



Toward Pro-Poor Local Economic Development in Zimbabwe: the role of pro-poor tourism

Regis Musavengane, PhD
Department of Tourism, College of Business and Economics
University of Johannesburg, Bunting Road Campus,
PO Box 524, Johannesburg 2006, South Africa
Email: regmuss2000@yahoo.com

Abstract

The United Nations' Sustainable Development Goal 8 (2030) explicitly encourages all countries to focus on economic growth and employment of their citizens. Closely related to this, is the pro-poor tourism approach. This article outlines strategies for pro-poor tourism development in Zimbabwe with the intention of enhancing local economic development in order to attempt to alleviate poverty in poor communities. The study adopted a documentary analysis methodology where it relied on secondary sources to critically argue pro-poor strategies and avenues that Zimbabwe tourism industry could adopt to enhance Local Economic Development in poor communities. The analysis showed that, Zimbabwe has previously focused on historically well-celebrated destinations and attractions, it now also need to harness possible tourist sites in poor communities so as to foster pro-poor local development. There is an urgent need for Zimbabwe to have good tourism governance processes and systems that will enable the effective attainment of pro-poor local economic development objectives. The study further noted the need to enhance economic opportunities for poor people to pursue tourism ventures and obtain a fair livelihood. Zimbabwe, further requires an urban renewal programme with an clear focus on urban regeneration to promote urban or township tourism in high density spaces in an effort to alleviate poverty and promote sustainability.

Key Words: Local economic development pro-poor Tourism, tourism governance, urban regeneration, Zimbabwe

Introduction

Having gone through a myriad of economic and political turmoils in the recent past, Zimbabwe seems to be set on the trajectory of economic development which will benefit the poor. This is especially since the removal of President Robert Gabriel Mugabe through military intervention, code named '*operation restore legacy*' in November 2017. This provides an immense opportunity for the Zimbabwean tourism sector to enhance the livelihoods of the majority of the population who are poor through a 'pro-poor tourism approach'. Pro-poor tourism is commonly defined as an approach that promotes and generates greater benefits for the poor (Pro-poor Tourism [PPT] Partnership, 2004). Zimbabwe is endowed with historically famous natural resources attractions (Manwa, 2007) which are well marketed and developed. However, tourism development is still in its early phases in Zimbabwe and the sector has a greater opportunity of expanding or growing through discovering, establishing and the renewal of destinations and attractions in especially the poor communities. The adoption of appropriate developmental approaches will possibly lead to the gradual growth and development of its tourism sector. According to the United States Local Government Commission 'growth means to get bigger, development means to get better – an increase in quality and diversity' (cited by Pike et al., 2007:1253). It is therefore suggested that Zimbabwe consider a pro-poor tourism approach to grow and develop the sector. This said, it is vital to note that since independence from minority colonial rulers (18 April 1980), it was only in 2014 that a National Tourism Plan (NTP) was developed "to facilitate the delivery of high quality,



sustainable tourism products and services that contribute to the economic development of Zimbabwe” (NTP, 2014:15).

Oftentimes, tourism is regarded as a panacea to economic (e.g. employment or income for entrepreneurs), environmental (e.g. ecotourism preserves ecosystem services and species) and social issues (e.g. foster unity and promotes local culture), however, there is limited evidence to suggest that the macro-gains of tourism are reaching the poor people at community level (Chok et al., 2007; Musavengane & Matikiti, 2015). For example, Zimbabwe’s tourism sector made a total GDP contribution of USD1.1bn, 81% of GDP in 2016 and accounts for USD 0.1bn investment or 4.3% of total investments (WTTC, 2017) but people are still living in excruciating poverty. The NTP aims to: “develop a tourism sector that that meets the requirements and expectations of the market, while contributing to the social and economic well-being of all Zimbabweans in a sustainable manner through relevant policy interventions” (NTP, 2014:15). This aligns with the United Nations’ 2030 Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 8: Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all (UN, 2017). At the top of the priorities of the new and current Zimbabwean president, His Excellency Emmerson Dambudzo Mnangagwa (ED hereafter) is to ensure economic development of Zimbabwe which results in the emancipation of the poor (State of Nation Address [SONA], 2017). Ashley and Roe (2002) opined that most sustainable tourism plans in Southern Africa include poverty alleviation as one of their themes. Thus, an explicit focus on pro-poor tourism strategies can lead and cultivate entrepreneurial skills through the spreading of ‘pro-development’ and ‘pro-poor thinking’ amongst tourism developers, policy-makers and other stakeholders, thereby alleviating poverty to some extent.

Equally socio-economic and environmental problems have been attributed to tourism globally (Christ et al., 2003; Musavengane & Simatele, 2016). It is therefore important to strike a balance between the perceived benefits and costs of tourism in order to ensure that there is sustainable tourism that will benefit the poor without negatively impacting the society and the environment. In light of the discussion so far, the aim of this article is to establish possible strategies for pro-poor tourism development in Zimbabwe with the intention of enhancing local economic development to alleviate poverty in poor communities. The study adopted a documentary analysis methodology where it relied on secondary sources, and situated the findings in the current developments in the country by using specific examples to emphasise crucial aspects. Structurally, this paper unfolds with three discussion and analysis sections. Firstly, a contextual analysis of pro-poor tourism as a panacea for poverty alleviation. This is followed by a review of local economic development in light of pro-poor and finally, the mapping of pro-poor tourism economic development strategies in Zimbabwe is undertaken.

Pro-poor tourism as a panacea for poverty alleviation

Pro-poor tourism focuses on how tourism impacts the livelihoods of the poor through the generation of sets of tourism development and growth strategies with the intention of alleviating poverty (Ashley et al., 2001; Rogerson, 2006; Musasa & Mago, 2015). Protagonists of Pro-poor Tourism (PPT) further argue that the unique characteristics of the tourism industry provide it with more opportunities to alleviate poverty when compared with other industries (Rogerson, 2006, 2012). First, tourism increases opportunities for poor people. For example, they can operate tourist curio and craft shops at destinations. Second, it boosts demand levels of products and services that are supplied and distributed by the poor. Third, it supports diversified livelihoods, especially in remote or rural communities. Fourth, it enhances the formulation of pro-poor policy and process changes (Truong, 2014). Ashley et al. (2001) are also of the view that, tourism contributes to harnessing sustainable tourism to enhance poverty alleviation. Mitchell and Ashley (2010) suggest three main routes through which poverty alleviation can be achieved by establishing viable tourism sector. First, its direct effects on the poor such as labour income or sales generated through selling craft products. The second



route is the secondary effects, which mainly involves indirect benefits that emanates from tourism, such as induced income earned by third-parties when tourism workers re-spend their income in the local income. The third route entails long-term changes in the macro-economy due to tourism development and growth. In the same vein, Ashley and Roe (2001) grouped strategies for making tourism beneficial to the poor in poor communities. First, by increasing access of the poor to economic benefits. Second, by addressing the social and environmental impacts often related to tourism. Nevertheless, although PPT is, in principle, not focused to promoting international tourism, the involvement of international aid agencies and non-governmental organisations has generally pronounced a PPT focused on international tourism schemes instead of locally focused tourism development (Schilcher, 2007; Scheyvens, 2007; Truong, 2014). This tends to have a negative impact on attaining the sustainable tourism development desired in developing nations, in particular in Africa (including Zimbabwe).

As noted by Rogerson (2006), many governments in the global South were reluctant to consider linking tourism to poverty alleviation, although a handful of tourism initiatives were poverty-driven. Gerosa (2003) also observed that, in Africa tourism was scarcely incorporated in poverty reduction strategies. It is only recently that governments have embraced the significance of the tourism sector by the macro-benefits it derives from it. Chiutsi and Mudzengi (2012) noted that most Sub-Saharan countries have realised tourism macro-benefits and their governments have committed to develop the sector. Thus, tourism is now advocated as a vehicle to alleviate poverty in developing economies (Scheyvens, 2007; Sharpley, 2009; Zapata et al., 2011). However, translating these tourism macro-gains into micro-benefits for the poor is still highly contested as the rich tend to control tourism processes in the poor communities (Manwa & Manwa, 2014; Musavengane & Simatele, 2016). It is therefore critical to for governments, tourism developers and donors to define efficient systems that will benefit the poor directly.

Pro-poor tourism proponents highlight the benefits that accrue to developing nations through tourism. For example, in countries like Zimbabwe which possess few competitive exports, tourism is believed to provide a viable developmental platform where competition is limited (Chok et al., 2007). The United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID) (2001) also reports that developing nations (who are mainly poor) are thought to have a comparative advantage as they possess essential assets that are critical for tourism development – cultural, natural and landscape. Zimbabwe has vast natural attractions, and this explains the dominance of nature tourism in the country (Mutana, 2013; Musasa & Mago, 2014). As the paper unfolds possible avenues are discussed which the country could consider for tourism development. In addition to the natural and cultural capital which tourism is dependent upon, pro-poor tourism can be built on the existing strong social capital among African communities (Musavengane & Simatele, 2017). Social capital can be defined as the networks of relationships that foster the development in a community through collective effort (Floress et al., 2011). It is centred to social networks which often results in shared norms, values and understandings which then facilitate co-operation within and amongst groups of people (Baksh et al., 2013; Musavengane & Simatele, 2017). Zimbabweans are generally regarded as peace-loving people with noble characters, and this can be viewed as social capital from which tourism can be developed. Building social capital can be a daunting and expensive exercise, so Zimbabwe is well positioned socially to grow its tourism sector.

As a poverty alleviation approach, PPT is guided by eight underlying principles; participation, a holistic livelihoods approach, balanced approach, wide application, distribution, flexibility, commercial realism, and cross-disciplinary learning (see Table 1 for descriptions). The principle acknowledges the subjectivity and multi-dimensional nature of poverty; the expand beyond income generation to embrace other variables that pertain and have impact to livelihoods of the poor.



Table 1: Pro-Poor Tourism Principles

Principle	Description
<i>Participation</i>	Participation of poor people in tourism decisions is important for their livelihoods is defined in the way tourism is developed.
<i>A holistic livelihoods approach</i>	Having a broad view of livelihood concerns of the poor (economic, social, and environmental; short-term and long-term) is critical as narrow focus on cash or jobs is derisory and inadequate.
<i>Balanced approach</i>	Diverse actions at both micro to macro levels are key to balance the tourism PPT. Linkages are crucial with wider tourism systems. Complementary products and sectors are encouraged to support pro-poor initiatives
<i>Wide application</i>	Pro-poor principles apply to any tourism segment, though strategies may vary between them (for example between mass tourism and wildlife tourism).
<i>Distribution</i>	For PPT to be attainable, distribution of benefits and costs should be fairly done.
<i>Flexibility</i>	Benefits that accrue to the poor tend to be limited by adopting blue-print approaches. It may be needed to adapt the pace or scale of development; appropriate strategies tend to take time to develop; situations are widely divergent.
<i>Commercial realism</i>	The goal of PPT is to alleviate poverty. Thus, its strategies have to work within the constraints of commercial viability.
<i>Cross-disciplinary learning</i>	PPT relies on untested approaches, thus, learning from experience is essential. It is therefore important for PPT to draw on lessons from poverty analysis, environmental management, good governance and small enterprise development.

Source: Ashley et al. (2000), Roe & Urquhart (2004), Chok et al. (2007)

Furthermore, although pro-poor scholarship recognises the insufficiency of tourism in reducing poverty in its entirety, the sector is a potential component of a broader pro-poor growth strategy, not least in the African context (Ashley & Mitchell, 2005; Rogerson, 2006). Ashley et al. (2001) noted the four all-encompassing factors that need to be attended to in any PPT initiative. First, it is important to have access to the market by overcoming physical barriers such as location, environmental, and social constraints on poor clientele. Second, is a drive in establishing commercial viable products which are of high quality at a competitive price, augmented with comprehensive marketing strategies. Third, is having sustainable policies that addresses matters regarding land tenure, planning processes and government capacity. In the context of Zimbabwe, the country has gone through land reform and having more defined policies will help to have sustainable tourism initiatives which will benefit the poor. Finally, policing is not adequate without proper implementation mechanisms. There is also a need to address skills shortages and implementation of responsible best practices at destinations (Spenceley, 2003). Zimbabwe may not have a huge challenge in acquiring skills as most of its citizens are relatively well educated and have acquired skills abroad during the turmoil period of the country when most people left the country (2001 – 2012). However, it needs stable policies and implementation mechanisms to realise the fruits of PPT initiatives. Thus, good governance is important in policing and implementing PPT strategies in developing countries that seem to have political upheaval, such as Zimbabwe

Zimbabwe Local Economic Development and Poverty

A Local Economic Development (LED) approach is viewed as a better pathway to address local challenges in light of a fast-paced, globalised economy as it appears to achieve the



objectives of sustainable development, including poverty alleviation (World Bank, 2003; Rogerson, 2006). Meyer-Stamer (2003) note that, central governments, to some extent, lack effective coordination of economic functions at local-level, leading to other actors (such as politicians, the elite and Non-profit organisations) to assume the economic role or leadership. In Zimbabwe, the central or national government appear to be in control of local economic processes. In light of international developments, it is important to devolve power to local authorities to realise the heavily needed sustainable development to alleviate poverty at the local-level. Nel (2001) argues that, local governments are vital key agents of change as they are tasked to respond to developmental needs at their localities with the aim of assisting the marginalised and poorest in society. Thus, local governments play a crucial role in informing policymakers, and as champions of democracy at local-level, are encouraged to be leaders, strategists and visionaries with positive influence on the community (Nel, 2001; Rogerson, 2006). Pro-poor local economic development strategies are critical in Zimbabwe for sustainable development of communities in dealing with the widespread poverty caused by the seeming state capture of the country by politicians, political parties and the increase of economic sanctions given to a number of Zanu-Pf (Zimbabwe African National Unity – Patriotic Front) politicians by the United States of America and other European nations following accusations of human rights abuses.

Manjengwa et al. (2016) reports that, poverty has been on the increase in Zimbabwe since 1990 when it adopted the Economic Structural Adjustment Programme (ESAP). ESAP was introduced by the Zimbabwean government as an alternative to continued production bottlenecks, stagnant local demand and high unemployment problem that threatened to become politically troublesome (Saunders, 1996). Before the wounds of ESAP could heal, the country embarked on a fast-track land reform programme (FTLRP) in 2000 due to mainly political motivations. This led to a further economic crisis as the event was unplanned and people were not prepared to take-over the land which led to another form of poverty. However, the act is, and has been, received with mixed feelings by different sectors, local and international societies. In the introduction of his book, *Zimbabwe's Fast Track Land Reform*, Prosper Matondi highlights that:

The Fast Track Land Reform Programme (FTLRP) has been inscribed on Zimbabwe's political and socio-economic map since 2000. In the early years of the reforms, the programme captured international attention and imagination, while in Zimbabwe itself it radically altered people's lives and livelihoods, and at the same time reawakened people's memories of the past. Therefore, the land reform programme was not simply about land, but also about people, especially the farmers and the communities in which they lived, originated from and settled in. It was also about the institutions they interacted with on multiple levels, and with whom they intersected at different times as the programme was speedily implemented. The programme radically transformed society, with former landowners being pushed aside, farmworkers having their livelihoods 'withdrawn', and new beneficiaries walking into new commercial land, without structured or sustained support. Yet the majority of people saw the FTLRP as the final embodiment of empowerment following Zimbabwe's independence in 1980. The FTLRP, therefore, comprises a complex mix of ingredients that have attracted the attention of both the domestic and the international community, in terms of what land reform means and how it should be delivered, but more importantly of what model works best to deliver land to the people, without tinkering with broader livelihoods. But perhaps the most difficult question is whether the reforms represent the final resolution of the colonial question or not (Matondi, 2012:1).

In view of Matondi's introduction, it is critical to note that, land has wider bearing effects in every sector of Zimbabwe's economy, including tourism. Hence, the developments in land reform processes define pro-poor tourism strategies that Zimbabwe can implement to alleviate poverty. This notion is supported by Manjengwa et al. (2014) who observed that, "land is an important asset for Zimbabwe and should be used in the 'best' way, for economic growth, social equity and environmental sustainability. Tension runs through all land reform between



justice, welfare and production". In his inaugural speech into office, the current president of Zimbabwe, President Mnangagwa reiterated that land is a vital asset for Zimbabweans and the gains of land reform which came through liberation should not be reversed (Zimbabwe Broadcast Corporation [ZBC] News Online, 2017). This provides an opportunity for the tourism sector to have localised economic development strategies that can alleviate poverty in land reformed communities (discussed in detail in the following section).

Following political unrest in the country since 2000, politicians and the elite seem to have taken over the operations of the country including earmarking land for development purposes despite forbidding laws and institutions. Among other reasons, tourism development was used as a reason for altering land use in Zimbabwe. For example, the alteration of preserved and acclaimed natural resources such as wetlands have been problematic in Zimbabwean urban areas and impacted by land barons (Financial Gazette, 2017). The problem is exacerbated by politicians, in most cases from the ruling party, Zanu-Pf who tend to override institutional processes. For instance, a Chinese company was approved by the Environmental Management Authority (EMA) and got approval from the City Council to establish a tourist and shopping mall, Long Cheng Plaza, on a well-known wetland located in Belvedere, a few kilometres from Harare CBD, ignoring the 1971 Ramsar Convention (RC) agreement to which Zimbabwe is a signatory (Matthews, 2013; Financial Gazette, 2017).

This paper argues that, for tourism to be pro-poor, sustainability institutionalisation is critical to realise poverty alleviation through tourism. Sustainability institutionalisation entails establishing structures, policies and processes aimed at having sustainable development (Heinrichs & Schuster, 2016).

The economic challenges facing Zimbabwe include, but are not limited to: collapsing industry, high unemployment (estimated to be over 90% - no formal statistics), lack of money in the formal market since dollarization (US\$) after hyperinflation of the Zimbabwean dollar (ZW\$), lack of foreign direct benefits, poor infrastructure, and inconsistent investment and ownership policies propagated by political interests and selfishness of politicians (Manjengwa, 2016; de Jager and Musuva, 2016). When combined, these challenges give rise to poverty in Zimbabwe communities, thus, pro-poor tourism can play a significant role in addressing some of these factors, thereby contributing to poverty alleviation through LED strategies. The objectives of LED initiatives toward poverty alleviation should focus more on strengthening the asset base of pro-poor communities, and to equip them with tools to manage their existing portfolio assets (Pillay, 2004; Rogerson, 2006).

The asset base of poor communities can be strengthened through broad pro-poor intervention measures, including improved regulatory frameworks, employment creation through invigorating and incentivising local economic activities, capacitation of the informal sector, and provision of municipal services such as good roads, street lighting and effective drainage systems (Rogerson, 2006). Figure 1 shows the nexus between tourism and poverty. Thus, tourism has the potential to alleviate poverty in Zimbabwe through LED strategies.



Fig 1: The nexus between tourism and poverty
Source: Rogerson (2006: 44)

Mapping pro-poor tourism economic development strategies in Zimbabwe

Siakwah (2018:3) observed that “most African economies have not fully explored their tourism potentially due to the inadequate development of the sites”. Zimbabwe’s tourism has continued to contribute positively to national development of the country in spite of seething socio-economic and political challenges. However, tourism has been limited to inherent destinations and attractions, and no further tourism development has happened to penetrate poor communities. The Zimbabwe National Tourism Plan explicitly states the need of diversifying the tourism product for the tourism sector to also be beneficial to the poor (NTP, 2014). The tourism sector in Zimbabwe has emphasised resort or nature tourism, and continues to market the already existing destinations. In view of this, this section will identify possible tourism destinations, attractions and pro-poor strategies to alleviate poverty in poor communities in Zimbabwe.

Pro-poor Tourism Strategies for Zimbabwe

Having good governance is the first strategy in realising pro-poor objectives in a country like Zimbabwe where governance processes deteriorated for a number of years (de Jager & Musuva, 2016). As cited by Duran (2013:4) the World Bank (2009) opined that “governance consists of the traditions and institutions through which authority is exercised in a country. This includes the process by which governments are elected, overseen and replaced; the government’s capacity to effectively formulate and carry out good public policies and the extent to which citizens respect the State and the institutions that govern economic and social interactions”. Based on this definition, the World Bank (2009) explicitly identified six dimensions of governance; i) voice and accountability; ii) political stability and absence of violence; iii) government effectiveness; iv) regulatory quality; v) rule of Law; and vi) control of corruption. Contextually, the United Nations World Tourism (UNWTO, 2008:31-32), defines tourism governance as the “process of managing tourist destinations through synergistic and coordinated efforts by governments, at different levels and in different capacities; civil society living in the inbound tourism communities; and the business sector connected with the operation of the tourism system”. Zimbabwe’s Ministry of Tourism and Hospitality should formulate policies that reflect good tourism governance and ensure that implementation is



done at local level to realise the desired pro-poor objectives through pro-poor tourism initiatives.

Secondly, as noted by Ashley et al. (2000) there is need to enhance economic opportunities for poor people to pursue tourism ventures. Expanding poor people's economic opportunities will open financial avenues for them to run effective tourism businesses. The Zimbabwe government should provide financial support for Local Economic Development endeavours, for example by establishing a LED Fund which will support all poor people based on merit not on favouritism of any nature as often happen in Zimbabwe (i.e. political affiliations or nepotism). Furthermore, tourism should be developed gradually to avoid rushing into foreign funding, as oftentimes, foreign investors will take benefits out of poor communities, and the poor will remain poor with jobs to do but without any meaningful ownership (also see Ashley, 2000; Booyens, 2010).

Thirdly, it is important to realise that poverty is an inherent phenomenon in Zimbabwe from the colonial past where black people were forced to stay in high density clusters (Manjengwa, 2016). Legislation such as the Industrial Conciliation Act (1934) and its Amendment (1959) promoted racial inequality in urban areas, which restricted black workers to mainly menial jobs thereby promulgating poverty in high density areas. In light of this, an urban renewal programme with explicit focus on urban regeneration should be adopted by the government to promote urban or township tourism in high density spaces. The government should identify possible spaces that can be developed for tourism purposes (see next section for suggestions).

Fourthly, Zimbabwe's largest populace resides in rural areas (including peri-urban spaces) (ZIMSTAT, 2013). It is therefore important for the Zimbabwean government to establish an integrated sustainable tourism rural development strategy, which aims to build locally owned tourism ventures upon existing attractions or activities in the community to attract tourists. As suggested by Musavengane and Simatele (2016a), rural economic local development can be realistic and pro-poor if well-coordinated and bottom-up approach is adopted. Zimbabwe can consider new ecotourism avenues such as agri-tourism in land reformed communities and in peri-urban spaces.

Tourism opportunities for poor-communities in Zimbabwe

Ashley et al. (2000) notes that, oftentimes tourism is an expansion or product diversification for the poor, without substituting the core activities. It will be critical for tourism to complement what is on offer, without clashing with the community's core activities. The following are possible tourism pathways that can be adopted by the Ministry of Tourism and Hospitality to promote pro-poor tourism in Zimbabwe.

Agric-tourism: Agriculture is the mainstay of Zimbabwe's economy, and most of the people who benefited from the land during the land reform process in 2000 are poor and their livelihoods seem to depend on pursuing agricultural activities. In an effort to promote effective agriculture, the government of Zimbabwe has embarked on 'command agriculture'. Under command agriculture, the government provides agricultural inputs to maize farmers who will then payback a loan at the end of the agricultural season, after selling the outputs to the Grain Marketing Board (GMB). It is against this backdrop that alternative income generating avenues are established by the farmers. Almost everyone is interested in experiencing how agriculture is unfolding in Zimbabwe following land reform episodes. Thus, Agritourism is the possible venture for farmers to earn extra income. Agritourism is commonly referred to as "small-scale enterprises and community ventures that showcase the activities and produce of rural families and the agricultural heritage of the farming regions to travellers" (Chikuta & Makacha, 2016). Similarly, Colton and Bissix (2005) defines it as an act of visiting an operational farm with the



intention of enjoyment, learning, or experiencing actual agricultural activities. Agriculture is Zimbabwe's legacy and heritage, thus agritourism can be encompassed into heritage tourism planning and policies of the country. Zimbabwe is divided into five Agro-ecological regions (AERs) based on climatic conditions, soil type, rainfall patterns and agricultural production potential (Matondi, 2012). Before the FTLRP, "the AERs were broadly and loosely characterised by distinct farming systems: communal lands (AERs III, IV and V); small-scale commercial farms (AERs IIb, III and IV); and large-scale commercial farms (AERs I, IIa and IIb). There were, however, some large-scale commercial farms located in AERs III, IV and V, predominantly livestock and game ranching farms" (Matondi, 2012: x). The government redistributed land in two models, **A1** (to the landless, poor and war veterans where beneficiaries have access to the following average allocations – agro-ecological region (AER) I: 1–12 hectares (ha); AER IIa: 15 ha; AER IIb: 20 ha; AER III: 30 ha; AER IV: 50 ha; AER V: 70 ha.) and **A2** (they have larger portions of land for commercial purposes) (GoZ, 2001). The focus of pro-poor tourism lies more with A1 farmers as they are the poorest between the two categories. Hegarty and Przeborska (2005) notes that diversifying a farm into agritourism will supplement and complement the primary agricultural activities, and further promote sustainable consumption and production of services. However, the government has to address challenges for developing the agritourism sub-sector, notably, the dilapidated infrastructure and particularly poor roads, a lack of skills in operating tourism ventures, and a lack of liquidity (Chikuta & Makacha, 2016).

Cultural-heritage (township) tourism: Zimbabwe's heritage defines the sovereignty of the country from prior colonial rulership. Heritage tourism is centred mainly at historical monuments such as the Great Zimbabwe, Matopo Hills, Chinhoyi Caves, limited (if any) cultural or heritage developments have been done in Zimbabwe's high-density areas (known as townships in other countries). Heritage tourism involves visiting of destinations and attractions connected to the culture and history of host people. Booyens (2010) and also Van der Merwe and Patel (2007) observed that heritage is progressively being used as a tool for urban planning and regeneration. Zimbabwe needs to harness opportunities for heritage tourism in high density areas to constitute a township tourism product. Township tourism products are mainly heritage and cultural attractions, local craft shops, art centres and traditional cuisines (Booyens, 2010).

Zimbabwe high density areas where the majority of people are poor could benefit if a number of avenues are opened up for tourism purposes. For example, the opening-up of houses for liberation heroes like former President Robert Gabriel Mugabe, current president Emmerson Mnangagwa, George Nyandoro, Enock Dumbunjena, Herbert Chitepo, Maurice Nyagumbo, Leopold Takawira, to the public will attract a number of tourists in the high density of Highfield in Harare, and similar houses can be identified in Bulawayo (for Joshua Nkomo and other Ndebele liberation heroes). Furthermore, houses of prominent African religious leaders such as Apostle Ezekiel Handinawangu Guti would attract many religious tourists, adding to the portfolio of religious tourism. It is documented that in 1956 Ezekiel Guti purchased cottage 593 and 240 in Highfield, Harare and an Angel of God was seen with the man of God, Ezekiel Guti (Guti, 1992, 2011). Examples of successful township tourism ventures are in neighbouring South Africa, notably Vilakazi Street in SOWETO (South-Western Townships of Johannesburg). It will be critical for the government of Zimbabwe to have a policy on township tourism and ensure that the micro-benefits remain within the communities. Township tourism is believed to have the potential to enhance the local economy of marginalised areas (Booyens, 2010).

Farmers Markets and Food Markets: similar to township tourism is the African farmers and food market tourism avenue. Naicker and Rogerson (2017) observed that, there is a rise of farmers and food markets globally. However, in Zimbabwe the area is yet to be embraced as a possible tourist destination. Farmers markets epitomise a form of local and alternative food



system that enhance local producers, and act as a source for locals to obtain health and fresh food supplies further strengthening the region's food security (Hall, 2008). Mbare *Musika* (market) located less than 8km from Harare Central Business District (CBD) is a long-existing pre-independence agricultural market where many buy and sell their produce. It is the oldest high-density suburb followed by Highfield. However, Mbare is plagued by a number of urban risks that can pose challenges to sustainable tourism development, notably, crime (theft), poor roads, poor drainage systems, and poor waste collection. If these are addressed the area can be used to regenerate the urban space and open it to local and international tourists who can buy locally produced products or see the place. Most of the elite in low-density areas of Harare are scared to visit Mbare. The government of Zimbabwe should ensure that food markets across the country have the following characteristics as identified by Hall and Sharpley (2008) for them to be tourist destinations: fresh produce, abundant and quality food products, safe, an entertaining family environment, seasonally and local grown produce, home-made food with home-grown food products sold by vendors in a clean environment.

Peri-urban Tourism: Neoliberal policies that have been adopted by many African nations led to urbanisation (movement of people from rural areas to urban areas) (Steel et al., 2017). Zimbabwe urban areas, in particular Harare, have experienced excessive influxes of people due to the centralisation of economic activities in the capital city. This necessitated high rental costs and forced many to look for alternative land in peri-urban settlements (commonly known as urban sprawl). For example, many Harare urban dwellers are moving into Domboshava rural community in the Goromonzi District. It is located just 27km away from Harare CBD which makes it suitable for them to travel to work and school daily. Pastoral and agricultural land has been turned into settlements in a fragmented manner. Lack of rural land-use policing and implementation tend to pose risks on future development of peri-urban areas in Zimbabwe. Domboshava is home to the Domboshava National Monument where tourists patronise to see the cave and pre-historic paintings (Woyo & Woyo, 2016), and Ngomakurira mountain where tourists enjoy mountain climbing. Both attractions are managed by the National Museum and Monuments of Zimbabwe (NMMZ). Having these attractions presents an opportunity for local communities to establish community-run tourism ventures such as hotels and conference centres, to augment the available attractions and these will all help to alleviate poverty. However, the challenge is the land use policy. Goromonzi rural district and Chief Chinamhora have to set aside land for future tourism development. It is not enough for people to have accommodation without any source of income. Furthermore, food insecurity is high because of changes in land-use. The participation of all stakeholders is vital to guarantee the future of peri-urban areas to avoid speculation which will lead to rural land-grabs whereby land-holders will illegally (according to Zimbabwe communal land law, land belongs to the government and not to be sold) sell communal land to land seekers.

Conclusions

The study set out to establish possible strategies for pro-poor tourism development in Zimbabwe with the intention of enhancing local economic development in order to alleviate poverty in poor communities. The paper established the need of having good tourism governance processes and systems that will enable the attainment of pro-poor local economic development objectives. It further noted the need to enhance economic opportunities for poor people to pursue tourism ventures. Zimbabwe, further requires an urban renewal programme with explicit focus on urban regeneration in order to promote urban or township tourism in high density spaces in an effort to alleviate poverty. The country should also consider new ecotourism avenues such as agri-tourism in land reformed communities and in peri-urban spaces. Zimbabwe has focused on historically well-celebrated destinations and attractions, it additionally needs to harness possible tourist sites in poor communities to foster pro-poor local development.



References

Ashley, C., Boyd, C. & Goodwin, H. (2000). Pro-poor tourism: Putting poverty at the heart of the tourism agenda. *Natural Resource Perspectives*, No 51. (Online: Accessed 02/01/2018) <http://www.odi.org.uk/nrp/51.pdf>.

Ashley, C., Goodwin, H. & Roe, D. (2001). Pro-Poor Strategies: Expanding Opportunities for the Poor (London: Overseas Development Institute).

Ashley C. & Dilys, R. (2002). Making tourism work for the poor: Strategies and challenges in southern Africa, *Development Southern Africa*, 19:1, 61-82, DOI:10.1080/03768350220123855

Baksh, R., Soemarno, T., Hakim, L. & Nugroho, I. (2013). Social capital in the development of ecotourism: A case study in Tambaksari Village Pasuruan Regency, East Java Province, Indonesia. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 3(3), 1–7.

Booyens, I. (2010). Rethinking township tourism: Towards responsible tourism development in South African townships, *Development Southern Africa*, 27:2, 273-287, DOI: 10.1080/03768351003740795.

Chikuta, O. & Makacha, C. (2016). Agritourism: A Possible Alternative to Zimbabwe's Tourism Product? *Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 4 (3), 103-111

Chiutsi, S. & Mudzengi. 2012. Community Tourism Entrepreneurship for Sustainable Tourism Management in Southern Africa: Lessons from Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 2 (8), 1-8.

Chok, S. Macbeth, J. & Warren, C. (2007). Tourism as a Tool for Poverty Alleviation: A Critical Analysis of 'Pro-Poor Tourism' and Implications for Sustainability, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10:2-3, 144-165.

Christ, C., Hillel, O., Matus, S. & Sweeting, J. (2003). Tourism and Biodiversity: Mapping Tourism's Global Footprint. Conservation International, Washington. (Online: Accessed 05/01/2018) <http://www.unep.org/PDF/Tourism-and-biodiversity.pdf>.

Colton, J.W. & Bissix, G. (2005). Developing agritourism in Nova Scotia: Issues and Challenges. *Journal of Sustainable Agriculture*, 27 (1), 91-112.

de Jager, N. & Musuva, C. (2016). The influx of Zimbabweans into South Africa: a crisis of governance that spills over, *Africa Review*, 8 (1) 15-30, DOI:10.1080/09744053.2015.1089013.

Department for International Development (DFID). (1999). Tourism and poverty elimination: Untapped potential. DFID, UK. (Online: Accessed 02/01/2018) http://www.propoortourism.org.uk/dfid_summary.PDF.

Duran, C. (2013). Governance for the Tourism Sector and its Measurement, UNWTO Statistics and TSA Issue Paper Series STSA/IP/2013/01 (Online: Accessed 02/01/2018), available: <http://statistics.unwto.org/en/content/papers>.

Financial Gazette. (2017). Wetlands Continue to Disappear. (Online: Accessed 20 December 2017) <http://www.financialgazette.co.zw/wetlands-continue-to-disappear/>.



Floress, K., Prokopy, L. S. & Allred, S. B. (2011). It's who you know: Social capital, social networks, and watershed groups. *Society & Natural Resources*, 24, 871–886.
doi:10.1080/08941920903493926.

GoZ (Government of Zimbabwe). (2001). *Land Reform and Resettlement, Revised Phase II*. Harare, Zimbabwe: Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement.

Guti, E.H. (1992). *African Apostle*. EGEA Books, Harare

Guti, E.H. (2011). *New African Apostle*. EGEA Books, Harare

Hall, C.M. (2008). Farmers' Markets in New Zealand. In *Food and Wine festivals and events around the world*. Edited by Hall, C.M. & Sharples, L. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Hall, C.M. & Sharples, L. (2008). *Food and Wine Festivals and events around the world* Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Hegarty, C. and Przezborska, L. (2005). Rural and agri-tourism as a tool for reorganising rural areas in old and new member states – A comparison study of Ireland and Poland. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 7 (2), 63-77.

Heinrichs, H. & Schuster, F. (2016). Still some way to go: institutionalisation of sustainability in German local governments. *Local Environment: The International Journal of Justice and Sustainability*, 22 (5): 536 – 552.

Pike, A., Rodriguez-Pose, A. & Tomaney, J. (2007). What kind of local and regional development and for whom? *Regional Studies*, 41, 1253–1269.
doi:10.1080/00343400701543355.

Pillay, U. (2004) Towards alternative conceptions of local economic reform in the developing world: the case of South Africa, *South African Geographical Journal*, 86, 39–43.

Pro-Poor Tourism Partnership (PPTP) (2004a) Defining pro-poor tourism. Pro-poor tourism info-sheets, Sheet No.1. (Online: Accessed 30/12/2017)
http://www.propoortourism.org.uk/info_sheets/1%20info%20sheet.pdf.

Saunders, R. (1996). Economic Structural Adjustment Programme (ESAP)'s Fables II. SAR, Vol 11, No 4. <http://www.africafiles.org/article.asp?ID=3876>

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

Schilcher, D. (2007). Growth versus equity: The continuum of pro-poor tourism and neoliberal governance. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10(2–3), 166–193.

Siakwah, P. (2018). Tourism Geographies and Spatial Distribution of Tourist Sites in Ghana. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 7 (1), 1-19.

Steel, G., van Noorloos, F. & Klaufus, C. (2017). The urban land debate in the global South: New avenues for research. *Geoforum*, 83, 133–141

Manwa, H.A. (2007). Is Zimbabwe ready to venture into the cultural tourism market? *Development Southern Africa*, 24 (3) 465-474.



Manwa, H. and Manwa, F. 2014. Poverty Alleviation through Pro-Poor Tourism: The Role of Botswana Forest Reserves. *Sustainability*, 6, 5697-5713. doi:10.3390/su6095697

Matthews, G.T.V. (2013). The Ramsar Convention on Wetlands: its History and Development. Ramsar Convention Secretariat, (Online: Accessed 20 December 2017) <https://www.ramsar.org/sites/default/files/documents/pdf/lib/Matthews-history.pdf>.

Manjengwa, J., Hanlon, J. & Smart, T. (2014). Who will make the 'best' use of Africa's land? Lessons from Zimbabwe, *Third World Quarterly*, 35:6, 980-995, DOI: 10.1080/01436597.2014.907722

Manjengwa, J., Matema, C. & Tirivanhu, D. (2016). Understanding urban poverty in two high-density suburbs of Harare, Zimbabwe, *Development Southern Africa*, 33:1, 23-38, DOI: 10.1080/0376835X.2015.1116376.

Matondi, P.B. (2012). Zimbabwe's Fast Track Land Reform. Zed Books, London.

Mitchell, J. & Ashley, C. (2010). Tourism and poverty reduction: Pathways to prosperity. London: ODI & Earthscan.

Meyer-Stamer, J. (2003). Why Is Local Economic Development So Difficult and What Can We Do to Make It More Effective (Duisburg: Mesopartner).

Musasa, G. & Mago, S. (2014). Challenges of rural tourism development in Zimbabwe: A case of the Great Zimbabwe-Masvingo district. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 3, (2), 1-12.

Musavengane, R. & Simatele, M. D. (2016). Community-Based Natural Resource Management: the role of social capital in collaborative environmental of tribal resources in Kwa-Zulu Natal, South Africa. *Development Southern Africa*, 33:6, 806-821. DOI: 10.1080/0376835X.2016.1231054.

Musavengane, R. & Musavengane, D. (2016a). Social capital and the pursuit of ecotourism as a land-use option in land reformed communities: a study of KwaZulu Natal's tribal areas, South Africa. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 5 (4), 1-21.

Musavengane, R. & Danny, S. (2017). Significance of social capital in collaborative management of natural resources in Sub-Saharan African rural communities: a qualitative meta-analysis, *South African Geographical Journal*, 99:3, 267-282, DOI:10.1080/03736245.2016.1231628.

Musavengane, R. & Matikiti, R. (2015). Does social capital really enhance community based ecotourism? A review of the literature. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 4 (1): 1-18.

Naicker, S. & Rogerson, J.M. (2017). Urban Food Markets: A New Leisure Phenomenon in South Africa. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 6 (3), 1-17.

National Tourism Plan. (2014). Government of Zimbabwe. Ministry of Tourism and Hospitality Industry, Government Printers, Harare

Nel, E. (2001) Local economic development: a review and assessment of its current status in South Africa, *Urban Studies*, 38, 1003–1024.



Roe, D. & Urquhart, P. (2004). Pro-poor tourism: Harnessing the world's largest industry for the world's poor; turning the rhetoric into action for sustainable development and poverty reduction. In T. Bigg (ed.) *Survival for a Small Planet – The Sustainable Development Agenda*, 309–325. London: Earthscan.

Rogerson, C.M. (2006). Pro-Poor local economic development in South Africa: The role of pro-poor tourism, *Local Environment*, 11:1, 37-60.

Rogerson, C.M. (2012). The tourism-development nexus in sub-Saharan Africa: Progress and prospects. *Africa Insight*, 42(2), 28–45.

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

Sharpley, R. (2009). Tourism and development challenges in the least developed countries: The case of The Gambia. *Current in Issues Tourism*, 12, 337–358.

State of Nation Address [SONA]. 2017. Zimbabwe Broadcasting Corporation. News Online
Truong, V. D. 2014. Pro-Poor Tourism: Looking Backward as We Move Forward, *Tourism Planning & Development*, 11:2, 228-242, DOI: 10.1080/21568316.2013.864996

United Nations. 2017. Sustainable Development Goal 8. (Online: Accessed 08/01/2018)
<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg8>.

United Nations and World Tourism Organization (2008). International Recommendations for Tourism Statistics 2008 (IRTS 2008), New York, Madrid (Online), available at:
<http://unstats.un.org/unsd/tradeserv/tourism/manual.html>

Van der Merwe, C.D. & Patel, Z. (2007). Understandings of urban regeneration, heritage and environment. In Rogerson, CM & Visser, G (Eds), *Urban Tourism in the Developing World: The South African Experience*. Transaction, New Brunswick, NJ.

World Bank (2003). *Local Economic Development: Quick Reference* (Washington: Urban Development Division, World Bank).

Woyo, E. & Woyo, E. (2016). The Impacts of Tourism Development at Domboshava National Monument in Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Research in Tourism and Hospitality*, 2 (3), 29-37.

Zapata, M.J. Hall, C.M., Lindo, P. & Vanderschaeghe, M. (2011). Can community-based tourism contribute to development and poverty alleviation? Lessons from Nicaragua. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14, 725–749.

ZIMSTAT (Zimbabwe National Statistics Agency). (2013). 2012 Population Census Results. Final Report. ZIMSTAT, Harare.