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ABSTRACT
A TFCA can be defined as a part or components of a larger eco-region that straddles the border between two or more countries, encompassing one or more protected areas as well as multi-resources. This research looked at the contribution of the Gonarezhou TFCA to the economic and social well being of local community.

The results showed that issues of communication between the community and the RDC and National Parks officials were of great concern. The community is not very clear of their role if any in the Gonarezhou TFCA development and they are advocating for better relationships with the National Parks and Rural District Council Officials. The lack of knowledge by the community has led to conflict between the Community and the responsible authorities.

From the findings the study came up with the following conclusions:

- There is need to involve the community in the development of the Gonarezhou TFCA
- Clear understanding of the benefits of the Gonarezhou TFCA by the community is key for its success
- Need for clear Institutional structures

The study concludes with recommendations which will enable the community to benefit from the development of the Gonareazhou TFCA and these are:

- Improved communication among all parties
- Setting up of defined structures at community level
- Community empowerment
- Community share ownership
- Use of existing models
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAMPFIRE</td>
<td>Community Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBNRM</td>
<td>Community Based Natural Resources Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBT</td>
<td>Community Based Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FZS</td>
<td>Frankfurt Zoological Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLTP</td>
<td>Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>International Union for Conservation of Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUZIT</td>
<td>Okavango Upper Zambezi International Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMU</td>
<td>Project Management Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDC</td>
<td>Rural District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETOSA</td>
<td>Regional Tourism Organisation of Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADC</td>
<td>Southern African Development Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBNRM</td>
<td>Transboundary Natural Resources Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFP</td>
<td>Transfrontier Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZPWMA</td>
<td>Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER 1

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

A TFCA can be defined as a part or components of a larger eco-region that straddles the border between two or more countries, encompassing one or more protected areas as well as multi-resources (Singh, 1998). Singh further explains that the concept recognizes that borders are political rather than ecological and aims to ensure that key ecological processes continue to function where borders have divided ecosystems, river basins or wildlife migration corridors. TFCA is to protect internationally shared ecosystems, increase the area available for wildlife and plant populations thereby reducing the extinction risk due to stochastic events and also re-establish seasonal migration routes. Singh also thinks that the TFCA concept is also being accepted as a means of increasing economic opportunities, decreasing cultural isolation as well as fostering cooperation in bilateral and regional framework. TFCA are defined as relatively large areas, straddling frontiers between two or more countries and cover large-scale natural systems encompassing one or more protected areas. TFCA involves a unique level of international co-operation between the participating countries, particularly on sensitive issues related to the opening of international boundaries and within each region. According to DFA (2003) for TFCA to become a reality, support is required at five levels, namely:

Political: TFCA involve a unique level of international co-operation between the participating countries, particularly on sensitive issues related to the opening of international boundaries. An open commitment by each Head of State is an essential prerequisite for the TFCA to succeed.

Regional: Within each region, the relevant international bodies have a key role to play in facilitating the process. SADC’s support for the TFCA process is of paramount importance.

Technical: Within each TFCA all the relevant "technical" responsible agencies must be consulted and involved, including the conservation departments and departments responsible for immigration, police, home affairs, customs, health, etc.
Local communities: All local communities in and adjacent to the TFCAs must be consulted at the start of the development process and every effort should be made to make them partners in the business opportunities that will open up.

Financial: TFCAs are expensive to establish and run successfully. Financial support must be forthcoming from the State, with perhaps the bulk of the funding coming from private sector investments and bilateral and multilateral aid agencies.

The Transfrontier Conservation Area concept was founded on the SADC Protocol on Wildlife Conservation and Law Enforcement (Maputo) of August, 1999 which committed members to ‘promote the conservation of shared wildlife resources through the establishment of transfrontier conservation areas’. The main support for formation of TFCAs is socio-economic development through tourism. The combined core mass state administered protected areas is referred to as Transfrontier Park (TFP) The Buffer zone around the TFP forms the TFCA. A TFP is established when the authorities responsible for areas where the primary focus is wildlife conservation agree to manage those areas as one integrated unit in accordance to the set joint management plan.

All SADC countries except for Mauritius and Seychelles have existing or potential sites for jointly managing natural resources that straddle international boundaries. Although there are different natural resources management policies, strategies and programmes they all share similar values and a common vision for the conservation of transboundary natural resources and this calls for some collective responsibility for natural resources along international boundaries.

This research will concentrate on the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area and the area of focus will be around Gonarezhou National Park and the surrounding Conservancies. The area covered is shown in the diagram below.
The Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park (GLTP) is a conservation initiative involving Zimbabwe, Mozambique, and South Africa. According to Dhliwayo, M., Breen, C., & NYyambe, N. (2009) the GLTP was established in 2002. It is one of the first two Transfrontier conservation initiatives that have been recognized through a treaty in the
SADC region, the other being the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park. The GLTP consists of Gonarezhou National Park, Malipati Safari Area, Manjinji Pan Sanctuary and the neighbouring community areas in southeastern Zimbabwe, which constitute the biodiversity corridor linking Gonarezhou to the Kruger National Park in South Africa and the Mozambique component is made up of Limpopo, Banhine, and Zinave National Parks. It is described as southern Africa’s flagship TFCA initiative. Carrying this “flagship” designation, one might expect that provision for community empowerment would be unambiguous in policies and law.

Today, the concepts of community participation and Transfrontier conservation are firmly part of the conservation discourse and practice in southern Africa. Magaya, W. and Mandivengerei, S. (2003) points out that the need for community participation in Transfrontier conservation is reflected in the various treaties, policies, and conventions establishing Transfrontier conservation initiatives in the region. According to (the) SADC Protocol on Tourism it has been established that the development of TFCAs can contribute to the welfare and improvement in the standards of living of rural communities through the development of tourism and tourism related products. TFCAs compliment the SADC principles related to alleviation of poverty and regional economic integration. It is from this expectation that this researcher found it necessary to find out if alleviation of poverty has been realized. From the SADC protocol point of view it will be important to establish the current position of the local people in and around Gonarezhou National Parks on how their livelihoods have been impacted through the development of the TFCA. Also of importance is to establish if the voices of the local communities are heard by the Rural District Council (RDC) and the Parks and Wildlife Authorities.

The purpose of this research is to determine the impact of community involvement in the development of GLTP TFCA. A second, but no less important purpose is to determine the impact of the TFCA and associated developments on local livelihoods. This research is specifically designed to address the impact of community involvement in the development of the GLTP in and around Gonarezhou National Park. The research will be focusing on household level, current/existing livelihood strategies and natural resource
utilisation patterns resulting from the TFCA. According to Munthali S.M. (2007) the TFCAs and other conservation interventions can contribute to poverty reduction through the development of natural resource-based enterprises and community involvement in industries such as tourism. It is expected that the level of economic and livelihood will be generated from employment and infrastructural development in the area. It will also be useful to look at the contribution of the Gonarezhou National park to the local community as a result of the TFCA development. It must be noted that GLTFCA will ideally provide economic and livelihood benefits, and it is hoped that this research can contribute to the discussion of how best to maximise benefits. Such monitoring is also necessary to ensure that any negative impacts from TFCA interventions are quickly identified and dealt with. This research will focus on the socioeconomic benefits for the local communities around the Gonarezhou National Park.

1.2. Research Problem

• Exclusion of the local community in the development of the GLTP

1.2 Sub Problem

• Lack of knowledge of the GLTP development hinders community buy-in

• Lack of poverty eradication from the local community through the development of the GLTP.

1.3 Research Question

• To what extent do the local communities participate in the management and conservation of wildlife and natural resources in and around Gonarezhou National Park?

1.4 Sub Question

• What is the level of employment created for the local communities by Gonarezhou National Park?
• What does the Rural District Council do to empower the local communities in terms of skills development and creation of business opportunities?

• Is there a quota of both consumptive and non-consumptive tourism set aside for the local communities?

1.5 Research Objectives

1.5.1 Main Objectives

Main objective is to assess the impact of community involvement in the development of the GLTP in Gonarezhou National Park and surrounding Conservancies.

1.5.2 General Objectives

• To highlight the challenges of the integration of wildlife conservation and rural development.

• To measure the impact of development in terms of business opportunities, employment creation, and skills development for the community living next to Gonarezhou National Park and surrounding conservancies

• To make recommendations to the policy makers on how best the local community can be involved in the tourism development and wildlife conservation in Gonarezhou National Park and surrounding Conservancies

1.5.3 Research Hypotheses

Involvement of local communities in the GLTP development in Gonarezhou and surrounding Conservancies will improve their standards of living and eradicate poverty.

1.5.4 Research Assumptions

The research will assist in bringing awareness to policy makers of the importance of local communities’ involvement in the development of the Gonarezhou National Park as part of GLTFCA. The participation of the local communities should be viewed as key to development of the Gonarezhou GLTFCA.
1.5.5 Research Limitations

The limitations may be that the National Parks Authorities and the District Rural Councils may withhold some information critical for this Research.

1.5.6 Scope of Research

The study is limited to the local community surrounding Gonarezhou National Park and the surrounding conservancies. The study is limited to the TFCA’s impact on Zimbabwean side.

1.5.7 Significance of The Research

This study will assist in improving understanding regarding participation by the local communities as it is the aim of the study to pave a way for the local community and Gonarezhou National Park management to work together for the development of the TFCA as well as for the benefit of the local communities. The research will also contribute to the policy making process of the Gonarezhou National Park and that of the Zimbabwe government in order to address the existing problems in terms of Tourism development, conservation and conflicts between the community and the problem animals and also between the community and the National Parks Officials.

1.5.8 Feasibility of Research

The research is feasible because it is a case study limited to Zimbabwe and also there will be sampling of households.

1.6 Conclusion

This chapter dealt with the concept of TFCAs in the SADC region. It also explained the objectives of the TFCA in as far as the local communities’ participation is concerned. The area of study is the Gonarezhou National Park and the surrounding conservancies. The problem which led to the carrying out of this research is the need for poverty eradication from the rural community through the development of the Gonarezhou National Park.
CHAPTER 2

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conversation Area (TFCA) straddles the borders of Mozambique, Zimbabwe and South Africa. This area includes the Kruger, Gonarezhou and Limpopo National Parks. In 2002 the Presidents of the three countries signed an international treaty to establish the park. The treaty recognizes the sovereignty of each country while acknowledging their mutual interests in the conservation and socio-economic development. As a relatively new concept, transfrontier conservation areas development has not only generated high hopes of alleviating environmental problems and pushing back the frontiers of poverty, but simultaneously increased concerns of a national interests and security nature. A look at this concept and the resultant debate will assist in contextualising the situating upon which the argument and concerns arise. The term ‘conservation area’ generally indicates an area where conservation is important, but where sustainable use of natural resources is possible. The term ‘park’ has a much more protectionist connotation (Hulme & Murphree, 2001). These two concepts are different but for the purposes of this research they will be interchangeable.

The term TFCA has its origin in North America. This concept has incrementally graduated from its humble beginnings to what it is today. Some refer to the agreement between USA and Canada on the Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park as providing the first practical signs that the idea had finally graduated into the public domain. The agreement between the USA and Canada, achieved in 1932 gave birth to the Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park, a union between Waterton Lakes National Park in Canada and the Glacier National Park in the USA, making it the World’s first international peace park. Unlike later TFCAs, as peace parks are often called, which are based on conservation and development, this one was made as a symbol of peace and friendship between the two countries (Mihalic, 2007).
2.2 The Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area (GLTFCA)

Spenceley, A. Tusabe, R. Habyalimana, S. (2009) describe the Transfrontier Conservation Areas as relatively large areas that encompass one or more protected areas and straddle frontiers between two or more countries. In November 2000 an agreement was signed by the governments of Zimbabwe, South Africa and Mozambique to establish a nearly 100 000 square km TFCA between their countries, which became known as the Gaza- Kruger-Gonarezhou TFCA. Two years later a formal treaty was signed to develop a smaller 35000 square km transboundary area containing core protected areas of Kruger National Park in South Africa, Gonarezhou National Park in Zimbabwe, and Limpopo National Park in Mozambique, known as the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park. This was seen as a first phase towards the wider, and re-branded, Great Limpopo TFCA.

Transboundary areas have a range of potential environmental, economic and social benefits. First, they have the potential to conserve a greater diversity of species within larger geographical areas across international boundaries than smaller national parks. Second, TFCAs may improve opportunities for tourism, by allowing visitors to disperse over greater areas with better quality experiences, and by providing more diverse natural and cultural attractions. Third, TFCAs have the potential to develop tourism in such a way that it is sustainable: supporting the costs of conservation management, while also providing employment and entrepreneurial opportunities for local people and support and enhance their livelihoods.

The GLTP is described as southern Africa’s flagship TFCA initiative. IUCN (2004) produced a documentary that explored what effects the introduction of the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park (GLTP) will have on communities living in and around the parks of Kruger (South Africa), Gonarezhou (Zimbabwe) and Limpopo (Mozambique). IUCN (2004) documentary further indicates that Transboundary initiatives such as the GLTP are expected to significantly boost regional economic growth and increase tourism inflow. This comes at a price and the people mostly affected are the communities. The local community believe the land is their heritage hence refusal to leave the area. The Zimbabwe part of the Great Limpopo Park hinterland is also bitterly contested. The
Chitsa people, evicted from their homeland thirty years ago, have already resettled in the park, claiming the land as their natural birthright. Also in Zimbabwe, the people of Sengwe Communal Lands, living in an area where a new corridor joining Gonarezhou National Park to the GLTP is proposed, cannot see any benefit from moving from their original land. IUCN further explains that if the GLTP project proceeds without the collaboration of these communities, poverty, anger and frustration will lead to further conflicts between the communities and the Wildlife Management Authorities. Despite these and other issues, the governments of Zimbabwe, Mozambique, South Africa and other stakeholders are fully behind the implementation of the GLTP and see it as an initiative that holds hope for the greater challenge of supporting the livelihoods of communities living in and around this mega park. One of the expectations of creating TFCA is to attain landscape–level conservation of healthy ecosystems while capitalizing on those shared assets to improve the quality of life for communities living within and around a particular TFCA.

The TFCA is expected to bring together some of the best and most established wildlife areas in southern Africa and provide buffer zones for the park. These protected areas include national parks, private conservancies, safari hunting areas and communal lands.

Objectives of the TFCA are to:

- Facilitate regional cooperation and biodiversity conservation
- Promote alliances in the management of natural resources through partnerships between different sectors such as governments, NGOs, communities and private sector
- Stimulate socio-economic development and sub regional economic growth
- Develop trans-border ecotourism
- Share and exchange technical and scientific information internationally

(Le Breton, J. 2004)
Key issues coming from the objectives above are conservation of resources. These are achieved through partnerships between different sectors such as the governments, NGOs, communities and private sector. In this research the partnerships involve the Rural District Council of Chiredzi, communities in and around Gonarezhou National Park, and the Gonarezhou National Park Officials. From this partnership the communities are expected to benefit from the development of the Gonarezhou National Parks through the following:

- Employment creation of the local community in the national Park and accommodation facilities within the park
- Revenue sharing from safari hunting
- Partnership in the tourist facilities development such as lodges, hotels, roads
- Empowerment of the local community through training on tourism principles, basic bookkeeping
- Infrastructural development such as roads, schools, clinics and shops
- Improvement of standard of living for the local community

(Le Breton, J. 2004)

The concept of community participation in TFCA development is similar to the Community Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE) programme which was launched in Zimbabwe in 1986. (Frost and Bond (2007). This was launched in the hope of resolving conflicts between Parks officials and the community. The idea was to allow people to collectively manage their natural assets. The CAMPFIRE project bestows local community more responsibility in wildlife conservation and management.

The concept of CAMPFIRE is very noble and if it is employed on the Gonarezhou TFCA it will ensure that the communities are involved. If the local people are involved they will be assured of benefiting from revenue from tourism products and wildlife hunting. These
benefits will provide the local people with a route out of poverty as they will benefit from the Gonarezhou National park and surrounding conservancies’ development. This researcher also believes that community involvement will lead to sustainable exploitation of wildlife benefits in the Gonarezhou area. This may be a solution to poaching challenges currently faced by Parks officials in the area. The TFCA concept should take a lot from the CAMPFIRE concept as this has been tried and tested with the Mahenye people who happen to be part of the GLTFCA. The concept of CAMPFIRE in Mahenye transformed the livelihood of the community through job creation and infrastructural development in the area which the communities expect to benefit from the TFCA.

The CAMPFIRE project gives local communities custody and responsibility to manage wildlife and tourism activities in their area. Community began to see the park as a reservoir of wealth and became protective of their newly found natural asset. This programme is viewed as an important driver for rural development. If the same concept is done with the Chitsa and Sengwe communities in the development of the TFCA in and around Gonarezhou it is likely to have the same effects. From the CAMPFIRE concept it is very clear that for any wildlife conservation to succeed the local people should be involved. Their involvement gives them rights and control over lands, territories and resources. What is required is to give the local people proprietorship of natural resources in a more sustainable manner. The communities should be able to make decisions and they will be better placed to conserve the natural resources within their localities. This can be achieved through involving the communities in ways of conservation and management of natural resources and wildlife respectively. The participation of the communities should be clearly laid down to avoid conflicts. This will be achieved when everyone involved is aware of their role in the wildlife and natural resources management process. This can be made possible by causing the local communities to appreciate natural resources, benefits and appropriate incentives that can be realized.

**CAMPFIRE Structures**

Frost and Bond (2007) explain that the CAMPFIRE programme emphasizes the formation and development of democratic institutions from the household level to the
village, the ward and district levels. Normally one village has hundred households and award is formed of six villages. The local people elect their campfire or natural resources committees at the various levels. The committees are a fusion of civic and traditional structures which makes them very inclusive. The committee members are given training in leadership skills, bookkeeping and project management. This kind of set up makes decision making legitimate and the local people are free to change their leadership if they are not happy with their performance. There is also room for transparency as the committees are accountable to the people who will have elected them.

The CAMPFIRE concept has the following objectives:

- To reduce poverty as a necessary condition of environmental conservation and game management
- To transform the structure of resource control from state to communal ownership
- To manage game within the new tenure structure as a means towards increased food production and reduced poverty. Logan and Moseley (2002)

The objectives mean that there is devolution of power over natural resources from the state to community ownership. The idea of devolution of power should be the way forward for the TFCA concept in Gonarezhou to be successful. The idea of devolution of power empowers the local community and gives them a sense of ownership. The local community should be able to benefit fully from proceeds from Gonarezhou National Park through the following

- Tourism and wildlife management
- Trophy hunting
- Nature tourism
- Live animal sales and meat cropping


When the community enjoys benefits from the TFCA development they will guard the resources with diligence and this will lead to sustainable conservation of resources. This will also lead to improved supervision of communally owned natural resources. When
there is devolution of power the community will not feel short changed as they will feel they are in control of their resources. There is need of transparency in the whole process. This means that the community should have representatives in the RDC and have a full knowledge of all the proceeds from their quota in the wildlife sales.

The CAMPFIRE programme has managed to have benefits from wildlife accrued to the local people through revenue sharing from tourism products and also through job creation opportunities. The distribution of money from tourism resulted in a positive change of community attitude to wildlife and of Parks Officials towards community members. This is the concept which should be employed by the TFCA initiatives in and around Gonarezhou National Park. If this is achieved it will go a long way in clearing the bad blood between the Parks officials and the Chitsa people. Both parties can work together for the development of the Gonarezhou National Park and the surrounding conservancies as they both will benefit from the proceeds. As is the case with the Mahenye people who benefited immensely from the CAMPFIRE programme it is also hoped that the Chitsa and Sengwe and even the Mahenye people will benefit from the development of the Gonarezhou National parks. This can be achieved through the involvement of the local people not only in revenue sharing and job opportunities. The involvement of the local people should also mean involving them in the decision making structures of the TFCA stakeholders. It is also important to empower the local people with skills which will assist them to run viable wildlife management and conservation projects. One believes that if the local people are empowered it will create commitment and enthusiasm of wildlife and natural resources management. The local people will feel that the wildlife belongs to the community and that they can also benefit as households. This may lead to anti poaching campaign by the local people as they would want to protect their animals. This is the most effective anti poaching campaign the Parks officials can employ.

Mombeshora, S (2005) in his presentation at Workshop Proceedings August 2005 raised the following issues which need to be addressed:

- Communities tend to act as labour pools that make conservation areas and private enterprises more productive, but community members’ returns (such as revenue,
employment and retail opportunities) for involvement in TBNRM remains ambiguous.

- Land is being converted from agricultural use to wildlife habitats due to the economic argument that wildlife-based tourism is more profitable.
- Community institutions are best suited to represent local people in planning activities, entering joint ventures with the private sector, equitably distributing benefits, negotiating with NGOs and developing plans and activities.

From Mombeshora’s arguments it is clear that the role of the communities in the Gonarezhou area of the TFCA is not clearly defined. The community is expecting to benefit from the development of the GLTFCA while the responsible authorities are not prioritizing the community. What seem to be happening is that the community is only informed and is not decision makers in the whole process. This makes the local community feel cheated and left out in the development of the GLTFCA and this results in the conflict between the local community and the Parks and Wildlife Authorities. As a result of this the communities think they can use the land for crop farming than for wildlife as they are not benefiting from wildlife management. This has led to a lot of poaching in and around Gonarezhou National Park. For example on 23 April 2011 it was reported that seven elephants were killed by poachers in Gonarezhou National Park in Nyamutongwe/Mumvuma-Chipinda Pools. ZimConservation (2012) also highlighted that A HIGH-LEVEL taskforce comprising police, National Parks investigations department, police units from neighbouring countries and Interpol has launched investigations into operations of tightly-knit syndicates that are believed to be behind large-scale poaching of animals in Gonarezhou National Park. In the past five months, six white and two black rhinos have been killed and dehorned while last year’s statistics indicated that Zimbabwe lost about 70 rhinos to poachers. Mombeshora’s discussions highlighted the need to be realistic regarding the practicalities of having wildlife, tourism, people, livestock and crops in one area. This can be resolved by making the role of communities to go beyond consultation and towards more involvement, with conservation linked to development and moving away from protectionism, Maluleke L. (2005).
Kundhlande, G. (2005) in his paper on the Sengwe communal area in Zimbabwe, described the importance of involving the community in Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) and tourism. Kundhlande further explains that a tourism development plan for the area was presented that markets the south-east Lowveld as a single destination, with complementary products including cultural tourism. It was also suggested that developing products from what is available in the communities is important to boost incomes and livelihoods. This concept agrees with the CAMPFIRE concept where the communities are so much involved in the natural resources management and development of tourism products.

The Sengwe area and the Gonarezhou National Park areas are marked with very poor infrastructure and low levels of investment in CBTs. The Gonarezhou National Park area is not easily accessible one need 4 x 4 vehicles to get there. There is need for the National Park Officials, RDC officials and the communities to work together to develop roads for easy access to the park. This development will increase the number of tourists to the Park and this will mean more revenue will be generated. The need for appropriate infrastructure and physical access to destinations cannot be ignored as these are key to the benefits accrued to the Gonarezhou TFCA.

A wide range of factors were identified by Mombeshora (2005) that are relevant to improving livelihoods for the poor in and around the GLTFCA through tourism. These include consideration given to community participation and improving livelihoods within policies and plans relating to the GLTFCA, job creation, capacity building and land restitution. Unresolved issues relating to the distribution of benefits and conservation fees coupled with the marginal scale of benefits from tourism were raised as problems which need urgent attention. The lack of capacity within communities to capitalize on tourism opportunities, and the uncertainty of land rights in some regions were identified as issues which hinder the local communities from benefiting from the GLTFCA. If these issues are resolved at all levels then the developments within and surrounding Gonarezhou National Park will provide opportunities for the poor to improve their quality of life.
2.3 Working with the Communities

As stated before that the TFCA encompasses three countries namely Mozambique, South Africa and Zimbabwe. This has created its own problems as approaches to working with communities vary between the participating countries, and a question is raised regarding how consistency could be established without interfering with different governments. Investigations carried out by Muboko N.(2011) show that communities were currently being treated poorly, and that since other complex issues such as wildlife management could be addressed on a transboundary level, there was no reason why communities could not also be addressed at that level. Raising awareness among communities about tourism and its impacts on culture, society and the environment would be easier if these stakeholders were more formally integrated into the process. Mombeshora in his discussions highlighted the importance of community involvement in tourism, and their opportunities and constraints. He noted that communities are not integrated within the institutional structure of the GLTFCA, and the government is responsible for including them within national processes. Therefore, in order to participate effectively in tourism within the TFCA, people need to be provided with mechanisms to access opportunities. From the literature reviewed it is evident that the communities are often the ‘less powerful’ partner due to a lack of knowledge and training to participate in negotiations equally. As a result the communities are sidelined where it matters most. They are only informed of what will have been discussed and they are expected to buy in the decisions made. This has created resistance from the communities in the development of the GLTFCA as they think that the concept will not benefit them, but will disadvantage them. It is important to inform the communities of what they will benefit from the development of the GLTFCA.

Community Involvement

The communities in the three countries have been involved in CBT developments. In Zimbabwe, SAFIRE is facilitating opportunities for communities to engage in the tourism sector in a meaningful way. Constraints include the lack of devolution of authority for natural resource management, and also low levels of investment in CBT and the occupation of Gonarezhou by settlers. The occupation of Gonarezhou is a major drawback on the development of the GLTP. This needs to be addressed as the authorities
and the settlers need to agree on a way forward. The agreement should aim at benefiting both the Parks officials and the local communities. This is where the CAMPFIRE concept needs to be introduced and show the local communities on how they will benefit from wildlife management and natural resources conservation. If the concept is achieved then the TFCA will be in a position to develop responsible CBT which will benefit the local communities in and around the Gonarezhou National Park. The same sentiments are echoed by Spierenburg M, Steenkamp, C. & Wels, H. (2007) that the Great Limpopo is one of the largest TransFrontier Conservation Areas in the world and they argue that residents living in or close to the TFCA will participate in its management and benefit economically and that the TFCA proponents claim social legitimacy for the project. This does not seem to be what is on the ground as it emerges that the local communities do not seem to be involved in the management of the wildlife and natural resources. From the literature gathered the Gonarezhou National Park still needs to be developed and there should be involvement of the local community. The involvement of the local communities will help get around challenges of poaching and deforestation as the communities would want to protect their resources for their livelihoods. These revelations have also prompted this researcher to want to explore more on the community involvement in the TFCA development on the Zimbabwean side. Nothing much has been said in the literature consulted so far about the communities’ involvement in CBT in and around the Gonarezhou TFCA area. This research will explore the impacts of the TFCA on the control of natural resource decisions and benefits for local communities in the GLTP TFCA.

2.4 Gonarezhou Conservation Project

The objective of the Gonarezhou Conservation Project is to promote and conserve the natural resources and the wildlife in the Gonarezhou National Park for the benefit of the local people. ZGF (2009) indicated that the pristine wilderness and the function of Gonarezhou’s natural ecosystem is for the benefit of the people in the area and in the larger region of the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area. The communities should be aware of this project and should be part of it if the project is to be successful.
The Gonarezhou Conservation Project was officially established towards the end of 2007, with a 10-year memorandum of understanding signed between Frankfurt Zoological Society (FZS) and Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority (ZPWMA). The focus in these first years were to establish a strong partnership based on mutual trust, and to jointly develop a planning framework within which the goals, roles and responsibilities of the project partners were clearly established. A revision of the General Management Plan was therefore undertaken, and much attention given to drafting an updated Tourism Plan that centres on promoting the specific characteristics of Gonarezhou that sets it apart and that will place it competitively within the regional tourism market.

**Key Project Outputs**

- Infrastructure development such as renovation of office and workshop areas, and junior and senior staff housing
- Logistical support such as provision of pickup trucks, tractors, fire-fighting equipment and road working equipment.
- Renovations of tourism infrastructure and reception area at Chipinda Pools
- Installation of robust and sophisticated radio communications equipment – enabling Park-wide radio contact.
- Provision of scout equipment and ongoing monthly support of patrol rations to increase patrol coverage and effectiveness
- Aerial survey of large mammals in Gonarezhou and adjoining wildlife areas in the Greater Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area, inclusive of Zinave National Park ([http://www.zgf.de/?projectId 2011])

The Gonarezhou Conservation Project is a very noble idea but it does not involve the local communities. The project’s goals are to manage and conserve the wildlife and natural resources in and around Gonarezhou National Park. This can be very successful by the involvement of the local people. The local people want to be part of these projects as long as they know they will benefit from the project output. If the outputs outlined above are achieved there will be increase in tourists’ visits which will mean more revenue generated. As the area is developed the livelihood of the local people will also improve.
and are assured of their quota from tourism products. The communities should become major stakeholders for this project to succeed.

2.5 Conclusion

What emerges from the literature review is the importance of community involvement in the success of the GLTFCA. From the introductions of the TFCAs the local communities are expected to benefit from the development of the TFCAs. What came out of the literature review is that the communities seem to be sidelined in the whole process and this is what the researcher will explore. The adoption of the park concept on the TFCA has impact on the Great Limpopo’s local residents’ control over natural resources and the management of the area. This has resulted in conflicts between the local communities and the TFCA’s Parks and Wildlife authorities which in turn have caused the relocation of the local communities. The literature review showed that local communities are under-represented and under-resourced actors in this power game. This has created problems which hinder the development of the Gonarezhou National Park hence the local communities should play a major role if the GLTFCA is to succeed.
CHAPTER 3

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on how the research into an analysis of the impact of community involvement in the development of GLTP: case study of the Gonarezhou National Park and the surrounding conservancies on the local community was structured and carried out. This chapter discusses the methodological framework within which the research was carried out. This is then followed by sampling methods, procedures used and the discussion of the data collection techniques used.

3.2 Theoretical Framework

3.2.1 Research Framework

Saunders (1997) suggests that there are two frameworks within which research can be conducted, that is positivism and phenomenology. Positivism is associated with causal relationships using quantitative data and hypothesis testing hence positivism is normally associated with quantitative data.

Quantitative research is regarded as the collection of numerical and statistical data and is perceived as the scientific approach to research. This research employs experimental and quasi-experimental strategies (Harvey 2002). Quantitative data is which can be sorted, classified, measured in a strictly objective way and is capable of being accurately described by set of rules or formulae or strict procedures which then make their definition unambiguous and independent of individual judgement.

Phenomenology is associated with qualitative research. Bryne (2001) argues that qualitative research can be viewed as inquiries of knowledge that is outside the framework prescribed by scientific method, as well as assumptions of inferential statistics.
The purpose of placing a research within a certain framework is to allow the researcher to find a better framework for designing the research. Also this helps the researcher to differentiate between workable and non workable research methods. Both methods have their advantages and disadvantages and to know them help the researcher to choose a method.

Kruger (2003) described below as advantages of quantitative methodology

- It allows for greater objectivity and accuracy of results
- It usually involves few variables and many cases and employs prescribed procedures to ensure validity and reliability
- The research can be replicated and then analysed and compared with similar studies
- Quantitative methods allow one to summarise vast sources of information and facilitate comparisons across categories and over time

On the other hand McCullough (1995) describes the disadvantages of quantitative research as follows

- The research is often carried out in unnatural, artificial environment so that a level of control cannot be applied to the exercise
- There is a gap between rhetoric and reality and preset answers will not necessarily reflect how people really feel about a subject and in some cases might just be the closest match
- The development of standard questions by researchers can lead to structural bias and false representation where the data actually reflects their views instead of participating subject.
- Results are limited as they provide numerical descriptions rather than detailed narrative and generally provide less elaborate accounts of human perception.
• Quantitative methods only deal with issues known at the beginning of research project as this is when the questions are decided and documented.

Qualitative research according to Kruger (2003) has its advantages also which are explained below

• It achieves a greater level of depth and detail than quantitative technique

• Allows sensitive subjects to be approached in a sensitive way by allowing the researcher to employ personal skills to help lessen difficulties of the subject matter

• Creates openness between all parties and can help generate new theories

• Provides opportunities for subjects and researchers to clarify ambiguities or confusion over concepts

• Creates a better understanding of a situation by reading a descriptive passage than just looking at demographic statistics

On the other hand Haralambos (2000) came up with disadvantages of qualitative research as follows

• Some subjects feel uncomfortable in the presence of an interviewer

• Qualitative results are more difficult to aggregate and therefore do not allow for systematic comparisons

• Fewer subjects tend to be studied resulting in a study being more difficult to generalize

• Influences like gender and ethnicity of researchers can impact on some of the answers given by the participating subject

From the above brief the researcher wanted to enjoy the benefits of using both approaches. To achieve this, the researcher used both quantitative and qualitative research methods.
3.2.2 Research Design

Robson (1993) argues that there are three research strategies that can be used in any research and these are experiments, case studies and surveys. Experiments are suitable for natural science researchers with control and experimental groups being exposed to stimuli and the responses thereof recorded. In case studies the research entails the development of intensive knowledge pertaining to a single case study of a small number of cases. Frankel and Wallen (1996) say surveys involve the collection of standardized data from given populations and used by researchers when they intend to establish opinions of large groups of people about a particular issue. Saunders (1998) believes that since the three strategies are mutually exclusive they can be used to complement each other in any context.

3.2.3 Population, Sampling and Sampling Procedures

3.2.3.1 Study Population

Saunders (1997) argues that whatever your research question and objectives you will need to collect data to answer them. He furthers explains that if you collect data from every possible case or group this is termed census. For many research questions and objectives this is not possible hence sampling becomes important. Sampling techniques provide a range of methods that enable one to reduce the amount of data one needs by considering only data from a sub group rather than all possible cases. Saunders (1997) says that sampling provides a valid alternative to census when:

- It would be impractical for you to survey the entire population
- Your budget constraints prevent a survey of the entire population
- Your time constraints prevent a survey of entire population
- You have collected all the data but need the results quickly

3.2.3.2 Sampling

Sampling techniques available are:
- Probability or representative sampling
- Non-probability or judgemental sampling

Sanders (1997)

In probability samples the chance of each case being selected from the population is known and is usually equal for all cases. This is often associated with survey based research. According to Saunders probability sampling can be divided into four stages namely:

- Identify a suitable sampling frame based on your research questions or objectives
- Decide on suitable sample size
- Select the most appropriate sampling technique and select the sample
- Check that the sample is a representative of the population

However Henry (1990) advises against probability sampling arguing that one should collect data on the entire population as the influence of a single extreme case on subsequent statistical analysis is more pronounced than for larger samples.

3.2.4 Data collection instruments

There are many dissertation data collection instruments to consider. Susan C. (2005) states that the choice on which one to use should focus on one major factor that is, is the tool able to measure the variables in the research questions one has stated in the proposal? This is the most important question to ask. Some of the instruments one can use are as follows:

Questionnaires, Focus groups, Interviews and participant observation just to mention a few.

3.2.4.1 The questionnaire
According to the Wikipedia, a questionnaire is a research instrument consisting of a series of questions and other prompts for the purpose of gathering information from respondents. Questionnaires have advantages over some other types of surveys in that they are cheap, do not require as much effort from the questioner, verbal or telephone surveys and often have standardized answers that make it simple to compile data. On the other hand, the questionnaires are limited by the fact that respondents must be able to read the questions and answer them. Questionnaires can be open ended which can generate large amounts of data that can take long time to process and analyse. Questionnaires can also be closed where the respondents choose the answer from answers provided.

3.2.4.2 Interview
Babbie, E. (1998) defines interview as an alternative method of collecting survey data. Rather than asking respondents to read questionnaires and enter their own answers, researchers send interviewers to ask the questions orally and record respondents’ answers. Interview is done in a face to face encounter and in some instances may require more than one interviewer. The interview surveys generally attain higher response rates than mail surveys because respondents seem to be reluctant to turn down an interviewer standing on their doorstep than to throw away a mailed questionnaire (Babbie 1998). The interviewer can be instructed to probe for answers. In the event that the respondent does not understand the questions the interviewer will be in a position to clarify matters thereby obtaining relevant responses.

3.2.4.3 Focus Groups
A focus group is a form of qualitative research in which a group of people are asked about their perceptions, opinions, beliefs, and attitudes towards a product, service, concept, advertisement, idea, or packaging. Henderson, N. R. (2009) Questions are asked in an interactive group setting where participants are free to talk with other group members. Focus Group is an interview, conducted by a trained moderator among a small group of respondents. The interview is conducted in an unstructured and natural way where respondents are free to give views from any aspect. The researcher did not use this method.
3.2.4.4 Participant Observation

According to Douglas, J.D. (1976) Participant observation is a structured type of research strategy. It is a widely used methodology in many disciplines, particularly, cultural anthropology, but also sociology, communication studies, and social psychology. Its aim is to gain a close and intimate familiarity with a given group of individuals (such as a religious, occupational, or sub cultural group, or a particular community) and their practices through an intensive involvement with people in their natural environment, usually over an extended period of time. The researcher also did not use this method because this method requires a longer period which the researcher did not have.

3.3 The Field Research

3.3.1 Research Design

The researcher after careful consideration decided to use the following:

3.3.2 Study Population

The researcher looked at population in the Chiredzi Rural District under chiefs Tshovani and Chitsa respectively. Chief Tshovani has ten wards and chief Chitsa has five wards respectively. It was not possible for the researcher to interview all population in these wards hence it became important to sample the population. In chief Tshovani the researcher decided to get two subjects from each ward which gave the researcher a total of twenty respondents from Chief Tshovani. In chief Chitsa the researcher decided to get three subjects from each ward which gave the total of fifteen respondents. Total respondents were thirty five.

3.3.3 Sampling

For the purposes of this research the researcher employed probability sampling as the research was targeted at local communities living in and around Gonarezhou National Park. The population involved is from the two chiefs namely Chitsa and Tshovani and this is where the sample was derived from.
3.3.4 **Data collection instruments**

The study used two main data collection tools namely questionnaires and guided interviews. These tools are discussed below together with the advantages and disadvantages associated with each tool.

3.3.5 **The questionnaire**

There was one type of questionnaire used for the local communities around the Gonarezhou National Park and the surrounding conservancies. The questionnaire was in English and the researcher could not get time to translate them. As a result the researcher had to administer the questionnaires in form of interviews to the communities and the researcher would complete the questionnaires on behalf of the communities. There were also some members of the community who could complete the questionnaires on their own with minimal assistance from the researcher. This approach helped the researcher to immediately collect the questionnaires and also where the respondents could normally not understand the questions the researcher was there to clarify. The way the questionnaires were administered enabled the researcher to get back all the questionnaires given to respondents which resulted in a very high response rate.

3.3.6 **Challenges with the questionnaire**

- The questionnaires were in English as a result most respondents could not answer on their own; they needed assistants of the researcher. The researcher needed more time to complete the questionnaires for the respondents and tried not to be biased.

3.3.7 **Interview**

There were two sets of guided interviews. One was for the Rural District Council Officials in Chiredzi and the other for the Parks and Wildlife Management Authority Officials in the Gonarezhou National Park. Interviews also helped the researcher to probe further and clarify issues and read the body language of the respondents. For the Parks and Wildlife the researcher interviewed two people namely the Area Manager Mr Mpofu and the Ecologist Mrs. Ganyiwa. Mr Mpofu as the Area Manager was in a position to give the overview of the relationship between the local communities and the National
Parks and also their relationship with the Rural Council. Mrs Ganyiwa being the Ecologist is also responsible for the issues affecting the communities about problem animals and how the communities can benefit from these problem animals. Also of importance is that Mrs. Ganyiwa is in a position to inform the communities of the importance of conserving their environment hence discouraging them from invading the National Parks.

Interview for the Chiredzi Rural Council was first done with the Chief Executive officer and the Human Resources Person who then introduced the researcher to Council officials who deal with the Transfrontier and the communities. The key person was Mr Choga who the researcher had to ask questions targeted at the Rural Council and he was very helpful in responding to questions asked. Where he needed assistance his colleagues would heap in. The Council officials were very useful.

3.4 Data presentation and analysis

After the field work the researcher needed to present and analyse the data collected. The data is presented in tables, graphs and pie charts to clearly demonstrate the results from the field work as will be demonstrated in the next chapter.

3.5 Research Limitations

Every study, no matter how well it is conducted, has some limitations. In a way the case study may be considered as a limitation on its own. The other limitation was of language most subjects were not fluent in both English and Shona, but were fluent in Shangaan hence the researcher had to depend on interpreters in some cases. The other limitations were funding and time management to do the research. The inaccessibility of some of the areas was also a limitation.

3.6 Ethics

The researcher conducted herself in an ethical manner which included the following:

Honesty
The researcher strove for honesty in all research communications and data collection. Did not fabricate, falsify, or misrepresent data.

**Objectivity**

The researcher avoided or minimized bias or self-deception. The researcher strove to avoid bias in data analysis and data interpretation.

**Integrity**

The researcher kept promises and agreements with the respondents that is the local communities, Rural District Council and National Parks personnel.

**Respect for Intellectual Property**

The researcher honored patents, copyrights, and other forms of intellectual property. The researcher did not use unpublished data, methods, or results without permission. Gave credit where credit is due. The researcher also gave proper acknowledgement or credit for all contributions to research.

**Confidentiality**

The researcher protected confidential communications and information supplied for the purposes of the research

---

### 3.7 Conclusion

This chapter presented the methodological framework underpinning the research both the Theoretical and Field frameworks. It showed that the study used both quantitative and qualitative approaches in order to enjoy benefits from both. The research discussed some of the research instruments that were used such as questionnaires and interviews. The challenges faced by the researcher were also highlighted. The research also dwelt on the ethical issues around the research and in the next chapter research findings are presented.
CHAPTER 4
4. DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter is a detailed report and analysis of the findings of the study. The data is presented in form of tables and graphs for clear explanation of the findings. Below are the findings and analysis of the study.

4.1 RESULTS

Demographic data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age group

![Age group chart](chart)

- 26-40: 18
- 41+: 12
- 16-25: 5
Of the thirty five (35) respondents, 51.4% were between the age of 26 and 40 while 34.3% of the respondents were above forty years and 14.3% were between 16 and 25 years of age. From the figures above it is clear that the majority of the population are still able boded that they should be working somewhere or doing their own businesses. All these are peasant farmers with limited resources and who in most cases depend on handouts from donors and government for a living. However these young people are ideal for any projects that may be planned for them by the RDC or National Parks or any other organisations which may be involved in the GLTFCA.

### Table 4.2 Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 35 respondents 80% were male and only 20% were female. From the figures above there is a mixture of both female and male but there is an unfortunate bias towards males. The females could not easily avail themselves and those who were available refused to be interviewed as they felt the questions were for the men. It was difficult for the researcher to
locate females for the interviews. Where they were located most of them thought it was male business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.3 Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 % of the respondents indicated that their occupation is farming. The area is in Region five hence farming is a challenge as there is little rainfall. Their farming depends on the rainfall and there are no irrigation schemes in the area hence challenge of drought every year. The fact that 100 % of the respondents are farmers in this region explains high cases of poaching as they will be looking for meat for food as they do not get enough food from the fields. This was said by some respondents who indicated that their tribe is a hunting tribe and from time to time would visit the Game Park for hunting. The communities also keep livestock which does not have enough grazing space and this explains the land invasions into the National Park in pursuit of grazing space for their livestock. The fact that the community is made up of farmers is an
advantage to the development of the GLTFCA as this will be additional to what they are currently doing and will also provide extra income for them.

### Table 4.4 Marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the population 94.3% were married while 2.6% were single and another 2.6% were widowed. Majority of the respondents were married which means that they are family people and have more responsibility and require some extra income to sustain their families. An extra income from projects that may come from the GLTFCA is likely to be welcome by the majority of the communities rather than waiting for income from cropping and livestock which have their own challenges.
The level of education of the respondents is fairly high as indicated by 54.3% of the population reached secondary education and 45.7% reached primary level. All of the people have attained some form of education which is an advantage for the responsible authorities as the communities are in a position to understand the importance of the GLTP to them if they are taught. These people are trainable and can easily buy into new ideas which are likely to benefit them. If the information about the benefits of the GLTP is translated into Shangaan everybody will be in a position to read and understand for themselves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Secondary level</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary level</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The TFCA meant different things to individual respondents as 57% of them indicated that they were not sure of the GL TFCA while 34% indicated that the GL TFCA meant nothing to them. 6% indicated that the GLTFCA is an expansion of the National Parks whilst 3% said that it is improvement on tourism. From the different statements it is clear that the concept of the GLTFCA is not very clear to the people of Tshovani and Chitsa. They have heard about it but did not understand the meaning and the benefits of the GLTFCA and some have nothing to do with it. The lack of understanding is a cause for concern as this may be the reason for conflict between the Chitsa people and the National Parks and Rural Council.
Of the population 94% indicated that they have no role to play in the conservation of the Gonarezhou and only 6% indicated that their role was to protect the wild life. These statements may also be contributing factors to poaching challenges as the community may be feeling the wildlife belongs to Parks and Wildlife Management Authorities and there is nothing for them in it.
Table 4.8 Community’s relationship with Rural District Officials in relation to Gonarezhou National Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BAD</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above graph explains the community’s views about their relationship with the Rural District Council Officers and the following are the results. 54.3% indicated that the relationship with Rural District Council Officers is poor and 42.9% indicated that the relationship is bad whilst 2.9% indicated that it is good. From the responses the relationship between the Community and the Rural District Council Officers is not as it is expected to be. The RDC is the link between the communities and other stakeholders like the National Parks and the CAMPFIRE programmes. The communities claim that there are no clear channels in place which allow them to communicate with RDC. Amongst the communities it is not clear who is supposed to speak for them to the relevant authorities. This might be the explanation why the communities are ignorant.
of the GLTFCA or their conservation role of the Gonarezhou as the Rural Council is supposed to bring awareness of programmes coming up to the people.

Table 4.9 Community’s relationship with National Parks Officials in relation to Gonarezhou National Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship with National Parks Officials</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions were asked on how the research population would view the relationship with the National Parks Officials and 37 % percent of the population indicated that the relationship with the National Parks is good whilst 14.6 % indicated that the relationship is very good and 2.9 % indicated that it is fair. On the other hand 37% indicated that the relationship is poor and 8.6% indicated it is bad. From this analysis, the relationship with National Parks is acceptable by the majority of the respondents. From the interviews the only relationship which the communities expect from the National Parks is that of getting meat and permission to graze their livestock in the Park during droughts. If there are clear structures at community levels then the relationship
would be more than that of meat and grazing area. The National Parks are strategically placed to train the communities on conservation issues and also on some tourists activities such as tour guides, accommodation facilities.

Benefits from the TFCA

Table 4.10 What are your expectations from the Gonarezhou National Park TFCA development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENTAL PROJECTS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVOLVEMENT AND SHARING</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTHING</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENTAL PROJECTS AND EMPLOYMENT CREATION</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The expectations of respondents varied as 48.6% indicated that they expect developmental projects from the GLTFCA development in their area while 31.4% indicated that they expect to be involved in the development and sharing of profits from the GLTFCA, 8.6% indicated that they expect to be employed while 11.4% do not expect anything. The different expectations are as a result that the community are not clear about the benefits from the GLTFCA development in their area. This goes back to poor relationship with the RDC because if the RDC had carried out awareness campaigns the communities would be in a better position to express their expectations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.11 Are these expectations being met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the population 97% indicated that their expectations are not being met whilst 3% indicated that they are being realized. The respondents show that their expectations are not being met but previously they indicated that they were not aware of their benefits from the GLTFCA development. This boils down to the fact that the RDC has not done their job in bringing to the attention of the communities the programmes which the communities can participate in. The benefits the communities are getting are from Malilangwe Trust and the CAMPFIRE programme respectively. Malilangwe Trust is a conservancy which offers developmental projects such as building of clinics, grinding mills, boreholes and construction of class room blocks where there is need. The Trust also built a secondary school for the communities. The Chizvirizviri CAMPFIRE programme also provides similar developmental projects to the wards it is operating in. These programmes should be linked to the development of GLTFCA and the communities need to know that these programs are linked to the GL TFCA development.
### Table 4.12 If not what is the problem?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT YET OPERATIONAL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT AWARE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVER CONSULTED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRIC FENCE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTURBENCES AND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARMFUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYENAS KILLING</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATTLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO BENEFITS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60% of the respondents indicated that they have not yet benefited because the GLTFCA is not yet operational. 11.4% of the respondents indicated that they were not aware of the benefits they would get while 8.6% indicated that they were never consulted of the benefits they would like to
get. 5.7% cited the problem of the electric fence which is harmful to people and the livestock and 2.9% indicated that the problem of hyenas killing their livestock as a hindrance to the benefits. The responses showed diverse problems which show the different understanding of the GLTFCA programmes by the community. The diversity is mainly caused by lack of awareness campaigns to the communities which will enable them to understand clearly what their benefits will be and how they will benefit. It is the RDC’s responsibility to put committee structures in the communities which will help with awareness of any programmes emanating from the GLTFCA. These committees will organise the communities to participate in these projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13 Improvement of livelihoods from the TFCA
In answering the question of improved livelihoods 60% of the respondents indicated that there is no improvement in their lives from the GLTFCA and 34.3% indicated that their livelihoods have improved from Malilangwe and not from the GLTFCA whilst 5.7% indicated their livelihood has become worse through the introduction of the GLTFCA. From these responses the communities do not link the Malilangwe Trust to the GLTFCA because of lack of knowledge which should have been communicated to them by the RDC. Some think that the GLTFCA will worsen their livelihoods as some of their land is taken away from them. This kind of thinking explains the conflict between the community and the National Parks. The community think that their livelihood has become worse because they do not have enough land as the result of the National Park which has taken some parts of their land. There is need for the RDC to communicate to the communities about the importance of conservation of wildlife and natural resources and how they will benefit from these programmes.
Table 4.14 Importance of TFCA concept to individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>NOT IMPORTANT</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>NOT IMPORTANT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOT SURE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VERY IMPORTANT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMPORTANT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 11.4 % people indicated that the TFCA concept is very important to them and 8.6 % indicated that the concept is important to them. 42.9 % indicated that the concept is not important to them and 37.1 % indicated that they were not sure if the concept is important to them. This is because the responsible authorities did not bring awareness of the GLTFCA concept to the people hence their ignorance about the importance of the concept. The people are depending on what they think and not what they were taught or informed by the responsible authorities. If the communities are able to link the existing programmes to the GLTFCA then they would know the importance of the concept. Many of them indicated that they have benefited from the CAMPFIRE programme and the Malilangwe Trust.
Table 4.15 What improvements happened due to the TFCA in Gonarezhou National Park?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>NO IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTHING YET</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the total population 63% indicated that there are no improvements that have happened as a result of the TFCA whilst 37% indicated that there is nothing yet implying that some improvements will be realised. The majority have not seen any improvements and it is not clear if they anticipate improvements to happen from the GLTFCA. From the interviews improvements were realised from other sources such as Malilangwe Trust and the CAMPFIRE programmes. There is still a challenge of lack of communication by the RDC that these programmes are linked to the Gonarezhou TFCA and their success means the success of the TFCA and the more benefits for the communities.
Table 4.16 What suggestions should happen to realize full benefits of the TFCA in Gonarezhou?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSULTATIONS AND INVOLVEMENT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINING AND AWARENESS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYMENT AND BENEFITS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWARENESS AND COMMUNITY ROLE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOLLOW EXISTING CONCEPTS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28.6% of the population suggested that if they are involved and consulted the benefits may be fully realised. 25.7% indicated that training of the community and awareness campaigns on the
importance of the TFCA can be done to enable realisation of full benefits. 20 % suggested if employment is created for them then they will also benefit from the TFCA. 14.3 % suggested that the community roles must be clearly defined in the development of the TFCA whilst 11.4 % suggested that the concept should follow the existing models of CAMPFIRE or Malilangwe for the communities to fully benefit. From the responses above it is clear that the communities have different understanding of what is at stake for them in the Gonarezhou TFCA development hence different reactions by the community. What this means is that if the development does not follow the models of the CAMPFIRE and Malilangwe Trust it will be very difficult to convince the community that the TFCA will benefit them. As a result the idea will not be acceptable by the community. These other models have been tried and tested and have proved to be working for the community hence similar models will not be rejected by the community.

Table 4.17 Are there activities in place to empower the community to manage their own natural resources?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT SURE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPFIRE PROJECT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In response to the question of activities in place 68.6% of the population indicated that there are no activities in place for them to manage their natural resources and 20% indicated that they were not sure whilst 11.4% indicated that there is CAMPFIRE for them. The responses above indicate that the communities are not aware of programmes available for them to manage their natural resources hence increase in poaching and land invasions. From the researcher’s discussions with the National Parks it was mentioned that the communities are involved in the CAMPFIRE programmes which cover the conservation of wildlife and other natural resources. The community in chief Chitsa where Chizvirizviri CAMPFIRE programme is running are not aware that this is linked to the GL TFCA. If they were aware they would do more for the programme to be more successful. From the establishment of the Gonarezhou TFCA the communities can also be involved in eco tourism and other tourism activities such as running of accommodation facilities and the management of attractions in the Gonarezhou TFCA area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.18 Who determines resource allocation from the wildlife tourism benefits?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the respondents 42% indicated that the Local Hunter determines the allocation of benefits from wildlife tourism while 37.1% indicated that it is the National Parks and 20% indicated that it is the Rural District Council who determines. Lack of knowledge by the community lead them to blaming everybody of cheating them and not knowing where to go when they have problem animals around. The correct structure is that the RDC determines what the community gets from the trophy sales. The RDC indicated that the community gets not less than 50% of the proceeds from the sales and the money should go to developmental projects. These challenges can be resolved through good communication among the concerned parties.

Table 4. 19 Are you satisfied by the establishment of the TFCA Park in relation to community benefit to date?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In responds to the question on satisfaction on benefits from the TFCA 89% of the respondents indicated that they were not satisfied with the establishment of the TFCA in relation to community benefit whilst 11% said they were satisfied. It is not very clear what the 11% are satisfied with, may be they were talking of benefits linked to the Conservancy and what they get from the National Parks. This lack of clarity on certain questions could have been avoided had there been a pilot survey before the actual field research. Piloting the questionnaire is an extremely valuable exercise which will save a great deal of time and effort in the long term as the sample would have highlighted problems and potential areas of misunderstanding, allowing the researcher to amend procedures and the questionnaire itself where necessary. By piloting the questionnaire, the researcher would also have been able to predict the time needed to conduct the main exercise with far more accuracy. The challenge on getting clear answers on certain questions is as a result that there was no pilot survey carried out by the researcher because of distance and time constraints.
There are different explanations given by the respondents depending on their different levels of understanding of the benefits from the Gonarezhou TFCA. 40% of the respondents indicated that the benefits are not yet realised because the TFCA is not yet operational whilst 37.1% indicated that there were not aware of the benefits. 11.4% indicated that they hoped for developmental projects but nothing is in place whilst 5.7% indicated that the TFCA has created more problems for them than benefits. Another 5.7% also indicated there are no benefits yet, but are hopeful to benefit from the development of the Gonarezhou TFCA. From all these responses it is clear that the communities are not in the picture of what to expect from the
development of the TFCA hence conflicts between the community and the local authorities and the National Parks over land and conservation of the wildlife. The uncertainty of the benefits is again as a result of lack of structures at community level. If there were laid down structures at community level then the villagers would be in the picture of the programmes to expect from the Gonarezhou TFCA.

Table 4.21 Are you aware of the Gonarezhou Conservation Project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the respondents which are 100 % indicated that they were not aware of the project. This project currently does not involve the communities as indicated in the next sentence. This project is a partnership between National Parks and a German organization. The Gonarezhou Conservation Project was officially established towards the end of 2007, with a 10-year memorandum of understanding signed between Frankfurt Zoological Society (FZS) and Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority (ZPWMA). The focus in these first years were to establish a strong partnership based on mutual trust, and to jointly develop a planning framework within which the goals, roles and responsibilities of the project partners were clearly established. A revision of the General Management Plan was therefore undertaken, and much attention given to drafting an updated Tourism Plan that centres on promoting the specific characteristics of Gonarezhou that sets it apart and that will place it competitively within the regional tourism market. The project’s goals are to manage and conserve the wildlife and natural resources in and around Gonarezhou National Park. These goals can be easily achieved through the involvement of the communities. If the communities are involved then cases of poaching will be reduced as the communities will be policing each other in order to preserve their natural resources. These natural resources will be another source of income for the communities hence they will guard them jealously. The communities are key to the success of this project.
Table 4.22 If yes, how do you view the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project is meant for the development of the Gonarezhou National Park which has no direct link to the communities. But for it to be effective there is need to involve the communities on issues of conservation of natural resources as this will make them value their natural resources.

4.2 Summary of the Interview with Gonarezhou National Parks Officials

The interview with National Parks Officials was as a result of issues raised by the respondents in Chiefs Chitsa and Tshovani. The researcher had to follow up with the National Parks Officials on issues of the benefits of the TFCA to the local community and also the issue of problem animals. The National Parks Officials informed the researcher that it was the responsibility of the Rural District Council to inform the Parks of the problem animals. The Parks responsibility is to allocate safari hunting quotas to the community and with the assistance of the Zambezi and Lowveld Hunters the community will be able to realize the profit from the hunting concessions. The major problem noticed in this kind of arrangement is that the communities are not aware of all these arrangements and of how much they are supposed to benefit from these hunting concessions. This makes the community not committed to the programme. On the other hand the National Parks indicated that the community will benefit from the GLTFCA in a great way through tourism products socio-cultural tourism, eco-tourism and wildlife tourism. The community will also benefit from land use option through irrigation they can grow sugarcane and other crops and these are expected to improve the community livelihoods. The sad thing about this whole arrangement is that the communities themselves seem not to be aware of the said benefits and how they are supposed to benefit from them. However the National Parks indicated that it is the responsibility of the Rural District Council to inform the communities of these developments. Generally the National Parks indicated that they have a good working relationship with the communities as they often hold meetings with representatives of the communities when need arises. These issues were not mentioned by the communities and this leaves a question on whether the community representatives report back to the communities or not. Some
communities indicated that their representatives were political appointees such as the Councilors and Members of Parliament (MP) who do not seem to have the communities’ interests at heart. The communities would like to elect their own representatives as is happening with the CAMPFIRE programmes in the Mahenye area. In this case the communities can give a vote of no confidence to the committees who are not performing as per people’s expectations.

4.3 Summary of Interview with the Rural District Council

The researcher needed to interview the RDC in response to the issues raised by the community. The Rural Council indicated that they have awareness campaigns for the communities whereby they are informed of the procedures to take with problem animals. The Council decides on the benefits from trophy fees, that the community gets not less than 50% of the fees. The community decides on what they do with the benefits but should focus on developmental projects. It is the responsibility of the Council to monitor and evaluate these projects. The Council also indicated that the communities have been informed of the benefits from the Gonarezhou TFCA which include non consumptive tourism. The villagers have been given mandate to identify sites for tourism development. The communities look for partnerships with people or organizations with expertise in tourism products and they agree on profit sharing. From the discussion it is not clear if the villagers will be trained in the running of the tourist facilities in the GLTFCA and where they will get the money from to start their businesses in the TFCA. Unlike in the CAMPFIRE programmes it is very clear that the communities will get not less than 50% from the sale of the trophies. The GLTFCA should be clear on what percentage of the proceeds goes to the communities. The answers provided by the RDC were not clear on what they have done so far to bring awareness to the communities about the development of the Gonarezhou TFCA. The RDC informed the researcher that the communities attend meetings about the Gonarezhou TFCA, but as observers. This does not give the communities the opportunities to air their concerns of the developments which affect them hence the reasons for conflict between the RDC and the communities. The responds by the RDC concerning their relationship with the communities was not very clear as the researcher wanted to know clearly what the RDC has put in place to train the communities and also to bring awareness about the GLTFCA. The RDC should be leaders in bringing awareness to the communities about any programmes which are available and will help
them economically and in conservation issues. This is a cause for concern because there is so much that the RDC can do for the communities to benefit from the TFCA development.

4.4 Summary of the Interviews with Chiefs Chitsa and Tshovani

The researcher had an opportunity to meet with the two chiefs namely Chitsa and Tshovani. Between the two chiefs there are issues of power struggle as Chief Chitsa feels that his land has been taken away from him because chief Tshovani wants to have more land and become more powerful than Chitsa. On the issues of the GLTFCA chief Tshovani is more tolerant than Chitsa as the latter openly declared that he does not want to hear anything about the Transfrontier. Both chiefs talked about advocacy for developmental projects in their areas. Chief Chitsa talked of benefits from the CAMPFIRE programme in Chizvirizvirizvi whilst chief Tshovani talked about benefits from Malilangwe Trust. If the Gonarezhou TFCA concept is clearly explained to them that the concept works the same way as the CAMPFIRE and Malilangwe then they can mobilize their people to support the GLTFCA. The chiefs have potential to come up with good programmes like the Mahenye CAMPFIRE programme if there is adequate awareness and proper structures at community levels. Both chiefs advocated for better communication channels with the responsible authorities and if this is achieved then the concept of the GLTFCA will be successful.

4.5 Conclusion

The data was collected from the areas around Gonarezhou National Park in the Lowveld area of Zimbabwe. The data analysis was done based on the questionnaires distributed to the Chitsa and Tshovani communities and the interviews held with the officials at the Gonarezhou National park and the Chiredzi Rural District Council respectively. The data analysis used tables and graphs to bring out the results of the research which enabled the researcher to interpret the results. The results show that the information from the communities differ from that from the Parks officials and the Rural Council Officials. It appears that communities are not very clear of their role if any in the GLTFCA development and they are advocating for better relationships with the Parks and Rural Council Officials. The lack of knowledge by the communities has led to conflict between the Communities and the responsible authorities. This has also led to land invasions in the National Park which is a cause for concern for the success of the GLTFCA.
CHAPTER 5

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusion

The findings of this study indicate that there are a number of issues which need to be addressed by the relevant authorities in order for the community to benefit from the development of the GLTFCA.

5.1.1 General overview

Poverty eradication from the community remains critical and this can be achieved through the development of the Gonarezhou National Park and surrounding conservancies such as the Save and Malilangwe. Community participation in economic activities taking place in Gonarezhou National Park can be achieved through the involvement of the local communities in the conservation of wildlife and natural resources within the Gonarezhou and surrounding conservancies.

5.1.2 Community Involvement

The issues of community involvement in the development of the GLTP need attention since the involvement of the community is critical for the success of programmes emanating from the TFCA. The responsible authorities should look at all possible ways of getting the community involved. As the communities get involved their role in the programmes should be clearly defined.

5.1.3 Community Understanding

The majority of the community has attained secondary education and this enables them to easily understand any new programmes that may arise as a result of the development of the GLTP. The understanding of the TFCA will be clearer when the benefits of it are clearly explained to the community.

5.1.4 Communication Channels
Communication is critical for any programme to succeed as the community need to know where to go with their queries and also the officials need to know who to communicate with. What this means is that there is need of clearly laid down communication channels for the community and the council officials.

It is important for the responsible authorities to address issues of community involvement, communication channels and benefits for the community for the GLTP to be successful. There should be ways by the responsible authorities to inform the community that the current benefits from the CAMPFIRE programme and the Malilangwe Conservancy are linked to the GLTP in order to achieve community buy in.

5.2 Recommendations

The study shows that the community has expectations from the GLTP, but the community does not know how they can benefit from these developments. On the other hand the responsible authorities think they have communicated the necessary information to the community. Hence the community should cooperate with them and agree to the development of the GLTP. The following recommendations are made with a view to increase awareness and benefits for the community.

5.2.1 Communication

From the study poor communication or lack of it was strongly voiced as a cause for concern. There is therefore need for a sufficient flow of information between role players to alleviate any fears from either party and ensure the understanding of plans and processes are clear to the communities. The researcher therefore recommends that proper communication structures be put in place to allow proper flow of information from the RDC to the community and vice versa. The RDC should first carry out a survey on community concerns and interest and this can be achieved through Focus groups where the community can freely express their concerns and interests. This will enable both parties to trust each other and want to work together.

For any project to succeed it requires a buy in of the people affected by its development. Without their buy in nothing will take off. Hence there is need for the RDC to hold awareness campaigns of the benefits for the community from the development of GLTP. These campaigns will remove fears of the people that their land will be taken away from them by the development of the
TFCA. The campaigns will also provide opportunities for the community to seek clarification in gray areas as far as the GLTP is concerned. The campaigns can be in form of meetings, workshops, talk shows, videos to show the community examples of success stories of what is happening elsewhere. For instance success stories of the Mahenye CAMPFIRE programme can be filmed and shown to the communities of Chitsa and Tshovani. The communities can be allowed to tour areas where similar projects have been successful for them to get ideas of what they can do and how they can do it.

5.2.2 Clearly defined Structures at Community Level
There is need for the RDC to establish clear functional structures at community level. These structures will go a long way in solving the challenges of ignorance of projects by the communities. The structures will also assist the RDC in the implementation of these programmes at the community level. The RDC should set up committees such as Ward Development Committees and Village Development Committees and these committees should be selected by the communities and the RDC and the National Parks should be co-opted in these committees. This will ensure transparency and the communities will be correctly guided where they need guidance.

5.2.3 Community Empowerment
Community empowerment can come in different ways, but the major goal of it is to provide the community with necessary resources to achieve the targeted objective. In this case the communities need to be empowered to enable them to run their projects and businesses in the GLTP. It will be good for the responsible authorities to identify those in the community who are interested in the programmes being offered in the GLTP and when identified these should be trained. Since the community will be expected to be major players in tourism business in the GLTP there is need to train them along those lines to equip them with necessary knowledge of the businesses they are venturing into. There is also need to capacitate them with skills which will facilitate the forging of joint venture opportunities.

5.2.4 Community ownership
This model has worked in some CAMPFIRE programmes such as Mahenye and in some neighbouring countries such as the Makuleke community in South Africa. This model allows more community involvement in the management of resources. Therefore the GLTP authorities should come up with ways in which the community will own some programmes where conservation of wildlife and natural resources will be concerned. The communities become partners with the relevant authorities and this initiative is a crucial determinant of the sustainability of the GLTP.

5.2.5 Use of Existing Models

For the communities to fully understand the purpose of the GLTP, it is important to use the existing models such as the CAMPFIRE and the Malilangwe Trust where the communities have received benefits from. It becomes easier to convince people of the introduction of a new programme with reference to other programmes which have been tried and tested. This researcher recommends the CAMPFIRE programme because it is community based and has well defined committees which look at programme issues which affect the community.

5.3 Areas of Future Studies

In future it will be desirable to carry out a study on the evaluation of community empowerment skills developed as a result of the development of the GLTFCA.

Also of importance is the need to study the impact of community ownership on the GLTFCA. These areas will help to assess if the community have benefited from the development of the GLTFCA.
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QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE COMMUNITIES IN AND AROUND GONAREZHOU NATIONAL PARK

I am a Masters of Science in Tourism, hospitality and leisure studies student at the University of Zimbabwe. I am carrying out a research as partial fulfillment of my degree. My research is on the analysis of the impact of community involvement in the development of GLTP: Case study of Gonarezhou National Park with reference to Chitsa and Tshovani communities. Your contribution towards the information required for this research will be greatly appreciated and the information will be treated with the confidentiality it deserves and will be used for the purposes of this research only.

May you please complete this questionnaire to the best of your knowledge?

1. **Personal Details**
   1.1 Please indicate your age:  
      - [ ] 16-25 Years  
      - [ ] 26-40 years  
      - [ ] 41 and above

   1.2 Please indicate your sex  
      - [ ] Male  
      - [ ] Female

   1.3 Occupation  
      - [ ] Farmer  
      - Other please specify ........................................

   1.4 Marital Status  
      - [ ] Single  
      - [ ] Married  
      - [ ] Divorced  
      - [ ] Widowed

   1.5 Number of Dependence  
      - [ ]

   1.6 Education level  
      - [ ] Primary Level  
      - [ ] Secondary Level  
      - [ ] Graduate

2. **Knowledge of the TFCA**
   2.1 What does the Transfrontier Conservation Area mean to you?..........................  
      ...........................................................  
      ........................................................................................  
      ............................................................................................................................

   2.2 What is your role in the development of the TFCA...........................................
2.3 What is your understanding of Community Based Tourism CBT)?

2.4 Was there any kind of awareness done about the TFCA if so please explain.

2.5 Was there any training given you about CBT if so explain the skills given.

3. Benefits from the TFCA

3.1 What were your expectations from the TFCA?

3.2 Were these expectations met? YES □  NO □

3.3 If not met what was the problem?
3.4 Has your livelihood improved because of the development of the TFCA in your area? Please explain your answer…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

3.5 How important is the TFCA concept to you as an individual?..................................................
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

3.6 In your opinion what benefits do you expect from the TFCA?...........................................
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

3.7 What do you think the responsible authorities should do for the community to benefit fully from the TFCA?..............................................................................................................
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

3.8 How do you view the channels of communication between the community and the responsible authorities?...........................................................................................................
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

3.9 Explain your answer in ............................................................................................................................
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
3.10 Are you satisfied by the developments of the TFCA in relation to community benefit to date?  YES □  NO □

3.11 Explain your answer in ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Thank you for taking your time to complete this questionnaire
INTERVIEW GUIDES FOR PARKS AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT OFFICIALS
I am a student studying for Masters of Science in Tourism at the University of Zimbabwe. I am carrying out a research as partial fulfillment of my degree. My research is on the analysis of the impact of community involvement in the development of GLTP: Case study of Gonarezhou National Park with reference to Chitsa and Tshovani communities. Your contribution towards the information required for this research will be greatly appreciated and the information will be treated with the confidentiality it deserves and will be used for the purposes of this research only

1. How are the local people involved in the management of resources in and around the Gonarezhou National Parks?

2. How do you view the relationship of Parks and wildlife officials and the Rural District Council officials?

3. How do you view the relationship between Rural District Council and the local people?

4. What tourism products developments have happened in Gonarezhou since the establishment of the TFCA?

5. Of these developments what percentage is owned by the local people?

6. What challenges are you experiencing from engaging the local people in the development of the TFCA if any?

7. What programmes are in place to empower the local community?

8. How many local people are employed by the Parks and Wildlife Authority?

9. If any what levels of employment?

10. How do you view the livelihood of the local people before and after the development of the TFCA?

11. What is your assessment of the Gonarezhou Conservation Project?
12. In this project is there any role played by the communities?

13. May you comment on the relationship between Parks and Wildlife officials and the local people?

14. How do you view your relationship with the community?

   Thank you for your time
INTERVIEW GUIDELINES FOR RURAL DISTRICT COUNCIL OFFICIALS

I am a student studying for Masters of Science in Tourism at the University of Zimbabwe. I am carrying out a research as partial fulfillment of my degree. My research is on the analysis of the impact of community involvement in the development of GLTP: Case study of Gonarezhou National Park with reference to Chitsa and Tshovani communities. Your contribution towards the information required for this research will be greatly appreciated and the information will be treated with the confidentiality it deserves and will be used for the purposes of this research only.

1. What is the background to the development of the TFCA in your area?
2. Was the TFCA concept and its objectives satisfactorily discussed among all the stakeholders?
3. How does the community participate in the development of the TFCA?
4. Any awareness campaigns done for the community for the TFCA?
5. How have the communities benefited from the TFCA development?
6. To date are there any benefits accrued to the local community from Gonarezhou National Park?
7. How do you view the relationship between the local community and the National Parks officials?
8. What developments have happened in and around the Gonarezhou National parks since the establishment of the TFCA?
9. In these developments how were the local people involved?
10. Are there any challenges you face in dealing with the local people concerning the conservation of natural resources in and around Gonarezhou?
11. If any challenges how do you address them?
12. How successful has been the TFCA concept in the Great Limpopo Transfrontier?
13. How is the Rural Council involved in the development of Community Based Tourism?

Thank you for your time