

Tanzania Towards Industrialization; Kilimo Kwanza Policy Towards Economic Growth and Self-Sustaining

Stephen Richard Mwaisakila^{1*} , James Kalimanzila Matemani² 

¹Department of Economic Planning and Development Policy, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia.

² Human Resource Officer, Ministry of Water and Irrigation, Tanzania.

*Correspondence : mwaisakila21@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Submitted; July 26, 2021

Revised; August 10, 2021

Accepted; September 20, 2021

Available online;

September 26, 2021

Keyword

Industrial Policy

Economic Growth

Tanzania

Self-Sustaining

ABSTRACT

Since independence, agriculture has been the backbone of Tanzania's economy. Factors like good climatical condition, arable land, and manpower give the advantage to do well in agriculture as a tool for economic growth and self-sustaining. Despite having a good agriculture policy (Kilimo Kwanza), the country is not doing well in utilizing its full potential in the agriculture sector. This is due to several challenges like the political economy of agriculture, budget bias (constraints) against agriculture, and market bias against agriculture. To solve those problems and make this policy and agriculture more sustainable in achieving economic growth, industrialization (Tanzania ya Viwanda), and self-sustaining, this study is recommending the government to make some adjustments in the policy to match with the annual budget trends to avoid deficits. Moreover, the government should provide education to increase perceptions to the decision-makers about the importance of agriculture in the economy to reduce the biases on agriculture in their decision-making processes



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

INTRODUCTION

Since independence in 1961, Tanzania has experienced a wide variety of policy regimes. Soon after independence, the government inherited an agricultural system characterized by a large semi subsistence smallholder sector and a small number of plantations and estates ([Sokoni, 2008](#); [Moyo, 2016](#)). In that system, export crops were controlled by marketing boards established by colonial authorities ([Bryceson, 1993](#); [Bauer, 2012](#)). In 1962, the government started to throw the colonial systems and implement the Agricultural Products Control and Marketing Act, which established a three-tiers single-channel marketing's system for maize, paddy, wheat, oilseeds, cashew nuts, and cotton. In this marketing system, crops were sent to cooperatives societies immediately after the harvest. Cooperative societies also send to regional cooperative unions as the agents responsible to sell in the national and international market ([Sarris & Van den Brink, 2019](#); [Kyazze, 2017](#)).

In 1967 the government initiated the Arusha Declaration policy which emphasized development strategy based on the principles of socialism, self-reliance, and egalitarianism. Basically, this was the first step for Tanzania toward self-reliance soon after the independence.

This system was followed by nationalization of large private businesses, including plantations, estates, importer/exporters, and food processors. Furthermore, major milling industries were nationalized and merged to form the National Milling Corporation ([Lofchie, 2014](#)). Moreover, the government launched the villagization campaign in 1973 in order to facilitate cooperative agricultural production and the delivery of social services ([Maro, 1999; Djanibekov et al., 2015](#)). Within four years of villagization campaign, millions of farmers were relocated in different part of the country. Basically, this campaign marks the beginning of the end of tribalism and social differences in Tanzania.

During Arusha declaration era to 1967-1980, Tanzania experienced the nationalization of a wide range of private companies in many sectors. In agricultural sector, the government created state enterprises from nationalized agricultural processing firms and large-scale estates. This process led to the increase in number of parastatal organization from approximately 40 in the 1960s to more than 400 in the early 1980s ([Minot, 2000; Msese, 2014](#)). However, in 1970s the government started to experience the economic strains resulted from nationalization policies. The expansion of government roles led to higher expenditure and fiscal deficits. The deficits in turn led to the emergence of inflation, which rose from 3 percent in 1971 to 49 percent in 1975. Furthermore, the country experienced 143 percent increase in domestic prices from 1970-75. However, despite all these economic shocks, the official exchange rate remained at 7.14 Tsh/US\$ ([Bryceson, 1993](#)). The stability of the exchange rate with high marketing costs incurred by the crop boards discouraged agricultural exports, which began to decline in the early 1970s. However in 1976 the economy started to improve again in response to a campaign to stimulate agricultural production which was also accompanied by good weather condition ([Hughes et al., 2015](#)).

However, in 1977 Tanzania experienced another shock after the collapse of the East African Community resulted into disruption of trade. Furthermore, in 1978 the war against Idi Amin in Uganda increased more government spending followed by the second oil shock occurred in 1979. This situation led to several changes where in the early 1980s, there were severe import and foreign exchange controls which contracted GDP and increase in fiscal deficits from 15 to 20 percent ([Bagachwa & Naho, 1995; Erce, 2018](#)). Moreover, this crisis led to a series of reforms in the 1980s where the National Economic Survival Program of 1981-82 initiated tried to address the imbalance through redistribution, cutting salaries and raising agricultural producer prices. The continuing crisis made the government to seek for external loans and grants whereas one of the requirements for external support, was government system changes from socialism to capitalism system through the adoption of the Structural Adjustment Program ([Said et al., 2015](#)). SAP requirements emphasized on macroeconomic reforms and a series of devaluations of currency. In 1984, the government had to devalue the shilling, raised producer prices, raised to 500 kg the amount of grain that could be privately traded, and reduced the number of goods subjects to price controls from around 2000 to 75 ([Amani, 1989; Sulle; 2020](#)). Furthermore, the cooperative system was reintroduced, and the three-tiered marketing channel restored in response to the problem of financial mismanagement, over-staffing, and high costs in the crop authorities.

Furthermore, in 1986 the government adopted the three-year Economic Recovery Program (ERP) supported by International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, and other international donors ([Yudiatmaja, 2012](#)). The ERP was followed by the formulation of second Economic Recovery Program (ERP II), also called the Economic and Social Action Plan (ESAP), introduced from 1989-1992. The main targets of these programs were to reduce the fiscal deficit, a series of large devaluations, import liberalization, positive real interest rates, and the elimination of most consumer price controls ([Maro, 1999](#)). This was followed by domestic food market liberalization in the agricultural sector. The government deregulated trade in food crops, starting with major staple foods including maize and rice between 1986-89. Also, in 1987 the government abolished Movement controls ([Osinowo, 2012](#)).

Moreover, in 1993 liberalization of traditional exports began with the changes in coffee, cotton, tobacco, and cashew nuts Acts allowing private traders to buy, process, and export these crops. The decision allowed private traders to operate legally in the coffee and cotton

sector in 1994-95, the following year also tobacco traders were allowed to operate privately without interference of regional marketing boards ([Minot, 2000](#)). Moreover, the decision was followed by closing of the Pyrethrum Board's factory in 1997 due to financial problems and privatized it in 1998 where the new owner restarted operations. During that time, private tea estates accounted for 70 percent of production, and the remaining estates and processing plants of the Tanzania Tea Authority were privatized. The privatization idea was to reduce government spending by allowing the government to disengage from direct production and marketing in order to focus on provisions of essential public services such as research and development, extension services, sanitary regulations, and quality control ([Maro, 1999](#); [Oloo, 2010](#)).

Another objective of the policy is to identify infrastructure development needs for Kilimo Kwanza. The government plan is to build adequate irrigation schemes targeting priority crops, production volumes and location. This is necessary in achieving the problem of climate change by substituting rainfed farming. In ensuring sustainability of perishable products like dairy products, fruits and vegetables, the government planned to establish adequate storage capacity at all levels for example, cold storage, household storage and national storage for commodities. However, since the adoption of this policy in 2009, the problem of storage still persists and perishable goods cannot be stored for long-time causing large price fluctuation between harvest time and peak time, because most of perishable products in the country are seasonally harvested. During harvest period, supply is always higher than demand causing price to be lower, during peak season supply is lower than demand causing price to increase more.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses secondary data from various online sources or commonly referred to as a literature review ([Onwuegbuzie & Frels, 2016](#)). A literature review is an overview of previously published works on a particular topic. This term can refer to a complete scientific paper or part of a scientific work such as a book, or an article ([Galvan & Galvan, 2017](#)). To describe agricultural policy trends in Tanzania, this study uses previous literature that differs from the World Bank and other published articles. This study uses an online website to obtain the 2018/19 parliamentary minister of agriculture report, which is used as a benchmark to analyze the status of food supply and demand in the country. In addition, to identify related problems and possible solutions related to the "Kilimo Kwanza" policy, this study reviews several articles published by other authors on agricultural policy issues.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The New Era: Kilimo Kwanza in Agriculture First Toward Growth and Self-Sustaining, 2009-Present.

"Kilimo Kwanza" is a national resolution policy introduced to accelerate agricultural transformation process. The program comprises a comprehensive set of policy instruments and strategic interventions in addressing various sectoral challenges while taking advantage of the numerous opportunities to modernize and commercialize agriculture in Tanzania ([Ngaiza, 2012](#)). Basically, Kilimo Kwanza policy was adopted in order to transform agriculture from conventional system to more advanced and modern way of farming as a way to stimulate self-sufficient production, trade and industrialization. The main objectives and focus of Kilimo Kwanza policy are to modernize and commercialize agriculture from peasant, small and medium scale farming to large scale production ([Region, 2013](#)). The government planned to transform peasant and small farmers to commercial farmers through emphasis on productivity and tradability.

Furthermore, the policy aimed at promoting medium and large-scale farmers for the full realization toward the vision of "Kilimo Kwanza". However, since the adoption of this policy in 2009, the participation of the government in achieving this objective is still minimal. In order to finance the policy programs, the government planned to increase budgetary allocation by allocating not less than 10 percent of National Budget to agriculture from 2010/11 and

progressively increase thereafter ([Gabagambi, 2013](#)). The allocation was planned to start in December 2009 immediately after the adoption of the policy. Also, the government plan was allocation of budget of all other ministries should be oriented to supporting Kilimo Kwanza. The reason behind this is because agriculture is the backbone of the country's economy, in order to achieve the goal of modernization and commercializing, there are several ministries which should be involved either direct or indirect. For example, ministry of science and technology should be responsible for equipment's, research and development (R&D), ministry of trade is responsible for both domestic and international trade and ministry of health should be responsible for quality control.

Furthermore, the government planned to encourage development partners to support Kilimo Kwanza policy as one of the financing methods while increasing budgetary allocation to irrigation activates to reach over 7 million hectares in 2025 ([TNBC, 2015](#)). The irrigation schemes seemed as a substitute for rainfed agricultural system which currently has largely affected by the climate change. Regardless of these government plans in 2009, the achievements of financing this policy has been unattainable. For example, data shows that out of 10 percent annual budget allocation plan by government, the highest allocation was only observed as 8.1 percent in financial year 2010/11 (APB). Another objective of this policy is to identify priority areas for strategic food commodities for the country's food self-sufficiency. The government planned to put in place arrangements for production of strategic commodities such as maize, cassava, rice, legumes, fish, meat and dairy products, wheat, bananas, potatoes, sorghum, millet.

Moreover, the policy focus in identifying priority areas and modalities for production of crops that can transform agriculture quickly with minimal financial and technological requirements, growing domestic/external market demand and potential for employment creation. In terms of trade barrier issues, the government planned to remove market barriers to agricultural commodities. The objective was planned to be achieved by allocating more resources to the National Food Reserve Agency to regulate the prices of food crops and make the Government the buyer of last resort. Moreover, the government planned to expand the capacity of National Food Reserve Agency (NFRA) for larger scale procurement and storage. In order to ensure price stabilization, the policy encourage the increase in private sector participation in buying agricultural products. The policy aimed at establishing price stabilization mechanism for agricultural commodities.

The implementation and achievements of this objective is still questionable where in the issue of price control, the government seems to act when market price is higher than the equilibrium price. But when the market price is lower than the equilibrium price, farmers are the one who always suffer. People who are always benefit from agricultural market are always the middlemen who buys crops during harvest season and store until peak season. Many farmers cannot keep crops up to peak season because they need to sell immediately after harvesting to financing their needs. If National Food Reserve Agency (NFRA) buy crops from farmers at reasonable price as planned in the policy, this problem could have been solved.

Government Tanzania Focus on Agriculture for Economic Growth and Government Need a Strong Sustainable Agricultural Policy.

Despite the current focus of the government in industrialization, the potential to accelerate economic development and eradicate poverty in Tanzania must anchor in agricultural transformation. This is because of its potential in improving the welfare of the majority of citizens in Tanzania. Agriculture is the most effective empowerment tool in developing countries economy whose success will transform the economic wellbeing of majority of Tanzanians ([TNBC, 2009](#)). Tanzania has unique potential resources which can be utilized for agriculture by minimum costs compared to other east African countries. Availability of 44 million hectares of arable, land but only 23 percent is currently under effective cultivation create an incentive for increase in production enough for food and commercial activities. Furthermore, there are lot of variety of animals which are currently kept in traditional system and still the production is good, transform animal keeping system to modern will eventually

increase production of meat and other associated products ([Ngaiza, 2012](#)). Up to 2017, 19 million cattle, 17 million sheep and goats, 30 million chicken which are not commercially exploited were reported to in animal census.

Furthermore, the conducive internal environment simplifies administration system in agricultural investment. For example, the country already implementing the Agricultural Sector Development Program (ASDP-Kilimo Kwanza) which focuses on modernization and commercialization of agriculture however, objective implementation has been a challenge to achieve the desired output ([Cooksey, 2013; Cooksey, 2013b](#)). Therefore, policy reforms are needed in order to ensure that the precious goal of the big ASDP policy are reached. Moreover, the existence growing private sector and a farming community which is geared to propel agricultural sector development is gradually increasing, people are ready to produce but poor government involvement is what hinder them. The Public Private Partnership interest seems stronger on private side while the concentration of the government in agriculture seems very low.

Despite of the ability to satisfy domestic needs, there are many external factors which shows the potential development probability of the country to concentrate in agriculture more for economic growth. The gradually shift on world economy from agriculture to manufacturing, increasing food demand and prices. This situation provides an opportunity for the developing countries agricultural sector to contribute significantly to the economic development of the country while increase the country's potential in international market ([Ngaiza, 2012](#)). Therefore, if the current utilization of 23 percent of arable land can still satisfy domestic market, the increase in production will eventually create surplus which can be sold in international market. Moreover, the African Union Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program resolved that increased investment in agriculture is the best option for economic development of African countries like Tanzania ([URT, 2011](#)).

Currently we observed many East African countries import food from outside the content while Tanzania has more than 50 percent of arable land not utilized yet. For example, Kenya have been importing maize from Mexico while there a lot of surplus production in Tanzania which farmers could have been benefited from export. The current modern agriculture policy (ASDP/Kilimo Kwanza) is very appropriate for the economic growth of the country. However, the challenge remains to be the implementation-able of the policy. The targets are good and relevant, although the question remain how they can be implemented related to the county's limited resources and budgets constraints.

Demand and Supply of Food In Domestic Market Food Production Its Availability

Report to Minister of agriculture report to parliament 2018/2019, The state of production and access to food products in Tanzania has continued to improve in the previous five years following increase in production of food crops from the 2013/2014 agricultural season to 2017/2018 where up to 2018/2019 season the country is self-sufficient compared to demand. In assessing food status, food production status and food security we look at some of the most important essential crops such as maize, sorghum and millet, rice, legumes, wheat, bananas, cassava and potatoes which are the main staple foods in Tanzania. During the same period, the country had a satisfaction level of 120 percent to 125 percent and has been producing surplus of 2,582,717 to 3,322,689 tons. According to minister of agriculture, these achievements are due to a variety of factors, including favourable climates, as well as the effective management and implementation of various policies and strategies implemented by Government and other agricultural stakeholders to increase productivity.

Statistics show that national food production conditions for the 2018/2019 season was 16,408,309 tons per grain (Grain Equivalent), while cereal is 9,007,909 tons. Compared to previous season, food production has dropped by 483,665 tons while cereals have dropped 455,642 tons and rice to 210,454 tons. In addition, the production of non-cereals has increased by 46,283 tons. Grain production reached 103 percent and non-grain production reached 145 percent. Thus, total production of cereal and non-cereal products reached 119.9 percent. Maize contributed 35 percent, cassava 17 percent, rice 12 percent, potatoes 10 percent and

other crops contributed 26 percent of production. Despite these achievements, food security is expected to be regionally different. In addition, the current availability of food is good due to the strong production in 2017/2018 agricultural season.

Based on the Self Sufficiency Ratio (SSR), the food status results show that the country will have a Satisfaction Rate of 119 percent in year 2019/2020. Analysis shows that food situation is expected to become good with higher production (Over satisfaction/Supply will be higher than demand) in 11 regions of Rukwa, Ruvuma, Songwe, Katavi, Njombe, Mbeya, Kigoma, Iringa, Kagera, Morogoro and Mtwara up to 225 percent. In addition, there will be Satisfaction (Demand=supply) in 7 regions of Geita, Simiyu, Coast, Lindi, Manyara, Singida and Tanga by 109 to 119 percent and expected Deficit in the 8 regions of Dodoma, Mara, Mwanza, Arusha, Tabora, Shinyanga and Kilimanjaro regions ranging from 98 percent to 99 percent. Dar es Salaam is not one of the agriculture production regions, thus only 3 percent of the population is subsistence due to the small, cultivated area that does not meet the food demand of its residents. Although, this region has the highest market penetration of food from 25 regions of mainland Tanzania and thus has a high adequacy.

In 2018/2019 season, production faced various challenges in some areas that affected crop production to varying degrees and led to a decline in crop production, especially maize. Among the challenges include inadequate rain especially during second season (in Bimodal Areas), autumn rains in many areas were not doing well. In addition, the following rains season (the latter rain season) was too late to start and thus affected agricultural activities in the areas. Moreover, the delay in the onset of rainfall and the undesirable dispersion in some areas of the rainy season Unimodal areas particularly in the Dodoma, Singida, Tabora, Shinyanga, and other areas of Morogoro, Mwanza, Mara, Simiyu and Manyara regions also affected production. Also, there were several insects' attacks particularly the Fall Army Worm (FAW), the rat and the Kweleakwelea which destroyed crops in the farm.

However, the government is also continuing to take several actions following the occurrence of these problems. The government is trying to strengthen the country's food safety information system to take appropriate action when necessary. Additionally, the government is conducting an In-depth Assessment of Food and Nutrition status in identified LGAs with areas that have potential indicators of food insecurity. The National Food Security Agency and the Bureau of Grain and Mixed Products is expected to begin purchasing food products from different locations. Also, the government is trying to strengthen the system for the availability and distribution of agricultural inputs, including pesticides, seeds and fertilizers. Tanzania Revenue Authority together with agricultural experts at the border stations are overseeing the exportation of export products to support accurate data on export volumes.

Government And Market Failure Related in “Kilimo Kwanza” Policy Implementation. Political Economy of Agriculture.

Historically, there is emerged perspective that that low-income agrarian economies tend to be discriminated against food producers. However, with economy development and agriculture shrinking relative to the rest of the economic sectors, policies progressively started to show consideration for farmers. Basically, this perspective was particularly true from independence period and the first era of structural adjustment programmes in the 1980s, when most African countries-initiated policies that under-priced food through an overvalued exchange rate. Many African countries reinforced these policies allowing access to food aid or concessional imports. The political reason behind it is because food prices are a major determinant of the real wages of urban workers, therefore the implementation of cheap food policies contributed on keeping average industrial wages low.

Basically, these policies left smallholders food crop producers at a disadvantage when they lacked access to cheap credit, subsidized irrigation, improved seeds and other inputs and leaving their income stagnate or decline. On the other hand, commercial farmers succeeded in tapping institutional subsidies, particularly on export markets. Furthermore, cheap food policies pose as a side-effect of the import-substitution industrialization strategy pursued through strategic protectionism and depreciation of the domestic currency. Basically, when

the currency is depreciated, it discourages importation because exchange rate increased. Moreover, in order to gain political influence from commercial agrarians, state sponsored agricultural development projects provided subsidies to large farmers in irrigation, fertilizers, credit and other necessary production inputs. However, the targeted group of beneficiaries toward the clients most essential for political support does not include those groups with most nutritionally risks. Generally, these negative consequences are mostly felt by smallholder farmers. Without market regulation, they are paying higher prices for production inputs and face unstable prices in the market.

Budget Against Agriculture.

Over the past decades, Tanzania has experienced the decrease in agricultural public expenditure. The government tends to strip agricultural budget in favouring other sectors like infrastructure, health and education spending. Furthermore, limited government expenditure in the agricultural sector has also prevented the provision of sufficient institutional support and suitable business environment while hindering private sector participation and investment in agriculture. Basically, in 2009 during the launching of Kilimo Kwanza policy, the government planned to allocate 10 percent of the general budget to finance Kilimo Kwanza policy. This decision was also derived from the terms of the New Partnership for Africa's Development's (NEPAD) and Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), governments which explained that each African country should devote at least 10 percent of national budget to agriculture in order to support water management and intensify irrigation ([Gabagambi, 2013](#)). Also, the NEPAD and CAADP objectives are to reduce the continent's dependence on rain-fed agriculture and increase resilience to climate change. However, this is not the case in Tanzania where statistics shows that the highest allocation leached was only 8.1 percent in financial year 2010.

Market Can Against Agriculture.

Agricultural market is characterized by uncertainty. The main two sources of uncertainty in agricultural market are undermine optimal allocation of resources and price uncertainty. Production uncertainty is caused by climatic change and other natural and environmental hazards such as pests and diseases. Normally, this risk is insurable because it can be calculated. But majority of the poor producer are not insured, because they cannot afford to pay the premium and must tackle risk through other means example; adapted technology, irrigation, storage, animal health monitoring, disease and pest prevention etc. ([Owusu et al. 2017](#)). There are no crop-insurance schemes because of the "moral hazard" which can arise with false accident reports and other falsifications. Also, the absence of crop-insurance in Tanzania is caused by distribution whereby majority of the farmers are smallholders who cannot afford, so insurance firms cannot guarantee profit from those schemes. This is because sustainable, schemes require a very powerful state capable of enforcing contracts.

Price uncertainty is basically generated by the occurrence of local or international market shocks. Also, it may sometimes be associated with exceptionally good conditions resulting in higher-than-expected production. Therefore, the risk cannot be removed through the insurance mechanism because any attempt to do that will lead to insurer bankruptcy. Basically, fluctuations in prices may discourage farmers from producing more, but stabilization policy can boost production. For example, the government of Malawi, faced a risk of food shortage in the late 1970s. To stimulate production, they decide to guarantee a high price for maize in the next season. The decision resulted in a burst of production and the government decided to sell at a loss on international markets because of higher production. In the next season Maize price was then lowered and left the market to determine its price. Since then, the country has become one of the food-aid recipients ([Kaluwa & Kandoole, 1989](#)). The problem with this policy was probably promising a high guaranteed price regardless of the production level.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis, modern agriculture complimented by kilimo kwanza policy is still the best alternative for self-sustaining and economic growth. However, due to political, budget and market biasness of agriculture in Tanzania, the policy objectives cannot be attained. However, going back to traditional method of farming is not the best alternative because it will allow the country to achieve self-sustaining goal while sacrificing growth which is desired by the country and all citizen in general. Therefore, it is necessary for the country to find best ways on how to reduce the barriers for success of kilimo kwanza policy so as to make it achievable due to limited available resources. Political barriers can be addressed through several means like increasing perceptions to the decision makers toward the importance of agriculture in the economy.

This will help to increase consideration of agriculture in decision making. However, the budget biasness needs a lot of adjustment in the plan itself because there have been a series of budget deficit problem in the country because of increasing dependency on borrowing and foreign aids. The deficit shifts the attention of the government from investment to service provision consideration when the budget cannot be funded at 100 percent. Therefore, the plan of allocation 10 percent of national budget to agriculture, and all ministries allocation some of their budget to support agriculture cannot be achieved. In this scenario, the policy cannot succeed because the implementation still depends on full budget, while the actual budget is lower every year therefore there is no room for compensations. Therefore, in order to make the policy more accurate and implementable as per limited resources available, the government need to make adjustment in the plan itself to match with the budget trend yearly. For example, instead of dealing with all crops and all zones in the country at once, the government can start by specifying which zone and crops that should be given priority and enough emphasize in a specific final year.

This will help to increase production and make improvements in a specified crop in a specified zone for that specific financial year. Ceteris paribus, we assume that if production of the specified crop is higher in a particular year, sales will be good, and farmers will have enough capital to invest themselves in the next season. Therefore, the government can then shift to other crops and other zone to make same improvements until all necessary zones and crops are reached. The process will be slower, and the goal cannot be achieved in a specified time zone as the current policy wants, but it will help to make the goal more achievable that it is now. However, different studies need to be conducted in order to identify which crop and zones should be given most priority due to the current budget trend and demand.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

-

REFERENCE

- Amani, H. K. R., Kapunda, S. M., Lipumba, N. H. I., & Ndulu, B. J. (1989). Impact of market liberalisation on household food security in Tanzania. *University of Zimbabwe (UZ) Publications*. <https://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/handle/20.500.12413/7973>
- Bagachwa, M. S. D., & Naho, A. (1995). Estimating the second economy in Tanzania. *World Development*, 23(8), 1387–1399. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X\(95\)00055-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(95)00055-H)
- Bauer, P. T. (2012). *West African trade: A study of competition, oligopoly and monopoly in a changing economy*. Routledge.
- Bryceson, D. (1993). *Liberalizing Tanzania's food trade*. London: James Currey.
- Cooksey, B. (2013a). The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) and agricultural policies in Tanzania: Going with or against the grain. *FAC Political Economy of Agricultural Policy in Africa (PEAPA) Working Paper*. www.futures-agriculture.org
- Cooksey, B. (2013b). What difference has CAADP made to Tanzanian agriculture?. <https://www.future-agricultures.org/publications/working-papers-document/what-difference-has-caadp-made-to-tanzanian-agriculture/>

- Djanibekov, N., Djanibekov, U., Sommer, R., & Petrick, M. (2015). Cooperative agricultural production to exploit individual heterogeneity under a delivery target: The case of cotton in Uzbekistan. *Agricultural Systems*, 141, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2015.09.002>
- Erce, A., & Mallucci, E. (2018). Selective sovereign defaults. *FRB International Finance Discussion Paper*, (1239). <http://dx.doi.org/10.17016/IFDP.2018.1239>
- Gabagambi, D. M. (2013). Assessing Implementation of CAADP in Tanzania and Engagement of Smallholder Farmers: Final Report. 75. <https://landportal.org/node/44606>
- Galvan, J. L., & Galvan, M. C. (2017). *Writing literature reviews: A guide for students of the social and behavioral sciences*. Routledge.
- Hughes, D. W., & Isengildina-Massa, O. (2015). The economic impact of farmers' markets and a state level locally grown campaign. *Food Policy*, 54, 78-84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2015.05.001>
- International Food Policy Research Institute. (2000). *Agriculture in Tanzania since 1986: Follower or leader of growth?*. The World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/0-8213-4779-9>
- Kaluwa, B. M., & Kandoole, B. F. (1989). The impact of market reforms on household food security in rural Malawi. University of Zimbabwe (UZ) Publications/Michigan State University (MSU). <https://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/handle/20.500.12413/8899>
- Kyazze, L. M., Nkote, I. N., & Wakaisuka-Isingoma, J. (2017). Cooperative governance and social performance of cooperative societies. *Cogent Business & Management*, 4(1), 1284391. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2017.1284391>
- Lofchie, M. F. (2014). *The political economy of Tanzania*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Maro, W. M. (1999). Agricultural marketing and transportation in Tanzania. *A collaborator study prepared for the World Bank and the International Food Policy Research Institute*.
- Moyo, S. (2016). *Family farming in sub-Saharan Africa: its contribution to agriculture, food security and rural development* (No. 150). Working paper. <https://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/173805>
- Msepe, J. (2014). *Parastatal organization and value for money in The procurement process: a case of Ttel* (Doctoral dissertation, Mzumbe University). <http://scholar.mzumbe.ac.tz/handle/11192/735>
- Ngaiza, R. (2012). *Ministry of Agriculture Food Security and Cooperatives FAO*. University of Nairobi. *Regional Workshop on an Integrated Policy Approach to Commercializing Smallholder Maiza Production*.
- Oloo, J. E. O. (2010). Food safety and quality management in Kenya: An overview of the roles played by various stakeholders. *African Journal of Food, Agriculture, Nutrition and Development*, 10(11). <https://doi.org/10.4314/ajfand.v10i11.64283>
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Frels, R. (2016). *Seven steps to a comprehensive literature review: A multimodal and cultural approach*. SAGE
- Osinowo, O. A. (2012). Agricultural Transformation In A Deregulated Economy: Role Of The Livestock Sub-Sector. *Agricultural Society of Nigeria*, 1.
- Owusu, S., Cofie, O. O., Osei-Owusu, P. K., Awotwe-Pratt, V., & Mul, M. L. (2017). *Adapting aquifer storage and recovery technology to the flood-prone areas of northern Ghana for dry-season irrigation* (Vol. 176). International Water Management Institute (IWMI).
- Region, T. (2013). *Adoption of Kilimo Kwanza Policy by Smallholder Citrus Farmers in Muheza District* (Doctoral dissertation, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology). <http://www.secheresse.info/spip.php?article73490>
- Said, I., Sangeda, A. Z., & Mahonge, C. P. (2015). Critical analysis of synergies between Kilimo Kwanza resolution and sustainable Forest Management in Tanzania. <http://www.suaire.sua.ac.tz/handle/123456789/2034>
- Sarris, A. H., & Van den Brink, R. (2019). 9 From Forced Modernization to Perestroika: Crisis and Adjustment in Tanzania. In *Adjusting to policy failure in African economies* (pp. 260-301). Cornell University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501737749-013>
- Sulle, E. (2020). Bureaucrats, investors and smallholders: Contesting land rights and agro-commercialisation in the Southern agricultural growth corridor of Tanzania. *Journal of*

- Eastern African Studies*, 14(2), 332-353.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17531055.2020.1743093>
- TNBC. (2009). Presentation on Kilimo Kwanza. Tanzania National Business Council (2009). Ten Pillars of Kilimo Kwanza (Implementation Frame- Work)., October, 46.
- TNBC. (2015). (Implementation Framework) Pillar No .1 National Vision On Kilimo Kwanza. 1, 1–26.
- URT. (2011). Tanzania Agriculture And Food Security Investment Plan (TAFSIP) 2011-12 to 2020-21. October 2011, 75. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-843X.98.3.318>
- Yudiatmaja, W. E. (2012). Jebakan Utang Luar Negeri Bagi Beban Perekonomian Dan Pembangunan Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Administrasi Publik dan Pembangunan*, 3(1).