SHARING TOURISM BENEFITS WITH THE LOCAL COMMUNITY: A BUSINESS PERSPECTIVE FROM THE GRASSROOTS IN TANZANIA
MUGANDA, M., SIRIMA, A., MOSHY, B. and MKUMBO, P.

Abstract

Local communities' participation in tourism benefit-sharing is central to tourism development. While there is a well-established literature on benefit-sharing from the perspective of wildlife protected areas and adjacent local communities, there is little emphasis on how other tourism businesses do this. Using a case study of Barabarani village, Tanzania, this paper examines how other tourism businesses share benefits with the neighbouring communities. It explores this using: in-depth semi-structured interviews with tourism businesses, NGOs, and key decision-makers within the community; a two-month period of field observations coupled with the researcher's experience with the wider community; informal discussions with some members of the local community; and document analysis.

The findings show that tourism businesses in Barabarani village have schemes that favourably benefit local people, but the extent to which a particular business has developed its schemes differed from one business to another depending on the nature of business, ownership, and objectives. In some businesses such schemes were automatically created as a 'by-product' of particular decisions they make. Overall, public businesses had more systematic benefitsharing schemes than private businesses. Thus, there was no guarantee local communities would receive benefits from private businesses, and if any, they were executed on an ad hoc basis.

Key words: local communities, benefit-sharing, tourism businesses, local employment creation, capacity building, pro-poor tourism, sustainable tourism

Introduction

Over the last seven years, tourism in Tanzania has recorded significant growth potential, with the industry's contribution to the country's GDP growing at a steady rate (Mwandosya, 2007). Resulting from the joint efforts by the government and the private sector in promoting the tourism industry as one of the country's key drivers of economy and marketing the country as the quality nature destination, the industry's contribution to national output (GDP) has shown a steady increase from 7.5 percent in   industry today is the number one foreign exchange earner for Tanzania, overtaking agriculture (eTN, 2008; Tanzania Tourist Board, 2008). Much as these figures reveal the substantial position tourism already occupies and the encouraging high growth rates currently recorded in Tanzania, one of the countries that suffer from widespread poverty, the central question remains whether tourism's potential to contribute to poverty alleviation in these countries can be realized.

While the government of Tanzania views tourism as a significant industry in terms of poverty alleviation among other things (Mwandosya, 2007), there is paucity of hard evidence regarding tourism, development and poverty alleviation. Consequently, little is known about local communities' involvement into the sharing of tourism benefits, and yet little is known about the extent to which tourism has contributed towards improving local people's livelihood. This information is crucial, especially to tourism managers, planners, policy - and decision – makers, and other local destinations within the country and elsewhere, given that there is an increasing recognition that tourism is one of the best placed powerful tools for poverty alleviation in poor countries like Tanzania (Honeck, 2008; Wilkerson, 1996; Chok and Macbeth, 2007; Zhao and Ritchie, 2007; Scheyvens, 2007;

Department of Wildlife Management,
Sokoine University of Agriculture, P.O.Box 3073
Morogoro, Tanzania.
*Corresponding author's email: mugandamichael@yahoo.co.uk

Scheyvens, 2008). Using a community case study of Barabarani village, Mto wa Mbu, Arusha, Tanzania, this paper seeks to examine tourism businesses' roles and involvement in poverty alleviation. Specifically, the paper intends to explore the extent to which tourism businesses in Mto wa Mbu have developed benefit-sharing schemes that embrace the local communities.

There has been an increasing emphasis, among academicians, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and development agencies over the past two decades, to use opportunities presented by tourism to diversify livelihood options and alleviate poverty in poor countries (Nicolau, 2008). Such emphasis is based on the grounds that international tourism is significant to poor countries and 80% of the world's poor people (living on or under US$1 per day) live in 12 countries, and in 11 of those countries including Tanzania, tourism is significant and expanding (Spenceley, 2008; UNWTO, 2002). This is further reinforced by the belief that tourism stimulates a wide range of economic opportunities that impact on many sectors including transport, communications, infrastructure, education, security, healthy, immigration, customs and accommodation (Nicolau, 2008; Spenceley, 2008; Van der Merwe and Wocke, 2007). This implies that as a growth sector, international tourism has the potential to provide economic benefits through direct and indirect creation of demand of products and services in developing countries where large populations of poor people reside (Nicolau, 2008; Van der Merwe and Wocke, 2007).

One of the outcomes of this argument is the emergence of the term 'pro-poor tourism', first introduced in 1999 (Scheyvens, 2007), which aims to ensure that tourism growth contributes to poverty reduction by generating net benefits for the poor (Ashley *et al*, 2001).To make tourism pro-poor, much of the emphasis has been directed to tourists themselves, governments and tourism businesses on the grounds that these are well placed towards improving the livelihoods of local communities and lifting them out of poverty (Ashley and Haysom, 2005;Meyer,

2007; www.responsibletravel.org). In addition, the principles of responsible tourism have been outlined, which focus on how to develop and promote travel experiences that support the well-being of local communities (www.responsibletravel.org). They also demonstrate how effective partnerships can benefit the local community and sustainable tourism in destinations (Ashley and Haysom, 2005; Nicolau, 2008). Furthermore, a number of UN programmes, donor agencies, private sector associations and NGOs have developed initiatives such as Global Code of Ethics for Tourism or, more recently and interrelated, Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria, organized around the four pillars of sustainable tourism, to encourage sustainable tourism development (www.sustainabletourismcriteria.org).

Some researchers have also proposed and advocated some new ways of doing tourism businesses, with some 'poverty alleviation face' beyond traditional philanthropic donations, by putting in place operating framework for promoting and developing incentives for good practice among companies, consumers and communities (Spenceley, 2008; Ashley and Haysom, 2005; Meyer, 2007; Nicolau, 2008). Partnerships can be created by engaging local people in the normal business operations such as through procurement or sourcing of inputs, contract out services, providing information to guests, creating packages of local excursions, or developing new leisure facilities (Ashley and Haysom, 2005). These can be done in a way that contributes more towards poverty alleviation by improving the social, economic, or environmental benefits while maintaining commercial returns. But what remains unclear is whether the private sector is willing to get into partnerships with the local community so that such business opportunities can be a way through which local communities can lift out of pervasive poverty. This may arise because the private sector, whose focus is often on profit, may have little or no interest in ensuring that poverty is reduced among local communities (Blowfield and Murray, 2008; Jamieson *et al*, 2004; Luvanga and Shitundu, 2003; ODI, 2006).

The major motivation for the private sector to integrate local communities into business practice may be external benefits such as the reduction of costs, the increase of market access, greater security over raw materials, improved quality of supply, closer relationships with governments and branding benefits (Meyer, 2007). The other motivation comes from a sustainability point of view, through which a growing number of companies have expressed commitment to the wider community in recent years (Blowfield and Murray, 2008; Hawkins, 2006; Mowforth and Munt, 2009; Werther and Chandler, 2006). This commitment is rooted in the positive and negative impacts that businesses had on society. Concerns over how business companies distribute wealth created between shareholders, and how they were responsible for the negative impacts resulting in the course of doing their businesses raised public outcry and subsequently the need for intervention. In response, sustainability became central in international agenda, with a view to shape companies' business behaviour so as to also focus on the welfare of the environment and the wider society rather than solely on profit (Hawkins, 2006; Werther *et al*, 2006). Businesses were thus forced to adapt effective sustainability planning - the first pillar of sustainability, to enable them implement the three other pillars: maximizing social and economic benefits to the local community; reduction of negative impacts to cultural heritage; and reduction of negative impacts to environment heritage. These have been promoted in various interrelated forms of tourism programmes, activities and experiences under various names, often used interchangeably, such as social tourism, responsible, green or ethical tourism, ecotourism, pro-poor tourism, philanthropic tourism, corporate social responsibility (CSR).

It is, however, important to realize that while there is a well-established tourism literature on tourism benefit-sharing from the perspective of wildlife protected areas and adjacent local communities (see for example Archabald and Naughton-Treves, 2001; Makame and Boon, 2008; World Bank, 1997), little emphasis has so far been given as to how tourism benefits accrued from tourism businesses are being shared among local communities themselves. Furthermore, there is little or no empirical evidence so far within the general literature on tourism, development and poverty alleviation on how tourism businesses such as accommodation providers in the destinations share their tourism benefits with adjacent local communities. An exception is Meyer (2007) who devised a workable conceptual framework of linkages between the accommodation sector and the 'poor' neighbouring communities in developing countries.

Theoretically, poverty alleviation is one of the central outcomes if these pillars are integrated in tourism businesses. Indeed, the literature through this framework pinpoints that tourism has a significant contribution towards poverty alleviation among local communities, especially when sustainable tourism practices arising from the principles of sustainable development and responsible tourism are taken into account. One approach to capture such contribution is through examining the extent to which local people participate in the sharing of tourism benefits. This can be assessed by looking at three critical ways through which tourism operators (tourism businesses) can embrace the local communities. These are: local employment creation- providing job opportunities specifically for local people (Chok and Macbeth, 2007; Scheyvens, 2007; Zhao and Ritchie, 2007); capacity building for local people- empowering local people to access tourism benefits through the provision of work experience opportunities, training, advice, loans or aid to enable local people to work for tourism or invest in tourism as local entrepreneurs (Tosun, 2000; Zhao and Ritchie, 2007); and sharing the tourism profits with the local community- using part of the business income to support community initiatives, purchase locally, incorporate opportunities for tourists to support local businesses, events or organizations, sponsor local charities or community based organizations, sponsor local events or sporting teams (Ashley *et al*, 2001; Ashley and Roe, 2003; Ashley and Haysom, 2005; Meyer, 2007). An interesting question

remains whether tourism businesses in Tanzania have integrated these, and if so, to what extent these have contributed towards poverty alleviation.

Materials and Methods
Study Area
Barabarani is a village in Mto wa Mbu ward, Monduli District in Arusha region, Tanzania. Other villages in the ward include Migombani and Majengo. The ward, Mto wa Mbu - the *River of Mosquitoes* or *mosquito creek* in English, is a small most popular town found in the famous northern tourism circuit of Tanzania in which various tourism businesses take place. The area is situated in the Great East African Rift Valley escarpment at 3.35^0 South latitude, 35.85^0 East longitude and about 1171 metres altitude above the sea level (Brochure, 2000). It is the host town at an entry-point and close to the entrance gate to the Lake Manyara National Park, which contributes significantly to making this study area also popular for wildlife-based tourism (Norton, 1991). Arguably, its position within a short distance to the entrance to the Lake Manyara National Park tends to link it up with and make Mto wa Mbu easily connected to wildlife safari tourism activities (Van der Duim *et al*, 2006). It is conveniently located on the way to the two world-renowned tourism attractions: the Ngorongoro Crater and the great Serengeti National Park, which together make Mto wa Mbu an ideal rest place for most safari travelers.

Similar to Muganda *et al* (2010), the decision to undertake this study in Barabarani village, Mto wa Mbu was largely based on a combination of four major factors. First, the area's location supports tourism activities and it is found within the tourism nodes of the well-established and famous northern tourism circuit. Second, it is close to Lake Manyara National Park. This makes Barabarani one of the villages in which the park outreach programme, Community Conservation Service (CCS), operates.

The outreach seeks to involve the local community in tourism by sharing tourism benefits with them. The way tourism benefits are shared, was one component the wider study was trying to address (see Muganda, 2009). Third, the area's history behind its emergence and the available local ethnic communities support cultural tourism. Fourth, the background information about this area and the evidence that there are already some tourism activities going on in the area-Barabarani village, are clear enough to make this research useful in the area. For example, statistics from village office indicated that out of 28,000 people in Mto wa Mbu ward, Barabarani alone serves as home to more than 15,969 people (58 percent) in an area of 1544 hectares by the year 2007 while the other two villages, Majengo and Migombani, contribute about 19 and 23 percent respectively. At the time of this research Barabarani had eight sub-villages, namely Kisutu, Korea, National Housing, Magadini, Jangwani, Migungani A, Migungani B and Kigongoni.

Furthermore, the area has a number of on-going community-based tourism activities such as the Cultural Tourism Programme and various small-scale formal and informal local tourism groups. Also, it has a number of tourism establishments such as tourist hotels, lodges, and campsites whose staffs were needed to participate in this study. It is worth noting that many tourism activities in Mto wa Mbu ward are concentrated in Barabarani village. Field observations, for example, revealed that all 15 guest houses and all 8 campsites available in Mto wa Mbu ward, including many restaurants whose number was not easily identified, are located in Barabarani village. These factors together made the area suitable for this community case study, which sought to examine how tourism businesses in the area have involved local communities in their business.

Data Collection
Data for this study was collected in June – August 2008 through a multiple-method approach (in-depth semi-structured with key tourism stakeholders available in the study area, field observations, and document analysis). These techniques complemented each other and ensured comparison while enabling crosschecking of the findings from one technique with those of another. Implicitly, this approach helped to successfully

address the central study questions while increasing greatly the validity of data (Simmons, 1994).

A total of 28 in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted. Of those who were interviewed, 11 were village government officials, and 9 were tourism establishments' representatives, of which 8 were from tourist campsites and one was from a national park,

Lake Manyara National Park (LMNP). There was one interviewee from the only community-based tourism organization (Mto wa Mbu Cultural Tourism Programme) and another from the only NGO operating in the study area. The rest of the interviewees were leaders of the small-scale tourism business groups available in the study area (Table 1).

Table 1 Breakdown of interviewees

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

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

These people were chosen based on their ability to contribute to the overall research objectives mainly because of their extensive knowledge, experience, expertise, and involvement with the tourism sector in the study area, and were identified from the onset.

Semi-structured interviews were preferred because the approach allows greater standardization and control while enabling easy comparison of responses to a question (Burton and Cherry, 1970; Finn *et al*, 2000). In addition, despite having specific questions, semi-structured interviews allow more probing to seek clarification and elaboration of the participant's own ideas, aspirations, and feelings while generating detailed, 'rich' context, qualitative data (Long, 2007). This flexibility allowed an extension of the interviews into other issues that were not

originally included in the interview checklists, but nonetheless helped towards addressing the study research questions.

To minimize any language and translation problems, all interviews were conducted by the researcher himself in the same way as Tosun (2006) observed when studying the expected nature of community participation in tourism development in Hatay, Turkey. Those who participated in the interviews were encouraged to give expression to their views, thoughts and intentions. Interviews were guided by a set of two interview checklists: one for the tourism businesses and another for the government agencies and NGOs. The interview checklists were designed to provide a framework of gathering information from participants. Both checklists contained introductory questions that aimed to identify the background information of a particular government agency,

NGO, or a tourism business, followed by questions designed to identify and explore key topics and issues that were central to this study. All interviews were conducted in Swahili, the national language of Tanzania, which all interviewees were familiar with and in which the researcher is fluent. However, with the consent of interviewees all interviews were tape recorded and transcribed, and notes were taken. Each interview lasted between 45 minutes and one hour.

As mentioned, other sources of data included informal discussions with some ordinary members of the local community, a two-month period of field observations, and document analysis especially for programme reports, Tanzania government documents, Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA) publications and other relevant documents accessed from interviewees' offices. The researcher visited all the eight sub-villages in the study area, with the intention to physically see, among other things, various issues raised by the participants. Additionally, field observations provided the researcher with a better understanding of what happens in the study area in relation to tourism, a realistic situation, rather than just relying on reported information. While "the good researcher is all eyes", careful observation often aids in interpreting data (Veal, 1997).

Using interview checklists, tourism businesses were asked to provide information regarding three key areas (local employment creation, local capacity building, and profit sharing), identified in the literature as some of the indicators on how tourism businesses share benefits with the wider community. This sought to identify if a particular tourism business had any scheme related to any of the three areas. Ultimately, this aimed at establishing if tourism businesses in the study area had developed schemes for sharing benefits with the wider community.

In analysing the data, free responses (qualitative data) arising from open-ended questions that participants answered using their own words, were coded into a set of categories developed from identified commonalities. The approach focused on meaning drawn from the content of the data and considered in a particular context (Finn *et al*, 2000). Paraphrasing while remaining faithful to the original meaning as it was given by the participant and/or selecting illustrative quotes that have been applied in a particular context, were the two approaches used to display qualitative data collected by the in-depth interviews. It also important to note that all the qualitative data had to be translated from Swahili back to English. The interview results are integrated and compared with those from field observations, informal discussions and document analysis. This verifies and strengthens the interview results.

Results and Discussion

Overall, the extent to which a particular tourism business has developed its benefit sharing scheme, differed from one tourism business to another depending on the nature of business, ownership, and why the business was established. This implies that the level of the commitment of tourism businesses to creating local employment, building local capacity, and sharing their business profits with the local community is determined by those three areas discussed separately in subsequent sections.

Local employment creation

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

> *"We recruit our guides from this community. This is our tradition since this*

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

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

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

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

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

"We know villagers complain a lot that their children are not given priority for TANAPA jobs despite having these resources [national parks] in their area and contributing their efforts to conserve them [national parks]...We always

encourage them to apply just like any other Tanzanians. But you know, they want us to simply give their children employment even if they don't qualify...just on the grounds that they live close to national park. I always say no to this, and that would be unfair to be honest! ... So what about those who don't have national parks in their area? You mean they should not dream about being employed by TANAPA? That's tribalism straight away!"

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

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

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

However, even without local job creation schemes, it was realized that all the watchmen in these campsites were local people, mostly Maasai men. But it was established by the

interviewees that they were employed not because they are local people from the study area, but because they are traditionally suited to these jobs. This tallied with Ihucha's observation in his article in one of the national newspapers, the Sunday Observer (2007) about the watchman role and the Maasai. According to this article, there has been a massive migration of Maasai men to urban centres in recent years in Tanzania where many of them are employed as night watchmen, the role described to mostly suit them as they are said to be ferocious, honest and hardy. Interviewees said the lack of a scheme to employ local people in campsites was attributed to their being small-scale businesses which needed only a few employees. Each campsite employed less than 10 people. However, the fact that these are purely privately owned businesses could also be another reason.

Local capacity building

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

CTP Mto wa Mbu contributes to local capacity building in two ways. First, it recruits and trains its tour guides locally. It also offers free work experience, especially to youths who wish to develop their careers and capture tour guide job opportunities in various tour companies. During the data collection, there were four trainees (two males and two females) on their three-month training period. Second, the programme has women empowerment projects as one of its fundamental objectives to help find solutions to gender inequality within society. Field observations identified 36 women working as part of 4 groups from different families positioned in four different parts of the village to offer local cuisine to tourists visiting the

Mto wa Mbu community through CTP. Through its micro-finance programme, CTP has established other women entrepreneur groups (comprising 24 women) which make local products such as mats, lunch boxes and other souvenirs from local materials such as banana fibres and coconut leaves. CTP arranges to sell these products in tourist lodges and campsites in the village.

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

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

The park also encourages tourist hotels to buy the products from local people. Second, through CCS outreach, the park provides training to communities in order to build their capacity on various issues such as project management and accounting, and the use of appropriate technology. Document analysis revealed that in 2001 for example, the park introduced fuel efficient stoves in the study area and trained people how to use them. This project aimed to build people's capacity to contribute actively to the conservation of their natural heritage by reducing dependence on firewood, which threatens the survival of trees in the national parks and forestry reserves. It has also introduced tree planting projects to enable local people to earn substantial incomes while conserving the environment.

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

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

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

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

> "We are trying to build the capacity of local people in various areas that stop them progressing. There is this issue of HIV/AIDS, I'm sure you are quite aware of…. Worse enough, people don't have basic business education-so it's hard for them to do even those small businesses! They don't know even how to make the

> most out of the loans they get from the government, banks and other agencies. We see everything here, we talk to them, and it's really a big problem! So we are trying to build their capacity in these areas and many more…"

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

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

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

Sharing tourism profits with the local community

All the tourism businesses interviewed have schemes of sharing their profits with the local community, but have different approaches to the implementation of these. Interviewees' responses to this question referred to improved social services, particularly in various community development initiatives such as classrooms, teachers' houses, dispensary and water projects. The results show that CTP Mto wa Mbu and LMNP seemed to have a well established mechanism of sharing their profits with local people. For example, CTP each year set aside 11.5 percent of its revenue for the Village Development Fund (VDF), which is spent on various development activities across the four villages it operates. Document analysis revealed that in 2007 the programme spent approximately USD $8,000 on village development activities, including a

contribution to the construction of the Rift Valley Secondary School (in Migombani village); payment of school fees for orphan students at Moita secondary school (in Losirwa village); contribution to the construction of Migombani village office; and other projects. Local government officials acknowledged CTP's contribution, with one of them saying,

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

LMNP has a benefit-sharing mechanism similar to that of CTP in the sense that has a predefined proportion of the amount to share with the neighbouring communities. Currently each national park set aside 7.5 percent of its budget for Support for Community Initiated Projects (SCIP), a programme implemented by each national park under the Community Conservation Service (CCS). Through the SCIP programme, LMNP have managed to contribute to various community initiatives in many villages surrounding the national park. In the study area for example, LMNP contributed USD 28,600 for the construction of the fence around the Mto wa Mbu primary school in 2006. In 2007 the park contributed USD 3,400 for the construction of teachers' houses at Jangwani primary school and another USD 27,000 for the construction of four classrooms at Mto wa Mbu primary school. One government interviewee spoke favourably,

"Ohoo! These are just recent developments. One time, I can't exactly remember the year, they renovated our public health dispensary in Kigongoni and constructed teachers' house at Majengo primary school. …They also purchased a number of bicycles to enable village officials go around their area of jurisdiction. …They also constructed two

teachers' house at Migombani primary school, and two classrooms and teachers' office at Kigongoni primary school. All these are in Mto wa Mbu ward!" (Government 1)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusion

This paper has examined the extent to which tourism businesses in the study area embrace the local community in the sharing of tourism benefits. Three critical success areas (local employment creation, local capacity building, and sharing the tourism profits with the local community) have been discussed.

The results have revealed that tourism businesses apply various approaches that favour local people in the study area to benefit from tourism. Specific jobs opportunities for local people have been and continue to be created. In terms of local capacity building, there are various training programmes specifically for locals, and the provision of financial aid, loans and advice mostly to disadvantaged groups of the local community such as youths and women. To build win-win partnerships with the broader community, tourism operators often use part of their profits to support community development initiatives such as building classrooms, dispensaries, water projects etc in an attempt to improve social services and ensure mutual benefits to visitors who use such services (e.g water) on their visits and the local community. As noted throughout this paper, the idea of using part of the business income to support community initiatives is well reflected in the literature on tourism benefit-sharing as one of the approaches of sharing tourism benefits with the local community (Ashley *et al*, 2001; Ashley and Roe, 2003; Ashley and Haysom, 2005; Meyer, 2007). However, in the study area, the operators' level of commitment to fulfilling such approaches is determined by a number of factors such as the nature of the business, ownership and the reasons or objectives for starting such businesses. Understanding these issues is crucial for proper planning and managing of tourism development while ensuring mutual benefits to business operators, visitors and the local community.

All three approaches of sharing tourism benefits (local employment creation, local capacity building, and profit sharing) appear to occur even though tourism businesses have different approaches driven by their objectives. Some business operators have no benefit-sharing scheme, but sometimes such a scheme is automatically created as a by-product of particular decisions they make. Other businesses have deliberate benefit-sharing schemes. But all in all, public or community-based businesses have more systematic benefit-sharing schemes than private businesses. There was no guarantee the local community would receive benefits from private businesses, and if there were any benefit-sharing schemes, they were executed on an ad hoc basis. This could be because the objectives of public or community-based businesses often target to benefit the wider community while private businesses are normally motivated by the owners' mission or have no interest in ensuring that poverty is reduced among local communities (Blowfield and Murray, 2008; Jamieson *et al*, 2004; Luvanga and Shitundu, 2003; ODI, 2006). The area has one large scale public tourism business (LMNP) and one small scale community-based tourism business (CTP), but has many small scale private tourism businesses which, as mentioned, do not have systematic benefit-sharing schemes. This ultimately results in fewer opportunities for

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

References
Archabald, K. and Naughton-Treves, L. (2001). Tourism revenue-sharing around national parks in Western Uganda: early efforts to identify and reward local communities. *Environmental Conservation*, 28 (2) 135-149

Ashley, C. and Haysom, G. (2005). From philanthropy to a different way of doing business: strategies and challenges in integrating pro-poor approaches into tourism business, a paper submitted to ATLAS Africa Conference. On WWW at

http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/download/2922.pdf. Accessed 24 April 2009
Ashley, C. and Roe, D. (2003). Working with the private sector on pro-poor tourism: opinions and experience from two development practitioners. On WWW at http://www.propoortourism.org.uk/working%20with%20the%20industry_final.pdf. Accessed 24 April 2009
Ashley, C., D. Roe and H. Goodwin (2001). Pro-poor tourism strategies: making tourism work for the poor. A review of experience. Pro-poor tourism report No.1,ODI, Nottingham. On WWW at

http://www.propoortourism.org.uk/ppt_report.pdf. Accessed 17 April 2009
Blowfield, M. and Murray, A. (2008). Corporate responsibility: a critical introduction, Oxford, UK
Brochure (2000) Mto wa Mbu cultural tourism programme. On WWW at http://infojep.com/culturaltours/mto_wa_mbu_brochure.htm. Accessed 12. Accessed June 2007

Burton, T. L. and Cherry, E. G. (1970). Social research techniques for planners. George Allen and Unwin Ltd, London
Chok, S. and Macbeth, J. (2007). Tourism as a tool for poverty alleviation: a critical analysis of 'pro-poor tourism' and implications for sustainability. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10 (2&3) 144-164
eTN (2008). Tourism leads Tanzania's economy. On WWW at http://www.travelwirenews.com/editions/17APR2008.htm. Accessed 17 April 2008
Finn, M., M. Elliott-White and M. Walton (2000). Tourism & leisure research methods; data collection, analysis and interpretation, Harlow, Longman
Hawkins, D. (2006). Corporate social responsibility: balancing tomorrow's sustainability and today's profitability, Palgrave Macmillan, New York
Honeck, D. (2008).LDC poverty alleviation and the Doha development agenda: is tourism being neglected? World Trade Organization, Manuscript dated 12 August 2008
Ihucha, A. (2007). Watchman role and the Maasai. On WWW at http://www.ippmedia.com/ipp/observer. Accessed 18 September 2008
Jamieson, W., H. Goodwin and C. Edmunds (2004). Contribution of tourism to poverty alleviation: pro-poor tourism and the challenge of measuring impacts, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, UN ESCAP
Long, J. (2007). Researching leisure, sport and tourism: the essential guide, SAGE Publication Ltd, London
Makame, M. K. and Boon, E. K. (2008). Sustainable tourism and benefit-sharing in Zanzibar: the case of Kiwengwa-Pongwe Forest Reserve. *Journal of Human Ecology*, 24 (2) 93-109
Meyer, D. (2007). Pro-poor tourism: from leakages to linkages. a conceptual framework for creating linkages between the accommodation sector and 'poor' neighbouring communities. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10 (6) 558-583
Mowforth, M. and Munt, I. (2009). Tourism and sustainability: development, globalisation

and new tourism in the Third World, Routledge, London

Muganda, M., Sahli, M. and Smith, K. (2010). Tourism's contribution to poverty alleviation: a community perspective from Tanzania. *Development Southern Africa Journal, Vol.27, No.5, 629-646*

Mwandosya, M. J. (2007). Tourism, human welfare and climate concerns: the case of Tanzania, presented by Prof. Mark J. Mwandosya (MP), Minister of State, Vice President's Office (Environment), to the international conference on secure and sustainable living: social and economic benefit of weather, climate change and water services, Madrid, Spain, 20/3/2007

Nicolau, J. L. (2008). Corporate social responsibility: worth-creating activities. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35 (4) 990-1006

Norton, B. (1991). The African elephant: last days of Eden. On WWW at http://www.ntz.info/gen/n00419.html. Accessed 12 June 2007

Tanzania Tourist Board (2007). Tourism expected to blossom next year-tourism annual report. On WWW at http://www.tanzaniatouristboard.com/. Accessed 11 August 2007

Scheyvens, R. (2008). Tourism and poverty reduction: issues for Small Island States. *Tourism Geographies*, 10 (1) 22-41

Scheyvens, R. (2007). Exploring the tourism-poverty nexus. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10 (2&3) 231-254

Simmons, D. G. (1994). Community participation in tourism planning. *Tourism Management*, 15 (2) 98-108

Spenceley, A. (2008). Responsible tourism in Southern Africa. In A. Spenceley (ed) *Responsible tourism: critical issues for conservation and development*, Earthscan UK & USA

Tosun, C. (2006). Expected nature of community participation in tourism development. *Tourism Management*, 27 (3) 493-504

Tosun, C. (2000). Limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries. *Tourism Management*, vol. 21. 613-633

United Nations World Tourism Organization (UN-WTO) (2002). On WWW at http://www.world-tourism.org. Accessed 24 June 2008

United Republic of Tanzania (URT) (2007). Youth Development Policy 2007,Ministry of Labour, Youth Developmen and Sports, Dar es Salaam.

Van der Duim, R., P. Karin and A. John (2006). Cultural tourism in African communities: a comparison between cultural Manyattas in Kenya and the cultural tourism project in Tanzania. In M. K. Smith and M. Robson (eds) *Cultural tourism in a changing world: politics, participation and (re)presentation*, Cleveland-UK, Channel View Publications

Van der Merwe, M. and Wocke, A. (2007). An investigation into responsible tourism practices in the South African hotel industry. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 38 (2) 1-15

Veal, A. J. (1997). Research methods for leisure and tourism: a practical guide, 2nd edition, Pitman Publishing, UK.

Werther, W. B., Jr. and D. B. Chandler (2006). Strategic corporate social responsibility: stakeholders in a global environment, Sage publications, London

Wilkerson, M. L. (1996). Information for developers: developing a rural tourism plan. *Economic Development Review*, 14 (2) 79

World Bank (1997). Benefit sharing in protected area management : the case of Tarangire National Park, Tanzania. On WWW at http://www.worldbank.org/afr/findings/english/find88.htm. Accessed 27 August 2008

Zhao, W. and Ritchie J.R. (2007). Tourism and poverty alleviation: an integrative research framework. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10 (2&3) 119-143