



## Tourism Governance and Attainment of the Sustainable Development Goals in Africa

Pius Siakwah, Regis Musavengane & Llewellyn Leonard

To cite this article: Pius Siakwah, Regis Musavengane & Llewellyn Leonard (2019): Tourism Governance and Attainment of the Sustainable Development Goals in Africa, *Tourism Planning & Development*, DOI: [10.1080/21568316.2019.1600160](https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2019.1600160)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2019.1600160>



Published online: 16 Apr 2019.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 132



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



# Tourism Governance and Attainment of the Sustainable Development Goals in Africa

Pius Siakwah <sup>a</sup>, Regis Musavengane <sup>b</sup> and Llewellyn Leonard<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Institute of African Studies, University of Ghana, Legon, Ghana; <sup>b</sup>School of Business and Economics, Department of Tourism and Hospitality, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa;

<sup>c</sup>Department of Environmental Science, University of South Africa (UNISA), Pretoria, South Africa

## ABSTRACT

Inclusiveness that improves tourism governance is significant for development if benefits from tourism are distributed equitably. Declaration of 2017 as the International Year of Sustainable Tourism and adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) have seemingly brought tourism to the forefront of development even where the SDGs have limited tourism focus. This paper examines how tourism governance is poorly applied in Africa. It interrogates the challenges of integrating tourism governance, mining, and conservation within the SDGs framework in Africa. Sustainable tourism governance frameworks have not comprehensively inculcated trust, justice, social capital, power, and participation. Using mining and conservation in South Africa and Zimbabwe respectively, it analyses how mining affects sustainability, as actors in tourism are unable to conserve and protect tourism sites. Achieving the SDGs requires collaboration between international actors, governments, the private sector, and locals in an inclusive governance based on justice, inclusion trust and equitable power relations.

## Highlights

- Improvement in tourism governance is important for development
- Challenges of integrating tourism in the SDGs in Africa
- Tourism governance is however poorly applied in Africa
- Sustainable tourism governance neglects trust, justice, power and participation.
- Mining and poor conservation undermines sustainable tourism
- To achieve the SDGs, collaboration among varied actors is critical

## KEYWORDS

Tourism; sustainability; governance; SDGs; South Africa; Zimbabwe

## 1. Introduction

Tourism is noted for its substantial contribution to the socio-economic development globally, including some of the emerging economies in Africa (Adu-Ampong, 2018, 2017; Musavengane, 2018; Siakwah, 2018; World Travel & Tourism Council (WTTC), 2017). There are, however, challenges in tourism governance with regard to the role of government, the private sector, benefits distribution, and the social and environmental cost of the sector (De Clercq & Belausteguigoitia, 2017; Nunkoo, 2017; Purdy, 2016).

Governance though not easily defined can promote effective and equitable resources use and development (Duran, 2013). The United Nation Development Programme (UNDP) (1997) defined governance as consisting of systems, mechanism, processes, relationships, and institutions through which groups and citizens articulate their interests, perform legal rights, recognise obligations and resolve differences. In Africa, “good governance” is often advocated for in the tourism industry in order for the continent to gain the macro and micro-benefits associated with the sector (Nunkoo, 2017; Robbins, 2016; WTTC, 2017). The World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC, 2017) reported that globally, tourism contributed 3.1% directly to GDP growth and provided 6 million net additional jobs in 2016. It generated US\$7.6 trillion (10.2% of global GDP) and 292 million jobs (thus, 1 in 10 global jobs). With reference to Africa, in 2016 tourism contributed US\$66.4bn directly to GDP (3.1% of the continent’s total GDP), and 7.8% of the continent’s GDP (WTTC, 2017). Employment-wise, tourism directly generated 8.4 million jobs, 2.6% of total employment in 2016 in Africa (WTTC, 2017).

Considering tourism’s potential in assisting towards achieving some of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs),<sup>1</sup> there are calls on and by policy-makers, researchers, tourism practitioners and destination managers to pursue and promote good governance in the sector (Amore & Hall, 2016; United Nation World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), 2016; Bramwell & Lane, 2011). In pursuance of that, 2017 was designated by the UNWTO as the International Year of Sustainable Tourism for Development (UNWTO, 2016). It is instructive to note that the SDGs made no explicit reference to tourism; it only makes implicit reference to tourism. These comprise Goal 8 which focuses on economic growth and employment; Goal 12 on sustainable consumption and production; and Goal 15 on conserve and sustainability of natural resources. With regard to tourism governance, Goal 16 emphasise on peace, justice, and institutions can be helpful in promoting inclusive equitable development. Indeed, although this highlighting the significance of the sector to development (UNDP, 2015), three mentions among 17 goals and the 169 targets is disingenuous to viewing tourism as important for achieving the SDGs and pro-poor development. Governance becomes critical for tourism to assist in achieving the SDGs. Despite the impressive macro contribution of tourism globally, there are varying degrees of governance challenges, especially in Africa. These include the disconnect between policies and practices; identity politics; exclusion of minorities; and translating macroeconomic gains into micro benefits (Leonard, 2017a, 2017b; Musavengane, 2018; Nunkoo, 2017).

Most African countries, including South Africa and Zimbabwe, failed to achieve the earlier Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) target. It is a worthwhile endeavour; however, there is a need to identify the lessons to be carried forward as Africa aims to achieve the SDGs in the areas of mining, conservation, sustainable development and tourism governance (Leonard, 2017b; Leonard & Langton, 2016; UNDP, 2015). Governance is used herein in consonance with emerging forms of association and coordination, comprising varied stakeholders—government, the private sector, Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs), local communities and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) actors (Duran, 2013; Farmaki, 2015) in promoting justice, inclusiveness, trust and equitable power relations in resources distributions and benefits. Governments become more of the centre of a network of interactions, interdependence, and cooperation among varied actors, while governance processes emphasise participation, (Bramwell, 2010; Leonard,

2017a), equitable power relations (Nunkoo, 2017; Commission of the European Communities (CEC), 2001), trust (Nunkoo, 2017; Robbins, 2016), justice (Fainstein, 2017; Jamal & Camargo, 2017), and fairness inclusion (Leonard, 2017a). Governance, therefore, entails interaction among multi institutions and social actors based on trust, inclusion, and exercise of the power to ensure the sustainable use of resources for the common good without disadvantaging other groups within the network.

This paper examines the challenges of integrating sustainable tourism governance, mining, and conservation within the SDGs framework in Africa. What are the challenges with integrating tourism into the SDGs? The literature surrounding “issues of integration” tourism in the SDGs is a burgeoning field (Le Blanc, 2015; Stevens, 2018; Tosun & Leininger, 2017; Weitz, Nilsson, & Davis, 2014). There are limited empirical examinations of “on-the-ground” efforts at integration of tourism in the SDGs. This article thus serves as an important review on local communities’ concerns of justice, inclusion, trust and power relations in tourism governance and the SDGs in Africa. Even though tourism does not feature much on the SDGs, it needs to be governed to achieve the SDGs through formal governance institutions while at the same time inculcating dimensions such as trust, justice, social capital and power relations within the broad governance system. This paper contributes to the special issue by arguing that tourism governance has been poorly applied in Africa in order to achieve sustainable development since aspects of governance has not comprehensively incorporated trust, justice, social capital, and power relations into formal institutions that guide the sector. Data for the study is drawn from existing policy and research documents on tourism, sustainability, and governance on South Africa and Zimbabwe. In addition to this introduction, the paper is organised into five sections. Section two discusses tourism governance and SDGs, including issues of justice, inclusion, social capital, and power relations. The methodology is discussed in section three and findings on tourism governance, mining, conservation, and SDGs in South Africa and Zimbabwe are discussed in section four. The conclusion advocates for a more inclusive and transparent approach to sustainable tourism governance beyond formal institutions, where justice, inclusion, social capital, power relations are prime if the SDGs are to be achieved in Africa.

### ***1.1. Situating sustainable development goals (SDGs) in tourism***

On 25 September 2015, the United Nations (UN) member states ratified the SDGs, leading to setting the agenda for global development goals by 2030. The agenda had 17 distinct SDGs (see Table 1) and 169 targets. Based on the broad framework, various sectors, including tourism fashioned out strategies to attain global SDGs. Notably, in tourism, this led to the declaration of 2017 as the International Year of Sustainable Tourism for Development by the UNWTO (UNWTO, 2016). This opened a gateway for international sustainable-related tourism journals and event organisers to call for Special Issues and Conference Papers to deliberate on the role of tourism in the United Nations (UN’s) SDGs. For example, the Journal of Sustainable Tourism (JoST) called for a Special Issue (SI) on “Critical Thinking to Realise Sustainability in Tourism Systems: Reflecting on the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals” (Boluk, Cavaliere, & Higgins-Desbiolles, 2017). Equally, the Institute of Development Studies at Massey University organised the first Tourism and the SDGs Conference (Tourism4SDGs19) (24–25 January 2019) in Auckland, New Zealand where

government, industry and researchers exchange ideas in attaining the shared vision on the UN's SDGs.<sup>2</sup> This signals the importance of the tourism sector in achieving the UN's 2030 SDGs even though the broad 17 goals made limited reference to tourism.

Sustainability and development are not new concepts in tourism (see Bramwell, Higham, Lane, & Miller, 2017), and this positions tourism actors in a better position in pursuing the UN's 2030 SDGs. Scheyvens and Hughes (2019) noted that tourism geographers, depending on their field can focus on at least one SDG. Table 1 highlights the potential of the tourism sector in attaining some of 17 SDGs. For the past decades, the themes or thesis that emerged in the discourse of "sustainable and development tourism" include (i) Rural thesis (directly or indirectly related to SDGs 1, 2, & 13); (ii) Safety, poverty and hunger thesis (SDGs 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 11); (iii) Inclusivity and justice thesis (SDGs 5, 10, 16 and 17); (iv) Nature-based resource-use and management thesis (SDGs 13, 14 and 15) (v) empowerment thesis (SDGs 4, 7, 9 and 8); and (vi) urban development (SDG 11, 6, 7, 8 and 9).

Specifically, pro-poor tourism approaches and volunteering tourism can facilitate the achievement of SDG 1: no poverty. As one pursues SDG 1, it can simultaneously lead to the attainment of SDG 2: zero hunger through Agri-tourism. This could further promote ecotourism and responsible tourism practices (see Table 1) by the service provider, thereby contributing to the combatting of climate change (SDG 13). Scheyvens and Hughes (2019, p. 341) observed that "this could lead us to question the food purchasing choices of hotels, resorts and cruise ships, and interrogating why the industry often overlooks local suppliers of food products". Furthermore, health tourism can be ideal in pursuit of SDG 3: good health and well-being. Responsible tourism can assist in realising SDG 6: clean water and sanitation. Accountable practices by both tourists and service providers assist in upholding hygienic environments and specs (Goodwin, 2005). Moreover, the tourism sector is known for having high rates of uneducated staff. Through various in-house courses tourism service providers are bridging the education gap, thereby achieving SDG 4; quality education (see Musavengane & Simatele, 2016). More related to this is inclusive tourism, which promotes inclusion of the marginalised persons, the poor, disabled and women, and this form of tourism can facilitate in achieving some of the SDGs (see Table 1). In addition, aqua-tourism and sustainable tourism, including ecotourism will respectively enable the attainment of SDG 14; life below water, and SDG 15; life on land. Tourism is further regarded as a peacebuilder in political strained environments and can further achieve justice through effective tourism governance.

Overall, there are some pieces of evidence to indicate that tourism has the potential to realising the UN's 2030 SDGs through various forms of tourism even though the SDGs seems to be silent on tourism explicitly. The magnitude of influence on the SDGs differs from one form to another. For example, in a study on the role of tourism in the attainment of SDGs in Cameroon, Kimbu and Tichaawa (2018) noted that the country has diverse potentials to achieve some SDGs despite challenges. There are equal challenges of governance, sustainability and inclusiveness in most Sub-Saharan countries, including Zimbabwe and South Africa, the focus of this study.

## **1.2. Tourism governance and sustainability**

Although governance remains a popular buzzword in policy and research circles, it is not easily defined (Duran, 2013; Farmaki, 2015; World Bank, 2009). Institutions often define

**Table 1.** Linking sustainable development goals and tourism.

Sustainable development goal	Explanation	Possible tourism specifics to attain the SDG
1. No poverty	Aims to end poverty in all its forms globally. Poverty entails the lack of income and resources to improve livelihoods, which will result into malnutrition and hunger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Pro-poor tourism (PPT) approaches (Goodwin, 1998). It is an approach to tourism development and management that “enhances the linkages between tourism businesses and poor people, so that tourism’s contribution to poverty reduction is increased, and poor people are able to participate more effectively in product development” (Pro-poor tourism [PPT], 2008).</li> <li>✓ Volunteer Tourism—(Wearing, 2002, p. 240) defined it as tourists “who, for various reasons, volunteer in an organised way to undertake holidays that may involve the aiding or alleviating the material poverty of some groups in society or environment”</li> </ul>
2. Zero hunger	Aims to end hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition through sustainable agricultural practices. Degradation of our land, depletion of our seas and oceans and climate change pose a threat of hunger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Agri-tourism—an act of visiting an operational farm with the intention of enjoyment, learning, or experiencing actual agricultural activities (Colton &amp; Bissix, 2005)</li> </ul>
3. Good health and well-being	Aims to ensure healthy lives and promotion of well-being for all at all ages. Good health and well-being guarantee sustainable livelihoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Health tourism—entails visiting destinations with resources with prophylactic and therapeutic properties that can provide medical treatment (i.e. spas, hot springs and sea water)</li> </ul>
4. Quality education	Aims to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promotion of life-long learning opportunities for all. Sustainable livelihoods can be built through quality education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Tourism in-house training courses and skills development of local communities</li> </ul>
5. Gender equality	Aims to achieve gender equality and empowerment of all women and girls. Oftentimes, women and girls are victims of violence and are excluded in decision-making processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Inclusive tourism It refers to “transformative tourism in which marginalized groups are engaged in ethical production or consumption of tourism and the sharing of its benefits” (Scheyvens &amp; Biddulph, 2018, p. 592)</li> </ul>
6. Clean water and sanitation	Aims to ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all. Poor water quality, scarcity of water and poor sanitation threatens human livelihoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Responsible tourism—aims to aims at developing principles and practices that make places better both for the resident’s quality life and for the quality of the tourist’s visit (Goodwin, 2005; Wheeler, 1991)</li> </ul>
7. Affordable and clean energy	Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all. Sustainable energy offers a transformation opportunity to all	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Alternative tourism (Eadington &amp; Smith, 1992)</li> </ul>
8. Decent work and economic growth	Aims to promote sustainable and inclusive economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Local Economic Development through tourism (Rogerson, 2012).</li> <li>✓ Inclusive tourism. (Scheyvens and Biddulph, <i>ibid</i>)</li> </ul>
9. Industry, innovation and infrastructure	Aims to build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialisation and foster innovation. Communities can sustainably be empowered through the provision of transport, irrigation, energy and information and communication technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Tourism super-structure can drive the establishment of infrastructure in communities</li> </ul>
10. Reduced inequalities	Aims to reduce inequality within and among tourism. Economic growth is not sufficient	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Inbound and outbound tourism.</li> </ul>

(Continued)

**Table 1.** Continued.

Sustainable development goal	Explanation	Possible tourism specifics to attain the SDG
	to reduce poverty if it is not inclusive. There is need to include marginalised persons in the growth processes	✓ Inclusive tourism (Scheyvens and Biddulph, <i>ibid</i> ).
11. Sustainable cities and communities	Aims to make human cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable. Urban risks such as crime, lack of sewerage facilities, poor housing and lack of basic services are threats to sustainable cities and communities	✓ Pro-poor tourism approaches (PPT, <i>ibid</i> ) ✓ Urban tourism—tourism that occurs in urban settings. Varies from city to city and town to town depending of various variables (Lerario & Turi, 2018)
12. Responsible consumption and production	Aims to ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns. Entails providing access to basic services, green and decent jobs and a better quality of life for all	✓ Community-based tourism (CBT) ✓ Inclusive tourism ✓ Responsible tourism (Wheeller, <i>ibid</i> ; Goodwin, <i>ibid</i> ).
13. Climate action	Aims to take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts	✓ Green tourism—Signify the acts that are environmentally friendly in tourism operations (Font & Tribe, 2001)
14. Life below water	Aims to conserve and ensure sustainable use of the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development	✓ Ecotourism—(Ceballos-Lascurain, 1996). Eco-tourism promotes responsible travel visitation to relatively undisturbed natural areas, promotes conservation, and provides socio-economic benefits to local populations
15. Life on land	Aims to protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainable management of forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss	✓ Aqua-tourism—entails the travelling from one usually abode to marine environment for recreational activities (Orams, 1999) ✓ Sustainable tourism (Wheeller, 1993). It is tourism which is developed and maintained in the area (community, environment) in such a manner and at such a scale that it remains viable over an indefinite period and does not degrade or alter the environment (human and physical) in which it exists to such a degree that it prohibits the successful development and well-being of other activities and processes' (Butler, 1999, p. 35).
16. Peace, justice and strong institutions	Aims to promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels	✓ Ecotourism (Ceballos-Lascurain, <i>ibid</i> ) ✓ Inclusive tourism (Scheyvens and Biddulph, <i>ibid</i> ) ✓ Peace through tourism. Founded and defined by D'Amore (1988, p. 9) as "peace within ourselves, peace with other people, peace between nations, peace with nature, peace with the universe and peace with our God". It focuses on the forms of tourism that promotes peaceful relations.
17. Partnerships for the goals	Implementation and revitalise global partnership for sustainable development. These inclusive partnerships depend on shared values, a shared vision, and shared goals that place people and the planet at the centre	✓ Justice Tourism—Holden's description of justice tourism is "a process which promotes a just form of travel between members of different communities. It seeks to achieve mutual understanding, solidarity and equality amongst participants" (cited in Pearce, 1992, p. 18) ✓ Justice Tourism (Pearce, <i>ibid</i> ) ✓ Collaborative Community-based tourism

governance to suit their objectives (Jamal & Camargo, 2017; Nunkoo, 2017). The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (1995) defined the term in relation to how societies use and supervise political authority in managing its resources; benefits are distributed; and the nature of relationships between governments and the governed (see Duran, 2013). To the CEC (2001), governance entails norms, processes, and behaviour in the exercise of powers, especially from a position of openness, participation, accountability, effectiveness, and coherence. Duran (2013, p. 9) analyses the term as the emergence of new forms of association and coordination, comprising government and private actors, and civil societies, as well as greater decision-making capacity of non-governmental actors in policy-making. Governance principles have been applied across sectors in economies, including sustainable tourism governance. These sustainability principles in tourism, however, have received appraisals, including criticism (Farmaki, 2015; Waligo, Clarke, & Hawkins, 2013). The problem of sustainable tourism resides in its practicability, with stakeholder relations identified as a barrier to effective governance and development (Daphnet, Scott, & Ruhanen, 2012; Farmaki, 2015; Leonard, 2018b; Waligo et al., 2013).

The UNWTO (2008, pp. 31–32) defines tourism governance as the “process of managing tourist destinations through synergistic and coordinated efforts by governments, at distinct 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.” The UNWTO, however, does not explicitly refer to “local communities” and how they are impacted by tourism. Duran (2013) suggests that while the UNWTO idea on governance represents a considerable advance, tourism governance should be analysed within “tourism system” and “tourist destination” (UNWTO, 2012). This must account for winners and losers in the sector. Fundamentally, for Duran (2013), governance entails the extent to which institutions (government, the private sector and other social actors) has the capacity to coordination, collaboration, and cooperation efficiently to enhance tourism information systems, transform needs into opportunities, and analyse the tourism industry sustainably. Sustainable tourism entails how tourism has a limited adverse impact on the environment, local cultures, and striving to improve employment for locals and contribute to national development (Musavengane, 2018; Nunkoo, 2017; Siakwah, 2018).

The traditional notion of sustainable tourism has, however, focused on natural resources in rural settings (Mbaiwa, 2017) with a limited focus on urban communities (Rogerson, 2002). Tourism studies remain stuck on traditional models of governance (Jenkins, Hall, & Mkono, 2014). Meta-governance, a critical approach where interventions and policies are regarded as reflections of theories and planning, offers new insights into tourism governance (Amore & Hall, 2016; Jessop, 2011; Meuleman, 2008; Pierre & Peters, 2000; Stoker, 1998). It focuses on the practices and procedures that secure control, with emphasis on relationality and negotiated links between government and governance (Amore & Hall, 2016; Hall, 2013, 2011; Whitehead, 2003). Meta-governance enables us to appreciate central-state led hierarchical authorities and micro-practices of innovation (Majone, 1989). Sustainable tourism governance can be promoted through multi-stakeholders, including local participation, engagement and transparency to examine winners and losers (Bramwell, 2010, 2007, 2004; Qian, Sasaki, Shivakoti, & Zhang, 2016; Richardson & Connelly, 2002). However, where some actors are excluded due to non-

invitation, dissent or conflicts, this defeats the purpose of participatory governance (Dredge, 2006; Hall, 2007; Lee, Riley, & Hampton, 2010; Romero & Tejada, 2011; Song, Liu, & Chen, 2013; Wan & Bramwell, 2015).

In this paper, we conceptualise governance as a network of interactions, interdependence, and cooperation among varied actors (including locals) in the management of the specific resource, emphasising participation, equitable power relations, trust, justice, fairness, and inclusion. It entails interaction among multi-social actors based on trust and exercise of the power to ensure sustainable use of resources for the common good without unnecessarily disadvantaging some social group. This slightly differs from the UNWTO definition which focuses on processes of managing tourist destinations through synergistic and coordinated efforts by governments, at distinct levels and in different capacities; civil society living in tourism communities; business sectors connected with operation of tourism system. The UNWTO's definition does not refer to "local communities" and how they are impacted by tourism. This emphasises that governance is not just a mere "technical" issue, instead, it illustrates the shadow of hierarchical power that serves the state and other interests (and values), but connected to power relationships at various scales and different winners and losers within the tourism system (Amore & Hall, 2016). Although there are other tensions such as gender inequality, environmental well-being, and efficiency, the paper focuses on inclusion, justice, social capital and power relations as these concepts captures how local people participate and share in tourism and its governance.

### **1.3. Justice and inclusion in sustainable tourism governance**

As a concept, the definition of justice is not straightforward. Theoretical perspectives on justice are inspired by various sources (Fainstein, 2017; Jamal & Camargo, 2017). Planning theorist Fainstein (2017) is one of the lead authors on the subject and he understands justice as a key principle for evaluating public policy effectiveness. Originally, justice has been a bedrock of Western liberal pluralistic societies, hence its incorporation into values of democracy, diversity, and equity, albeit with challenges (Fainstein, 2017; Jamal & Camargo, 2017). In Africa, just, equitable and fair distribution of resources to the populace is non-negotiable. Equally, justice in sectors management and benefit distribution is regarded by scholars and policy-makers as a crucial principle for sustainable tourism governance (Jamal & Camargo, 2017). This relates to how tourism practitioners should be concerned with hyper-neoliberal driven tourism practices that prioritise profit over cultural values and historical/social context of tourism. Tourism governance should be guided by sustainability, responsibility, and pro-poor driven (Jamal & Camargo, 2017; Musavengane, 2018). Inclusive participation and equity in the distribution of costs and benefits are just principles that should underpin sustainable tourism governance (Jamal & Camargo, 2014, 2017). Promoting justice in tourism governance is critical in achieving some of the SDGs as policy-makers and practitioners can identify the winners/losers in the industry and empower them.

Despite the merits of exploring justice in tourism governance, there is little mention of it in the tourism governance literature. Jamal and Camargo (2017, p. 3) show how appreciating justice is vital for tourism governance as it sensitises our understanding, definition or description of governance. Justice is, however, complex and means different things to

diverse people. For some, it is rights and duties, income distribution, wealth, principles of fairness, equality, and liberty, while for others, it is power, social well-being and building a good society (Jamal & Camargo, 2017, p. 3). Tourism governance cannot be decontextualised or ahistoricised, instead, it is embedded in a wider society, spatially and temporally. Thus, institutional structures that govern the distribution, use, and conservation of tourism goods are shaped by complex historical, socio-political and cultural values. The interests and values of policy-makers and stakeholder in tourism are intangible though institutionally embedded injustice. There is the need for justice in the current regimes of promoting tourism to achieve some of the SDGs.

To achieve justice, we need respectable inclusive interrelationships among multi-stakeholders. All stakeholders have to be included in the decision-making processes and benefit sharing. Tourism governance becomes a pluralistic style to policy-making, with an increasing role for non-state actors, including local communities, while de-emphasising the power of the state in the network (Baggio, Scott, & Cooper, 2010; Hezri & Dovers, 2006; Nunkoo, 2017). Nunkoo (2017, p. 278) notes that in contrast to neoclassical theories that focused on market relationships, inclusive governance principles recognise non-market actors like local communities and CSOs in development. Within this perspective, governance offers impetus for marginalised locals in tourism policy-making to become partners in the sector. Thus, due to multiple stakeholders in tourism management, Baggio et al. (2010) noted a complex and dynamic interaction among these stakeholders, sometimes subjected to external shocks. Effective governance emphasises stakeholder interactions, regardless of power relations to promote sustainable tourism (Baggio et al., 2010; Hall, 2011). Sustainable tourism governance further admonishes actors in the sector to adopt suitable institutions, procedures, and decision-making rules. Though these do not imply consensus among actors since conflicts can potentially emerge as various actors promote their interests (Bramwell & Lane, 2011; Musavengane & Leonard, 2019; Musavengane & Simatele, 2017). Practitioners need to promote trust among actors and utilise existing social capital to promote justice and inclusiveness in tourism governance so that local communities will not feel short-changed.

### ***1.3.1. Trust and sustainable tourism governance***

As human societies and social life thrive on trust, and this underlies the functioning of institutions (formal/informal), decision-making processes, and social, political, and community relations (Robbins, 2016). However, trust is a complex construct, sometimes defined in terms of the psychological state of an actor toward another with whom the actor has some interdependent to valued resources (Holmes & Rempel, 1989; Nunkoo, 2017). Defining trust, however, purely from a psychological perspective is inadequate in illuminating it as this narrows trust to cognitive behaviour, ignoring emotional and social influences (Kramer, 1999). It is more appropriate to define trust in terms of individuals' choice behaviour in various conviction dilemma (Miller, 1992; Nunkoo, 2017). Trust fosters good governance and sustainability by facilitating cooperation among varied actors (Kugler & Zak, 2017). It creates goodwill, reinforces relationships, enhances stakeholder satisfaction, commitment and legitimacy (De Clercq & Belausteguigoitia, 2017; Mpinganjira, Roberts-Lombard, & Svensson, 2017; Nunkoo & Smith, 2015).

As a concept, trust is a relational construct, essential in establishing and maintaining relations among and between multi-social actors, including actors in tourism. The

emerging literature on trust provides two perspectives to the study of its relationship with sustainable tourism governance: bottom-up (micro to macro); and top-down (macro to micro) (Nunkoo, 2017). The top-down approach perceives trust as shaped by wider structural elements like institutions and rule of law. Within this context, trust is endogenous to the political system (Sztompka, 2016). However, the bottom-up approach is grounded in the school of thoughts of De Tocqueville (1835), Putnam (1993), and Fukuyama (1995) who consider trust as shaped by interpersonal relationships, and rooted in and shaped by culture and history, and emerges from micro to influence macro elements. In this framework, trust as especially emerging from the micro level is conceptualised as essential for building social capital for development.

### ***1.3.2. Social capital in tourism governance***

Social capital is the relationship through which groups or individuals identify, communicate, network, dialogue, resolve conflicts, and realise collective/individual potential as change agents in sustainable tourism governance (Baksh, Soemarno, Hakim, & Nugroho, 2013; Leonard, 2018b; Nunkoo, 2017). Musavengane and Simatele (2017) analyse social capital as a collection of dimensions of trust, solidarity, social cohesion, collective actions, and cooperation. As a concept, social capital is centred on social networks, shared norms and values that facilitate co-operation within and among groups and individuals (Baksh et al., 2013). Blewit (2008, p. 78) denotes social capital as the relationship by which groups and individuals identify, network, build trust, dialogue to realise collective and individual potential as agents of change. Social capital, trust, and power are inherent to social relations, useful in reducing conflicts and facilitating collaboration in tourism governance (Nunkoo, 2017).

### ***1.3.3. Power relations in sustainable tourism governance***

Social capital and trust are products and functions of power relations. Power is, however, a contested concept and has remained at the periphery of the tourism literature (Hall, 2010; Nunkoo, 2017). It encompasses varied aspects, from being an actor-based activity intended to influence, to a Foucauldian conception of power as embedded in everyday discourses (Purdy, 2016). Parallel to Foucault, Wolf (1999) provides an interesting perspective on power that highlights its omnipresence in social relations. Wolf (1999) notes:

Power is often spoken of as if it were a unitary and independent force, sometimes incarnated in the image of a giant monster such as Leviathan or Behemoth, or else as a machine that grows in capacity and ferocity by accumulating and generating more powers, more entities like itself. Yet it is best understood neither as an anthropomorphic force nor a giant machine but as an aspect of all relations among people (Wolf, 1999, p. 4).

From the above, power is a relational and social construct. Drawing from that, power in governance is a “medium in social relations to structure fields of action” (Göhler, 2009, p. 36). In tourism governance, power is sometimes seen as omnipresent, guiding the interactions among actors, influencing or trying to influence the formulation of policies and their implementation (Nunkoo, 2017). These power relations determine how decisions concerning tourism and its benefits are appropriated among the diverse actors in the industry. Power and trust are, however, vital in tourism development that should be studied jointly in social relations and institutions (Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2012). They

shape sustainable tourism governance policies. Abuse of power in tourism governance is minimised by promoting participation, transparency, and inclusiveness.

Tourism governance in Africa is, however, underpinned by fragmentation of policies without inculcated trust, inclusion, justice, dynamic power relations and transparent participation. This weakens the socio-economic and cultural impacts of tourism, especially in local communities where tourist resources are located. There is the need to improve inclusive governance to facilitate or translate macro gain in tourism to micro benefits for locals. This will require amending the disconnect between theory and practice in the sector. Promoting sustainable tourism entails consideration of justice, inclusion, trust, and power relations between and among local communities, government, and private sector operators. Locals do not have to be disconnected from tourist resources by government and private operatives. As Kato (2018) noted, sustainable and resilient tourism development requires assisting communities to maintain their connection with their places that are closely related to traditional ecological knowledge found in personal stories, monuments, and folktales. It similarly requires ensuring transparency in governance and sharing of sector's proceeds. Sustainable tourism governance is thus, not just a technical matter; it is an issue of justice, inclusion, trust, and power relations.

#### **1.4. Methodology and study area**

This paper examines the challenges of integrating tourism into the SDGs in Africa, using South Africa and Zimbabwe as case studies. Africa is unique for this analysis on tourism governance and SDGs since the continent largest population thrives on natural resources/environment and these resources are at the same time critical for tourism development. However, in the processes of transforming these environments via tourism (re)development, local communities are sometimes excluded from these spaces, and tourism benefits do not often translate into something useful for the local communities. Transnational corporations profit from the sector at the expense of locals. Issues of justice, inclusion, and unequal power relations are ignored in the distribution of tourism benefits in Africa.

The methodology is a comparative case analysis, with the data being primarily document analysis. Data for this study is drawn from existing policy documents and research papers related to tourism, governance, mining, and conservation on South Africa and Zimbabwe. Even though interviews can allow people to tell their stories in tourism and SDGs, secondary data is used for this study because it is more readily available and given the time and resources available. The two countries are also among the most written about in terms of tourism in Africa, albeit South Africa' tourism is more developed than Zimbabwe (Boluk, 2011; Boluk et al., 2017; Fair Trade Tourism, 2015). These countries have been chosen due to their distinct levels of economic development, governance, and tourism development. According to the Human Development Report (2016) South Africa is ranked 119 and has a Human Development Index (HDI)<sup>3</sup> of 0.666, whilst Zimbabwe is ranked 154 and has an HDI of 0.516. Thus, the two countries can be used seemingly to represent the various levels of development of tourism on the continent. These cases of South Africa and Zimbabwe regarding tourism and the SDGs illustrate how governance and politics (national and local) interact with mining, conservation practices and transnational actors to shape development and provide lessons for the region as a whole since this is also an African wide issue. Mining impacts protected environments, natural tourism sites and sustainability

when governments are unable to conserve and protect tourism sites. There is an inadequate collaboration for effective tourism governance.

Neuman (2011) notes that document analysis helps to compare cases easily, and is less expensive and unobtrusive. We adopted a document review of the literature on sustainable tourism governance and development in Africa, especially in the two countries. The criteria used to determine inclusion or exclusion of data sources in the study are (i) articles and reports with a focus on tourism development in the two countries over the past 20 years (ii) conservation and mining (iii) sustainable tourism governance. Based on the data from the readings, themes were developed around tourism governance in Africa—transparency, institution formation processes, governance, accountability, social capital, power relations, justice, inclusion, and inequality. The data were manually analysed to appreciate the challenges that underpin tourism governance, mining, conservation and SDGs in Africa. Reliability and trustworthiness of the findings are ensured by using peer-reviewed papers and triangulation of several data sources.

### **1.5. Overview of the case studies**

**South Africa:** The importance of the tourism sector as a significant contributor to employment in South Africa has been identified as the “new gold” due to the labour-intensive nature of the industry and potential to contribute to poverty alleviation (Chauke, 2013). According to Statistics South Africa (2016), the tourism industry created 32,186 new jobs in 2015, raising the tourism workforce from 6,79,560 individuals in 2014 to a total of 7,11,746 individuals. One in 22 employed people in South Africa works in the tourism industry, representing 4.5 per cent of the total workforce. This excludes indirect and informal tourism employment creation. Not surprisingly then, tourism surpasses the mining sector as an employer with the latter employing about 4,62,000 individuals in the quarter ending December 2015. South Africa’s environmental landscape is also rich in biodiversity to further promote tourism and employment. According to the Department of Environmental Affairs (2017) the country occupies only 2% of the world’s surface area, is home to nearly 10% of the world’s plant species (24,000 species), contains 7% of the world’s vertebrate species, and 5.5% of the world’s known insect species. South Africa is ranked as the 5th richest country in Africa in terms of the number of endemic species and 24th in the world. It is for this reason that the National Tourism Sector Strategy (NTSS) (2016–2026) also notes the country’s natural environment as one of its greatest tourism resources, and, therefore, the tourism industry needs to be actively involved in conserving and protecting it. Tourism governance is therefore crucial in ensuring the protection of South African environmental resources and to contribute to achieving the SDGs as outlined during the former part of this paper.

**Zimbabwe:** Tourism plays a significant role in the economic development of Zimbabwe, it has 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). In 2016 travel and tourism directly supported 159,500 jobs (2.1% of total employment). This is expected to rise 2.1% per annum to 200,000 jobs (2.0% of total employment) in 2027 (WTTC, 2017). The total contribution of travel and tourism to employment in 2016, including jobs indirectly supported by the industry, was 5.2% of total employment (393,000 jobs). This is expected to rise by rising by 0.8% per annum to 430,000 jobs in 2027 (4.3% of total) (WTTC, 2017). On world

rankings, out of 185 countries, relative to GDP contribution, Zimbabwe is ranked 137 in absolute terms and 117 in relative size. In the long-term growth forecast of the period 2017–2027, it is ranked number 140 (WTTC, 2017). The slow growth of the sector can be attributed to a number of political and economic challenges including unplanned fast-track land reform which has sharply hampered conservation efforts.

As the case in most Sub-Saharan countries, Zimbabwe relies heavily on natural resources which are the backbone of diverse nature-based tourism forms, notably those that depend on wildlife or biodiversity conservation (Calfucura, 2018; Musavengane & Matikiti, 2015; Manwa, 2007). Ntuli and Muchapondwa (2015) observed that, particularly in Southern Africa, wildlife conservation has become popular and embraced as a vehicle for rural development by policymakers and development practitioners alike because of bountiful tourism opportunities that come with it. A significant proportion of wildlife is co-managed by local communities, conservationists, Conservation Non-Profit Organisations (CNPOs) and private game farmers under varied forms of community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) (Kamuti, 2014; Musavengane & Simatele, 2016; Ngubane & Brooks, 2013). In the same vein, Kashwan (2016) notes that biodiversity conservation has been the point of convergence between local communities, government authorities, and non-government agents to negotiate the conflicts associated with co-management of common pool resources (CPR). Historically, common lands inhabited by indigenous communities, with *de facto* right, were incorporated into state programmes without the consent of local people (Calfucura, 2018). There is wide literature which shows that, in Africa colonisers forcefully removed people from their land to pave way for wildlife conservation agenda under the concept of people-free landscape which led to overwhelming conflicts between wildlife, government and local communities (Calfucura, 2018; Dressler et al., 2010; Shackleton, Campbell, Wollenberg, & Edmunds, 2002). This appears to have created a governance gap in the conservation arena in Zimbabwe and most African spaces with wide-reaching implications on realising the anticipated sustainable tourism and achieving SDGs.

## **2. Findings and Discussions on tourism governance in Africa**

This section analyses how the improvement of governance of mining and conservation in South Africa and Zimbabwe respectively can potentially assist tourism development and attainment of some of the SDGs targets. We advocated for an integrated, inclusive, justice and transparent participation approach to tourism governance where neoliberal motives do not unnecessarily override locals needs. The discussion is based on the emerging themes from the data.

### **2.1. Tourism governance in South Africa: implications of mining on tourism development**

In the interest of promoting justice, since South Africa's transition to democracy, a plethora of environment and tourism policies have emerged to ensure a solid development foundation to ensure tourism governance. For example, the 1996 Constitution makes provision for a right to a healthy environment, and the right to have the environment protected by preventing pollution and degradation (South African Constitution, 1996). The Tourism Act No. 3 of 2014 makes provisions for the development and promotion of sustainable tourism

for the social, economic and environmental benefit of South African citizens. The Tourism Act embraces the NTSS as part of the legislative framework for the management and development of tourism (Department of Tourism, 2017; Tourism Act, 2014). Other policies linked to tourism protection include the 1998 National Waste Management Strategy (NWMS), which has the objective of reducing the generation and environmental impact of all forms of waste, and to ensure that the health of the people and the quality of the environmental resources are no longer affected by uncontrolled and uncoordinated waste management. The 1998 National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) emphasises that people's needs must be put at the forefront when matters of environmental management are considered. Worth noting is that in 2013 the Department of Environmental Affairs, Department of Mineral Resources (DMR), Chamber of Mines, South African Mining and Biodiversity Forum, and the South African National Biodiversity Institute, produced the Mining and Biodiversity Guidelines. The guidelines are supposed to give direction on how to avoid important biodiversity completely, minimise impacts through careful design and operation, rehabilitate where feasible and/or offset significant residual mining impacts, as part of a thorough environmental impact assessment (EIA). However, despite strong tourism growth, environmental policies and guidelines to ensure effective tourism governance and environmental protection, historical and new mining operations in the new democracy are still impacting on nature tourism sites (Ochieng, Seanego, & Nkwonta, 2010) with mining developments also being approved by the ruling party via the DMR in sensitive and protected environmental areas (discussed further below) (Leonard, 2016).

Limited research has been conducted to understand governance issues and mining impacts on specific protected environments and tourism sites and impacts on sustainability (Leonard, 2016; Leonard & Langton, 2016; Leonard & Lebogang, 2017). The South African government has not been able to ensure the conservation and protection of tourism sites from mining development in the country. For historical sites, Leonard and Langton (2016) note the impact of acid mine drainage (AMD) on protected sites in the West Rand. The authors note that although the subject of AMD has been researched academically (and in technical terms), there has been a lack in understanding of what challenges tourists' attractions are facing and what measures have been taken to protect these sites by the government.

The West Rand is home to the Cradle of Humankind World Heritage Site which contains a unique landscape and fossil sites. The area also contains a number of nature reserves (i.e. Cradle Nature Reserve, Rhino and Lion Reserve, Krugersdorp Nature Reserve). The impact of AMD on tourism sites has also been previously noted by McCarthy (2011) emphasising the proliferation of mining applications near the Olifants and Vaal rivers. Historical pollution and pollution from new mining developments will lead to contamination of sensitive environmental areas and impact groundwater aquifers. This has already been witnessed in the Randfontein area, where AMD is flowing northwards towards the Krugersdorp game reserve and cradle of human-kind world heritage site (Ochieng et al., 2010). Mariette Liefferink (personal communication, 25 July 2015 in: Leonard & Langton 2016) the CEO of the Federation for a Sustainable Environment (FSE) which is acting against mining pollution, noted how AMD impacted on the Krugersdorp game reserve and tourism, " ... it is a beautiful area, but it's contaminated, so that detracts from tourism". The informant further explained that the game reserve was not well visited because of

the contaminated water, including the visual aspects and poor conditions of the animals. This, therefore, had implications for job creation and the development of tourism in the area as a whole.

Similarly, for current mining operations in South Africa, Leonard and Lebogang (2017) refer to a case of mining development in Limpopo, South Africa, where the government is considering approving mining applications in the Mapungubwe Heritage Site, having implications for this tourism site as a major tourist attraction in the region. With increasing mining activities there have been concerns from community members that this would lead to the buying out of farmers and lodges that service the tourism sector with lack of trust from communities towards government and mining companies. The introduction of mining would result in visual and noise pollution and disrupt the tranquillity of the area, impacting on the cultural value attached to the environment through ancestor worships, and hence a decline in overall tourism development. South Africa's transition to democracy has therefore not resulted in improved enforcement and protection of sensitive areas. Another recent case against mining in protected areas allowed by the national government has been in August 2017 by a coalition of eight civil society and community organisations in South Africa resisting the proposed coal mine inside a protected area and strategic water source area in Mpumalanga. The action by the coalition was legal proceedings to set aside the decisions of the Ministers of Mineral Resources and Environmental Affairs to allow a coal mine to be built inside a declared protected environment. The two Ministers gave their approval for the 15-year underground coal mine proposed by Indian owned mining company Atha-Africa Ventures Pty Ltd (Atha) inside the Mabola Protected Environment outside Wakkerstroom in Mpumalanga. They did so despite a series of court challenges and appeals pending against each of the licenses given for this mine, and without any public participation (Centre for Environmental Rights, 2017). It is surprising then that despite good tourism governance guidelines and policies that the state would allow mining in protected and tourism sites. Tourism governance in post-apartheid South Africa has therefore been weak with a disconnection between policies, plans, and practices, which has increased lack of trust and cohesion between civil society and government generally.

The further disconnection between policies, plans and practices and overlapping government functions has been observed by several authors. For example, Leonard (2017a) notes that according to the NEMA (1998) the Department of Minerals (i.e. DMR) is not listed under schedule 1 for national departments exercising functions that may affect the environment, suggesting lack of coherence and tensions between environmental regulations, including governance and enforcement. For example, the Mineral Petroleum and Resources Development Act (MPRDA) No 28 of 2002 regulates the prospecting for an optimal exploitation of minerals in the country. There is a disparity between NEMA and the MPRDA as the former strongly promotes environmental protection, while the latter promotes the "optimal" exploitation of environmental resources. Politically, the environment is given limited attention by the ruling party, and there is a general failure to integrate environmental concerns into mainstream planning, development and macroeconomic policy (Fig, 2005). According to Polity (2014), environmental regulation in the mining sector faces a predicament. A joint parliamentary briefing by the DEA and DMR in 2013 on mining environmental management, noted that environmental management legislation had bedevilled Government since democracy. During this time indecisiveness as

to which department/s needed to manage the environment was a problem. This has had implications for effective tourism governance.

There is a lack of collaboration between government departments to ensure effective tourism governance. For example, according to the South African NTSS (2016–2026), some of the critical success issues for the sustainable competitiveness of tourism are strategic and shared visionary leadership and balancing economic, social and environmental issues. This requires sound and effective governance structures and processes that manage and support tourism. However, despite a robust strategy, it seems that integrated governance processes remain a challenge to enhance the tourism sector for sustainable growth. Firstly, a weakness of the NTSS is that the tourism working groups which is the intergovernmental structure dealing with governance, planning, and development seems limited in scope. This deals with issues related specifically for tourism development and collaboration but does not seem to include “non-tourism” departments such as the DMR, which generally approves mining developments in sensitive conservation tourism areas. Thus, a more holistic national governance approach is needed when dealing with tourism governance. According to Bizcommunity (2017), there are also too many loopholes in legislation governing the mining sector and the line between what are mining corporation responsibilities are unclear. Leonard (2017a) and Leonard (2018a) also noted for government and mining relations, a lack of effective governance has resulted in mining companies taking advantage of enforcement loopholes. This has been complicated by a high staff turnover in government with the mining industry employing government officials with much higher salary packages (Leonard, 2017a). This has therefore impacted on tourism governance and enforcement.

Leonard (2017b) also notes how poor governance has impacted on how citizens have been drawn into EIA’s for mining development in tourism areas, with participation characterised by tokenism to get mining developments approved, thus impacting on sustainable tourism development. This abuse of the EIA process to get mining developments approved in tourism areas has been witnessed in Dullstroom a small town situated in Mpumalanga, which is a popular fly-fishing tourist destination and known for its pristine environment. According to an environmental scientist at the Mpumalanga Tourism Parks and Agency (MTPA) (personal interview, 3 October 2013) which is a public entity established to provide for the sustainable management and promotion of tourism and nature conservation and to ensure the sustainable utilisation of natural resources:

The EIA, the NEMA regulations, everything is in place, it is a very good system but it has been abused ... It [a proposed mining site] is right in the heart of our envisage environment and Lakenvlei is one of the best pristine [areas] with crane species like our [endangered] wattle cranes ... We can’t afford a coal mine to start there ... We had a few advocates with us and that the public participation process was flawed ... The mine plan was on the table for an application for a mining right ... So they had no legal prospecting right ... but they nevertheless went forward without a water use license ... They [government] haven’t got the political willpower to take on [mining] ... [and are] not willing to have conflict ... there is not enough regulated people that can force, implement the laws (Personal Interview, 3 October 2013).

It is clear that tourism governance in South African remains a challenge despite a strong legislative environment. These challenges include poor enforcement of regulations and allowing mining developments in natural tourism sites. This has been complicated by poor collaboration between government departments, overlapping government functions

and blurring of the lines which has not resulted in adequate tourism governance. Poor governance has also allowed mining corporations to spearhead mining operations in sensitive areas without proper approval. This has further influenced the lack of genuine participation of citizens to inform development processes. Viewing environmental and tourism regulations holistically and better enforcement by the government will ensure the sustainability of tourism resources. This, in turn, will contribute to growth and employment generation by using tourism resources sustainably (i.e. SDG 8) and ensure the sustainable consumption of resources (i.e. SDG 15). However, until an integrated holistic tourism governance approach to sustainable development is applied, coupled with joint and equal collaboration between government departments—and between government, corporations and citizens—South Africa's natural tourism assets and tourism development will remain under threat. There is an urgent need for government to reassess how power is exercised and the way it interacts with civil society and communities over development in a democratic society so as to ensure inclusion, trust, and transparency in participation and decision making.

## ***2.2. Tourism governance Dynamics in the Zimbabwean conservation sector***

Coupled with SDG16 that emphasise on peace, justice, and strong institutions, this section focuses on SDG15; life on land—protecting, restoring and promoting sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss. The discussion framework anchors on discourses on justice, transparency, accountability, social capital, participation, power and institution formation processes.

In terms of tourism development, Zimbabwe has over-emphasized and relied on nature tourism and neglected other tourism avenues. It is only recently, in 2014 since 1980 independence that a National Tourism Policy was developed through the Ministry of Tourism and Hospitality “to facilitate the delivery of high quality, sustainable tourism products and services that contribute to the economic development of Zimbabwe” (NTP, 2014, p. 15) with the aim to “develop a tourism sector 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, p. 15). NTP states that the government will facilitate the development of other forms of tourism including, township tourism or urban tourism. This notion is in accordance with Christie & Compton (2001) suggestion, that African governments should play a leading role in developing tourism products through regulatory frameworks that ensure tourism sustainability, poverty alleviation, and social inclusion. Politics seem to be the main focus of the government of Zimbabwe and led to power-play struggles which derailed the progression of the tourism sector and institution formation processes in the tourism sub-sectors including conservation. If power is to be used in the interest of promoting good tourism governance it can promote the formulation and implementation of tourism policies (Nunkoo, 2017).

Zimbabwe's efforts to conserve and sustainably utilise its diverse array of natural resources has been greatly compromised by the country's long and bitter struggle for equitable redistribution of land that had been unfairly expropriated by the minority white settlers during the colonial era. Zimbabwe gained independence in 1980, but the

government inherited a state where land was grossly unequally distributed—a colonial legacy of a distorted pattern of land ownership (Chaumba, Scoones, & Wolmer, 2003). The land issue caused Zimbabwe to endure through a debilitating social, political, and economic crisis which in turn posed challenges to the governance of its natural resources. The fast-track land reform programme (FTLRP) was marked with violence and mostly regarded as a populist move designed to strengthen the popularity of the ruling Zanu-Pf party (Zimbabwe African National Unity-Patriotic Front) (Balint & Mashinya, 2006; Manjengwa, Matema, & Tirivanhu, 2016; Musavengane, 2018). Since the year 2000 the electoral processes and outcomes have been discredited by the Zimbabwe main opposition party, Movement for Democratic Change (MDC) (also known as MDC-Alliance—a coalition of opposition parties that contested in the 2018 harmonised election) and the international community, which further plunged the country into socio-economic and political quandary, including diminishing conservation resource base which negatively affected nature tourism, specifically wildlife tourism-related activities (De Jager & Musuva, 2016). Partisan practices were followed in allocating the land, where the Zanu-Pf elites were allocated the prime land including the one earmarked for conservation purpose. Due to the lack of skill and interest on conservation, flora and fauna were diminished in the land reformed areas especially in previously “white” owned conservation or game reserves. Inclusive, just and participative land reform process could have eliminated loss of biodiversity in conservation areas.

In their research in Zimbabwe’s Mahenye community, Balint and Mashinya (2006) found out that, the crisis in Zimbabwe affected conservation programmes such as the Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE). CAMPFIRE project income deteriorated as a result of FTLRP, and game viewing tourism diminished, leading to a further decline in hunting revenue. Balint & Mashinya (2006) further associated the decline of conservation to poor leadership combined with the lack of support from outside agencies in effectively utilising natural resources which tend to have weakened the governance system. This suggests the need for enhancing local participatory decision-making institutions even in seemingly successful conservation schemes to promote “good” governance. Furthermore, Balint & Mashinya (2006) noted that to ensure successful conservation in Zimbabwe and Sub-Saharan countries, full devolution of authority to the local communities need to be anchored with good governance and sufficient capacity. Jones & Murphree (2001) and Tom (2011) noted that oftentimes Rural District Councils (RDCs) in countries where legislation provides for “Appropriate Authority” over wildlife to be devolved to community levels, are reluctant to provide that authority to community level structures. This reluctance by RDCs to devolve wildlife authority to community members tend to be influenced by the loathness of political and economic elites to transfer wildlife macro-benefits into micro-gains that will directly benefit the community instead of them (Larson & Lewis-Mendoza, 2012; Muboko & Murindagomo, 2014). As observed by Green (2008) in his “decentralisation and conflict in Uganda” study and (Nelson, Nshala, & Rogers, 2007) in the “evolution and reform of Tanzanian wildlife management” case, the clinging to power by RDCs tend to threaten the success of devolution processes. Consequently, local communities tend to be passive to participate in wildlife issues because they consider the activity as not theirs, hence continuous conflicts between community members, wildlife and conservation management authorities (Muboko & Murindagomo, 2014). It is critical to establish trust among

conservation actors including community members. Trust creates goodwill to reinforce relationships, enhances stakeholder satisfaction and commitment and increases legitimacy (Mpinganjira et al., 2017).

Nevertheless, in other countries such as Kenya, as observed by Baskin (1994) governments and their departments are supportive in promoting community-based natural resources management (CBNRM) through devolution of authority which in turn help communities to enjoy micro-gains of their natural resources. However, in Zimbabwe and elsewhere, lack of legislation that grants rural structures (i.e. wards) power, authority and ownership over natural resources, including wildlife, CAMPFIRES administrative guidelines could not be implemented adequately, but just encouraged (Fabricius & Koch, 2004). Moreover, in Zimbabwe, the enabling legislation for use and control of vast natural resources is fragmented, resulting in the devolution of authority to be difficult hence weaken the functionality of tourism and related sectors (Muboko & Murindagomo, 2014). Shackleton & Campbell (2001) opined that, where there are overlapping jurisdictions and competing institutions, it becomes difficult to impossible to establish effective collaborative natural resource management institutions, or where they are successfully formed they will encounter enormous operational challenges as competing institutions tend to attract conflicts due to diverse goals. The motivation to establish strong institutions with controlled rights at the micro-community level (Child & Dalal-Clayton, 2004) in Zimbabwe was founded on the necessity for communities to establish legal entities engrained on secure land tenure, to enhance formal contracts to be established between local communities and external operators (Bond & Frost, 2005; USAID, 2009). Rihoy and Maguranyanga (2007) noted that the establishment of conservation plans which are mostly influenced by governance systems of external support agencies through the RDC committees tend to have weakened the relationships with the existing institutions. Muboko and Murindagomo (2014) further argued the implementation of the seemingly progressive conservation policies remains problematic in most Sub-Saharan countries. Hence, the need to address the devolution processes in conservation to enhance the realisation of the intended goals of devolution at the community level. This will further promote the building of trust among community groups and individuals who will foster good governance and sustainability (Kugler & Zak, 2017).

Looking through the lenses of participation and justice, in their study on bioeconomic analysis of community wildlife conservation in communities located near Gonarezhou National Park in Zimbabwe. Ntuli and Muchapondwa (2017) reported that an Integrated Conservation and Development Projects are essential for future rural development in Southern Africa. This will enhance community-based ecotourism initiatives, thereby promoting sustainable tourism development in rural spaces. Furthermore, Ntuli & Muchapondwa (*ibid*) noted that excessive anti-poaching enforcement by the park agency within the national game parks and in nearby communal areas is not optimal as it weakens social relations between park authorities and community members. Such a result aligns with approaches and policies or institutional reforms that emphasise greater control of natural resources by community members through devolution and decentralisation of natural resources management (NRM) functions including decision-making (Child, 2004). Ntuli and Muchapondwa (2017) further suggested that RDC should transfer decision-making functions and benefits to sub-district communities to incentivise local people to engage in conservation. This will in-turn increase community

participation and enhance sustainable community-based ecotourism (CBET) development in Sub-Saharan Africa. Cooney, Roe, Dublin, and Booker (2018) noted that communities need a greater voice in decision-making as well as in the development of policies that affect them. This applies at every level, from local to global.

Moreover, Ntuli and Muchapondwa's (2015) study on the role of institutions in community wildlife conservation in Zimbabwe inveterate that strong institutions are key ingredients for cooperation in pursuit of conservation goals. They argued that essential institutional attributes of governance (i.e. participation and democracy), monitoring and enforcement seem to enhance cooperation. Other key variables found to be pivotal in instilling cooperation on conservation among Zimbabwean populace include community-level trust, punishment, and tenure (Ntuli & Muchapondwa, *ibid*). Cooperation has a positive and considerable influence on biodiversity thereby determining the sustainability of the ecotourism product at the community level. Ntuli and Muchapondwa (2015, p. 28) therefore argued that institutions tend to have a direct effect on cooperation, and indirectly influence biodiversity outcomes through cooperation. We, therefore, argue that institutions have a role in determining the sustainability of tourism in Sub-Saharan Africa. In addition to cooperation, social capital, training, benefits and information sharing were found to significantly influencing biodiversity production in Gonarezhou National Park and surrounding communities (Ntuli & Muchapondwa, 2015). Thus, from a policy perspective, Ntuli and Muchapondwa (2015) noted that external enforcement of conservation rules and regulation tend not to promote sound ecological endeavours; rather, better outcomes are realised when regulations are formulated and implemented by indigenous communities. Furthermore, the provision of full autonomy to local communities has a possibility to enhance the monitoring of each other and internalise enforcement of rules and regulations.

Turning on to land reformed communities, Chigumira (2017) noted that the fast-track land reform programme (FTLRP) has quantitatively increased the relative number of peasant farmers in Zimbabwe's rural landscape. These farmers hail from diverse backgrounds that straddle different social classes from both rural and urban areas. Ntuli and Muchapondwa (2015) observed that biodiversity tends to be more pressurised under resettlement schemes, therefore, the state authorities (i.e. park authorities) should engage "new farmers" on training them to manage common pool resources. This would enhance collective conservation efforts thereby creating avenues for new forms of tourism such as agritourism and rural tourism. Collective effort can be realised through the strong social capital, which refers to the relationship by which groups and individuals identify, communicate, network, build trust, dialogue, resolve conflicts, and realise collective and individual potential as agents of change (Blewit, 2008). Strong Social capital can, therefore, promote good sustainable tourism governance in land reformed communities that are pursuing conservation activities. Most Sub-Saharan African states are tabling the issue of land reform and are drawing lessons from Zimbabwe.

This combination of findings provides some support for the conceptual premise that process-based governance is critical to the success of tourism projects in both rural and urban spaces and the overall realisation of SDG15 and other relevant SDGs. The evidence presented reveals the importance of strengthening the major components of tourism governance, including, justice, trust, social capital and power-relations among stakeholders. Pursuance of these in good faith has the potential to realise

tourism-related SDGs presented earlier. From the evidence above, poor tourism governance appears to have chiefly emanated from power-play and partisan politics, where politics supersedes tourism growth and development decisions. Fast-track land reform programme seems to have affected community-based ecotourism, where exclusionary of key players and lack of skills in running the sector hampered tourism efforts. Thirdly, lack of legislation that grants power to local communities to pursue tourism projects, this tends to derail the attainment of SDG 16; Peace, justice and strong institutions. This results into lack of devolution of authority in tourism-based communities, a situation which threatens the development of tourism at the local level.

Taken together, the findings of this study have provided some insights into the central question posed in this study: what are the challenges with integrating tourism into the SDGs? This enhances our understanding of contemporary tourism governance in the mining and conservation sub-sectors in South Africa and Zimbabwe. We argue that tourism can potentially facilitate the attainment of SDGs through pursuing guiding principles of justice, transparency, accountability, social capital, participation, inclusiveness and fair power relations.

### **3. Conclusion: trust, justice, and inclusiveness in sustainable tourism development**

Tourism has become recognised as important for socio-economic development, with the declaration of 2017 as the International Year of Sustainable Tourism for Development. Although the SDGs has not really brought tourism to the forefront of development, it does make implicit references to tourism-related development. Therefore, it can be noted that by improving tourism governance, sustainable and inclusive development can be promoted. This paper argues that sustainable tourism governance has been poorly applied in Africa, with examples and policy-relevant lessons from the cases of Zimbabwe and South Africa. The role of tourism in the attainment of the SDGs has also not been explicitly articulated. But to improve tourism governance and pro-poor development, in addition to infrastructure, there is a need for the inculcation of trust, justice, social capital and participation in tourism sector development on the continent (see Scheyvens & Hughes, 2019).

This paper examined how tourism governance has been poorly applied in Africa to achieve sustainable tourism and development by not inculcating trust, justice, social capital, power and relations in the development processes. There is a disconnect between policy and practice in tourism governance in Africa. This was noted in the two cases where power-play struggles, especially with the government and the unequal relations between stakeholders, derailed the progression of the tourism sector. Governance in South Africa and Zimbabwe did not entail inclusion and cooperation among varied actors, especially for local groups excluded from developments. For the case sites specifically, this paper argues that limited research has been conducted to appreciate how mining affects protected environments, tourism sites, and sustainability. Governments have not been able to ensure the conservation and protection of nature tourism sites from mining development. There is an inadequate collaboration between communities and the government (departments) to ensure effective tourism governance.

Justice, trust, social capital, and power relations are necessary in the tourism-poverty reduction nexus and this may challenge the arguments that tourist infrastructure is the most crucial variable for tourism to have a wide (anti-poverty) impact (Folarin & Adeniyi, 2019). As Scheyvens and Hughes (2019) noted, justice, trust, social capital, and power relations need to collaborate tourist infrastructure to ensure its meaningful impact on poverty reduction.

Currently, mining operations in South Africa are allowed in natural tourist sites and protected areas, with implications for the sector's development, long-term sustainability and job creation. Poor governance has allowed mining corporations to spearhead mining operations in sensitive areas without proper approval, leading to lack of genuine participation of citizens in tourism and other development processes, leading to lack of trust in government for environmental protection and proper governance. Some communities and CSOs have therefore turned to legal avenues to obtain justice for improper decisions made by the South African government. In Zimbabwe, conservation and sustainable tourism are compromised by the struggle for equitable redistribution of land resources since the colonial era. Zimbabwe relies on diverse nature-based tourism forms but its efforts at sustainably utilising the resources have been compromised by the struggle for equitable land redistribution. Institutions, social capital, justice, inclusiveness and local community engagement in policy formulation and implementation is critical in attaining the SDGs within a sustainable, responsive and pro-poor manner. There is a need for collaboration between governments, institutions, international actors, CSOs and locals to promote governance based on justice, inclusion, trust, and equitable power relations. Local communities must become genuine partners in sustainable tourism governance in Africa.

## Notes

1. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), otherwise known as the Global Goals, are a universal call to action to end poverty, protect the planet and ensure that all people enjoy peace and prosperity. These 17 goals build on the successes of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) while including new areas such as climate change, economic inequality, innovation, sustainable consumption, peace, and justice, among other priorities. The SDGs also has 169 targets. The goals are interconnected – often the key to success on one will involve tackling issues more commonly associated with another. These goals are extensively discussed here: <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/sustainable-development-goals.html>. This paper does not aim to repeat them and their implications for sustainable development here.
2. <https://tourism-sdg.nz/>, Accessed on 6 December 2018.
3. Each year, the United Nations Development Programme publishes its HDI, ranking all the world's countries according to life quality of its inhabitants. Major parameters include global access to education and health services, longevity and equal income opportunities.

## Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the insightful comments from the anonymous reviewers.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## ORCID

Pius Siakwah  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3874-4286>

Regis Musavengane  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5276-7911>

## References

- Adu-Ampong, E. A. (2017). State of the nation address and tourism priorities in Ghana—a contextual analysis. *Tourism Planning and Development*, 14(1), 135–138. doi:10.1080/21568316.2015.1101392
- Adu-Ampong, E. A. (2018). Tourism and national economic development planning in Ghana, 1964–2014. *International Development Planning Review*. doi:10.3828/idpr.2018.2
- Amore, A., & Hall, C. M. (2016). From governance to meta-governance in tourism? Re-incorporating politics, interests and values in the analysis of tourism governance. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 41(2), 109–122. doi:10.1080/02508281.2016.1151162
- Baggio, R., Scott, N., & Cooper, C. (2010). Improving tourism destination governance: A complexity science approach. *Tourism Review*, 65(4), 51–60.
- 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.
- Balint, P. J., & Mashinya, J. (2006). The decline of a model community-based conservation project: Governance, capacity, and devolution in Mahenye, Zimbabwe. *Geoforum*, 37, 805–815.
- Baskin, Y. (1994). There's a new wildlife policy in Kenya: Use it or lose it. *Science*, 265, 733–734.
- Bizcommunity. (2017, June 8). Mining is destroying SA's environment – Bench Marks Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.bizcommunity.com/Article/196/558/76519.html>
- Blewit, J. (2008). *Understanding sustainable development*. London: Earthscan.
- Boluk, K. (2011). In consideration of a new approach to tourism: A critical review of fair trade tourism. *The Journal of Tourism and Peace Research*, 2(1), 27–37.
- Boluk, K., Cavaliere, C. T., & Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2017). Critical thinking to realize sustainability in tourism systems: Reflecting on the 2030 sustainable development goals. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(9), 1201–1204.
- Bond, I., & Frost, P. G. H. (2005, June 15–18). CAMPFIRE and the payment for environmental services. In *Paper prepared for the workshop: Payments for environmental services (PES) – methods and design in developed and developing countries* (pp. 1–26). Titisee: Institute for Environmental Studies, University of Zimbabwe.
- Bramwell, B. (2004). Partnerships, participation, and social science research in tourism planning. In A. Lew, M. Hall, & A. Williams (Eds.), *A companion to tourism* (pp. 541–554). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bramwell, B. (2007). Critical and normative responses to sustainable tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 32(3), 76–78.
- Bramwell, B. (2010). Participative planning and governance for sustainable tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 35(3), 239–249. doi:10.1080/02508281.2010.11081640
- Bramwell, B., Higham, J., Lane, B., & Miller, G. (2017). Twenty-five years of sustainable tourism and the *Journal of Sustainable Tourism: Looking back and moving forward*. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(1), 1–9.
- Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (2011). Critical research on the governance of tourism and sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4–5), 411–421.
- Butler, R. W. (1999). Sustainable tourism: A state-of-the-art review. *Tourism Geographies*, 1(1), 7–25.
- Calfucura, E. (2018). Governance, land and distribution: A discussion on the political economy of community-based conservation. *Ecological Economics*, 145, 18–26.
- Ceballos-Lascurain, H. (1996). *Tourism and protected areas*. Gland: IUCN — World Conservation Union.
- Centre for Environmental Rights. (2017). Coalition defending Mpumalanga water source area. Retrieved from <http://www.fse.org.za/index.php/item/570-coalition-defending-mpumalanga-water-source-area>
- Chauke, A. (2013, September 4). Tourism the new gold: Mokonyane. *SANews*.

- Chaumba, J., Scoones, I., & Wolmer, W. (2003). New politics, new livelihoods: Agrarian change in Zimbabwe. *Review of African Political Economy*, 30(98), 585–608.
- Chigumira, E. (2017). Political ecology of agrarian transformation: The nexus of mining and agriculture in Sanyati district, Zimbabwe. *Journal of Rural Studies*. doi:10.1016/j.jrurstud.2017.11.003
- Child, B. (Ed.). (2004). *Parks in transition*. London: IUCN, World Conservation Union/Earthscan.
- Child, B., & Dalal-Clayton, B. (2004). Transforming approaches to CBNRM: Learning from the Luangwa experience in Zambia. In T. O. McShane & M. P. Wells (Eds.), *Getting biodiversity projects to work: Towards more effective conservation and development* (pp. 256–289). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Christie, I. T., & Crompton, D. E. (2001). *Tourism in Africa (English)*. Africa region working paper series no. 12. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Colton, J. W., & Bissix, G. (2005). Developing agritourism in Nova Scotia: Issues and challenges. *Journal of Sustainable Agriculture*, 27(1), 91–112.
- Commission of the European Communities (CEC). (2001, July 25). European governance. A white paper, COM 428 final. Brussels.
- Cooney, R., Roe, D., Dublin, H., & Booker, F. (2018). *Wildlife, wild livelihoods: Involving communities in sustainable wildlife management and combatting the illegal wildlife Trade*. Nairobi: United Nations Environment Programme.
- D'Amore, L. J. (1988, October 23–27). *Tourism: The world's peace industry*. Paper presented at tourism: A vital force for peace, 1st global conference, Montreal.
- Daphnet, S., Scott, N., & Ruhanen, L. (2012). Applying diffusion theory to destination stakeholder understanding of sustainable tourism development: A case from Thailand. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(8), 110–1124.
- De Clercq, D., & Belausteguigoitia, I. (2017). Reducing the harmful effect of role ambiguity on turnover intentions: The roles of innovation propensity, goodwill trust, and procedural justice. *Personnel Review*, 46(6), 1046–1069.
- 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 of Environmental Affairs. (2017). Retrieved from <http://soer.deat.gov.za/593.html>
- Department of Environmental Affairs, Department of Mineral Resources, Chamber of Mines, South African Mining and Biodiversity Forum, and South African National Biodiversity Institute. (2013). *Executive Summary of the Mining and Biodiversity Guideline: Mainstreaming biodiversity into the mining sector*. Pretoria. 12. Retrieved from [https://www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/legislations/miningbiodiversity\\_guidelines\\_executivesummary.pdf](https://www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/legislations/miningbiodiversity_guidelines_executivesummary.pdf)
- Department of Tourism. (2017). Retrieved from <https://www.tourism.gov.za/AboutNDT/Pages/Tourism-Act.aspx>
- De Tocqueville, A. (1835). *Democracy in America* (2nd ed.). London: Saunders and Otley.
- Dredge, D. (2006). Policy networks and the local organisation of tourism. *Tourism Management*, 27, 269–280.
- Dressler, W., Büscher, B., Schoon, M., Brockington, D., Hayes, T., Kull, C., ... Streshta, K. (2010). From hope to crisis and back again? A critical history of the global CBNRM narrative. *Environmental Conservation*, 37(1), 5–15.
- Duran, C. (2013). Governance for the tourism sector and its measurement, UNWTO statistics and TSA issue paper series STSA/IP/2013/01. Retrieved from <http://statistics.unwto.org/en/content/papers>
- Eadington, W. R., & Smith, V. L. (1992). Introduction: The emergence of alternative forms of tourism. In W. R. Eadington & V. L. Smith (Eds.), *Tourism alternatives: Potentials and problems in the development of tourism* (pp. 1–12). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Fabricius, C., & Koch, E. (2004). *Rights, resources and rural development: Community based natural resources management*. London: Earthscan.
- Fainstein, S. S. (2017). Urban planning and social justice. In M. Gunder, A. Madanipour, & V. Watson (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of planning theory* (pp. 130–142). London: Routledge.
- Fair Trade Tourism. (Ed.). (2015). *Annual report 2014/2015*. Retrieved from [http://www.fairtrade.travel/source/websites/fairtrade/documents/FTTSA\\_AR\\_2014\\_v5.pdf](http://www.fairtrade.travel/source/websites/fairtrade/documents/FTTSA_AR_2014_v5.pdf)

- Farmaki, A. (2015). Regional network governance and sustainable tourism. *Tourism Geographies*, 17(3), 385–407. doi:10.1080/14616688.2015.1036915
- Fig, D. (2005). Manufacturing amnesia: Corporate social responsibility in South Africa. *International Affairs*, 81(3), 599–617.
- Folarin, O., & Adeniyi, O. (2019). Does tourism reduce poverty in Sub-Saharan African countries? *Journal of Travel Research*. doi:10.1177/0047287518821736
- Font, X., & Tribe, J. (2001). Promoting green tourism: The future of environmental awards. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3, 9–21.
- Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity* (No. D10 301c. 1/c. 2) (No. D10 301c. 1/c. 2). New York: Free Press Paperbacks.
- Göhler, G. (2009). 'Power to' and 'power over'. In S. R. Clegg & M. Haugaard (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of power* (pp. 27–39). London: Sage.
- Goodwin, H. (1998). Sustainable tourism and poverty elimination. Retrieved from <http://www.haroldgoodwin.info/resources/dfidpaper.pdf>
- Goodwin, H. (2005). Responsible tourism and the market. *International Centre for Responsible Tourism*. University of Greenwich, UK, Occasional Paper No. 4.
- Green, D. E. (2008). Decentralization and conflict in Uganda. *Conflict, Security and Development*, 8(4), 427–445.
- Hall, C. M. (2007). *Pro-poor tourism: Who benefits? Perspectives on tourism and poverty reduction* (3rd ed.). Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Hall, C. M. (2010). Power in tourism: Tourism in power. In D. V. L. Macleod & J. G. Carrier (Eds.), *Tourism, power and culture: Anthropological insights* (pp. 199–213). Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Hall, C. M. (2011). A typology of governance and its implications for tourism policy analysis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4–5), 437–457.
- Hall, C. M. (2013). Framing behavioural approaches to understanding and governing sustainable tourism consumption: Beyond neoliberalism, “nudging” and “green growth”? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(7), 1091–1109.
- Hezri, A. A., & Dovers, S. R. (2006). Sustainability indicators, policy and governance: Issues for ecological economics. *Ecological Economics*, 60(1), 86–99.
- Holmes, J. G., & Rempel, J. K. (1989). Trust in close relationships. In C. Hendrick (Ed.), *Close relationship* (pp. 81–93). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Human Development Report (HDR). (2016). UNDP.
- Jamal, T., & Camargo, B. A. (2014). Sustainable tourism, justice and an ethic of care: Toward the just destination. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 22(1), 11–30.
- Jamal, T., & Camargo, B. A. (2017). Tourism governance and policy: Whither justice? *Tourism Management Perspectives*. doi:10.1016/j.tmp.2017.11.009
- Jenkins, J. M., Hall, C. M., & Mkono, M. (2014). Tourism and public policy: Contemporary debates and future directions. In A. Lew, C. M. Hall, & A. Williams (Eds.), *Companion to tourism* (pp. 542–555). Malden: Wiley Blackwell.
- Jessop, B. (2011). Metagovernance. In M. Bevir (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of governance* (pp. 106–123). London: Sage.
- Jones, B., & Murphree, M. (2001). The evolution of policy in community conservation in Namibia and Zimbabwe. In D. Hulme & M. Murphree (Eds.), *African wildlife and livelihoods: The promise and performance of community-based conservation* (pp. 38–52). Oxford: James Currey.
- Kamuti, T. (2014). The fractured state in the governance of private game farming: The case of KwaZulu-Natal province, South Africa. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 32(2), 190–206.
- Kashwan, P. (2016). Integrating power in institutional analysis: A micro-foundation perspective. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 28(1), 5–26. doi:10.1177/0951629815586877
- Kato, K. (2018). Debating sustainability in tourism development: Resilience, traditional knowledge and community: A post-disaster perspective. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 15(1), 55–67. doi:10.1080/21568316.2017.1312508
- Kimbu, A. N., & Tichaawa, M. T. (2018). Sustainable development goals and socio-economic development through tourism in Central Africa: Myth or Reality? *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 23(3), 780–796.

- Kramer, R. (1999). Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 569–598.
- Kugler, J., & Zak, P. J. (2017). Trust, cooperation, and conflict: Neuropolitics and international relations. In *Advancing interdisciplinary approaches to international relations* (pp. 83–114). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Larson, A. M., & Lewis-Mendoza, J. (2012). Decentralisation and devolution in Nicaragua's North Atlantic Autonomous Region: Natural resources and indigenous people's rights. *International Journal of the Commons*, 6(2), 179–199.
- Le Blanc, D. (2015). Towards integration at last? The sustainable development goals as a network of targets. *Sustainable Development*, 23(3), 176–187.
- Lee, T. J., Riley, M., & Hampton, M. P. (2010). Conflict and progress: Tourism development in Korea. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(2), 355–376.
- Leonard, L. (2016). Mining and/or tourism development for job creation and sustainability in Dullstroom, Mpumalanga. *Local Economy: The Journal of the Local Economy Policy Unit*, 31(1–2), 249–263.
- Leonard, L. (2017a). State governance, participation and mining development: Lessons learned from Dullstroom, Mpumalanga. *Politikon*, 44(2), 327–345.
- Leonard, L. (2017b). Environmental impact assessments and public participation: The case of environmental justice and mining development in Dullstroom, Mpumalanga. *Environmental Assessment Policy and Management*, 19(1), 1–25.
- Leonard, L. (2018a). Mining corporations, democratic meddling, and environmental justice in South Africa. *Social Sciences*, 7(12), 1–17. doi:10.3390/socsci7120259
- Leonard, L. (2018b). Examining civil society social capital relations against mining development for local sustainability in Dullstroom, Mpumalanga, South Africa. *Sustainable Development*. doi:10.1002/sd
- Leonard, L., & Langton, A. (2016). Challenges facing tourist attractions due to acid mine drainage in the West Rand, Gauteng. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 5(1), 1–12.
- Leonard, L., & Lebogang, T. (2017). Exploring the impacts of mining on tourism growth and local sustainability: The case of Mapungubwe Heritage site, Limpopo, South Africa. *Sustainable Development*. doi:10.1002/sd.1695
- Lerario, A., & Turi, S. D. (2018). Sustainable urban tourism: Reflections on the need for building-related indicators. *Sustainability*, 10, 1–25.
- Majone, G. (1989). *Evidence, argument and persuasion in the policy process*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- 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
- Manwa, H. A. (2007). Is Zimbabwe ready to venture into the cultural tourism market? *Development Southern Africa*, 24(3), 465–474.
- Mbaiwa, J. W. (2017). Poverty or riches: Who benefits from the booming tourism industry in Botswana. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 35(1), 93–112. doi:10.1080/02589001.2016.1270424
- McCarthy, T. (2011). The impact of acid mine drainage in South Africa. *South African Journal of Science*, 107(5/6), 1–7.
- Meuleman, L. (2008). *Public management and the metagovernance of hierarchies, networks and markets: The feasibility of designing and managing governance style combinations*. Amsterdam: Springer.
- Miller, G. J. (1992). *Managerial dilemmas: The political economy of hierarchies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act (MPRDA). (2002). Retrieved from <http://cer.org.za/virtual-library/legislation/national/mining/mineral-and-petroleum-resourcesdevelopment-act-2002>
- Mpinganjira, M., Roberts-Lombard, M., & Svensson, G. (2017). Validating the relationship between trust, commitment, economic and non-economic satisfaction in South African buyer-supplier relationships. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 32(3), 421–431.

- Muboko, N., & Murindagomo, F. (2014). Wildlife control, access and utilisation: Lessons from legislation, policy evolution and implementation in Zimbabwe. *Journal for Nature Conservation*, 22, 206–211.
- Musavengane, R. (2018). Toward pro-poor local economic development in Zimbabwe: The role of pro-poor tourism. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 7(1), 1–14.
- Musavengane, R., & Leonard, L. (2019). When race and social equity matters in nature conservation in post-apartheid South Africa. *Conservation & Society*. doi:10.4103/cs.cs\_18\_23
- 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.
- Musavengane, R., & Simatele, D. (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., & Simatele, M. D. (2016). Community-based natural resource management: The role of social capital in collaborative environmental management of tribal resources in Kwa-Zulu Natal, South Africa. *Development Southern Africa*, 33(6), 806–821. doi:10.1080/0376835X.2016.1231054
- National Environmental Management Act (NEMA). (1998). Act 107, Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Republic of South Africa. Retrieved from <http://www.kruger2canyons.org/029%20-%20NEMA.pdf>
- National Tourism Policy (NTP). (2014). *Government of Zimbabwe. Ministry of Tourism and Hospitality Industry*. Harare: Government Printers.
- National Tourism Sector Strategy (NTSS). (2016–2026). Retrieved from <https://www.tourism.gov.za/AboutNDT/Publications/National%20Tourism%20Sector%20Strategy%20NTSS%202016-2026.pdf>
- Nelson, F., Nshala, R., & Rogers, W. A. (2007). The evolution and reform of tanzanian wildlife management. *Conservation & Society*, 5, 232–261.
- Neuman, W. L. (2011). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ngubane, M., & Brooks, S. (2013). Land beneficiaries as game farmers: Conservation, land reform and the invention of the 'community game farm' in KwaZulu-Natal. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 31(3), 399–420.
- Ntuli, H., & Muchapondwa, E. (2015). The role of institutions in community wildlife conservation in Zimbabwe. *Environment for Development*, Discussion Paper Series, EfD DP (15–23), 1–51.
- Ntuli, H., & Muchapondwa, E. (2017). A bioeconomic analysis of community wildlife conservation in Zimbabwe. *Journal for Nature Conservation*, 37, 106–121.
- Nunkoo, R. (2017). Governance and sustainable tourism: What is the role of trust, power and social capital? *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 6, 277–285.
- Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2012). Power, trust, social exchange and community support. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 997–1023.
- Nunkoo, R., & Smith, S. L. J. (2015). Trust, tourism development and planning. In R. Nunkoo & S. L. J. Smith (Eds.), *Trust, tourism development and planning* (pp. 1–8). London: Routledge.
- Ochieng, G., Seanego, E., & Nkwonta, O. (2010). Impacts of mining on water resources in South Africa. *Scientific Research and Essays*, 5(22), 3351–3357.
- Orams, M. (1999). *Marine tourism: Development, impacts and management*. London: Routledge.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). (1995). *Participatory development and good governance*. Paris: OECD.
- Pearce, D. G. (1992). Alternative tourism: Concepts, classifications and questions. In W. R. Eadington & V. L. Smith (Eds.), *Tourism alternatives: Potentials and problems in the development of tourism* (pp. 15–30). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Pierre, J., & Peters, B. G. (2000). *Governance, politics and the state*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Polity. (2014). New era for environment management of mining projects. Retrieved from <http://www.polity.org.za/article/a-new-era-for-environmental-management-of-mining-projects-2014-09-05>
- Pro-poor Tourism. (2008). *What is pro-poor tourism?* Retrieved from [http://www.propoortourism.org.uk/what\\_is\\_ppt.html](http://www.propoortourism.org.uk/what_is_ppt.html)
- Purdy, J. M. (2016). The role of power in collaborative governance. In R. D. Margerum & C. J. Robinson (Eds.), *The challenge of collaboration in environment governance: Barriers and responses* (pp. 246–265). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

- Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Qian, C., Sasaki, N., Shivakoti, G., & Zhang, Y. (2016). Effective governance in tourism development – an analysis of local perception in the Huangshan mountain area. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 20, 112–123.
- Richardson, T., & Connelly, S. (2002). *Building consensus for rural development and planning in Scotland: A review of best practice*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Central Research Unit.
- Rihoy, E., & Maguranyanga, B. (2007). *Devolution and democratisation of natural resource management in Southern Africa: A comparative analysis of CBNRM policy processes in Botswana and Zimbabwe*. Harare: Centre for Applied Social Sciences University of Zimbabwe.
- Robbins, B. G. (2016). What is trust? A multidisciplinary review, critique, and synthesis. *Sociology Compass*, 10(10), 972–986.
- Rogerson, C. M. (2002). Urban Tourism in the Developing World: The Case of Johannesburg. *Development Southern Africa*, 19, 169–190.
- Rogerson, C. M. (2012). The tourism-development nexus in sub-Saharan Africa: Progress and prospects. *Africa Insight*, 42(2), 28–45.
- Romero, I., & Tejada, P. (2011). A multi-level approach to the study of production chains in the tourism sector. *Tourism Management*, 32(2), 297–306.
- Scheyvens, R., & Biddulph, R. (2018). Inclusive tourism development. *Tourism Geographies*, 20(4), 589–609.
- Scheyvens, R., & Hughes, E. (2019). Can tourism help to “end poverty in all its forms everywhere”? The challenge of tourism addressing SDG1. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. doi:10.1080/09669582.2018.1551404
- Shackleton, S., & Campbell, B. M. (2001). *Devolution in natural resource management: Institutional arrangements and power shifts: A synthesis of case studies from Southern Africa*. Bogor: CIFOR.
- Shackleton, S., Campbell, B., Wollenberg, E., & Edmunds, D. (2002, March). Devolution and community based natural resource management: Creating space for local people to participate and benefit? *Natural Resource Perspectives*, 76, 1–6.
- Siakwah, P. (2018). Tourism geographies and spatial distribution of tourist sites in Ghana. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 7(1), 1–19.
- Song, H., Liu, J., & Chen, G. (2013). Tourism value chain governance: *Review and Prospects*. *Tourism Geographies*, 17(3), 385–407. doi:10.1080/14616688.2015.1036915
- South African Constitution. (1996). Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996. Retrieved from <http://www.justice.gov.za/legislation/constitution/saconstitution-web-eng.pdf>
- Statistics South Africa. (2016). Retrieved from <http://www.statssa.gov.za/?p=9264>
- Stevens, C. (2018). Scales of integration for sustainable development governance. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, 25(1), 1–8.
- Stoker, G. (1998). Governance as theory: Five propositions. *International Social Science Journal*, 50(155), 17–28.
- Sztompka, P. (2016). Two theoretical approaches to trust; their implications for the resolution of inter-group conflict. In L. Alon & D. Bar-Tal (Eds.), *The role of trust in conflict resolution* (pp. 15–21). Cham: Springer.
- Tom, D. (2011). *Factoring culture and discourse into an appraisal of the neoliberal synthesis of wildlife conservation and rural development in Sub-Saharan Africa* (Master's Thesis). Durham University.
- Tosun, J., & Leininger, J. (2017). Governing the interlinkages between the sustainable development goals: Approaches to attain policy integration. *Global Challenges*, 1(9), 1700036.
- Tourism Act. (2014). Retrieved from <https://www.tourism.gov.za/AboutNDT/Publications/tourism%20act%20no%203%20of%202014.pdf>
- United Nations and World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). (2008). *International recommendations for tourism statistics 2008 (IRTS 2008)*. New York. Retrieved from <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/tradeserv/tourism/manual.html>
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (1997). *Governance for sustainable human development*. New York: UNPD.

- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2015). *Sustainable development goals (SDGs)*. Nairobi: Author.
- United Nation World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). (2012). *A closer look at tourism: Sub-national measurement and analysis – towards a set of UNWTO guidelines*. Madrid: Author.
- United Nation World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). (2016). *Annual report 2016*. Madrid: Author.
- USAID. (2009). Environmental guidelines for small-scale activities in Africa (EGSSAA), Africa Bureau's environmental compliance and management support (ENCAP) program. Retrieved from <http://www.encapafrika.org>
- Waligo, V. M., Clarke, J., & Hawkins, R. (2013). Implementing sustainable tourism: A multi-stakeholder involvement management framework. *Tourism Management*, 36, 342–353.
- Wan, Y. K. P., & Bramwell, B. (2015). Political economy and the emergence of a hybrid mode of governance of tourism planning. *Tourism Management*, 50, 316–327.
- Wearing, S. (2002). Re-centering the self in volunteer tourism. In G. S. Dann (Ed.), *The tourist as a metaphor of the social world* (pp. 237–262). Oxon: CABI.
- Weitz, N., Nilsson, M., & Davis, M. (2014). A nexus approach to the post-2015 agenda: Formulating integrated water, energy, and food SDGs. *SAIS Review of International Affairs*, 34(2), 37–50.
- Wheeller, B. (1991). *Tourism's troubled times: Responsible tourism is not the answer*. *Tourism Management*, 12(2), 91–96.
- Wheeller, B. (1993). Sustaining the ego. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1(2), 121–129. doi:10.1080/09669589309450710
- Whitehead, M. (2003). 'In the shadow of hierarchy': Meta-governance, policy reform and urban regeneration in the West Midlands. *Area*, 35(1), 6–14.
- Wolf, E. R. (1999). *Envisioning power: Ideologies of dominance and crisis*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- World Bank. (2009). *The worldwide governance indicators*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group.
- World Travel & Tourism Council (WTTC).. (2017). *Travel and tourism economic impact 2017–world*. London: Author.