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Abstract

Smallholder coffee farmers in Tanzania today are facing a deep financial crises. This is the result of several different reasons but one important factor is the political and economic reforms Tanzania has experienced from being one of the strongest socialist states in Africa to one of the most liberalized. For smallholder coffee farmers this has meant dealing with difficult challenges such as big fluctuations in the coffee bean price but it has also meant opportunities. The purpose for this study is to see if, and to what extent coffee tourism can help in community development and be a leverage to the living standard for people who are dealing with this business. In order to do this the authors have conducted a minor field study in the northern part of Tanzania. We argue that coffee tourism can increase and help stabilize income for smallholder coffee farmers through diversification, contribute to community development and work as a counter-force to the structural changes and the crisis that rural areas in Tanzania are dealing with today.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACU</td>
<td>Arusha Cooperative Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERP II – ESAP</td>
<td>Economic Recovery Program II - Economic and Social Action Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCC</td>
<td>Global Commodity Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVC</td>
<td>Global Value Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICA</td>
<td>International Coffee Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICO</td>
<td>International Coffee Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non Government Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNCU</td>
<td>Kilimanjaro Native Cooperative Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNV</td>
<td>Netherlands Development Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCTP</td>
<td>Tengeru Cultural Tourism Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCB</td>
<td>Tanzanian Coffee Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsh</td>
<td>Tanzanian shilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTB</td>
<td>Tanzanian Tourist Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Introduction

The coffee bean is and has for many years been the most valuable commodity on a global scale only second to oil. This study intends to look at how this important crop is used in a way that differs from its original purpose as a trade commodity. From a different view the coffee bean can create value in other ways than as a finished coffee product. We have explored coffee from a tourist point of view namely the phenomenon of coffee tourism in northern Tanzania. We have investigated to what extent coffee tourism has been beneficial for the people involved but also how it generates positive effects for the community and contribute to development. Even though coffee tourism itself has not been studied to a larger extent there is a lot of prior research about the situation on agriculture and smallholder farming in Tanzania. There is also extensive information to get about the subject of tourism in this area.¹ Our notion that coffee tourism could work in favor of regional development derives somewhat from wine tourism projects that in many cases around the world has worked as effective tools for boosting development (Hall & Mitchell 2000). Wine tourism has been seen as a way to create employment and economic growth especially in rural areas where traditional industries diminishes. There is much information and research to back up this statement² and our thesis is that if it could work with wine tourism, then why not with coffee tourism in Tanzania?

The coffee bean has been especially important for the economy within many developing countries, were 90 % of the world production of coffee takes place. The consumption of coffee on the other hand is mostly concentrated to countries in the developed world (Ponte 2002). This means that the coffee bean historically has generated much export earnings for Third World countries, one of them being Tanzania in east Africa. Despite of this many smallholder coffee farmers face an economic crisis where they find it hard to make a living by just growing coffee (Baffes 2005). At the same time tourism is becoming a more lucrative business in Tanzania and represents a big part of its economy (Wade et al 2001). This study has been undertaken in the northern parts of Tanzania and has been looking at a combination of these two phenomena which together creates the concept of coffee tourism.

The idea is that coffee tourism could be one way to overcome these economic difficulties smallholder coffee farmers experience in Tanzania today. We start by giving a definition of what we mean by coffee tourism. We have not been able to find a proper single definition of coffee tourism since it could have many meanings. Before writing this paper we conducted a

minor field study in Tanzania and the definition used in this paper is based on our own experience after visiting two separate coffee tours in the northern part of Tanzania. It seems to us that coffee tourism share similarities with the concept of for example wine tourism. There are some ingredients that have to be considered before coffee tourism can be accounted as coffee tourism. First of all coffee tourism is conducted in a coffee plantation environment. By this we mean that coffee tourism has to be carried out in an area where coffee beans are grown and produced. Second coffee tourism has to deliver information and educate about coffee. For example information about how coffee growing is carried out, who is growing coffee and its importance to farmers and the process that makes a coffee bean a finished coffee product ready to be consumed. Third the tourist should experience the process of making coffee and be able to test the flavor of the local product. This means that for example visiting a café to enjoy a cup of coffee locally produced does not account as coffee tourism in this case even though it could very well be seen as coffee tourism in some other context.

In the last decades there has been a shift in the Global Commodity Chain (GCC)³ where value adding to the coffee product is now taking place outside the coffee bean producing countries. This means that the developing countries miss out on much of the potential income within the coffee industry where big western based companies take most of the revenues (Ponte 2002).

In the 1980s the Tanzanian government started to implement comprehensive structural changes within their socialistic structure towards a more free market driven society. From being a socialist regime where the state was in control, private investors now started to be allowed to take part of the Tanzanian market. This could be argued having both advantages and negative effects. For the coffee farmers this meant that inputs, such as fertilizers and fungicides that used to be subsidized now became more expensive. Also the price for coffee became much more unstable and could vary a great deal thereby creates uncertainty amongst smallholder coffee farmers (Wade et al 2001). These changes together with declining profits have led coffee growers to attempts to diversify their way of making income, both within farming and also to involve off-farming activities (Larsson 2001).

³ Global Commodity Chain (GCC) in a concept developed by Gereffi & Korzeniewicz in the mid 1990’s (Gereffi et al 2003, Ponte 2002, Schamp et al 2007). The concept is also sometimes referred to as Global Value Chain (GVC) which is a phrase that developed later on to include services and other more complex value-creating activities and not only standard commodities. GCC is used to analyze the trade patterns for commodities (and services included in GVC) within the globalized world. Production and distribution systems are nowadays integrated throughout the whole world thereby the concept of globalization (Gereffi et al 2003). As for example coffee served in restaurants or sold in grocer’s stores goes through a host of steps before it reaches the final destinations. It is the linkage between there steps that are analyzed in GCC.
Off-farming business could for example be within the context of tourism. The tourism industry has for the last decades been growing rapidly in Tanzania. Today tourism counts as the second largest industry, only beaten by agriculture (Wade et al 2001). Traditionally the tourism industry in Tanzania has been focusing on national parks. Even though it is still true that national parks are the main target for tourists the government, according to the Master Plan for tourism has a desire to increase other types of tourism attractions. This means for example different kinds of cultural tourism activities (Tourism Master Plan 2002). Coffee tourism is what we would argue to be a part of cultural tourism. Coffee tourism seems to be a rather new phenomenon in Tanzania. There are so far relatively few people and organizations involved in this business and the ones we came in contact with during this study had only recently started their coffee tourism business. The cases we studied all experienced difficulties making a living by growing coffee. For them a solution became to establish coffee tourism business as a complement to produce and sell coffee beans.

Research shows that there is a large interest for people to experience and learn about different cultures in other corners of the world (Boniface 2003, Bessière 1998). Seemingly this kind of tourism is still growing and a popular way for tourists to experience local traditions is by learning more about food and beverages from a particular place. The value in this kind of tourism lies in the desire to experience what is true and genuine, go back to the simplistic and nature which is the opposite of a modern hectic life and fast food culture (Bessière 1998). For example coffee is a popular beverage in western societies, however not many consumers are aware of the history and process of making coffee. Coffee could be said to make a journey from being just a simple commodity in the poorest parts of the world to become a luxury experience in a trendy coffee house in rich western world countries. We suggest that there is a demand by tourists to be told and experience this story.
1.1 Research issue, objective and questions

The world market price of coffee has fallen in recent years, and at the same time has the costs of inputs increased for coffee growers in Tanzania. This has made it more difficult for small holder farmers to make a living by growing and selling coffee. Farmers that earlier only focused on growing coffee are beginning to diversify their income by looking at other earning activities, both within and outside the agricultural sector. Meanwhile tourism is becoming a more important factor for the economy in Tanzania. From being quite restrictive with tourism development Tanzania’s government has in the last 10-15 years begun to see the potential of tourism and has implemented comprehensive strategies to attract more tourists. Seemingly there is an increasing interest by people to experience different local cultures worldwide. This is often made through visiting areas to experience their food and beverage tradition which has been commonly known as culinary tourism. A good example of this is the establishment of wine tourism around the world which has boosted the economy for their regions and surroundings.

Our objective with this study is to see how coffee tourism functions and contributes to the living standards for those involved in this and the surroundings as a whole. The thesis is that if wine tourism works as an effective regional development tool then coffee tourism can do the same. The purpose for this study can therefore be defined as:

*Can coffee tourism function as a leverage to the living standards for those involved and how can the surroundings benefit from this? Can it be argued that coffee tourism can function as a community development tool?*

The following questions will be used during the study:

- What is meant by coffee tourism?
- How well is coffee tourism established in the area where this study is taking place?
- Which are the reasons for establishing a business within coffee tourism?
- Has coffee tourism increased the living standards for the people that have invested in this business?
- Has coffee tourism been beneficial for the surroundings and to what extent?
1.2 Research methodology

In this chapter we will describe the methodological approach for the study that we have carried out. The study is based on a minor field work. The strategy for the research is a case study using a qualitative method with an inductive approach. The information is mainly gathered through semi-structured interviews with a few respondents and informants. The section also covers selection procedures and limitations.

The research is based on the question whether coffee tourism can work as a regional development tool in the Arusha/Kilimanjaro regions in northern Tanzania. The question derives from examples in wine tourism that has proven to boost regions in different parts of the world e.g. in the Mediterranean and Australia (Hall & Mitchell 2000). The purpose for this study has changed somewhat during the time it has been in progress. The original idea aimed to study the possibilities for smallholder coffee farmers within the Arusha area to start and run business within the tourism sector. This was based on Rolf Larsson’s doctoral dissertation in sociology *Between crisis and opportunity Livelihoods, diversification, and inequality among the Meru of Tanzania* (1999) at the University of Lund. He describes that there is a crisis for farmers within the agriculture that has led to ongoing diversification amongst the livelihood to more non-farming activities in the area. This however turned out to be a much too demanding project which we did not have the possibility to carry out due to the time limit. Instead we found that it would be more appropriate to study only a few units that are dealing with coffee tourism and from those be able to draw conclusions on if coffee tourism can uplift the living situation for those involved and also the surrounding. The information was gathered through a minor field work that lasted for a period of nine weeks in the northern circuit of Tanzania. There we visited a couple of local smallholder farmers to see what kind of problems they face and get a view on how a typical coffee farm in Tanzania operates. Furthermore we conducted our study at two different locations that are running coffee tourism business. One on a smaller scale called Tengeru Cultural Tourism Program (TCTP). TCTP is owned and operated by a woman named Mama Gladeness Pallangyo with help from her son Lema Pallangyo in their village situated about 10 km west of the town of Arusha. The second case named Kilimanjaro Native Cooperative Union (KNCU) works on a somewhat larger scale and has several villages and farmers as partners. KNCU is a coffee
cooperative union that works for the interest of coffee farmers in their district. They buy and distribute coffee beans produced by coffee farmers and since 2004 they have a department for coffee tourism with two full time people working with this (Faraja 081118). These two cases are our main focus for this study. However we have also interviewed other organizations to complement information and opinions such as Arusha Cooperative Union (ACU) and Tanzanian Tourist Board (TTB). The research had its starting-point in Arusha town and as the work proceeded the area was expanded into also including the Kilimanjaro region. More on the cases and the area can be read later on in this essay.

1.2.1 A case study with a qualitative approach

The strategy for this study has been the use of a case study with a qualitative approach. We have focused on conducting an idiographic study where we do a research using only two units rather then a larger number. This is quite standard procedure in social science studies compared with studies carried out within science (Alvesson & Sköldberg 2008). Case studies are characterized by a focus on one or very few units that the researchers use to make general conclusions. The purpose is to get deeper understanding and knowledge that otherwise would not be possible by using a survey (Denscombe 2000). Meriam (1994) writes that the case study differs from for example surveys. When surveys use few variables on many different units the case study on the other hand focuses on studying as many variables as possible but on only one or few units. The case study wishes to deepen the insights through studying a case in detail and thereafter draw generalized conclusions from the specific case (Denscombe 2000).

The quest for discovering new knowledge and understanding is typical for case studies using a qualitative method. This is also the aim with this study which means that it is mainly based on an inductive approach. With an inductive approach, such as this study, the purpose is to make generalizations and hypothesis from the cases that have been studied rather than to verify already existing thesis (Meriam 1994). Even though the question if coffee tourism could work as a regional development tool to some degree derives from wine tourism districts and its linkage to regional development it is not, of course, entirely applicable to coffee tourism in Tanzania. It is more our intention to see if coffee tourism can work as a development tool in Tanzania rather then to compare it with the success of regional development use of wine tourism. It could therefore be argued that this study mainly focus on drawing its conclusions from closeness to the empirical data. This is what is emphasized in for example grounded theory (Alvesson & Sköldberg 2008).
For this study we have chosen two separate cases to get the information needed to answer the questions and the purpose set out for this research. A case study seemed to be the most appropriate strategy due to several reasons. First of all there was a limited amount of time for this project which means that the research had to be rather small scale in which a case study is very suitable (Denscombe 2000). Second we discovered during the research that only a few numbers of coffee farmers had established coffee tourism business in the area. This means that for example a survey would have been insufficient, but a case study appropriate where the efforts are concentrated to only a few units. Third the aim for the study was to find as many variables concerning coffee tourism as a regional developing tool as possible. Fourth this is a rather unexplored subject and to be able to cover as many variables as possible the strategy of case study seemed to be the most satisfying option in order to get the desired result. This is closely connected to qualitative method which is better then quantitative when it comes to capture the complex processes between people and societies and is not bound to narrow variables within a certain context (Alvesson & Sköldberg 2008).

There are two different ways of implementing a study, qualitative and quantitative. Meriam (1994) says that the two methods differ in the ways that assumptions about the reality are presented. For this study we have chosen a qualitative approach. Denscombe (1998), states that qualitative studies are mainly concerned with presenting the material in form of written words and in a descriptive way. Qualitative data presented in a descriptive way is used to describe a certain phenomena, people, organizations or events as they are. In the case of this research we set out to study regional development through the means of coffee tourism with the help of two specific units. The goal is to reproduce the story of how coffee tourism has made an impact on regional development and gain insights on how the different variables interact. It is important to describe the cases as thick and as thorough as possible so that the reader can decide for her/himself if the researchers interpretation of what has been studied is valid or not (Denscombe 2000, Meriam 1994). Other important features are that the researcher should not affect or interfere in what is being studied, but rather observe without interference and keep an open mind for new knowledge and understanding. This is an explorative approach where flexibility is a keyword. The selection of informants and questions are constantly modified and audited in order to get the best result (Alvesson & Sköldberg 2008). It is our aim to tell an as much objective and correct story as possible in this paper when using the information gathered from the cases and other informants. However it is important to
know that qualitative data is the result of interpretation from us making the research, just as preconceptions and prior knowledge matters when analyzing the result.

1.2.2 Pragmatism

One could argue that this study follows a pragmatic philosophy and purpose. Pragmatism is not always an easy term to define and the opinions on what signifies pragmatism may differ depending on who you ask. Here we will outline in what way we consider this study to be pragmatic from the work of the famous American philosopher and Professor Richard Rorty (1931-2007) who was a great supporter of pragmatism as a way to do research. Alvesson & Sköldberg (2008) characterizes pragmatism as an “anti-theoretical” philosophy (Alvesson & Sköldberg 2008:129). We consider this not to be necessarily the case even though it could be regarded as anti-theoretical in the way that, as they say, *it is about staying as close to the practical and empirical reality as possible* (Alvesson & Sköldberg 2008:129). That is why they consider pragmatism to be one of the cornerstones within grounded theory which focuses on empirical data. There is however another more important feature that signifies pragmatism and which could be interpreted as anti-theoretical. That is that pragmatism does not search for ONE universal and general truth for a phenomenon. Neither does it admit there is such a thing. Instead pragmatism praises relativism (Rorty 2003). For example a pragmatist might say that there are a lot of things to be said about coffee tourism but nothing to say about coffee tourism in general. This is not to say that we have not discovered “truths” during this study. That we have. But what pragmatism says is that it is important to know that there is no timeless or universal truth about the phenomenon of coffee tourism. There is no core essence within the term that grants our analyses of coffee tourism to be still true in 20 or 50 or 100 years from now or in other parts of the world. Neither does it guarantee that coffee tourism still exists some years from now, nor does it maybe have to. Pragmatism says that truth is not static over time, but instead truth stands in relation to its surroundings and the current paradigm in society (James 2003, Rorty 2003). For example in an interview with Faraja (081118) at KNCU she stated that in the search for suitable locations for coffee tourism they were looking for specific attributes such as clean environment, nice view (over Kilimanjaro) and good transportation possibilities. In places lacking these or other important attributes coffee tourism might not be successful. Therefore the aim with research should not be the discovering of one universal truth but instead the final goal should be the appropriate use of a certain phenomenon. Alvesson & Sköldberg (2008), states that a pragmatic research aims to look at what could be socially beneficial. Pragmatic research moves forward by seeing to the
best of interest for as many groups of people as possible, similar to the utilitarian way of thinking. You seek to satisfy as many different and separate needs as possible by looking at the area and its specific possibilities. Either you find support in the study for your thesis and material to justify your arguments and therefore minimize the doubts or you find out that the theories are not relevant and you throw them away (Rorty 2003).

We have found out during the work that this way of thinking is in line with the original purpose for this study. The Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) encourages students who are willing to take an interest in development issues and developing countries. They have made this study possible by giving us the scholarship needed and have also played an important role in the preparations. But they do have some requirements and one of them is that the study should contribute to a better world, even if only in a small way, by focusing on development issues and benefits for local people in developing countries. It is our hope and beliefs that this study will shine some light on ONE possible way, namely coffee tourism, to improve the living standards for small holder farmers in the northern part of Tanzania. Later on we will give support to this idea and try to justify the notion that coffee tourism can be and is a tool for at least one group of people in the world to face current economic problems. This paper does not however suggest that coffee tourism is necessarily an important tool *per se* and that it stands in relation to many other factors that have to be considered.

1.2.3 Selection of information sources

Selection of suitable information sources for this study has been made by snowballing. Snowballing selection process belongs to the category of strategic selection methods and is an effective way for researchers involved with a small scale research project to make a desired number of sources (Grönmo 2006). The process of finding appropriate information by using this method was made through recommendations that lead us to what we considered to be suitable information sources. The recommendations could come from participants in the study or other persons that could have relevant suggestions. An advantage with snowballing is that it is especially practical when the researcher performs a study where he/she has a limited knowledge about the geographical area. This seemed to be the best strategy since we had not prior to this field work been to the area in question.

The study is mainly based on data collected through interviews and written material from two organizations directly dealing with coffee tourism and coffee farmers who are linked together
with the organizations. To broaden the knowledge we have also chosen to use other informants such as representatives from tourist- and coffee organizations and coffee farmers in the area who are not currently dealing with coffee tourism to get a wider view on the subject being studied. The organizations dealing with coffee tourism can be described as one having a more small scale family business character and the other a more large scale organization that is operating a bigger area involving several coffee farmers. By choosing two cases that operate on a different scale we have the possibility to better achieve the goals with a qualitative study and to cover as many variables as possible. Our intention was also to meet with a Dutch NGO that has been involved with pro-poor tourism projects in this area which involves different cultural tourism programs, such as for example coffee tourism. They had been somewhat active in giving advice to Tengeru Cultural Tourism Program. Unfortunately the advisors who have been dealing with this project were not reachable at the time the field work was in progress.

1.2.4 Interview technique
The main source of information during the field work for this study has been collected through interviewing relevant individuals and organizations. This means that the empirical text is mainly based on primary data from both respondents and informants. Since the study was carried out in Tanzania, a country where not everyone speaks English, we in some cases had to have help from an interpreter. This was the case when interviewing the smallholder coffee farmers. When interviewing the coordinator for Tengeru Cultural Tourism Program there was a need for interpretation which was made by the son of the coordinator who were also deeply involved in the organization and asked questions by us. So at that time and also later when interviewing farmers at KNCU we interviewed two sources simultaneously. When referring to these interviews in the text and the information can be argued come partly from both respondents we have chosen to use this way (Name & Name Date). There were situations though when we interviewed two completely different sources but in the same day. These are referred to as (Name Date, Name Date) in the text. All interviews were recorded with the exception of one where the respondent felt that he could speak more relaxed and freely without a recording machine. In this interview notes were taken as the interview went on.

Typical for studies using a qualitative approach in a case study is the use of semi-structured interviews. This is also the case for this study. Semi-structured interviews mean that we as researchers have made a list of subjects and questions that needs to be answered during the
time of the interview. However, flexibility is a keyword when using semi-structured interviews and the respondent should be free to speak openly about her/his ideas. The interviewer should be ready to ask follow-up questions depending on what the respondent answers and not be too strict with following the order in which the questions will be asked. Also in qualitative studies and semi-structured interviews the researcher has the possibility to remove a question or change the formulation of it if he/she discovers that the question is wrong or irrelevant for the study. This leads us into the question of reliability and validity.

1.2.5 Reliability and Validity

The information gathered during a field study is supposed to be used for answering predetermined questions set out for the study. Being able to produce a satisfying analyze depends to a great deal on the quality of the data or material generated during the field work. A useful way of determine the quality of material can be by looking at its reliability and its validity for the study.

In short, reliability refers to exactly what it means, namely how trustworthy the material is. Reliability is mostly connected to the choice of information sources and how the data is collected. High reliability can be achieved by gathering information thorough and systematic from reliable and relevant sources. As Alvesson & Sköldberg (2008:227) states: “a source that is not a real source is worth nothing”. One can measure the reliability in a study by comparing the results from similar studies on the same kind of subject. Providing that the same methodological approach has been used in all studies the data from them should be close to identical. If so, the study has a high reliability (Grönmo 2006). However in researches with a qualitative approach this could sometimes be problematic due to several reasons. First of all statistical data from several units is not the purpose in qualitative studies, but instead get deepen knowledge through insights on how a person see and experiences a certain phenomena. This is certainly the case of this study. Our aim is to se how the persons in our two cases experiences coffee tourism as a way to work in favour of regional development. Second it is not always possible to apply the exact same field study on the same phenomena due to the complexity and flexibility within many social science phenomena. They are often constantly changing (Grönmo 2006, Holme & Solvang 1997). For example if this study would have been carried out one, two or five years back in time or some time in the future the situation and peoples opinion on the subject would probably have been somewhat different. Reliability therefore has not the same central role in qualitative studies as it would have in
quantitative studies (Holme & Solvang 1997). Nevertheless it is of course still important to get reliable data, and the way to do this is mainly to choose correct information sources.

High validity is also connected to the choices of the sources that you gather information from but it refers to a higher degree on how valid and relevant the information is to the aim for the study. If the data collected in the field correspond well with what the researchers set out to study then it has a high validity. Therefore the selection of methods to use for the study and which questions when getting information is critical (Grönmo 2006). Since you as rule work close with the units in a qualitative study this is rarely a big problem because you as a researcher can be flexible when gathering material. However there are some factors that the researcher has to consider. For example the researcher can misinterpret the respondents’ signals and real motives behind the answers in semi-structured interviews since they are like conversations then questions which need only a simple yes or no. Another thing is to always be aware of so called tendency critic which refers to the informants’ possible desire to consciously give misleading information due to different reasons (Alvesson & Sköldberg 2008). For example in our case one possible, however not likely, scenario is that informants from a unit misinterpret our role. Maybe they will see us not as students but as people working directly with SIDA looking for projects to support. We have therefore been careful when telling respondents who we are and the purpose for this study. There is also the question whether the researcher should be more active in the interview or remain more passive and let the respondent talk freely (Holme & Solvang 1997). In either case the researcher should in beforehand have made themes or several questions on the subject he/she wants answers to. For this study we mostly asked the informants a question and waited for the answer and then asked the next or possible a follow-up question if the answer was not satisfying enough. However in one interview we found ourselves asking one or two questions to get them started and then they kept talking and covered almost all of our questions without us even asking them. There we found no reason to interrupt their talking and instead waited until they finished so we could ask follow-up questions and other questions we had not gotten the answers to.
1.3 Context

In this chapter we would like to outline some of the background to the problem and the situation for smallholder coffee farmers in Tanzania and the problem they face. We will also briefly discuss the development of tourism within Tanzania with its opportunities and difficulties.

1.3.1 History of coffee in Tanzania

The export industry of coffee beans in Tanzania began to play a major role for its economy in the 1950’s. Export income rose high at this time for Tanzanian coffee. This was much triggered by good world market prices for coffee at that time and also increasing access to fertilizers and farm machinery, made possible through the governments help. The income from coffee farming created a general rise in per capita income and gave opportunities for more households and families to get a better economy and for example being able to send their children to get education or improving their housing standards. There was a general optimistic view on the future economic development (Larsson 2001).

There have for a long time been attempts to control the world trade of the coffee crop. Governments in producing countries have for many years been controlling the production and stocks of the coffee bean and therefore also the global prices for the commodity. In 1962 an International Coffee Agreement (ICA) took place which included most of the producing and consuming countries around the globe. This was in favor of the producing countries because it helped stabilizing the price of coffee bean so they did not fluctuate too much from one year to another (Ponte 2002). Throughout the making of most finished products for consumers to buy, lays a long chain of different activities involving several actors. Since we now have

ICA was formed in 1962 together with International Coffee Organization (ICO) which was created simultaneously. The agreement came to involve in one hand all of the major consuming countries, which are situated mainly in North America and Europe and accounts for about 95 % of the consumption. And on the other “side” of the agreement were almost every producing country (Bates & Lien 2001, Ponte 2002). In short ICA was an attempt to stabilize the world market prices for coffee. This was made by introducing quotas where each member producing country agrees to not export more coffee then their given quota (Bates & Lien 2001, Bohman et al 1996). ICA was considered to work relatively well for many years and Ponte (2002) outlines four factors that made ICA possible; the participation of consuming countries; the existence of producing countries where the government were in control of decisions of concerning export; Brazil’s acceptance to reduce their market share for coffee; and a common strategy of import substitution in producing countries which led to high commodity prices (Ponte 2002:1104). ICA was abandoned in 1989 (Bohman et al 1996, Ponte 2002).
entered a time of global economy, the different parts involving value adding, trade and consumption of a commodity often takes place in different parts all over the globe. This can be analyzed through the Global Commodity Chain (GCC) and could also be applied to the coffee production. This is a useful tool when analyzing how the income from a product is divided between the actors involved in its creation and selling. Because of the ICA regime the producing countries in the developing world could better dictate the price of coffee worldwide and the income from coffee was quite fairly balanced between the rich and poor countries. The price paid to coffee bean growers between the beginnings of 1970 to the end of 1980 remained in general pretty stable around 20 % of the total income and the income retained by consuming countries around 50-55 % (Ponte 2002).

In 1967 a political agenda for Tanzania was formed preceded by the Arusha declaration. The Tanzanian government implemented one of the most restricted socialist policies in Africa with a central top-down controlled economy. This affected all kinds of business activities, including smallholder farmers, were under strict control by communal rural groupings called Ujamaa villages. The agricultural producers were tied under contracts to the governments cooperatives that handled all the marketing for Tanzanian crops and farmers were not allowed to sell directly to private investors (Baffes 2005, Temu 2000). In the mid 1970’s the Tanzanian economy began to go into a deep crisis. This was caused by a combination of internal and external reasons. The crisis eventually forced the Tanzanian government to start negotiate with IMF and the World Bank. They accused Tanzania of having much too restrictive agricultural policies and said that this was the cause behind low growth of agricultural GDP. IMF and the World Bank were criticizing the Tanzanian governments’ strong control and regulations of the market were the state were both the supplier of inputs and also the monopoly buyer of crops. This together with high taxes was said to be some of the causes behind the crisis that deeply affected the rural households around the country (Baffes 2005, Temu 2000).

In order to receive the necessary help from IMF and the World Bank, Tanzania had to implement fundamental structural adjustment programs. From the beginning of 1980 several attempts have been made to imply programs which would lead to a more liberalized economy, one more successful than the other. Structural negotiations and adjustments piece by piece eventually led to a program called Economic Recovery Program II - Economic and Social Action Program (ERP II - ESAP). This finally meant that the state lost its position as the main monopoly actor, now private companies were allowed to buy directly from the producers and
the Ujamaas were abandoned (Temu 2000). The structural programs also meant that education and health care were no longer free. Subsidies for agricultural inputs like fertilizers and fungicides completely disappeared.

“Considered earlier as the most regulated economy in Africa, Tanzania has perhaps transformed into one of the most liberalized.” (International Monetary Fund, 1995 p. 1. Quoted by Ponte 2000).

All these changes in the Tanzanian political policies occurred about the same time that the ICA regime also diminished. Ponte (2002) argues that the end of the ICA regime has led to a change in the GCC. The power has shifted from the producers within the developing countries, to instead being in the hands of the big global enterprises positioned in the consuming countries. The power today can be argued to be concentrated to only a few global companies that have outrivaled many smaller and local traders. As a result of the end of the ICA regime in 1989 and the shift in power, the farmers’ share of the total income from coffee dropped to an average of only 13% while the consuming countries retained as much as 78% between the years of 1989-95 (see Figure 1).
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Source: Ponte (2002)

In the 1990’s, there were a remarkable rise in prices for important inputs like fertilizers, insecticides and fungicides in Tanzania. These inputs that used to be subsidized by the government were not longer free, which meant that the farmers had to buy it themselves. Although the market price for Tanzanian coffee rose to a peak in 1994 (mainly caused by frostin in Brazil) and remained high throughout the 1990’s, this was adamant by the rising costs for agricultural inputs (Larsson 2001). At the end of the 1990’s and in the beginning of
the 21st century the world market price for coffee reached an all time low. This was much due to growing competition not least from Vietnam who entered the market and became the second largest producer of coffee in the world (Ponte 2002). Another important factor that kept the world prices low at that time was a large increase in amount of coffee produced by Brazil due to technical innovations. Most of the smallholder coffee producers in Tanzania (about 90%) lack modern equipment and market information necessary to compete with bigger producing countries. Even though there is a market for more expensive high quality coffee, that Tanzanian coffee is considered to be, producers are unable to generate enough quantity that is demanded by the specialty coffee companies (e.g. Starbucks Coffee Company). Therefore Tanzanian coffee makers are forced to sell their coffee at a lower price for the undifferentiated commodity market. Despite the liberalization there have been very little investments in the Tanzanian coffee sector (Temu 2000).

Ponte (2002) argues that there is a present crisis facing farmers in coffee producing countries, and that even though discussions have been made how to solve this crisis, there is yet no long time solution in sight. Declining profits from producing coffee has led to diversification among smallholder farmers (Bryceson 2002, Larsson 2001, Temu 2000). Bryceson (2002) claims that this diversification is a result of the major political and economic reforms that has taken place in Tanzania which has created a process of both economic and social structural changes in rural areas. Economic changes involve switching into growing other crops with higher and faster yields, selling and renting their land to businessmen and turn to other trading and service activities. Social changes meaning young people abandoning traditional farming to move into cities, changes in male attitudes towards women working leading to more women engaging in wage labor activities and in general a more individualization of economic activities (Bryceson 2002).

1.3.2 History of tourism

The former strongly socialist state of Tanzania in the 1960’s and 70’s with its Ujaama policies had the philosophy that Tanzania should be as self-reliant as possible and not depend on other countries. Tourism was considered not to work in favor of this idea but would rather create a dependency towards the developed world. Therefore they discouraged private and foreign investment within the tourist sector and little infrastructure to facilitate tourism development was made (Wade et al 2000). Despite the few inputs in the tourism sector the number of tourists coming in to Tanzania increased some during the 1960’s and 70’s. This was mainly the cause by a spill-over effect from the much growing tourism industry in Tanzania’s
neighbor country in the north, Kenya. Many tourists crossed the border temporarily to visit the national parks in Tanzania who were connected with the parks in Kenya. However this meant no big economic profits for Tanzania. In the middle of 1980’s the tourism industry began to recover and investments within the industry were made initially by the state who wanted control of the tourism sector. But due to the political and economic reforms initiated in Tanzania foreign investors were allowed to take part the growing tourism industry and in this time the Tanzanian Tourist Board (TTB) was created to further help endorse tourism within Tanzania (Wade et al). These changes began to occur in the beginning of the 1990’s and the number of tourists was growing rapidly throughout the whole decade. In 1991 the number of tourists were 186 800 while in 2005 international travelers was accounted for just over 600 000 people (Corporate Plan 2008/09-2012/13:7).

However, even if this increase is significant the nominal earnings from tourists have grown even more. Compared to its neighbor Kenya, Tanzania has relatively few visitors. This is on the other hand considered to be one of the strengths for Tanzanian tourism industry. For example the visitor density to Tanzanian national parks compared to Kenyan is much lower which creates a high valued and high yielding tourist destination (Wade et al 2000). The year 1991 foreign tourists brought a nominal income of US$ 94.7 million (Kweka et al 2003) while in 2005 this number had increased with about 850% to US$ 822 million (Corporate Plan 2008/09-2012/13:7). In average a tourist spent over US$ 1 000 in 1998 while visiting Tanzania compared to about US$ 400 in the rest of Africa (Kweka et al 2003). For package tourists the average amount of US$ in Tanzania spent per day was 156 in 2005 (Corporate Plan 2008/09-2012/13:7). With all these increasing numbers tourism has become the second biggest foreign exchange earner for Tanzania after agriculture (Wade et al 2000). The industry of tourism in Tanzania today is mainly focused on wildlife experiences that can be found in various national parks that are mostly located in the northern part of the country. There are also a rather big flow of tourists to the largest city in Tanzania Dar es Salaam and its nearby island Zanzibar (Kweka et al 2003).
2 Theoretical framework

The thesis for this study is mainly derived from the successful relationship between wine and tourism as a tool for restructuring and development in rural areas. The idea of development is defined and examples are derived from the discussion of tourism. A demand discussion from the concept of heritage, food and drink tourism in rural areas are also included. Finally we bring some ideas of what tourist settings and staged authenticity are and what implications this could have on the tourist experience.

2.1 A tool for development

In traditional places for wine growing, like around the Mediterranean, and also what are named New World wine regions, for example, Australia, wine tourism has come to be perceived as one of the means to combat the effects of restructuring in rural areas. Within these areas the government and organizations have mediated private investments in wine tourism through offering seminars, education, marketing and sometimes direct financing (www.wfa.org.au). Tourism professor Michael Hall advocates the positive effects of wine tourism. He means that in those areas where there have been investments made in wine tourism it has increased the possibility of sustaining the economic as well as social bases of a region and has also included means for environmental dimensions. Examples of its likely effects are that it will enhance the opportunities for creation of jobs as well as sales of local merchandise. It could mean an opportunity for the individual wine grower and also for the region to diversify their sources of income as well as it can increase the customer loyalty for the specific product. From an environmental dimension, wine growing can obtain sustainable land use in areas which otherwise are considered uneconomic. Tourism could help to support that kind of land diversification in those areas and might maximize the returns (Hall &

---

5 Rural restructuring is a process which has affected the rural production as well as it has resulted in social and political changes. This have had effects on peoples way of living and how they govern themselves, examples could mean changes in rural demography and/or employment shifts. It is argued that this has had a direct and dramatic impact on the traditional agriculture production in for example the western world concerning farm size and number of farms. Rural economies are today more economically, culturally and environmentally diverse and the population tend to become more concentrated in larger centers (Hall & Mitchell 2000).
Mitchell 2000). The arguments are highly interesting and applicable to the discussion of coffee tourism as we find that the problem in this study is correlated to these specific issues.

Further arguments for the benefits of wine tourism are for its contribution in raising the attractiveness of the region in the international marketplace, in what is said to be a highly competitive time. The wine products originating from one place have the possibility of bringing on positive regional images, especially those products of higher quality. It might also at the same time promote other products but wine in that region. Wine tourism is therefore said that it has the capacity of contributing to national as well for regional development (Hall & Mitchell 2000). Some of the arguments are not specific for wine tourism but would be highly applicable to the general discussion of tourism as it seems that tourism in general today counts as a tool for structural adjustments and development in rural areas (Murphy 1985, Sharpley 2002). Some arguments for the benefits of tourism that we find noteworthy would be for its backward linkage opportunities. It is argued that tourism offers more backward linkages through the local economy than any other industry. This is due to that the tourism industry requires many services and goods like food, accommodation, entertainment and local transports. This gives the opportunity for other local industries to gain incomes through providing this business with necessary goods and or for example the construction industry. Another would be that tourism uses resources that already exists, are free or that requires few investments. These resources come to use and create incomes which they would not have done otherwise. Due to its use of natural resources tourism is considered as a proper solution of rural difficulties where other job creating activities seem hard to establish (Sharpley 2002).

The idea of making a study on coffee tourism is partly derived from the better known concept of wine tourism. The research on wine tourism has made us to think of questions if there are some other values also in coffee but the flavor of it. Can it be argued that coffee tourism might generate some similar effects in a place or region as wine tourism is doing, and therefore would also be a tool for development? The concept of wine tourism has therefore worked as a frame when conducting this study. According to Hall & Mitchell (2002) wine tourism has the advantage of being based on a working industry and a “living” culture. This is in opposite to heritage tourism that would often be based on fossilized and even sometimes a falsified traditional culture. It therefore has the potential to change and to be sustained by that change. In Tanzania coffee growing is still an important industry and part of many people’s lives which generates income for thousands of farmers. Coffee tourism thus would have the advantage to count as a “living” culture similar to wine tourism.
2.2 Development

Then what is development? Sharpley (2002) concludes that there is no easy definition of it and that the definitions are often contested. It seems though that development is perceived by many as something that is a progress and something that will lead to modernization. It is also something that within discussions of tourism has been considered as a vehicle for westernization. This definition we would say is contested though it is argued that westernization is something that is for good and for worse, but somehow there is a point here. These arguments are in the context of the discussion of tourism as a development tool especially in the developing countries and that is something which could close the gap to the more developed world. It is said to ensure economic and social progress and something which could redistribute wealth and power (Sharpley 2002).

This study focuses mainly on development from a community and tourism perspective. Murphy (1985) portrays tourism development at a community level as three steps that describe to what degree tourism will affect the community. The initial stage is when a few numbers of adventurous tourists enter the community. They will have only a small impact on the area since they require very little facilities. Eventually, as the destination becomes more widely known and accessible for visitors the community enters a middle stage and the number of travelers will increase. The third and final stage means that the community destination now attracts a large number of visitors who are demanding a more comprehensive infrastructure in terms of facilities and attractions to make them feel at home (Murphy 1985:7). This new infrastructure that is required in order to keep up with the large visitor numbers may also be beneficial for residents living in the community since rural areas often lack the same developed infrastructure that exists in urban areas. However as Murphy (1985) states are these heavy investments often too extensive for the private sector to carry out and therefore help from the government is needed. Tourism affects both the people directly involved in this business as well as the community as a whole who has to host this activity. Both parties’ wishes to benefit financially on tourism and it can create development both social and economic. However tourism can also create a form of dependency where only a few local businessmen benefit and the majority of the residents are left out. To maximize socioeconomic benefits for the community as many locals as possible have to participate in the tourism activities and its revenues (Murphy 1985).

Below follows a list that contains some concrete achievements that tourism can lead to. They derive from the discussion on wine tourism and the possibilities it may achieve:
• to sustain and create local incomes, employment and growth
• to contribute to the costs of providing economic and social infrastructure like: roads, water, sewage and communication.
• to encourage the development of other industrial sectors for example: through local purchasing links.
• to contribute to local resident amenities like: sports and recreation facilities, outdoor recreation opportunities, and arts and culture and services like: shops, post offices, schools and public transport.
• to contribute to the conservation of environmental and cultural resources, especially as scenic (aesthetic) urban and rural surroundings are primary tourist attractions.

(Hall & Mitchell 2002:449)

All these arguments are of interest for our study to see how investments in coffee tourism might touch one or more of these arguments. We find that the last argument is interesting and of important consideration for its role of helping to sustain the resources that will be the base of the tourism product at the same time as it also make up much of the distinctive regional conveyed in the international profile.

2.3 A demand for the rural

We would say that it is obvious that there has to be a demand for rural tourism in the first place to succeed with the objectives of contributing to regional development. Proof that there is an ongoing hype for food and drinks we argue is found daily in media like newspapers, TV, magazines and books, all displaying their specialist in cuisine and food. The hype for the culinary stretches to include specialists also in drinks, not least coffee with an increase in bars and baristas and wine with their wine clubs, books and an ever increase in range of products. These drinks seem to require the right knowledge to be savored in the right way by the consumer. Bessière (1998) claims that food and drinks is a big part of the culture we are about to protect and which works as a kind of identity marker. It makes up the certain features of social groups and will also distinguish a specific place from another through its uniqueness. Cooking traditions in a specific place mark the character of the society and mentality of the people within it. For example wine farms in Provence can show the genuine way of living and working situation of wine producers which is closely connected to the image of France. In the same way coffee plantations can show the traditional living conditions for a smallholder coffee farmer in Tanzania. What is of interest is how tourism might help to reveal or sustain
these heritages of a specific place and that tourists appropriate that culture or identity through its gastronomic behavior.

Bessière (1998) consider food and gastronomy as an element for tourism development at the local level and as identity markers of a region. In the same paper he also concludes that there is an increasing interest for the rural and the local within the larger society but he asks why traditional products arouse such an interest. At first he argues that tourism in rural areas is influenced by a myth of nature, originality and purity that leads us back to what he calls “the good old days and where gastronomy seems to be an important component for this (Bessière 1998).

Second to argue is connected to the argument above. Modern food is often perceived as unnatural and dangerous and more of an artifact such as fast food chains like McDonalds and prepackaged food e.g. Findus. It is described as non traditional food with no identity and is instead functionalized and standardized. This recalls the notion of "back to nature" and would be an increase in interest of the past by the city dweller. Instead they value natural food products with a touch of the country which awakes the nostalgia of old traditions Bessière (1998). Boniface (2003) explanation of this behavior is that it is a resistance to the globalization effect of homogenization and unfair power of action in favor to the big companies. This is often mediated through consumer purchases. The consumer then chooses a removal from the everyday, trying alternatives and thinking about ethical dimensions to consumption. This she says is much of concern for food and drinks. The desire for the natural, unprocessed or local food is used in marketing and among advertisers as a strategy to gain attention for their product. This is certain with food products that transmit a feeling that you are actually buying grandmother’s home made food when it for real is mass produced. What is further said is that the food has to tell a story of its history, identity and nature which will guarantee the certain quality (Bessière 1998). Bessière (1998) concludes that eating is more than the physiological aspect. It is as much about collecting symbols, what we eat also makes us becoming a part of a culture or collective identity. So when we are eating or taking part of these natural food products we are integrating into a social world against the modern and processed food and we appropriate the culture and identity of a specific area. We symbolically integrate a forgotten culture. An actual visit to for example coffee farmers in Tanzania where you make your own coffee from scratch would guarantee a product that is genuine and traditional. At the same time you will get the feeling of helping local farmers financially and taking part of their everyday life.
However this will lead to some discussions on what authenticity really is. MacCannel (1973) talks about the appearance of tourist space and tourist settings. He mentions examples within industries or public institutions from where outsiders can experience and watch the daily operations of these places as a form of attraction. For example The New York Stock Exchange offers the hectic daily activities proceeding viewed by tourists from a balcony or it has come to be popular to experience foreign ancient cultures like for example the Masai’s in Africa or the Aborigine’s in Australia. The problem is that it sometimes would be hard to tell if these tourist settings are for real or if they are just imitating some real activities, so called staged authenticity. These settings he says are sometimes more real than the real thing itself meaning that the people being watched act in a way they think the tourists imagine they should in the specific situation. The mere real life will be out there when we least pay attention to it but at the time we book a tour with a tourist company then we are likely buying our selves an inauthentic experience (MacCannel 1973). We argue that this could be applied to the discussion of culinary tourism as well. Tourists would not me attracted to participating in mass producing food but instead they are looking for the unprocessed local food production as a unique cooking experience.

A third argument is that there seems to be a certain group of travelers with an increasing search for tourism experiences that will gain increasing knowledge and education (Boniface 2003). This certain group of travelers would fit Poon’s (1997) description of the "new tourist" who for example is more experienced, educated and one that search for the real and natural. This new traveler also looks for the unexpected and to gain new impressions of new cultures. This is possibly gained through consuming traditional handicraft, individualized and produced at small scale, food and drink. The mission of learning and education is said to be the recreational experience. As an explanation of this search for knowledge Boniface (2003) means is connected to fear. It is a fear of losing connection to traditional methods in the making of food or handicraft of a specific place or season. There would also be a fear to the modern GM processed food explained earlier. This is of course not always the case. For some a visit to rural areas just offers an opportunity to see and experience how food is grown and processed which is something that is not belonging to the daily routines (Boniface 2003).
3 Empirical findings

This section begins with a description of the geographical area where the study has been conducted. We will then go on with our empirical findings starting with giving our view on the coffee farms and their surroundings. This is followed by a more detailed description on the two cases this study has focused on and the economic impact they have had on their community and some of the projects they have resulted in. Finally there will be a discussion on the supply and demand for coffee tourism in northern Tanzania.

3.1 Geographical area of the study

The geographical location for this study has been the northern part of Tanzania, in the regions of Arusha and Kilimanjaro. As mentioned in the methodological chapter the selection process of information sources has been carried out by snowballing. The starting point for this was Arusha town, the capital city of Arusha region. Our choice of Arusha town is based on that this is the centre pin of tourism in the northern circuit of Tanzania because of its closeness to the most popular national parks and Arusha is the starting point for many tourists. Also Arusha town is the home of one of two tourist information offices (the other one is the head office in Dar es Salaam) in Tanzania. Another equally important factor as tourists flow is of course the presence of coffee and coffee farms. Arusha town borders to the slopes of Mount Meru where the soil is very suitable for growing coffee and there are numerous amounts of coffee farms in the surroundings. The first contacts we made with coffee farmers were just outside of the centre of Arusha town where coffee farmers were not hard to find. Also the Arusha Cooperative Union (ACU) has their head office in Arusha town, where we received much information about how the coffee farmers’ situation in the area is today. However it was not as easy to find coffee growers who had made tourism a part of their business. In fact within the city we were only able to locate one unit that could be said dealing with coffee tourism in the way we define coffee tourism as. Unfortunately they thought that they would not be able to contribute much to our study since the tourism part of their business was only a very small piece and could just as well be without it. After some research we then found out the closest suitable unit for a case study was located in an area named Tengeru. Tengeru village is situated about 10 km east of Arusha town and within the Arusha region.
For the next case study we had to relocate to the city of Moshi which is situated about 1.5 hour east of Arusha town with a car or bus. Moshi is the capital city of Kilimanjaro region and is sited not far from Kilimanjaro national park where Africa’s highest mountain lies which also has the name Kilimanjaro. Even though there is not very much tourism flows into Moshi there are plenty of coffee growers in the area. Moshi is also the place where the trading of Tanzanian coffee takes place and where international buyers come to by coffee for import (Lemilia, 081030). We partly did an interview research within the centre of Moshi with a coffee cooperative union that also is working together with coffee farmers in a tourism project. The farmers involved with the project are however situated outside of the city. We for example visited one village named Uru in north Msuni area. This is about 10 km north of Moshi and just on the border to Kilimanjaro national park.
3.2 The Farmers

When deciding to make a visit up at the smallholder farmers in the regions of Arusha and Kilimanjaro, it is very likely that one will have to leave the paved trunk roads and travel for a bit on some of the unpaved roads to reach these farmers. Sometimes the only way of reaching them will be by foot on a smaller pathway. The roads leading up to the farmers are many times in a bad condition and not to a desired standard. The bad standard of the road has often made it hard to cross these roads under specific periods of changing weather, especially during rain season. This problem used to be of concern for the village Uru North Msuni near to Moshi town, which is running a coffee tourism business under the supervision of the KNCU (Faraja 081118, Zacharia 081118). Earlier they had to use a 4-wheel driven motor vehicle to and from the area but too often it has meant cancelled trips or delayed shuffling of tourists. In 2007 they dealt with that problem after a decision in the annual general meeting of the village represents. The decision meant that they brought money out of the community fund to finance and carry through a road project to improve a length of 2 km of that road, (see chapter “economic impact” for explanation of community fund). An amount of 2,987,400 Tsh was used from the fund to hire a road constructing firm that made the road accessible at any time or any weather condition (Faraja 081118).

When arriving up at the farms we noticed that their surroundings offer beautiful scenery of mountains and hills, either the mountain Kilimanjaro or the Mount Meru. This untouched nature is mixed by the traditional agricultural landscape shaped for a long time by different tribes e.g. the Masai people or Chaga. The area is dominated by smallholder farmers that have cultivated the land for generations. Smallholders are defined as:

“Rural cultivators practicing intensive, permanent, diversified agriculture on relatively small farms in areas of dense population” Netting (1993:2)

It seems that the intensive usage of land is necessary as most farmers own only a small piece of land. According to our respondents a normal size of land owned by these farmers is approximately one hectare, this was for example the case for three of our interviewed farmers (Lemilia 081030, Shio 081118, Steven 081020). Netting (1993) further concludes that smallholders possess long experience and are highly skilled as they get high yields year after year without affecting the good soil. From one hectare we were told that it is possible to receive about 1000 kg of coffee berries per year with the condition these farmers possess (Shio 081118). It was clear though that the amount of coffee berries harvested was largely shifting from 250 kg up to 1000 kg per year. We were also told that on the plantations it is
most common to mix different crops, like sugarcanes, maize, bananas and coffee in one and same plot (Lyomo 081115).

The conditions for the farmers mean that they are reliant on the weather for getting a good harvest where especially water is an important supply. A lack of irrigation system among indigenous farmers is one of the factors affecting the harvest (Shio 081118). What else that will affect the amount of coffee berries received during the harvest is the access to fungicides and insecticides. The lack of resources to buy these chemicals for defeating different attacks on the coffee tree is a big problem (Steven 081020, Philip 081020). It turned out that this became a major subject for discussion during our interviews. Visits to the plantations also give proof about the problems the different diseases arouse where the trees or the berries are dying. One of the farms we visited for the intention of making an interview failed because the coffee plants had died out due to diseases and attack by insects. Many of the trees are also as old as 50-70 years which means that they won’t produce as much as they used to (Shio 081118). The reason why the farmers do not easily replace these old trees with new ones is that it has been considered expensive (Steven 081020). To replace the trees mean that the farmer will have to wait three years for them to give the first harvest and further seven years for them to be harvested their full capacity (Shio 081020). There have been actions taken to meet these problems by the initiative of KNCU. Since 2005 they can offer the surrounding farmers a new type of plant that is more resistant to attacks and diseases (Zacharia, 081118). The plant was developed by the government in the first place and at KNCU they now grow this plant through a project set up at Uru North Msuni. The project has also been financed through the community fund and means that the plants are growing in constructed green houses. The farmers can now buy a plant at a price of 100 shillings. That is about half of the price for a plant on the market. What also seem to be most common among the smallholders are the usage of old and traditional methods and tools for the process of growing crops (Larsson, 2001). No modern equipment was shown, with this we mean like tractors or other machineries for harvesting. Instead we were told that it mainly is the family members that do
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the harvest through picking the berries by hand and we were shown some old tools for further processing that will make the coffee bean ready to be taken to the market.

After the harvest and when the farmer has processed the bean, which means that they skin and dry the beans themselves, they will bring it to the local cooperative called a primary society. The primary society works on the behalf of the farmers by marketing their coffee and also handles the payment from the sales. They bulk the beans until they are brought to the auction in Moshi town which is arranged by Tanzanian Coffee Board (TCB). At the auction the beans are sold to international bidders (Baffes 2005). The unions like ACU and KNCU are directing and coordinating several primary societies and work for the farmer’s best on a greater scale. Some of the objectives of ACU are for example to do marketing but also to offer the farmers inputs like machineries and chemicals at an affordable price (Lemilia, 081030). The unions then are organized under the TCB which works as a coordinator on a national basis for all the cooperative societies (see figure 4). The price paid today to the farmers for one kg of coffee beans is 1500 Tsh (Lemilia 081030). In USD this will be approximately 1.2 USD. Clear though is that there is a fluctuation variety in the price paid from year to year. For example in 2005 the price set for the farmers in the area of Moshi was 400 Tsh but two years later in 2007 the farmers received 1900 Tsh for one kilo (Zacharia & Shio 081118, Faraja 081118). Important to note is that the price might shift depending on which quality the bean holds (Lemilia 081030).
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Tanzania has obviously not a developed handling of waste. It meant that the surroundings were not all free from garbage which gives a negative impression of an otherwise beautiful nature. This was also the concern for the farms that sometimes could be littered. This is understandable as the main focus for a family was obviously to earn an income of the day or other chores that came in first hand, and not to deal with cleaning their farms or the surroundings. But as we will discuss later it is crucial to deal with this environmental problem and keep clean surroundings in order to attract tourists to the coffee farms (Faraja 081118, Pallanyo, G 081105).

3.3 Coffee tourism in northern Tanzania: two cases

“The idea was to create a substitute to generate an income to the community as the agriculture was dropping and keeping animals was harder and harder as the days went on. So it was also to create a program that would bring income not just to her and her family but also involve other people like the guides and the Mama’s from the neighborhood involved in tourism or in this program. Then it will generate income from people who comes but also to show people from outside the country and the daily activities and the life they are involved with everyday” (Pallangyo, L 081105)

3.3.1 TCTP

The Cultural Tourism Program at Tengeru village was established in Dec 2004 by Mama Gladness Pallangyo and her son Lema Pallangyo. They decided to start this project due to the arising difficulties they faced of growing crops and keeping livestock which they have been doing since 1982. The difficulties were about getting access to fertilizers and other necessary inputs for running a farm. They also point to a decrease in rain fall which gave a low harvest and which also meant that there was a shortage of food for the cows. They also mention the lack of land available to feed the animals as further raising difficulties (Pallangyo, G 081105).

The idea of starting a place where they could bring visitors in a tourism purpose was a further development from a program that she already was involved in through a Danish organization. That program was about bringing volunteers from foreign countries to an African host family where they could learn more about the culture and their way of living before they went out to work on the field. She got the suggestion to bring tourists from one of the attendees in that program which made her to further investigate this idea. She finally came in contact with the Cultural tourism programs that had already been established in the country and were 16 at that time. Those programs had all been conducted with help from the Netherlands Development Organization (SNV). Unfortunately this organization were out of resources to help developing
further programs at that time so she had to rely on her own efforts and through looking for local help. Her efforts of doing research of the other programs that already existed and by the help from local entrepreneurs finally resulted in a Cultural tourist program. They point though that the process from idea to product has been full of obstacles and not an easy task. Today the program provides a coffee tour, lake tours and mountain climbing among other things (Pallangyo, G 081105). The coffee tour is the solely most popular and received more than 60% of the total attendees in 2007. The idea of using coffee as an attraction was according to Pallangyo, L (081105) his own idea. He was taking in to consideration the competition from the other existing programs and it seemed that there was an abundance of tours to the local tribes like the Masai’s but that there were no others dealing with coffee tours nearby. He believed that there would be an interest to experience how coffee is grown and produced and to learn about its history as it is a drink which is largely consumed among foreigners especially within the western countries. He points that these people from foreign countries know very little of the making of that coffee and it’s way from bean to cup so considers that there would be a market for this. He perceived this to be in parity of what a cultural program really stands for, to relieve the daily lives and not necessarily has got something to do with the past, even though we discovered when taking part of a tour that the concept refers much to its history. From the beginning he gathered the necessary material and carried through with the tours by himself but today they have one employee who is conducting the tours and guiding. This project then has lead to further tours like those mentioned earlier where all the money received from these are supposed to return and fall in the hands of the community (Pallangyo, L 081105).

3.3.2 KNCU
The next case is about 72 kilometers from Arusha in the town called Moshi in Kilimanjaro region. The objectives from the project conducted by Kilimanjaro Native Cooperative Union (KNCU) are similar to the ones by TCTP. It has been to support the communities and farming families within those areas as they are facing harder times as producers of coffee. They also started to receive tourists in 2004 (Faraja 081118). The difference with this project and the one in Tengeru is that behind this project stands an organization that is the driving actor and coordinates all the farmers involved in this project. KNCU is made up of 60 000 small scale coffee farmers on the slopes of Kilimanjaro. They were well informed with the many difficulties a farmer was exposed to which lead to many uprooting their coffee trees. So the project called “Kahawa Shamba” which mean coffee farm in Kiswahili, is to give an
opportunity for the farmer to earn some additional income that could contribute to a better living. In the beginning they received help from different organizations and tour operators to start up the project and to afford necessary investments. KNCU then contributed with 25% of the initial costs and the other investors together contributed with the remaining 75%. The farmers on the other hand have to contribute with a piece of their land to put some huts or tents on. This is the only initial contribution they are obliged as well as to make sure that their farm and surrounding is nice and clean and also to take part in seminars and education about hospitality management, cooking skills and guiding performance (Faraja 081118). Kahawa Shamba was at first set out as a pilot tourism project with five major goals that we present here:

- To provide a new source of income for local coffee farmers
- To generate funds for community development to pay for new facilities in the area
- To help coffee farmers to acquire new skills and reacquire forgotten ones
- To give travelers a place in which to learn more about Chagga culture
- To link fair-trade coffee buyers/consumers and the producers

The project is situated at three sites and offer different tours and possibilities for over staying. The sites are in Lyamungo, Hai and Uru-North-Msun (Faraja 081118, Zacharia & Shio 081118). We made a visit at the last one of these three sites. The site we visited offered beautiful scenery of the top of Mount Kilimanjaro and slopes draped with green vegetation. Some of the view also revealed of the agricultural activities been going on for a long time which have shaped the landscape. They offered among other things a half day coffee tour that they had chosen to call “from bean to cup” and which informs the visitor everything about the process of growing and making coffee and lets the visitor make his own cup of coffee. From the initial idea of coffee tours they have developed further tours to offer a full program including a stay of several days. The tourism project is made up of three main products; Tourist accommodation at Lyamungo village, The
Coffee Tours in Uru-North (Moshi Rural District), Isuki, Nkawansira, Lemira-Mroma (Hai district) and Campsite and restaurant at Uru-North Msuni Rural Cooperative Society.

3.4 Community impact

The purpose for starting coffee tourism in both our cases was to create a substitute to generate income besides growing coffee. When asked if coffee tourism had contributed to the economic situation in the villages where it has been conducted the answer was undoubtedly yes ((Faraja 081118, Pallangyo, L 081105). Here we will begin to describe how the income is divided between the people involved and in what ways coffee tourism has been beneficial for the communities. As the figures from KNCU show there has been a big increase in both numbers of visitors and money income. When they first started with coffee tours in 2004 the visitor number to the coffee sites of Uru, Lemira and Nkwansira were 218 people. Already the next year, 2005, the number had increased more than three times to reach a figure of 784 visitors. In the year 2007 visitors for these coffee sites had cracked the thousand barriers when they managed to attract almost 1200 tourists. This is without a doubt a big increase in just a couple of years but even more impressive is huge increase of income that the tourists brought. In 2004 the income from all of the sites working together with KNCU was about 5 million Tsh. In 2007 this number had reached a stunning 60 million Tsh. Of this money 75 % is given to the coffee farmers and the community while KNCU is handed the remaining 25 %. In 2007 the distribution of income was divided as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total receipts from all sites: (Lyamungo, Uru, Lemira &amp; Nkwansira)</th>
<th>60,635,361 Tsh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divided as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families &amp; Farmers</td>
<td>8,089,500 Tsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s groups</td>
<td>16,496,900 Tsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>12,567,750 Tsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>6,407,900 Tsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local purchases</td>
<td>1,300,00 Tsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>1,300,000 Tsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>531,000 Tsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total payments</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,693,050 Tsh</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained by KNCU office</td>
<td><strong>14,479,350 Tsh</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also the Cultural Tourism Program in Tengeru has a similar way of distributing their income from coffee tourism. Here is one example on how the income from a full day coffee tour including lunch for one person was distributed between the actors in 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guide fee</td>
<td>5 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting area fee (e.g. coffee plantation)</td>
<td>2 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration fee</td>
<td>4 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact person fee</td>
<td>2 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community fee</td>
<td>2 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>3 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18 USD</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pallangyo, L (081105) emphasizes that this is a good program because it means 100 % of the money gained would come back to the people involved and to their community since no tax or fee is taken by the government. The main reason for Mama Gladness Pallangyo and her son Lema Pallangyo to start the TCTP was to create a substitute to generate income ((Pallangyo, G & Pallangyo, L 081105). They saw that agricultural was dropping and keeping animals became harder and more expensive so they wanted to start a business that would involve several people, from guides to the women in the area. The money income is collected in a certain fund and at the end of every year they have discussions with representatives from the government on what project they would like to support, like for example the local school or
tree planting projects. (Pallangyo, L 081105) says that coffee tourism has helped with bringing a better income to their farm because it means that you have a way to bring in money during the rest of the time when there is not harvest time for coffee which takes place only once a year. Another positive side effect of coffee tourism is that coffee farmers are often more concerned with taking good care of the plantation area, otherwise tourists would not find it as attractive to come visit. This extra motivation for keeping coffee farms clean and in good health does not only help sustain a better environment but also make the coffee trees more productive. Tourism helps you preserve what you have within agriculture (Pallangyo, L 081105). When asked if this cultural tourism program has been an economic success Mama Gladness answer is;

“I won’t say when you consider it for the whole region maybe it has not been very helpful. There are some programs maybe that has made change that the government could not have achieved. Some of them have been school building or renovations and tree planting projects. They have been helped by the development fee. As you know CTP is conducted in the village area so when you speak about the region it includes all Arusha. [...] So it does not reach the care or wide range of supporting the whole region but it does in a small way, I mean in a certain area of the village” (Pallanyo, G & Pallanyo, L 081105).

But bringing coffee tourists to the area have had other indirect effects. For example some of the visitors are touched by the community work and decide to contribute in different ways. This could be by donating money to projects or for example books and sports articles to the school and other such things. Both private people and business organizations give away money to whatever they feel like supporting. Within the area tourists also indirectly help local trading in the sense that TCTP buy lunch ingredients, such as vegetables from local farmers (Pallangyo, L 081211). Coffee tourism has played a significant role for bringing income through TCTP. Pallangyo, L (081105) estimates that in the year 2007 they had about 360 visitors and out of them about 250 choose the coffee tour from all of the selections available.

At KNCU they say that it is hard to tell how many people that are positively affected by income from coffee tourism. From every site KNCU are working with at least four villages and how many farmers that are directly touched from this project would be somewhere around 80 but as some of the income go directly to what is called Community Development Fund it is harder to estimate how many that would gain from it (Faraja 081118, Kahawa Shamba Project Profile 2004-2007). This is because through the community development fund those money are used for projects which could increase the livelihood of people this
would for example concern renovation of schools (Philip 081020, Steven 081020). Faraja (081118) says that for every activity that brings money to the organization 5% is deducted to the development fund. This fund she says is meant to help the farmers in general and it does not matter if they are involved with the tourism project or not. For example the money has been used for schools in the areas of Uru and Lyamungo and also repairing roads which is often very much needed after heavy rain as they are mostly gravelled roads (Faraja 081118). Farmers we interviewed in a village that works with KNCU mentions that in 2006 the government decided to build a secondary school in the area and thanks to money from the camp site with tourists the village could contribute by financing two classrooms in this school (Shio & Zacharia 081118). Coffee tourism income has made the farmers in the area happy since they no longer have to contribute as much to projects such as renovating the school from their own pockets. Traditionally everybody in the village had to take a piece of their earnings from farming and give as a community developing fee. This has not been easy much due to declining profits (Shio & Zacharia 081118). But as Faraja (081118) says coffee tourism project has been established as an answer to this problem and most of the developing fee now derives from income that tourists bring. This has led to more money being left for the farmers. Faraja (081118) also points to the earlier mentioned side effect that profits from coffee growing has increased as a result of tourism because of the importance of taking better care of the plants which has made them more profitable (Faraja 081118).

Like we mentioned before there have not been much heavy investments needed, especially not by the farmers themselves. At KNCU all that the farmers have had to provide is a piece of the land for this kind of use and make sure that the plantations and its surroundings are kept clean and attractive. However when we arrived at Uru they were in full work of building a new bar. This cost quite a lot of money and takes much time. Faraja (081118) emphasizes that this is not an easy project for them to carry out due to costs and it has to be build little by little in time as they get money. There is already a restaurant at the camp site which was built through income from coffee tours and was finished in 2007. In this restaurant there are women’s groups working. These women are saving money from the restaurant on their own initiative from which they then have used for opening a shop where they sell drinks to tourists (Shio 081118). Future projects involve women’s groups selling milk at the market in Moshi, buying mountain bikes for tourists to rent, providing income for local youth groups and setting up a small scale fruit and vegetable unit in the village (Kahawa Shamba Project Profile 2004-2007). When starting tourism business they received financial support from sponsors
and tour operators (Faraja 081118). The project profile document mentions especially a few partners that have been helpful. Initially it was founded by the British government’s Department for International Development (DFID) together with other organizations such as Twin Trading, Tribes Travel, Cafédirect and KNCU Fairtrade Premium Found (Kahawa Shamba Project Profile 2004-2007). Now the business is relatively sustainable and they run it by themselves without the help of sponsors. One of the primary goals with KNCU fair tourism project was that it would eventually be self sufficient and run by the locals. Now the farmers and women’s groups have been sufficiently trained in hospitality and cooking skills to take care of tourists in a professional way (Faraja 081118).

Mama Gladness at TCTP has not had the help of bigger organizations and is operating at a much smaller scale. She was at first worried about all the investments she thought would be necessary in order to establish a tourism business. She was wondering how she would be able to handle all of the environment and attractions and buildings etc without any expertise or much money to invest. But after discussions with a Danish consultant who gave her the advice that not much more than clean water and a toilet would be necessary to at least get started she felt more at ease. And indeed the project has proven to work rather well with only small investments been done such as a toilet with running water, signs to show the way from the main road and efforts to keep a clean surrounding.

Figure 6 Tengeru Cultural Tourism Programme start and finishing point of coffee tour
3.5 A thirst for coffee & tourism

3.5.1 Supply side analysis

We mentioned earlier that coffee since its introduction in 1906 has been one of the most important cash crops in Tanzania. KNCU for example is made up of 60,000 small scale farmers and ACU consists of 19,000 members. That will give some figure of how many that makes a living by growing coffee. In 2007 Tanzania exported about 54,000 tons of coffee beans for the international market (Lemilia 081030). This amount was 1% of the total world production in 2007. In comparison countries like Brazil and Vietnam delivered 2,024,400 and 957,000 tons in 2007 (www.kaffeinformation.se). A general opinion among our respondents is that Tanzania might produce and deliver some of the highest quality of coffee beans in the world but their profile or recognition in the international market they consider as low. Kenya on the other hand has managed to increase their profile and to create a brand which people seems to be more aware of (Shio & Zacharia 081118, Lyiomo 081115). One explanation of this might be that most of the beans are only skinned and dried in Tanzania and will go for export and get processed in the country where it is exported to. Thus Tanzania will not be associated with a commodity ready for consumption that puts them on the international map of coffee brands (Pallangyo, L 081105). Another thing would be that Tanzania so far has lacked the knowledge or tradition of acquiring more attention compared to for example its neighbour Kenya. As Pallanyo, L puts it

“Tanzania has always been displaced behind Kenya, they are more awaked. Even if many would consider the Tanzanian coffee to be of better quality, their coffee is more popular” (Pallangyo, L 081105).

Zacharia (081118) puts his view on this and says that Tanzania is in a period where they from a tourism point of view are “warming up”, both in quality of the tourism product and also in marketing the product but as they are learning they will soon reduce the gap to Kenya. This he considers as necessary if they are about to compete for the tourists. In the master plan for Tanzanian tourism you can read that the government wishes to diversify the tourism product. The idea is to bring more resources to develop the supply of cultural tourism. In the context of cultural tourism they seem to mean historical sites, cultural activities, crafts and visitation to the different tribes (Tourism Master Plan 2002). We have earlier in this paper argued that coffee growing is a “living” culture similar to that of wine growing. Coffee tourism is a relatively new phenomenon, except those cases we visited there were one or two more places that offered coffee tours. From our respondents it is clear though that the government have not
mediated much, if any, investments to develop a coffee tourism concept. The ideas have instead come from organizations or through individual considerations about what would be of interest for tourists to experience (Pallangyo, G 081105, Faraja 081118). Support to their projects has come from international organizations and tour operators that have acted as consultants, financers and to some extent also the marketing part. KNCU has received much of their finance from foreign organizations and have had consultants from Holland (Faraja 081118). TCTP on the other hand sees their personal effort as the reason that they managed to carry through with their project. They mean that they in the first place did not receive much attention or support for their project as they were told that the funding for these projects were off at the moment. Instead they mean they received attention when they had a ready product to show, where they for example got help with the marketing part by Tanzania Tourist Board and SNV. Lyiomo (081115) at TTB points that it between them and the farmers are unsatisfying collaboration to market and heightening the awareness or to develop the product for this type of tourism. When reading the master plan for tourism it seems that focus has instead been more to favour renovation of buildings, fixing historical sites or to assist in developing different cultural programs in general (Tourism Master plan 2002). There has not been much attention or efforts yet of trying to make common marketing to spread the myth or to create a brand of Tanzania as a producer of high quality coffee and tourism (Lyiomo 081115). Those we have interviewed all agree that coffee tourism could create awareness and market the Tanzanian coffee and give the coffee its status they mean it deserves as it is one product of very high quality.

3.5.2 Demand side analysis
This chapter discusses how our cases have experienced the demand for the concept of coffee tourism since their start up. Coffee tourism in Tanzania appears to be a relatively new phenomenon but our cases have already faced a remarkable increase in interest. KNCU had for example an increase in visitors from 218 people in the first year 2004 to 1186 visitors in 2007. In percentage this is an increase of 544%. However the first part of 2008 showed a decline in visitor numbers. Faraja (081118) explains that this was caused by the disturbance in Kenya in connection with the election of the new president. This clearly shows Tanzania’s dependency on the flow of tourists from Kenya in the first place (Faraja081118, Zacharia 081118). TCTP has also seen an increase from when they started until today. Of 350 attendees last year (2007) 250 of came with the intention to do the coffee tour. This meant that there has been an increase from 2005 when they at that time had a total of about 160 visitors.
It seems hard to define the typical visitor for the coffee tour. Both KNCU and TCTP have youngsters and older people attending the farms. At TCTP there is a slight favour of older people doing the tour and they are the ones who spend most money in connection with the tour on for example merchandise (Pallangyo, G 081105). There are not many families attending the tours even though they at KNCU have special tours for that typical group of travelers (Faraja 081118). The countries where the main part of their visitors originates are the Netherlands and USA (Pallangyo, L 081105). Faraja (081118) adds that 90% of their visitors are from the Netherlands but also says that the UK is a growing market. This could be explained by that organizations and tour operators which have been funding these projects are situated in those countries and therefore would likely run marketing campaigns within the country. Except from that they receive much of their visitors from package tours where the main attraction is the safari and where the cultural tours would function as an add-on experience next to the safari. According to Pallangyo, L (081105) people can no longer afford a long stay in the parks as they used to because of the raise of park fees or other costs, then the operators have to find other trips to satisfy the tourist. But he also considers that there is an increase in interest to experience local people and their way of living, this is so that you can say you have experienced the real Tanzania and not just been taken from point A to B. He means that the value of cultural tourism is when you establish friendship and connection with the locals and which is something that seems to attract more and more visitors (Pallangyo, L 081105).

One of the ideas of TCTP in Tengeru was to let tourists experience the daily life of local people. He means that the people in the area of Arusha are experiencing what he calls a transitions period of development compared to other regions in Tanzania. They are still however not to compare with the transition that have been experienced in the western countries. So he considered they could offer an experience of traditional production that the tourist’s cannot experience somewhere else. The idea of coffee tourism was as we said earlier more of a coincidence. By this we mean that it was not something they had registered an increasing demand for at the time they started up with their project, but they had some considerations that many westerners consume coffee but few know much about its process. However the program would be of mutual benefit he says as they have been experiencing a transition period themselves. He concludes that:
“Although the cultural program has been a very good program that has been trying to hold people in their tradition and indigenous way and all this kind of things. It will also give them their proud if you go to the Masai’s they are more than willing to perform, they find that people take picture of them because of their dress, they would never take picture of them in regular clothes it’s got no value for the identity. So it creates their awareness so it’s like we can still use motors and we can definitely go to Arusha and buy small machineries for grinding coffee but it is still nice to keep the history and learn the story” (Pallangyo, L 081105)

What he says is that cultural tourism has got both values for the locals as it creates awareness of their own environment and history just as much as it has got high value for tourists coming to experience it and to interact with those people. But what else that seems important to consider is that the people or places have got no tourist value if they do not perform in their traditional way or what is expected from them. Many of the locals might use modern machineries for processes or dress in a more fashion (e.g. western, modern) way but when the tourists come and visit them they start a performance where they might switch to traditional clothing or pretend that they use old tools. But as he says this has a function even for them as it keeps their history alive and makes them feel proud of their origin. This is also why they are more than willing to perform or act in a certain way as he says (Pallangyo, L 081105). This is similar to the aim set up by KNCU who emphasizes the importance of reacquire forgotten skills and traditions (Kahawa Shamba Project Profile 2004-2007).

We experienced that the coffee tour at TCTP has a focus on the history of coffee and traditions even though it is still a highly living culture. By living culture we mean that it still has an important function of generating incomes for many people. But they acted around the past or how it used to be in a time where no modern machineries existed and where hard work on the field was a must. In fact most people would still use old methods but as said before they are in a transition period where for example modern machineries are becoming more common.

What would be the favourite part of the tour is where the tourists are about to make their own cup of coffee (Pallangyo, L 081105). In this part of the tour we were given the opportunity to make a cup of coffee in a traditional way. We were skinning, roasting, grinding and boiling the coffee using simple tools and learning the old secrets of making a good cup. Else from that we were given a lesson of the introduction of coffee to Tanzania. We had to walk a bit to reach their plot with coffee trees; this made us to pass local villages where daily activities were running in a full pace. In the meantime the guide informed us on what kind of different
crops were growing there as well as the history of coffee plantation in the area and what kinds of problems the farmers face in terms of e.g. pesticides. The day ended at the base camp enjoying our own made cup of coffee.

**4 Conclusion and recommendations**

When we first set out to do this field study we intended to look at coffee tourism from a regional perspective and how coffee tourism could work as a regional development tool. However when we arrived at place in northern Tanzania we soon found out that there was only few businesses dealing with coffee tourism and they were operating at a small scale, not enough to make an impact on a larger region. Instead we found that coffee tourism has had a substantial impact on a smaller community level. Income from coffee tourism has increased from every year in both of our cases and now make up significant part of income earnings for those involved. It has also meant that the income is more evenly distributed throughout the year and they are not as dependent on profits from growing and selling coffee beans which can fluctuate much from one year to another. Money from coffee tourism has increased resources for different community projects such as for example building and maintaining roads, building school classrooms, replacing old coffee trees with new better ones, constructing green houses and creating work opportunities for several people including many women’s groups. These women’s groups have in return used this income to create other businesses such as selling food and drinks to tourists.

As we have discussed earlier in the text coffee tourism has also meant different indirect positive effects for the community and coffee farmers. One tangible example of this is that many farmers have realized the importance of taking better care of their coffee plantations in order to keeping them attractive for tourists. This has been one of the requirements from KNCU to the farmers and has led to the positive side effect of coffee trees being more productive. Of course in the long run this might also lead to an improved environmental awareness where farmers realize the bad sides of throwing waste in the nature. Another important indirect effect is that tourists who visit the area often get involved in community projects such as renovating schools, sponsor schools with books, planting trees and doing business with the locals.

The economic reforms that took place in Tanzania during the late 1980’s did not have the desired effect on boosting coffee bean trading if anything the farmers now facing more uncertainties. This has led to rural restructuring with tendencies of coffee farms diminishing.
We argue that coffee tourism may help sustain the economic and social base within these rural areas in much the same way that Hall & Mitchell (2000) claim that wine tourism has been important for wine producing countries facing structural changes. In order to achieve community development it is important that as many of the locals as possible feel that they are benefited by coffee tourism projects. As this study have shown the primary goal for the established coffee tourism businesses in northern Tanzania is to generate income for residents, farmers, women’s groups and community fund and thereby make sure that the earnings are spread to a wide range of people. As we can see the positive effects from coffee tourism coincide with the earlier mentioned desired achievements that Hall & Mitchell (2000) has outlined for wine tourism. At a community level it can therefore be argued that coffee tourism in Tanzania has been successful.

Murphy’s (1985) three stages of tourism community development can be useful when evaluating the effects of coffee tourism. We argue that TCTP is in a first stage of development where a few number of tourists have found appreciation for its establishment. Also KNCU are at an early stage but operate on a somewhat larger scale and are perhaps moving into a second more comprehensive stage. However it is important to consider that so far coffee tourism is a tertiary attraction and depended on an already relative big tourism flow to the country or region in hand. Countries like Tanzania are located far from where the main target of tourists live and therefore it is not likely that tourists will spend a great deal of money and travel far distances only to participate in a one or two days coffee tour. If the goal is to turn in to a full scale primary tourism attraction with a large number of tourist flows it would require huge efforts, both in terms of marketing and building facilities and infrastructure that would call for bigger participation from the government and foreign investors. Thus, could common efforts create a destination with enough strength to be recognized internationally as a high class coffee region. It is also our belief that increased marketing of Tanzania as coffee tourism region in the world may increase awareness of Tanzanian coffee production as a whole and thereby assist international trading of Tanzanian cultivated coffee. Research drawn from established wine regions show that tourism can help marketing the product in the international marketplace (Hall & Mitchell 2000). This is especially true for high quality products which the Tanzanian coffee bean is considered to be. This co-working can create an effect that is beneficial for the attractiveness both for the coffee trading industry as well as the tourism industry in Tanzania. In short, the product i.e. coffee helps marketing the region and the region (as a tourism attraction) in turn helps marketing (Tanzanian) coffee.
From one point of view the coffee plantation consists of trees used for one purpose only, that is to grow and sell coffee beans. However, as we hopefully have shown, from a different perspective a coffee plantation represents a farming tradition and a living culture and a story behind one of the most popular beverages in the world. This story and source of knowledge is to be experienced by tourists who in return will contribute to the survival of this livelihood and community development and help re-establish coffee production that otherwise run the risk of fading out in some rural areas. One can also refer back to the discussion of the coffee bean in the global commodity chain where value adding has shifted from producing- to consuming countries. We argue that from the tourism perspective there are other values to the coffee bean than its obvious attributes as a commodity trade. These values originate in the demand for experiencing coffee at its origin. We suggest that by making use of these values Tanzania may reclaim some of the power within the GCC thus receive more credit for their product. One subject for further studies can therefore be to see if coffee tourism might help redistribute the power in the GCC between developed- and developing countries and what measures that would be necessary in order to achieve this.
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