that the recruitment process could be difficult, especially given that everything would now be happening virtually, and that knocking on the doors of conservation or development organizations, safari companies, and other NGOs would not be possible.

Having identified land as a relevant and contentious issue through preliminary research in the literature review and, now, through NVivo coding, I had decided that identifying NGOs addressing the issue of land could be a helpful way to then identify individuals with potentially useful information. After a Google search of keywords such as land rights, Tanzania, and indigenous land, I was able to identify several organizations working on the issue of land. From there, I looked through approximately ten webpages to identify which of these organizations have done work or research in northern Tanzania. Once I had narrowed it down to three organizations, I then read the biographies of their teams to identify which individuals might be best to contact. Most of these individuals contacted had recommended others to also reach out to, whether they had agreed to an interview or not, which is a form of snowball sampling. Although Willis (2006) notes the potential to obtain similar viewpoints and opinions as a result of snowball sampling, the recommendations provided included varying sources of expertise (researchers, organizations, and lawyers) and still seemed the best option to find additional respondents. These individuals' recommendations and the subsequent snowball list of individuals and their contact information made a handful of additional interviews possible. This list of individuals extended beyond those working in the indigenous land-rights context and included a number of experienced and well-informed researchers and academics.

Safari companies were more difficult to identify and recruit. Though there are many foreign-owned safari companies, the primary ones that came up in traditional search results were Tanzanian-owned or, at the very least, operated out of Arusha. After many different keyword searches, I finally came across an article from Travel and Leisure, a New York-based magazine and online platform for travel inspiration and prestigious travel awards. The article was called "The Top 10 Safari Outfitters," awarding the top safari companies of 2020, according to the compiled feedback and opinions of Travel and Leisure readers in an annual survey. All of the top 10 safari outfitters of 2020 were foreign-owned and, perhaps unsurprisingly given that it is an

American magazine; primarily based out of the US. Nine out of these ten safari operators offered services in northern Tanzania, and all of them included their philanthropic work on their webpages. Though each company had its own programs and partnerships, they all hinted at similar objectives and preoccupations; conservation of wildlife and ensuring a sustainable safari that would not negatively impact the local populations. Oftentimes, cultural experiences that engage with local communities were also offered as part of a safari addition. Of the dozen companies contacted, only 3 responded, with one suggesting that their work and engagement in Tanzania would not suffice to contribute to this research, another agreeing to an interview, and another providing contacts for their partnering organization that carries out conservation and community engagement initiatives (which then did not respond to emails).

Similar to safari companies; conservation organizations also proved to be difficult to get on board. First, there is the issue of identifying organizations that have a global or regional approach rather than a Tanzania-based organization. Then, it is a matter of that organization having initiatives and programs in Tanzania. It was surprising to find that many global or regional conservation organizations do not have active projects and initiatives in Tanzania. For example, the African Conservation Foundation (ACF) has programs and safaris offered in Cameroon, Uganda, South Africa, and Botswana, among others, but offers no engagement in Tanzania, while Wildlife ACT carries out most of its conservation activities in South Africa, with a bit of involvement in Seychelles. Many Tanzania-focused conservation organizations were located in Tanzania, limiting my outreach to much larger, often global, organizations. As such, I contacted the African Wildlife Foundation (AWF), the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), and The Nature Conservancy (TNC), along with individual members from these organizations. Unfortunately, the World Wildlife Foundation (WWF) does not offer a general line of contact and explicitly states on its website that it does not engage with students as it receives a high volume of communications. Attempts at connecting to WWF through contacts within the organization were unsuccessful.

Interviews.

The eight interviews conducted lasted approximately 50-75 minutes and were all conducted virtually over the online meeting platform Zoom, though I asked participants whether there is another platform that they are more comfortable using. I was flexible with regards to

time zones and making myself available to accommodate participants' schedules, given the virtual nature of this research. Additionally, I asked all participants to sign a consent form prior to beginning the interview (usually sent a couple of days in advance, along with the Zoom meeting information) which requested consent to record the interview. This enabled me to later transcribe each interview using an encrypted and secure software before reviewing each transcription, both re-listening and reading through the interview. Consent was given by returning the form, confirming in email format, or (in one case) verbally at the start of the interview.

The interviews followed a structured/semi-structured format with three separate lists of questions prepared. Each interview structure was similar, with specific wording and prompts for 1) NGOs and INGOs, 2) safari tour operators, and 3) academics and other experts in the field. I used these templates as a way to guide discussions and not necessarily as a rigid line of questioning. The semi-structured format ensures consistency across interviews while accounting for individualized differences among respondents. Semi-structured interviews address the desired issues while allowing an open-forum for further interpretation and conversational flow. Muganda et al. (2010) remarked how "the flexibility of the semi-structured format allowed for the emergence of issues not originally included in the interview checklist" (p. 634-635). Willis (2006) recommends that questions be designed in a way that will facilitate the exposure of a range of opinions and experiences, which was the intention when designing the questions.

The pre-determined line of questioning fit well with the direction of the discussion for most of the interviews and I asked the majority of questions, along with follow-ups based on responses. In interviews where it became clear that the questions would not necessarily correspond to the expertise and knowledge of the individual, the interview instead went into much more of an open-discussion approach, listening to the individual's responses and asking questions based on their expertise and in ways that might further inform this research. I posed all core questions (e.g., do you feel that the involvement of communities in the conservation of wildlife is an important matter, why/why not?) to each participant.

I did not include interviews in the coding process as it seemed important to keep the two processes quite separate. By keeping interview responses separate from coded resources I can properly make comparisons between the two methods and draw out common themes. Instead of

NVivo coding, I read through interview transcripts multiple times and highlighted or noted the reoccurring statements and ideas that came from asking the same questions to different respondents. As I will demonstrate in the next chapter, I started by grouping responses regarding community-based conservation and others addressing Tanzanian development. I then identified the emergent themes and ideas within these categories.

Limitations

The primary limitations of this research are threefold. The first is being limited to interviewees located outside of Tanzania, the second is the time constraints and zoom-fatigue, while the final limitation is an uneven engagement of stakeholder groups.

Location

At the start of this chapter, I discussed my decision to forego the Tanzanian research permit, thus limiting my participant pool to individuals outside of the country. I hypothesized that the majority of stakeholder groups would still be accessible and that the two that I lost with this decision (local people and government workers) would have been incredibly difficult, if not impossible, to engage with virtually. I was surprised to find that this was a more limiting decision than anticipated, as many individuals and organizations that I contacted had referred me to others that were in Tanzania and would have had the technological bandwidth for an interview. Some respondents had also asked if colleagues or partnering organizations located in Tanzania could join the interview call. This limiter was not detrimental to the research, however, it proved to be limiting nonetheless.

Time Constraints

COVID-19 has shifted nearly everyone's way of operating and has severely impacted many peoples' time-management and schedules. There seems to be a sort of heightened awareness of time and of individual efficiency, which I have gathered through my own experiences and speaking with others. That said, it is hard to tell whether or not interviews may have gone on longer and/or offered further information if conducted in person. There is a different set of rules and standards when meeting online, with both parties often at home, and there is such an obvious awareness of the passing of time as well as the competing priorities (emails coming in, caregiving responsibilities, household duties, etc.). Additionally, there is an

element of zoom-fatigue involved, whereby an online conversation exceeding a certain amount of time (usually approximately an hour) tends to drag on and participants lose focus. Based on other zoom experiences and discussions with others, this seems to be a common issue that nearly everyone now working through online platforms has experienced. In contrast, it is much easier to be engaged in an in-person conversation, wholly focused on the individual in front of you, and lose track of time discussing a topic of much interest to everyone involved. This limitation applies to me as well as to respondents interviewed.

Stakeholders

Finally, not being able to engage with all relevant stakeholder groups, aside from those that were excluded in the desk-based approach, is an important limitation. As mentioned in this chapter, safari tourism operators and conservationists (both individuals and organizations) were quite difficult to get responses from. As a result, I only interviewed one safari company and the research involved no conservationists. This fact will be particularly relevant when analyzing the interview transcripts and pulling out themes, as it will completely exclude some perspectives from that process. It is impossible to say whether or not interviews with conservationists or additional safari companies would have greatly impacted the main themes drawn from interviews.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

Introduction

Given that this research has used a mixed-methods approach by applying both quantitative and qualitative methods, I will also breakdown the analysis to differentiate the two methods. Identifying and extracting results from resources coded in NVivo was fairly simple, given that the software provides several tools for analyzing coded data. The interview transcripts, being separate from all other resources that I included in the coding process, were analyzed by reading through and finding common themes, ideas, or statements. The following sections will present results drawn from NVivo as well as the themes and ideas ensuing from interviews.

Content Analysis

Below are the results drawn from coding in NVivo, separated into two subsections: code distribution, and matrix coding. I will explain each section separately with the results presented. A complete NVivo codebook can be found in Annex A. This data is important to the research as it provides an indication of how the impacts on one variable interacts with impacts on another, and questions where there may be a correlation between these impacts that could be explored further.

Code Distribution

I coded a total of 104 resources through NVivo for this research (see Annex B for a list of all resources broken down by classification). The last chapter outlined the three parent nodes used in phase one of coding; impacts on local people and communities, impacts on country development, and impacts on wildlife conservation. The most frequently coded parent node was “impacts on local people and communities” at 472 references, followed by “impacts on country development” at 197 references and “impacts on wildlife conservation” with 182 references.

Child nodes for each of the above represent the specific positive and negative impacts identified. The results can be found in Table 1 below. This table shows that over half (nearly 54 percent) of impacts on local people and communities were coded as being negative impacts, while less than 19 percent were coded as positive impacts. The discrepancy between negative and positive impacts on country development was far less, with over 31 percent coded as

negative and nearly 26 percent coded as positive. Similarly, just over 30 percent of impacts on wildlife conservation were negative while a little over 27 percent were coded as positive.

Tables 2 through 6 demonstrate a disaggregation (by file classification) of these same distributions of positive and negative impacts cited within each of the three parent nodes. These results appear to align with the narrative within existing literature on the topic, as set out in chapters one and two. For example, the academic literature (Table 2) and reports (Table 6) lean heavily towards negative impacts across the board, particularly among impacts on local people and communities. This is in line with the critical angle of Tanzania's CBC presented by many authors in the literature review (Benjaminsen and Brycen, 2012; Bluwstein et al., 2018; Bwagalilo, 2018; Homewood et al., 2015; Mwakaje et al., 2013; Moyo et al., 2016; Sulle and Banka, 2017; etc.).

The general themes covering positive impacts on wildlife conservation in these files included reported increases in wildlife numbers within WMAs, conservation-related job creation, as well as the significant financial investments (through taxes, tourism, and NGOs) in conservation. The negatives focused primarily on wildlife crime (including poaching), the lack of traditional knowledge in conservation discussions, and the human-wildlife conflicts resulting from WMAs. With regards to impacts on country development, the positives highlighted World Bank indicators (like HDI on the rise) as well as revenues from tourism and its associated employment opportunities increasing aggregated wealth. However, among the negative impacts were rising inequality levels, a lack of social services to rural areas and a privatized rather than pro-poor approach to tourism.

The WMA revenues being invested in community development emerged positively for local people and communities, along with tourism and conservation-related employment, and references to certain positive policy benefits (Village Land Act, WMAs and revenue sharing). Negative impacts, however, highlighted limited household/individual income, human rights and policy violations, dispossession, and negligible benefits from WMAs.

Interestingly, English media and online resources (Table 3) highlight more of the negative rather than positive impacts on local people and communities as well as on country development, while presenting more evidence for the positive impacts on wildlife conservation. This may reflect the source of these media authors and their target audiences. While some may

draw from the critical literature to develop a digestible narrative for readers on the issues of wealth inequality, dispossession, human rights abuses and poverty around protected areas (see IWGIA, 2018; Kamati, 2016; Makoye, 2018; etc.), others may choose to focus on the conservation success stories in Tanzania, such as increased wildlife populations within WMAs and decreased prevalence of elephant poaching (see Harvey, 2020; Lee, 2018; etc.). Negative impacts on wildlife conservation touched on the shrinking wildlife landscapes (due to agriculture, urbanization, etc.) and on traditional economic development being harmful to wildlife. A prominent positive impact indicated for local people and communities and for country development was contribution from wildlife tourism revenues and employment.

Perhaps more intriguing are the results from Kiswahili media and online resources (Table 4), which trend towards the positive impacts across all three categories. This may be a result of the government regulations on journalism as noted in chapter three, making it difficult to report on any negative impacts. Therefore, it does not seem surprising that the Kiswahili content available online and in the media more heavily reflects the government narrative of positive impacts across all three categories. While the positive impacts on wildlife conservation highlight success stories following government interventions and how tourism contributes to conservation and preserving ecosystems; the limited negatives pointed to how ecological benefits and outcomes of conservation are not well recognized and understood by communities[4]. In a similar vein, these resources note the government's clear commitment to development through conservation campaigns and the tourism industry, while recognizing that land is important for the Tanzanian economy and is also a huge source of contention. These land conflicts are described as negatively impacting local people and communities, especially through human-wildlife conflict in and around protected areas. Nevertheless, these resources primarily point out the empowerments of communities through WMAs, along with the benefits and employment opportunities through wildlife conservation.

Policy documents (Table 5) have the largest ratio of excerpts coded under the parent nodes that are attributed to neither positive nor negative impacts. This is a result of the very direct nature of policy documents, which typically outline broad impacts and make assertive

[4] It is important to note that the validity of these statements is not explored further. Whether or not communities *understand* the benefits of conservation may inaccurately describe the situation by implying ignorance. Instead, it could simply be that communities do not see the immediate or short-term benefits of wildlife conservation.

statements rather than discussing or pointing to the details of impacts (positive or negative). Of those that did point to either child node, there were more references to positive impacts on local people and communities as well as country development than negative, while the negative impacts to wildlife conservation were marginally more recognized. This could be a result of the w*ays* in which the parent node categories interact with one another and their positive or negative impacts. For example, a passage from the Rural Development Strategy states that "protected areas have been encroached upon for farming and settlement. Overgrazing, ground fires and felling of trees for various uses […] are reducing the regeneration of plants and animals" (URT, 2001, pg. 15). Though only referring to a direct impact on wildlife conservation, this quote frames local people and communities as the reason behind this negative impact. Mitigating the negative impacts on conservation, then, are likely used here as a justification for policy direction.

Examples of negative impacts on wildlife conservation in policy documents includes poor management of natural resources for full economic potential, overexploitation by rural communities, and wildlife poaching, while a broad commitment to protecting wildlife is among the few positives. The positive impacts on country development echo those seen in other documents, such as increased tourism revenues and employment opportunities, as well as better access to social services. The policy documents coded note, however, that the tourism industry is not being used to its full potential and has a weak impact on poverty reduction. Finally, these documents are careful to highlight the many positive impacts for local people and communities, particularly in regards to customary claims to land, empowered and decentralized WMA structures, compensation and benefits from wildlife conservation and tourism, etc. The few negative impacts identified included the prohibition of any human activities in or near protected areas and the limitations in place on livestock grazing.

Table 1: Overview of all Parent and Child Nodes

Child Node	Parent Node		
	Impacts on local people and communities (472)	Impacts on country development (197)	Impacts on wildlife conservation (182)
Positive Impacts	89	51	50
Negative Impacts	253	62	55

Table 2: Overview of Parent and Child Nodes in Academic Articles and Book Chapters

Child Node	Parent Node

	Impacts on local people and communities (254)	Impacts on country development (80)	Impacts on wildlife conservation (69)
Positive Impacts	34	17	14
Negative Impacts	170	27	24

Table 3: Overview of Parent and Child Nodes in Media and Online Resources (English)

Child Node	Parent Node		
	Impacts on local people and communities (35)	Impacts on country development (24)	Impacts on wildlife conservation (37)
Positive Impacts	3	7	22
Negative Impacts	26	13	11

Table 4: Overview of Parent and Child Nodes in Media and Online Resources (Kiswahili)

Child Node	Parent Node		
	Impacts on local people and communities (32)	Impacts on country development (13)	Impacts on wildlife conservation (20)
Positive Impacts	15	5	10
Negative Impacts	11	1	3

Table 5: Overview of Parent and Child Nodes in Policy Documents

Child Node	Parent Node		
	Impacts on local people and communities (94)	Impacts on country development (38)	Impacts on wildlife conservation (33)
Positive Impacts	28	9	2
Negative Impacts	7	1	4

Table 6: Overview of Parent and Child Nodes in Reports

Child Node	Parent Node		
	Impacts on local people and communities (57)	Impacts on country development (42)	Impacts on wildlife conservation (24)
Positive Impacts	9	13	2
Negative Impacts	39	20	13

Also noted in the previous chapter was the reoccurring theme of reference to a loss of land and access among "negative impacts on local people and communities". Nearly 26 percent of nodes coded as negatively impacting local people and communities (65 total) made a direct reference to dispossession, appropriation, and/or a loss of access to natural resources. Finally, I created an inductive node to track all coded items (e.g., everything under this node is also found coded elsewhere) for a direct mention of state intervention, be it a reference to a policy, act,

legislation, etc. Though it was interesting to see the frequency of this node overlapping with others, its relevance and accuracy became questionable. I could make the argument for it to apply on all codes in government documents, and many impacts coded under other nodes could also be traced back to state interventions (even if not directly referenced). For these reasons, this node was not relied upon when analyzing the results of this research.

Matrix Coding

Another useful feature of NVivo is the ability to produce coding matrices with your data. This was a helpful and highly informative tool as it brings the correlation between nodes to the forefront. Using the matrix coding function, I was able to identify relationships between the impacts on each local people and communities, wildlife conservation, and country development. See Annex C for a visual representation of all of the matrices below, along with more detailed information. In the below breakdown, "references" refers to specific coded passages and not the references resource at large.

Local People and Communities | Country Development.

The matrix comparing the nodes of impacts on local people and communities with that of impacts on country development showed that 96 references overlap between the two, meaning that those references have an impact on both. 19 of the references that positively impact local people and communities also have an impact on country development, 7 of which are positive and 1 negative. Contrarily, 41 of the 96 references negatively impact local people and communities, 2 of which have a positive impact on country development and 26 have a negative impact.

Local People and Communities | Wildlife Conservation.

When looking at the relationship between impacts on local people and communities versus the impacts on wildlife conservation; 83 references overlap in the two nodes. 22 references out of the 83 had a positive impact on wildlife conservation, of which 4 positively impacted and 7 negatively impacted local people and communities. A total of 38 references in this matrix negatively impact local people and communities, with 15 of these also negatively impacting wildlife conservation. Four of the 8 references to dispossession also negatively impact wildlife conservation.

Country Development | Wildlife Conservation.

Only 24 references overlapped the nodes of impacts on country development and impacts on wildlife conservation. Overall, more of these references positively impacted wildlife conservation (8) than negatively (4), while the overall positive and negative impacts on country development were both 6. Four of the 24 references had a positive impact on both parent nodes, while 3 had a mutually negative impact.

Interview Analysis

I will separate the results from interviews into two broad categories, similar to the structure of the interviews themselves. These categories include community-based conservation (CBC) and Tanzanian development, each of which will discuss some main themes that emerged during the interviews. A breakdown of each respondent number (R1-R8) and their experience with/relation to the research can be found in Annex D.

Community-Based Conservation

The general perception and opinions about CBC were that it can be quite beneficial to both communities and wildlife (sometimes even identified as the key for successful conservation) however, not in its current form. Nearly all respondents viewed current conservation policies in Tanzania, and across much of Africa, as having maintained the colonial approach of fortress conservation, characterized by militarization and rife with violence (R2-Academic, R3-Consultant on ethno-ecology, R4-Indigenous Rights Advisor, R7-Human Rights Lawyer, and R8-Legal Officer; with R1-Academic and R6-Director/Founder of a safari company alluding to such ideas). All respondents said that true buy-in from communities living alongside protected areas and granting land ownership is key to successful CBC. Instead, there is a separation from the land that these communities have called their own for generations. R4-Advisor stated that CBC "could be done in a way that helps and not in a way which leads to [a] violation of people's rights […] and depriving them of their livelihoods," but the challenge is that CBC has been "built on the very old-fashioned colonial models of conservation" and "there's still a long way to go" for truly participatory CBC. Respondents repeatedly cited conservation policies (R1-Academic, R2-Academic, R3-Consultant, R4-Advisor, R8-Legal Officer, R5-Indigenous Rights Advocate, and R7-Lawyer) as being responsible for dispossession

and marginalization of local communities. Referencing dispossession, R3-Consultant commented that "their culture got to be under pressure because they couldn't practice their traditional lifestyles […] and the result has been poverty and political marginalization. They've just been cast aside." Many of the evictions referenced (R3-Consultant, R4-Advisor, R5-Advocate, R7-Lawyer, and R8-Legal Officer) included violence against people, burning bomas[5], confiscating or killing livestock, and issuing fines to villagers, which "totally impoverishes them and undermines their livelihood opportunities" (R4-Advisor). R8-Legal Officer argued that a rights-based approach should be implemented for CBC projects, whereby the government acknowledges local peoples' "rights to culture, the right to identity [and] the right to religion, which more often than not is tied to the land".

R4-Advisor, R5-Advocate, R7-Lawyer, and R8-Legal Officer stated that most, if not all, of the people in these communities are not aware of their land rights and that they can apply for ownership under the Land Act, nor do they know how they can effectively fight for and defend their land. R5-Advocate stated that indigenous people "don't know that they're entitled to their land," while R7-Lawyer commented that government (or other security) forces would come in to the villages and harass people enough to "dissuade [them] from standing up for themselves or trying to call foul when their land is taken from them." One respondent has worked with an organization that was heavily involved with educating communities about their rights, and they explained that the process of obtaining a land title is extremely cumbersome and that the rights are very infrequently respected once they are obtained; "even though you have your certificate, it can be somehow ignored or overruled by those who have the power" (R4-Advisor). There were rarely any reports of compensation in exchange for land, and revenues or benefits from tourism activities were consistently cited as being low-wage employment opportunities at best (R1-Academic, R2-Academic, R3-Consultant, R5-Advocate, and R7-Lawyer) which, according to R2-Academic, "sometimes make up for what they lost and sometimes they don't". R2-Academic also noted that they had heard of good revenue sharing from the Ngorongoro Conservation Area (NCA), but was not certain of details. R6-Safari books cultural visits in NCA and reported that they provide cash compensation directly to the village chief or the village council. However, R4-Advisor said that the number of "no-go" zones in NCA was increasing, thus further restricting

[5] *Boma* is a Swahili word that translates to village or homestead in English. A boma is a settlement of houses surrounding a cattle enclosure and is usually bordered by a thorn fence (Goldman, 2011).

access to some of the most impoverished pastoralists of the country, and was being managed more and more like a national park. Similarly, they argued that wildlife buffer zones (which include parts of WMAs) were often used to “non-transparently enlarge conservation areas”.

In terms of the narratives used by various actors (government, conservationists, tour operators, etc.) to address or identify communities living alongside protected areas, the responses were quite similar. I did not directly ask all respondents about the framing of communities by the above-stated actors, but by drawing from those who were asked and from words used in conversation, respondents offered narratives such as enemies, invaders, encroachers, poachers, trespassers, and threats. Respondents also used the words salvation and stakeholder.

Finally, the primary challenges for communities living alongside wildlife that respondents identified, aside from dispossession and loss of access to natural resources, included access to education and information (R1-Academic, R2-Academic, R3-Consultant, R4-Advisor, R5-Advocate, and R8-Legal Officer) because “they know the education they’re getting in these remote areas is not very good” (R1-Academic) and access to healthcare (R1-Academic, R3-Consultant, R4-Advisor, R8-Legal Officer), particularly among the women who “always emphasize the health problems (R4-Advisor). Other challenges include employment (R1-Academic and R5-Advocate), false claims of communities damaging wildlife (R3-Consultant and R8-Legal Officer), human-wildlife conflict (R2-Academic and R7-Lawyer), access to electricity (R1-Academic), child and early marriage (R5-Advocate), and corruption within CBC (R3-Consultant).

Tanzanian Development

When discussing CBC and, by extension, wildlife tourism’s contributions to development and poverty reduction in Tanzania, it was fairly consistently noted that wildlife tourism (in its current form) can be detrimental to local communities. The costs to implicated communities include loss of access to resources, cultural marginalization, food insecurity, political struggles, and economic hardships, which were said to often outweigh any of the reported benefits. The majority of respondents agreed that the wildlife tourism industry, through CBC, could contribute to Vision 2025, but with certain caveats.

Firstly, R1-Academic noted that wildlife tourism has to play a role in Vision 2025, given its contributions to national income, but it is a very fragile and volatile industry. R2-Academic commented on Tanzania's unique positioning with regards to wildlife tourism and the prices that can therefore be charged to reflect its uniqueness, stating "there is no other Serengeti". Most respondents were skeptical with regards to *how* it would be implemented to include CBC, and its success would be dependent on who is developing/involved with the model used for conservation to achieve development (R1-Academic, R2-Academic, R4-Advisor, R5-Advoate, and R8-Legal Officer). R4-Advisor also emphasized Tanzania's resource advantages and the need to prioritize them in a way that "also benefits the surrounding communities [and] making sure that all citizens [and] livelihoods in Tanzania are taken good care of and that poverty is being reduced." According to R8-Legal Officer; if tapped correctly then CBC has the potential to push lots of sustainable economic growth. This would mean that implementation is done with a wholesome picture in mind and by properly ensuring that benefits to local communities are substantial, with a priority on taking care of citizens and reducing rural poverty. R7-Lawyer said that the positive growth numbers (e.g., World Bank data) meant little with regards to poverty reduction among local communities and that they are "skeptical that economic growth is the best measure for wellbeing", while R5-Advocate noted that any growth reported is strictly at the top, as there have been no development changes among local communities.

Finally, R6-Safari would encourage the government to recognize and support auxiliary industries engaged with the wildlife tourism industry, such as crop and chicken farmers, coffee growers, etc. They also noted that the standard of living among those employed in tourism has greatly improved over their 18 years in the industry. They commented specifically on education and further employment opportunities among these individuals, however, they also recognized that the Tanzanian government does not offer the same incentives to its local communities that are offered in neighbouring countries Kenya and Namibia. As one respondent pointed out; there is a lot of work to still be done before wildlife tourism can properly benefit Vision 2025.

Respondents reported that the 18% VAT did not affect tourist bookings too much since people are not very price-sensitive to a safari experience given its "once in a lifetime" luster (R1-Acadmic and R6-Safari). R1-Academic noted, however, that some safari companies have also found workarounds to perhaps report less revenue and therefore pay less tax. Otherwise, there

might simply be fewer funds for companies to maintain their vehicles or increase pay to tour guides. In terms of development projects benefiting stakeholders of the wildlife tourism industry following the VAT introduction, only R4-Safari noted “that you definitely see upgrades in the [Tanzanian] airports”. Other than this, respondents were not aware of any new development projects in the last four years, though that does not mean that they are not happening.

Development projects using wildlife tourism revenues that come recommended by respondents included healthcare facilities (R1-Academic, R3-Consultant, R4-Advisor, and R8-Legal Officer), education and training opportunities (R1-Academic, R2-Academic, R3-Consultant, R4-Advisor, R8-Legal Officer), employment opportunities (R3-Consultant and R4-Advisor), access to water (R4-Advisor, R5-Advocate and R8-Legal Officer) and increased cultural tourism (R5-Advocate). Respondents also noted that projects and improvements need to “support, enable and help adapt traditional livelihood practices” (R3-Consultant), rather than pushing a “modern” approach (R3-Consultant and R8-Legal Officer). Another important mention was for these projects to be initiated at the community levels, and to ensure support on increased knowledge of their rights (R2-Academic, R5-Advocate and R7-Lawyer). Initiatives must be “driven by local indigenous groups that would be affected or local communities that would be affected because I just don’t think it’s going to be set up for success if it isn’t” (R7-Lawyer).

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

This chapter will further explore the results identified in chapter four, presenting them within the theoretical frameworks set out in the introduction. First, I will revisit Ribot and Peluso's (2003) theory of access within the context of this research, addressing the mechanisms of access and who controls and seeks to maintain access in and around northern Tanzania's protected areas. Then, Hall et al.'s (2011) powers of exclusion will be the foundation for how local people and communities living alongside wildlife are excluded, particularly emphasizing how discourse enhances exclusionary practices, making them widely accepted. Finally, political ecology will combine both the theory of access and powers of exclusion by incorporating the numerous factors that surround and interact with CBC, using it as a mechanism for achieving Tanzania's development and conservation goals.

Theory of Access

As explained in chapter one, Ribot and Peluso's theory of access (2003) frames access as the ability to benefit from things both tangible or intangible, such as symbols or language. They consider the social relations that surround access, encompassing both the formal rights of access and the ability to benefit. The interpretation of the theory of access within this research will first identify the values attributed to resources by different stakeholders within a rights-based mechanism of access, before exploring who controls and seeks to maintain access through structural and relational mechanisms.

Access Denied

Land dispossession in Tanzania's northern tourism circuit and conservation areas is not unknown. It has been widely researched and exposed, as demonstrated in chapter two. The concept became so prevalent throughout this research that I inductively included it in the coding process as a child node to "negative impacts on local people and communities". Out of the 253 references to negative impacts, 65 directly referenced dispossession or restricted access. Just like Ribot and Peluso's theory, access abilities are not strictly related to land in this northern Tanzanian context, but also the resources found on and around the land. I will break this down further within the context of their two mechanisms of access; rights-based, and structural and relational.

Rights-Based Mechanisms of Access.

Both access control and access maintenance are components of the intricate relationships involved with “resource appropriation, management, or use” whereby the values and meanings of resources are often at odds (Ribot and Peluso, 2003, p. 159). The contentions between local people and other actors (state, conservationists, western elite, etc.) on the value and meaning of resources are undeniable, but who controls the access and who seeks to maintain it in the context of Tanzania’s northern protected areas?

Values and Meanings of Resources.

First, it is important to determine what values and meanings the actors involved (namely local people and communities as well as the State) attribute to resources. In this case, the primary resources being discussed are found in and around Tanzania’s national parks and protected areas – arable land, grazing zones, water, wildlife, etc. To local people and communities, these resources are paramount to their livelihoods and survival. All respondents interviewed and most articles referenced the Maasai, who are traditionally pastoralists and rely on their cattle for food security (R3-Consultant and R4-Advisor, see also Hopcraft et al., 2015; Goldman et al., 2016; Melubo, 2020). As such, they require large tracts of land in order to graze their cattle and sustain their livelihoods, while often also maintaining an element of agricultural land (R4-Advisor, also see Abukari and Mwalyosi, 2020; Goldman et al., 2016). Other subsistence resources highlighted by R2-Academic included firewood, building materials, as well as fodder and water for livestock. These encompass some of the livelihood and practical values that they attribute, however, there are also cultural meanings attached to some natural resources among Maasai communities. R8-Legal Officer highlights that aspects of identity, culture, and religion can be, and most often are, associated with aspects of the land and natural environment (e.g., particular trees on village land).

From the perspective of the state, the value and meaning of resources in northern Tanzania are fairly obvious; revenues from wildlife tourism, which implicates wildlife conservation. Creating an environment that enables wildlife tourism and setting key targets for tourism development that revolve around wildlife are found among *the positive impacts on wildlife conservation* node in the policy documents of the content analysis, along with the increased revenues accrued from it under *positive impacts on country development*. Kiswahili

media documents also comment on the *positive impacts* that tourism has on conservation and ecosystem preservation. R3-Consultant noted that "the tourism model sustains the conservation model and vice versa". Society has wildlife tourism set in the idea of a "wild Africa", free of the presence of human settlement or interaction (R1-Academic and R3-Consultant, see also Brockington, 2015; Melubo, 2020; Siurua, 2006) which pushes a conservation model in Tanzania that has alienated people from the land, some referring to it as continued implementation of the colonial fortress model (R2-Academic, R3-Consultant, R4-Advisor and R8-Legal Officer). Specifically, R8-Legal Officer said that we are dealing with "fortress conservation and policies that push for conservation to the exclusion of all others". The revenues from tourism in Tanzania account for nearly 20 percent of GDP, most of which is a result of wildlife tourism specifically (Caro and Davenport, 2015; Kideghesho, 2016; Kolumbia, 2018), making it an important sector for the government to have full access to.

Access Control and Access Maintenance.

The authors frame "legal access" within rights-based mechanisms as being "derived from rights attributed by law, custom, or convention" and implies "the involvement of a community […], state or government that will enforce a claim" (Ribot and Peluso, 2003, p. 162). These rights can then be asserted to control access to resources, while others seek to gain or maintain access from the rights-holders. It would be reasonable to conclude that the Maasai have legal access to claim the land that they have inhabited for generations and its affiliated resources, according to custom and convention. As R3-Consultant puts it; it was "never fully recognized that […] the land is theirs, it's their historic place where they live", further stating that "it's where generations and generations of their families have lived and have been born". Others also reiterated the centuries that the Maasai have lived in these areas of northern Tanzania, stating that they have lived within these (now) reserves for time immemorial (R8-Legal Officer) and that removing them from their traditional, customary land is not sustainable and overall bad policy (R7-Lawyer). Before government intervention with CBC initiatives like WMAs, individual safari companies that engaged directly with villages in wildlife areas strongly respected customary claims to land and wildlife (Bluwstein, 2017; Melubo et al., 2019), thus seeking to maintain access from Maasai villages.

The “rights attributed by law” are where it tends to become more convoluted, as Tanzanian laws both reinforce these customary claims of rights to access and contradict them. I discussed this in chapter two regarding the politics of land and was further elaborated on during interviews, particularly with R4-Advisor. Villages can “demarcate their land so they can have titles as a collective village” under the Village Land Act of 1999 (R4-Advisor). This land law reform was cited multiple times within the *positive impacts on local people and communities*, though was often followed by a related *negative impact*. Under this Act, villages can get a certificate outlining their land boundaries and can gain the right to occupy the land and access some of its resources (R4-Advisor, see also URT, 1999b; Snyder and Sulle, 2011). I emphasize only *some* of its resources because ultimately the land is still owned by the state, thus giving the President authority to buy or sell the land as deemed necessary (URT 1999v, Snyder and Sulle, 2011). Of course, by default, any resources on that land would also then fall under the ownership of the state (e.g., grass for grazing, water, firewood, etc.). The Director of Wildlife has to approve tourism ventures in WMAs and can supersede any village/tour operator arrangements in areas outside of WMAs by allocating hunting blocks, where the government prohibits other types of tourism and does not distribute revenues to communities (Benjamin and Brycen, 2012; Snyder and Sulle, 2011).

Contrary to legal access in Ribot and Peluso’s theory is “illegal access”, which is a form of access that may not be endorsed by state or society, and is often derived through theft or coercion. Violence, or the threat of violence, and manipulation are often elements of illegal access. The actual legality of it is dependent on the perceiver, whereby some may view these actions as legitimate while others might consider them corrupt and in violation of other laws, customs, and conventions. They refer to this as a form of “rights-denied mechanism of access”. Illegal access is another method by which the state gains access to land and other resources through the dispossession of Maasai villages in northern Tanzania. Nearly a quarter of all of the coded resources and all of the respondents interviewed, with the exception of R1-Academic and R6-Safari, referenced or vocalized the issues of Maasai being forcefully dispossessed of their land. References to the violence within land conflicts in Tanzania were cited as a *negative impact to local people and communities* in all file classifications included in the content analysis, aside from policy documents. Violent approaches for removing villages from these areas include harassing villagers, burning down bomas, stealing or killing livestock, and fining or arresting

pastoralists (R4-Advisor, R5-Advocate, R7-Lawyer and R8-Legal Officer). According to R7-Lawyer, the security forces come in to "burn down bomas, [and] remove people from their land. They would terrify them." In some more extreme cases respondents added raping female villagers and killing villagers, including children, as some of the violence that has taken place (R4-Advisor, R5-Advocate).

Therefore, on addressing the question of who controls the access and who seeks to maintain access – one's perspective might be a big factor. This perspective presents itself clearly in the content analysis, where government documents make no acknowledgement of the struggles outlined above. Ribot and Peluso argue that those seeking to maintain access "transfer some benefits to those who control it. They expend resources to cultivate relations or transfer benefits to those who control access in order to derive their own benefit" (2003, p. 159). Based on custom and convention we can reasonably make the argument that the right to access (and therefore to benefit from) lies with local people and communities, in this case, the Maasai. In this scenario, the Maasai would hold control, as they have occupied the land and cared for its resources for centuries, while the state, tour operators, and conservationists would seek to maintain access to traditional Maasai land. To some degree, as will be further explained in the following section, this is occurring. However, illegal access on the part of state, private, and non-governmental actors is occurring on a much more pervasive level than is customary or legal access. Through a handful of the structural and relational mechanisms of access below; the roles of access control and access maintenance have been flipped upside down, dating back to the very beginnings of colonial fortress conservation.

Structural and Relational Mechanisms of Access.

These mechanisms of access are related to the cultural and political-economic structures that influence the access being sought. They include access to technology, capital, markets, labour and labour opportunities, knowledge, authority, and social identity. For this discussion, I will only expand upon access to capital, labour, knowledge, and authority, though all have some degree of relevance.

Access to capital includes both finances and equipment, which can be used to gain access control or to help maintain access. On one side of the argument, the government and its affiliated actors (private sector and conservationists) use capital to maintain access to land and resources in

northern Tanzania for the sake of tourism and wildlife conservation. They do so through participatory approaches and benefit-sharing, mostly of revenues, and in some private sector cases (typically unsuccessfully, according to R7-Lawyer) through Corporate Social Responsibility projects. However, the benefit and revenue sharing in northern Tanzania's WMAs are quite unclear and often minimal (Benjaminsen and Brycen, 2012; Homewood et al., 2015; Snyder and Sulle, 2011). Though many of the *positive impacts to local people and communities* across all file classifications referenced the benefits accrued through wildlife tourism, the *negatives* also indicated the negligible amounts and unequal distribution of benefits among academic articles, reports, and English media. Nearly all respondents mentioned, in some way, the inadequate capital benefits to communities. R3-Consultant compares the revenues accrued by the government through wildlife tourism and those given to Maasai in Tanzania as "peanuts compared to the amount of resources; land resources, water resources, plant and animal resources, that they've had to surrender," further commenting that "the benefits that they get from conservation and tourism do not compare at all" to those received by other stakeholders and to what they have given up (see also Kideghesho, 2008). Once they have surrendered these resources (even under a participatory pretense), the inability to utilize and benefit from them further (e.g., protected areas cannot be used for grazing) makes it so that the control and maintenance of access become reversed. In WMAs specifically, it begins with the government or NGOs working with communities to establish land-use plans (areas for grazing, for livestock, for agriculture, for wildlife conservation, for homes, etc.) and thus seeking to maintain access from the Maasai who control access through customs and convention. Once they have this buy-in and the conservation areas are established, the guise of participatory CBC seemingly keeps control with the communities, when in reality the government gains control through rights attributed by law and illegal access, using the violence expressed above and taking a militarized approach for enforcement (R7-Lawyer, see also Namkwahe and Nyakeke, 2018).

One of the ways that the government and its affiliates control access in northern Tanzania is through *access to labour and labour opportunities*. With much of their livelihood practices limited by the loss of access to resources, the job opportunities presented by wildlife tourism in the area become a source of income for many Maasai who seek to maintain access. Job creation and opportunities were heavily referenced as *positive impacts on local people and communities* and on *country development* within policy documents and Kiswahili media in the content

analysis. These jobs, however, are often low-skill and low-wage jobs (R1-Academic, R2-Academic and R3-Consultant) and are quite limited in number (R1-Academic, R2-Academic and R5-Advocate). However, from R6-Safari's perspective as a tourism operator; there has been an "amazing increase in standard of living for employees that are working in the tourism sector" in the last 18 years.

Access to knowledge is another method for justifying state control over resources, whereby elite knowledge supersedes local and indigenous knowledge. Expert status is usually acquired through traditionally western norms of higher education, specialized training and titles, and it gives NGOs, the state, and other actors the privileged knowledge to shape discourses and views around controlling and limiting access to resources (Ribot and Peluso, 2003). This concept of validating the traditional idea of expert knowledge while discrediting local knowledge is integral in northern Tanzania. The relevance that local knowledge has to both development and especially to conservation in northern Tanzania will be discussed in more detail later.

Access to knowledge can also contribute to *access to authority,* specifically those who design and implement the law (Ribot and Peluso, 2003). International NGOs and private sector actors often share the same traditional version of what knowledge is and have the ability to communicate in the same language, thus giving these organizations and companies access to government authorities. Within Maasai villages, there are also differences in access to authority, particularly with regard to language. Cases of corruption whereby NGOs and tourism operators "make sure that those leaders would benefit a lot from convincing the local communities that they should get on board with these community-based projects" (R3-Consultant) can be facilitated by circumstances where only a couple of village leaders speak English. R8-Legal Officer also noted language barriers with regards to documents that get shared with communities from the government and NGOs. R6-Safari said that payments for cultural tourism activities with their organization are negotiated and given to the village chief, who spoke English, or village council so that the village could use the funds as they see fit (e.g., cash handouts to members or infrastructure projects). Although there is no indication or confirmation of corruption in R6-Safari's practices, it is an example of *how* access to authority (in this case, the tourism company arranging payments) can facilitate corruption within the village.

Ultimately, though local people and communities (primarily Maasai in northern Tanzania) have the right to benefit from resources through the Village Land Act; they are unable to benefit since their access to these resources is denied through rights-denied, illegal access, and a lack of access to capital, labour, knowledge, and authority. Physically enforcing one's control over access to resources, as is often the case around Tanzania's protected areas, can lead to a recognition of authority, thus reinforcing the legitimacy of controlling powers (Ribot and Peluso, 2020). R3-Consultant stated that it is "difficult for the Maasai to feel some sort of agency" over their land, resources, and future because "they're overwhelmed by people wanting to have a say or having a stake". Dispossession, as we have seen in the literature review, in coding results, and through interviews, is a deeply rooted political issue in Tanzania.

Powers of Exclusion

Hall et al. (2011) contrast the theory of access by suggesting exclusion as opposite to access, and thus the prohibition of having an ability to benefit from resources. They put forth the four fundamental powers of exclusion as regulation, markets, force, and legitimation. Exclusion by regulations, markets, and force have all been addressed in the previous section through the continued resource dispossession of local populations that is so often carried out with violent force and "validated" by the capital accumulation from wildlife tourism said to benefit all parties. I will touch on these exclusions briefly, and will discuss the legitimation pillar in more depth to position this research within the powers of exclusion.

Exclusion by Regulations

Regulations include the formal and informal rules that determine access to and exclusions from land. The components of regulations include determining boundaries, land-use possibilities, ownership claims, and who can make legitimate claims to land (Hall et al., 2011). Tanzania has regulations in place through the Land Act and Village Land Act, which both set out the acceptable uses for land, demarcation of boundaries, and provide the framework for obtaining legal claims (not ownership) to land. While these regulations were seen as a *positive impact* in the content analysis, the negative side of this was that land and its resources, we have learned, remain owned by the state, which then determines those eligible to occupy different areas, often without seeking consensus from the impacted communities (Snyder and Sulle, 2011; Bluwstein, 2017). The state also approves land use, as the formation of WMAs requires detailed land-use

planning (R4-Advisor, see also Huggins, 2018; IWGIA, 2016; Minwary, 2009; Ramutsindela and Noe; 2012) to determine the boundaries within WMAs for specific land uses, such as grazing zones, conservation areas, agriculture, human settlements, etc.

Exclusion by Markets

Exclusion in markets is closely related to access to capital, whereby "the price of land is a primary determinant of who can gain access to land and who cannot" (Hall et al., 2011, p. 17), noting also that those participating in markets are often the same as those regulating the markets. The lack of access to capital among local people and communities around protected areas in northern Tanzania excludes them from engaging in markets for land, instead favouring those with existing capital. R1-Academic talked about communities who may want to enter into the wildlife tourism industry on their own, within their land, but limited access to capital excludes them from the wildlife tourism market and prevents them from building a lodge, obtaining safari vehicles, effectively marketing, etc.

Exclusion by Force

Hall et al. (2011) emphasize that exclusion by force does not necessarily involve violence, but can also include implicit force or threats of violence. I have already discussed the violence related to evictions and dispossession in Tanzania, but the implicit force in northern Tanzania would be characterized by the militarized conservation outlined in chapter two. When land has been demarcated for conservation, the surveillance of these areas becomes strict, and regulations are enforced through the threat of violence (at times resulting in real violence). R4-Advisor refers to the fortress conservation model that dominates over CBC in Tanzania, explaining its enforcement as "a very militarized top-down manner where your goal is to protect the wildlife, which is of course important, but you do it in a very harsh and police kind of manner where you exclude the local populations." R2-Academic and R7-Lawyer also referred to instances that they are aware of paramilitary being used to protect conservation efforts in other countries with similar CBC models. Many local people are not informed about how they can defend themselves and are not aware of their rights to claim land under Tanzanian regulations, R4-Advisor stating that "many of these villages don't know about the law at all. They have no idea that this is something they can do," which makes them incredibly susceptible to force, whether implicit or violent because they "don't know how to fight against [it], to use laws or

other resources to fight for [their] land" (R5-Advocate), and become dissuaded from standing up for themselves (R4-Advisor, R5-Advocate, R7-Lawyer and R8-Legal Officer).

Exclusion by Legitimation

Legitimations are characterized by "justifications of what is or of what should be and appeals of moral value" (Hall et al., 2011, p. 18). Based on the moral duty that is often a motivator in legitimation (e.g., the moral duty to protect wildlife through conservation), the authors note that there is typically a conflict between discourses on differing sides of the legitimations. For example, local people and communities might see land and resources as part of their ancestral territory, while a safari operator would feel that those same resources are their right since they paid for the land and resource access. I would like to take the question of discourses in exclusion even further, by recognizing how the framing of local people and communities adds to the legitimization of their exclusion.

Exclusionary Discourse.

The ambient exclusions explained by Hall et al. (2011) refer to exclusionary discourses that we have all become familiarized with and do not even question, such as the exclusion of people and human settlements from conservation areas. The discourse used to frame and identify local people and communities living around protected areas in northern Tanzania is furthering the legitimation agenda of conservationists and many safari operators, facilitated by the government. The language generally used by these actors when talking about communities living around protected areas imply negative and destructive tendencies. The framings referred to by respondents included enemies (R4-Advisor), invaders (R4-Advisor), encroachers (R8-Legal Officer), dangers (R2-Academic), poachers (R2-Academic, R7-Lawyer and R8-Legal Officer), trespassers (R4-Advisor and R7-Lawyer), and threats (R2-Academic and R3-Consultant). R4-Advisor says that they "are treated like illegal invaders who are just to get out of there", while R3-Consultant adds that "there has been false assumption and false accusation that the Maasai [are] a threat to wildlife." This supports Doolittle's (2007) findings of similar terminologies used to describe these individuals. R8-Legal Officer noted that the framing of local people as poachers, and taking a very "us-versus-them" approach, has led to the unnecessary use of deadly force by park rangers rather than arrests and court sentencings, even in cases of non-poachers. They further note that even in situations when there are poachers within the communities, it is

important to recognize the individual poacher's actions are not necessarily reflective of the community.

From a more positive angle, the words salvation and stakeholder were also both used. R2-Academic particularly highlighted the contradiction between local people being seen as both a danger to conservation that needs to be mitigated, as well as the salvation for and beneficiaries of successful conservation. They stated that in many CBC projects "[local people] are seen as the salvation – a solution to conservation, with the exception of poaching." Similarly, R6-Safari said that "the reason [fortress conservation] doesn't work is because it doesn't have buy in from some of the biggest stakeholders, which is the people who live next to these families [of wild animals]."

Self-Exclusion.

Hall et al. (2011) consider community-based natural resource management, which includes CBC, as being innately inclusive in that it "emphasizes common property, community cohesion and locally driven, collective action" (p. 64). However, there is a counter-intuitive element of self-exclusion within CBC, which relates back to the land-use planning done by communities when establishing WMAs in Tanzania. This process requires that the communities involved set boundaries for certain land uses within their claimed land, which inherently excludes themselves from these areas. R4-Advisor was part of an organization that helped villages in northern Tanzania understand their rights and create these land use plans when establishing legal claims to their land. They noted that conservation NGOs have also been involved in facilitating that process for villages, however with a much less participatory and more rushed approach (see also chapter one, "Tanzania's Political Landscape"). These organizations, particularly African Wildlife Foundation, managed to manipulate "villages to leave huge chunks of their village land to wildlife conservation strictly where they could not graze" and engage in other livelihood activities (R4-Advisor). Only once everything was finalized and the land use plans were enforced did villages realize the magnitude of land that they now had restricted access to. The coercion to join a WMA was also seen as a *negative impact on local people and communities* within the content analysis. This approach is an example of villages excluding themselves and their livelihood practices from their own, legally-

recognized tracts of land. This is a perfect example of a situation where access control and maintenance of access become reversed by demarcating land for conservation.

Political Ecology

Political ecology is an all-encompassing theory that relates factors of politics, economics, markets, and social interactions to issues related to the environment, ecology, and sustainability. It is foundational to both the Theory of Access and Powers of Exclusion, which are grounded in the interactions of factors considered in political ecology. These factors then shape resource access, exclusion, and control within wildlife conservation and the wildlife tourism industry in Tanzania, which has an impact on both development and conservation objectives.

Specifically, political ecology is about politics and "recognizing the political character of environmental and resource issues" (Le Billon, 2015, p. 598). While chapters one and two highlight the heavy involvement of NGOs and CSOs in Tanzania's conservation, as well as that of communities and local officials, Death (2013) states that despite this range of actors "Tanzania's history and political culture of statist, centrist control continues to exert an influence on the manner in which environmental governance is structured" (p. 7). This makes it difficult to assert that natural resource management in Tanzania is done in a participatory manner without hierarchy, given that the state is "reluctant to formally cede authority" (Death, 2012, p. 9). Therefore, despite Tanzania's progressions through socialist and multi-party systems, the bureaucratic hue and practices remain. This section will address the consequences of this state control, primarily through policy, and will situate the interactions of the various factors within political ecology to determine how they impact country development in Tanzania and the conservation of its important wildlife.

Impact on Tanzanian Development

How the state engages with local people and communities living in around protected areas of northern Tanzania has an impact on its national development objectives. The coding portion of this research revealed that 27 percent of the references overlapping the nodes *impacts on local people and communities* and *impacts on country development* were coded as having negative impacts on both. Out of the 96 overlapping references, 41 negatively and 19 positively impacted local people and communities, while 28 negatively and 12 positively impacted country

developments. These figures demonstrate that based on the 104 total resources coded for this research; engagement with local people and communities results in primarily negative impacts (nearly 54 percent), and those of which also impact country development do so negatively. Respondent responses and existing research demonstrating that state engagement with local people and communities is negatively impacting Tanzania's development objectives are further recognized below, through the frameworks of access and exclusion.

Access, Exclusion and Livelihoods.

The incremental loss of access and increased exclusion for local people and communities, which has led to a transfer of control to the state that is covered up through the win-win rhetoric of CBC, has been seriously impacting their livelihoods and development opportunities. R3-Consultant stated that "in general, the wildlife tourism sector has been detrimental to the wellbeing of the Maasai communities", leading to cultural marginalization, poor food security, and losses incurred politically, culturally, and economically that are not offset by wildlife tourism. Vaccaro et al. (2013) argue that the loss of access and forced relocations are part of a "political inequality [that is] inherent to conservation policies" (p. 259). These themes also presented themselves among *negative impacts on local people and communities* and on *country development* across nearly all file classifications. R4-Advisor suggested that the enlargement of national parks and areas for wildlife conservation are the biggest drivers for dispossession in Tanzania, often executed in a militarized, top-down approach that excludes communities and leads to conflict. Le Billon (2015) argues that conflict – often as a reflection of unequal power relations – is at the core of political ecology and would refer to this as an environmental conflict over access and control to resources. Similar to Hall et al.'s (2011) ambient exclusions, Le Billon (2015) also notes the "naturalization" of environmental conflicts and asserting them as an unavoidable consequence of ecological processes as being a naturally political move, devaluing the "conflict" itself.

Having access to, and therefore not being excluded from the land is of critical importance for the survival and development of these communities. Naturally, the concern of formal ownership was emphasized (R1-Academic and R3-Consultant) for proper development so that these communities can practice their traditional livelihoods. R1-Academic went as far to say that the "key thing with development or conservation is ownership". Being denied access and rights

to their land hugely affects their abilities to develop themselves as communities (R8-Legal Officer). However, while securing land titles is possible in Tanzania under the Village Land Act, R4-Advisor specifies that these titles are not always respected. They informed that government can still come in and claim that they need the land as a wildlife conservation area, and while the titles certainly help to make the argument of land claims; those who have power can easily ignore and overrule it. Although it is far better to have the land titles, there is no sense of security due to the lack of proper governance and democracy within these issues in Tanzania (R4-Advisor). Le Billon (2015), draws from other works to warn of the violence (physical and structural) that can result from these types of power relations within the environmental conflicts of political ecology. Environmental conflicts will arise naturally without addressing the social relations and processes of legitimation that are in place to enable the politicization of the environment and its resources.

The increased land dispossessions among communities are putting their culture under more pressure by limiting resources, which has led to huge levels of poverty and exclusion (R3-Consultant). Less access to grazing areas and water resources generally means "that the amount of cattle that Maasai families could have [has] to be reduced, so they would lose food security and they would lose their traditional livelihoods" (R3-Consultant). Pastoralist communities, namely the Maasai, treat livestock as a source of currency (R8-Legal Officer). If they are excluded from accessing vital natural resources to keep livestock alive then their form of capital dies, leading to further poverty.

In situations whereby their livestock gets stolen or confiscated because of what authorities consider to be illegal grazing, pastoralists are often issued huge fines to get their livestock back, which further impoverishes them as they see no alternatives to paying (R4-Advisor). When they do make the argument against authorities for what they consider to be this serious offence, the exclusionary narratives discussed previously work as they are meant to (R7-Lawyer). For example, claiming that their livestock was confiscated from them is easily framed by authorities (be them government or otherwise) as a minute offense with little bearing, whereas in reality, this represents their livelihoods and survival. As R7-Lawyer puts it, "that's just the beginning of the psychological and physical abuse" that excluded communities often face, positing them as trespassers whose structures, livestock, and crops don't matter. Moore (1996)

argues that the state is not exempted from these cultural politics at play, but rather is part of a larger body of institutions shaping the "struggles over meanings of rights, legitimacy and authority" (p. 140). Additionally, not only does Le Billon (2015) place conflict at the core of political ecology, but he specifies conflicts that are "in defense of the environment as a source of livelihood for indigenous and marginalized communities" (p. 605). The concerns expressed through this research and the environmental conflicts described in northern Tanzania fit well within Le Billon's definition of conflicts in the framework of political ecology.

Finally, some respondents made references to the different livelihood experiences based on gender, accounting for the patriarchal nature of many African cultures. R8-Legal Officer emphasizes the importance of considering the experiences of women, youth, and persons with disabilities within communities when taking a participatory and rights-based approach. Women are the most vulnerable within the communities (R8-Legal Officer) making organizations like the Pastoral Women's Council (PWC), which advocates specifically for the rights of pastoralist women in Tanzania, particularly important as a grassroots initiative for their development.

Tanzania Development Vision 2025.

Tanzania's ambitious goal of achieving middle-income status by 2025 was achieved in July 2020. The World Bank upgraded Tanzania to lower-middle-income based on its 2019 Gross National Income (GNI)/capita, from low-income in 2018[6] (Serajuddin and Hamadeh, 2020). As noted by Battaile (2020), this does not suffice towards the achievement of the Tanzania Development Vision (TDV) 2025, because "investing in both human development and physical capital is key to achieving these broad goals and improving the quality of life for all Tanzanians." R3-Consultant argued that despite this achievement; a lot of work still needs to be done for TDV 2025 to really work, particularly in the context of wildlife tourism and conservation.

With regards to World Bank indicators, Tanzania has seen steady growth both economically and socially over the last couple of decades (UNDP, 2019), though disparities between rural and urban areas, genders, and wealth distribution demonstrates continued inequality (Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), 2018; Maliti, 2019). Inequality between

[6] Important to note that this is reflective of 2019 figures and does not take into account any adjustments as a result of COVID.

rural and urban areas also considers quality education, water, and sanitation access, and of course general wealth, whereby the rural poor experience increases in poverty while those at the top further accumulate wealth (Maliti, 2019). R7-Lawyer expresses their skepticism about economic growth and quantitative data such as that from the World Bank being used to measure wellbeing and the improvement of livelihoods, stating that economic growth is not always indicative of rural development. Reference to these World Bank indicators having improved (and some objectives to further improve them) were seen across many file classifications in the content analysis as a *positive impact on country development*, while others also pointed out the *negative impacts* identified above.

TDV 2025 has three main targets aimed at "achieving a high-quality livelihood for its people, attain good governance through the rule of law and develop a strong and competitive economy" (URT, 1999a, p. 12). When comparing these targets with the results from this research, it becomes evident that although Tanzania achieved middle-income status ahead of 2025; they have not yet realized the TDV 2025 targets. More specifically, the goals for achieving high-quality livelihoods for its people are being pushed further away through the government's engagement with communities living alongside protected areas, who represent some of the poorest people in the country (R4-Advisor, see also Kideghesho, 2008; Lee, 2018; Maliti, 2019; Nelson, 2012)

As previously noted, a majority of respondents (R1-Academic, R2-Academic, R4-Advisor, R5-Advocate, R8-Legal Officer) were skeptical about how TDV 2025 can benefit these communities through the wildlife tourism industry. Many of the challenges faced by local people and communities that were identified as impacting livelihoods and development are in direct conflict with the goals of achieving high-quality livelihoods. The first goal is for food self-sufficiency and security, which R3-Consultant and R4-Advisor have already noted is put at risk when access to land and resources are diminished, affecting livestock. Gender equality, another goal for achieving high-quality livelihoods, was also brought up as a challenge for development by R1-Academic, R5-Advocate and R8-Legal Officer (also see ECA, 2018) and within reports and English media as a *negative impact on country development*. Other goals for this achievement that were less discussed in this research include a reduction in infant mortality rate (identified as a challenge by R3-Consultant), universal access to safe water (identified by R1-

Academic, R3-Consultant, R4-Advisor, R5-Advocate and R8-Legal Officer), and life expectancy.

Ensuring access to quality primary healthcare for all Tanzanians and quality reproductive health services "for all individuals of appropriate ages" (URT, 1999a, p. 12) is a goal of TDV 2025 that still needs work. R1-Acadmic, R3-Consultant, R4-Advisor and R8-Legal Officer all highlighted the extremely poor quality of health care facilities and clinics in remote areas, or the complete lack thereof (see also Mitekaro and Poche, 2017), with R3-Consultant emphasizing that "health is a tremendous issue." Proper access to health facilities is especially prevalent as a concern among women in rural communities, as they currently have to travel long distances to get any semblance of health care (R1-Academic and R8-Legal Officer). Many of these communities "have to walk for very long distances […] to be able to access a modicum of a place where they can get some health care" (R8-Legal Officer). Access to health care was referenced as a *negative impact* within academic articles, while it fell under *positive impacts* within Kiswahili media and policy documents. Tanzania's Five Year Development Plan II (FYDP-II), which sunsets at the end of this 2020/2021 fiscal year, has health and the overall improvement of health systems listed as an intervention for human development, though it does not mention rural access to health care (Ministry of Finance and Planning, 2016). This continues to exclude an entire, robust population of individuals from an improved health care strategy, continuing to marginalize rural communities already lacking proper access to health care and facilities.

The goal to achieve universal primary education and to eradicate illiteracy levels by 2025 (URT, 1999a) appears to be particularly unrealistic according to respondents who emphasized that education access is a challenge that is impacting livelihoods and development (see also Mitekaro and Poche, 2017). R1-Academic noted that oftentimes these local populations are aware that they are not getting a high-quality education, which is typically tied to a lack of solid infrastructure (R1-Academic, R3-Consultant, R4-Advisor), including limited or no access to electricity and internet and "sometimes [they] don't have [access to] textbooks and pencils (R1-Academic). Having "adequate and sufficient teachers who can then offer the service and [receive] remuneration" (R8-Legal Officer) is another element of high-quality education that is still not being met in these rural communities. They cannot achieve quality education when a

school has only one teacher who is responsible for multiple classes of over fifty students (R8-Legal Officer). It is nearly impossible, then, to expect students to properly learn anything and attain, for example, levels of literacy high enough so that they can understand the government documents provided to them in only English or Kiswahili (R8-Legal Officer) or to work in tourism and other auxiliary industries. Improving education opportunities for girls was also noted as a development priority by R3-Consultant and R5-Advocate. All of these educational factors (raised as impacting local peoples' development and livelihoods) are addressed in the FYDP-II.

However, despite the goals of having improved teacher/pupil ratios, better materials, and improved boarding for girls (Ministry of Finance and Planning, 2016); the plan continues to exclude local people in rural, pastoralist communities. Education systems and infrastructure are far better developed in urban areas than rural areas where there is significant underdevelopment (Maliti, 2019; Mitekaro and Poche, 2017). R3-Consultant suggests that the current education structure in place in Tanzania encourages students to "leave [their] old ways behind and follow the modern world.". An educational system that enables and supports pastoralism is critical to ensure engagement and avoid exclusion of many local people living around protected areas (R3-Consultant and R8-Legal Officer). Enabling pastoralism means recognizing that access to grazing land and water for livestock is critical so that students do not have to leave class or skip school altogether to ensure that their family's cattle (a.k.a. their family's livelihood) survives (R8-Legal Officer), and recognizing that these communities are frequently on the move in search of this access (R4-Advisor). Not having access to quality education also limits peoples' ability to get higher-wage jobs in the tourism industry, such as management or accounting positions (R1-Academic and R5-Advocate). This impacts the final goal of achieving high-quality livelihoods for Tanzanians, which is the absence of abject poverty.

While Kiswahili media and policy documents looked at wildlife tourism job creation positively in the content analysis, R1-Academic and R5-Advocate both emphasized the significant lack of jobs available, with R5-Advocate saying that "there is so [much] less opportunity to work" than there should be, and when local people are generally employed in the tourism sector it is through low-wage jobs that do not generate sustainable revenues (R1-Academic, R3-Consultant, R5-Advocate and R7-Lawyer). Accruing income through this employment is still better than nothing and can be considered development to some degree, but

R2-Academic was careful to note that it typically does very little, if anything, for poverty reduction. Without substantial income generation, livelihoods are placed at an even bigger risk. It is always important to note that from R6-Safari's vantage point, the livelihoods of those working in the tourism industry have improved in the last 18 years, primarily in terms of education and employment opportunities. Improved livelihoods for those employed in wildlife tourism are certainly productive in contributing to poverty reduction, however, it does not necessarily mean that it is sufficiently contributing to eliminating poverty. Individuals can remain in abject poverty and reside within marginalized communities while their livelihoods see some improvements.

Finally, excluding local people and communities from the land, thus limiting their access to resources, also limits their abilities to develop and continue livelihood practices such as livestock herding, which we have learned is a form of currency, food security, and overall survival. This has actively increased levels of poverty among these populations (R3-Consultant and R4-Advisor). The FYDP-II mentions CBC as an intervention method for natural resource management, but within the same strategy commits to protecting wildlife "in order to arrest increasing invasion and encroachment of wildlife habitats" (Ministry of Finance and Planning, 2016, p. 58). This is an example of the exclusionary narrative of local people and communities around protected areas in official government plans for development and the achievement of TDV 2025. This narrative is met with no specific acknowledgement of the communities living alongside wildlife zones and their unique challenges and development needs to achieve the absence of abject poverty in Tanzania. Both R4-Advisor and R5-Advocate commented that ensuring they provide these social amenities to communities is solely the responsibility of the government, which is also to blame for the current lack thereof. "The government has to invest in [rural people]" to really develop (R5-Advocate) and provision of amenities "ought to be the government's responsibility" (R4-Advisor). Unfortunately, most respondents actively engaged in Tanzania are unaware of any development projects that took place or are currently underway as a result of tourism revenues and the 18 percent VAT on the industry (except for R6-Safari, who noted updates to airports). Tourism revenues may be contributing to government spending on development; however, respondents are unaware of this and other sources have not identified development projects. The provision of these important social services is essential to reduce poverty among Tanzania's rural communities (Kinyondo and Pelizzo, 2018) and contribute to eliminating nation-wide poverty.

Contrary to the FYDP-II, the 2001 Rural Development Strategy (RDS) specifically targets the development and improvement of rural livelihoods, within the context of TDV 2025. This strategy recognizes both that natural resources are important for rural livelihoods, and that increased poverty leads to unsustainable use of these natural resources. It further acknowledges the centralization of resource management and the need to empower communities in resource management. The RDS aims specifically at ensuring access to "education, health, land, financial services and markets, and ensuring the sustainable management of the natural resource base" (URT, 2001, p. 27). Intervention strategies include growth for everyone, increased access to services, reducing vulnerability, and ensuring good governance. RDS was intended to act as a guide for the medium-term implementation of TDV 2025 and addressed many of the real issues revealed over the course of this research (e.g., centralized resource management and insufficient education capacity, including teacher-student ratios). Unfortunately, this rolling rural development strategy, as they referred it to in the document (URT, 2001), seems to have instead been forgotten about with little (or no) further implementation. It is difficult to pinpoint when the RDS was relevant to Tanzania's development, as its purpose was to support and enhance the implementation of other policies and strategies. The RDS may have had more relevance before the first FYDP in 2011. Instead, Tanzania's ongoing Five Year Development Plans have been at the frontlines towards achieving TDV 2025.

These policies and development plans, which do not seem to be substantially addressing the challenges and needs of local people and communities living alongside wildlife that respondents identified, are also holding the country back from achieving TDV 2025. The government's engagement with these communities, primarily through tourism and conservation, is not contributing to the alleviation of poverty or improved livelihoods as they are losing access to and being excluded from natural resources that comprise their livelihoods and define their wealth. Tourism has led to increased centralization of resources, even while it is portrayed and understood "as a means to alleviate rural poverty and create positive local incentives for environmental conservation" (Nelson, 2012, p. 370). Inequalities in the distribution of the costs and benefits associated with the large revenues from access to resources is increasing vulnerability to environmental conflicts and further aggravating tensions (Le Billon, 2015). The elements of pro-poor tourism have not been considered or implemented in Tanzania's northern circuit, where they could be very beneficial to both development and conservation.

Impact on Wildlife Conservation

Neumann (1999) asserts that wildlife conservation is explicitly a political matter. He notes that "the politics of conservation revolve around contested notions of land and resource rights" among a few different groups (p. 117). He specifies these groups by pointing to contentions amongst the local people and communities themselves, and between the communities and the state, which is often working alongside Western conservation organizations. Through this research's data, the impacts of state engagement with local people and communities living in and around protected areas of northern Tanzania on the conservation of wildlife in the country were not easily identifiable. Through the content analysis, only 24 references overlapped between *impacts on country development* and *impacts on wildlife conservation*. Generally speaking, references that negatively impacted one also negatively impacted the other, with the same result for positive impacts. This was not surprising, given that wildlife conservation is paramount to Tanzania's GDP and foreign income. More interesting, however, were the 83 overlapping references from *impacts on wildlife conservation* and *impacts on local people and communities*. A total of 38 references impacting wildlife conservation negatively impacted local people and communities, eight of which were also coded under dispossession. There were 15 references to overlapping negative impacts on both, while the overlapping positive impacts were minimal with only four references. This piece of data, that negative impacts on local people and communities have generally negative impacts on wildlife conservation, asserts a notion that respondents frequently discussed.

Reports of wildlife conservation in Tanzania suggest that populations are on the rise, though still facing reduced numbers compared to populations decades ago (Goldman, 2011; Lee and Bond, 2018; Harvey, 2020). The declining wildlife in Tanzania was referenced across all file classifications in the content analysis as a *negative impact on local people and communities*. It is not widely discussed, but according to R1-Academic, more elephants are born each year than are being poached. R1-Academic agreed that despite the challenges of CBC, including its minuscule benefits to communities; CBC has been relatively beneficial to wildlife conservation. However, for sustainable success in wildlife conservation there needs to be a greater element of ownership (R1-Acadmic and R3-Consultant). Without proper ownership there is increased poverty created by conservation, which then leads to more unsustainable practices, according to R3-Consultant

(see also Melubo, 2020). The use of philanthropy and the practice of reserving areas strictly for wildlife conservation has led to the current situation of many endangered and threatened wildlife species (R6-Safari). The creation of protected areas for conservation is central to the political ecology of conservation as exclusionary rights and specific boundaries are established by more powerful, often political, actors (Vaccaro et al., 2013). The authors assert that establishing protected areas is "as much a social process with political and economic consequences" as it is a process whereby the knowledge and preferences of those more powerful stakeholders are at the forefront (p. 258). Essentially, the structural framework for conservation involves the "mainstream consolidation" of political interactions, market integration and cultural shifts to reach broad social acceptance.

Contrarily, the notion that traditional Maasai knowledge is the key to successful wildlife conservation was heavily stressed among R3-Consultant, R7-Lawyer and R8-Legal Officer. Academic articles, reports, and English media in the content analysis all stressed the importance of traditional knowledge and land rights for successful conservation through its *positive* and *negative impacts on wildlife conservation*. The model of national parks and excluding people from the area is not only a violation of their rights but also is unsustainable and "ignores the interplay that people have had with their environment for forever" (R7-Lawyer). The Maasai gear their culture and practices towards "preserving land and not harming ecosystems" (R3-Consultant). Their traditional knowledge that has been passed on for generations is undervalued and hardly recognized in the current exclusionary conservation models (R3-Consultant, R7-Lawyer and R8-Legal Officer, see also Kideghesho, 2010; Melubo, 2020). Preserving these traditional land management practices is critical for conservation, as "almost all the alternatives are detrimental to wildlife" (R3-Consultant).

Worth mentioning briefly is that wildlife hunting is something that the government of Tanzania permits. This industry brings in significant revenue for the government, which is generally not shared with local people and villages, despite hunting blocks often overlapping village land (Benjaminsen and Brycen; 2012; Snyder and Sulle, 2011). R7-Lawyer argued that allotting huge hunting blocks (often to wealthy foreigners) is contrary to the wildlife conservation agenda. R8-Legal Officer further extended concerns that enabling foreign investment for hunting revenues accrued at the top is signaling to local people and communities

that their development does not matter and that they do not deserve to achieve improved livelihoods like much of the rest of the country. Hunting blocks in Tanzania and how they are managed and engaged with, both by the state and by local communities, is a much broader topic than cannot adequately be covered in this thesis. For further reading, see Hariohay et al., 2018; Sachedina and Nelson, 2010; Wright, 2016; etc.

Though small achievements have been recorded in wildlife conservation, the widespread belief appears to be that long-term wildlife conservation needs to better incorporate pastoralist communities. R6-Safari urged conservationists to come to this realization, stating that if stakeholders involved do not figure out a way to ensure proper CBC then wildlife numbers will never sufficiently increase. The Maasai have lived in these wildlife landscapes for centuries, and the majority of these areas exist because of traditional pastoralist land management, not despite it (R3-Consultant and R8-Legal Officer, see also Kideghesho, 2010; Melubo, 2020). Unfortunately, the legitimacy of exclusion through discourses, both political and apolitical, and how the Maasai are framed is negatively impacting wildlife conservation, as the Maasai are actually responsible for creating and cultivating these wildlife landscapes, not threatening them.

These interactions between the Tanzanian political landscape (policies, strategies, laws, regulations, etc.) and social narratives have shaped the current wildlife conservation model to be ecologically unsustainable and harmful to livelihoods, and thus to development. It is through the government's efforts to protect Tanzania's ecological uniqueness that both conservation and development have faced increased challenges in efforts to improve. Limiting access to resources by excluding the biggest stakeholders through policies and discourses has not led to their being "the salvation" for wildlife conservation through CBC. Instead, it has accelerated unsustainable livelihood practices and created a cycle of diminishing conservation and contributing to poverty. As a result of these interactions, R3-Consultant noted that communities are the losers in this current conservation model as it impacts their livelihoods and development potential, along with the natural resources upon which they depend. The NVivo content analysis further highlights that *positive impacts on wildlife conservation* also have *positive impacts* on Tanzania's development objectives. Contrarily, *negative impacts on wildlife conservation* generally impacts local people and communities negatively as well. Finally, *negative impacts on local people and communities* (which are frequently tied to conservation) have a corresponding *negative impact on country*

development. The impacts on one of these elements are likely to have impacts on the others, making the state's engagement with local people and how it carries out wildlife conservation practices critical to achieving TDV 2025.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

This concluding chapter will revisit the research question and objectives set out in the introduction, before moving onto policy recommendations that have emerged from this research. The potential implications that the COVID-19 pandemic could have on these findings are then addressed. Finally, I present suggestions on future areas of research that could further develop these conclusions.

Research Question and Objectives

This research has worked to provide an update on the analysis of CBC and wildlife tourism in Tanzania. It is one of the first studies following the 18% VAT, and among very few to address TDV 2025 and how wildlife tourism and conservation contribute to national development. The research pulled together information and findings through a multitude of resources and approaches. The initial review of both academic and policy literature in chapters one and two clearly outlines Tanzania's desire to develop and ensure high-quality livelihoods, leading to the achievement of middle-income status. Existing resources also highlight the challenges and inequalities at the forefront of CBC in Tanzania, including the predominance of fortress and militarized conservation, revenue sharing and distribution from tourism, and land dispossession. The qualitative content analysis coding of academic articles, policy documents, and mass media articles in both English and Kiswahili supported the literature review by indicating that much of CBC negatively impacts local people and communities, which also limits Tanzania's national development. Information found among these data sources were often distinctly different based on their origination and author. For example, policy documents from the government of Tanzania had primarily positive ambitions regarding development and CBC, while academic research typically pointed to flaws in those same documents. Mass media resources were careful to not be too critical of government practices, more often remarking on the wildlife tourism industry in general and the positive statements from government officials or reports. Rarely would Tanzania-based media sources criticize the government or contradict the statements made. Instead, they would report on the more indisputable facts of what they said or did, without offering counter-arguments and opinions. In this regard, it was critical to ensure the variety of resources used. Interviews with key respondents revealed the challenges of wildlife

tourism and CBC in Tanzania that corroborated with those identified in the literature review and further supported the notion that those practices can be harmful to Tanzania's development.

With wildlife tourism playing such an important role in Tanzania's economy and implicating so many of its rural communities, it is an important factor in achieving development and conservation goals. Unfortunately, many of the impacts on rural communities living alongside wildlife in northern Tanzania had negative outcomes. The benefits accrued by local people and communities living in and around protected areas are very limited, with jobs having been the primary benefit identified. However, as we have seen previously; available jobs are scarce and pay low-wages. In instances of infrastructure development, Homewood et al. (2015) note that funds are usually derived from tourism revenues (in WMAs, particularly) and appear to benefit the entire community, while individualized benefits (medical and educational bursaries or job opportunities) only benefit a portion of individuals. Results from NVivo also indicated that negative impacts often accompanied the impacts identified as having positive implications for local people and communities. The government's strong control and ownership over the land and its resources makes this an inherently political issue involving differing levels of power that exacerbate these negative outcomes.

Local people and communities living around protected areas are further impoverished through dispossession and limiting access to natural resources, upon which they depend for their livelihoods. Tourism development has done very little to offset these costs associated with any form of engagement in community-based conservation initiatives. Pro-poor tourism could benefit Tanzania's development and its tourism sector; however, it is not used as a tourism or development approach. Being excluded from the image of a "wild Africa" has led to a decrease in land and natural resource access for critical livelihood practices. Of course, like any situation impacting large groups of people, the perceived benefits vary among individuals involved. Some members of communities may benefit greatly from CBC, while others might feel at a disadvantage and marginalized, further impoverishing them. Overwhelmingly, however, both the coding and interview results were indicative of generally negative impacts on local people and communities.

The goals of Tanzania's Development Vision 2025 are not being achieved, and the current Development Plan for implementation (expiring in April 2021) does not adequately

address the needs of the country's poorest citizens; those living in rural areas neighbouring wildlife conservation areas. The actions being carried out by the government, whether based on laws or illegal actions such as forcing people out of their villages, are contributing to the abject poverty levels in these regions. Additionally, development plans and strategies currently being implemented disproportionately favour urban areas and modern lifestyles over traditional, pastoralist livelihoods. Generally speaking, negative impacts on local people and communities identified in NVivo coding also negatively impacted Tanzania's development.

Although wildlife tourism has an incredibly significant revenue stream in Tanzania's northern circuit, the actual re-investment in stakeholders is unclear. Despite triangulation through different methods of data collection, there was no evidence of investment in development projects, especially in those that would directly benefit the industry's various stakeholders. Neither the published resources coded nor the respondent interviews pointed to any of these types of development projects. Particularly regarding the 18 percent VAT imposed on tourism services in 2016 and said to be for development projects; all but one respondent expressed no knowledge of any development projects impacting the stakeholders of wildlife tourism in northern Tanzania. Several respondents were careful to mention that this does not indicate projects are not being funded using these VAT revenues, it simply means that they have not identified any. R6-Safari, who has noticed upgrades to airports since the implementation of the VAT, also noted that many of these projects take a long time to establish and begin, which may also be a factor.

Finally, CBC's benefits for conservation were ultimately uncertain. The lack of conservationist respondents may have had an impact on this, while literature was also fairly limited. Short-term results on wildlife conservation appear to be relatively successful, however, initiatives were identified as more closely resembling fortress conservation, excluding local populations from the areas under the guise of participatory CBC. There were many indications that the long-term sustainability of natural resources depends on local populations, particularly pastoralists, who have protected and enabled wildlife conservation for centuries. The state's current practices of excluding local people from conservation areas are not only deeply impacting their development and increasing poverty, but also negatively impacting long-term wildlife conservation and fostering unsustainable practices. Perhaps this is less surprising when

placed in the context of Tanzania's political landscape, as explored in chapters one and five. With such bureaucratic processes, centralized state authority over resources, and restrictions on media freedoms, it seems unlikely that Tanzania's government is creating an enabling environment for participation in CBC and for sustainable development. While the CBC narrative continues to be pushed and the results limited at best, one might begin to question the purpose of "CBC" in Tanzania – is it truly to facilitate wildlife conservation and rural development, or is to put forward to maintain a particular image to make tourism more desirable, for example?

The political landscape of Tanzania, both historically and presently, does not enable ecological sustainability and does not support rural development through policy nor practice. Ultimately, the impacts of state engagement with local communities in and around protected areas in northern Tanzania have immediate negative implications for development and long-term risks for wildlife conservation.

Policy Recommendations

To improve the impacts of wildlife tourism and conservation on local people and communities living in these areas, I have prepared a few recommendations for the government of Tanzania. A lot of work will need to be done to achieve TDV 2025, and these recommendations ought to be considered towards its achievement.

First is the fairly obvious recommendation to reinvest in these rural areas. Particularly investing in social infrastructure that is so severely lacking and thus impacting peoples' ability to develop and reduce poverty. This includes education infrastructure, health clinics and hospitals, water resources, etc. More than simply investing in the infrastructure, it is important to do so in a way that ensures proper functionality, meaning sufficient teachers and materials in schools, as well as available medical staff and stocked equipment. Additionally, accounting for pastoralist traditions and livelihoods is particularly relevant to ensure that these social amenities and public services are truly and realistically meeting their needs. Both R1-Academic and R8-Academic emphasized that government projects, structured in a way that ensures ongoing maintenance and continued support, are preferred for development over cash handouts. Simply building infrastructure without accounting for specific lifestyles and ensuring continued support will not be beneficial for poverty reduction.

It would also be beneficial for the government to transparently report on spending, particularly on funds accrued through tourism and the 18 percent VAT. It becomes discouraging for stakeholders of the industry to see no development projects underway that would benefit them when these revenues are evidently being accrued by the government and had reportedly been for development. Tanzania should provide annual reports on what projects have taken place to improve the industry and help its stakeholders (e.g., improved roads, better access to water in rural areas, improved public infrastructure in rural areas, airport upgrades, etc.).

Tanzania should encourage tourism operators and its National Parks Authority (TANAPA) to take a pro-poor approach by marketing tourism in a way that includes pastoralists. Currently, local people are “portrayed without livestock, farms, knowledge and aspirations, but with hospitality and the appropriate Maasai attire” (Bluwstein, 2017, p. 110). This image of “wild Africa” has been detrimental to the Maasai as it excludes them from the picturesque narratives of the African landscapes that their culture helped shape and develop. If CBC is primarily for the sake of enhancing the experience for tourists and easing any of their colonial-like concerns, as I have suggested above, then marketing tourism in a way to really show participatory conservation in practice would surely be beneficial. Beginning to market the industry in such a way that demonstrates the realities of the human-wildlife coexistence could begin to re-integrate people in conservation areas and diminish acceptance of this particular “ambient exclusion”.

Finally, R6-Safari emphasized that the government should recognize that you can kill wildlife, the natural beauty of Africa, and its competitive advantage with too much tourism. Taking a step back from the mass tourism agenda and using wildlife tourism to propel itself further down the path of economic development would ensure the sustainability of the natural environment and its resources, including the unique wildlife of East Africa.

Potential Implications of COVID-19

Within Tanzania’s FYDP-II are some ambitious tourism objectives for 2020, including a total of nearly 2.5 million tourists vising the country. Of course, the COVID-19 pandemic will have had an impact on tourism in Tanzania and, therefore, the revenues accrued from the industry. The government projected a fairly significant reduction in tourism revenues for 2020 (approximately USD 2 million) and estimate between 900,000 – 1,000,000 tourists (The Citizen,

2020). Although the lack of tourists will surely impact Tanzania's development objectives; the country opened its doors to tourist arrivals early on, which will certainly help its recovery (The Citizen, 2020). There is still the concern of jobs within the tourism industry and its auxiliary industries, which will likely have a massive impact on the livelihoods of the poorest groups in Africa and increase rural poverty (Lindsey et al., 2020).

The authors also consider wildlife tourism one of the primary funding mechanisms for wildlife conservation in Africa (Lindsey et al., 2020). A reduction in donor funding as a result of economic downturns and shifting priorities is another concern for wildlife conservation, both of which can reduce the abilities of governments and conservationists to manage conservation areas. The threats to wildlife conservation that the authors expect include "increased poaching, tree cutting, artisanal mining, [protected area] encroachment, agricultural conversion and possibly the ultimate degazettement[7] of the most-affected [protected areas]" (Lindsey et al., 2020, p 1303). The authors particularly point to Tanzania as a risk for degazettement if protected areas come to be perceived as financial sinkholes without the tourism on which they rely. As COVID-19 disproportionately impacts those already living in poverty, Tanzania (and Africa in general) cannot reasonably expect CBC initiatives to support wildlife conservation through this financial lull.

Future Research

The impacts of COVID-19 on the questions addressed throughout this research is a critical next step in research on the topic. This pandemic has the potential to change the landscape of tourism for a significant period, which would have an immense impact on a country like Tanzania that so heavily depends on tourism. The direct impacts on local people and communities who are employed by tourism and rely on tourism revenue, whether significant amounts or not, will also need to be addressed. Impacts have likely been felt among rural populations, though perhaps to a lesser degree than at the national level, indicating the lack of true benefits from tourism among local people and communities. The impacts of COVID-19 on wildlife conservation in northern Tanzania should also be researched, taking into account the expectations and potential implications outlined by Lindsey et al. (2020).

[7] Degazettement is used to refer to situations whereby national parks or other protected areas lose their legal status and protection entirely (Mascia and Pailler, 2011).

Additionally, this research did not adequately take into account the differences between genders and other intersectionalities. Addressing differences in experiences and outcomes between genders would have been incredibly difficult, if not impossible, from a desk-based approach. It would require field research to properly determine how the experiences differ between men and women as well as among individuals with disabilities, youth, elders, etc.

Finally, the death of Tanzania's President Magufuli was announced on March 17, 2021, while this thesis was being finalized. In this regard, there is potential for big policy change in Tanzania and the policy concerns addressed in this thesis may need to be re-visited in future research. At this time, so closely following the announcement of former President Magufuli's death, the future of Tanzania's political landscape and policy direction remains unclear. President Magufuli's Vice President, Samia Suluhu Hassan, will be sworn in to complete the presidential term as the country's first female President (Feleke, 2021).

REFERENCES

Abukari, H., & Mwalyosi, R. B. (2020). Local communities' perceptions about the impact of protected areas on livelihoods and community development. *Global Ecology and Conservation, 22.*

African Wildlife Foundation (2016). African conservancies volume: Towards best practices. Volume 1 in the series *African Conservancies.* Nairobi, Kenya: AWF Conservation Centre.

Ahebwa, W. M., van der Duim, R., and Sandbrook, C. (2012). Tourism revenue sharing policy at Bwindi Impenetrable National Park, Uganda: A policy arrangements approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 20*(3): 377-394.

Amnesty International. (2019). *Tanzania 2019*. Retrieved (December 27, 2020) from https://www.amnesty.org/en/countries/africa/tanzania/report-tanzania/

Araujo, C.L., do Carmo, E.A., and Cruz, F.O. (2019). Describing the experience of young researchers in interdisciplinary qualitative research based on critical discourse analysis (CDA) using NVivo. In A.P. Costa, A. Moreira and L.P. Reis (Eds.). *Computer supported qualitative research: New trends on qualitative research.* (pp. 1-11). Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-01406-3_1

Ashley, C., and Roe, D. (2002). Making tourism work for the poor: Strategies and challenges in southern Africa. *Development Southern Africa, 19*(1): 61-82. DOI: 10.1080/0376835022012385 5

Azungah, T. (2018). Qualitative research: Deductive and inductive approaches to data analysis. *Qualitative Research Journal, 18*(4): 383-400. DOI 10.1108/QRJ-D-18-00035

Battaile, W. G. (2020, July 10). What does Tanzania's move to lower-middle income status mean? *World Bank Blogs.* Retrieved (September 2020) from https://blogs.worldbank.org/africacan/what-does-tanzanias-move-lower-middle-income-status-mean

Beaumont, P. (2019, October 29). Tanzania president Magufuli condemned for authoritarian regime. *The Guardian.* Retrieved (February 28, 2021) from https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2019/oct/29/tanzania-president-magufuli-condemned-for-authoritarian-stance.

Benjaminsen, A., and Bryceson, I. (2012). Conservation, green/blue grabbing and accumulation by dispossession in Tanzania. *The Journal of Peasant Studies, 39*(2): 335-355.

Benjaminsen, T. A., Bryceson, I., Maganga, F., & Refseth, T. (2011). Conservation and land grabbing in Tanzania. Presented (2011, April 6-8) at the International Conference on Global Land Grabbing.

Benjaminsen, T.A., Goldman, M. J., Minwary, M. Y., & Maganga F.P. (2013). Wildlife management in Tanzania: State control, rent seeking and community resistance. *Development and Change, 44*(5): 1087-1109. DOI: 10.1111/dech.12055

Blaikie, P. M., and Brookfield, H. (Eds.). (2015). *Land degradation and society.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Bluwstein, J. (2017). Creating ecotourism territories: Environmentalities in Tanzania's community-based conservation. *Geoforum, 83:* 101-113.

Bluwstein, J., Lund, J. F., & Brehony, P. (2018, November 1). Why conservation success stories in Tanzania need a closer look. *The Conversation.* Retrieved (2018, November 1) from https://theconversation.com/amp/why-conservation-success-stories-in-tanzania-need-a-closer-look-104580?__twitter_impression=true

Brockington, D. (2004). Community conservation, inequality and injustice: Myths of power in protected area management. *Conservation & Society, 2*(2): 411-432.

Brockington, D. (2015). The enduring power of fortress conservation in Africa. In Gargallo, E. (coord.), *Proceedings of the Conference "Protected Areas, Biodiversity and Communities: Learning from Conservation Experiences in Africa". Nova Africa,* (32). Barcelona, Spain: EA Publications. https://centredestudisafricans.org/proceedings-of-the-conference-on-conservation-and-communities-in-africa/

Burton, F. (1997). Can ecotourism objectives be achieved? *Annals of Tourism Research, 25*(3): 755-758.

Bwagalilo, F. (2018, October 30). A double-edged sword for development: A narrative of wildlife crop damage. *Nepsus Research Project.* Retrieved (2018, November 1) from https://www.nepsus.info/single-post/2018/10/30/A-Double-Edged-Sword-for-Development-A-Narrative-of-Wildlife-Crop-Damage

Caro, T., and Davenport, T. R. B. (2015). Wildlife and wildlife management in Tanzania. *Conservation Biology, 30*(4): 716-723. DOI: 10.1111/cobi.12658

Charnley, S. (2005). From nature tourism to ecotourism? The case of the Ngorongoro Conservation Area, Tanzania. *Human Organization, 64*(1): 75-88.

Choy, L. T. (2014). The strengths and weaknesses of research methodology: Comparison and complimentary between qualitative and quantitative approaches. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 19*(4): 99-104.

Death, C. (2013). Environmental mainstreaming and post-sovereign governance in Tanzania. *Journal of Eastern African Studies, 7*(1): 1-20. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17531055.2012.729777

Di Minin, E., Leader-Williams, N., & Bradshaw, C.J.A. (2016). Banning trophy hunting will exacerbate biodiversity loss. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution, 31*(2): 99-102.

Doolittle, A. A. (2007). Fortress conservation. In P. Robbins (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of environment and society* (pp. 705). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Dressler, W., Büscher, B., Schoon, M., Brockington, D., Hayes, T., Kull, C., & Shrestha, K. (2010). From hope to crisis and back again? A critical history of the global CBNRM narrative. *Environmental Conservation, 37*(1), 5–15.

Duffy, R. (2014). Waging a war to save biodiversity: The rise of militarized conservation. *International Affairs, 90*(4): 819-834. DOI: 10.1111/1468-2346.12142

Duffy, R. (2017, 20 July). We need to talk about the militarization of conservation. *Green European Journal.* Retrieved (2019, March 8) from https://www.greeneuropeanjournal.eu/we-need-to-talk-about-militarisation-of-conservation/

Duffy, R., Dickinson, H., & Joanny, L. (2017, July 12). Foreign 'conservation armies' in African may be doing more harm than good. *The Conversation.* Retrieved (2019, March 8) from https://theconversation.com/foreign-conservation-armies-in-africa-may-be-doing-more-harm-than-good-80719

Economic Commission for Africa (2018, March 19). New report on Tanzania shows income inequality declining as rural-urban disparities remain. Retrieved (September 2020) from https://www.uneca.org/stories/new-report-tanzania-shows-income-inequality-declining-rural-urban-disparities-remain

Feleke, B. (2021, March 18). Tanzania's President John Magufuli who urged citizens to 'pray coronavirus away' has died. *CNN.* Retrieved (2021, March 20) from https://www.cnn.com/2021/03/17/africa/john-magufuli-tanzania-death-intl/index.html

Fereday, J., and Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 5*(1): 80-92.

Fennell, D. A. (2000). What's in a name? Conceptualizing natural resource-based tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research, 25*(1): 97-100.

Folarin, O., and Adeniyi, O. (2020). Does tourism reduce poverty in sub-Saharan African countries? *Journal of travel research, 59*(1): 140-155. DOI: 10.1177/0047287518821736

Freilich, M. (1963). Toward an operational definition of community. *Rural Sociology, 28*(2): 117-127.

Frontani, H. G. (2017). Conservation and wildlife. In *Oxford bibliographies.* DOI: 10.1093/OBO/9780199846733-0022

Gardner, B. (2017). Elite discourses of conservation in Tanzania. *Social Semiotics, 27*(3): 348-358. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10350330.2017.1301799

Goldman, M. (2003). Partitioned nature, privileged knowledge: Community-based conservation in Tanzania. *Development and Change, 34*(5): 833-862.

Goldman, M. (2011). Strangers in their own land: Maasai and wildlife conservation in northern Tanzania. *Conservation and Society, 9*(1): 65-79.

Goldman, M., Davis, A., and Little, J. (2016). Controlling land they call their own: Access and women's empowerment in northern Tanzania. *The Journal of Peasant Studies, 43*(4): 777-797.

Goodwin, H. (1996). In pursuit of ecotourism. *Biodiversity and Conservation, 5*(3): 277-291.

Greenloons (n.d.). *About eco certification.* Greenloons.org. Retrieved March 3, 2021 from https://greenloons.com/about-certification/.

Gregory, T. E. (1931). Economic nationalism. *International Affairs, 10*(3): 289-306.

Hall, D., Hirsch, P., and Murray Li, T. (2011). *Powers of exclusion: Land dilemmas in Southeast Asia.* Honolulu, Hawaii: University of Hawai'i Press.

Hansen, M., Faran, T., & O'Byrne, D. (2015). The best laid plans: Using the capability approach to assess neoliberal conservation in South Africa – The case of the iSimangaliso Wetland Park. *Journal of Environment & Development, 0*(0): 1-23.

Hariohay, K. M., Jackson, C. R., Fyumagwa, R. D., and Røskaft, E. (2018). Trophy hunting versus ecotourism as a conservation model? Assessing the impacts on ungulate behaviour and demographics in the Ruaha-Rungwa ecosystem, central Tanzania. *Environment and Natural Resources Research, 8*(2): 33-43.

Harvey, F. (2020, March 19). Win for conservation as African black rhino numbers rise. *The Guardian.* Retrieved (November 11, 2020) from https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/mar/19/win-for-conservation-as-african-black-rhino-numbers-rise

Hill, T., Nel, E. and Trotter, D. (2006). Small-scale, nature-based tourism as a pro-poor development intervention: Two examples in Kwazulu-Natal, South Africa. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography, 27*: 163-175. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9493.2006.00251.x

Hirschler, K. and Hofmeier, R. (2019). *A decade of Tanzania: Politics, economy and society 2005-2007.* Leiden Boston.

Holmes, G. (2011). Conservation's friends in high places: Neoliberalism, networks, and the transnational conservation elite. *Global Environmental Politics, 11*(4): 1-21.

Homewood, K., Bluwstein, J., Lund, J.F., Keane, A., Nielsen, M.R., Msuha, M., Olila, J., and Burgess, N. (2015). The economic and social viability of Tanzanian Wildlife Management Areas. *Copenhagen Centre for Development Research,* (4).

Hopcraft, J.G.C., Bigurube, G., Lembeli, J.D., and Borner, M. (2015) Balancing conservation with national development: A socio-economic case study of the alternatives to the Serengeti road. *PLoS ONE 10*(7). doi:10.1371/journal. pone.0130577

Hsieh, H.-F. and Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(9):1277-1288. DOI: 10.1177/1049732305276687

Huggins, C. (2018). Land-use planning, digital technologies, and environmental conservation in Tanzania. *Journal of Environment & Development, 27*(2): 210-235.

Hulme, D., and Murphree, M. (1999). Communities, wildlife and the 'new conservation' in Africa. *Journal of International Development, 11*: 277-285.

Hyden, G. (1975). Ujamaa, villagization and rural development in Tanzania. *Development Policy Review, A8*(1): 53-72. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7679.1975.tb00439.x

Igoe, J., & Brockington, D. (2007). Neoliberal conservation: A brief introduction. *Conservation and Society, 5*(4): 432-449.

Infield, M. and Adams, W. M. (1999). Institutional sustainability and community conservation: A case study from Uganda. *Journal of International Development* (11): 305-315.

International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs. (2016). *Tanzanian pastoralists threatened: Evictions, human rights and loss of livelihood*. https://www.iwgia.org/en/resources/publications/308-human-rights-reports/3206-tanzania-pastoralists-threatened-eviction-human-rights-violations-and-loss-of-livelihood-.html

Jain, N. (2017, March 22). Probing rural poachers in Africa: Why do they poach? *Mongabay*. Retrieved (2020, February 9) from https://news.mongabay.com/2017/03/probing-rural-poachers-in-africa-why-do-they-poach/

Kamati, D. (2016, July 19). Magufuli closes debate on tax. *The Citizen.* Retrieved (2019, January 20) from https://www.thecitizen.co.tz/news/Magufuli-closes-debate-on-VAT/1840340-3300626-etv60az/index.html

Keane, A., Lund, J. F., Bluwstein, J., Burgess, N. D., Nielsen, M. R., and Homewood, K. (2020). Impact of Tanzania's wildlife management areas on household wealth. *Nature Sustainability, 3:* 226-233. DOI: 10.1038/s41893-019-0458-0

Kelly, A. B. (2011). Conservation practice as primitive accumulation. *The Journal of Peasant Studies, 38*(4) : 683-701.

Kideghesho, J. R. (2016). The elephant poaching crisis in Tanzania: a need to reverse the trend and the way forward. *Tropical Conservation Science, 9*(1): 369-388.

Kjekshus, H. (1977). The Tanzanian villagization policy: Implementational lessons and ecological dimensions. *Canadian Journal of African Studies, XI*(2): 269-282.

Kolumbia, L. (2018, September 29). Government reviews tourism policy to increase returns. *The Citizen.* Retrieved (2018, November 21) from https://www.thecitizen.co.tz/News/Government-reviews-tourism-policy-to-increase-returns/1840340-4783590-format-xhtml-aeehlrz/index.html

Latif Dahir, A. (2018, May 15). Ecotourism is being used to displace one of East Africa's long-standing indigenous people. *Quartz Africa.* Retrieved (March 29, 2019) from https://qz.com/africa/1278167/maasai-evicted-in-tanzania-for-ecotourism-and-land-conservation/

Le Billon, P. (2015) Environmental conflict. In T. Perreault, G. Bridge, and J. McCarthy (Eds.), *the Routledge handbook of political ecology* (pp. 598-608). Routledge. 10.4324/9781315759289

Lee, D. E., & Bond, M. L. (2018). Quantifying the ecological success of a community-bases wildlife conservation area in Tanzania. *Journal of Mammalogy, 99*(2): 459-464.

Lindsey, P., Allan, J., Brehony, P., Dickman, A., Robson, A., Begg, C., Bhammar, H., Blanken, L., Breuer, T., Fitzgerald, K., Flyman, M., Gandiwa, P., Giva, N., Kaelo, D., Nampindo, S., Nyambe, N., Steiner, K., Parker, A. Roe, D., … Tyrrell, P. (2020). Conserving Africa's wildlife and wildlands through the COVID-19 crisis and beyond. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* (4): 1300-1310.

Luvanga, N. and Shitundu, J. (2003). *The role of tourism in poverty alleviation in Tanzania.* Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers.

Maguire, G. A. (1969). *Toward "uhuru" in Tanzania: The politics of participation.* Cambridge University Press.

Malanga, A. (2019, February 10). Number of national parks rises to 21. *The Citizen.* Retrieved (2019, February 13) from https://www.thecitizen.co.tz/News/1840340-4975244-19uvl/index.html

Maliti, E. (2019). Inequality in education and wealth in Tanzania: A 25-year perspective. *Social Indicators Research,* 145: 901-921. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-018-1838-y

Marijnen, E., & Verweijen, J. (2016). Selling green militarization: The discursive (re)production of militarized conservation in the Virunga National Park, Democratic Republic of the Congo. *Geoforum, 75:* 274-285. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.08.003

Mariki, S. B., Svarstad, H., & Banjaminsen, T. A. (2015). Elephants over the cliff: Explaining wildlife killings in Tanzania. *Land Use Policy, 44,* 19-30. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2014.10.018 0264-8377/

Mascia, M. B., & Pailler, S. (2011). Protected area downgrading, downsizing, and degazettement (PADDD) and its conservation implications. *Conservation Letters,* (4): 9-20.

Mathiesen, K. (2015, June 2). Tanzania elephant population declined by 60% in five years, census reveals. *The Guardian.* Retrieved (2018, November 23) from

https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/jun/02/tanzania-epicentre-of-elephant-poaching-census-reveals

Mawi, F. A. and Mashenene, R. G. (2020). Community-based conservation using wildlife management area model in the Ruvuma landscape in Tanzania: Entrepreneurial myth or reality? *African Journal of Applied Research, 6*(1): 46-60. http://doi.org/10.26437/ajar.01.04.2020.04

McCann, N. (2017, October 10). Attacks on 'militarized' conservation are naïve (commentary). *Mongabay.* Retrieved (2018, March 8) from https://news.mongabay.com/2017/10/attacks-on-militarized-conservation-are-naive-commentary/

McCarthy, J. 2005. Devolution in the woods: community forestry as hybrid neoliberalism. *Environment and Planning A 37:* 995-1014.

Melubo, K. (2020). Why are wildlife on the Maasai doorsteps? Insights from the Maasai of Tanzania. *AlterNative, 16*(3): 180-192. https://doi.org/10.1177/11771801209

Melubo, K., Lovelock, B., & Filep, S. (2019). Motivations and barriers for corporate social responsibility engagement: Evidence from the Tanzanian tourism industry. *Tourism and Hospitality Research, 19*(3): 284-295.

Ministry of Community Development, Women Affairs and Children. (1996). *Community development policy.* Dar es Salaam, TZ: Author.

Ministry of Finance and Planning. (2016). *National five year development plan 2016/17 – 2020/2021*. Dar es Salaam, TZ: Author.

Ministry of Lands and Human Settlements Development. (1997). *National land policy*. Dar es Salaam, TZ: Author.

Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. (n.d.). About us. Retrieved (2018, November 23) from http://www.mnrt.go.tz/about/category/ministry-overview

Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. (1999). *National tourism policy.* Dar es Salaam, TZ: Author.

Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. (2007). *The wildlife policy of Tanzania.* Dar es Salaam, TZ: Author.

Minwary, M. Y. (2009). *Politics of participatory wildlife management in Enduimet WMA, Tanzania.* [Master's thesis, Noragric, Norwegian University of Life Sciences (UMB). http://www.umb.no/noragric

Moore, D. S. (1996). Marxism, culture and political ecology. In R. Peet and M. Watts (Eds.) *Liberation ecologies: Environment, development and social movements,* (pp. 125-127). Routledge.

Moyo, F., Ijumba, J., & Lund, J. F. (2016). Failure by design? Revisiting Tanzania's flagship wildlife management area Burunge. *Conservation and Society, 14*(3): 232-242.

Muganda, M., Sahli, M., and Smith, K. A. (2010). Tourism's contribution to poverty alleviation: A community perspective from Tanzania. *Development Southern Africa, 27*(5): 629-646. DOI: 10.1080/0376835X.2010.522826

Mulindwa, P. (2019, July 10). Tanzania continues clampdown with new restrictive laws that undermine development. *News24.* Retrieved (2021, March 9) from https://www.news24.com/news24/Columnists/GuestColumn/tanzania-continues-clampdown-with-new-restrictive-laws-that-undermine-development-20190710

Munanura, I. E., Backman, K. F., Hallo, J. C., and Powell, R. B. (2016). Perceptions of tourism revenue sharing impacts on Volcanoes National Park, Rwanda: A sustainable livelihoods framework. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 24*(12): 1709-1726.

Murray Li, T. (2007) Practices of assemblage and community forest management. *Economy and Society, 36*(2): 263-293.

Mwakaje, A. G., Manyasa, E., Wawire, N., Muchai, M., Ongare, D., Mugoya, C., Masiga, C. W., & Nikundiwe, A. (2013). Community-based conservation, income governance, and poverty alleviation in Tanzania: The case of Serengeti ecosystem. *The Journal of Environment & Development, 22*(1): 51–73.

Namkwahe, J., & Nyakeke, B. (2018, November 17). Tanzania launches 300-man strong anti-poaching force. *The Citizen.* Retrieved (2018, November 26) from https://www.thecitizen.co.tz/News/1840340-4856190-j08xqz/index.html

Neves, K., and Igoe, J. (2012). Uneven development and accumulation by dispossession in nature conservation: Comparing recent trends in the Azores and Tanzania. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie, 103*(2): 164-179. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9663.2012.00710.x

Nelson, F. (2012). Natural conservationists? Evaluating the impact of pastoralist land use practices on Tanzania's wildlife economy. *Pastoralism: Research, Policy and Practice, 2*(15): 1-19.

Neumann, R. P. (1999). Land, justice, and the politics of conservation in Tanzania. In C. Zerner (Ed.), *People, plants, and justice* (pp. 117-133).

Ngowi, H.P. (2009). Economic development and change in Tanzania since independence: The political leadership factor. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations, 3*(4): 259-267.

Njoya, E. T., and Seetaram, N. (2018). Tourism contribution to poverty alleviation in Kenya: A dynamic computable general equilibrium analysis. *Journal of Travel Research, 57*(4): 513-524. DOI: 10.1177/0047287517700317

Owens, G. R. (2014). From collective villages to private ownership: Ujamaa, Tamaa, and the postsocialist transformation of peri-urban Dar es Salaam, 1970-1990. *Journal of Anthropological Research, 70*(2): 207-231.

Paulson, S., Gezon, L. L., and Watts, M. (2003). Locating the political in political ecology: An introduction. *Human Organization, 62*(3): 205-217.

Pelizzo, R. and Kinyondo, A. (2018). *Making tourism work for Tanzania*. Beau Bassin: Mauritius: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.

Prior, L. (2014). Content analysis. In P. Leavy (Ed.), *the Oxford handbook of qualitative research (1st edn)*. Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199811755.013.008

QSR International. (n.d.b). *Let's get started with NVivo for Windows.* Retrieved (22 February, 2021) from https://help-nv.qsrinternational.com/12/win/v12.1.98-d3ea61/Content/tutorials/en/get-started-tutorial1.htm?iframecontent=true

QSR International. (n.d.a) *Using NVivo.* Retrieved (22 February, 2021) from https://help-nv.qsrinternational.com/12/win/v12.1.98-d3ea61/Content/concepts-strategies/using-nvivo-for-qualitative-research.htm

Ramutsindela, M. and Noe, C. (2012). Scalar thickening: Wildlife management areas and conservation scales in southeast Tanzania. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography, 33*: 137-151. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9493.2012.00450.x

Reporters Sans Frontiers (n.d.). *Tanzania: "Bulldozing" the media*. Retrieved (December 27, 2020) from https://rsf.org/en/tanzania.

Rhodes, T. (2015, December 15). Tanzania's press wait to see if new president will reform troubling media laws. *Committee to Protect Journalists.* Retrieved (2021, March 9) from https://cpj.org/2015/12/tanzanias-press-wait-to-see-if-new-president-will/

Ribot, J., & Peluso, N. L. (2003). A theory of access. *Rural Sociology, 68*(2): 153-181.

Ribot, J., & Peluso, N. L. (2020). Postscript: A theory of access revisited. *Society and Natural Resources, 33*(2): 300-306.

Robbins, P. (2012). *Political ecology: A critical introduction. Second edition.* Wiley-Blackwell.

Roe, D., and Mayers, J. (2018, March 3). To save Africa's wildlife, conservation needs a radical shake-up. *International Institute for Environment and Development.* Retrieved (2020, February 7) from https://www.iied.org/save-africas-wildlife-conservation-needs-radical-shake

Sachedina, H., and Nelson, F. (2010). Protected areas and community incentives in savannah ecosystems: A case study of Tanzania's Maasai Steppe. *Oryx, 44*(3): 390-398.

Salerno, J., Borgerhoff Mulder, M., Grotte, M. N., Ghiselli, M., & Packer, C. (2016). Household livelihoods and conflict with wildlife in community-based conservation areas across northern Tanzania. *Oryx, 50*(4): 702-712. DOI: 10.1017/S0030605315000393

Schreier, M. (2014). Qualitative content analysis. In U. Flick (Ed.), t*he SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis.* (pp. 170-183). SAGE Publications, Inc. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446282243.n12

Sebunya, K. (2019, February 22). The battle to save Africa's most threatened wildlife species. *Open Access Government.* Retrieved (2020, February 7) from https://www.openaccessgovernment.org/africas-threatened-wildlife-species/59570/

Serajuddin, U., & Hamadeh, N. (2020, July 1). New World Bank classifications by income level: 2020-2021. *World Bank Blogs.* Retrieved (September 2020) from https://blogs.worldbank.org/opendata/new-world-bank-country-classifications-income-level-2020-2021

Shapwanale, N. (2018, July 30). Businessmen 'prey' on poor Namibians to poach rhino for international syndicates. *Namibian.* Retrieved (2020, February 9) from https://www.namibian.com.na/180000/archive-read/Businessmen-prey-on-poor-Namibians-to-poach-rhino-for-international-syndicates

Sirima, A. and Backman, K.F. (2013). Communities' displacement from national park and tourism development in the Usangu Plains, Tanzania. *Current Issues in Tourism, 16:* 719-735. DOI: 10.1080/13683500.2013.785484

Siurua, H. (2006). Nature above people: Rolston and "fortress" conservation in south. *Ethics and the Environment, 11*(1): 71-96.

Slocum, S. L., & Backman, K. F. (2011). Understanding government capacity in tourism development as a poverty alleviation tool: A case study of Tanzanian policy-makers. *Tourism Planning & Development, 8*(3): 281-296. DOI: 10.1080/21568316.2011.591157

Snyder, K. A., and Sulle, E. B. (2011). Tourism in Maasai communities: A chance to improve livelihoods? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 19*(8): 935-951.

Spenceley, A., Snyman, S., and Rylance, A. (2019). Revenue sharing from tourism in terrestrial African protected areas. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 27*(6): 720-734. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2017.1401632

Sulle, E. & Banka, H. (2017). Tourism taxation, politics and territorialisation in Tanzania's wildlife management. *Conservation and Society, 15*(4): 463-473.

Tanzania's most wanted elephant ivory trafficker sentences to 12 years in prison. (2017, March 3). *States News Service.* Retrieved (2018, November 25) from http://link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/A484233753/AONE?u=otta77973&sid=AONE&xid=48e0a7b

Tanzania Tourist Board. (n.d.). Wildlife Management Areas. Retrieved (2019, February 5) from https://www.tanzaniatourism.go.tz/places-to-go/category/wildlife-management-areas

The Citizen. (2020, September 24). High hopes in Tanzania's tourism after Covid-19. *The Citizen.* Retrieved (November 2020) from https://www.thecitizen.co.tz/news/-High-hopes-in-Tanzania-s-tourism-after-Covid-19/1840340-5626820-mt5c83z/index.html

TIES – The International Ecotourism Society. (2019). *Certificate in sustainable tourism management.* Ecotourism.org. Retrieved March 3, 2021 from https://ecotourism.org/certificate-in-sustainable-tourism-management/.

United Nations Development Program (UNDP). Inequalities in human development in the 21st century: Tanzania (United Republic of). Retrieved (September 2020) from http://hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr_theme/country-notes/TZA.pdf

United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) and Convention on Migratory Species (CMS). (2006). Wildlife watching and tourism: A study on the benefits and risks of a fast-growing tourism activity and its impacts on species. UNEP/CMS Secretariat. Bonn: Germany.

United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). (2014). *Towards measuring the economic value of wildlife watching tourism in Africa – briefing paper*. UNWTO. Madrid: Spain.

United Republic of Tanzania (URT). (1999a). The Tanzania Development Vision 2025. https://www.mof.go.tz/mofdocs/overarch/vision2025.htm

United Republic of Tanzania (URT). (1999b). *Village Land Act, 1999.* Dar es Salaam, TZ: Author.

United Republic of Tanzania (URT). (2001). *Rural Development Strategy, 2001.* Dar es Salaam, TZ: Author.

United Republic of Tanzania (URT). (2009). *The Wildlife Conservation Act, 2009.* Dar es Salaam, TZ: Author. http://extwprlegs1.fao.org/docs/pdf/tan97858.pdf

Vaccaro, I., Beltran, O., and Paquet, P. A. (2013). Political ecology and conservation policies: some theoretical genealogies. *Journal of Political Ecology, 20:* 255-272. DOI: 10.2458/v20i1.21748

Vergeer, W. (2016, July 13). Tourism tax brings chaos to Tanzania's safari industry. *HuffPost.* Retrieved (2020, January 20) from https://www.huffpost.com/entry/tourism-tax-brings-chaos-to-tanzanias-safari-industry_b_57860b4ae4b0b107a24013f3

Walker, P. A. (2005). Political ecology: Where is the ecology? *Progress in Human Geography, 29*(1): 73-82.

Willis, K. (2006). Interviewing. In V. Desai & R. Potter (Eds), *Doing development research* (p. 158-167). London, UK: Sage Publications.

World Bank. (2018, March 1). Growing wildlife-based tourism sustainably: A new report and Q&A. *The World Bank: Who We Are.* Retrieved (2018, November 21) from

https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2018/03/01/growing-wildlife-based-tourism-sustainably-a-new-report-and-qa

World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC). (2019, December 8). Global wildlife tourism generates five times more revenue than illegal wildlife trade annually. Retrieved (2020, January 26) from https://www.wttc.org/about/media-centre/press-releases/press-releases/2019/global-wildlife-tourism-generates-five-times-more-revenue-than-illegal-wildlife-trade-annually/

World Wildlife Fund (WWF). (2016, November 4). Tanzanian president leads crackdown on elephant poaching. *WWF – News.* Retrieved (2018, November 23) from http://wwf.panda.org/wwf_news/?283491/Tanzanian-president-leads-crackdown-on-elephant-poaching

Wright, V. C. (2016). Turbulent times: Fighting history today in Tanzania's trophy hunting spaces. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies, 34*(1): 40-60. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02589001.2016.1196325

Wynberg, R., and Hauck, M. (2014). People, power, and the coast: A conceptual framework for understanding and implementing benefit sharing. *Ecology and Society, 19*(1): 27. ttp://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-06250-190127

York, G. (2018, August 29). Southern Africa has too many elephants, lions. Is contraception the answer? *Globe and Mail.* Retrieved (2020, February 7) from https://www.theglobeandmail.com/world/article-southern-africa-has-too-many-elephants-and-lions-is-contraception-the/

Zamawe, F.C. (2015). The implications of using NVivo software in qualitative data analysis: Evidence-based reflections. *Malawi Medical Journal, 27*(1): 13-15).

Zoomers, A. (2010). Globalisation and the foreignization of space: Seven processes driving the current global land grab. *The Journal of Peasant Studies, 37*(2): 429-447. DOI: 10.1080/03066151003595325

ANNEXES

ANNEX A: NVivo Codebook

Name	Description	Files	References
Impacts on Country Development	Referencing a clear impact on national development in Tanzania.	64	197
Negative Impact	Referencing a distinctly negative impact on development.	29	62
Positive Impact	Referencing a distinctly positive impact on development.	32	51
Impacts on local people and communities	Referencing a clear impact on local people and communities or villages in Tanzania.	78	472
Negative Impact	Referencing a distinctly negative impact on local people and communities or villages in Tanzania.	60	253
Dispossession	Direct references to dispossession, appropriation and/or loss of access to natural resources.	25	65
Positive Impact	Referencing a distinctly positive impact on local people and communities or villages in Tanzania.	40	89
Impacts on Wildlife Conservation	Referencing a clear impact on wildlife conservation in Tanzania.	62	183
Negative Impact	Referencing a distinctly negative impact on wildlife conservation.	30	55
Positive Impact	Referencing a distinctly positive impact on wildlife conservation.	32	50
State Interventions	Existing codes that make direct reference to government interventions through regulations, policies, acts, etc.	23	64

ANNEX B: Coded Resources

Academic Articles and Book Chapters

Abukari, H., & Mwalyosi, R. B. (2020). Local communities' perceptions about the impact of protected areas on livelihoods and community development. *Global Ecology and Conservation, 22.*

Benjaminsen, A., and Bryceson, I. (2012). Conservation, green/blue grabbing and accumulation by dispossession in Tanzania. *The Journal of Peasant Studies, 39*(2): 335-355.

Bluwstein, J. (2017). Creating ecotourism territories: Environmentalities in Tanzania's community-based conservation. *Geoforum, 83:* 101-113.

Bluwstein, J., Lund, J. F., Askew, K., Stein, H., Noe, C., Odgaard, R., Maganga, F., Engström, L. (2018). Between dependence and deprivation: The interlocking nature of land alienation in Tanzania. *Agrarian Change:* 1-25. DOI: 10.1111/joac.12271

Caro, T., and Davenport, T. R. B. (2015). Wildlife and wildlife management in Tanzania. *Conservation Biology, 30*(4): 716-723. DOI: 10.1111/cobi.12658

Gardner, B. (2012). Tourism and the politics of the global land grab in Tanzania: Markets, appropriation and recognition. *The Journal of Peasant Studies, 39*(2): 377-402.

Gardner, B. (2017). Elite discourses of conservation in Tanzania. *Social Semiotics, 27*(3): 348-358. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10350330.2017.1301799

Goldman, M. (2003). Partitioned nature, privileged knowledge: Community-based conservation in Tanzania. *Development and Change, 34*(5): 833-862.

Goldman, M. (2011). Strangers in their own land: Maasai and wildlife conservation in northern Tanzania. *Conservation and Society, 9*(1): 65-79.

Goldman, M., Davis, A., and Little, J. (2016). Controlling land they call their own: Access and women's empowerment in northern Tanzania. *The Journal of Peasant Studies, 43*(4): 777-797.

Green, M. (2015). Making Africa middle class: From poverty reduction to the production of inequality in Tanzania. *Economic Anthropology, 2:* 295-309.

Hopcraft, J.G.C., Bigurube, G., Lembeli, J.D., Borner, M. (2015) Balancing conservation with national development: A socio-economic case study of the alternatives to the Serengeti road. *PLoS ONE 10*(7). doi:10.1371/journal. pone.0130577

Igoe, J. & Croucher, B. (2007). Conservation, commerce, and communities: The story of community-based wildlife managements areas in Tanzania's northern tourist circuit. *Conservation & Society, 5*(4): 534-561.

Keane, A., Lund, J. F., Bluwstein, J., Burgess, N. D., Nielsen, M. R., and Homewood, K. (2019). Impact of Tanzania's wildlife management areas on household wealth. *Nature Sustainability, 3:* 226-233. DOI: 10.1038/s41893-019-0458-0

Kideghesho, J. R. (July 2008). Who pays for wildlife conservation in Tanzania and who benefits? 12th Biennial Conference of the International Association of the Study of the Commons, University of Gloucestershire.

Kideghesho, J. R. (2010). 'Serengeti shall not die': Transforming an ambition into a reality. *Tropical Conservation Science, 3*(3): 228-248.

Kinyondo, A. & Pelizzo, R. (2015). Tourism, development, and inequality: The case of Tanzania. *Poverty and Public Policy, 7*(1): 64-79.

Kinyondo, A. & Pelizzo, R. (2018). Growth, employment, poverty and inequality in Tanzania. *Africology: The Journal of Pan African Studies, 11*(3): 164-181.

Kweka, J., Morrissey, O., & Blake, A. (2003). The economic potential of tourism in Tanzania. *Journal of International Development, 15:* 335-351.

Lee, D. E. (2018). Evaluating conservation effectiveness in a Tanzanian community wildlife management area. *The Journal of Wildlife Management, 82*(8): 1767-1774.

Lee, D. E., & Bond, M. L. (2018). Quantifying the ecological success of a community-bases wildlife conservation area in Tanzania. *Journal of Mammalogy, 99*(2): 459-464.

Maliti, E. (2019). Inequality in education and wealth in Tanzania: A 25-year perspective. *Social Indicators Research,* 145: 901-921. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-018-1838-y

Mariki, S. B., Svarstad, H., & Banjaminsen, T. A. (2015). Elephants over the cliff: Explaining wildlife killings in Tanzania. *Land Use Policy, 44,* 19-30. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2014.10.018 0264-8377/

Melubo, K. (2020). Why are wildlife on the Maasai doorsteps? Insights from the Maasai of Tanzania. *AlterNative, 16*(3): 180-192. https://doi.org/10.1177/11771801209

Melubo, K., Lovelock, B., & Filep, S. (2019). Motivations and barriers for corporate social responsibility engagement: Evidence from the Tanzanian tourism industry. *Tourism and Hospitality Research, 19*(3): 284-295.

Minwary, M. Y. (2009). *Politics of participatory wildlife management in Enduimet WMA, Tanzania.* [Master's thesis, Noragric, Norwegian University of Life Sciences (UMB). http://www.umb.no/noragric

Mitekaro, M. G., & Poche, M. (2017). Relationship between tourism and local community development in terms of health in Arusha region, Tanzania. *European Journal of Business and Management, 9*(3): 51-63.

Muganda, M., Sahli, M., and Smith, K. A. (2010). Tourism's contribution to poverty alleviation: A community perspective from Tanzania. *Development Southern Africa, 27*(5): 629-646. DOI: 10.1080/0376835X.2010.522826

Nelson, F. (2012). Natural conservationists? Evaluating the impact of pastoralist land use practices on Tanzania's wildlife economy. *Pastoralism: Research, Policy and Practice, 2*(15): 1-19.

Nelson, F. & Ole Makko, S. (2005). Communities, conservation, and conflicts in the Tanzanian Serengeti: Preserving rights to gain benefits. In B. Child, & M. W. Lyman (Eds.), *Natural resources as community assets: Lessons from two continents* (pp. 121-145). Sand County Foundation & Aspen Institute.

Pelizzo, R. and Kinyondo, A. (2018). *Making tourism work for Tanzania*. Beau Bassin: Mauritius: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.

Picard, C. (2015). Conserving Tanzania's wildlife: What is the policy problem? In S. G. Clark, A. M. Hohl, C. Picard, & E. Thomas (Eds.), *Large-scale conservation in the common interest* (pp. 139-158). Springer.

Sanga, S. A. (2019). Practitioners' Perspectives on Land Resource Conflicts and Resolution in Tanzania. *Journal of Rural and Community Development, 14*(2): 87-106.

Snyder, K. A., and Sulle, E. B. (2011). Tourism in Maasai communities: A chance to improve livelihoods? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 19*(8): 935-951.

Steyn, J. N. & Spencer, J. P. (2013). Are sustainable policies and strategies working in Tanzania? *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance (AJPHERD), 19*(2): 299-312.

Sulle, E. & Banka, H. (2017). Tourism taxation, politics and territorialisation in Tanzania's wildlife management. *Conservation and Society, 15*(4): 463-473.

Weldemichel, T. G. (2020). Othering pastoralists, state violence, and the remaking of boundaries in Tanzania's militarized wildlife conservation sector. *Antipode, 52*(3): 1496-1518.

Media and Online Resources (English)

Aljazeera. (2019, July 10). Elephant, rhino populations on the rise in Tanzania: Gov't. *Aljazeera.* Retrieved from https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2019/07/10/elephant-rhino-populations-on-the-rise-in-tanzania-govt/

Bluwstein, J., Lund, J. F., & Brehony, P. (2018, November 1). Why conservation success stories in Tanzania need a closer look. *The Conversation.* Retrieved (2018, November 1) from https://theconversation.com/amp/why-conservation-success-stories-in-tanzania-need-a-closer-look-104580?__twitter_impression=true

Economic Commission for Africa (2018, March 19). New report on Tanzania shows income inequality declining as rural-urban disparities remain. Retrieved (September 2020) from https://www.uneca.org/stories/new-report-tanzania-shows-income-inequality-declining-rural-urban-disparities-remain

Harvey, F. (2020, March 19). Win for conservation as African black rhino numbers rise. *The Guardian.* Retrieved (November 11, 2020) from

https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/mar/19/win-for-conservation-as-african-black-rhino-numbers-rise

Ihucha, A. (2018, October). Tanzania tour operators want new tourism policy. *Business Weekly.* Retrieved (February 2019) from https://www.busiweek.com/tanzania-tour-operators-want-new-tourism-policy/

International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED). (2013, March 21). Conference to reveal links between conservation and land grabs. *IIED.org.* Retrieved (March 2019) from https://www.iied.org/conference-reveal-links-between-conservation-land-grabs

International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA). (2018, May 22). Half a million of indigenous peoples' livelihoods threatened in Tanzania. *IWGIA.org.* Retrieved (November 2019) from https://www.iwgia.org/en/news/3252-indigenous-peoples-livelihood-threatened-tanzania

Kamati, D. (2016, July 19). Magufuli closes debate on tax. *The Citizen.* Retrieved (January 20, 2019) from https://www.thecitizen.co.tz/news/Magufuli-closes-debate-on-VAT/1840340-3300626-etv60az/index.html

Lee, D. E. (2018, August 10). Tanzania community wildlife management areas are successfully conserving wildlife. *Leonardo DiCaprio Foundation.* Retrieved (August 2020) from https://www.leonardodicaprio.org/tanzanian-community-wildlife-management-areas-are-successfully-conserving-wildlife/

Lee, D. E. (2018, March 1). Community-based wildlife conservation is bringing success to Tanzania. *The Conversation.* Retrieved (August 2020) from https://theconversation.com/community-based-wildlife-conservation-is-bringing-success-to-tanzania-92537

Makoye, K. (2018, November 12). Tanzanian farmers crack the code for fighting land grab. *OZY Media.* Retrieved (July 2019) from https://www.ozy.com/around-the-world/tanzanian-farmers-crack-the-code-for-fighting-land-grab/88561/

Mangat, R. (2017, October-December). Positive results in Tanzania's community wildlife management areas. *SWARA Magazine.* Retrieved (September 2020).

Masare, A. (2016, July 7). Fears of Tanzania tourism heading for gloom escalate. *The Citizen.* Retrieved (November 2018) from https://www.thecitizen.co.tz/magazine/Fears-of-Tanzania-tourism-heading-for-gloom-escalate/1840564-3283726-fmaou4z/index.html

Masare, A. (2018, May 22). This is why Bunge committee is skeptical on tourism VAT. *The Citizen.* Retrieved (November 2018) from https://www.thecitizen.co.tz/News/-Why-Bunge-committee-is-sceptical-on-tourism-VAT/1840340-4573912-m2n76a/index.html

McCann, N. (2017, October 10). Attacks on 'militarized' conservation are naïve (commentary). *Mongabay.* Retrieved (2018, March 8) from https://news.mongabay.com/2017/10/attacks-on-militarized-conservation-are-naive-commentary/

Nelson, F. (2020, January 20). African conservation entrepreneurs and business solutions to the biodiversity crisis. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Retrieved (September 2020) from https://ssir.org/articles/entry/african_conservation_entrepreneurs_and_business_solutions_to_the_biodiversity_crisis#

Nyakeke, B. & Mikofu, J. (2019, February 19). Tanzania to 9,000 families: We'll not evict you. *The Citizen*. Retrieved (June 2019) from https://www.thecitizen.co.tz/News/Tanzania-to-9-000-families--We-ll-not-evict-you/1840340-4988476-5sifkd/index.html

Oakland Institute. (2018, May 10). The true costs of safari tourism: Foreign companies devastate Tanzania's Maasai in the name of conservation. *Oakland Institute*. Retrieved (February 2019) from https://www.oaklandinstitute.org/safari-tourism-foreign-companies-devastate-tanzanias-maasai

Penn State. (2018, August 13). Community-based conservation management has positive effect on wildlife. *ScienceDaily*. Retrieved (February 2019) from https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/08/180813104234.htm

Penresa. (2019, June 18). Focus on Tanzania: Investing in the future: Tanzania's blueprint to become a middle income nation. *Forbes*. Retrieved (September 2020) from https://www.forbesafrica.com/brand-voice/2019/06/18/investing-in-the-future-tanzanias-blueprint-to-become-a-middle-income-nation/

Peralta, G. (2017, June 2). Tanzania's new VAT tax on tourism could potentially slowdown an otherwise thriving east African country. *Cornell – SC Johnson College of Business*. Retrieved (February 2019) from https://www.johnson.cornell.edu/article/emerging-markets-institute/research/emi-at-work/46943/tanzania-unleashes-tax-on-tourism/

Porokwa, E. (2020, May 11). Indigenous world 2020: Tanzania. *IWGIA*. Retrieved (August 2020) from https://iwgia.org/en/tanzania/3594-iw-2020-tanzania.html

Reuters Staff. (2019, April 5). Tanzania's tourism revenues jump 7 pct in 2018. *Reuters*. Retrieved from https://www.reuters.com/article/tanzania-tourism/tanzanias-tourism-revenues-jump-7-pct-in-2018-idUSL8N21N38Q

Roe, D., & Mayers, J. (2018, March 3). To save Africa's wildlife, conservation needs a radical shake-up. *International Institute for Environment and Development*. Retrieved (June 2019) from https://www.iied.org/save-africas-wildlife-conservation-needs-radical-shake

Sautner, S. (2019, November 12). Massive wildlife survey in Tanzania points to elephant recovery in key landscape. *WCS Newsroom*. Retrieved (September 2020) from https://newsroom.wcs.org/News-Releases/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/13470/Massive-Wildlife-Survey-in-Tanzania-Points-to-Elephant-Recovery-In-Key-Landscape.aspx

Sauwa, S. (2019, May). Gov't seeks parliament endorsement of Sh120 billion for natural resources and tourism ministry. *The Citizen*. Retrieved (July 2019) from https://www.thecitizen.co.tz/news/Gov-t-seeks-Parliament-endorsement-of-Sh120-billion/1840340-5128312-qa62orz/index.html

Sauwa, S. (2019, November). Tanzania signals continuity of development path in 2020-21 budget plan. *The Citizen.* Retrieved (February 2020) from https://www.thecitizen.co.tz/news/Tanzania-signals-continuity-of-development-path-in-2020-21-/1840340-5338296-format-xhtml-24ogcbz/index.html

Smeltz, M. (2019, April-June). Elephants of Tarangire: With incentives, a community in northern Tanzania turns the tide against poaching. *SWARA Magazine.* Retrieved (September 2020).

Tairo, A. (2019, August 10). Tanzania bans UAE firm form hunting for violations of rules. *The East African.* Retrieved (November 2019) from https://www.theeastafrican.co.ke/news/ea/Tanzania-bans-UAE-firm-from-hunting-for-violation-of-rules/4552908-5230844-nv6oaz/index.html

The Citizen Political Platform Reporter. (2016, June). Budget can't support industrialization. *The Citizen.* Retrieved (January 2019) from https://www.thecitizen.co.tz/news/1840340-3250498-oglcfaz/index.html

The Citizen OpEd. (2016, July 7). Heed stakeholders' views on decision to tax tourists. *The Citizen.* Retrieved (December 2018) from https://www.thecitizen.co.tz/oped/Heed-stakeholders--views-on-decision-to-tax-tourists/1840568-3283476-idqbbe/index.html

The Citizen. (2016, December). Time to pump more cash into tourism promotion. *The Citizen.* Retrieved (December 2018) from https://www.thecitizen.co.tz/oped/1840568-3494712-viv8bdz/index.html

Trompell, S. (2019, August 16). The conservation bias in Tanzania's wildlife management areas. *London School of Economics.* Retrieved (August, 2020) from https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/africaatlse/2019/08/16/conservation-bias-tanzania-wildlife-management-areas/

United Nations. (2019, May 6). UN report: Nature's dangerous decline 'unprecedented'; Species extinction rates 'accelerating'. *UN.org.* Retrieved (August 2020) from https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/blog/2019/05/nature-decline-unprecedented-report/

Yale Environment. (2018, May 11). Maasai herders lose land to tourism in Tanzania, says new report. *E360 Digest.* Retrieved (January 2019) from https://e360.yale.edu/digest/maasai-herders-lose-land-to-tourism-in-tanzania-says-new-report

Media and Online Resources (translated from Kiswahili)

FAO. (n.d.). Community wildlife parks (WMAs): Benefits, challenges, and steps. *FAO.org.* Retrieved (November 2020) from http://www.fao.org/3/i0821sw/i0821sw04.pdf

Habari Leo Writers. (2020, September 18). Stone roads improve life in Mwanza. *Habari Leo.* Retrieved (November 2020) from https://www.habarileo.co.tz/habari/2020-09-175f6366447c0aa.aspx

IPIS Research Institute. (2020, March). Summary on "business & human rights in Tanzania" – First quarter of the year: January – March 2020. *IPIS Research.* Retrieved (November 2020) from https://ipisresearch.be/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/2020-Q1-Briefing-Tanzania_Kiswahili.pdf

Lyatuu, L. (2020, October 30). Rice pudding and elephant prevention techniques. *Habari Leo.* Retrieved (November 2020) from https://www.habarileo.co.tz/habari/2020-10-295f9ae1001725b.aspx

Mbarali, J. N. (2020, October 9). New vegetation is now reintroducing wildlife to the Ihefu Valley. *Habari Leo.* Retrieved (November 2020) from https://www.habarileo.co.tz/habari/2020-10-085f7f081964826.aspx

Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. (n.d.). Government of Tanzania partners with private sectors to improve tourism infrastructure. *Maliasili.go.tz.* Retrieved (November 2020) from https://www.maliasili.go.tz/highlights/view/serikali-ya-tanzania-kushirikiana-na-sekta-binafsi-kuboresha-miundombi

Office of the Prime Minister. (2020, September 8). Tanzania: Sustainable development, tourism and youth employment. *Vatican News.* Retrieved (November 2020) from https://www.vaticannews.va/sw/world/news/2020-09/tanzania-maendeleo-endelevu-utalii-ajira-kwa-vijana-mkakati.html

Shelutete, P. (2020, July 31). New national park levies for the financial year 2020/2021. *Tanzania National Parks.* Retrieved (November 2020) from https://www.tanzaniaparks.go.tz/uploads/publications/en-1596110464-PRESS%20CONFERENCE.pdf

Utalii Tanzania. (2017, May 24). *Hotuba ya waziri wa maliasili na utalii mheshimiwa prof. Jumanne Maghembe – Makadirio ya mapato na matumizi ya fedha 2017/18*. Retrieved (November 2020) from https://web.facebook.com/notes/utalii_tanzania/hotuba-ya-waziri-wa-maliasili-na-utalii-mheshimiwa-prof-manne-maghembe-makadir/1451961011529336/

Policy Documents

Ministry of Community Development, Women Affairs and Children. (1996). *Community development policy.* Dar es Salaam, TZ: Author.

Ministry of Finance and Planning. (2016). *National five year development plan 2016/17 – 2020/2021*. Dar es Salaam, TZ: Author.

Ministry of Lands and Human Settlements Development. (1997). *National land policy*. Dar es Salaam, TZ: Author.

Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. (1999). *National tourism policy.* Dar es Salaam, TZ: Author.

Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. (2007). *The wildlife policy of Tanzania.* Dar es Salaam, TZ: Author.

Tanzania National Parks Policy Committee. (1994). *National Parks Policy.* Arusha, TZ: Tanzania Litho Limited.

United Republic of Tanzania (URT). (1999). The Tanzania Development Vision 2025. https://www.mof.go.tz/mofdocs/overarch/vision2025.htm

United Republic of Tanzania (URT). (1999). *Land Act, 1999.* Dar es Salaam, TZ: Author.

United Republic of Tanzania (URT). (1999). *Village Land Act, 1999.* Dar es Salaam, TZ: Author.

United Republic of Tanzania (URT). (2001). *Rural Development Strategy, 2001.* Dar es Salaam, TZ: Author.

United Republic of Tanzania (URT). (2008). *The Tourism Act, 2008.* Dar es Salaam, TZ: Author.

United Republic of Tanzania (URT). (2009). *The Wildlife Conservation Act, 2009.* Dar es Salaam, TZ: Author. http://extwprlegs1.fao.org/docs/pdf/tan97858.pdf

Reports

Homewood, K., Bluwstein, J., Lund, J.F., Keane, A., Nielsen, M.R., Msuha, M., Olila, J., and Burgess, N. (2015). The economic and social viability of Tanzanian Wildlife Management Areas. *Copenhagen Centre for Development Research,* (4).

International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs. (2016). *Tanzanian pastoralists threatened: Evictions, human rights and loss of livelihood*. https://www.iwgia.org/en/resources/publications/308-human-rights-reports/3206-tanzania-pastoralists-threatened-eviction-human-rights-violations-and-loss-of-livelihood-.html

IPBES. (2018). The IPBES regional assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services for Africa. Archer, E. Dziba, L., Mulongoy, K. J., Maoela, M. A., and Walters, M. (eds.). *Secretariat of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services,* Bonn, Germany.

McDowell, D. (Fall 2012). The impact of income generating programs at Tarangire National Park, Tanzania. *Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection*. Retrieved (November 2020) from https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=2424&context=isp_collection

RSM Eastern Africa. (n.d.). *Tanzania budget highlights 2019-2020*. Retrieved (November 2020) from https://www.rsm.global/kenya/sites/default/files/media/rsm_tanzania_budget_2019-20_newsletter.pdf

SNV Netherlands Development Organization. (October 2007). *Tourism and development: Agendas for Action.* Retrieved (November 2020) from http://www.bibalex.org/Search4Dev/files/284922/117217.pdf

Tourism Confederation of Tanzania. (June 2009). *Tanzania tourism value chain study: Final report.* http://www.best-dialogue.org/wp-content/uploads/TCT_BFR_Tanzania_Tourism_Value_chain_study_2011_06.pdf?eda283

Travers, R. (2014). *Business climate review: Sustainable tourism sector. United Republic of Tanzania*. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).

UNCTAD. (2015). Enhancing linkages between tourism and sustainable agriculture sectors in the United Republic of Tanzania. https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/ditcted2015d4_en.pdf

United Nations Development Program (UNDP). (2018). Tanzania human development report 2017: Social policy in the context of economic transformation.

UNDP. (2019). Inequalities in human development in the 21st century: Tanzania (United Republic of). Retrieved (September 2020) from http://hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr_theme/country-notes/TZA.pdf

ANNEX C: Matrix Coding

Impacts on Local People and Communities | Impacts on Country Development

	Impacts on Country Development	Positive Impact on Country Development	Negative Impact on Country Development
Impacts on Local People and Communities	96	12	28
Positive Impacts on Local People & Communities	19	7	1
Negative Impacts on Local People & Communities	41	2	26
Dispossession	5	1	1

Impacts on Local People and Communities | Impacts on Wildlife Conservation

	Impacts on Wildlife Conservation	Positive Impact on Wildlife Conservation	Negative Impact on Wildlife Conservation
Impacts on Local People and Communities	83	22	22
Positive Impacts on Local People & Communities	11	4	0
Negative Impacts on Local People & Communities	38	7	15
Dispossession	8	1	4

Impacts on Country Development | Impacts on Wildlife Conservation

	Impacts on Wildlife Conservation	Positive Impact on Wildlife Conservation	Negative Impact on Wildlife Conservation
Impacts on Country Development	24	8	4
Positive Impacts on Country Development	6	4	1
Negative Impacts on Country Development	6	2	3

ANNEX D: Research Respondents

Experience with/relation to the research	Respondent Number	Identification
Academic Research – University of Waterloo	Respondent one (R1)	Ryan Snider
Academic Research	Respondent two (R2)	Anonymous
Consultant with expertise in ethno-ecology	Respondent three (R3)	David Boerma
Advisor on indigenous rights	Respondent four (R4)	Anonymous
Indigenous rights advocate	Respondent five (R5)	Anonymous
Director & founder of safari tourism company – Deeper Africa	Respondent six (R6)	Karen Zulauf
Human rights lawyer	Respondent seven (R7)	Anonymous
Legal Officer - international human rights organization	Respondent eight (R8)	Anonymous