



# THE IMPACT OF LAND MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS ON COMMUNITY ATTITUDES TOWARDS TOURISM AND CONSERVATION IN SIX SOUTH AFRICAN COUNTRIES

Susan Snyman

Environmental Policy Research Unit, University of Cape Town & Wilderness Safaris, Rivonia, Johannesburg, South Africa

## ABSTRACT

Many rural areas of Africa are characterised by high levels of unemployment, poverty and increasing population densities. Arid climates and erratic rainfall also make many of these areas marginal for agriculture and offer few alternative employment opportunities. Ecotourism in these areas can offer a sustainable land use option that promotes biodiversity conservation, can assist in poverty reduction and promote local socio-economic development. Receipt of benefits from ecotourism is also claimed to improve community attitudes towards conservation. Through extensive questionnaire surveys, this study analysed the impact of land management systems on community attitudes towards tourism and conservation in six southern African countries: Botswana, Malawi, Namibia, South Africa, Zambia and Zimbabwe. The study found that diverse land management systems such as government-owned land and communal land had differing effects on attitudes. Overall, some level of community ownership or participation, such as in joint ventures, resulted in more positive community attitudes. The results highlight the importance of empowerment and ownership in order to promote biodiversity conservation and ensure the long-term sustainability of ecotourism operations.

## INTRODUCTION

In southern Africa, many early conservation efforts from the late 1800s and early 1900s either displaced local communities or restricted their access to natural resources (Barrow & Fabricius, 2002; Borrini-Feyerabend, Kothari & Oviedo, 2004; Kepe et al., 2005; Kideghesho et al., 2007; Scanlon & Kull, 2009; Gurung, 1995; Grung, 2003). This negatively affected community attitudes towards conservation and in the last few decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, efforts to rectify growing tensions and gain community support led to conservation and ecotourism models that increasingly included communities in the decision-making and benefit sharing process.

The community approach to conservation sought to ensure that local communities would reap benefits from conservation that were over and above the costs. These costs include: problems resulting from human-animal conflict such as loss of crops, livestock, and sometimes human life (Woodroffe, Thirgood & Rabinowitz, 2005); the

opportunity cost associated with land being used for conservation and not being available for other uses (Alexander, 2000; de Boer & Baquete, 1998; Sibanda & Omwega, 1996; Sifuna, 2010); and loss of access to natural resources.

Social exchange theory assumes that potential beneficial outcomes will create positive attitudes towards tourism (Andereck et al., 2005; Teye et al., 2002). Local communities seek benefits of ecotourism in exchange for something that they estimate to equal the benefits that they offer in return, such as natural resources provided to tourists and ecotourism operations (Sirakaya et al., 2002; Teye et al., 2002). Individuals that perceive benefits from an exchange are likely to view it positively and those that perceive costs are likely to evaluate it negatively (Andereck et al., 2005). Residents who are dependent on the tourism industry for support, or who perceive a greater level of personal benefit or economic gain, tend to have more positive perceptions of tourism impact than others (Brunt



*Land-use tourism, Damaraland Camp © Dana Allen*

& Courtney, 1999; Child, 2000; Child & Harris, 2008; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Jurowski et al., 1997; Lankford & Howard, 1994; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Sirakaya et al., 2002 in Andereck et al., 2005; Shibia, 2010; Walpole & Goodwin, 2001; Wang & Pfister, 2008).

The benefits of ecotourism, and community attitudes towards it, are strongly influenced by the level of community dependence on ecotourism for livelihood support (Sirakaya et al., 2002), and differs, within and between communities (Jurowski & Gursoy, 2004). Benefits are essentially value domains and the perception of the importance of benefits will differ between individuals as they attach different values to them. In tourism, economic and non-economic value domains may influence attitudes towards ecotourism (Wang & Pfister, 2008).

Through an appreciation of biodiversity conservation, communities may reduce direct pressures on natural resources (Aichi Biodiversity Strategic Goal B). The flow of ecotourism benefits to communities aligns with the Aichi Biodiversity Strategic Goal D of enhancing the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services (Convention

of Biological Diversity Aichi 2020 Biodiversity Targets). In line with this, Langholz (1999; 2008) argued that ecotourism income can minimise or eliminate dependence on activities that exploit natural resources, such as commercial agriculture, logging and cattle farming. There is; however, evidence of increased income also leading to greater exploitation of natural resources and therefore negative impacts on biodiversity (Stronza, 2007; Stronza, 2010). Thus, formal, as well as informal, education relating to conservation is critical.

An understanding of what factors influence community members' attitudes towards ecotourism and conservation can assist in managing expectations. It can also be used in education and awareness-raising programmes to improve attitudes and garner support from communities living in and around conservation areas (Allendorf et al., 2006; Chidakel, 2011; Sifuna, 2010; Simelane et al., 2006). This understanding is important because, as pointed out by Emerton (1999), benefit distribution is a necessary, but not in itself sufficient, condition for communities to engage in wildlife conservation. Management's understanding of the perceptions and attitudes of local residents is likely to





**A survey at Orupembe conservancy, Namibia © Chris Bakkes**

influence the quality of their interactions. Ap (1992) described such understanding as, 'crucial' for the development of a successful and sustainable ecotourism sector, while Newmark et al. (1994) claimed it as an essential ingredient in the design and implementation of any project to promote conservation and development (in Gillingham & Lee, 2003). Depending on community attitudes towards conservation and ecotourism, local communities can influence the long-term success or failure of ecotourism operations in their area (Akyeampong, 2011). Consequently, it is critical to have an understanding of community attitudes in areas of ecotourism development.

Community attitudes towards ecotourism and conservation vary as a community develops, as well attitudes are variable in time, space and location (Emerton, 1999; Faulkner & Tideswell, 1997 in Sirakaya et al., 2002). Based on the premise that modern ecotourism is assumed to involve local communities, the introduction, implementation and sustainability of community engagement projects relies heavily on an understanding of cultural, economic, and non-economic characteristics of the communities with which one is engaging. It is therefore essential that differences in communities are understood, and taken into consideration, in all policy development and implementation (Simelane et al., 2006).

In summary, studying community attitudes towards tourism and conservation is important for a number of reasons:

- it can disclose whether or not strong attitudes exist towards a protected area which, in some cases, may help to explain behaviour (Lepp & Holland, 2006 in Anthony, 2007): these attitudes may be strongly positive, strongly negative or neutral;
- it can inform policy makers and managers which factors influence attitudes and this can assist with prioritising avenues for action (Anthony, 2007; Browne-Núñez & Jonker, 2008; Zimmerman et al., 2005 in Groom & Harris, 2008), including ways to maximise benefits to communities and to mitigate costs;
- it can also reveal opportunities for improving relationships and outreach programmes with communities living adjacent to protected areas (Anthony, 2007); and,
- it can give an understanding of why communities behave in particular ways towards protected areas and tourism operations and their staff.

Conservation and ecotourism are inextricably inter-linked, but community attitudes towards them may differ as community members see direct benefits associated with ecotourism in terms of employment, but see costs associated with conservation in terms of human-wildlife conflict. They may therefore have contradictory attitudes towards tourism and conservation. Identification of the primary dynamics of these relations will therefore allow for more focused planning in terms of protected areas and the associated ecotourism operations and in so doing maximise positive attitudes towards conservation and ecotourism.

Critical to the long-term success of ecotourism, and consequently, conservation, is the determination of how land ownership arrangements affect attitudes towards conservation and ecotourism. For an ecotourism operation to be sustainable it needs to contribute to the conservation of biodiversity in the protected areas in which it is located, it needs to be acceptable to the communities in the area and it needs to be commercially viable. This paper provides comparative community data across six countries allowing for an analysis of the differences between various communities and countries, focusing specifically on the impact of land management systems, and provides guidance for tourism operators and policymakers based on the results.

Table 1. The camps, communities and ethnic groups surveyed in each country

Country	Camps surveyed	Land Tenure	Communities surveyed	Ethnic groups surveyed
<b>Botswana</b>	Duba Plains, Vumbura Plains, Little Vumbura	Kwedi Concession where camps situated is owned by the Okavango Community Trust ( <i>Community</i> concession). The community owns the concession and receives annual rental from private sector operator.	Okavango Community Trust (OCT) villages – Seronga, Gunotsoga, Beetsha, Eretsha, Gudigwa	Bayei, Hambukushu, Basarwa, Bakgalagadi
<b>Malawi</b>	Mvuu Camp, Mvu Wilderness Lodge	National Parks owns the land ( <i>Government</i> )	Balaka District, bordering Liwonde National Park	Lomwe, Yao, Nyanja, Tumbuka, Tonga
<b>Namibia</b>	Skeleton Coast Camp	Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) runs Skeleton Coast National Park ( <i>Government</i> ). <i>Voluntary community levies</i> are paid to the four adjacent conservancies.	Okondjombo Conservancy; Purros Conservancy; Sanitatas Conservancy; Orupembe Conservancy	Herero, Himba, Damara,
	Palmwag Lodge	For Palmwag Lodge: Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) as well as the Big Three Conservancies ( <i>government &amp; conservancy payments</i> ).	Torra; Anabeb; Sesfontein Conservancies	Herero, Himba, Damara, Riemvasmaker
	Doro Nawas Lodge	For Doro Nawas Camp a <i>joint venture</i> with the Doro !Nawas Conservancy.	*N/A	Herero, Himba, Damara, Riemvasmaker
	Damaraland Camp	For Damaraland Camp: a <i>joint venture</i> with Torra Conservancy	Torra Conservancy	Herero, Himba, Damara, Riemvasmaker
<b>South Africa</b>	Rocktail Beach Camp	iSimangaliso Wetland Park owns the land. <i>Joint venture partnership</i> between WS & the Mpukane Community	Mpukane Community	Zulu
	Pafuri Camp	<i>Tripartite agreement</i> between the Makuleke community, Wilderness Safaris and South African National Parks ( <i>Community, private sector &amp; government</i> )	Makuleke community: Makuleke; Makahule & Mabaligwe villages	Tsonga
<b>Zambia</b>	Kalamu Lagoon Camp	National Parks owns the land ( <i>Government</i> )	Villages in the Malama Chiefdom adjacent to South Luangwa National Park	Kaonde, Senga, Chewa, Ngoni, Bemba & Nyanja
<b>Zimbabwe</b>	Davison's Camp; Makalolo Plains; Little Makalolo; Linkwasha	National Parks owns the land ( <i>Government</i> )	Villages in Tsholotsho District adjacent to Hwange National Park	Ndebele, Kalanga, Lozi, Shona

Due to time constraints, community surveys were not conducted specifically in Doro!Nawas Conservancy. The camp staff surveys were; however, still included in the analysis, as they are relevant to the study.

## METHOD<sup>1</sup>

Socio-economic questionnaire surveys were conducted in camps run by Wilderness Safaris<sup>2</sup> in Botswana, Malawi, Namibia, South Africa, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Three hundred and eighty-five staff surveys were collected in 16 high-end ecotourism camps, constituting a majority of the staff in these camps (52 per cent to 68 per cent of camp staff). A further 1,400 community surveys were conducted in over 30 rural communities, covering more than 16 different ethnic groups and an average of approximately 25

per cent of households (10 to 84 per cent of households). Wilderness Safaris was chosen for the study as it offers a consistent set of objectives and operates according to a standard policy framework across all its operations over a broad area in southern Africa. This allows for a comparison of interactions under changing circumstances, such as varying land management arrangements, population densities and employment in high-end ecotourism. Two types of community members were differentiated in this study: those directly employed in a high-end ecotourism

operation (staff) and those not employed in the high-end ecotourism operation (community). For each camp, both groups of respondents were from the same community, living either in or around the protected area where the ecotourism operation was situated. This allowed for the comparison of attitudes towards conservation and ecotourism between the two groups. Table 1 summarises the camps, and communities/ethnic groups surveyed in each country.

Both male and female interviewers conducted the surveys, and local translators were used in circumstances where the respondent could not speak or understand English. The surveys contained questions relating to demographics, social welfare and living standards, education, employment patterns, income and expenses, health and safety, and attitudes toward tourism and conservation. Each survey was conducted verbally, with the interviewer completing the questionnaire survey during the interview. Each survey took approximately 20-30 minutes when conducted in English, and approximately 25-45 minutes when translated, depending on the respondent's educational level.

They consisted of a structured set of questions; the majority were close-ended, some provided the option for further explanation. Interviewers introduced themselves to respondents and explained the purpose of the research: A study on the socio-economic impact of conservation and tourism on surrounding communities. The interviewers likely would have been associated with Wilderness Safaris because of their vehicles in some areas and through the introduction process; this may have biased responses. It is impossible to predict the direction of the bias; however, as

some respondents may have been negative in order to ensure changes or positive in order to win favour with the private sector operator in the area (Allendorf et al., 2006). Respondents were told that the surveys were confidential and their participation in answering all questions in the survey was voluntary. This resulted in some questions not being answered. Non-response to questions did not cluster on particular questions, as no particular question had a greater non-response rate than any other question. All data collected were analysed using SPSS, v. 12, and a combination of descriptive statistics, Chi-square tests and independent samples t-tests.

## RESULTS

This research paper forms part of a larger Doctoral study looking at the socio-economic impacts of high-end ecotourism on rural communities and attitudes towards tourism and conservation (Snyman, forthcoming). Overall, staff employed in ecotourism held more positive attitudes than those not employed in ecotourism. Wilderness Safaris' policy is to employ as many staff as possible from the local community. The size of a community relative to the number of its members who are employed in tourism, as well as the number of alternative employment options available in the area, can have a significant impact on attitudes and behaviours related to the protected area. This was observed by the author in the Zambian surveys around South Luangwa, the Zimbabwe surveys around Hwange National Park and the South African surveys in KwaZulu-Natal, where the majority of the community were very positive about tourism and conservation, as it was one of very few livelihood options in the area (Snyman, forthcoming).



*Survey at Maninji Village adjacent to Liwonde National Parks, Malawi © Susan Snyman*



*Survey at Ngamo Village adjacent to Hwange National Park © Susan Snyman*



**Table 2. Impact of land management system on community attitudes towards tourism and conservation: Breakdown of staff and community respondents**

Attitude	% who felt that there had been a positive change in the villages due to tourism	% who felt that tourism creates jobs for local people	% who felt that tourism reduces poverty in the area	% who have family employed in tourism/conservation	% who collect natural resources from the conservation area	% who felt that conservation was important	% who had problems with wild animals	% who would like to visit the conservation area
Conservancy Staff	84	96	72	72	12	96	20	Missing*
Conservancy Community	33	63	26	60	93	96	47	Missing
Community Trust Staff	83	93	83	43	2	99	58	Missing
Community Trust Community	44	75	57	37	1.2	87	75	44
Government Land** Staff	79	83	73	31	3	99	74	96
Government Land Community	54	63	56	43	7	84	95	78
Government Land with comm. levy*** Staff	94	100	100	47	6	100	18	Missing
Government Land with comm. levy*** Community	42	64	42	39	99	91	64	Missing
Joint Venture Staff	69	86	72	42	55	100	52	41
Joint Venture Community	68	82	73	71	64	88	64	54

\*Missing: indicates that the question was not included in those surveys

\*\*Government land in this study was all National Parks

\*\*\* The community levy found in these cases was a voluntary levy paid by Wilderness Safaris to the communities in the area

Statistical analysis showed that formal education (i.e. number of years educated) had the greatest impact on overall attitudes, with those possessing more formal education, in general, having more positive attitudes. There was a statistically significant difference between the mean number of years of formal education of staff ( $M=9.12$ ) and of community respondents ( $M=5.78$ ,  $t(826.738)=17.197$ ), with a large effect size,  $r=0.51$ . Other variables that affected attitudes included: gender, number of children, number living in the household; human-wildlife conflict; total monthly household income; and having a family member employed in tourism and/or conservation. This is discussed in more detail in Snyman (forthcoming); however, the

focus of this paper is on the affect of land management systems. This is detailed next.

Table 2 gives an average of total respondents for each of the land management systems studied. A breakdown between staff and community respondents for each land management system is given in Table 2. The land management systems discussed in this study include:

- *Conservancy*: community-owned land that is managed by a representative management committee and has a registered membership, legal constitution, outline of a benefit distribution plan and defined boundaries
- *Community Trust*: a legal entity, commonly formed in

**Table 3. Impact of a joint venture engagement versus no community ownership on community attitudes towards tourism and conservation**

Attitude	Land tenure arrangement	Statistical significance
Per cent of respondents who felt that tourism creates jobs for local people	Joint venture (Community & Private Sector)	$\chi^2 (1) = 36.091, p < .001$
	Government Land (National Park)	
Per cent of respondents who felt that tourism reduces poverty in the area	Joint venture (Community & Private Sector)	$\chi^2 (1) = 31.876, p < 0.001$
	Government Land (National Park)	
Per cent of respondents who felt that conservation was important	Joint venture (Community & Private Sector)	$\chi^2 (1) = 9.984, p < 0.05$
	Government Land (National Park)	
Per cent respondents who felt that there had been a positive change in the villages due to tourism	Joint venture (Community & Private Sector)	$\chi^2 (2) = 13.615, p < 0.05$
	Government Land (National Park)	

a community-based natural resource management programme (CBNRM), to represent the community, specifically in all agreements with the private sector

- *Government Land*: where the government owns the protected area/conservation land. In this study, all such areas were National Parks
- *Government land with community levy*: in this study the tourism camp was situated in a National Park (owned by the government), but the tourism operator paid voluntary community levies to the communities bordering the area
- *Joint venture*: a contractual partnership between a community or local institution and the private sector, to work together in establishing and operating a tourism enterprise.

Overall, respondents in the joint venture system (a partnership between a community and the private sector) were the most positive about tourism, with Conservancy members having the highest percentage of family employed in tourism or conservation. Where the land management fell under government (all National Parks in this study) respondents had the highest percentage of problems with wild animals and the greatest desire to visit the conservation area. Where there was some level of community empowerment or receipt of benefits, attitudes were more positive towards tourism and conservation. In an analysis of the whole sample, in all cases, except for the Conservancy approach, more than 50 per cent of respondents felt that tourism reduces poverty in the area. In all land management approaches, more than 50 per cent of respondents felt that tourism creates jobs for local

people and that there has been a positive change in their village as a result of tourism in the area. The joint venture and community trust systems; however, showed the most positive attitudes.

Table 2 shows that both staff and community respondents who had the highest percentage of problems with wild animals and greatest interest in visiting the protected areas being studied were from those areas where the government owned the land (National Parks in this study). This points to a need for National Parks to invest time and/or money in human-wildlife mitigation efforts if they are to ensure the long-term support of communities in the area. The historical exclusion of these communities from the protected areas and the illegality of entry could possibly explain this high percentage and, therefore, desire of these communities to visit the protected area. It does; however, illustrate the possible benefit that could be derived from community outreach projects that include structured/controlled access for the communities to the protected area. Table 2 also illustrates that where a large percentage of respondents had family employed in tourism or conservation, they also generally had more positive attitudes towards tourism and conservation (in the conservancy and joint venture systems).

Table 3 shows an analysis of the difference in attitudes between respondents living in an area where there is community involvement through a joint venture between the community and private sector, and those living in an area adjacent to a government-owned protected area with no community involvement. A Chi-square test showed that in all attitudes analysed in the table, where there was



*Chimbwa Village, Zambia © Susan Snyman*

community involvement, the respondents had more positive attitudes towards conservation and ecotourism. These differences were all statistically significant and highlight the importance of some level of ownership.

## **DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR MANAGEMENT**

It was observed that the greater the involvement of the community in tourism operations, the more chances there are for linkages to be established between the community and the tourism operation. Partnerships between the private sector and rural communities allows for a transfer of knowledge, skills and, in some cases, capital. The direct benefits, usually from tourism, received by rural communities for conserving natural resources can often result in more positive attitudes. This study shows that land management arrangements that give communities some level of ownership or empowerment, as well as allowing them to be involved in the decision-making and benefit distribution process, may serve to improve attitudes and, consequently, long-term support.

Past studies have found similar results. For example, Weldaji et al. (2003) in North Cameroon, Infield and Namara (2001 in Weladji et al., 2003) in Uganda and Romañach et al. (2007) in Kenya all found that where communities had some level of ownership they had more positive attitudes towards conservation. Land ownership alone is; however, not sufficient to promote wildlife conservation (Romañach et al., 2007) or positive attitudes towards ecotourism operations.

Alleviating poverty in rural areas can help to reduce pressure on biodiversity (Aichi Biodiversity Strategic Goal B) by lessening the need for unsustainable use, providing opportunities for alternative livelihoods, and by placing people in a position where they can choose to conserve (Walpole & Wilder, 2008). Tourism is one of few businesses able to generate income in these impoverished rural areas with high unemployment levels and marginal opportunities for agriculture (Ashley & Roe, 2002; Boudreaux & Nelson, 2011; Lapeyre, 2011; Scherl et al., 2004; Spenceley & Goodwin, 2007) and therefore to assist in poverty reduction and overall improvements in social welfare.



In summation, some management conclusions drawn from this study include:

- Alternative livelihoods, such as ecotourism employment, may assist in steering households away from absolute reliance on natural resources for survival, which could in turn promote biodiversity conservation and long-term sustainable use, as well as positive attitudes (Aichi Biodiversity Strategic Goal B).
- The use of local suppliers of goods and services by a tourism operator serves to extend the benefits of tourism beyond employment or ownership (for example Pafuri Camp in South Africa outsources staff transport to community members, as well as selling community crafts in the shop and buying eggs from the community). Private sector support and capacity building is critical for this in order to guide local producers in terms of the quality and quantity of goods required for the tourism industry (Aichi Biodiversity Strategic Goal D).
- Land ownership arrangements do impact attitudes, but not always significantly. The importance of some level of ownership or empowerment is; however, critical to the long-term maintenance of positive attitudes and the sustainability of the ecotourism operations. An example of a successful joint venture between the private sector and a community is that of Damaraland Camp and the Torra Conservancy in Namibia (*see* Snyman, 2012b, for a detailed analysis of this relationship). The joint venture has recently been the first case of a conservancy raising their own capital funding for the expansion of an existing operation, serving to further empower the community and enhance their business skills.
- Communities need to be involved in the decision-making processes relating to ecotourism and conservation in their area. Ownership, capacity building and empowerment have been shown to lead to more positive attitudes towards conservation and ecotourism and therefore sustainability (Aichi Biodiversity Strategic Goal E).
- In areas where government owns the land and which have no community involvement there have to be benefits, both tangible and intangible, received by the community, as well as a mitigation of the negative impacts associated with conservation (human-wildlife conflict). Outreach programmes, introduced by the private sector tourism operator, in communities abutting the Park could include educational programmes as well as social welfare projects. Such programmes would serve to link conservation and tourism directly to benefits (Aichi Biodiversity Strategic Goal D).
- The inclusion of the community does not always have to be directly in the tourism business, it can be through including cultural activities and local culture in the tourism operation. This can serve to empower community members through an expression of their culture, the sale of local crafts as well as payments for various cultural activities, such as dancing and singing. It is however, important that culture is not commodified and that there is mutual respect between tourists and local people. The introduction of an Ethics Charter and Codes of Conduct for Cultural Tourism for the tourism operator can serve to ensure that cultural tourism increases knowledge, raises awareness and enriches all involved (some examples of these are the World Tourism Organisation's Global Code of Ethics for Tourism, the International Council on Monuments and Sites Cultural Tourism Charter, National Responsible Tourism Guidelines for South Africa and the Wilderness Safaris Ethics Charter for Cultural Tourism).
- Formal education is critical. This includes education in general, as well as specifically in terms of biodiversity conservation, ecotourism and sustainability.
- Overall awareness raising is important – including specifically relating to ecotourism and conservation. Government, NGOs or the private sector can do this. Ecotourism operators can play an important role in this through environmental talks and conservation and tourism awareness-raising days in communities, as well as offering environmental lessons and game drives to community school children, as many have never been into the protected area adjacent to their homes (*see* [www.childreninthewilderness.com](http://www.childreninthewilderness.com) for Wilderness Safaris environmental education programme, and <http://www.africafoundation.org/empowering-education/> for the & Beyond Africa Foundation) (Aichi Biodiversity Strategic Goal E);
- Business skills training is important in terms of empowering communities and ensuring a more equal partnership between communities and the private sector. Business skills required include, amongst others, budgeting, marketing, accounting, reporting and communication skills (Aichi Biodiversity Strategic Goal E).

It is not only important to maximise benefits to communities, there needs to be a concomitant process of minimising costs, as often there are more who will bear the

costs than there are those who will benefit from the conservation and ecotourism in the area. In order to encourage community support for conservation and the consequent protection of natural resources, a direct connection needs to be ascertained between conservation and ecotourism and the benefits that accrue to the community from it, whether collective or individual (Snyman, 2012), direct or indirect.

Direct and indirect ecotourism employment along with ecotourism operations with some level of community ownership, have a positive influence on community attitudes towards tourism and conservation. An overall understanding of what factors influence community members' attitudes to tourism and conservation can assist in managing expectations and can be used in awareness-raising programmes to improve attitudes and garner support from communities living in and around conservation areas (Allendorf et al., 2006; Chidakel, 2011; Sifuna, 2010; Simelane et al., 2006). Understanding and managing community expectations, as well as community perceptions, under varying socio-economic circumstances, as well as varying land management systems, will lead to more efficient, equitable and sustainable community-based conservation and tourism models.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges financial support from SIDA (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency) through the Environmental Policy Research Unit, University of Cape Town. Special thanks are due to Wilderness Safaris for the funding, accommodation and transport to conduct the surveys for this research. Thanks to all interviewers, translators, staff and community members who helped with and/or participated in the surveys for this research. Thank you to the anonymous reviewers and editors for helpful advice and comments.

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> For a more detailed outline of the methods used in the overall study see Snyman (2012) and Snyman (forthcoming)

<sup>2</sup> For more information on Wilderness Safaris see [www.wilderness-safaris.com](http://www.wilderness-safaris.com)

## REFERENCES

- Allendorf, T., Swe, K. K., Oo, T., Htut, Y. et al. (2006). 'Community attitudes towards three protected areas in upper Myanmar (Burma).' *Environmental Conservation* 33 (4):344-352.
- Alexander, S. E. (2000). 'Resident attitudes toward conservation and black howler monkeys in Belize: The Community Baboon Sanctuary.' *Environmental Conservation* 27(4):341-350.
- Andereck, K.L., Valentine, K.M., Knopf, R.C. and Vogt, C.A. (2005). 'Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts.' *Annals of Tourism Research* 32 (4):1056-1076.
- Anthony, B. (2007). 'The dual nature of parks: attitudes of neighbouring communities to Kruger National Park, South Africa.' *Environmental Conservation* 34 (3):236-245.
- Ashley, C. and Jones, B. (2001). 'Joint ventures between communities and tourism investors: Experiences in southern Africa.' *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3(2).
- Barrow, E. and Fabricius, C. (2002). 'Do rural people really benefit from protected areas – rhetoric of reality?' *Parks* 12 (2):67-79.
- Borrini-Feyerabend, G., Kothari, A. and Oviedo, G. (2004). *Indigenous and local communities and protected areas: Towards equity and enhanced conservation*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK, xviii+111pp. [website] Available at: <http://plateauperspectives.org/pubs/Indigineousper cent20peoples.pdf>. [Accessed 23 January 2012].
- Boudreaux, K. and Nelson, F. (2011). 'Community conservation in Namibia: empowering the poor with property rights.' *Economic Affairs* 31(2):17-24.
- Browne-Núñez, C. and Jonker, S.A. (2008). 'Attitudes toward wildlife and conservation across Africa: a review of survey research.' *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 13:47-70.
- Chandralal, K. P. L. (2010). 'Impacts of tourism and community attitudes towards tourism: A case study in Sri Lanka.' *South Asian Journal of Tourism and Heritage* 3(2):41-49.
- Chidakel, A. (2011). 'Conservation attitudes and Community Based Natural Resource Management in an Understocked Game Management Area of Zambia.' FIU Electronic Theses and Dissertations, Paper 450. [website] Available at: <http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/etd/450> [Accessed 10 August 2011].
- Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD) Aichi 2020 Biodiversity Targets. [website] Available at: <http://www.cbd.int/sp/targets/>. [Accessed 14 November 2012]
- Coria, J., and Calfucura, E. (2012). 'Ecotourism and the development of indigenous communities: the good, the bad and the ugly.' *Ecological Economics* 73:47-55.
- Currie, J.A. (2001). 'Towards sustainable conservation: Community perceptions of game reserves in the Maputoland Region of South Africa: Comparative case studies of Phinda and Mkhuzi Game Reserves.' Submitted in partial fulfilment of the academic requirements for the degree of Master of Sustainable Environmental Management, Middlesex University, London.
- De Boer, W. F., and Baquete, D. S. (1998). 'Natural resource use, crop damage and attitudes of rural people in the vicinity of the Maputo Elephant Reserve, Mozambique.' *Environmental Conservation* 25(3):208-218.

- Emerton, L. (1999). *The nature of benefits and the benefits of nature: why wildlife conservation has not economically benefitted communities in Africa*. Community conservation research in Africa: Principles and comparative practice paper no. 9, Institute for Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester.
- Gillingham, S. and Lee, P.C. (2003). 'People and protected areas: A study of local perceptions of wildlife crop-damage conflict in an area bordering the Selous Game Reserve, Tanzania.' *Oryx* 37(3):316-325.
- Groom, R. and Harris, S. (2008). 'Conservation on community lands: the importance of equitable revenue sharing.' *Environmental Conservation* 35(3):242-251.
- Hulme, D. and Murphree, M., (eds.). (2001). *African Wildlife and Livelihoods: the promise and performance of community conservation*. James Currey Ltd.
- Jurowski, C. and Gursoy, D. (2004). 'Distance effects on residents' attitudes toward tourism.' *Annals of Tourism Research* 31(2):296-312.
- Kepe, T., Wynberg, R. and Ellis, W. (2005). 'Land reform and biodiversity conservation in South Africa: Complementary or in conflict?' *International Journal of Biodiversity Science and Management* 1:3-16.
- Kideghesho, J.R., Røskaft, E. and Kaltenborn, B.P. (2007). 'Factors influencing conservation attitudes of local people in Western Serengeti, Tanzania.' *Biodiversity Conservation* 16:2213-2230.
- Lapeyre, R. (2011). 'The Grootberg lodge partnership in Namibia: Towards poverty alleviation and empowerment for long-term sustainability?' *Current Issues in Tourism* 14 (3):221-234.
- Lapeyre, R. (2011). 'Governance structures and the distribution of tourism income in Namibian communal lands: a new institutional approach.' *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geographie* 102(3):302-312.
- Lepp, A. (2007). 'Resident's attitudes toward tourism in bigodi village, Uganda.' *Tourism Management* 28:876-885.
- Newmark, W.D., Manyanga, D.N., Gamassa, D-G.M. and Sariko, H.I. (1994). 'The conflict between wildlife and local people living adjacent to the protected areas in Tanzania: human density as a predictor.' *Conservation Biology* 8(1):249-255.
- Romañach, S.S., Lindsey, P. and Woodroffe, R. (2007). 'Determinants of attitudes towards predators in central Kenya and suggestions for increasing tolerance in livestock dominated landscapes.' *Oryx* 41:185-195.
- Scanlon, L.J. and Kull, C.A. (2009). 'Untangling the links between wildlife benefits and community-based conservation at Torra Conservancy, Namibia.' *Development Southern Africa* 26:1, 75-93.
- Scherl, L.M., Wilson, A., Wild, R., Blockhus, J., Franks, P., McNeely, J.A. and McShane, T.O. (2004). *Can protected areas contribute to poverty reduction? Opportunities and limitations*. IUCN-The World Conservation Union, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK, viii+60pp.
- Shibia, M. G. (2010). 'Determinants of attitudes and perceptions on resource use and management of Marsabit National Reserve, Kenya.' *Journal of Human Ecology* 30(1):55-62.
- Sibanda, B.M.C. and Omwega, A.K. (1996). 'Some reflections on conservation, sustainable development and equitable sharing of benefits from wildlife in Africa: the case of Kenya and Zimbabwe.' *South African Journal of Wildlife Research* 26:175-181.
- Sifuna, N. (2010). 'Wildlife damage and its impact on public attitudes toward conservation: a comparative study of Kenya and Botswana, with particular reference to Kenya's Laikipia Region and Botswana's Okavango Delta region.' *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 45:274-296.
- Simelane, T.S., Kerley, G.I.H., and Knight, M.H. (2006). 'Reflections on the relationships between communities and conservation areas of South Africa: the case of five South African national parks.' *Koedoe* 49(2):85-102.
- Sindiga, I. (1995). 'Wildlife-based tourism in Kenya: land use conflicts and government compensation policies over protected areas.' *The Journal of Tourism Studies* 6(2):45-55.
- Sirakaya, E., Teye, V. and Sönmez, S. (2002). 'Understanding residents' support for tourism development in the central region of Ghana.' *Journal of Travel Research* 41:57-67.
- Snyman, S. (2012). 'The role of tourism employment in poverty reduction and community perceptions of conservation and tourism in southern Africa.' *The Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 20(3):395-416.
- Snyman, S. (forthcoming). *The economics of ecotourism: based on over 1800 surveys in six southern African countries*. PhD thesis, School of Economics, University of Cape Town.
- Snyman, S. (2012b). 'Ecotourism joint ventures between the private sector and communities: An updated analysis of the Torra Conservancy and Damaraland Camp partnership, Namibia.' *Tourism Management Perspectives* 4:127-135.
- Spenceley, A., and Goodwin, H. (2007). 'Nature-based tourism and poverty alleviation: Impacts of private sector and parastatal enterprises in and around Kruger National Park, South Africa.' *Current Issues in Tourism* 10(2-3):255-277.
- Stronza, A., and Gordillo, J. (2008). 'Community views of ecotourism.' *Annals of Tourism Research* 35(2).
- Stronza, A. (2007). 'The economic promise of ecotourism for conservation.' *Journal of Ecotourism* 6(3):210-230.
- Teye, V., Sönmez, S.F., & Sirakaya, E. (2002). 'Resident attitudes toward tourism development.' *Annals of Tourism Research* 29 (3):668-688.
- Walpole, M. J., and Goodwin, H. J. (2001). 'Local attitudes towards conservation and tourism around Komodo National Park, Indonesia.' *Environmental Conservation* 28(2):160-166.
- Wang, Y. and Pfister, R.E., (2008). 'Resident's attitudes toward tourism and perceived personal benefits in a rural community.' *Journal of Travel Research* 47(1):84-93.
- Waylen, K.A., McGowan, P.J.K., Pawi Study Group and Milner-Gulland, E.J. (2009). 'Ecotourism positively affects awareness and attitudes but not conservation behaviours: a case study at Grand Riviere, Trinidad.' *Oryx* 43(3):343-351.
- Weladji, R.B., Moe, S.R. and Vedeld, P. (2003). 'Stakeholder attitudes toward wildlife policy and the Bénoué Wildlife Conservation Area, North Cameroon.' *Environmental Conservation* 30 (4):334-343.
- Weladji, R.B. and Tchamba, M.N. (2003). 'Conflict between people and protected areas within the Bénoué Wildlife Conservation Area, North Cameroon.' *Oryx* 37:72-79.
- Woodroffe, R., Thirgood, S. and Rabinowitz, A. (eds) (2005). *People and Wildlife: Conflict or Coexistence?* The Zoological Society of London, Cambridge University Press.



## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

**Susan Snyman** has a Master of Business Science (Economics) from the University of Cape Town, South Africa, and is currently working towards a PhD (Economics) at the same university. Having completed PhD coursework at the University of Goteborg in Sweden in 2008, the focus of her PhD research is on the socio-economic impact of high-end ecotourism in remote, rural

communities adjacent to protected areas, based on over 1800 community surveys in six southern African countries. Sue has 14 years' experience in the ecotourism industry in southern Africa, including guiding, community development and liaison, camp management and environmental impact assessments as an independent consultant.

## RESUMEN

Muchas zonas rurales de África se caracterizan por altos niveles de desempleo, pobreza y aumento de la densidad poblacional. Los climas áridos y las precipitaciones irregulares también hacen que muchas de estas zonas sean poco rentables para la agricultura y ofrecen pocas oportunidades de empleo alternativas. El ecoturismo en estas zonas puede ofrecer una opción viable para la utilización sostenible de la tierra basada en la conservación de la biodiversidad y ayudar a reducir la pobreza y promover el desarrollo socioeconómico a nivel local. Con la generación de beneficios del ecoturismo también se logra mejorar la actitud de las comunidades hacia la conservación. A través de cuestionarios extensos, este estudio analizó el impacto de los sistemas de gestión de la tierra en las actitudes de las comunidades hacia el turismo y la conservación en seis países de África meridional: Botsuana, Malawi, Namibia, Sudáfrica, Zambia y Zimbabwe. El estudio concluyó que los diversos sistemas de gestión de la tierra, tales como la propiedad estatal o comunal de la tierra, tenían diferentes efectos sobre las actitudes. En general, un cierto grado de propiedad o participación comunitaria, como por ejemplo, en empresas mixtas, generó actitudes más positivas por parte de la comunidad. Los resultados destacan la importancia del empoderamiento y el sentido de propiedad para promover la conservación de la biodiversidad y asegurar la sostenibilidad a largo plazo de las operaciones ecoturísticas.

## RÉSUMÉ

De nombreuses zones rurales africaines sont caractérisées par de forts taux de chômage, de pauvreté et une densité démographique croissante. Le climat aride et les précipitations irrégulières rendent également beaucoup de ces zones marginales pour l'agriculture et offrent peu d'alternatives en termes d'opportunités d'emplois. Dans ces zones, l'écotourisme peut offrir une option durable d'utilisation des terres en favorisant la conservation de la diversité biologique, la réduction de la pauvreté et le développement socio-économique local. Entre autres avantages, l'écotourisme permet en outre d'améliorer l'attitude des communautés envers la conservation. Grâce à l'utilisation de questionnaires approfondis, cette étude analyse l'impact des systèmes de gestion des terres sur les attitudes des communautés envers le tourisme et la conservation dans six pays d'Afrique australe : l'Afrique du Sud, le Botswana, le Malawi, la Namibie, la Zambie et le Zimbabwe. L'étude a ainsi constaté que des différences dans les systèmes de gestion des terres, par exemple entre les terres possédées par l'État et les terres communales, entraînent des attitudes différentes. Globalement, un certain niveau de propriété ou de participation communautaire, comme les associations, rend l'attitude des communautés plus positive. Les résultats soulignent l'importance de l'autonomisation et de la propriété pour encourager la conservation de la diversité biologique et garantir la durabilité à long-terme des activités d'écotourisme.