
Original Article

Local Communities' Ownership of Tourism Enterprises in Lupande Protected Area, Zambia.

Chilyango F. Chiwele¹

¹ Africa Research University (ARU), Keystone University of Africa, Lusaka, Zambia

* Correspondence: Chiwele email: chilyangochiwele@gmail.com

Received: 17 September 2024; Accepted: 22 October 2024; Published: 30 October 2024

Abstract: The study investigated the entry barriers to local communities' ownership of tourism enterprises in Zambia. Lupande Game Management Area, in Eastern Province, was utilized as a case study. The primary objective of the study was to examine the entry barriers to ownership of tourism enterprises in Zambia. It employed a qualitative research methodology as the primary research approach. Significant study findings were that the local community members' income, education, skills, and capacities were so inadequate that most did not own tourism enterprises. The proportion of ownership of tourism enterprises was such that over 95% were owned by foreign and external investors, and only less than 5% were owned by local investors, primarily domiciled in urban areas. Chronic institutional challenges in the country's Game Management Areas (GMAs) were part of major barriers to community ownership of tourism enterprises. Lack of devolved collective rights over natural resources such as wildlife and forests to local communities and weaknesses in local management institutions related to their performance as collective, community-level natural resource governance are part of the most significant barriers. The law does not provide for communal ownership of land either. To promote local communities' ownership of tourism enterprises in protected areas, there is a need for existing unsupportive legal, policy, and institutional frameworks to be replaced with supportive and favourable ones.

Keywords: Community-based resource management, entry barriers, tourism enterprises, protected areas, consumptive tourism, non-consumptive wildlife

1. Introduction

Given the close interrelationship between local natural resource use and livelihoods and the management of wildlife and forests nationally, community-based natural resource management is central to both livelihoods and conservation outcomes locally and nationally. Chronic institutional challenges in Game Management Areas (GMAs) created by lacking community authority and ability to benefit from trophy hunting and other wildlife uses remain in Zambia. Field-level experiments with community game ranching, community trusts, and "conservancies" are working on trying and developing new approaches to community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) at the local or landscape scale but remain limited by the national legal and policy context in the wildlife sector (Davis et al., 2020).

Various factors have constrained the progress of community-based natural resource management in the country over the past several decades. In particular, the two most significant barriers have been the lack of devolved collective rights over natural resources such as wildlife and forests to local communities and weaknesses in local management institutions related to their performance as collective, community-level natural resource governance (Lindsey et al., 2014). Similar to this, investors have the option to alienate land but not communities (Hair, 2017). The study sets out to investigate the local

communities' entry barriers to ownership of tourism enterprises in protected areas in Zambia using Lupande Game Management Area as a case study.

Tourism boosts the economy's revenue, creates thousands of jobs, develops the country's infrastructures of a country, and plants a sense of cultural exchange between foreigners and citizens (Fornell, 2003). Furthermore, through the concept, underprivileged communities are able to build capacity, achieve empowerment, alleviate poverty, diversify livelihoods, and encourage community participation in decision-making (Curcija et al., 2019; Dodds, Ali and Galaski, 2018). Sustainable tourism cannot be achieved until community members actively support tourism development (Armstrong, 2012).

The Eighth National Development Plan (8NDP) recognizes tourism as one of the sectors for economic diversification and job creation in Zambia due to its potential to generate revenue, foreign exchange earnings and employment. The tourism industry in 2019 contributed 7 percent of Gross Domestic Product and 7.2 percent of total employment. Expenditure from International visitors was USD 849 million, 10 percent of Zambia's total exports (Office of the Auditor General, 2020).

The World Bank argues that tourism contributes to local development by providing destination countries with economic benefits but the benefits from tourism do not disseminate to all levels of society (World Bank 2019). However, Curcija contradicts this argument by stating that local community involvement assists in the proper distribution of economy and at the very same time improve the long-term prospects of tourism (Curcija, 2019). Community-based tourism has a high prospect in rural tourism development, and its success depends on better community leadership, support, and participation of local administrative groups (Curcija, 2019). According to Curcija, tourism development provides local people time to adjust in new environmental, social and economic conditions and helps prevent negative results of rapid uncontrolled development. Involving local people in determining their development will prevent conflicts that would inevitably affect the tourism's sustainability (Curcija, 2019).

Tourism remains the sector that is the priority in achieving sustainable economic growth and reducing poverty in Zambia. In terms of the Poverty Reduction Support Programme, the Government's focus is to diversify the tourism product from being mainly wildlife based to include cultural tourism, game and national park concessions, safari hunting, etc. The benefits of additional resources from this sector could be channeled towards improved food security, health, education, household incomes and consequently, improved standard of living of the people of this nation especially in rural areas where most of the local communities live in poverty adjacent to tourism protected areas (Poverty Reduction Support Programme, 2020)

In the 1980s, a need was recognized for greater community participation in wildlife based land uses in Game Management Areas (Fernandez, et.al, 2010). In the early 1980s, subsidiary legislation was introduced to partially decentralize authority over wildlife to communities (Fernandez, et.al, 2010). The Zambia Wildlife Act of 1998 established Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA) as a parastatal responsible for managing protected areas (Chemonics International Inc., 2011). The Wildlife Act identified Community Resource Boards as the institutions for communities to co-manage and benefit from wildlife in Game Management Areas though no mechanisms were created to enable communities to benefit from wildlife in national parks (Chemonics International Inc., 2011). Wildlife-based land uses in the protected area network have the potential to improve livelihoods significantly for communities. The primary benefit to communities from national parks is employment and the development of wildlife-based economies around tourism hubs such as the growth point of Mfuwe, adjacent to South Luangwa National Park. Tourism generates an estimated 19,000 jobs in Zambia, though the proportion derived specifically from parks is not clear (Hamilton, et al., 2007).

Community based natural resource management

Community participation is believed as a method of grassroots democracy, where individuals have a right to participate in decision-making on matters that directly affect their lives. It is seen as a corrective style especially when local residents are poor or geographically disadvantaged (Burns, 2004). Carr advocated that the objective of sustainable tourism development can be attained through the voluntary involvement of local communities (Carr, 2016). Murphy recognized that there would be proper consensus, less chance of delays and more harmonious development, only if more individuals are motivated to be involved in tourism development at an early stage (Murphy, 1985). Tourism should be community driven, where community members are responsible to control tourism infrastructure and facilities available in their surroundings (Snyman, 2012).

The local community experiences both positive and negative effects of tourism enterprises, either directly or indirectly; hence their involvement is crucial to effectively managing these effects and reaping the rewards of tourist-related activities (Cole, 2006). Participation is capable of transforming the passive attitude of the community into a responsible and favorable outlook, inspiring entrepreneurial ventures, building partnership and collaboration, promoting a spirit of cohesiveness, and rejuvenating relationships between people, tourism destinations, and external stakeholders

(Moscardo, 2011). Consequently, this can increase the prospects of more successful and sustainable development (Carter, 2007). However, researchers deliberate that participatory tourism development may vary from locality to locality and region to region. They opine that not every form of community participation could produce the expected standard benefits for locals since it can take many forms ranging from manipulative participation to citizen power (Tosun, 1999). The active involvement of the community in many destinations, including Zambia, is not apparent due to highly centralized decision-making and underestimating the role of locals in decision-making processes. (Bittar Rodrigues & Prideaux, 2018)

More importantly, community participation is concentrated on community control over managing and developing tourism ownership and generating direct financial benefits (Yanes et al., 2019). Community participation minimizes negative tourism impacts by encouraging community members to become involved in planning and development and effectively dealing with adverse impacts (Bittar Rodrigues & Prideaux, 2018; Ndlovu et al., 2018). Furthermore, the concept increases the local community's tolerance for tourism development, promoting cooperation and ensuring the sustainability of community-based tourism development projects (Kihima & Musila, 2019). In addition to participation, another focus that is widely discussed is ownership. Ownership and participation are important in managing community-based tourism (Towner & Towner, 2016). Another aspect that is considered necessary in community-based tourism is a partnership (Rodrigues & Prideaux, 2017)

Community-based tourism (CBT) is about social justice, empowerment, equity of benefits, redistributive measures, ownership of the tourism sector, and holistic community development. It is also participatory. Community-based tourism can also be described as self-participatory: the community itself initiates and drives the development. Secondly, the findings indicate that tourism development at destinations goes through stages during which community-based tourism is gradually jeopardized and marginalized by outsiders and the local elite. As a consequence of CBT, tourism destination control increases potential growth through external stakeholder support which is important. It is an important element of economic diversification for both emerging and developed countries and, in developing countries, is a top export sector (UNWTO, 2017). However, tourism also presents challenges, problems, and negatives, such as the vast use of water and adverse effects on communities (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2017:1; Nagarjuna, 2015:14). In addition, "many scholars argue that tourism also perpetuates class and regional inequalities and stimulates economic, environmental and social problems, which have created considerable doubts about tourism being a reliable development strategy in the less-developed world" (Tosun, Timothy, & Öztürk, 2003). The same UNWTO – together with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) – recognized the double face of tourism, its essential contribution to, among others, job creation and environmental protection, and its negative impacts such as "greenhouse gas emissions, economic leakages, resource management or impact on local communities and cultural assets" (UNWTO & UNDP, 2017).

The tourism sector "also contributes to negative impacts on the local community" (Jirojkul & Techato, 2017:1825). Community-based tourism is a form of tourism that arose to offset the negative impacts of conventional or mass tourism (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2017:2; Gadi Djou, Baiquni, Widodo, & Fandeli, 2017:16) such as leakages and falling of local control of natural resources. Community-based tourism is gaining popularity (Mearns & Lukhele, 2015:2), and it "is increasingly being promoted as a means of reducing poverty and fostering local community development" (Runyowa, 2017). This does not mean community-based tourism does not present challenges and difficulties and attracts its own critics. For example, Mitchell and Muckosy (2008:2) suggest that community-based tourism is not the answer to community poverty alleviation through tourism; instead, the same authors propose the need "it is working with mainstream tourism to strengthen links between tourism and local people – often Indigenous populations who are located in disadvantaged regions and have vulnerable livelihoods." So, community-based tourism marketing and market access are undoubtedly a problem in predominantly developing countries; a significant challenge is then the difficulties that village-based enterprises meet when trying to market themselves internationally, where the target market is, and therefore, can easily fold at the outset if success is not visible (Timothy, 2002).

The tourism sector can have positive and negative impacts on a local community, so tourism can affect the lives of the local community in various ways. For some local communities, tourism can be a driving force of overall development, and for others, it may cause negative effects (Nagarjuna, 2015). In this context, local community involvement becomes fundamental to increase the benefits of tourism and minimize the negative impacts (Nagarjuna, 2015). The issues and relevance of community involvement in tourism are well-recognized by researchers (Salleh, Shukor, Othman, Samsudin, & Idris, 2016). Community involvement in tourism is the foundation for change and development (Rasoolimanesh & Jaafar, 2016). Novelli and Gebhardt (2007) remark, "Community participation is often suggested as an essential ingredient in improving the quality of tourism's contribution to national development." On the other hand, increased participation of indigenous communities means involving

low-income groups and people in rural and urban areas; who are not generally involved in the process of government.

Thus, community-based tourism should entail community development in remote, rural, impoverished, marginalized, economically depressed, undeveloped, poor, indigenous, ethnic minorities, and people in small towns (Tasci, Semrad & Yilmaz, 2013). From a poverty perspective, it is proposed that specific poverty measurements, such as a poverty scale from the United Nations, can assist in identifying disadvantaged community members, and each country can apply its own criteria in this regard. However, poverty should not be exclusively related to “inadequate income and human development but also embraces vulnerability and a lack of voice, power and representation” (Zhao & Ritchie, 2007). By the same token, community development should not be seen as exclusively related to statistics. Community-based tourism aims to empower underprivileged groups sustainably (Tasci, Semrad & Yilmaz, 2013). Thus, issues beyond strict economic matters must also be considered, such as community development, social justice, empowerment, self-reliance, and so on (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016). However, there are various possible forms of community participation in tourism (Tosun, 2006). Participation allows for differing degrees of external involvement and local control, reflecting the power relationships (Tosun, 2006).

Community-based tourism should be seen in the context of specific parameters and specific characteristics. The literature describes various characteristics and challenges, such as the issue that community-based tourism should be an Indigenous effort, that it should be aimed at individual and community well-being, that communities often lack financial resources and capacities, and that community-based tourism frequently has difficulties in marketing or market access (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2016). The word “community” in community-based tourism must mean disadvantaged or marginalized community members (Tasci et al., 2013).

Another fundamental issue of community-based tourism is that disadvantaged community members should be the actors and beneficiaries: they control, own, and manage community-based tourism development. Thus, community-based tourism “is conceived, managed, and supplied by the local communities of a given territory” (Terencia, 2018). Again, community-based tourism “is managed and run by the community itself. Management decisions are made by local people, and profits directly go to the community” (Nataraja & Devidasan, 2014). Community-based tourism’s origins can be traced back to the alternative development approaches of the 1970s (Giampiccoli, 2015). The alternative development strategies and alternative forms of tourism development, such as community-based tourism, were therefore correlated to the alternative development concepts and issues, such as empowerment, self-reliance, and sustainability, by the critics of the negative impact of international mass tourism (Mitchell & Muckosy, 2008, Telfer, 2009, Zapata et al., 2011).

The Zambian government has made several attempts to address the underperformance of the protected area network. For example, in 2006, the Zambian Government embarked upon a reclassification program for protected areas, and in early 2013, a moratorium was imposed on hunting in Game Management Areas (Government of Zambia, 2010). In addition, two protected areas have been added to the estate in recent years: 50 km² of Lusaka National Park and 5,104 km² of Mukungule Game Management Areas. However, key challenges with regard to the functioning and effectiveness of Zambia’s protected areas network remain.

These problems are pronounced where human settlement is permitted or tolerated inside protected areas, as occurs in parts of Ethiopia, Mozambique, Tanzania, and Zambia (Owen-Smith and Ogutu, 2003). As earlier mentioned, Zambia has a vast wildlife estate encompassing 20 national parks (64,000 km²), 3 wildlife and bird sanctuaries (33.5 km²), 36 Game Management Areas (167,000 km²), and several other protected area categories, comprising 40% of the nation’s land area (Government of Zambia, 2010).

In the 1980s, a need was recognized for greater community participation in wildlife-based land uses in Game Management Areas (Fernandez et al., 2010). In the early 1980s, subsidiary legislation was introduced to partially decentralize authority over wildlife to communities (Fernandez et al., 2010). The Zambia Wildlife Act 1998 established the Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA) as a parastatal responsible for managing protected areas (Chemonics International Inc., 2011). The Wildlife Act identified Community Resource Boards as the institutions for communities to co-manage and benefit from wildlife in Game Management Areas. However, no mechanisms were created to enable communities to benefit from wildlife in national parks (Chemonics International Inc., 2011). Wildlife-based land uses in the protected area network have the potential to improve livelihoods significantly for communities.

The primary benefit to communities from national parks is employment and the development of wildlife-based economies around tourism hubs such as the growth point of Mfuwe, adjacent to South Luangwa National Park. Tourism generates an estimated 19,000 jobs in Zambia, though the proportion derived specifically from parks is not clear (Hamilton et al., 2007).

Tourism-related employment is significant because it improves attitudes towards wildlife conservation (Snyman, 2012). However, most parks generate virtually no employment for communities due to the lack of small-scale tourism operations. In Game Management Areas in Zambia, benefits accruing to communities from trophy hunting include income generation for Community Resource Boards, employment, and, in some cases, various forms of development assistance from hunting operators. However, no earnings are generated in half of the Game Management Areas, and average earnings accruing to communities across all these areas are low (USD11.9/km²). Concurrently, communities incur significant costs as a result of living with wildlife, and approximately 50 people are killed annually by wild animals (Chomba et al., 2012). People in Game Management Areas are poorer and less educated than the national average, and Game Management Areas have low agricultural potential and offer few alternative livelihood opportunities (Manning, 2011).

Trophy hunting in the Game Management Areas has the potential to generate significant incomes for communities if wildlife populations are allowed to recover and systems are put in place to ensure equitable benefit sharing and best practices (Lindsey et al., 2013). Similarly, national parks have the potential to benefit rural communities through tourism-related employment and business opportunities. The protected areas network has enormous potential to contribute to rural and national economic growth by providing the basis for developing a significant tourism industry (Makoche Kanwa, 2013). However, wildlife populations are waning in many Game Management Areas and national parks, and incomes from trophy hunting and photo-tourism are limited to fractions of the Game Management Areas and national parks (Hamilton et al., 2007). In addition, mechanisms to enable communities to benefit legally from the protected area network are limited. Consequently, this network is under-performing in ecological, economic, and social terms.

Community participation, which encourages the active involvement of the local community in tourism development, is very important in achieving sustainability goals and improving local community welfare (Ertuna & Kirbas, 2012).

As tourism is promoted as a tool for community conservation and development, the emphasis must be on local communities and their needs and capacities. If well-designed, community-based tourism can become a mechanism for reducing poverty and improving the quality of life, providing economic benefits to people in local communities. There is a general agreement in the existing literature regarding the potential contribution of community-based Tourism to poverty alleviation and sustainability of the tourism industry and local communities (Tosun & Timothy, 2003).

Community empowerment means that empowered communities can benefit more from tourism development opportunities and use these opportunities more constructively (Rodrigues and Prideaux, 2018). This is the opposite of what has been happening in protected areas where communities involved in tourism enterprises get peripheral benefits. In contrast, most of the benefits accrue to external actors or tourists. Furthermore, it can be concluded that community-based tourism (CBT) is understood to be managed and owned by the community for the community (Purbasari & Manaf, 2018). However, ownership alone is not enough; the transfer of ownership from an external actor to the community will only be successful if the community has the required management skills to run the project as a commercial business (Rodrigues & Prideaux, 2017). Basically, ownership of the property at the destination enhances their sense of attachment to the destination (Chubchuwong, Beise-zee, & Speece, 2015).

Many African countries have designated generous proportions of their land surface as protected areas. Such protected areas vary greatly, from strictly protected areas with no human settlement to areas with resident communities. It is generally difficult to fund protected area networks adequately, and they are facing severe threats from poaching and human encroachment (Hamilton et al., 2007). These problems are pronounced where human settlement is permitted or tolerated inside protected areas, as occurs in parts of Ethiopia, Mozambique, Tanzania, and Zambia (Owen-Smith and Ogutu, 2003). As earlier mentioned, Zambia has a vast wildlife estate encompassing 20 national parks (64,000 km²), three wildlife and bird sanctuaries (33.5 km²), 36 Game Management Areas (167,000 km²), and several other protected area categories, comprising 40% of the nation's land area (Government of Zambia, 2010).

The Zambian government has made several attempts to address the underperformance of the protected area network. For example, in 2006, the Zambian Government embarked upon a reclassification program for protected areas, and in early 2013, a moratorium was imposed on hunting in Game Management Areas (Government of Zambia, 2010). In addition, two protected areas have been added to the estate in recent years: 50 km² of Lusaka National Park and 5,104 km² of Mukungule Game Management Areas. However, key challenges with regard to the functioning and effectiveness of Zambia's protected areas network remain.

The country's floral diversity contains over 3,000 species, of which 211 are endemic. The total fauna diversity exceeds 3,600 species, of which 2,032 are invertebrates, 409 fish, 67 amphibians, 150 reptiles, 739 birds, 224 mammals, and 598 species of microorganisms. The government considers

the wildlife sector as critical to national economic development inter alia promotion and growth of wildlife-based -tourism, employment creation, and poverty reduction, as mentioned earlier in the discussion.

Human settlement is prohibited in national parks, and land use is limited primarily to photo-tourism. National parks have generally not suffered from human encroachment, but are subject to widespread poaching, regular uncontrolled burning (which sometimes emanates from areas outside of the park boundaries), and, in some cases, informal mining (Becker, McRobb, Watson, Droge, Kanyembo, et al., 2013). With the exception of Lusaka and Mosi-oa-Tunya national parks, no protected areas in Zambia are fenced, and most are simply demarcated with cut-lines or rivers. In some cases, beacons with multiple uses of wildlife are permitted.

3. Materials and Methods

Not enough data on community-based natural resource management in Zambia are available because very few studies have been undertaken. The same can be said about the rest of the Southern African region. This study employed a case study research design. It was based on the descriptive nature of the research, which is focused on answering the 'what' and 'how', etc., including the extent of its research question. According to Stake (2005), a case study-based design is recommended in studies that require the collection of in-depth information to obtain multiple perspectives and points of view that capture a holistic understanding of the phenomenon. This design involves the use of numerous sources of data, which are rich in real-life situations.

The population that was covered by the study was approximately 119,313. The sample size used in the analysis was based on the researcher's available time and financial resources, which was 110 respondents.

This sample was arrived at by basing it on the Slovene formula, which is given by $n=N/(1+Ne^2)$ where 'n' is the sample size, 'N' is the population size, and 'e' is the margin of error (95% confidence level) decided by the researcher, to come up with findings which were as representative as possible. The researcher, therefore, used a simple random sampling method on settlements linked to 269 tourism-protected enterprises in the study area by using the formula: $n = N / 1+N(e)^2$, where n = sample size, N = population, and e = Confidence level (i.e., 5%) to obtain an unbiased sample size from the population of tourism protected areas;

Key respondents constituted local community members, traditional leaders, Community Resource Boards, and Village Action Group members living in and adjacent to protected areas. Other informants who including the Department of Wildlife and National Parks, Ministry of Tourism, Ministry of Commerce, Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development, and Zambia Chamber of Commerce officials in the study area, were drawn from this target population in the study area, regional and national headquarters.

The group representing local communities, traditional leaders, Community Resource Boards, and Village Action Group members accounted for the interviewees drawn from the Lupande Game Management Area covering the Lupande Game Management Area study area.

The researcher extensively employed probability and non-probability sampling procedures such as simple random sampling, convenience, and snowballing sampling methods while collecting qualitative data on local communities' ownership of tourism enterprises in the study area and probability sampling such as purposive sampling. Purposive sampling helped the researcher access data that could only be obtained from specific sources because of the specialized nature of the same information.

The procedures used to gather secondary and primary data covered by the study were literature review, observation, interviews, and focus group discussions. Interviews constituting both open-ended and closed-ended questions were used to gather primary data. Secondary data were gathered from the documented information sources.

The primary data collection instruments utilized in this study were questionnaires and interview schedules. These tools were extensively used because they are cheaper and easier to use. They, in turn, provided information on knowledge and practices related to local communities' ownership of tourism enterprises in protected areas in Zambia. Focus group discussions were conducted to ensure that the data obtained from the personal interviews were triangulated.

Qualitative data analysis instruments were utilized to analyze the respondents' raw data. These were evaluated by utilizing Content analysis, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), and Excel, facilitating the presentation of research findings in tables and figures. Using these instruments, the researcher could generate valuable and relevant inferences from the data or scores generated by those instruments. Further, these instruments have been used by several researchers in social

sciences in the past and have proven to be effective, showing consistency and repeatability. This also provided proof of the validity and reliability of the information collected.

4. Results and Discussion

The survey involved an investigation of entry barriers to local community ownership of tourism enterprises in a protected area. To collect reliable data relating to this subject matter, a study population of 119,313 people was targeted in the study area: Lupande Game Management Area, located in the Eastern part of Zambia, and was used as a case study. The study focused on investigating four data categories: a typology of local communities, barriers, national policies, skills, and mechanisms. Key data collected during this study are presented below:

Table 1: The highest level of Education Attained

Highest level of education	Frequency	Percentage
Below Primary education	6	4.5
Lower Primary education	11	10.0
Upper Primary education	15	13.6
Lower Secondary education	19	17.3
Upper Secondary education	31	28.2
College	14	12.7
University education	9	8.2
Post graduate studies	5	5.5
TOTAL	110	100

Source: Field survey, 2024

Table 2: Occupational Status of Respondents.

Occupation	Frequency	Percentage
Fishing	9	8.2
Farming	51	46.4
Conservationists	5	4.6
Trading	4	3.6
Safari camp drivers	5	4.6
Cleaners (Lodge)	3	2.7
Community game scouts	5	4.6
Safari guides	4	3.6
NGO workers	3	2.7
Art sculptors	2	1.8
Lodge chefs	4	3.6
Plumbers	2	1.8
Civil servants	5	4.6
Barber shop owners	2	1.8
Hunting outfitters	2	1.8
Wildlife photographers	2	1.8
Book keepers (Lodge)	1	0.9
TOTAL	110	100

Source: Field Survey, 2024

Table 3: Average Income levels of Local Community Members

Category	Monthly income	Annual income
Small scale farmers	K1500.00	K16,000.00
Medium scale farmers	K2,000.00	K18,000.00
Small scale fishermen	K600	K7,000.00
Lodge workers	K2,800	K33,600.00
Safari guides	K5,000.00	K60,000.00
Safari drivers	K2,000.00	K24,000.00
Safari camp chefs	K2,800.00	K33,600.00
Lodge chefs	K3,000.00	K36,000.00
Village game scouts	K2,500.00	K30,000.00
Government game scouts	K6,000.00	K72,000.00
Civil servants	K5000.00	K72,000.00
District Council workers	K5,000.00	K60,000.00
NGO staff	K15,000.00	K180,000.00
Traditional leaders	K15,300.00	K183,000.00
Lodge owners	K150,000.00	K1,800,000.00
Bush camp owners	K120,000.00	K1,440,000.00
Safari outfitters	K170,000.00	K2,040,000.00
Project implementers	K100,000.00	K100,000,000.00
Project workers	K45,000.00	K540,000.00
Safari camp owners	K120,000.00	K1,440,000.00

Source: Field survey, 2024

Table 4: Average Income levels

Category	Monthly income	Annual income
Small scale farmers	K1500.00	K16,000.00
Medium scale farmers	K2,000.00	K18,000.00
Small scale fishermen	K600	K7,000.00
Lodge workers	K2,800	K33,600.00
Safari guides	K5,000.00	K60,000.00
Safari drivers	K2,000.00	K24,000.00
Safari camp chefs	K2,800.00	K33,600.00
Lodge chefs	K3,000.00	K36,000.00
Village game scouts	K2,500.00	K30,000.00
Government game scouts	K6,000.00	K72,000.00
Civil servants	K5000.00	K72,000.00
District Council workers	K5,000.00	K60,000.00
NGO staff	K15,000.00	K180,000.00
Traditional leaders	K15,300.00	K183,000.00
Lodge owners	K150,000.00	K1,800,000.00
Bush camp owners	K120,000.00	K1,440,000.00
Safari outfitters	K170,000.00	K2,040,000.00
Project implementers	K100,000.00	K100,000,000.00
Project workers	K45,000.00	K540,000.00
Safari camp owners	K120,000.00	K1,440,000.00

Source: Field survey, 2024

Tables 1,2,3, 4, and 5 present part of the typology of local communities in the Lupande Game Management Area. There are small-scale farmers and fishermen who are mainly employed in low-paying jobs. The highest educational qualifications of most of the study population are between upper primary and upper secondary education.

Their average income ranges between K1,500 per month or K16,000 per annum to K3,000 per month or K 36 000 per annum. This is well below the money required to establish a viable tourism-based business. Hence, none of the local community members own such a venture except one, who was also suspected not to be a real owner but just in front of either a foreign investor or an elite investor based along the line of rail of Zambian town. Most of the local people do not possess the essential skills and capacities to enable them to establish viable tourism businesses.

Table 5: Proportion of Ownership of major Tourism enterprises

S/N	ENTERPRISE	LOCAL INVESTOR/ ZAMBIAN	EXTERNAL INVESTOR/ INTERNATIONAL	ORIGIN
1.	Mfuwe Lodge		100%	Foreign
2.	Time and Tide Lodge		100%	Foreign
3.	Njobvu Safaris Lodge	100%		Lupande
4.	Wildlife Lodge		100%	Lusaka
5.	Lubi Bush Camp		100%	Lusaka
6.	Kafunta Lodge		100%	Foreign
7.	Tafika Lodge		100%	Lusaka
8.	Sangani Lodge		100%	Foreign
9.	Kabele Bush Camp		100%	Foreign
10.	Safari Explorer Bush Camp		100%	Foreign
11.	Green Safaris Lodge	5% (Lupande)	95% (External)	Foreign
12.	Zikomo Lodge		100%	Foreign
13.	Manda Lodge		100%	Foreign
14.	Croc Valley Lodge		100%	Foreign
15.	Thorn Croft Lodge		100%	Foreign
16.	Flatdogs Lodge		100%	Foreign
17.	Pelican Lodge		100%	Foreign
18.	Kudu Lodge		100%	Foreign
19.	Puku Lodge		100%	Foreign
20.	Yosha Lodge		100%	Foreign
21.	Kaingo Bush Camp		100%	Foreign
22.	Manzi Bush Camp		100%	Foreign
23.	Mwamba Bush Camp		100%	Foreign
24.	Nchindeni Bush Camp		100%	Foreign
25.	Zungulila Bush Camp		100%	Foreign
26.	Kukaya Bush Camp		100%	Foreign
27.	Kuyenda Bush Camp		100%	Foreign
28.	Island Bush Camp		100%	Foreign
29.	Surefoot Safari Lodge	50% (Lupande)	50% (Foreign)	Local/Foreign
30.	Kwalata Hunting Safari Lodge		100%	Lusaka
30.	Mvu Hunting Safari Lodge		100%	Lusaka
31.	Project Luangwa Cafe		100%	Foreign
32.	Tintas Restraunt	100%		Lupande
33.	Dorphil Restraunt	100%		Lupande
34.	Tribal Textile Restraunt	100%		Lupande
35.	Ambuya Restraunt	100%		Lupande
36.	Matizye Restraunt	100%		Lupande
37.	Favour Restraunt	100%		Lupande

Table 6: Effectiveness of Government Policy in the promotion of Local Communities' Ownership of Tourism Enterprises

Effectiveness of Govt. policy	Frequency	Percentage
Very effective	8	7
Effective	11	10
Ineffective	25	23
Very ineffective	59	54
Non response	7	6
TOTAL	110	100

Source: Field survey, 2024

Table 7: Aspects of unsupportive aspects of Hospitality and Tourism policy

Category of Provisions	Frequency	Percentage
Lack of policy backing for local communities to access financial assistance from lending institutions	22	20
Excessively long licensing process	13	12
Lack of one stop shops for facilitating the ease of, registration, licensing and renewal.	16	15
Exorbitant license fees	11	10
Highly centralized sources of permits for establishment of business in protected areas	13	11
Highly centralized sources for tourism enterprises	9	8
Multiple licenses and licensing agencies	7	6
Lack of policy support for partnership between local and external investors	5	5
Marginalization of local communities in decision making	4	4
No policy backing for discouraging cartels between foreign investors and foreign tourists	10	9
TOTAL	110	100

Source: Field survey, 2024

Table 8: Measures for promotion of local communities' ownership of tourism enterprises

Measures to lead to promotion of local communities' ownership of tourism enterprises	Frequency	Percentage
1. Decentralization of tourism licensing offices to district level.	8	7
2. Sensitization of local communities to form Tourism based co-operative societies.	10	9
3. Provision of legal backing to enable local communities' access financial assistance from banks and other lending institutions.	16	15
4. Formulation of policy to promote partnership among local, national and international investors in the sector.	7	6
5. Enactment of law to enable local communities own land communally.	12	11
6. Enactment of law to enable local community members to access long lease tenure.	13	12
7. Establishment of a one-stop Tourism licensing centre/ agency at national , provincial and district levels	15	14
8. Devolution of institutional framework for wildlife management to community level.	9	8
9. Involvement of local communities in decision making regarding the awarding of hunting blocks and concessions	8	7
10. Streamlining of decision making by traditional leaders regarding land allocation to community members through an appropriate legal framework.	6	5
11. Provision of a clear legal frame work which attaches more value to human beings than animals.	4	4
12. Formulation of a policy which provides more flexibility to land-use in protected areas	2	2
TOTAL	110	100

Source: Field survey, 2024

Tables 5,6,7 and 8 present entry barriers to local communities' ownership of tourism enterprises. These range from financial through policy, skills, and capacity to legal aspects of Zambia's existing legislation associated with the tourism sector. The absence of a one-stop tourism registration, licensing, renewal shops/centers, and multiple licenses serve as demotivating factors for those who want to invest in this sector, especially since the licensing agencies are only found in Lusaka. The local community members do not have a tourism-based cooperative society either.

The lack of sensitization of local communities to form tourism-based Cooperative societies was a serious drawback as it did not enable the local people to pool their resources together. The existing legislation associated with the tourism sector tends to favour foreign or external investors rather than the local people in several ways. For instance, the local community members are not entitled to long-lease land tenure. On the contrary, foreign or external are entitled to it. Further, local community members have no legal backing to access financial assistance from lending institutions. The current law does not allow them to own land communally, either.

The absence of one-stop Tourism licensing centres was a fantastic drawback for prospective investors desiring to invest in tourism enterprises in this protected area. With this, the feeling of several r Decentralizing of Tourism one-stop licensing centres to district level was desirable so prospective investors based outside Lusaka could still obtain licenses from district centres or places they can easily

access from their residences. Such a measure would encourage prospective investors to own tourism enterprises because it would be cost-saving, less time-consuming, and less cumbersome. The absence of a law to allow local people to own land communally makes them have little chance of succeeding if they want to own tourism enterprises.

As part of measures to promote local communities' ownership of tourism enterprises, the government should develop a legal framework for wildlife management at the regional level. Such a measure would enable local community members to derive more benefits from wildlife and, in the process, receive increased motivation to participate in the ownership of such enterprises.

Another measure that would promote the local communities' ownership of tourism-based businesses is providing a clear legal framework that attaches more value to human beings than animals to motivate the local people. The streamlining of decision-making by traditional leaders regarding land allocation to community members through an appropriate legal framework would be another significant mechanism to promote local communities' ownership of tourism-based businesses. This view was supported by a good number of respondents in that it would lead to the local people being given enough priority in allocating land where they can invest their resources profitably.

The absence of involvement of local communities in decision-making regarding the awarding of hunting blocks and concessions was deemed to be a disincentive on the part of local people desiring to invest in tourism business undertakings because they currently have no say in terms of who should be awarded such concessions and at which rate (price). Formulation of a policy that provides more flexibility to land use in protected areas would encourage local people to own tourism enterprises because most of them would like to utilize the land on which their businesses exist in a way that would make their businesses cost-effective and attractive to tourists and clients. Currently, the policy does not provide any flexibility in land-use planning.

The absence of a policy to promote partnership between local, national, and international investors in the sector has also disadvantaged local people who may want to invest in this sector because this serves as a recipe for competition. In the process, the local people are discouraged from investing in this sector because they do not have what it takes to compete with external or foreign investors.

Author Contributions: Writing—Original draft preparation and writing—Chilyango.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Acknowledgments: The authors thank Africa Research University for approving their study, as this is an extract from a PhD Thesis.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

7. References

1. Armstrong, R (2012). An analysis of the conditions for success of community-based tourism enterprises. ICRT Occas. Oxford, UK.
2. Burns' M (2004). The Impact of Wildlife Management Policies on Communities and Conservation in Game Management Areas in Zambia: Message to Policy Makers." Natural Resources Consultative Forum.
3. Carr (2016). Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. <https://www.iucn.org/theme/protected-areas/about>.
4. Chemonics International Inc (2011). Situational and livelihoods analysis study in nine Game Management Areas, surrounding the Kafue National Park, Zambia. Washington DC, USA: Millenium Challenge Corporation.
5. Cole, S. (2006). Information and empowerment: The keys to achieving sustainable tourism. Journal of Sustainable Tourism.
6. Chubchuwong M, Beise-zee, & Speece, L (2015). <https://www.monroecollege.edu>. Retrieved on April 2, 2015. <https://www.monroecollege.edu>.
7. Curcija, N. (2019). Tourism Management Dynamics: Trends, Management, and Tools. Routledge.
8. Ertuna B & Kirbas, G (2012). Does tourism contribute to local livelihoods? A case study of tourism, poverty and conservation in the Indian Sundarbans. Kathmandu, Nepal; 2007. Report No.: No 26–07.
9. Fernandez A, Richardson RB, Tschirley DL, Tembo G (2010). Wildlife conservation in Zambia: Impacts on rural household welfare. Michigan State University: Food Security Collaborative Working Papers.
10. Fornell, C (2003). Structural equation modeling and regression: Guidelines for research practice. J. Mark. Res. Oxford, UK.

11. Fourth National Development Plan (2004). CDF. Lusaka, Zambia
12. Giampiccoli, A. (2015). Community –based tourism, origins and present trends. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 21(2): 675- 687.
13. Gilmour D, A & Fisher, R, J (1991). National Tourism Policy." Ministry of Tourism and Arts, Republic of Zambia. https://www.mota.gov.zm/?wpfb_dl=70.
14. Government of Zambia (2010). Reclassification and effective management of the national protected areas system. Lusaka, Zambia: Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources.
15. Government Republic Zambia, (2015). Eighth National Development Plan. Lusaka times. Zambia.
16. GRZ (1997). Tourism in the future: Cycles, waves or wheels? *Futures*, 41:346-352.
17. Hair, J.F., (2017). *Advanced Issues in Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling*; Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA.
18. Hamilton K, Tembo G, Sinyenga G, Bandyopadhyay S, Pope A, et al. (2007). The real economic impact of nature tourism in Zambia. Lusaka, Zambia: Natural Resources Consultative Forum.
19. Jirojkul, S., & Techato, K. (2017). Social responsibility in community-based tourism enterprise. *Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences*, 12(7): 1825-1829.
20. Kihima B and Musila, O (2019). Environmental values and the so called true ecotourist . *Journal of Travel Research*, 51,793-803.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0047287512451133>
21. Kline, R.B (2011). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*, 3rd ed.; Guilford: New York, NY, USA.
22. Lindsey, Peter A. (2014). Underperformance of African Protected Area Networks and the Case for New Conservation Models: Insights from Zambia." *PloS One* 9 (5): e94109. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0094109>.
23. Lindsey P, Balme G, Booth V, Midlane N. (2013). The significance of African lions for the financial viability of trophy hunting and the maintenance of wild land. *PLoS One*: - e29332.
24. Manning I (2011). Wildlife conservation in Zambia and the Landsafe customary commons. *Natural Resources Journal* 52: 195–214.
25. Mitchell, J., & Muckosy, P. (2008). A misguided quest: Community-based tourism in Latin America. *ODI Opinion*, 102. Available at <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/r4d/PDF/Outputs/COPLA/tourism-OpPaper.pdf>.
26. Mtapuri, O., & Giampiccoli, A. (2017). A conceptual coalescence: towards luxury community based tourism. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 6(3): 1-14.
27. Nagarjuna, G. (2015). Local community involvement in tourism: a content analysis of websites of wildlife resorts. *Atna. Journal of Tourism Studies*, 10(1): 13-21.
28. Novelli, M., & Gebhardt, K. (2007). Community based tourism in Namibia: "reality show" or "window dressing". *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10(5): 443-479.
29. Owen-Smith N, Ogutu J (2003). Interactions between biotic components. In: Du Toit J, Rogers K, Biggs H, editors. *The Kruger experience: ecology and management of savanna heterogeneity*. Washington DC: Island Press.
30. Purbasari N & Manaf, A (2018). *Tourism: a community approach*. New York: Methuen.
31. Rodrigues, C & Prideaux, B (2017). *Tourism development: Principles and practices*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Limited.
32. Saayman, L. (2012). *An Introduction to Sports Tourism and Event Management*. Bloemfontein: Sun Media Metro.
33. Saayman L. (2018). *An introduction to the natural history of Nech Sar National Park*. Ethiopian Wildlife and Natural History Society. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
34. Snyman, S (2012). *Techniques for socially sustainable tourism development: lessons from Mexico*". Department of Geography Publication Series, University of Waterloo
35. Saayman, M., & Giampiccoli, A. (2016). Community-based and pro-poor tourism: initial assessment of their relation to community development. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 12: 145-190.
36. Tasci, A. D. S., Semrad, K. J., & Yilmaz, S. S. (2013). *Community based tourism finding the equilibrium in COMCEC context: Setting the Pathway for the Future*. Ankara: COMCEC Coordination Office.
37. Terenica L (2018). The significance of hedonic values for environmentally relevant attitudes, preferences, and action. *Environment and Behaviour*, 46(2): 163-192
38. Towner J, D. and Towner K, (2016). Travel motivations and the influential factors: The case of Penang, Malaysia. *Anatolia*, 23(2016), 23(2), 169-176
39. Tosun, C. & Timothy, D. J. (2003). Arguments for community participation in tourism development. *Journal of Tourism Studies*.
40. United Nations World Tourism Organization UNWTO. (2011). *Global report on women in tourism 2010*. Retrieved from http://cf.cdn.unwto.org/sites/all/files/pdf/global_report_on_women_in_tourism_2010.pdf.
41. World Bank (2019). *Parks Canada Agency - Development Plan*. Washington D.C; USA.
42. Yanes M, Richards, G., & Wilson, J. (2019). Wildlife tourism conception: Consum
43. ption: Consumptive or non-Consumptive? *International Journal of Tourism*
44. *Research*, 3(1) , 81-86
45. Zhao, W. & Ritchie, J. B. (2007). Tourism and poverty alleviation: An integrative research framework. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10(2-3): 119-143.