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Abstract
This study determined the relationship between socio-economic factors and participation in decision-making among women community in Zanzibar. Data was collected from 387 respondents using structured questionnaire distributed to nine wards of Zanzibar and analyzed using Smart PLS. The descriptive analysis revealed that there is a high level of participation in decision-making among women community in Zanzibar whereby the mean is equal to 3.8519, and standard deviation is 0.75238. The Smart PLS analysis results indicated that there are significant negative relationships between level of education, nature of tourism activities and participation in decision making. Hence, this result indicates that the less educated the women are the less they participate in the decision-making process. Further, the nature of tourism activities is also negatively affecting the decision to participate in the decision-making process.
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1. Introduction

A considerable amount of literature have been published on the women empowerment through tourism activities as essential global agenda. In the United Nation’s Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), for example, five of the eight goals are openly and implicitly connected to women empowerment (Jucan & Jucan, 2013). In the SDGs, achieving equality and women’s empowerment through their seventeen goals is essential (UN Women, 2015). Similarly, the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) had Action Plan related to women empowerment in 2006 (Ampumuza, et al. 2008). This Action Plan has considered and set women participation in tourism development as vital political agenda for research and work (Ampumuza, et al. 2008). This observation suggests women participation in tourism is consistent, to gender equality (Honey & Gilpin, 2009), women’s empowerment policies and overall development (Ferguson, 2007). Based on this understanding, many developing countries in particular seem to capitalise on tourism, to expand internal and external investment to increase job
opportunities (Bayissa et al., 2018) and address local community development (Magigi & Ramadhani, 2013; Nita, 2019). This observation is crucial as it supports the assertion that connects women empowerment with tourism.

Another observation to establish a link between women empowerment and tourism is made by Connell and Rugendyeke (2008), and Deepak and Tek (2010). The authors maintain that tourism is labour intensive and can transform women into formal and respected employment opportunities, contribute to improve household wellbeing, and remove traditional views against them. These benefits are then correlated with statistics of UNWTO (2010) that the women representation in tourism in Latin America, Mali and Lesotho in Africa is about 85, 81.1 and 79.5 percent respectively. Based on these statistical correlations, it is obvious that women participation in tourism sector has potentials to their empowerment. Discussed in the context of practicality, however, and UNWTO’s generalizability on relationship of women empowerment and participation in tourism is problematic. What is not yet clear is the lack of direct explanation of relationship of demographic background of women participating in tourism activities and their empowerment. For instance, the Connell’s and Rugendyeke’s suggestion does not take account of education level nor does it address the kind of participation and marital status of women in question. Globally women participation in tourism industry as a total work force is around up 70 percent, only 40 percent work in hospitality section (Baum, 2013).

In addition, there has been little quantitative analysis of link between level of education, and nature of tourism activities to dimensions of participation in tourism industry (World Bank, 2015). The study chooses level of education and nature of tourism industry because, most of women engaging in tourism activities their level of education is very low due to the nature of activities they do informally and some of the works need high level of education that lead to making good decision. For example in managerial activities that need high skills and knowledge, so increasing in education, knowledge and skills could increase their participation in decision making, implementation and sharing benefits. In addition, the study is interested to know if the nature of tourism activities influences the women to participate in tourism decision-making. Previous studies argued that the level of education and nature of tourism both influence women participation in this sector. With regards to these argument, the study aims to examine the relationship between socio-economic factors (education and nature of tourism activities) and participation in decision making in Tourism industry among women in Zanzibar.

2. Literature Review

Participation has a widely contribution to community wellbeing. Different literatures recommended that participation as a concept is commonly applicable in community development (Narayan & Katrinka, 2002; Ginige & Ritchards, 2012; Saidu, Abu Samah, Redzuan & Ahmad, 2013, Adeleke, 2020; Jayswal & Jaiswal, 2015). The meaning of participation varies according to its application and the context in which it occurs. Cohen & Uphoff (1977:6) defined participation as “people’s involvement in decision making process about what would be done and how it is done; their involvement in implementing programs and decisions by contributing various resources and cooperating in specific organizations or activities; their sharing in benefits of development programs; and their involvement efforts to evaluate such programs.” Escobar (1995). Narayan and Katrinka (2002), Ginige and Ritchards (2012), Abu Samah and Aref (2009), Nikkah & Redzuan (2009), and Cohen and Uphoff (1980) define participation as a means of involving people in action that influence social wellbeing such as increasing income, self-efficacy, esteem and security while collecting their efforts, setting goals, combining resources and try to take collective action for the purpose of improving their welfare.

Participation has been conceptualised as a bottom-up approach in its representation of partnership and ownership (Cohen & Uphoff, 1980; Singh, 2006, Saidu et al, 2014). In these sense people were involved in decision making, implementing in various programs, sharing benefits and involving in evaluation process (Cohen & Uphoff, 1980). The idea of participation recognized in community development project and programs since 1970s and 1980s due to the reason of failure of stakeholders to participate in community development projects (Escobar, 1995). This situation establishes the need of the members or individuals to participate in tourism activities around the community from the early stage of designing up to the end process of implementation of tourism activities to influence efficiency and community power (Narayan & Katrinka, 2002; Ginige & Ritchards, 2012). More
interesting, these participation may help the members (women) in the community to have local control and greater influence over their community resources (Cohen & Uphoff, 1980; Saidu et al., 2014). Consequently, community development program prospered when people contributed to decision making, planning, implementation and evaluation (Cohen & Uphoff, 1980). Wondira and Ewetu (2019), and Laura et al. (2018) indicated that community participation is an engine to development activities which enhances decision making, implementation and improve socio-economic well-being to the people. In line with this arguments, involvement of people in community development is very important because it helps to know where the people are, what they know, what they have, and what they expect to be, initiate the distribution of other programs and introduction of new activities or project (Chowdhury, 1996; Saidu et al., 2014). The involvement of community in development projects assures people’s commitment and sustainability of developmental projects (Abu Samah, Ahmad, & Ndaeji, 2013; Barati, Samah, & Ahmad, 2012) and improves social performance (Brammer et al., 2012; Zainoddin, Amran & Shaharudin, 2020).

Socio-economic factors influence participation in any community development activities (Apipoonyanon, Kuwornu, Szabo, 2020). It determines the behaviour of the people to increase power of making decision, project implementation share the benefits obtained from developmental project. Various literature also indicates that education and nature of tourism activities influence participation in decision making in rural development projects in different areas such as microfinance and tourism industry (Khan, Sajjad, Hameed, Khan and Jan, 2012; Abira & Sireeranhan, 2012; Nwoye & Ndaeji, 2019; Person, 2015; Hyounggon et al. 2007; Tovad & Oystein, 2013; Lingling et al. 2013). These studies show direct relationship between education and the nature of tourism activities and participation in decision making. However, there are few studies that consider women tourism activities. Hence, the conceptual framework of the study was developed as shown in the figure 1. The relationship between nature of tourism activities, education and participation of women in decision making were observed. According to the conceptual framework, this study hypothesizes that:

1. $H_{01}$: There is no significant relationship between education and participation in decision making.
2. $H_{02}$: There is no significant relationship between nature of tourism activities and participation in decision making.

![Conceptual Framework](image)

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework

3. Materials and Methods

In this quantitative study, Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table were used to determine a sample size with a population of 14378 participants in tourism industry in Zanzibar. The estimated sample size was 375 at alpha 0.05 level of significance (95% level of confidence). The researcher adds 10% of sample size of the respondents to avoid drop out. Therefore, the required sample size was 412 in order to reduce a sampling error and ensuring more representativeness (Singh & Masuka, 2013). The multistage cluster sampling technique was used to select the respondents from nine wards in Zanzibar. The Wards include Mkoani Mjini, Makombeni, Wambaa, Madungu, Wesa, Utaani, Limbani, Fundo and Makangale.
The structured questionnaire was used as an instrument for data collection because it is the most affordable way to gather quantitative data and practical way to gather data on the spot (Debois, 2016). Also, large number of participants can be reached within a limited time frame and produce data which cannot be gathered by any other means. Additionally, it is suitable for addressing research issues which affect the society. The data were collected within two months from August to the first week of October, 2019 from 387 respondents (women). The questionnaire was adopted and modified from Sambagi, 2009; Moyle, Dollard and Biswas, 2006, Ndaeji, 2014. Ten items of participation in decision making with five-point Likert scale of 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree were used. Smart PLS was used for testing the hypotheses to determine the influence of education and nature of tourism activities to participation in decision making because it is the one of the best techniques used to find the fundamental relationships between two or more variables. Education and nature of tourism activities were measured by the observed variable based on the nature of the study. The level of education has eight options from 1= primary, 2 = secondary, 3 = vocational training, 4 = certificate, 6 = diploma, 7 = degree, 8 = no education) while nature of tourism industry has nine options from 1 = accommodation, 2 = snorkelling, 3 = restaurant, 4 = tourist guide, 5 = selling vegetables, 6 = making souvenir products, 7 = selling food, 8 = sea food farming, 9 = vegetable farming. The level of participation in decision-making was analyzed by using descriptive statistics analysed using SPSS version 23 software.

4. Results and discussion

Based on the social scientific researches some demographic features of the respondents should be considered to strengthen the conclusion drawn from the data collected on the basis of relevance and capability of the source of the data. Table 1 below consists of the demographic profiles of the respondents.

It is observed from the table 1 that there is a proportion of the women in every age range. The majority of the respondents (50.1%) belong to the economically most active age group range between 35 and 40 years. Majority of women participated in tourism activities were married (76.2%) while 12.7% were single and only 11.1% were divorced. The household with 6 to 10 members for women participating in tourism activities was higher (50.1%), followed with 1 to 5 members which represent moderate level (35.1%) while the family with 11 to 15 members their participation is low (14.7%). By district, the study shows that 40.6% of the total respondents are from Mkoani district followed by Wete district, ChakeChake district and Micheweni district which represent 24.8%, 20.4% and 14.2% respectively.
### Table 1: Demographic characteristics (N=387)

| Variables                                      | Frequency | Percent |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| **Age**                                        |           |         |
| 35-40                                          | 194       | 50.1    |
| 41-45                                          | 66        | 17.1    |
| 46-50                                          | 56        | 14.5    |
| 51-55                                          | 23        | 5.9     |
| 56 and above                                    | 48        | 12.4    |
| **Total**                                      | 387       | 100     |
| **Marital status**                             |           |         |
| Single                                         | 49        | 12.7    |
| Married                                        | 295       | 76.2    |
| Divorced                                       | 43        | 11.1    |
| **Total**                                      | 387       | 100     |
| **Household income after participation in tourism activities** | | |
| 0-500,000                                      | 65        | 16.8    |
| 501,000-1,000,000                              | 114       | 29.5    |
| 1,001,000-1,500,000                            | 66        | 17.1    |
| 1,501,000-2,000,000                            | 58        | 15      |
| 2,001,000-2,500,000                            | 28        | 7.2     |
| 2,501,000-3,000,000                            | 19        | 4.9     |
| 3,001,000-above                                | 37        | 9.6     |
| **Total**                                      | 387       | 100     |
| **Districts**                                  |           |         |
| Mkokoani                                       | 157       | 40.6    |
| Chakechake                                     | 79        | 20.4    |
| Wete                                           | 96        | 24.8    |
| Micheweni                                      | 55        | 14.2    |
| **Nature of Tourism Activities**               |           |         |
| Accommodation                                  | 16        | 4.1     |
| Snorkeling                                     | 17        | 4.4     |
| Restaurant                                     | 28        | 7.2     |
| Tourist guide                                  | 22        | 5.7     |
| Selling vegetables                             | 79        | 20.4    |
| Ms-product                                     | 129       | 33.3    |
| Selling food                                   | 81        | 20.9    |
| Sea food farming                               | 10        | 2.6     |
| vegetable farming                              | 5         | 1.3     |
| **Education**                                  |           |         |
| Primary                                        | 95        | 24.5    |
| Secondary                                      | 166       | 42.9    |
| Vocational training                            | 23        | 5.9     |
| Certificate                                    | 26        | 6.7     |
| Diploma                                        | 14        | 3.6     |
| Degree                                         | 6         | 1.6     |
| No education                                   | 57        | 14.7    |
5. Relationship between socio-economic factors and decision making

The principal goal of this study was to examine the relationship between socio-economic factors and participation in decision making in tourism industry among women in Zanzibar. The table 2 below shows the findings of this study.

Table 2: Relationship between socio-economic factors (education and nature of tourism activities) and decision-making

| Relationship                                      | Std. Beta | t-values | p-values |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Education -> participation in decision making     | -0.180    | 3.085    | 0.002    |
| Nature of tourism industry -> participation in decision making | -0.115    | 1.989    | 0.047    |

The PLS output presented in the table 2 shows that, there are negative significant relationship between education and participation in decisions in tourism industry among women in Zanzibar. The result indicated that education has negative significant impact on participation in decision making in tourism industry (β = -0.180, t = 3.085, p = 0.002), meaning that the less educated they are in the community the less they participate in decision making in tourism activities in Zanzibar. Thus the null hypothesis ($H_0_1$) is failed to be accepted. To connect this result with the real situation in Zanzibar is that to participate in making decisions in tourism industry in Zanzibar, their low level of education (mostly secondary school) make them less participatory in the tourism activities related decision making. This result also is consistent with the study of Iqbal (2010) which shows that there is negative significant relationship between human capital (education, skills and knowledge) of the respondents and participation in decision making. The outcome of this is similar to the study conducted by Saidu, Asnarulkhadi, Ma’arof and Ahmad (2014) which indicated that there was significant negative relationship between level of education and participation in decision making ($r = -0.372$, p = 0.000). This study is also in line with Emerole et al. (2008) and Meinzen-Dick et al. (2011) which showed that participation in decision making is influenced by knowledge. In contrast, Doss et al. (2014); Doss and Meinzen-Dick, (2015); Mutenje et al. (2016); Hyounggon et al. (2007); Torvald and Oystein (2013); Deepak and Tek (2010); MingMing and Geogffrey (2012); Ishamael (2016) revealed that there is significant positive relation in tourism activities, education and participation in decision making.

Similarly, the Partial Least Square analysis (PLS), analysis of the nature of tourism activities showed there is significantly negative relationship between the nature of tourism activities and participation in decision making in tourism industry (β = -0.115, t = 1.989, p = 0.047). The null hypothesis ($H_0_2$) is failed to be accepted. This is very interesting result, whereby the finding implied that the more women participate in several tourism activities the less participated in decision making in tourism industry. The main reason of this finding is that decision of women in Zanzibar to participate in tourism sector is within the hand of their elders in their community. Contrary to the study of Hyounggon et al. (2007); Tovald and Oystein (2013); Lingling et al. (2013) which shows nature of tourism activities like local festival, recreation parks, fresh water fishing, hunting, backcountry hiking and skiing and adventures activities influenced participation.

The possible reason might be people with lower level of education implies that their level of participation must be high and vice versa is true (Palikhe, 2018; Amoah, 2018). These meanings that women who have lower level of education have lower level of participation in tourism activities and vice versa. Based on this study finding majority of women have lower level of education, this implies that women have lower chance to participate in tourism activities and participation in decision making.

6. Conclusion

The study concluded that the women participating in tourism activities have developed the less capacity to decide on how to choose, to market and to decide which product they are going to produce. This capacity enhances their level of decision-making to become less active and high involvement in informal activities. Moreover, education
and nature of tourism activities influence their level of participation in decision making. In Zanzibar, women with low level of education participated actively less in the decision-making process and were actively involved in hand-making souvenir products. This activity is associated with the nature of tourism activities which shows that even the respondents who have secondary level of education have capability of doing it. The author recommends that skills acquisition centres should establish in community level areas for women to learn on how to add value for their products, and also to train them on how to manage their financial position for the sake of improving their economic and social status by increasing their income and social living. Besides, it is suggested that the government should provide financial support to the women to invest in tourism activities.
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