



# **Land Use Practices along Saadani-Wami-Mbiki Wildlife Corridor and their Implications to Wildlife Conservation**

**Lawrance Ebenezeri Kileo<sup>1</sup> and Nsajigwa Emmanuel Mbije<sup>1\*</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Wildlife Management, College of Forestry, Wildlife and Tourism, the Sokoine University of Agriculture, P.O. Box 3073, Morogoro, Tanzania.*

## **Authors' contributions**

*This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.*

## **Article Information**

DOI: 10.9734/AJEE/2021/v16i430264

### Editor(s):

(1) Prof. Angelo Paone, Liceo Scientifico Ettore Majorana, Italy.

### Reviewers:

(1) Bintooro K. Kamukasa Adonia, Nkumba University, Uganda.

(2) Kush Shrivastava, Nanaji Deshmukh Veterinary Science University (NDVSU), India.

Complete Peer review History, details of the editor(s), Reviewers and additional Reviewers are available here:  
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/75619>

**Original Research Article**

**Received 10 September 2021**

**Accepted 21 October 2021**

**Published 26 November 2021**

## **ABSTRACT**

Saadani-Wami-Mbiki wildlife corridor has been facing conservation threats as a result of various land-use practices (LUP) carried out in and around the corridor. The understanding of changes happening in the corridor over time is important for establishing the management baseline data. This study aimed at identifying land use practices along the Saadani-Wami-Mbiki wildlife corridor and their implications to wildlife conservation. Specifically, the study sought to determine the rate of land cover changes in the corridor between 1975 and 2011 and the effects associated with land use practices on wildlife conservation. The land sat imageries of 1975, 1995, and 2011 were used to assess the rate of vegetation cover changes as a result of various land use practices carried out along. The household survey and Key informants' interview methods were used to obtain socio-economic data which were analyzed using SPSS while GIS data were analyzed using the ERDAS IMAGINE 9.1 and ArcGIS 9.3 programs. In the past 36 years (1975-2011), the cultivated land increased by 25%, settlement by 13%, open forest by 10% while closed forest and grassland decreased by 18% and 3% respectively. Shifting cultivation, overgrazing, charcoal burning, settlements, and poaching were identified as major land use practices threatening wildlife conservation within the corridor. Based on the results, it was recommended that, the Government

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: [mbije@sua.ac.tz](mailto:mbije@sua.ac.tz);

should formulate a land use management plan and introduce a community-based natural resources management strategy to improve natural resources utilization and reduction of human stress to the corridor.

**Keywords:** Wami-Mbiki; Saadan National Park; Wildlife Corridor; pastoralist; Wami River land use practices.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The rapid loss of biodiversity and habitat around the world is occurring as a result of farmers clearing land for new fields, settlements, and logging [1]. In Tanzania, shifting in land use patterns has caused rapid degradation that has led to the reduction of biodiversity in various protected areas resulting in natural habitat destruction [2-4]. Following these practices, some protected areas are now becoming ecological islands because of emerging various land use practices. These results in blockage of animals' routes i.e. Wildlife corridors, dispersal areas, foraging grounds, salt licking areas and breeding sites leading to loss of wildlife critical areas [5-6]. Wildlife corridors are central to the health of the wildlife, but have been interfered with and shrinking as a result of various land use practices that are carried out in and around them (Vincent *et al.*, 1999). In Tanzania, corridors have been easily invaded because of a lack of legal protection status. The study was done by Noe [7] between Mt. Kilimanjaro and Amboseli National Parks revealed that settlement and agriculture have resulted in reducing the actual size of the corridor from approximately 21 km<sup>2</sup> in 1952 to 5 km<sup>2</sup> in 2001. This also has caused changes in the number of migratory routes and wildlife distribution. Some corridors, such as Kwakuchinja and Kitendeni are seriously threatening the ecological integrity because they are under very intensive pressure of agriculture, settlement and extensive livestock grazing [8-9].

Wildlife corridors secure the integrity of physical environmental processes that are essential for the requirements of particular species [10]. For a population to be in good health and be able to reproduce needs some factors such as sufficient foraging area and its habitat which most of the protected areas do not meet. This marks the necessity to have the corridors linking Protected Areas allowing animals dispersal in searching for their basic needs, maintain and sustain viable populations [11]. Moreover, corridors are the key to the survival of wildlife and ecosystems. They are important for the conservation of wildlife by

acting as an extension of the core protected areas and hence contribute to maintaining the biodiversity inside and outside the core protected areas.

This is done by maintaining the genetic variation in populations where inbreeding is inevitable [12]. This enhances colonisation, recolonization, and prevention of inbreeding through gene flow which increases genetic variation. As a result, the vigour for the animal is increased enabling it to cope with its environment. In addition, they provide refugia when the environment in the territorial areas becomes adverse, increases foraging areas, and lowers diseases incidences. Therefore, protection, restoration, and establishment of wildlife corridors are referred to as the appropriate measures to improve the ecological values of ecosystems by manifesting ecological networking [6,13] Jimenez-Osornio *et al.*, 2008). The focus of this study was to identify various land use practices carried out along the Saadani-Wami-Mbiki Wildlife Management Area and their implications for wildlife conservation.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

**Study Site Description.**-The Saadani-Wami-Mbiki Wildlife Corridor lies in the coastal area of Tanzania (Fig. 1). The corridor links Saadani National Park and Wami-Mbiki Wildlife Management Area. The corridor lies on the northern side and is about 80 km from the major commercial city of Dar es Salaam. The area occupied by the corridor is interspersed with rocky hills of thin soil cover and valleys with deep clay or alluvial soils; altitude varies between 350 and 400m. The corridor can easily be accessed by road in some areas e.g. from Chalinze - Segera road through Mandela village. The size of the corridor is estimated to be about 62 km long and 10 km wide.

**Sampling Procedure:** A cross-sectional design which allows data to be collected at one point in time was adopted as suggested by Kothari, [14] and Saunders *et al.*, [15]. Based on the list of villages from the District Office and

reconnaissance survey, a purposive sampling method was used to select three villages namely Matipwili, Mandela and Pongwe Msungura. The villages were selected based on location concerning accessibility and proximity to the corridor. The sampling units of 30 households in each village were randomly selected from the sampling frame (village register). This sample size is recommended by Saunders *et al.*, [15] on grounds that it is a reasonable sample size for socio-science studies as it is statistically large enough to make scientific conclusions. In most African traditions and customs, the household is the basic unit of social structure.

The survey was conducted using a structured questionnaire containing both open and closed-ended questions (Appendix I). The method was used to obtain information on land use practices, socio-economic and cultural activities undertaken in and along the corridor. Also, the technique was used to obtain villagers' views on the

remarkable impacts associated with these land use practices on the corridor and wildlife. Key informants included individuals who were conversant with their environment and willing to talk to the researcher. They also included the most influential people in the village such as District Game Officer (DGO), Village Game Scouts (VGS), Village Agricultural Extension Officers, and Wami-Mbiki WMA and Saadani National Park Officials. The discussion was guided by a checklist (Appendix II) and aimed at collecting information concerning the types of land use practices done in and around the corridor and their associated impact on wildlife conservation. Furthermore, the collected information was on the trend of wild animals and human-wildlife interaction within and along the corridor. This was supplemented by direct observation and secondary data which included various documents and publications obtained through grey literature, literature search using the Internet and from Wami-Mbiki WMA office.




Fig. 1. Location of the corridor and study villages

## 2.1 Data Analysis

Quantitative data from household surveys were processed and analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 12.0 computer program and Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet. Descriptive statistics were applied to determine frequencies, percentages, and multiple responses. The qualitative data were analyzed using content and structural-functional analysis techniques. The content analysis method was used to analyze in detail the components of verbal discussions held with key informants and from open-ended questions.

Remote sensing and GIS techniques were employed to assess vegetation cover changes as a result of land use systems along the corridor. Three sets of Landsat satellite imageries for 1975, 1995, and 2011 were purchased by considering the possible minimum presence of cloud cover, Spatio-temporal characteristics, image data availability, and image data costs. Image pre-processing, rectification/geo-referencing, enhancement, and correction for distortions for all acquired images were done. The researcher used a handheld GPS for ground-truthing/geo-referencing purposes. This was used to coordinate which later on were applied in allocating features for verifying and documenting types and magnitude of vegetation cover change in the area.

## 2.2 Materials

The study used Multispectral Scanner (MSS) of 27<sup>th</sup> July 1975, Landsat 7 ETM+ imagery of 27<sup>th</sup> July 1995, and Landsat 7 ETM + of 21<sup>st</sup> February 2011. The images were obtained from the Institute of Resources Assessment (IRA) of the University of Dar es Salaam. Topographical maps with a scale of 1:50,000 were acquired from the Survey and Mapping Division of the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Human Settlements Development for geo-referencing Landsat images preparation of land use/cover interpretation key. The sub-scenes covering the Saadani-Wami-Mbiki wildlife corridor were extracted from the mentioned images. Global Positioning System (GPS) was used in land use and cover map verification and updating land use and land cover map to include land use pattern up to year 2011. Images were selected based on low cloud cover, seasonality, date and phonological effects. Supervised Maximum Likelihood Classifier (MLC) remote sensing classification methodologies were utilized to

create a base map for ground-truthing. Supervised classification process involved classification of training sites on the image which represent specific land classes to be mapped.

## 2.3 Data Analysis

Assessment of the rate of cover change. The estimation for the rate of change for the different covers was computed based on the following formulae; [16]

$$\% \text{ Change}_{\text{year } x} = \frac{\text{Area}_{i \text{ year } x} - \text{Area}_{i \text{ year } x+1}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \text{Area}_{i \text{ year } x}} \times 100 \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Annual rate of change} = \frac{\text{Area}_{i \text{ year } x} - \text{Area}_{i \text{ year } x+1}}{t_{\text{years}}} \quad (2)$$

$$\% \text{ Annual rate of change} = \frac{\text{Area}_{i \text{ year } x} - \text{Area}_{i \text{ year } x+1}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \text{Area}_{i \text{ year } x} \times t_{\text{years}}} \times 100 \quad (3)$$

Where;  $\text{Area}_{i \text{ year } x}$  = area of cover i at the first date

$\text{Area}_{i \text{ year } x+1}$  = area of cover i at the second date

$\sum_{i=1}^n \text{Area}_{i \text{ year } x}$  = the total cover area at the first date and

$t_{\text{years}}$  = period in years between the first and second scene acquisition dates

## 3. RESULTS

**The spatial extents of different land cover classes:** The mainland use/land cover maps for 1975, 1995 and 2011 are presented in Figs 4, 5 and 6 respectively. Analysis shows that in the year 1975 (see Fig. 2) the land use/cover in the study area was dominated by closed forest and bushland occupying 30% (59 413 ha) and 25% (50 788 ha) respectively followed by cultivated land occupying 13% (26 165 ha) then grassland 12% (24 278 ha) and shrubs 11% (22 007 ha). Others were open forest and settlement, occupying 4% (8 599 ha) and 4% (7 618 ha) respectively and finally, open water bodies comprising 1% (1 095 ha).

Fig. 3 shows that in 1995, closed forests continued to occupy the largest land cover. It comprised 23% (46 681 ha) of the total land cover, followed by cultivated land 18% (35 608 ha). Bushland and shrubland occupied 13% (26 616 ha) and 13% (25 362 ha) respectively.

Others included settlement and grassland which occupied 12% (24 474 ha) and 11% (22 812 ha) respectively. The open forest occupied 9% (18 493 ha) and open water bodies 1% (1 095 ha).

In 2011, the cultivated land occupied 38% (76 791 ha) followed by settlement which counted for 19% (37 282 ha) of the total area (Fig.4). Furthermore, the closed forest occupied 17% (33 392 ha) followed by bushland 12% (24 509 ha), open forest 8% (15 577 ha), grassland 6% (12 690 ha), and open water bodies that occupied 0.01% (900 ha).

Areas used for cultivation and settlement seemed to be increasing gradually throughout the study period from 26 165 ha (13%) and 7 618

ha (4%) in 1975 to 76 791 ha (38%) and 37 282 ha (19%) in 2011 while closed forest, grassland, and bushland decreased from 59 413 ha (30%), 24 278 ha (12%) and 50 788 ha (25%) in 1975 to 33 392 (17%), 12 690 ha (6%) and 24 509 ha (12%) in 2011 respectively (Fig. 5). The combined land cover areas of closed forest, grassland, and bushland decreased from 1 343 479 ha (67%) in 1975 to 70 591 ha (35%) in 2011. The areas used for cultivation increased from 26 165 ha (13%) to 76 791 ha (38%) in the same period. Also, the area used for settlement increased tremendously from 7 618 ha (4%) in 1975 to 37 282 ha (19%) in 2011.




Fig. 2. Land cover/use Map of Image scene, 1975




Fig. 3. Land cover/use Map of Image scene, 1995




Fig. 4. Land cover/use Map of Image scene, 2011




Fig. 5. Land Use/Cover Distribution for Saadani-Wami-Mbiki wildlife corridor between 1975 and 2011

**Changes in land use/cover in the Saadani-Wami-Mbiki Wildlife corridor:** According to Table 1, the period between 1975 and 1995 show that the cultivated area increased by 9443 ha (5%); bushland decreased by 24 172 ha (12%) while the area for grassland shrunk by

1466 ha (1%). In the same period, settlement increased significantly by 16 856 ha (8%) as opposed to a closed forest which indicated a decrease by 12 732 ha (6%) while open forests and shrubs recorded an increase by 9894 ha (5%) and 3355 ha (2%) respectively.



Moreover, in the period between 1995 and 2011, the closed forest decreased by 13 289 ha (7%), grassland by 10 122 ha (5%), shrubs by 25 362 ha (13%), and bushland by 2 107 ha (1%) while the open forest decreased by 2 916 ha (1%) (Table 1). However, the cultivated land increased by 41 183 ha (20%) and settlement by 12 808 ha (6%).

**Rate of land use/cover change in the Saadani-Wami-Mbiki Wildlife corridor:** Tables 2 and 3 show the rate of land use/cover change in the Saadani-Wami-Mbiki wildlife corridor. It was found that grassland decreased at a rate of 73 ha (0.1%) per year between 1975 and 1995 and continued decreasing at the rate of 633 ha (0.3%) per year between 1995 and 2011. Furthermore, it was revealed that the closed forest decreased at the rate of 637 ha/year (0.3%) between 1975 and 1995 while decreasing at the rate of 831 ha/year (0.4%) in the period between 1995 and 2011. In addition, it was found that cultivated land increased at a rate of 472 ha (0.3%) per year between 1975 and 1995 and at a rate of 2574 ha (1.3%) per year between 1995 and 2011. Bushland decreased at the rate of 1209 ha (0.6%) per year between 1975 and 1995 and 132 ha (0.1%) per year between 1995 and 2011. In addition, settlement increased at the rate of 843 ha (0.4%) per year between 1975 and 1995 and 801 ha (0.4%) per year between 1995 and 2011. The open forest increased at the rate of 495 ha (0.3%) per year between 1975 and 1995 and continued increasing at the rate of 182 ha (0.1%) per year between 1995 and 2011. The other land cover that seemed to be changing was shrubs which indicated that they increased at the rate of 168 ha (0.1%) per year between 1975 and 1995 and decreased at the rate of 1 585 ha (0.8%) per year between 1995 and 2011.

**Changes detection matrix of different land use/cover:** The change detection of land cover/use in the corridor between 1975 and 1995 is presented in Table 4. During this period, 5 202 ha of closed forest was converted to bushland, 3 980 ha to cultivated land, 759 ha to settlements, 7 412 ha to grassland, 10 ha to open forest, 10 226 ha to shrubland while 15 851 ha remained unchanged. The bushland experienced the same sequence whereby 3530 ha were converted to grassland, 3230 ha to cultivated land, and 874 ha to settlements while 5331 ha remained unchanged. Furthermore, 1268 ha of open forest were converted to bushland, 330 ha to cultivated land, 728 ha to grassland, 1373 ha to shrubland, and 40 ha to settlement while 750 ha remained

unchanged. About 6167 ha of shrubland were converted to cultivated land, 1733 ha to settlements, 3337 ha to grassland while 1792 ha remained unchanged.

The analysis of land use/cover change detection for the period between 1995 and 2011 is presented in Table 5. The closed forests changed by 1716 ha to grasslands, 4190 ha to cultivated land, 1491 ha to settlements, 2090 ha to bushland, 4 ha to open forest, 4480 ha to shrubland while 1457 ha remained unchanged.

About 8047 ha of the open forest were converted to bushland, 4058 ha to cultivated land, 3483 ha to grassland, and 3950 ha to settlements while 4117 ha remained unchanged. About 4865 ha of bushland were converted to grassland, 5155 ha to cultivated land while 393 ha remained unchanged. Also, 1 959 ha of grassland were converted to cropland, 1240 ha to settlements while 1347 ha remained unchanged.

**Land use practices (LUP) along Saadani – Wami-Mbiki Wildlife corridor:** Results in Table 6 show various land use practices that were identified along Saadani –Wami-Mbiki wildlife corridor. It was revealed that 23% of the local community was involved in shifting cultivation. Furthermore, it was found that 21% of the local community was involved in livestock keeping. In addition, charcoal burning activity was performed by 17% of all local communities in the area. Other activities included poles extraction and fishing.

**The perception of the local community on the implications of various land use practices to Wildlife Conservation:** About 24% of the respondents perceived loss of habitat as the implication of various LUPs done along the corridor (Table 7). Furthermore, 17% of the local community indicated that the various LUPs in the area caused disturbance of the wildlife movement. Other implications of LUP activities in the area were land degradation, reduction of animal fodders, declined animal populations, and blockage of the corridor.

#### 4. DISCUSSION

**Rate of land use/cover change in the corridor:** Results presented in Fig. 4, 5, and 6 revealed that there were different rates of land use/vegetation cover changes as observed in the analyzed satellite imageries of 1975, 1995, and

**Table 1. Changes in different land use/cover coverage (ha) for years 1975 - 1995 and 1995 – 2011**

Vegetation Types	1975		1995		2011		Relative Change (1975-1995)		Relative Change (1995 -2011)	
	Area_ha	%	Area_ha	%	Area_ha	%	Area_ha	%	Area_ha	%
Bushland	50788	25	26616	13	24509	12	-24172	-12	-2107	-1
Cultivated land	26165	13	35608	18	76791	38	9443	5	41183	20
Closed forest	59413	30	46681	23	33392	17	-12732	-6	-13289	-7
Grassland	24278	12	22812	11	12690	6	-1466	-1	-10122	-5
Open forest	8599	4	18493	9	15577	8	9894	5	-2916	-1
Settlement	7618	4	24474	12	37282	19	16856	8	12808	6
Shrubs	22007	11	25362	13	0	0	3355	2	-25362	-13
Open waterbodies	2273	1	1095	1	900	0	-1178	-1	-195	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>201141</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>201141</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>201141</b>	<b>100</b>				

Source: Institute of Resources Assessment

**Table 2. Area cover, area change, and rate of change between 1975 and 1995**

Vegetation Types	1975		1995		Area change (ha)	%	Annual rate of change (ha/yr)	Annual rate of change (%/yr)
	Area (ha)	%	Area (ha)	%				
Bushland	50788	25	26616	13	-24172	-12	-1209	-0.6
Cultivated Land	26165	13	35608	18	9443	5	472	0.3
Closed Forest	59413	30	46681	23	-12732	-6	-637	-0.3
Grassland	24278	12	22812	11	-1466	-1	- 73	-0.1
Open Forest	8599	4	18493	9	9894	5	495	0.3
Settlement	7618	4	24474	12	16856	8	843	0.4
Shrubs	22007	11	25362	13	3355	2	168	0.1
Open water bodies	2273	1	1095	1	-1178	-1	-59	-0.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>201141</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>201141</b>	<b>100</b>				

Source: Institute of Resources Assessment



**Table 3. Area Cover, Area change and rate of change between 1995 and 2011**

Vegetation Types	1995		2011		Area change (ha)	%	Annual rate of change (ha/yr)	Annual rate of change (%/yr)
	Area (ha)	%	Area (ha)	%				
Bush land	26616	13	24509	12	-2107	-1	-132	-0.1
Cultivated Land	35608	18	76791	38	41183	20	2574	1.3
Closed Forest	46681	23	33392	17	-13289	-7	-831	-0.4
Grassland	22812	11	12690	6	-10122	-5	-633	-0.3
Open Forest	18493	9	15577	8	-2916	-1	-182	-0.1
Settlement	24474	12	37282	19	12808	6	801	0.4
Shrubs	25362	13	0	0	-25362	-13	-1585	-0.8
Stream	1095	1	900	0	-195	-0	-12	-0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>201141</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>201141</b>	<b>100</b>				

*Source: Institute of Resources Assessment.*

2011. This could be attributed to an increase in the human population in the area as the population increased from 173 871 to 228 967 during the period 1988-2002 with an average annual growth rate of 2% [17]. The major population pulling factors to this area included adequate and fertile land to cater for livelihoods through cultivation, settlements, livestock keeping, and charcoal making, amongst others. The introduction of new crops for commercial purposes such as sesame and pineapples in the area has also attracted people to open new virgin lands which are more fertile to maximize production. Loss of corridors for agriculture and other land uses is common in many parts of Tanzania. Jones *et al.*, [18] for example, reported that the Mikumi–Wami-Mbiki and Tarangire – Lake Manyara Corridors were under increasing pressure due to cultivation, human settlements, charcoal making, and extraction of timber/poles. Furthermore, the study by Noe [7] found that the increase in population along the Kitendeni

Wildlife Corridor created more demand on land for cultivation and settlement.

**Furthermore:** Results showed that shifting cultivation was among the land use practices being undertaken in the area. This could have been caused by factors such as population growth, lack of land use management plan, loss of soil fertility, inefficient agricultural extension services, and poverty of local communities in the area. The study was done by Rahman *et al.*, [19] in Eastern Bangladesh, reported that population pressure influence farmers' decision to continue shifting cultivation. Furthermore, URT [17] reported that population increase lead to opening more land for production while increasing pressure over resources. In the same vein, Ntongani et al. [4] reported that an increase in population in Selous-Niassa Corridor resulted in shifting cultivation ending up degrading the corridor.

**Table 4. Change detection matrix for 1975 – 1995**

Classes in 1995	Classes in 1975								Total
	BL	CL	CF	GL	OF	SE	SB	OW	
Bushland	(5331)	3230	6955	3515	3816	874	2752	143	26616
Cultivated Land	13560	(5018)	6717	2722	1704	1589	1591	262	35608
Closed Forest	5202	3980	(18565)	7412	10	759	10226	527	46681
Grassland	6760	3874	6627	(1884)	15	1396	1652	604	22812
Open Forest	1268	330	6008	728	(750)	40	1373	114	18493
Settlement	5598	3448	5304	3950	2202	(1186)	2526	360	24474
Shrubs	12783	6167	8995	3337	10	1733	(1792)	239	25362
Open waterbodies	286	118	342	97	92	41	95	(24)	1095
<b>Total</b>	<b>50788</b>	<b>26165</b>	<b>59413</b>	<b>24278</b>	<b>8599</b>	<b>7618</b>	<b>22007</b>	<b>2273</b>	<b>201141</b>

Source: Institute of Resources Assessment.  
 BL=Bushland, CL=Cultivatedland, CF=Closed Forest, GL=Grassland, OF=Open Forest, SE=Settlement, SB=Shrubs, OW=Open waterbodies

**Table 5. Change detection matrix for 1995 – 2011**

Classes in 2011	Classes in 1995								Total
	BL	CL	CF	GL	SE	OF	SB	OW	
Bushland	(393)	5155	4399	4865	3780	833	4965	119	24509
Cultivated Land	10846	(12254)	18724	10689	8381	1835	13547	515	76791
Closed Forest	2090	4190	(1457)	1716	1491	4	4480	149	15577
Grassland	1936	1959	3877	(1347)	1240	205	2061	65	12690
Settlement	3750	8260	7057	3574	(5042)	584	8753	262	37282
Open forest	8047	4058	9167	3483	3950	(4117)	500	70	33392
Open waterbodies	3	76	0	11	9	300	1	(500)	900
<b>Total</b>	<b>27065</b>	<b>35952</b>	<b>44681</b>	<b>25685</b>	<b>23893</b>	<b>7878</b>	<b>34307</b>	<b>1680</b>	<b>201141</b>

Source: Institute of Resources Assessment.  
 BL=Bushland, CL=Cultivatedland, CF=Closed Forest, GL=Grassland, OF=Open Forest, SE=Settlement, SB=Shrubs, OP=Open waterbodies

**Table 6. Respondents practicing different land uses along the corridor**

LUP	Frequency (N=90)	Percent
Shifting cultivation	44	23
Livestock grazing	40	21
Charcoal making	33	17
Illegal hunting (poaching)	15	8
Poles extraction	11	6
Lumbering	6	3
Firewood collection	11	6
Mining	4	2
Fishing	3	2
Sand/gravel extraction	4	2
Infrastructure development	1	1
Settlement	22	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 7. Perceptions of the people on implications of various LUP to wildlife conservation**

Implication	Frequency (N=90)	Percent
Interrupt animal movements	29	17
Loss of habitats	41	24
Degradation of the area	16	10
Reduce animal fodders	20	12
Reduce places to hide	23	14
Reduce animal population	16	10
Blockage of the corridor	21	13
<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100</b>

In addition, the poverty of local communities along the corridor has been the driving factor for shifting cultivations. This is because local communities are primarily subsistence farmers and fail to go for alternatives such as the purchase of fertilizers. Thus, the only option for the local community in this area was to open new virgin land for cultivation. The study was done by Rahman et al. [19] in Eastern Bangladesh found that villagers who are primarily subsistence farmers produce enough foods for their family's survival as their priority on agricultural production. In some regions, poverty-driven cultivation can occur if small-scale and subsistence farmers lack resources or secure land tenure and are forced to move into forested areas to grow food and earn their livelihoods [20]. Particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa where Tanzania lies, small-scale farmers who lack resources for increasing crop productivity on nutrient-depleted soils may use additional forested lands to maintain production and their livelihoods [21].

Additionally, livestock keeping was among the land use practices being undertaken in the area. The observed livestock-keeping activities in the area were probably due to a lack of binding laws

that restrict them from grazing in this corridor. WCST [22] stated that weak policy and law enforcement were the main conservation challenges facing wildlife corridors in Tanzania. This has been the factor leading to the immigration of pastoralists to this corridor from other areas. Elsewhere in Tanzania, Malmer and Nyberg, [23] Killebrew and Wolff, [24] attributed overgrazing to a lack of land management plan and weak laws.

Charcoal making and fuelwood extraction were identified as other major land use practices threatening the corridor. Charcoal was regarded as a profitable business in this area. Msuya *et al.* [25] stated that for Tanzania mainland, the demand for charcoal has constantly increased and prices were also rising. At the value of over TSHS 20 billion charcoal is considered as one of the highly valued industries which play a significant role in maintaining local communities' livelihoods' security in Tanzania [26]. Similarly, charcoal making and fuelwood collection are the main sources of energy for cooking since the Government had not yet provided a strategy for providing an alternative energy source [12]. Only about 14 percent of Tanzanians have access to electric power energy [27].

The results showed that various land use practices have far reaching implications on wildlife conservation in the corridor. These included loss of habitats and decreased animal species. The invasion caused by livestock, shifting agriculture, and charcoal burning were ranked as major factors degrading the corridor. Scientific studies have shown that animals are threatened by the presence of features like houses and farms located in their routes as substitutes of the natural vegetation cover [7, 4,12]. This scenario might have contributed to the local extinction of some mammal species in the area. These species included Black Rhino (*Diceros bicornis*), Cheetah (*Acinonyx jubatus*), Wildebeest (*Connochaetes taurinus*), Wild dogs (*Canis familiaris*), Impala (*Aepyceros melampus*), Blue duiker (*Cephalophus monticola*), and Eland (*Taurotragus oryx*). However, the population for some mammals had increased because of the beliefs attached to them such as Bush pig (*Potamochoerus porcus*) and Warthog (*Phacochoerus asthiopicus*) since the area is dominated by Muslims who do not feed on them. Other increased animals included Striped polecat (*Ictonyx striatus*), Hippopotamus (*Hippopotamus amphibious*), Crocodile (*Crocodilus niloticus*), Yellow baboon (*Papio cynocephalus*), and Monitor lizard (*Varanus indicus*).

Furthermore, there was a reduction of foraging ground for wild animals due to encroachment caused by agriculture and settlement. The area suitable for grazing by wildlife declined from 145 351 ha (82%) ha in 1975 to 86 168ha (43%) in 2011 (IRA, 2011). Human-wildlife contacts observed in the corridor had aggravated conflicts. Some of the reported conflicts included those related to crop damage, destruction of houses, livestock depredation, diseases (zoonotic) transmission, and illegal hunting, just to mention a few. However, the declining trend of wildlife population in this area could be a reflection of ecosystem degradation due to other factors than human-induced factors. Such factors could be a change in climatic condition which as well influences food availability.

Charcoal making and firewood collection require a large volume of wood which in turn depletes tree stocks resulting in various forms of environmental degradation such as soil erosion, lowering and affecting abundance and diversity of trees in an area of concern [28-30]. The demand for charcoal from the corridor was relatively increasing in which people were cutting both dead and green kinds of wood. The

situation resulted in a bush clearing which caused patches of bare land hence negatively impacting the biodiversity. This was revealed on the changes seen in the classified satellite imageries from 1975 to 2011 (Figs 4, 5, and 6). The amount of charcoal that was carried out daily from the area was between 40 and 60 sacks. Furthermore, there are inadequate records of the extent to which illegal tree harvesting was carried out in the area but a habitat change in the traditional route must have acted as an impediment to the wild animal movement.

## 5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The study has shown that although the Saadani-Wami-Mbiki Wildlife Corridor forms an important connection between the Saadani National Park and Wami-Mbiki WMA, its status has been decreasing with time as a result of various land use practices carried out in and around. There were nine recognized human-induced types of land use practices carried out in and around the corridor, among them being agriculture that was singled out as the major land use practice. This type of land use was mainly practiced along and within the corridor. Livestock keeping was the second activity but was mainly practiced by immigrants. Other activities included firewood collection, extraction of poles/withies, charcoal making, illegal hunting, fishing, sand extraction, mining, and logging which had profound negative impacts on the welfare and conservation status of the corridor. These land use practices were influenced by the increase in population and poverty of local communities along the Saadani-Wami-Mbiki Wildlife Corridor.

The vegetation cover of the corridor has been decreasing for over 36 years. This tendency has influenced the destruction of wildlife habitats, decrease in foraging ground, loss of natural vegetation, elimination of important cover for prey, interruption of animal movements, and blockage of the corridor. As a result, some mammal species have disappeared and others had their population decreased abundantly.

It is recommended that both Government and other conservation stakeholders should introduce and implement the community-based conservation approach so that the active involvement of the villagers in the protection of the wildlife in and outside this corridor is realized. This could be a solution to harmonise with the conservation of this corridor. Rural and poor

communities can engage in conservation activities if and only if co-operation and support are granted to them. Furthermore, it is recommended that The Government should support a land use management plan in villages bordering the wildlife corridors to reduce human pressure on natural resources found within. The Government should prepare village strategic land use plans, surveying villages, demarcate the corridors, and public natural resources available to have the proper use of the resources in the area.

## CONSENT

As per international standard or university standard, respondents' written consent has been collected and preserved by the author(s).

## COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES

1. Kideghesho JR, Nyahongo JW, Hassan SN, Tarimo TC, Mbije NE. Factors and Ecological Impacts of Wildlife Habitat Destruction in the Serengeti Ecosystem in Northern Tanzania. *AJEAM-RAGEE*. 2006;917-32.
2. Karpati A. Dynamics of wildlife corridors as a result of land changes. *Landscape Ecology Fall*; 2003. Available: [www.crssa.rutgers.edu/courses/Isse/Web\\_Patch/final/Amy?karpati\\_Final/htm](http://www.crssa.rutgers.edu/courses/Isse/Web_Patch/final/Amy?karpati_Final/htm) site visited on 23/05/2011.
3. Ogungo PO, Njuguna JW. Institutions, incentives and conflicts in forest management. In: *A perspective Proceedings of the IFRI East African Regional Conference* (Edited by Shemweta, D. T. K. et al), Nairobi Kenya. 2004;9-24.
4. Ntongani WA, Munishi PKT, Mbilinyi BP. Land use changes and conservation threats in the eastern Selous-Niassa wildlife corridor, Nachingwea, Tanzania. *African Journal of Ecology*. 2009;48:880-887.
5. Kideghesho JR. Participatory land-use planning for Kwakuchinja Wildlife Corridor. *Kakakuona*. 2000;19:8-14.
6. Hofer H, Hildebrandt TB, Goritz F, Marion LE, Mpanduji DG, et al. Distribution and movements of elephants and other wildlife in the Selous-Niassa wildlife corridor, Tanzania. German Technical Cooperation, Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania. *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit*; 2004.
7. Noe C. The Dynamics of the Land Use Changes and their Impacts on the Wildlife Corridors between Mt. Kilimanjaro and Amboseli NP, Tanzania. *LUCID Working Paper Number 31*, University of Dar es Salaam, International Livestock Research Institute and UNEP/DGEFC. 2003;39.
8. Shauri V, Hitchcock L. *Wildlife Corridors and Buffer Zones in Tanzania; Political Willpower and Wildlife Management in Tanzania*. Lawyers' Environmental Action Tea (LEAT); 1999. Available: [www.lead.or.tz/publications/wildlife\\_corridors/wildlife\\_corridors.pdf](http://www.lead.or.tz/publications/wildlife_corridors/wildlife_corridors.pdf). Site visited on 22/03/2011.
9. Kideghesho JR. Trends of areas adjacent to Tarangire National Park, Tanzania. What community based land-use planning can offer? *Kakakuona*. 2002;24:9-15.
10. Mulongoy MC. Land use assessment of the in reserved lands: A case study of Mbole Muyonzo traditional land, Zambia. Dissertation for Award of MSc Degree at Sokoine University of Agriculture, Morogoro, Tanzania. 2006;104.
11. Tran M. Pros and Cons of Wildlife Corridors. University of California; 1997. Available: <http://www.dbc.ui.edu/~sustain/global/sensem/index.htm>. Site visited on 23/05/2011
12. Massawe GM. Impacts of Human Activities on the Conservation of Igando-Igawa Wildlife Corridor in Njombe and Mbarali Districts, Tanzania. Dissertation for Award of MSc. Degree at Sokoine University of Agriculture, Morogoro. 2010;14.
13. Kisingo A, Sabuni CA, Coiffait L, Hayhow B, Larsen B. Effects of habitat fragmentation on diversity of small mammals in Lulanda Forest in Mufindi, Tanzania. *Belg. J. Zool*. 2005;135 (supplement):109-112.
14. Kothari CR. *Research Methodology, Methods and Techniques* (Second Revised Edition) New Age International (P) Limited. New Delhi-110002. 2004;401.
15. Saunders M, Lewis P, Thornhill A. *Research Methods for Business Students*.

- Fourth Edition. FT Printice Hall, Harlow, England. 2007;624.
16. Kashaigili JJ, Majaliwa AM. Integrated assessment of land use and cover changes in the Malagarasi river catchment in Tanzania. Elsevier Journal of Physics and Chemistry of the Earth. 2010;35:730–741
  17. URT. Tanzania Census 2002: Analytical Report Volume X. national Bureau of Statistics, Ministry of Planning, Economy and Empowerment, The Government Printer, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. 2006;194.
  18. Jones T, Caro T, Davenport TRB.(Eds). Wildlife Corridors in Tanzania. Unpublished report. Tanzania Wildlife Research Institute (TAWIRI), Arusha. 2009;6.
  19. Rahman SA, Rahman MF, Sunderland TCH. Causes and consequences of shifting cultivation and its alternative in the hill tracts of Eastern Bangladesh. Journal of Agroforestry systems. 2011;83(1):167-4366.
  20. Sánchez PA, Palm CA, Vosti SA, Tomich TP, Kasyoki J. Alternatives to slash and burn: Challenge and approaches of an international consortium. In Slash-and-burn agriculture: The search for alternatives, edited by C.A. Palm, S.A. Vosti, P.A. Sanchez, and P.J. Ericksen. New York: Columbia University Press. 2005;3-37.
  21. Palm CA, Smukler SM, Sullivan CC, Mutuo PK, Nyadzi GI, Walsh MG. Identifying potential synergies and trade-offs for meeting food security and climate change objectives in sub-Saharan Africa. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2010;107:19661-19666.
  22. WCST. Startegic Plan. 2009;2009-2013. Available:[http://www.hydroquebec.com/publications/en/strategic\\_plan/index.html](http://www.hydroquebec.com/publications/en/strategic_plan/index.html) Site visited on 17/ 09/2012
  23. Malmer A, Nyberg G. Forest and water relations in miombo woodlands: Need for understanding of complex stand management. Working Papers of the Funnish Forest Research Institute. 2008;98:70-86.
  24. Killebrew K, Wolff H. Environmental Impacts of Agricultural Technologies. Evans School of Public Affairs. University of Washington; 2010.
  25. Msuya N, Masanja E, Temu A. "Environmental Burden of Charcoal Production and Use in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania," Journal of Environmental Protection. 2011;2(10):1364-1369.
  26. Sawe EN. An overview of charcoal industry in Tanzania Issues and Challenges. Prepared for the National R&D Committee on Industry and Energy. Tanzania Traditional Energies Development Organization (TaTEDO): Dar es Salaam Tanzania. (Unpublished); 2004.
  27. Worldbank. Doing Business in Tanzania: 2011 Country Commercial Guide for U.S. Companies International Copyright, U.S. & Foreign Commercial Service and U.S. Department of State; 2010. Available: <http://www.worldbank.org/ida>. Site visited on 29/ 09/2012
  28. Monela G. Solsberg. Defforestation rate and land use/land cover changes in rainforests of the Nguru mountains, Tanzania. Faculty of Forestry Records No. 68. Sokoine University of Agriculture. 1988;68;14.
  29. Monela GC, Kihyo VBMS. Wood Energy in Sub-Saharan Africa. World Forests, Society and Environment. World Forests, Kluwer Academic Publishers. 1999;1:153-160.
  30. Monela GC, Abdallah JM. Principle Socio-Economic Issues in Utilization of Miombo Woodlands in Tanzania. MITMIOMBO – Management of Indigenous Tree Species for Ecosystem Restoration and Wood Production in Semi-Arid Miombo Woodlands in Eastern Africa. Proceedings of the First MITMIOMBO Project Workshop held in Morogoro, Tanzania, 6th–12th February 2007. Working Papers of the Finnish Forest Research Institute 50: 115–122 Available:<http://www.metla.fi/julkaisut/worki ngpapers/2007/mwp050.htm>. Site visited on 30/09/2012

**Appendix 1: Questionnaire for Household Based Interview**

Questionnaire number.....  
Date:...../...../ 2011  
Interviewee's name.....  
Location:  
a)Village..... b).Ward..... c).Division.....  
d).District.....  
d). Region.....

**A: Demographic Data**

- 1. Respondent's age: a) Below 30 yrs..... b) 31-40 yrs.....  
c) 41-50 yrs..... d) 51-60 yrs.....  
e) Above 60 yrs.....
- 2. Respondent's sex: a) Male..... b) Female.....
- 3. Marital status: a) Single..... b) Married.....  
c) Widowed..... d) Separated.....  
e) Divorced.....
- 4. Household size: a) Below 4..... b) 4-6.....  
c) 7-9..... d) Above 9.....
- 5. Education status:  
a) None..... b) Primary education.....  
c) Secondary education..... d) Tertiary education.....
- 6. Major economic activity:  
a) Farming..... b) Livestock.....  
c) Charcoal burning..... d) Hunting.....  
e) Logging..... f) Lumbering.....  
g) Employed..... h) Business.....
- 7. Other economic activities (List them according to preferences):  
a) Farming.....(.....) b) Livestock keeping.....(.....)  
c) Charcoal burning...(.....) d) Hunting.....(.....)  
e) Logging.....(.....) f) Lumbering.....(.....)  
g) Employed.....(.....) h) Business.....(.....)

- 8. Residential status: a) Native..... b) Immigrant.....
- 9. If you are an immigrant, how long have you been in this area (years).....
- 10. What is your tribe?..... From which Region?.....

**B: Conservation Awareness**

- 11. Do you know what wildlife corridor is:  
a) Yes..... b) No.....
- 12.What is the status/use of the corridor in the past  
.....  
.....



13. Do you think people are now practicing different land use systems in the corridor than in the past?

- a) Yes ..... b).....

14. What is the current integrity status of the corridor?

- a) Excellent..... b) Good.....  
c) Fair..... d) Bad.....  
e) Worse.....

15. Where do you cultivate the crops?

- a) Near the corridor..... b) Far from the corridor.....

16. What are the activities that hamper/threat the integrity of the corridor? List them according to their importance in conservation activities.

- a) .....  
b).....  
c).....

17. What are the consequences of these activities to;

- a) Wild animals conservation.....  
b) Habitat.....

18. What is the current conservation status of the corridor

.....

19. What are the current or the future plans conservation activities carried out in the corridor?

.....

20. Are you aware about the consequences of human activities on the corridor?

- a) Yes..... b) No .....

Elaborate.....

### **C: Human-Wildlife Interaction**

21. Do you see wild animals in that area?

- a)..... b).....

22. If Yes, name them in major categories of wild animals that are seen in recent times, seen their signs, pellets, foot prints or heard of being exist here:

- a) Herbivores.....  
b) Predator.....  
c) Primates.....

23. What animals currently not seen but used to be seen and

.....

Why?.....

24. In which season of the year normally has high population of wild animals in the area?

- a) Dry season..... b) Wet season.....
- c) Both seasons.....

Reasons.....

25. What is their direction during their movement?

- a) From Saadani National Park to Wami-Mbiki Wildlife management Area.....
- b) From Wami-Mbiki Wildlife management Area to Saadani National Park.....
- c) From both direction.....
- d) No idea.....

26. Based on the list of animals above which are resident of the corridor and which are migratory?

- a) Resident animals.....
- b) Migratory animals.....

27. What is your comment on the trend of animals?

- a) Buffalo a) Increasing..... b) Decreasing..... c) No idea.....
- b) Zebra a) Increasing..... b) Decreasing.....
- c) No idea.....
- c) Wildebeest a) Increasing..... b) Decreasing.....
- c) No idea.....

Reason.....

**D: Human activities**

28. What are the land use systems carried out along the corridor?

- a) Cultivation..... b) Livestock grazing.....
- c) Charcoal burning..... d) Hunting.....
- e) Logging..... f) Lumbering.....
- g) Firewood..... h) Others (specify).....

29. What is the intensity/state of these land use systems in the corridor?

- a) Very high..... b) High..... c) Fair.....
- d) Low..... e) Very low..... f) No idea.....

30. Do these activities carried out legally?

- a) Yes..... b) No.....
- c) No idea.....

31. Why people prefer to take economic activities along the corridor rather than in other areas?

- a) .....
- b) .....

32. What is the extent of people dependency to the corridor?

- a) Very high..... b) High..... c) Fair.....
- d) Low..... e) Very low..... f) No idea.....

33. What are the cultural activities carried out in the corridor?

a) Ritual..... b) Medicinal..... c) Others (specify).....

34. Is there any traditional method of conservation?

a) Yes..... b) No.....

35. If yes, what is (are) the method(s)?

a).....  
b).....

36. What is the effectiveness of these methods to the conservation activities?

.....  
.....

### **E: Suggestions about Conservation**

37. Do you think is important to let the area (Wildlife corridor) to wildlife rather than human being?

a) Yes..... b) No.....

38. Support your answer (s) above:

.....  
.....

39. What do you think should be done in order that conservation of natural resources in the corridor becomes successful?

.....  
.....  
.....

### **Appendix II: Checklist for Key Informants**

1. What is the conservation status of the corridor?
2. Is there any policy or law or regulation that protects the corridor?
3. What are land use systems carried out along the corridor?
4. What is the extent of land use practices along the corridor?
5. How these activities do affect the conservation strategies of buffalo, zebra and wildebeest?
6. What are the consequences of those activities to the integrity of the corridor?
7. What are possible measures for remedy?
8. What are wild animals that are inside the corridor?
9. What were the common wild animals that were inside the corridor?
10. What are wild animals that are using the corridor as a migratory route?
11. What were the common wild animals that were using the corridor as a migratory route?
12. What conservation activities are currently undertaken?
13. What do you think should be done in order that conservation of natural resources in the corridor becomes successful?

© 2021 Kileo and Mbije; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Peer-review history:*  
*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:*  
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/75619>