

**Proceedings of the
7th International Conference on
Tourism Research**
Hosted by the Centre for Tourism
Research in Africa
at the The Cape Town Hotel School,
Cape Peninsula University of
Technology, South Africa
18-19 March 2024



**Prof. Rishi Balkaran and
Dr Chris Hattingh**

A conference managed by ACI, UK

aci

**Proceedings of the
7th International Conference on
Tourism Research
ICTR 2024**

Hosted By

**the Centre for Tourism Research in Africa
at the Cape Town Hotel School, Cape
Peninsula University of Technology
South Africa**

18-19 March 2024

Copyright the authors, 2024. All Rights Reserved.

No reproduction, copy or transmission may be made without written permission from the individual authors.

Review Process

Papers submitted to this conference have been double-blind peer reviewed before final acceptance to the conference. Initially, abstracts were reviewed for relevance and accessibility and successful authors were invited to submit full papers. Many thanks to the reviewers who helped ensure the quality of all the submissions.

Ethics and Publication Malpractice Policy

ACIL adheres to a strict ethics and publication malpractice policy for all publications – details of which can be found here:

<http://www.academic-conferences.org/policies/ethics-policy-for-publishing-in-the-conference-proceedings-of-academic-conferences-and-publishing-international-limited/>

Self-Archiving and Paper Repositories

We actively encourage authors of papers in ACIL conference proceedings and journals to upload their published papers to university repositories and research bodies such as ResearchGate and Academic.edu. Full reference to the original publication should be provided.

Conference Proceedings

The Conference Proceedings is a book published with an ISBN and ISSN. The proceedings have been submitted to a number of accreditation, citation and indexing bodies including Thomson ISI Web of Science and Elsevier Scopus.

Author affiliation details in these proceedings have been reproduced as supplied by the authors themselves.

The Electronic version of the Conference Proceedings is available to download from <https://papers.academic-conferences.org/>

The Conference Proceedings for this year and previous years can be purchased from <http://academic-bookshop.com>

E-Book ISBN: 978-1-914587-95-5

E-Book ISSN: 2516-3612

Print ISBN: 978-1-914587-94-8

Print ISSN: 2516-3604

Published by Academic Conferences International Limited

Reading, UK

+44 (0) 118 324 6938

www.academic-conferences.org

info@academic-conferences.org

Contents

<u>Preface</u>	vii
<u>Committee</u>	viii
<u>Biographies</u>	x
<u>Keynote Paper</u>	
<i>Bleisure Travel Reimagined: Implications for Research</i> Ikechukwu O. Ezeuduji	2-9
<u>Academic Papers</u>	
Indigenous Therapeutic Tourism: Challenges, Emerging Trends, and Sustainability Fernanda A. Ferreira, Márcio Abella , Flaviano Fônseca, Jorgenaldo Santos	11-18
<i>Human Resources Management and the Impact of the Restaurant Opening Hours: An Exploratory Study</i> Daniel Azevedo, Susana Silva	19-27
<i>Preparing for Pandemics: Reflecting on the Impact of Strategic Elements in the COVID-19 Influenced Online Travel Agencies' Marketing Mix</i> Rifa F. Darmawan, John Baker	28-36
<i>Paradisiacal Lived Experiences of Tourists in Islas de Gigantes</i> Don Anton Balida	37-46
<i>The Competitiveness of Tourist Destinations: A Review of the Scientific Literature</i> Franklin Cordova-Buiza, Yesenia Aylen Serruto-Perea	47-56
<i>The Implementation of the Circular Economy R-Principles and Strategies: The Portuguese Hotel Industry Perspective</i> Susana Rodrigues, Natália Santos, Berta Costa	57-66
<i>COVID-19 Disruptions Driving Sustainable Tourism: A Case of the Hawaiian Tourism Industry</i> Maryanne Eva, Mark Esposito	67-73
<i>Gender Perspectives on the Service Quality of Low-Cost Hotels</i> Precious Ezeh, Ikechukwu Ezeuduji	74-81
<i>An Importance–Performance Analysis Approach to a Tourism Destination: the Case of Lisbon Metropolitan Area, Portugal</i> João Ferreira do Rosário, Filipe Segurado Severino, Sandra Nunes, Zélia Raposo Santos, Teresa Costa, Maria de Lurdes Calisto	82-91
<i>Accessible and Inclusive Tourism: The Hotel Industry in Porto – The InterContinental Porto, Palácio das Cardosas</i> Ana Ferreira, Marta Villares	92-99

<i>A Western Cape Food Tour: Examining Indigenous Foods in Eateries Through the Lived Experience Model</i>	Hennie Fisher, Prof Gerrie Du Rand	100-111
<i>The Socio-Economic Impact of a Major Cultural Event in Cape Town During and Post-Pandemic Era</i>	Dr Janice Hemmonsbey , Elhaam Abrahams, Dr Hilary Bama, Dr Gift Muresherwa	112-121
<i>Wildlife Volunteer Tourism: Scientific and Educational Contributions in South Africa</i>	Uwe P Hermann, Charmaine D De Klerk	122-129
<i>Sustainability practices in the Hospitality Industry: Evidence from Chain Hotels in Kandy</i>	Janith Iddawala, Binuri Mehara Welengoda, Banudee Thisali Rathnayaka	130-139
<i>Regulatory Performance of Tourist Hunting and Legal Game Meat Trade in Tanzania</i>	Reuben M.J. Kadigi	140-148
<i>Nation-branding Opportunities Through Sport Mega-events: Tourism Impact from FIFA World Cup in South Africa 2010 and Qatar 2022</i>	Brendon Knott, Kamilla Swart, Othman Althawadi, Yara Zeyad Ali	149-156
<i>Film Tourism, Creative Process and Territorial Entrepreneurship</i>	Eunice Lopes, Jorge Simões, Eunice Duarte, Ana Pacheco, Rúben Loureiro	157-165
<i>Social Sustainability: The Challenges to the Restaurant Sector</i>	Beatriz Maia, Susana Silva, António Melo	166-172
<i>Cooking Up a Sustainable Future: insights of Circular Economy in the Restaurants</i>	António Melo, Beatriz Maia, Susana Silva, Goretti Silva, Daniel Azevedo, Henrique Camões, Carla Melo	173-179
<i>Covid-19 Impact on Future Study Choices: Will Students Consider a Tourism Qualification post the Pandemic?</i>	Washington Makuzva, Gift Muresherwa	180-187
<i>Developing and Managing Tourism in the Post Covid-19 Era: Perceptions from Hotel Industry Professionals in Cyprus</i>	Nikolaos Boukas, Stelios Marneros	188-196
<i>Ethical and Medical Dilemmas of Extreme Tourism</i>	Melvin Marsh	197-202
<i>Leveraging Major Sport Events' Success Towards Positioning Qatar as a Sport Tourism Destination</i>	Mohammed Yaqot, Brenno C. Menezes, Kamilla Swart	203-212
<i>The Limited Hospitality Career Knowledge of Learners In Township High Schools, Cape Town</i>	Celiwe Anathi Menze, Dr Nyathela-Sunday	213-221

<i>A Cybersecurity Collaborative Model: Best Practices Sharing Among South African Tourism and Hospitality Businesses</i>	
Tapiwa Gundu	222-231
<i>Unlocking the Potential of Hybrid Learning: Tourism Student Voices in South African Universities of Technology</i>	
Pavla Mokoena, Christiaan Hattingh	232-238
<i>The integration of Graduate Attributes within the Hospitality Management Curriculum at Higher Education Institutions</i>	
Ngizimisele Moshosho, Tshinakaho Nyathela-Sunday, Oswald Mhlanga	239-247
<i>Challenges and Opportunities Facing Ecotourism in Sub-Saharan Africa from Climate Change Desertification</i>	
Thomas Mullikin	248-254
<i>Sustainable Tourism Practices in the Post-Covid Era: Lessons from Southern Africa</i>	
Gift Muresherwa, Washington Makuzva, Cynthia Nokubonga Dube	255-262
<i>eSports Events, the good, the bad and the ugly, from a Parent's Perspective</i>	
Rosa Naudé-Potgieter, Nosiphiwo Mahlangu	263-269
<i>Experiential Marketing and Purchase Intention of Ecotourism Experiences: Z-Generation case</i>	
Sónia Nogueira, Marília Durão, Luís Pacheco, Makhabbat Ramazanova, João Carvalho	270-279
<i>Religious Pilgrimages in South Africa: A Catalyst for Sustainable Tourism and Local Economic Development</i>	
Linda Nompumelelo	280-287
<i>Women Tourism Entrepreneurs in KwaZulu – Natal, South Africa: Capabilities and Challenges?</i>	
Nompumelelo Nzama, Ikechukwu O. Ezeuduji	288-296
<i>The Disruption of the Pandemic in the use of Hospitality Establishments and Services in South Africa</i>	
Tshinakaho Nyathela-Sunday, Stanley Lekata, Hema Kesa, Mosa Selepe	297-305
<i>Improving environmental sustainability in Hospitality and Tourism: the key strategies</i>	
Mónica Oliveira, Susana Silva, Cândida Silva	306-313
<i>Entrepreneurship, Tourism, Local Fashion, and Curriculum Development: A South African study</i>	
Sweta Patnaik	314-321
<i>Tourism as a Catalyst for Supporting Sustainable SMME Development</i>	
Sweta Patnaik, Shamil Isaacs	322-330

<i>Applying the Jobs-to-be-done Framework to understand Hoteliers' Needs on Accommodation Platforms</i>	Lydia Christine Penkert, Marco Cobus Pretorius	331-339
<i>Voluntourism in the Context of Community-Based Tourism, and Regenerative Tourism: A Theoretical Exploration Focusing on Responsibility</i>	Rositsa Röntynen, Minna Tunkkari-Eskelinen	340-348
<i>Host Scaling and Revenue Management: Is there a link?</i>	Ruggero Sainaghi, Graziano Abrate	349-355
<i>Exploring word-of-mouth: The Impact of Social Interaction, Attitudes and Video Ad Design in Tourist Behaviour</i>	Sara Santos, Maria Vasconcelos, Sónia Ferreira, Luísa Augusto, Pedro Espírito Santo	356-363
<i>Tourism Destination Management and Public-Private Partnership Networks: a Literature Review</i>	Yesenia Aylen Serruto-Perea	364-371
<i>Impact of the Pandemic on Event Tourism: The Resilience of Japanese Pop Culture Events</i>	Filipe Segurado Severino, Francisco Silva	372-380
<i>Perceptions and Realities of Lisbon: An Examination of the Image of a Tourist Destination</i>	Filipe Segurado Severino, Ana Gláucia Roque, Margarida Cristina, Zélia Raposo Santos, Sandra Nunes, Teresa Costa	381-389
<i>Instagram as a Digital Marketing Tool of a Hotel Brand</i>	Cândida Silva, Susana Silva, Ana Rodrigues	390-400
<i>Tourists' Luxury Value and Sustainability Perceptions of South African Exotic Leather Products</i>	Nadine Sonnenberg, Marlien Labuschagne, Helena De Klerk	401-408
<i>The Impact of Covid-19 on Consumer Behavior in the Food VS Clothing Sectors</i>	Manuel Sousa Pereira, António Cardoso, Eduarda Graça, Ana Leal, Alvaro Cairrão	409-418
<i>Tourism and Hospitality Industry Employees' Experiences of Career Shocks and Career Resilience</i>	Anne Törn-Laapio, Marianne Ekonen, Pia Heilmann	419-425
<i>The Challenges of Tourism Sector Employees in Türkiye: Aegean Region Example</i>	Nuray Turan	427-432

PhD Papers

<i>Encouraging Intersectoral Collaboration to Promote Medical Tourism in South Africa</i>	Michaëlle Deonarain, Prof Renitha Rampersad	434-442
<i>Aspects of Ecosystem Approach in Governing a Tourism Destination</i>	Rositsa Röntynen	443-451

Masters paper

Indigenous Games as a Catalyst for Sport Tourism Development in South Africa
Abenathi Ivy Ntelezi, Hilary Kennedy Nji Bama, Gift Muresherwa 453-460

Work in Progress Papers

Bridging the Gap Between Legitimacy and Neutralisation Strategies in Sustainability Reporting
Eljas Johansson 462-464

Late Papers

e-Sports Events: A Sports Parent's Perspective
Nosiphiwo Mahlangu, Rosa Naudé-Potgieter 466-472

The Perceptions of Tourism Students Towards Blended Learning: A Case From a Comprehensive University in South Africa
Sibusiso Ntshangase, Nolwazi Mabaleka 473-480

Potentials of Rural Tourism Around Hluhluwe iMfolozi Park, South Africa: Local Community Perspective
Nelisile Mgabhi, Nomfundo Mzimela, Ikechukwu Ezeuduji 481-488

Tourism Entrepreneurial Education and Intention Among Youths: A Case from KwaZulu-Natal in South Africa
Zinhle Mhlongo , Sibusiso David Ntshangase , Ikechukwu Onyekwere Ezeuduji 489-496

Socio-demographic Variables and Push Travel Motivation: Tourists Visiting a Protected Area in South Africa
Nomfundo Sinethemba Mzimela, Sibusiso David Ntshangase, Ikechukwu Onyekwere Ezeuduji, Nelisile Zanele Mgabhi 497-504

Preface

These proceedings represent the work of contributors to the 7th International Conference on Tourism Research (ICTR 2024), hosted by the Centre for Tourism Research in Africa at the Cape Town Hotel School, Cape Peninsula University of Technology, South Africa on 18-19 March 2024. The Conference Chair is Prof Rishi Balkaran and the Programme Chair is Dr Chris Hattingh, both from Cape Peninsula University of Technology (CPUT), South Africa.

ICTR is a well-established event on the academic research calendar and now in its 7th year the key aim remains the opportunity for participants to share ideas and meet the people who hold them. The scope of papers will ensure an interesting two days. The subjects covered illustrate the wide range of topics that fall into this important and ever-growing area of research. Today, more than ever, there is a need for research and scientific guidance as the tourist sector struggles to cope with the consequences of the Covid-19 pandemic, inflation, socio-political turbulences, climate change and disaster risk.

The conference will open with a keynote presentation given by *Associate Professor Kamilla Swart*, Hamad Bin Khalifa University, Qatar on the topic of *The Future of the Olympic Games - When will it be Africa's turn?* Before the lunch break a second keynote presentation by *Associate Professor Kaitano Dube*, Vaal University of Technology, South Africa will take place. He will discuss the *Opportunities and Challenges of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Tourism and Hospitality Research*. The second day of the conference will open with an address by *Professor Ike Ezeuduji*, University of Zululand, South Africa who will talk about *Bleisure Travel Reimagined: Implications for Research*. Finally, there will be a fourth keynote address by *Professor Catheryn Khoo*, Torrens University, Australia who will talk about *Contested HISTORY: Representation in HERitage Tourism*.

With an initial submission of 120 abstracts, after the double blind, peer review process there are 52 Academic research papers, 2 PhD research papers, 1 Masters Research papers and 1 work-in-progress papers published in these Conference Proceedings. These papers represent research from Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Cyprus, Finland, India, Indonesia, Italy, Nigeria, Oman, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Türkiye, United States and Vietnam.

We hope you enjoy the conference.

Prof Rishi Balkaran and Dr Chris Hattingh
Cape Peninsula University of Technology
South Africa
March 2024

ICTR Conference Committee

Dr Sara Abdoh, Faculty of Applied Arts, Egypt; Mira Ahtila, Jyväskylä Educational Consortium, Jyväskylä, Finland; Dr Mohammad Alazaizeh, Zayed University, UAE; Prof Paulo Almeida, Leiria Polytechnic, Portugal; Assc Carmen Dolores Álvarez-Albelo, Institute of Social Sciences and Tourism, University of La Laguna, Spain; Dr Suzanne Amaro, Polytechnic Institute of Viseu, Portugal; Dr Maria Elena Aramendia-Muneta, Universidad Pública de Navarra, Spain; Prof Alina Badulescu, University of Oradea, Romania; Dr Hilary Kennedy Nji Bama, Cape Peninsula University of Technology, South Africa; Prof Neeta Baporikar, HP-GSB, Namibia University of Science and Technology, Namibia; Prof Dimitrios Belias, Department of Business Administration, University of Thessaly, Greece; Daniel Binder, FH JOANNEUM University of Applied Sciences, Graz, Austria; Prof José Luís Braga, Instituto de Estudos Superiores de Fafe, Portugal; Prof Zelia Breda, University of Aveiro, Portugal; Prof Acma Bulent, Anadolu University, Turkey; Dr Sancha Campanella, ISAL - Instituto Superior de Administração e Línguas, Portugal; Prof António Cardoso, University Fernando Pessoa, Portugal; Prof Luísa Cagica Carvalho, Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal, Portugal; Prof Conceição Castro, Polytechnic Institute of Porto, Portugal; Assc Petr Cech, University College of Business in Prague, Czech Republic; Prof Mohinder Chand, Kurukshetra University, India; Prof Ricardo Correia, Bragança Polytechnic Institute, Portugal; Prof Smaranda Adina Cosma, Babes-Bolyai University, Romania; Prof Teresa Costa, Business School, Polithenic Institute of Setúbal, Portugal; Prof Vânia Costa, Polytechnic Institute of Cávado and Ave, Portugal; Dr Muriel Crick, Mona School of Business & Management, University of the West Indies, Jamaica; Prof Carlos Rompante Cunha, Polytechnic Institute of Bragança, Portugal; Assc Turan Erman Erkan, Atilim University, Ankara, Turkey; Dr Luisa Errichiello, Italian National Research Council (CNR), Italy; Dr Rosse Esparza, USIL - Universidad San Ignacio de Loyola, Perú; Lyn Fawcett, Ulster Business School, UK; Prof Paula Odete Fernandes, Polytechnic Institute of Bragança & UNIAG, Portugal; Prof Gonçalo Fernandes, Polytechnic Institute of Guarda, Portugal; Dr Pedro Ferreira, University Portucalense, Portugal; Prof Fernanda A. Ferreira, School of Hospitality and Tourism of the Polytechnic Institute of Porto, Portugal; Prof Victor Figueira, Polytechnic Institute of Beja, Portugal; Assistant Professor Diogo Goes, Higher Institute of Administration and Languages (ISAL), Portugal; Dr Roberto Gómez-Calvet, Universidad Europea de Valencia, Spain; Prof Paulo Jorge Gonçalves, Polytechnic of Porto, ISCAP and CEOS Research Center, Portugal; Dr Aleksandra Grobelna, Gdynia Maritime Academy, Poland; Dr Christiaan Hattingh, Cape Peninsula University of Technology, South Africa; Prof. dr. Oliver Kesar, University of Zagreb, Faculty of Economics & Business, Department of Tourism, Croatia; Dr Mana Khoshkam, Islamic Azad University, West Tehran Branch, Iran; Prof Joanna Kizielewicz, Gdynia Maritime University, Poland; Prof Jesuk Ko, Universidad Mayor de San Andres (UMSA), Bolivia; Prof Mortaza kokabi, Shaheed Chamran Univ, Iran; Assc Aleksandra Kowalska, Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin, Poland; Kelly La Venture, Bemidji State University, Minnesota, USA; Dr Ramona-Diana Leon, Universitat Politècnica de Valencia, Spain; Dr Małgorzata Leśniak-Johann, Chair of Tourism and Leisure, University of Business in Wrocław, Poland; Prof Eunice Lopes, Polytechnic Institute of Tomar, Portugal; Prof Sofia Lopes, Polytechnic Institute of Leiria, Portugal; Prof Maria José Magalhães, Saint Michael's College, USA; Prof Rekha Maitra, DAV Centenary College, India; Dr Arkadiusz Malkowski, West Pomeranian University

of Technology in Szczecin, Poland; Prof Carlos Peixeira Marques, University of Trás-os-Montes and Alto Douro, Portugal; Jorge Marques, Universidade Portucalense (UPT), Portugal; Dr Jose Alberto Martinez-Gonzalez, Universidad de al Laguna, Spain; Dr Jones Mathew, Great Lakes Institute of Management, Gurgaon, India; Prof Fátima Matos da Silva, Universidade Portucalense (UPT), Portugal; Dr Andrei Maxim, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iasi, Romania; Assc Ludmila Mládková, University of Economics Prague, Czech Republic; Dr Christopher Moon, Middlesex University, UK; Prof Luís Mota Figueira, Polytechnic Institut of Tomar , Portugal; Prof Dr Pedro Mucharreira, ISCE - Instituto Superior de Ciências Educativas/UIDEF, Instituto de Educação, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal; Prof Catarina Nadais, CEGOT, Portugal; Assc Sónia P. Nogueira, Polytechnic Institute of Bragança, Portugal; Cristiana Oliveira, Universidad Europea de Canarias, Spain; Assc Verónica Oliveira, IPleiria, Portugal; Prof Elisabeth T. Pereira, DEGEIT & GOVCOPP, UNiversity of Aveiro, Portugal; Prof Raquel Pereira, ISCAP, Portugal; Prof Rita Peres, Estoril Higher Institute for Tourism and Hotel Studies, Portugal; Dr Marta Pérez-Pérez, University of Cantabria, Spain; Dr Birgit Phillips, University of Graz, Austria; Prof Nazanin Pilevari, islamic azad university, Iran; Prof Ana Pinto Borges, ISAG - European Business School and Research Center in Business Sciences and Tourism (CICET), Portugal; Prof Ana Pires, Polytechnic Institute of Leiria, Portugal; Dr Paula Rama-da-Silva, CEAL/ESHTE, Portugal; Dr Makhabbat Ramazanova, Universidade Portucalense (UPT), Portugal; Prof Maria José Rios de Magalhaes, Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Portugal; Prof Ana Isabel Rodrigues, Polytechnic Institute of Beja, Portugal; Dr Susana Rodrigues, Polytechnic Institute of Leiria, Portugal; Dr Jakson Renner Rodrigues-Soares, Universidade da Coruña, Spain; Dr Ángel Rodríguez-Pallas, University of A Coruña, Spain; Prof Rossana Santos, University of Madeira, Portugal; Prof Taina Savolainen, Business School, University of Eastern Finland, Joensuu, Finland; Dr Ousanee Sawagvudcharee, Centre for the Creation of Coehrent Change and Knowledge, Thailand; Prof Cândida Silva, Polytechnic Institute of Porto - School of Hospitality and Tourism, Portugal; Prof Susana Silva, School of Hospitality and Tourism, Institute Polytechnic of Porto, Portugal; Dr Ardhendu Shekhar Singh, Symbiosis International University, Pune, India; Cristina Sousa, ISCTE, Lisbon, Portugal; Prof Manuel Sousa Pereira, Instituto Politécnico de Viana do Castelo, Portugal; Dr Riccardo Spinelli, Department of Economics and Business Studies, University of Genoa, Italy; Dr Nornazira Suhairom, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia; Prof Vera Teixeira Vale, Aveiro University, Portugal; Anne Törn-Laapio, JAMK University of Applied Sciences, Jyväskylä, Finland; Minna Tunkkari-Eskelinen, JAMK University of Applied Sciences, Jyväskylä, Finland; Dr Desislava Varadzhakova, National Institute of Geophysics, Geodesy and Geography at Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Bulgaria; Dr Isabel Vaz de Freitas, Universidade Portucalense (UPT), Portugal.

Regulatory Performance of Tourist Hunting and Legal Game Meat Trade in Tanzania

Reuben M.J. Kadigi

Department of Trade and Investment, Sokoine University of Agriculture, Morogoro, Tanzania.

rmjkadigi@sua.ac.tz

Abstract: Recently, the government of Tanzania has legalized the sale of game meat under special rules namely the Wildlife Conservation (Game Meat Selling) Regulations of 2020 as an effort to curb illegal hunting. The regulations mention tourist hunting as one of the sources of commercial game meat. Other sources include resident hunting; wildlife farms/ranches/zoos; and culling, cropping, and control of problem animals. In this paper we examine the performance of tourist hunting, legal game meat in the country, and its regulatory framework from the perspectives of key stakeholders, including both public and private or non-state stakeholders. We use a variant of Likert's methods of summated ratings and the cumulative ordinal regression model to analyse and compare the opinions of stakeholders. We found that there are still challenges, especially related to sources of wild animals. Operators of game meat facilities find it difficult to source game meat from tourist hunting companies and the latter are not willing to offer the meat to licensed operators of game meat shops. Our results support the hypothesis that authorization of the game meat trade can serve as one of the boldest conservation tools to mitigate illegal poaching if well-planned and regulated. The results of the cumulative ordinal regression model predict an improvement of 42% in the performance of regulatory framework per unit improvement in the procedures for application and registration of game meat selling facilities ($p = 0.010$). The paper recommends leveraging stakeholders' active engagement and strengthening cooperation between game meat value chain actors and law-enforcement authorities. An innovative participatory model for enforcing game meat sanitary and safety regulations is also recommended to avoid potential health risks to consumers. It underscores the importance of institutional capacity building, awareness creation, and adequate funding in the fight against illegal hunting and game meat trade. In order for the country to be able to achieve sustainable game meat trade in the country, the challenge of limited wild animal sources has to be addressed, possibly by supporting the establishment of privately owned wild animal farms, ranches, and zoos, this also has its own challenges that need to be addressed too.

Keywords: Tourist hunting, Game meat trade, Regulatory framework, Poaching, Hunting legislations

1. Introduction

Many countries that are endowed with wildlife are struggling to combat the problem of poaching. Still, the demand for wildlife products and the use of sophisticated poaching methods continue to threaten the security, economy, and biodiversity in these countries (USAID, 2023). In fact, poaching and selling of illegal wildlife products not only targets local demands but transcends regional boundaries to meet demands in other countries and continents (Chaber et al., 2010). This makes the problem of poaching even more complex, especially in countries where the tourism industry depends heavily on wildlife and protected areas. In East Africa, for example, the available information indicates that before the COVID-19 pandemic, the tourist industry brought over \$6 billion to the region each year (USAID, 2023). This has attracted many governments to review their wildlife policies and regulatory framework to address the problem of wildlife poaching. This has generally taken two main pathways. The first requires the adoption of more stringent regulations, including the imposition of bans and moratoria in wildlife trade. The second advocates the use of market-based instruments, such as the authorization of trade in game meat, to mitigate poaching and achieve efficiency and equity in the utilisation and management of wildlife resources.

The role of market-based instruments in achieving efficiency and equity in managing natural resources is widely discussed in the literature (see Kaine et al., 2017 for details). Most important in the context of game meat trade is perhaps the argument that command and control approaches, such as; the banning of game meat trade in this case, can also be problematic and can produce adverse conservation outcomes (Biggs et al., 2013). It can discourage sustainable harvesting, and it can also exacerbate poaching or lead to food insecurities and economic shocks (Booth et al., 2021). As such, some countries, notably Tanzania and many scholars have subscribed to the authorisation of game meat trade as a means to mitigate poaching and help redistribute the benefits accruing from wildlife management (Fukushima et al., 2021; Koh et al., 2021; Chaves et al., 2018). Some scholars have even gone further and argued that when hunting is banned; poaching drastically increases (Naidoo et al., 2016).

Despite significant research on poaching and sale of illegal wildlife products undertaken so far, empirical evidence to support the use of market-based instruments to control poaching is lacking, at least in the context

of the game meat trade. This research gap limits our understanding of how tourist hunting, combined together with the authorisation of game meat trade can optimise wildlife conservation efforts. Therefore, this paper attempts to fill this gap by examining the performance of the recently instituted game meat regulatory framework in Tanzania using the opinions gathered from different stakeholders, including both public and private or non-state stakeholders. The paper is motivated by the fact that of recent, the regulatory framework that governs wildlife conservation in the country has substantially changed from being more restrictive and exclusive in the early 1960s through the mid-1970s to being less restraining and increasingly welcoming private participation and community-based initiatives in the late 1970s to early 2020s. Substantial reforms have occurred in early 2020 when the establishment of game meat selling facilities and the sale of game meat was officially authorised by the government under special rules stipulated in the Wildlife Conservation (Game Meat Selling) Regulations 2020 (URT, 2020). This came as part of an effort to combat poaching.

This research was deemed important because the prevalence of poaching and illicit game meat trade is a problem of growing concern among conservation agencies in many countries. Despite the effort to curb it through market-based regulatory approaches, there are indications that many challenges still remain. Thus, the problem this paper addresses is the lack of a thorough understanding of the nature of the problem and the very factors that influence the performance of the new market-based wildlife regulatory frameworks. We understand the veracity that having legislation in place is one thing but guaranteeing its performance can be something else. Thus, the overall objective of the study was to investigate the question of whether the new game meat legislation in Tanzania has worked as expected. The specific objectives were to evaluate whether a) the new legislation has reduced poaching or not, b) the hunting of wild animals for game meat in areas designated for hunting continued as expected or not, c) the operationalization of game meat butchereries continued well or not, and d) the actors in the game meat value chain complied with the conditions and requirement specified in the new regulatory framework or not. State differently, the author wanted to investigate what has worked and what has not worked during the initial implementation of the new legal framework for the game meat trade in the country. The lessons generated from this study are useful in informing future policy and regulatory reforms not only in Tanzania but also in other countries with similar contexts and challenges.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Legal Game Meat Trade or Bans?

Overall, the literature on wildlife utilization and management is quite polarized, especially regarding the debate on whether imposing stringent controls and regulations against illegal hunting and bushmeat trade would be a better approach to control poaching or not. On the one hand, there are viewpoints that wildlife management authorities should impose strict bans and moratoria for several reasons. First, poaching leads to the overexploitation of some wild animal species and drastically affects ecosystem health, diversity, and stability. Secondly, poaching and bushmeat trade can quickly spread diseases and pathogens and cause serious health issues (He and Li, 2021; Subramanian, 2012). Examples of health-related issues include incidences of swine fever, as well as HIV transmitted to humans through hunting and slaughtering of bushmeat. According to Worobey (2021), COVID-19, caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus, is believed to have originated from (potentially illegal) wildlife trade. Thirdly, poaching also directly affects tourism, making the bushmeat trade a financial threat to many protected areas, especially national parks (OCTA, 2011). Governments may lose revenues due to illegal wildlife trade, hence burdening the socio-economic development of a country because the loss from taxes cannot be invested in public services (ibid).

On the other hand, there are viewpoints that regulations and bans are not only insufficient, but they are also problematic (Koh et al., 2021; Veríssimo and Wan, 2019). They are expensive to impose and enforce, and thus, ensuring the quality of these instruments is challenging. Many scholars have already acknowledged that achieving regulatory quality is becoming difficult and one of the major obstacles to sustainable management and utilization of wildlife resources (Coad et al., 2021; Ingram et al., 2021; Fukushima et al., 2021). This latter viewpoint believes that poaching can be controlled through market mechanisms such as the commodification of game meat trade in Namibia (MITSMED, 2019) and Tanzania (URT, 2020).

2.2 Legal Game Meat Trade in Tanzania

As already mentioned, the year 2020 has realized substantial wildlife management reforms in Tanzania notably the establishment of game meat selling facilities and the sale of game meat. This was officially allowed by the

government under special rules stipulated in the Wildlife Conservation (Game Meat Selling) Regulations 2020 as part of the effort to curb poaching (URT, 2020). By this new legislation, the Minister of Natural Resources and Tourism in Tanzania is given the mandate to designate certain areas in the country or vehicles to be used as game meat selling facilities (URT, 2020). In addition, the Tanzania Wildlife Management Authority (TAWA) is mandated to provide support to help people begin their private wild animal farms, zoos, and ranches. TAWA for example is required to supply these people with heifers and young animals so that they can later harvest wild animals for commercial purposes (URT, 2020).

3. Research Approach and Methodology

3.1 Sampling Procedure and Data Collection

This paper is based on a game meat survey that was conducted in early to mid-2022 to evaluate the opinions of key stakeholders regarding the new regulatory framework for the game meat trade in the country and its performance. Depending on the characteristics of the actor populations, both the “probability” and “non-probability” sampling methods were used to select the respondents. Specifically, purposive sampling” and snowball sampling were used as “non-probability” sampling methods. Few participants were initially selected, keeping in mind the purpose of our study (Glen, 2015). Purposive sampling was preferred because it is somewhat less costly, more readily accessible, and more convenient, and selects only those relevant to the research design (Cambell et al., 2020). The study districts were selected using the purposive sampling procedure based on a criterion of whether wild animal hunting and selling of game meat were practiced in the districts. This was followed by a “stratified random sampling” to classify or separate stakeholders into strata as summarized in Figure 1. The representatives of animal hunters, owners of game meat butcherries, wild animal farms, zoos, and ranches, as well as, the sellers of game meat were randomly selected from the registers of key actors and members of the Tanzania Wildlife Farmers and Game Meat Suppliers Association (TAWIFAGAMSA) which were obtained from the leaders of the Association and the District Game Offices; and from the registers of customers kept by operators of game meat selling facilities or game meat shops, respectively. Our sample also included the representatives of communities residing close to hunting areas or blocks. These representatives were selected from the village registers using the systematic random sampling method. In total, 145 stakeholders from 40 districts within 17 regions in Tanzania were selected and interviewed using a semi-structured questionnaire.




Figure 1: Sample size and proportions of interviewees by stakeholder categories

3.2 Data Analysis

The analysis of stakeholders’ perceptions used a standard scaling technique notably the variant of summative construction of the Likert scale (Likert, 1932) dubbed by Krosnick et al. (2005) as the “Likert’s method of summated ratings.” The technique uses a standard scaling procedure or method that attributes numerical values to responses (Clason and Dormody, 1994). Individual statements about game meat trade in Tanzania were extracted from the recent Wildlife Conservation (Game Meat Selling) Regulations 2020 (URT, 2020). These were grouped into the following three sets of statements or indicators:

- a. The performance of regulatory framework governing game meat trade in the country (PERFORM);
- b. The appropriateness of procedures for application and registration of game meat selling facilities (PARGMF); and
- c. The appropriateness of the management and operation of game meat selling facilities as well as the fairness of offenses and penalties for the person to whom the certificate is issued when convicted of an offense under the Act or contravenes any of the terms or conditions under which the certificate was issued (MOGMSOP) - as required by Regulation 13(1) of the Wildlife Conservation (Game Meat Selling) Regulations (URT, 2020).

Specifically, the interviewees were asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with each of the individual statements in the three sets provided and indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed (Table 1). A five-point Likert scale was used based on the following response alternatives: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), undecided (3), agree (4), and strongly agree (5). In addition, a “cumulative ordinal model”, sometimes dubbed the “graded response model” (Samejima, 1997), was used to assess the determinant of the performance of the regulatory framework governing game meat trade in the country using the three sets of individual statements or indicators (PERFORM, PARGMF, and MOGMSOP).

Table 1: The variables and indicators used in the perception survey

Variables	Code	Statement
PERFORM	QN-B1-1	Authorisation of the sale of game meat has reduced poaching and encroachment in wildlife-protected areas.
	QN-B1-2	Allowing individuals to own wildlife farms will not decrease the demand for beef, goat, and sheep meat.
	QN-B1-3	The operationalization of game meat butcheries has continued well.
	QN-B1-4	The hunting of wild animals for game meat has continued as expected.
	QN-B1-5	The number of customers of raw and grilled game meat has increased.
	QN-B1-6	Registered places for slaughtering wild animals and selling game meat were regularly inspected.
	QN-B1-7	Operators who did not have certificates of ivory possession surrendered it.
	QN-B1-8	Operators slaughtered animals in approved slaughterhouses/slabs.
PARGMF	QN-B2-1	Procedures for application and registration of game meat selling facilities were appropriate.
	QN-B2-2	Qualifications required for registration of facilities were appropriate.
	QN-B2-3	Duration for making decisions on the applications was appropriate.
	QN-B2-4	The conditions for operating game meat facilities are appropriate.
MOGMSOP	QN-B2-5	Condition to apply for trophy dealer's license is appropriate.
	QN-B2-6	Legislation for revoking, cancelling, or suspending certificate of legislation is appropriate.
	QN-B2-7	Implementation of the M&E system of game meat selling facilities was appropriate.
	QN-B2-8	Penalty for contraveners of provisions of these Regulations was appropriate

4. Study Findings

The study findings suggested that legal hunting and sale of game meat could be one of the strongest conservation approaches to mitigate poaching and bushmeat trade in the country. Many of the respondents (Appendices 1 to 3) felt that the authorization of the game meat trade has helped reduce poaching and encroachment in protected areas and that, the customers of raw and grilled game meat were increasing day by day. However, it should be noted that the authorization of the game meat trade has also not completely solved the problem of poaching in Tanzania. The problem still persists. As Twining-Ward and Chapman, (2020) argue "controlling poaching and game meat trade is immensely challenging..." It is argued further that the extent to which a legally controlled game meat trade can contribute to reducing poaching will depend on the complexity of the limiting factors, including the capacity to supply sustainably harvested wild animals and domesticated wild animals (UNEP, 2017). It will also depend on the level of law enforcement efforts and the ability to create awareness among value chain actors (Subramanian, 2012).

In Tanzania, the Government Notes (GN) 84 of the Wildlife Conservation Act (CAP. 283), published on 7th February 2020, recognizes four sources of game meat: resident hunting, tourist hunting, wildlife farms/ranches/zoos, as well as, culling/cropping, and control of problem animals (Regulation 4, 2020). However, one of the key issues that have emerged from the survey is the inadequate supply of wild animals for butchering. Many stakeholders perceived that the resident hunting blocks allocated for commercial game meat supply were having fewer animals than the ones allocated to tourist hunting. It should be noted here that the government diversified the modalities of allocating hunting blocks since October 2017 by adopting an electronic (e)-auction system (TAWA, 2018). This was partly due to the general perspective about e-auctions that they are not only enhancing good governance but also optimizing the socio-economic potential of the country's hunting industry, and responding to market forces in a more transparent manner (TAWA, 2018). As such, e-auctions are becoming very popular across the world and are considered more transparent than the conventional approaches because of the advantages they offer, especially that of allowing global participation or attracting a large audience from around the globe (Medius, 2019).

However, e-auctions have their own drawbacks too (Barnier and Velasquez, 2022). Under imperfect market conditions, competitive advantage may tend to shift to those who have a relative advantage, in terms of their capacity to bid (Barnier and Velasquez, 2022). Thus, monopolistic or oligopolistic behaviour is likely to occur, and barriers to entry can be high as weaker players are driven out of the bid (Barnier and Velasquez, 2022). The informal discussions with resident hunters in the study districts indicated that there were already concerns amongst the stakeholders regarding equity issues due to the inability of local outfitters and hunting companies to compete with foreign bidders. The award of e-auction is based solely on the ranking of bids, such that the hunting block is allocated to the highest bidder (TAWA, 2018). The highest bidder is then billed and required to pay 25% of his/her bid price within twelve working hours following the conclusion of the auction (TAWA, 2018). The remaining money (75%) had to be paid within fourteen days from the date of auction closure and failure would lead to the cancellation of the offer and a penalty of 25% of the fee paid (TAWA, 2018).

More than half of both the government officials (51%) and non-state stakeholders (54.3%) were undecided about whether the operators of game meat butchereries who did not have certificates of possession of ivory were surrendering the ivory products to the government as required by the regulations or not. Quite a lot of respondents (35.3% and 34.0% of the government officials and non-state stakeholders respectively) were also uncertain whether operators of game meat butchereries were slaughtering wild animals in approved slaughterhouses or slabs. This sends an alarm that this piece of the new legislation requires much attention on the side of law enforcers to address these issues. However, one of the key lessons that are learned from the Tanzanian case and from many other previous studies, such as the studies by Ariffi (2015), and Challender and MacMillan (2014) is that law enforcement by itself cannot address the problem of poaching. Policymakers have to think out of the box and effectively engage the different stakeholders to win their support (Challender and MacMillan, 2014). It is argued elsewhere in the literature that, the formalization of the game meat trade, without ensuring effective control mechanisms and law enforcement, will simply legitimize the present poaching activities, and unsustainable game meat trade (Andimile, et al., 2021). In essence, authorizing the game meat trade is generally multifarious and must be understood in light of its complexity (ibid).

It was also interesting to observe a polarised standpoint between government officials and non-state stakeholders about the role of the procedures for the application and registration of game meat selling facilities (PARGMF) on the performance of the new regulatory framework (PERFORM). From the viewpoint of the government officials, PARGMF was a non-significant driver of performance (PERFORM) ($p = 0.648$) while the

non-state stakeholders perceived it to be significantly influencing PERFORM ($p = 0.005$). This is worth noting because cumbersome business pre-approval procedures, which create rent-seeking opportunities, are not only unique to the game meat industry. It is a common phenomenon in many other industries of the economy of the country, including the health, mining, construction, transportation, and logistics sectors (URT, 2017). The most important lesson from these contradicting perspectives is perhaps that, the development of an effective regulatory framework would require active engagement of a broad range of stakeholders and ideas. Without listening to different stakes, the process can be too disappointing. Governments should be able to listen and answer questions from those who are regulated, especially regarding the scope and effectiveness of their regulatory policy, and how they measure its success (OECD, 2010).

Another important area of focus would be compliance with regulations that aim to avoid potential health risks to consumers. Quite a lot of respondents were uncertain whether licensed and registered places or amenities for slaughtering wild animals and selling game meat were regularly inspected by the responsible Ministry Committee of experts or not (43.1% versus 35.1% for government officials and non-state stakeholders respectively). The fact that both the government officials and non-state stakeholders were also almost equally undecided (35.3% and 34.0% respectively) about whether operators of game meat butcheries were slaughtering wild animals in approved slaughterhouses or slabs, needs attention too. One would generally argue that there is limited knowledge and awareness about the potential health risks of selling and consuming uninspected game meat. A recent study by Foya et al. (2023) found that more than half (57%) of the people residing adjacent to Western Nyerere National Park in Tanzania were not aware of the potential health risks of consuming illegal bushmeat. In Sierra Leone, the study by Subramanian (2012), who investigated hunting practices and awareness of zoonotic disease risk associated with bushmeat trade, found that only 24% had knowledge of disease transmission from animals to humans.

5. Conclusion

This paper is based on a stakeholder's perception survey conducted in Tanzania to investigate their opinions about the performance of the country's recently instituted regulatory framework for the game meat trade. Albeit its focus on one country, the study provides some important insights that other countries with similar challenges could learn from. In a nutshell, the following four key conclusions are made. Firstly, the problem of poaching and encroachment in protected areas seems to decline with the implementation of the new game meat regulations. Secondly, the hunting of wild animals for game meat in areas designated for hunting is not continuing as expected due to inadequate supply of wild animals for butchering. The resident hunting blocks have comparably fewer animals than the tourist hunting blocks. At the same time, local outfitters and hunting companies lack the capacity to compete with foreign bidders in the e-auction system. Thirdly, there are still issues of weak law enforcement on the side of regulators that need to be addressed. For example, regulators should ensure that all the operators of game meat butcheries slaughter their wild animals in approved slaughterhouses and slabs. They should also ensure that all operators of game meat butcheries who do not have certificates of possession of ivory surrender the ivory products to the government as required by the law. Lastly, but not least, the licensed and registered places or amenities for slaughtering wild animals and selling of game meat should regularly be inspected by the responsible experts.

All these notwithstanding, the evidence from the study supports the assertion that the authorisation of game meat trade can be one of the boldest conservation tools to mitigate poaching if well-planned and governed. It can have severe impacts on potential earnings from tourist hunting, the creation of jobs, and the production of game meat. However, the paper acknowledges the complexity and heterogeneity of game meat value chains and trade. These should be well-thought-out to ensure that a governance system that is geographically and politically relevant to the national specificities and agenda of the country in question is recommended. Prior to the actual implementation of new regulatory frameworks, it is important to adopt a multidisciplinary and participatory approach to collate and scrutinise the opinions of different stakeholders together as part of a long-term engagement for sustainable governance of the game meat industry. Accordingly, the following recommendations are drawn:

- a. Leveraging of active engagement of key stakeholders in the governance of the game meat trade. In the Tanzania context, this requires developing a participatory model for enforcing game meat sanitary and safety requirements to avoid potential health risks to consumers;
- b. Exploring the need for, the added value of, and the feasibility of new legislative and policy initiatives to ensure that government actions against poaching remain sufficiently strong and proportionate. This

should go hand in hand with the improvement of policies, regulations, an enabling environment for game meat trade, and awareness campaigns;

- c. Building institutional capacities of both public and private stakeholders with a view to making proportionate game meat trade and discouraging poaching; and
- d. Instituting an equitable e-auction model to ensure that both local (resident) hunters, as well as tourist and professional hunters, have equal access to vacant hunting blocks available for auction.

References

- Barnier, B., and Velasquez V. (2022) "Free Market Definition and Impact on the Economy", [online] <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/f/freemarket.asp>.
- Biggs, D., Courchamp, F., Martin, R., and Possingham, H.P. (2013) "Conservation. Legal trade of Africa's rhino horns", *Science*, Volume 1, No. 339, 6123, 1038-1039. DOI: 10.1126/science.1229998. MMID: 23449582.
- Booth, H., Clark, M., Milner-Gulland, E.J., Amponsah-Mensah, K., Antunes, A.P., Brittain, S., Castilho, L.C., Camos-Silva, J., de Araujo-Lima-Constantino, Li, Y., Mandoloma, L., Mneji, L.M., Iponga, M., Moyo, B., McNamara, J., Rakotonarivo, S.O, Shi, J., Tagne, C.T.K., van Velden, J., and Williams, D.R. (2021) "Investigating the Risks of Removing Wild Meat from Global Food Systems. *Current Biology*, 31, 8, 1788–1797. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2021.01.079>.
- Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D. and Walker, K. (2020) "Purposive Sampling: Complex or Simple? Research Case Examples", *Journal of Research in Nursing*, Volume 25, No. 8, pp 652–661. DOI: 10.1177/1744987120927206
- Chaber, A.L., Allebone-Webb, S., Lignereux, Y., Cunningham, A.A., and Rowcliffe, J.M. (2010) "The scale of illegal meat importation from Africa to Europe via Paris." *Conservation Letters*, Volume 3, pp 317–323. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-263X.2010.00121.x>
- Challender, D.W.S., and MacMillan, D.C. (2014) "Poaching is More than an Enforcement Problem", *Conservation Letters*, Volume 7, No. 5, pp 484–494. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12082>.
- Chaves, W.A., Valle, D.R., Monroe, M.C., Wilkie, D.S., Sieving, K.E., and Sadowsky, B. (2018) "Changing Wild Meat Consumption: An Experiment in the Central Amazon, Brazil", *Conservation Letters*, Volume 11, No. 2, e12391 <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12391>
- Clason, D. L., and Dormody, T. J. (1994) "Analyzing Data Measured by Individual Likert-type Items", *Journal of Agricultural Education*, Volume 35, No. 4, pp 31-35.
- Coad L., Willis, J., Maisels, F., Funk, S., Doughty, H., Fa, J.E., Gomez, J., Ingram, D.J., Li, Y., Nihotte, L., Paemelaere, E., Sartoretto, E. van Vliet N., and Nasi, R. (2021) "Impacts of Taking, Trade and Consumption of Terrestrial Migratory Species for Wild Meat," Secretariat of the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), [online] https://www.cms.int/sites/default/files/publication/CMS_Report_impacts_wild_meat_terrestrial_migratory_species.pdf.
- Foya, Y.R., Mgeni, C.P., Kadigi, R.M.J., Kimaro, M.H., and Hassan, S.N. (2023) "The Knowledge about the Potential Health Risks of Illegal Bushmeat Activities among Local Communities Adjacent to Western Nyerere National Park, Tanzania", *Open Journal of Ecology*, Volume 13, pp 22-36. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oje.2023.131003>.
- Fukushima, C.S., Tricorache, P., Toomes, A., Stringham O.C. Rivera-Tellez, E., Ripple, W.J., Peters, G., Orenstein, R.I, Morcatty, T.Q., Longhorn, S.J., Lee, C., Kumschick, S., de Freitas, M.A., Duffy, R.V., Davies, A., Cheung, H., Cheyne, S.M., Bouhuys, J., Barreiros, J.P., Amponsah-Mensah, K., and Cardoso, P. (2021) "Challenges and Perspectives on Tackling Illegal or Unsustainable Wildlife Trade", *Biological Conservation*, 263, 109342. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2021.109342>.
- Glen, S. (2015) "Probability Sampling: Definition, Types, Advantages and Disadvantages", From StatisticsHowTo.com: Elementary Statistics for the rest of us! [online] <https://www.statisticshowto.com/probability-and-statistics/sampling-in-statistics/probability-sampling/>.
- He, L., Li, H. (2021) "Failed it or Nailed it: A Historical-comparative Analysis of Legislating Bushmeat Ban in China. *The Chinese Journal of Comparative Law*, Volume 9, No. 2, pp 157-177. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cjcl/cxab012>.
- Ingram, D.J., Coad, L., Milner-Gulland, E.J., Parry, L., Wilkie, D., Bakarr, M.I., Benitez-López, A., Bennett, E.L., Bodmer, R., Cowlshaw, G., El Bizri, H.R., Eves, H.E., Fa, J.E., Golden, C.D., Iponga, D.M., van Minh, N., Morcatty, T.Q., Mwinyihali, R., Nasi, R., Nijman, V., Ntiamao-Baidu, Y., Pattiselanno, F., Peres, C.A. Rao, M., Robinson, J.G., Rowcliffe, M., Stafford, C., Supuma, M., Tarla, F.N., van Vliet, N., Wieland, M., and Abernethy, K. (2021) "Wild Meat is Still on the Menu: Progress in Wild Meat Research, Policy, and Practices from 2002 to 2020. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, Volume 46, pp 221-254, [online] <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev-environ-041020-063132?download=true>.
- Kaine, G., Greenhalgh, S., Boyce, W., Lourey, R., Young, J., Reed, E., Keenan, B., and Mackay, S. (2017) "A microeconomic perspective on the role of efficiency and equity criteria in designing natural resource policy", *Ecology and Society*, Volume 22, No. 1. <http://www.ijstor.org/stable/26270100>.
- Koh, L.P., Li, Y., and Lee, J.S.H. (2021) "The Value of China's Ban on Wildlife Trade and Consumption. *Nature Sustainability*, Volume 4, pp 2–4. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-020-00677-0>.

Krosnick, J.A., Judd, C.M., and Wittenbrink, B. (2005) "The Measurement of Attitudes. In D. Albarracín, B.T. Johnson, M.P. Zanna (eds.). *The Handbook of Attitudes*. Mahwah NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, New York. pp 21–76 [online] <https://web.stanford.edu/dept/communication/faculty/krosnick/docs/The%20Measurement%20of%20Attitudes.pdf>

Likert, R. (1932) "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes", *Archives of Psychology*, Volume 22, No. 1932 – 33, pp 5 – 55. https://legacy.voteview.com/pdf/Likert_1932.pdf.

Medius (2019) "What is an E-auction? The Benefits of Electronic Auctions", [online] <https://www.medius.com/glossary/what-are-e-auctions/>.

MITSMED (2019) "Growth Strategy for Namibia's Game Meat Industry and Associated Value Chains", Ministry of Industrialisation, Trade and SME Development, [online] https://csnk.cz/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Game-Meat_Strategies_Web.pdf.

Naidoo R., Weaver, L.C., Diggle, R.W., Matongo, G., Stuart-Hill, G., and Thouless, C. (2016) "Complementary Benefits of Tourism and Hunting to Communal Conservancies in Namibia", *Conservation Biology*, Volume 30, No. 3, pp 628–638. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/cobi.12643>

OCTA (2011) "EU Organised Crime Threat Assessment", European Police Office, The Hague, The Netherlands [online] <https://www.europol.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/socta2013.pdf>

OECD (2010) "Regulatory Policy and the Road to Sustainable Growth", <https://www.oecd.org/regreform/policyconference/46270065.pdf>.

Samejima, F. (1995) "Acceleration Model in the Heterogeneous Case of the General Graded Response Model", *Psychomet*, Volume 60, No. 4, pp 549–572.

Subramanian, M. (2012) "Zoonotic Disease Risk and the Bushmeat Trade: Assessing Awareness among Hunters and Traders in Sierra Leone. *EcoHealth*, Volume 9, No. 4, pp 471–482. DOI: 10.1007/s10393-012-0807-1.

TAWA (2018) "Guidelines for the Allocation of Hunting Blocks through Auctioning (Made under Section 38 (11) of the Wildlife Conservation Act, Cap. 283)", Tanzania Wildlife Management Authority (TAWA), Morogoro, Tanzania.

Twining-Ward, C., and Chapman, C.A. (2020) "It's time to Implement Solutions that Make the Bushmeat Trade Unnecessary (Commentary)" [online] <https://news.mongabay.com/2020/05/its-time-to-implement-solutions-that-make-the-bushmeat-trade-unnecessary-commentary/>.

UNEP (2017) "Sustainable Wildlife Management: Guidance for a Sustainable Wild Meat Sector. Note by the Executive Secretary" CBD/SBSTTA/21/3 [online] <https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/a612/74fe/5b889ce0cf5e22eb61f69c5d/sbstta-21-03-en.doc>.

URT (2017) "Blueprint for Regulatory Reforms to Improve the Business Environment", Ministry of Industry, Trade and Investment, Dodoma. [online] <https://www.velmalaw.co.tz/wpcontent/uploads/2018/05/Blueprint-for-Regulatory-Reforms-to-improve-the-Business-Environment-dated-December-2017.pdf>.


URT (2020) "The Wildlife Conservation (Game Meat Selling) Regulations, 2020", Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Dodoma, Tanzania.

USAID (2023) "Combating Wildlife Crime", United States Agency for International Development (USAID), [online], East Africa Regional Office, <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/2023-06/Combating%20Wildlife%20Crime%20fact%20sheet.pdf>.


Verissimo, D., and Wan, A.K.Y. (2019) "Characterizing Efforts to Reduce Consumer Demand for Wildlife Products", *Conservation Biology*, Volume 33, pp 623–633. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13227>.

Worobey, M. (2021) "Dissecting the Early COVID-19 Cases in Wuhan. *Science*, 374, pp. 1202-1204, 10.1126/science.abm4454.

Appendix 1: Results of opinion ranking for individual perception questions (pooled sample: n = 145)



Appendix 2: Results of opinion ranking for individual perception questions (government officials n = 51)



Appendix 3: Results of opinion ranking for individual perception questions (non-state stakeholders: n = 94)

