Introduction

Tanzania is one of the most stable countries in East Africa. However, it faces important political, religious, and social challenges, including the marginalisation of youth and women, and high levels of poverty. Politics, criminality, and land use are viewed as the major sources of local conflicts in Tanzania. Moreover, across many regions, localised conflicts lead to regular outbreaks of violence, destruction of property, and a general sense of insecurity. The country has also seen an increase in violent extremism attacks these past years, a phenomenon spreading from neighbouring countries Kenya and Mozambique.

After President Samia Suluhu Hassan took power, there have been several notable political developments. The President appointed a new Director of Public Prosecution (DDP) and replaced several other governmental figures. The new DDP dropped charges against 36 Muslim clerics, setting them free after 7 years under arrest for terrorism. Also, opposition leader Freeman Mbowe (Chadema party) was arrested in July on suspicion of terrorism. Many in the opposition claim his arrest was motivated by political reasons, and have started movements on social media (#Mbowe_is_NOT_a_terrorist). His case is being followed closely by the opposition and by international observers, as it is an indication of the political stability of the country.

Data collection and analysis

Data for the third conflict scan report for Tanzania was gathered from 8 to 16 June 2021, in Mtwara Urban and Tandahimba districts. This report was prepared by the Search for Common Ground (Search) Tanzania team, with support from Search’s COVID-19 Response Programming Team and Institutional Learning Team. For more information on the data collection methodology and tools used by Search for Common Ground for this research, click here. This report is part of a series of regular conflict scans aimed at providing quick and actionable answers to a set of specific questions. The previous reports for Tanzania can be found here & here.

To cite this report:
Search for Common Ground, Tanzania Conflict Scan, November 2021.

* This publication was produced with the financial support of the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of Search for Common Ground and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.

Update: COVID-19 Measures and Impact on Conflict

During Magufuli’s presidency, COVID-19 was largely denied, politicians promoted traditional treatments, and there were restrictions on media reporting about COVID-19. After his death, Vice President Samia Suluhu Hassan took over, becoming the first female president of Tanzania. Since coming to power, President Hassan has prioritised freedom of media and efforts to fight COVID-19, and has formed an experts committee to advise the government on the pandemic response, including on vaccination efforts. The country in June 2021 finally also joined the COVAX initiative, prioritising healthcare workers, the elderly, people with chronic diseases, security actors, and international travelers for vaccination (but no compulsory vaccination would be imposed on any group). Underscoring the urgency of the situation, the government recently placed a large order of vaccines from the African Union and has secured over 1 million vaccines (Johnson and Johnson) donated by the US government.\(^4\)

In July 2021, the Ministry of Health published its first report on COVID-19 data. As of 12 October 2021, there are 26,043 confirmed cases and 724 deaths.\(^5\) The government is now also undertaking awareness raising campaigns and implementing safety protocols such as compulsory masks wearing, social distancing and limited crowding in public places and government offices, the provision of sanitizing materials in every government agency, and increased media freedoms to support information sharing about COVID-19.

COVID-19’s Impact on Social Cohesion & Trust

People's trust in COVID-19 information in our media partners has increased significantly, amid a more open media environment and renewed government commitment to address the pandemic.

The top trusted media channels to obtain information about COVID-19 are:

- Radio: 47% (Jan 21) vs 34% (June 21)
- TV: 30% (Jan 21) vs 27% (June 21)
- Friends and family: 6% (Jan 21) vs 17% (June 21)
- Social media (Facebook, Twitter, WhatsApp): 12% (Jan 21) vs 13% (June 21)

We noticed an important decrease in people's trust in radio stations for information about the pandemic, although it is not clear why.

Out of those who listen to these stations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan 21</th>
<th>June 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>trust (very much or mostly) the information shared about COVID-19</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower levels of trust in the information (rarely, somewhat)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do not trust it</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, more men than women listen to our radio partners.

More Muslims than Christians listen to our media partners, which may be largely explained by the make-up of our target districts (predominantly Muslim).

This is a sharp increase from last time, and can be seen particularly among women and elderly respondents, some of the hardest-to-reach groups when it comes to information about COVID-19. Increased levels of trust are likely due to the government's efforts to improve access to information and prioritise pandemic response, and to media actors being able to report more freely on the pandemic situation in the country.

\(^4\) Devex, "Tanzania finally joins COVAX", June 17, 2021.
\(^6\) WHO, "COVID-19 Portal", October 2021
Satisfaction with COVID-19 related-services and trust in government remain relatively high, while service requests decreased

Overall, there has been a notable decrease in the percentage of respondents who sought COVID-19 related services in the past 3 months.

Out of those who requested COVID-19 services, satisfaction levels are:

**Support requested from any service provider**

- **Highly satisfied and satisfied:**
  - June 21: 65% (60%)
  - Jan 21: 60%

- **Somewhat satisfied:**
  - June 21: 30% (29%)
  - Jan 21: 29%

- **Not satisfied:**
  - June 21: 4% (3%)
  - Jan 21: 3%

- **Never received a response:**
  - June 21: 1% (9%)
  - Jan 21: 9%

These figures are relatively consistent with the previous report; however, there was a notable decrease in the amount of respondents who did not receive a response to their request, and this might account for the slight increase in satisfaction levels. Satisfaction levels with government services have remained stable since the beginning of the year.

**Trust in Search’s media partners (very much, mostly)**

- Youth (18-34):
  - Sept 20: 51%
  - Jan 21: 48%
  - June 21: 61%

- Adults (35-49):
  - Sept 20: 63%
  - Jan 21: 34%
  - June 21: 66%

- Elderly (50+):
  - Sept 20: 54%
  - Jan 21: 30%
  - June 21: 68%

A very high percentage of respondents share information about COVID-19 with family and friends. As the Tanzanian media has started reporting on COVID-19 more regularly and openly, we will hopefully see a decrease in rumours and misinformation spreading along informal channels, as citizens have greater access to reliable and accurate information. Information sharing is slightly higher among men than women.

Satisfaction with COVID-19 related-services and trust in government remain relatively high, while service requests decreased

Despite this decrease in requesting services, our findings show that 44% of respondents (or a member of their household) have fully or partially lost the main source of income during the pandemic.

**Top requested services from the government**

- Health:
  - Jan 21: 78%
  - June 21: 71%

- Freedom of movement:
  - Jan 21: 61%
  - June 21: 44%

**Health and freedom** of movement remain the top requested services in the third round, although there was a notable decrease in freedom of movement requests as well as a slight decrease in health service requests.

7. For this report, Search only provides a breakdown of satisfaction levels for the government, which is the top requested service provider. In the previous report, we provided a breakdown for the second top requested service provider as well; however, we did not include such a breakdown for the second provider (community members) in this report as the level of requests to them is insignificant (4%).
In this round, Muslims in our target areas have higher trust that the government treats everyone equally in the pandemic response, compared to Christians. This may point to needs of adults and elderly remaining unaddressed, lower quality of services received, and/or the socio-economic impacts of the pandemic being felt harder by these age groups.

Respondents’ Trust in Government:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sep 20</th>
<th>Jan 21</th>
<th>June 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth (18-34)</strong></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adults (35-49)</strong></td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elderly (50+)</strong></td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents’ Trust in Non-governmental actors is very stable since the beginning of 2021:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sep 20</th>
<th>Jan 21</th>
<th>June 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muslims</strong></td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christians</strong></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents’ Trust in Government:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sep 20</th>
<th>Jan 21</th>
<th>June 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction with governmental services among young people (18-34 years)</strong></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction with governmental services among adults (35-49)</strong></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction with governmental services among elderly (50+)</strong></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are relatively consistent with the previous round; however, trust is notably lower for this round and the second round compared to the first. Clearly, the commitment of the country’s new leadership to address the pandemic still needs to bear fruit among the population. After hearing for so long that the pandemic was no (longer) a threat in Tanzania or was a hoax, many respondents may still need to be convinced by the new government’s actions.

In this round, Muslims in our target areas have higher trust that the government treats everyone equally in the pandemic response, compared to Christians.

Respondents’ Trust in Non-governmental actors is very stable since the beginning of 2021:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sep 20</th>
<th>Jan 21</th>
<th>June 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muslims</strong></td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christians</strong></td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike trust in the government, more Christians trust non-governmental actors compared to Muslims, which is also consistent with the previous report.
Actual interaction between individuals dramatically decreased, despite high levels of valuing inter-group collaboration and feelings of safety when interacting

Compared to the last report, horizontal cohesion has decreased overall due to a significant decline in actual interaction across divides. However, valuing collaboration across divides remained consistent from the previous round as did feelings of safety when interacting across divides. Additionally, there are notable distinctions between groups. For example, valuing collaboration and actual interaction between religious groups remains higher compared to collaboration and interaction across political divides. These trends are likely because political divisions tend to be more salient than religious divisions in Tanzania. Moreover, the sampled areas for this report are relatively homogenous in terms of religion, which might be a reason for lower rates in general for interaction across religious divides, as there are fewer opportunities for this kind of interaction. We also note a drop in women valuing collaboration, whereas for men it continues to (slightly) increase since the start of the pandemic.

8. This does not include feelings of safety when interacting with the opposite sex
9. As a reminder, the other countries are Kenya, Nigeria, Palestina, Uganda, and Yemen. All country reports are accessible through our webpage Working Together Against Corona.

This is is at the lowest rate since the start of the pandemic in Tanzania, and contrary to what we are seeing in the other countries that are part of this multi-country research (where we see actual interactions go up since the start of the pandemic in most places). Interaction decreased dramatically across both religious and political divides, however interaction across religious divides remains higher than across political divides. Higher levels of interaction in the previous report might have been due to increased engagement during the electoral period, and now that the elections are over, opportunities to interact may have decreased. Hence, recently there are no cross-cutting issues that may bring people together.

The decline in interaction with individuals from other religious or political groups is particularly sharp for women, although men also saw a notable decrease.
More people feel safe when interacting across political divides than they do when interacting across religious divides, despite lower levels of actual interaction. These are important shifts from the previous round. Perhaps the electoral period back then led to lower feelings of safety when interacting across political divides, and those tensions could have now diminished considerably. However, more research is needed to better understand the drop in feelings of safety when interacting across religious divides.

Men feel safer than women when interacting across gender divides. However, feelings of safety increased among both groups compared to the previous report.

**Next Steps For COVID-19 Response Efforts**

Response providers should leverage growing trust in COVID-19 information and capitalise on agency among citizens to share COVID-19 related information

- Although trust in COVID-19 information increased quite significantly between the last round and this round, rising from 44% to 65%, trust levels in information are still somewhat low in general. Additionally, information sharing continues to be incredibly high, and while this showcases a level of agency among citizens to share information about COVID-19; as mentioned in our previous report, there is a risk that information sharing is linked to spreading of misinformation and rumours. It remains critical that response providers continue building trust in information by ensuring citizens have access to reliable and timely information about the pandemic via information channels citizens trust the most (e.g. radio).

- Moreover, response providers should take advantage of a citizenry who are actively sharing information and ensure they are sharing the right information by integrating participatory communication strategies. For instance, providing citizens with access to information platforms that allow for two-way dialogue; developing social media campaigns alongside community influencers, youth, and women; or supporting local media to develop participatory information campaigns with citizens. Creating a sense of ownership and responsibility among citizens to support information and awareness raising will both help mitigate rumours and misinformation while further increasing trust in information, and promote feelings of agency and self-efficacy, which may ultimately help combat some of the mental health stress created by the pandemic.

To increase trust and satisfaction in COVID-19 services, response providers should tailor response efforts to diverse needs across groups

- Between this round and the previous, satisfaction and trust in both governmental and non-governmental service providers remained relatively consistent. However, when looking at trends across groups (i.e. age, religion, and gender), satisfaction and trust has fluctuated over time for certain groups. For instance, adults and elderly respondents saw drastic decreases in satisfaction compared to the previous round, while youth remained consistent. There has also been a notable drop in satisfaction among women between the previous round and now (from 84% to 68%). Moreover, a significant percentage of respondents report a full or partial loss of income
within the household, yet, service requests declined drastically between rounds. These trends might indicate that there are unmet needs or concerns among certain groups, and while trust levels remained relatively consistent, such a drastic decrease in service requests despite growing needs, seems to contradict that trust. Response providers should avoid a one-size-fits-all approach by tailoring and adapting to changing needs, particularly as the secondary effects of the pandemic become more pronounced and affect groups differently.

Response providers should provide increased opportunities for groups to interact across divides as a critical part of pandemic response efforts

- While valuing collaboration and feelings of safety when interacting across divides remained relatively high and consistent since the last report, actual collaboration across divides dropped significantly. High levels of interaction in the previous round was likely due to increased opportunities for engagement throughout the electoral period. As the socio-economic effects of the pandemic continue to loom large, with a significant percentage of respondents reporting a full or partial loss of household income as well as fewer opportunities for social interaction, among others, collaboration and engagement remains critical for longer-term response efforts. Inevitably, as these secondary effects become more pronounced, the potential for competition, conflict, and even violence among and between groups is likely to increase. Therefore, collaboration across divides should remain a core pillar of response efforts, not only to build trust between groups but also to ensure diverse needs are met and response measures are accepted by all groups without perceptions of competition or discrimination. Not only should response providers integrate participatory methods to develop response strategies themselves, response efforts should also offer opportunities for increased interaction.