

A project funded by the United Nations Development Programme/Global Environment Facility (UNDP/GEF) and executed by the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS)

SOCIO-ECONOMIC SPECIAL STUDY

Report No. 16

SUNUKA

**Socio-economic study of Sunuka village,
Kigoma Region, Tanzania**

Dar es Salaam

February 2000

C.G. Mung'ong'o
National Socio-Economics Co-ordinator

**Pollution control and other measures to protect biodiversity
in Lake Tanganyika (RAF/92/G32)**
**Lutte contre la pollution et autres mesures visant à protéger
la biodiversité du lac Tanganyika (RAF/92/G32)**

The Lake Tanganyika Biodiversity Project has been formulated to help the four riparian states (Burundi, Congo, Tanzania and Zambia) produce an effective and sustainable system for managing and conserving the biodiversity of Lake Tanganyika into the foreseeable future. It is funded by the Global Environmental Facility through the United Nations Development Programme.

Le Projet sur la Biodiversité du Lac Tanganyika a été formulé pour aider les quatre états riverains (Burundi, Congo, Tanzanie et Zambie) à élaborer un système efficace et durable pour gérer et conserver la diversité biologique du lac Tanganyika dans un avenir prévisible. Il est financé par le FEM (Fonds pour l'Environnement Mondial) par le biais du Programme des Nations Unies pour le Développement (PNUD)

Burundi: L'Institut National pour l'Environnement et la Conservation de la Nature

D R Congo: Le Ministère de l'Environnement et de la Conservation de la Nature

Tanzania: Vice President's Office, Division of Environment

Zambia: Environment Council of Zambia

Lake Tanganyika Biodiversity Project Socio-Economic Special Study Report Series

Series editors: Dr. K. Meadows, SESS Co-ordinator & K. Zwick, SESS Facilitator

PLANNING, CRITIQUE, & SYNTHESIS			
I	Summary and critique of the SESS 1996 - 8	Meadows, K & K. Zwick	1999
II (En)	Report of the first SESS Working Group Meeting	Meadows, K & K. Zwick	1999
II (Fr)	Rapport de la première Réunion de Groupe de Travail de l'ESSE	Meadows, K & K. Zwick	1999
III (En)	The SESS Recommendations to the SAP	Meadows, K & K. Zwick	2000
III (Fr)	Les Recommandations de l'ESSE au PAS	Meadows, K & K. Zwick	2000
IV (En)	SESS Final Report	Meadows, K & K. Zwick	2000
IV (Fr)	Rapport Final de l'ESSE	Meadows, K & K. Zwick	2000
BURUNDI			
1	Gatumba: Etude socio-économique du village de Gatumba, Bujumbura Rurale, Burundi	Sindayizeruka, O.	2000
2	Kibenga: Etude socio-économique du village de Kibenga, Bujumbura Rurale, Burundi	Sindayizeruka, O.	2000
3	Kinindo: Etude socio-économique du village de Kinindo, Bujumbura, Burundi	Sindayizeruka, O.	2000
4 (Fr)	Burundi: Rapport National Final	Sindayizeruka, O.	2000
4 (En)	Burundi : Final National Report	Sindayizeruka, O.	2000
CONGO			
5	Kigongo: Etude socio-économique du village de Kigongo, Territoire d'Uvira, RDC	Kitungano, G.	1999
6	Kilomoni: Etude socio-économique du village de Kilomoni, Territoire d'Uvira, RDC	Kitungano, G.	2000
7	Makobola: Etude socio-économique du village de Makobola, Territoire d'Uvira, RDC	Kitungano, G.	2000
8 (Fr)	RD Congo: Rapport National Final	Kitungano, G.	2000
8 (En)	DR Congo: Final National Report	Kitungano, G.	2000
TANZANIA			
9	Fishing in the River Mungonya at Bubango, Kigoma Rural District, Tanzania	Walsh, M., L. Said, B. Marwa, & K. Banister	1996
10	Participatory Rural Appraisal in Mtanga village, Kigoma Rural District, Tanzania	Lwoga, C.M.F. (Ed.)	1997
11	Kirando: Participatory Rural Appraisal in Kirando Ward, Rukwa Region, Tanzania	Mung'ong'o, C.G. (Ed.)	1997
12	Buhingu: Participatory Rural Appraisal in Buhingu Ward, Kigoma Region, Tanzania	Mung'ong'o, C.G. (Ed.)	1997
13	Socio-economic & institutional appraisal of the Malagarasi-Luiche catchment, Kigoma Region, Tanzania	Mung'ong'o, C.G.	1998
14	Socio-economic & institutional appraisal of the Mpanda-Sumbawanga catchment, Rukwa Region, Tanzania	Mung'ong'o, C.G.	1998
15	Mwamgongo: Socio-economic survey of Mwamgongo village, Kigoma Region, Tanzania	Mung'ong'o, C.G.	1999
16	Sunuka: Socio-economic survey of Sunuka village, Kigoma Region, Tanzania	Mung'ong'o, C.G.	2000
17 (En)	Tanzania: Final National Report	Mung'ong'o, C.G.	2000
17 (Fr)	Tanzania: Rapport National Final	Mung'ong'o, C.G.	2000
ZAMBIA			
18	Chituta Bay – Kapata village PRA report	Damaseke, M.	1997
19	Chisanza (A): Socio-economic survey of Chisanza (A) village, Mbala District, Zambia	Chitalu, G.M., F. Ng'andu, & K. Zwick	1999
20	Nsumbu: Socio-economic survey of Lupiri town & Munshi village, Kapata District, Zambia	Chitalu, G.M. & F. Ng'andu	2000
21	Kabyolwe & Kapoko: Socio-economic survey of Kabyolwe & Kapoko villages, Mpulungu District, Zambia	Chitalu, G.M.	2000
22 (En)	Zambia: Final National Report	Chitalu, G.M.	2000
22 (Fr)	Zambia: Rapport National Final	Chitalu, G.M.	2000

Available from: <http://www.ltbp.org> and Natural Resources Institute Central Avenue, Chatham, Kent, ME4 4TB, UK

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Aims and objectives	1
2 METHODS	2
2.1 Sampling strategy	2
2.2 Data collection techniques	2
3 THE STUDY AREA.....	3
3.1 Location and history.....	3
3.2 Geophysical characteristics.....	3
3.3 Social infrastructure	4
3.3.1 Educational services and levels.....	4
3.3.2 Health and sanitation.....	4
4 RESULTS	5
4.1 Structural distribution of well-being.....	5
4.1.1 The relatively well-off	5
4.1.2 The relatively poor	5
4.1.3 The poorest of the poor	5
4.2 Household characteristics	5
4.2.1 Types of households.....	5
4.2.2 Household size and composition.....	5
4.2.3 Dependence ratios	6
4.3 Livelihood activities.....	6
4.3.1 Fishing.....	6
4.3.2 Agriculture and livestock.....	6
4.3.3 Others	6
4.4 Labour use and availability	7
4.5 Access to financial resources	7
4.6 Use of natural resources	7
4.7 Gender relationships	7
4.7.1 Women's labour and time use	7
4.7.2 Women's control of resources, income and decision-making processes	7
5 CONCLUSION.....	8
5.1 The politics of poverty and development.....	8
5.2 Need for improved health education	8
6 REFERENCES.....	9
APPENDIX A ITINERARY	10
APPENDIX B HOUSEHOLD INTERVIEW GUIDELINES.....	11

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The Lake Tanganyika Biodiversity Project is developing a Strategic Action Plan for the conservation of Lake Tanganyika. In preparation for this, the Project is undertaking a series of Special Studies of biodiversity, sedimentation, pollution, fishing practices, and socio-economics. The Socio-Economic Special Study (SESS) aims to identify ways in which the Project can promote:

- participation in fisheries and wider natural resource management by local communities;
- improved, more sustainable fisheries and resource utilisation practices;
- alternative livelihood and income earning opportunities outside of fisheries, especially where lake biodiversity is threatened; and
- environmental education work, to facilitate the above, and to promote general awareness of the importance of the lake resource, especially amongst local people and local government.

1.2 Aims and objectives

The aim of the SESS is to investigate the social and economic aspects of life at selected sites in the area with the objectives of improving understanding of:

- livelihood strategies of local communities, as a basis for informed intervention by interested partners in development;
- patterns of natural resource utilisation, and the threats to natural resources and biodiversity of the lake;
- the socio-economic make-up of lakeshore communities and the key stakeholder groups;
- institutional mechanisms whereby improved resource management and local development initiatives might be introduced.

From these investigations specific proposals for action will be developed for implementation by appropriate local, national, or international institutions and organisations. Data collected from the studies will form a baseline against which their impacts can be measured.

Since January 1997 PRA investigations have been carried out in various villages in Tanzania. The first investigation which involved a multidisciplinary approach was carried out at Mtanga village in the vicinity of Gombe Stream National Park (GSNP). Results of that work are reported in Lwoga, 1997. A second comprehensive PRA was undertaken in August 1997 in four villages in Kirando Ward, Nkansi District, Rukwa Region; results are reported in Mung'ong'o (Ed.) (1997a). A third PRA was undertaken in December 1997 in Buhingu Ward, Kigoma Rural District, Kigoma Region, in the vicinity of the Mahale Mountains National Park, and a was reported in Mung'ong'o (Ed.) (1997b).

In February and July 1998 two surveys were conducted in selected areas in the wider catchment in Kigoma Rural, Kasulu, Sumbawanga Urban, Sumbawanga Rural, Nkansi, and Mpanda Districts to collect data on the socio-economy and institutional set-up of the Tanzanian lake basin (Mung'ong'o, 1998ab). The areas were selected according to peculiarities in economic activities, type of institutions and stakeholders, and habitats.

In October 1999 a fourth village level socio-economic study was undertaken in Mwamgongo village, Kigoma Rural District, and was reported in Mung'ong'o (1999).

This report covers the results of a fifth socio-economic study undertaken in Sunuka village, Kigoma Rural District, in January, 2000 (see appendix A for fieldwork itinerary). The study team comprised of:

- Dr C.G. Mung'ong'o, National Socio-Economics Co-ordinator;
- Mr Omari Kashushu, Research Officer, TAFIRI;
- Mr Hamza Mabochi, Community Development Officer, Kigoma;
- Ms. Esther Ntirugelegwa, Community Development Officer, Kigoma;
- Mr. Moshi Sanze, Agricultural Extension Officer TACARE;
- Mr. Rueben Mfanga, Agricultural Extension Officer, TACARE; and
- Ms Karen Zwick, Socio-Economics Facilitator

2 METHODS

2.1 Sampling strategy

Interest in this village was determined by its proximity to the delta of the Malagarasi River, an area where agriculture is at least as important as fishing.

Community and themed focus group meetings were held opportunistically on the first day of fieldwork and resulted in maps, transect walks, timelines, seasonal calendars, and wealth group definitions (see appendix B for list of people met). These meetings were supplemented on the second and third day with informal semi-structured household interviews, in which every fourth household was interviewed. Thirty-six out of a target of 40 households were interviewed. Informal key informant interviews were held with the acting Head Teacher of the local school, the Health Officer, the Fisheries Officer, the Village Executive Officer, and the Village Chairman.

2.2 Data collection techniques

In order to improve understanding of household characteristics, dynamics, and survival strategies one of the first data collection tools used was wealth and social group definition. Informed local people were asked to define what constitutes "wealth" in the village, and then, on the basis of this definition, to identify socio-economic groups. Steps followed included:

- Listing of assets that are perceived as "wealth" in the village. The list was headed by catamarans, oil palm plots, cultivable land, permanent/iron roofed houses, and shops (*duka*).
- Determining the importance of each of these as criteria for assessing wealth or social status.
- Defining wealth groups depending on the types and quantities of assets owned by households

A household with more than one engine-powered catamaran, four to five acres of oil palms (*migazi*), more than ten acres of cultivated land, or a *duka* with a capital of 500,000 TSh qualified as well-off. A household with a combination of these assets, e.g., a catamaran and a *duka*, etc, was considered more well-off than one with only one of the three assets, as the former's income generating capacity was diversified and constant, while the latter was seasonal.

A very poor household was, on the other hand, defined as one with none of these assets, insecure food supply; poor shelter and clothing, and little hope in life. Begging is a major survival strategy, and the elderly and unemployed are included in this group.

In between these extremes villagers identified two other middle groups. These were the not-so-wealthy (*Wenye uwezo kiasi*) and the not-so-poor (*Wasio na uwezo kiasi*). The not-so-wealthy had paddle catamarans, a permanent house, at least an acre of oil palms, three to four acres of cultivated land, some duka worth less than 200,000 TSh, or were rice traders operating with a capital of 50,000 to 100,000 TSh, and employed others to work for them. The not-so-poor depended on *kibarua* on other people's catamarans or *shambas*, cultivated two acres or less for subsistence, but did not have a secure food supply throughout the year.

A semi-structured checklist of questions (see appendix B) was used to collect information on household size and composition, educational levels, sources of livelihoods, expenditure priorities, labour use and availability, access to financial resources, health and sanitation, access to natural resources, and gender relations and the division of labour. Other data collection tools used included daily timetables, seasonal calendars, and direct observation. Each morning after breakfast the team met to review the previous day's work and plan for the day. Information gaps were identified and ways of plugging them were decided upon.

3 THE STUDY AREA

3.1 Location and history

Sunuka is situated Kigoma Rural District, just south of the delta of the Malagarasi River. It is bordered by Karago village to the north, the sub-villages of Songambebe and Msimba to the east, and Kirando village to the south. Within the village are six *vitongoji* (sub-villages), namely Kinyaba, Msombwezi, Sunuka, Lulinga, Mikamba and Mafundikae.

Informal village records indicate that the population is 5,734, distributed in 520 households. The ethnic composition reflects the fluidity which has prevailed in region as a result of cross-border trade, fishing, and political conflicts in neighbouring Burundi and Congo, and the dominant Ha make up only 60% of the population, with the rest comprising of Bembe from Congo (35%) and Tongwe (5%). Fifty-six percent of households are Christian, and 44% are Moslem.

Compared to other many other lakeshore villages, Sunuka is fairly young. Historically the area was sparsely populated with scattered settlements, and it was only during the Villagisation Programme (VP) of the 1970s that village grew and acquired its present structure, with immigrants coming from as far away as Kasulu. As most of the immigrants were cultivators, settlements became concentrated along ridges leaving the valleys for farms. As they were also mostly poor, the social map of the village is fairly uniform, with most (91%) of houses built of mud bricks with thatched roofs.

3.2 Geophysical characteristics

The village is spread along the lakeshore over six ridges and five rivers namely the Msombwezi, the Sunuka, the Lulinga, the Mafundikani, and the Petro. The largest river is the Lugufu which forms the border with Kirando village to the south. The village lies in a semi-humid belt which receives between 900-1000 mm of rain. Rainfall is unimodal, falling heavily between October and April. There is very little rain during the other months of the year. The soils are principally loams interlaced with sandy clay loams immediately beside the lake. Judging by the composition of the conserved vegetation in the Kalemela Forest Reserve in the north of the village, the indigenous vegetation was probably *miombo* woodland, mainly comprised of *Brachystegia speciformis*. Much of this vegetation is, however, no longer visible in the village as it has been cleared for agriculture, settlements, and the growth of exotic trees such as mangoes, oil palms, coconut and *Senna siamea* (*mijohoro*).

3.3 Social infrastructure

3.3.1 Educational services and levels

The village has one primary school with an enrolment of about 600 pupils, only about 25% of which is female. The school has problems of shortage of teachers – at the time of this study there were only four, resulting in very large class sizes – and shortages of teaching materials. It has also a problem with student dropout, which runs at about 50%. Although the household interview data demonstrate that many people had gone through primary school, the focus group discussions revealed that a considerable number had not finished the required seven years of study. The high dropout rate was attributed to the high labour demands, especially for girls (in *kusoloza* (cleaning and processing of fish), as cooks in fishing camps, in farming, in processing palm oil, etc.), which is exacerbated by high fees (Yusufu Lucas, pers. comm.). Hence, only a negligible percentage of the students who finished primary education went through to secondary school. Educational levels are, therefore, low, and those of women lower than those of men, although those of the youth are higher than those of their parents.

3.3.2 Health and sanitation

The people of Sunuka have access to a sizeable health centre, which is the Ward referral centre. However, its services are not satisfactory. It has only five members of staff: an ACO; a MCHA; two nursing assistants; and a health assistant for a catchment of approximately 16,000 people. There is also not enough medicine, as it depends entirely on a monthly yellow kit, and no operating facilities or transport to Kigoma. It is for these shortcomings that although all the respondent households visit the centre for treatment first, many (37%) buy their own medicines or use traditional herbal remedies (23%).

According to the household interview data the most prevalent diseases in Sunuka are malaria (100%) and diarrhoea (63%), followed by intestinal worms (35%) and cholera (33%). The Health Centre records, list the ten most prevalent complaints as malaria, pneumonia, diarrhoea, non gastro-enteritis infections, upper respiratory tract infections, intestinal worms, urinary tract infections, skin diseases, and eye and ear infections. Many of the of the most common complaints result from poor sanitation, which is a major problem.

Generally, health education is provided to mothers who attend clinics, and according to the interview data, all households have access to health education services. However, as noted elsewhere along the lake (Mung'ong'o (Ed), 1997ab) such knowledge fails to reach men, as they do not accompany their spouses to health centre. Thus, although all households visited were recorded to have pit latrines, they are not always used, and many people defecate in the lake and on the beach. Almost half of all households (42%) do not boil their drinking water, ostensibly due to shortage of fuelwood, and the fatalist belief that “death does not come by cholera alone” (E. Ntirugelegwa, pers. comm.). Special efforts need to be made by health educators to reach all groups of people in ways which are effective.

4 RESULTS

4.1 Structural distribution of well-being

Although four wealth groups were defined (see section 2.1) no household was actually ranked in the well-off group.

4.1.1 The relatively well-off

The relatively well-off (*Wenye uwezo kiasi*) comprises 10% of households. This group owns paddle catamarans, a permanent house, at least an acre of oil palms, three to four acres of cultivated land, some duka worth less than 200,000 TSh, or are rice traders operating with a capital of 50,000 to 100,000 TSh, and employ others to work for them.

This group is a disparate entity embracing a broad spectrum of households from those who are almost in the well-off group to those are in the relatively poor group. A general feature of this group, however, is that households are the largest in size in the village, with those at the upper end of the spectrum generally larger than average, and those at the lower end smaller. As farming and fishing, the main systems of production in the village, are highly labour intensive, and the distribution of the means of production, particularly in fishing, is highly skewed, such a pattern of labour distribution inevitably puts this group in an advantageous socio-economic position. Furthermore, once a household has attained a certain level of prosperity, it is able to draw in and support more extended family members, and thus expand further.

4.1.2 The relatively poor

The relatively poor (*Wasio na uwezo kiasi*) are the largest group, comprising 60% of households. They depend on *kibarua* on other people's catamarans or *shambas*, cultivate two acres or less of rice, cassava, or maize for subsistence, but do not necessarily have a secure food supply throughout the year.

4.1.3 The poorest of the poor

This group forms the lowest social stratum but is the second largest in the village, comprising 30% of households. They have none of the assets listed under the previous three groups, and are insecure in food supply, have poor shelter and clothing, and little hope in life. Households headed by women, or unemployed youths, or those made up of elderly people only are included in this group; begging is a major survival strategy.

4.2 Household characteristics

4.2.1 Types of households

In Tanzania it is normal to find rural households headed by men, if not the husband, then a close kin: a son; a brother; or an uncle. In Mwamgongo 91% of households interviewed were headed by men. The few female household heads are widows (7%) or divorcées (2%). Nineteen percent of households are polygynous.

4.2.2 Household size and composition

Household size varies depending on the type of household, although the overall average from the statistics provided by the village government (section 3.1) is 11.0, which is large. They are largest in well-off households where polygyny, extended families, and bonded labour arrangements are the norm. The poorest households are the smallest, ranging between two and four people, with an average of only three.

4.2.3 Dependence ratios

A dependence ratio is the total number of dependant children, elderly and disabled people in a household divided by the number of able bodied adults who form the labour force. On average the ratio is 0.8:1, which is very low, but it varies amongst social groups, being lowest in the more well-off group and highest in the poorest.

4.3 Livelihood activities

4.3.1 Fishing

In contrast to Mwamgongo, fishing is a secondary activity in Sunuka, and only 23% of households interviewed were involved as fishermen, fish processors, or fish traders. All of these households also farmed. The main gears are lift nets used from catamarans (*kipe*) used offshore to catch *Stolothrissa tanganyicae* (*dagaa*) and/or *Lates stappersii* (*migebuka*), used by 26% of fishermen sampled, gillnets (*makila*) (14%), and lines (*kachinga* or *ndoanao*) (2%). Beach seines were not mentioned, perhaps because they are not important, perhaps because of a lack of trust deterred people from discussing this banned gear. Major problems include theft of gear (35%) and lack of capital or credit (21%).

4.3.2 Agriculture and livestock

Crop cultivation is the most important economic activity in the village, and while every households farms to some degree, 74% are entirely dependant on it. The principal crops are cassava (100% of farming households), maize (91%), rice (30%), bananas (21%), sweet potatoes (19%), and beans and oil palms (9% each). Rice, beans, and palm oil are the main cash crops. Irrigated fields in the Msombwezi lowlands are cultivated throughout the dry season.

Cultivated land was mostly distributed by the village government during the VP (84%). Fields tend to be small, with the majority (68%) cultivating four acres or less, Only 12% of households cultivate more than seven acres. Productivity is low due to lack of extension services (100%), lack of management (95%), and land degradation (47%), with the majority (81%) of those farming producing less than seven bags of maize per year, and 28% producing less than four bags.

Food must be bought from other villages, and 70% of households reported food purchases as a major expenditure priority, but this is difficult for the poorest, and 49% of households have food security problems.

Major problems include vermin (63%), lack of inputs (40%), theft of crops in the fields (35%), lack of extension services (12%) and lack of capital or credit (9%).

Levels of livestock ownership are low, with no cattle in the area. Interview data show that about a third (37%) of households keep goats and/or chicken and geese. Those who do tend to keep five or fewer goats, and about 15 chicken and/or geese.

4.3.3 Others

Other economic activities include running shops, kiosks, or market stalls, or restaurants. The shops and restaurants are fairly small and sell basic household items and traditional local meals, respectively.

4.4 Labour use and availability

In Tanzania most households depend on the labour force available within the household. When demand exceeds supply they resort to communal labour such as work parties (Mung'ong'o, 1995:107). In Sunuka family labour is still depended upon for both agriculture and fishing. However, in times of crisis in farming, such as during the weeding and harvesting periods, *kibarua* (hired labour) is preferred to work parties. This would suggest that people in lakeshore villages such as Sunuka people are becoming more individualistic in their attitude to economic production, and that the labour of relatives has acquired monetary value and can no longer be freely called upon as social capital.

Households with fishing gear normally use their youths as hands. When that labour force is not enough outsiders are also hired. Hence, during the fishing season many youths drop out of school.

4.5 Access to financial resources

The basic sources of livelihoods for the people of Mwamgongo are the lake and the land, and every member of the community has the birthright to exploit these resources to the best of his or her ability. However, there are few institutions offering credit or development assistance, although 19% of households had accessed finances from friends and/or relatives. If extra funds were available, the majority of respondents (67%) indicated that they would invest in agriculture or establish a business (54%). Investment in fishing did not feature at all prominently.

4.6 Use of natural resources

Apart from the lake and the land, the most important natural resource is wood, used for fuel (100%) as well as for poles, timber, and charcoal production. Distances to fuelwood collection areas are increasing, and women now have to travel on and a half hours each way. Tree planting was cited by many (77%) as a solution to shortages of fuelwood, but it is not clear how many are actually undertaking this.

4.7 Gender relationships

4.7.1 Women's labour and time use

Apart from the biological roles of motherhood, women in the village spend their time provisioning for their families, fetching water, cooking, cleaning the house, etc.. Much time is also spent outside the house walking to and from the fields (one and a half hours each way) doing agricultural work, collecting fuelwood, undertaking petty businesses, and attending to community development activities.

The most important problems listed by women during themed focus group discussions were all related to family provisioning, and included low farm productivity, associated with low food productivity and low incomes, heavy work load as families depend on mothers, health related problems, including difficulties in transporting women with complication in childbirth, scarcity of fuelwood, and low non-farm income generation capacity.

4.7.2 Women's control of resources, income and decision-making processes

In the tradition of the Ha the man controls all household resources and income generated, and generally (93%) is the main decision maker, even where the woman's contribution to the household economy is half or more.

5 CONCLUSION

5.1 The politics of poverty and development

Sunuka is fairly homogeneous community, with fewer obviously well-off households, but also fewer very poor households than communities such as Mwamgongo.

However, there is a serious problem of lack of good governance and poor integration of immigrants, specifically those from Congo. Many of the Congolese are in fact second generation, have never been to Congo, and consider Sunuka their home. Cultural differences remain, but need not be divisive. Unfortunately, however, the situation is being exacerbated by individuals who hope to gain economically and/or politically from a conflict. For example, it had not been possible to hold the 1999 local government elections, and thus at the time of the study there was no village government at all. This stalemate needs to be resolved if Sunuka is to be put on the road to development.

5.2 Need for improved health education

Most of the more common medical complaints suffered in the village result from poor sanitation. Most households have pit latrines, and people appear to know that drinking unboiled water is risky, but do not act on this knowledge. Further investigation into the reasons for these behaviours is required to help health educators reach all groups of people in ways which are effective. Of particular interest are the roles of unequal gender relations and local leadership and village governance.

6 REFERENCES

- Lwoga, C.M.F. (Ed.) 1997. Participatory Rural Appraisal in Mtanga village, Kigoma Rural District. Lake Tanganyika Biodiversity Project, (RAF/92/G32), Socio-Economic Special Study Report No. 10. Dar es Salaam.
- Mung'ong'o, C.G. 1995. *Social processes and ecology in the Kondoa Irangi Hills, Central Tanzania*. Meddelanden series B 93, Department of Human Geography, Stockholm University.
- Mung'ong'o, C.G. (Ed.). 1997a. KIRANDO: Participatory Rural Appraisal in Kirando Ward, Rukwa Region, Tanzania. Lake Tanganyika Biodiversity Project (RAF/92/G32), Socio-Economic Special Study Report No. 11. Dar es Salaam.
- Mung'ong'o, C.G. (Ed.). 1997b. BUHINGU: Participatory Rural Appraisal in Buhingu Ward, Kigoma Rural Region, Tanzania. Lake Tanganyika Biodiversity Project (RAF/92/G32), Socio-Economic Special Study Report No. 12. Dar es Salaam.
- Mung'ong'o, C.G. 1998a. Socio-economic & institutional appraisal of the Malagarasi-Luiche catchment, Kigoma Region, Tanzania. Lake Tanganyika Biodiversity Project (RAF/92/G32), Socio-Economic Special Study Report No. 13. Dar es Salaam.
- Mung'ong'o, C.G. 1998b. Socio-economic & institutional appraisal of the Mpanda-Sumbawanga catchment, Rukwa Region, Tanzania. Lake Tanganyika Biodiversity Project (RAF/92/G32), Socio-Economic Special Study Report No. 14. Dar es Salaam.
- Mung'ong'o, C.G. 1999. MWAMGONGO: Socio-economic study of Mwamgongo village, Kigoma Rural Region, Tanzania. Lake Tanganyika Biodiversity Project (RAF/92/G32), Socio-Economic Special Study Report No. 15. Dar es Salaam.

APPENDIX A ITINERARY

Monday, 10th January, 2000

- CM travels to Kigoma
- planning and preparation meetings

Tuesday, 11th January, 2000

- preparation for field trip (food, accommodation, etc.)
- travel to Sunuka

Wednesday, 12th January, 2000

- community meeting
- themed focus group meetings
- identification of key informants
- planning of household sampling strategy
- household interviews
- key informant interviews

Thursday, 13th January, 2000

- household interviews
- KZ travels to Kigoma

Friday, 14th January, 2000

- household interviews

Saturday, 15th January, 2000

- final community meeting
- travel to Kigoma

Monday, 17th January, 2000

- review meeting
- CM travels to Dar es Salaam

APPENDIX B HOUSEHOLD INTERVIEW GUIDELINES

Start by introducing yourself, and asking the people if they are willing to participate under conditions of strict anonymity. They need not answer anything they don't want to, but we hope that if they provide us with good information, we can help them to solve some of their problems appropriately. But, until we do a survey, we can't do anything. We are outsiders, who know little or nothing about their lives; they are the experts, and we would like the opportunity to learn from them.

Date:

Start time:

Your name and the name of any other team members with you.

A: OBSERVATION (just look!)

- Describe the house: the walls, the roof, the floor, the door, the windows, the furnishings. How many rooms can you see?
- What other buildings can you see (latrines, food stores, animal shelters)?
- Can you see where they do the cooking?
- Is the area clean, well looked after? Can you see a rubbish pit?
- Is there electricity, or a generator, or a car battery?
- Are there any luxury consumer items (radio, cassette player, television)?
- Who is there? How are they dressed? What's going on?

B: THE HOUSEHOLD

- Who lives there? For each person try to find out how they are related to the head of the household, their age (approximate), their sex, their level of education, their main occupation (include all children and babies too). For each adult man, how many wives does he have?
- How does each person contribute to the well being of the household? Do they bring in food, or money, or provide some form of domestic or other labour? Are there seasonal variations?
- Who is the head of the household? Who is the main interview respondent? Who is responsible for bringing in the largest part of the food the household eats? Who brings in most of the money? Who makes decisions about how the household is managed? Who makes decisions about household expenditure?
- Is there anyone else there (during the interview)? Who? What are they doing?
- For the members of the household, try to find out their ethnic background.
- Where was the respondent born? If not here, when did he/she come here? Why? Does he/she think he/she will stay here in the future?
- Is this the only home, or is there another (or more than one)? If so, where? Who lives there? Why? Why do the rest live here? Which is the primary one? Do they move seasonally, or do they live here full time?
- Is the house owned, or rented, or what?
- Are they religious? Of what denomination?

C: THE HOUSEHOLD ECONOMY

- What is the staple food? Who is responsible for bringing it in?
- What other foods do they eat? Who is responsible for bringing these in?
- How often do they eat fish? Any preferred species? How much is eaten in a week? Who is responsible for bringing it in? Are there seasonal variations?
- How often do they eat meat? What type commonly used? Who is responsible for bringing it in? Are there seasonal variations?
- Do members of the household exchange goods with others (e.g., fish, other foods, wood, etc.)? Do they provide services (do work) for which they are paid in kind (i.e., not money)? Who does what? What do they gain from it? Are there seasonal variations?
- What are the main income (money) generating activities undertaken by the members of the household? Who does what? What do they gain from it (approximately)? Are there seasonal variations?
- What are the main household expenses? How much are they (approximately)? Are there seasonal variations?
- Is there enough to manage? If yes, what do they do with any surplus? If no, how do they survive?
- If they had little more money, what would they do with it?
- Do they own any productive assets (fishing gear, farm land, means of transport (bicycle/car/lorry/passenger boat), small businesses (kiosk/shop/bar/restaurant/hotel), land for rent, rooms for rent, grinding mill, sewing machine, etc.)? Who owns them?

D: FARMING & ANIMAL HUSBANDRY

- What subsistence crops do they grow? What cash crops? For each crop, who is involved? Are they helped by anyone else? When is the busy season? How much time do they spend working during the different seasons? Where are the fields? What area is cultivated (approximately)? How much is produced (approximately)? Does the crop need treating or processing? If the crop (or a part of it) is sold, how much does it bring in (approximately)? Where is it sold? By whom? To whom? How is it transported? What are the problems? What are possible solutions?
- Are the fields owned? By whom (male or female)? How were they acquired? Or rented? From whom? How much does this cost?
- Is the soil fertile? Is it managed in any way?
- Is erosion a problem? If so, are any measures taken to combat it?

- What kinds of animals do they keep? For each type of animal, how many are there? Where are the animals kept/grazed/watered? Who is involved in rearing them? Are they helped by anyone else? Is there a busy season? How much time do they spend working during the different seasons? What is their production rate (approximately) (include milk, eggs, etc.)? If some are sold, how much does this bring in (approximately)? When are they sold? Where? By whom? To whom? How are they transported? What are the problems? What are possible solutions?
- Do they have any interaction with the Dept of Agriculture, or any other institutions or extension services?

E: FISHING

- What methods of fishing are undertaken by the members of the household? For each method, who is involved? Who do they fish with? Do they own any of the gear? If so, how was it acquired? What is the arrangement between the gear owner(s) and the crew? Is there a busy season? How much time do they spend working during the different seasons? From where, and where do they fish? What types of fish do they catch? What do they do with the fish when they are landed? What do they gain from it (fish/money) (approx.)? What are the arrangements between the fishermen and the people to whom they sell their fish?
- What are the major problems? What are possible solutions?
- What interaction do they have with the Department of Fisheries, or any other institution or organisation?

F: FISH PROCESSING & TRADING

- What types of fish are processed? How? For each type of processing, who is involved? Is there a busy season? How much time do they spend working during the different seasons? How do they obtain the fish? What are the expenses (purchase of fresh fish, purchase of salt, rental of drying grounds, purchase of wood for smoking, construction of ovens for smoking, etc.) (approximately)? How much to they process? What do they gain (approximately)? What is the arrangement with regard to drying grounds? What do they do with the fish once they are processed? What are the arrangements between the processors and the people to whom they sell the fish?
- What is the arrangement with regard to wood for smoking? What wood species is preferred? How much is used (approximately)? Where does it come from?
- What are the major problems in fish processing? What are possible solutions?

- What types of fish are traded? For each type, who is involved? Is there a busy season? How much time do they spend working during the different seasons? How do they obtain the fish? What are the approximate expenses involved in purchasing of fish, transportation, etc.? Where do they sell the fish? To whom? What is the arrangement with regard to transport? What is the final destination of the fish? How much do they trade? What do they gain (approximately)?
- What are the major problems in the trade? What are possible solutions?

G: OTHER ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES (be flexible!)

- What other economic activities are people engaged into? For each activity, who is involved? Do they work with others? Is there a busy season? How much time do they spend working during the different seasons? What raw materials are needed? Where do these come from? What are the expenses (approximately)? How much do they sell? What do they gain (approximately)? Who buys the goods or services? What are the problems? What are possible solutions?

(this might include formal sector salaried employment, informal sector paid employment (e.g., as a hired farm labourer, domestic servant (housegirl/boy, askari)) a waiter or waitress in a restaurant or bar, a shop assistant, etc.), casual labour (fish porter, messenger, etc.), collection and sale of a natural resource (fuelwood, timber, thatching grass, traditional/herbal medicines, honey, etc.), fabrication and sale (or repair) of locally manufactured items (boats, nets, furniture, charcoal, clothes, baskets, etc.), trade, shopkeeping, kiosk "keeping", production and sale of local beers or spirits, preparation and sale of cooked food, laundry, rental of farm land, fish drying grounds, houses, rooms, etc., provision of transport services, grinding of maize, sale of services (mechanic, hairdresser), etc.).

H: USE OF NATURAL RESOURCES

- For fuelwood: How much is needed and collected in a week? Who is involved in collecting it? From where? How much time does this take? Are there seasonal variations? If it is sold or traded, what do they gain? If it is bought, how much does this cost? What are the problems? What are possible solutions?
- For timber: How much timber is produced in a year? What tree species are commonly used? Where do they come from? How much is sold? Where? Who sells? Who buys? What do they gain (approximately)?
- For poles for house construction: How much is produced in a year? What tree species are commonly used? Where do they come from? How much is sold? Where? Who sells? Who buys? What do they gain (approximately)?
- For thatching grass/grass for making baskets/mats, etc., traditional/herbal medicines, wild food plants, mushrooms, honey, wild animals or birds, insects, etc: Who is involved in collecting them? Who processes or transforms them? Who consumes them?
- Have they planted any trees? Why/why not? Who is involved? What types are planted? How many? How are they doing? What are the problems? What are possible solutions?
- Do they have any interaction with the Department of Forestry, or any other institution or organisation?

I: HEALTH & SANITATION

- What are the main health problems? What do they do when someone falls sick?
- Have the children been vaccinated?
- Have there been any deaths in the family? Who? When? How? How old were they?
- For each adult woman, how many (living) children does she have? Were there others who died? Has she had any miscarriages or still births?
- Where does their drinking water come from? Who is involved in collecting it? How long does this take? Do they treat it?
- Is there a pit latrine? Who is responsible for maintenance and hygiene?
- What happens to rubbish?
- Do they have any interaction with the Department of Health, or any other institution or organisation?

Do they have any questions of you? Are there other topics they consider important which you haven't covered?

End time:

Interviewer's comments: Was the respondent interested, talkative, open, friendly, or not?

Remember

- These are just guidelines. Feel free to talk about whatever your respondent is most interested in (make up questions as you go along), and skip over what he/she is not interested in; if it's not interesting to your respondent, it's not important.
- Keep in mind your five helpers: **Who? When? Where? How? Why?**
- Try to get a conversational flow going; don't rush. Fewer high quality, in-depth interviews are better than many inaccurate or superficial ones.
- Be polite; use positive body language (eye contact, smiles) to show that you're interested and encourage your respondent.
- **Look:** record your own observations, but remember to note them as such.
- **Listen:** don't interrupt, and never argue. Don't put your own words into your respondent's mouth; ask open questions ("Tell me about..."), and always record your respondent's ideas (even if you think they're mistaken).
- **Write it down:** make a note of everything at the time. Paper is one of the cheapest parts of the survey, and information can always be discarded later, but only if you've got it.