1   **Classification and characterisation of livestock production systems in northern**
2   **Tanzania**

3   de Glanville W.A.[1*], Davis A.[2], Allan K.J.[1], Buza J.[3], Claxton J.R.[1], Crump J.A.[4,5,6,7], Halliday

4   J.E.B.[1], Johnson P.C.D.[1], Kibona T.J.[3], Mmbaga, B.T.[6,7,8], Swai E.S.[9], Uzzell C.[10#], Yoder J.[11],

5   Sharp J.[12], Cleaveland S.[1]

6

7   [1] Institute of Biodiversity, Animal Health and Comparative Medicine, University of Glasgow,
8   Glasgow, UK

9   [2] School of Social and Political Sciences, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK

10   [3] Nelson Mandela African Institution of Science and Technology, Arusha, Tanzania;

11   [4] Centre for International Health, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand;

12   [5] Division of Infectious Diseases and International Health, Duke University Medical Center,
13   Durham, NC, USA;

14   [6] Duke Global Health Institute, Duke University, Durham, NC, USA;

15   [7] Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College, Tumaini University, Moshi, Tanzania;

16   [8] Kilimanjaro Clinical Research Institute, Moshi, Tanzania;

17   [9] Department of Veterinary Services, Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries, Tanzania;

18   [10] School of Geographical and Earth Sciences, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK;

19   [11] School of Economic Sciences, Washington State University, Pullman, WA, USA;

20   [12] School of Geographical and Sustainable Development, University of St Andrews, UK.

21

22   [#]Current address: Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, Imperial College, London
23   *Address for correspondence: will.deglanville@glasgow.ac.uk

24   **Abstract**

25   Livestock keepers in sub-Saharan Africa face a growing range of pressures, including climate
26   change, land loss, restrictive policies, and population increase. Widespread adaptation in
27   response to such pressures can lead to the emergence of new, non-traditional typologies of
28   livestock production.

29   We sought to characterise livestock production systems in northern Tanzania, a region
30   undergoing rapid social, economic, and environmental change. Questionnaire and spatial data
31   were collected from 404 livestock-keeping households in 21 villages in Arusha and Manyara
32   Regions in 2016. Multiple factor analysis and hierarchical cluster analysis were used to classify
33   households into livestock production systems based on household-level characteristics.
34   Indicators of vulnerability, including household-level reports of hunger, illness, livestock loss,
35   land loss and crop losses were compared between production systems.

36   Three distinct clusters emerged through this process. The ethnic, environmental and livestock
37   management characteristics of households in each cluster broadly mapped onto traditional
38   definitions of 'pastoral', 'agro-pastoral' and 'smallholder' livestock production in the region,
39   suggesting that this quantitative classification system is complementary to more qualitative
40   classification methods. Our findings also suggest that traditional systems of livestock
41   production continue to persist in northern Tanzania. Nonetheless, we found indicators of
42   substantial change within livestock production systems, most notably the adoption of crop
43   agriculture in the majority of pastoral households. Smallholder households were less likely than
44   either pastoral or agro-pastoral households to report hunger, illness, and livestock, land or crop
45   losses.

46   Livelihoods that rely solely on livestock are relatively rare in northern Tanzania, which
47   represents an important shift in production in the region, particularly among pastoralists. Policy
48   initiatives to improve household and community well-being should recognise the continuing
49   distinctiveness of traditional livestock production systems in the region.

50

51   **Introduction**

52   Livestock play a key role in the livelihoods of many households in low-income countries. In
53   Tanzania, 50% of all households keep livestock, with the sale of products derived from animals
54   constituting an average of 15% of the annual income of rural livestock-keeping households [1].
55   Livestock in these settings also make important, but often under-recognised, contributions to
56   livelihoods, for example as a basis for informal household insurance and financing, soil fertility,
57   and labour saving, as well as to household nutrition through the production of animal source
58   foods [2]. Indeed, livestock provide the social, cultural, and economic backbone to many rural
59   economies in low-income settings, particularly those in marginal, semi-arid and arid
60   environments. Here, the mobility of cattle, sheep, goats, and/or camels allows livestock keepers
61   to utilise grazing and browsing on common land over a potentially wide geographic area [3],
62   optimising production and reducing vulnerability to the effects of local rainfall deficits [4]. In
63   these environments, livestock can also provide the security to pursue potentially riskier
64   activities that rely on local rainfall, such as crop agriculture [4]. Supporting livestock production
65   among the rural poor can provide an important route toward sustainable development,
66   equitable livelihoods, and household health and welfare [5].

67   Livestock-based livelihoods are under growing pressure in many low-income countries from a
68   range of sources [6]. These include the effects of climate change which, in East Africa, are
69   expected to include increasing variability in precipitation [7-9]. Such effects are already
70   becoming apparent in the region. In grassland areas of northern Tanzania, for example, the
71   growing season during the 'long rain' period has declined from an average of 100 days in 1960
72   to 63 days in 2010 [10]. Droughts in East Africa are also becoming more frequent and severe.

73   In 2009, during one of the most severe droughts in living memory, up to 90% of livestock in
74   some areas of northern Tanzania died [11]. Changing systems of land tenure, including the
75   conversion of previously communal land to private ownership or wildlife conservation, further
76   contribute to reduced availability of grazing land [12-16]. Livestock keepers in East Africa are
77   therefore having to adapt to rapidly changing circumstances. Examples of adaptation include
78   the adoption of non-traditional livestock species [17,18], new ways of rearing livestock [19], and
79   the diversification of livelihood profiles in semi-arid areas away from livestock-focused
80   production (i.e. pastoralism) toward mixed livestock and crop agriculture [20,21]. The extent of
81   these changes and their implications for the characteristics and distribution of 'traditional'
82   systems of livestock production in countries undergoing rapid social, economic, and
83   environmental change warrants continued examination.

84   In northern Tanzania, three traditional typologies of livestock production (or livestock production
85   systems) have existed for several centuries [22,23]. These systems of production can broadly
86   be described as 'pastoral', 'smallholder', and 'agro-pastoral'. While there has been substantial
87   geographic and social overlap between systems, and their boundaries often hard to define [22],
88   each has traditionally been linked to particular environmental conditions and ethnic groups.
89   Pastoral systems have been found in the semi-arid, rangeland areas of northern Tanzania and
90   historically dominated by Maasai ethnicities, with less populous groups such as the Barabaig
91   also present. This production system has traditionally relied primarily (but not exclusively [22])
92   on livestock production, utilising long distance movements in response to variable rainfall
93   patterns in an agriculturally marginal environment as a dominant risk-management strategy.
94   Complex social organisation and systems of mutual support in response to the wide range of
95   potential hazards that are present in these environments (including frequent droughts and
96   livestock disease) have long been a feature of these communities [22]. Smallholder farming
97   systems, by contrast, have traditionally been found on the high soil fertility slopes of Mount
98   Kilimanjaro, Mount Meru and the Pare mountains. Here, members of ethnicities such as the
99   Chagga, Meru, and Pare have reared typically small numbers of livestock that are integrated
100   closely with intensive cash and subsistence crop production [23-25]. Agro-pastoral systems in
101   northern Tanzania have also traditionally involved mixed crop and livestock agriculture but have
102   typically been found in more marginal areas. While crop production has generally made the
103   largest overall contribution to household livelihoods [26], large herd sizes with varying levels of
104   mobility have allowed agro-pastoral farmers to also maximise the productivity of available
105   grassland areas [4,27]. Agro-pastoral production in the region has historically been practiced
106   by groups such as the Arusha and Iraqw, with the former having maintained particularly close
107   social, cultural, and economic relationships with pastoral communities [23,28].

108   In light of livestock keeper adaptation to changing conditions in northern Tanzania, it is
109   uncertain the extent to which these three broad typologies still characterise livestock production
110   systems in the region. An evaluation of current characteristics of livestock production, and the
111   classification of the production systems that exist in northern Tanzania, can contribute to the

112   design of system-specific programmes that can support a range of livestock-based livelihoods
113   [6,29]. It can also provide the basis for monitoring further change in these systems [6,29,30]
114   and for identifying vulnerabilities to current and future hazards.

115   Myriad new livestock production typologies could emerge from demographic, technological,
116   and environmental change. For example, a relatively small number of livestock keepers in
117   Tanzania have adopted exclusively commercial production to meet growing demand for
118   livestock products, particularly among urban populations. This has included beef ranching and
119   the establishment of zero-grazing dairy units with European breeds of cattle [1]. The
120   commercialisation and intensification of livestock production is strongly promoted by the
121   Government of Tanzania [31]. Non-traditional, intensive production systems that have a greater
122   focus on narrowly defined production objectives rather than subsistence or the socio-cultural
123   utility of livestock are therefore likely to continue to emerge.

124   In addition, new technologies such as mobile telephones [32], new strategies and tools for
125   household health management [33], and changes in land tenure and land availability [34] may
126   lead to more subtle changes within traditionally defined production systems. While such
127   adaptive change may increase overall diversity within a particular geographic area, it could also
128   lead to further blurring of the boundaries between production systems. For example, the
129   adoption of crop agriculture by Maasai pastoralists has been reported as a response to
130   changing land tenure practices in northern Tanzania [20,21]. Widespread adoption and
131   subsequent change within this traditional pastoral system could therefore conceivably lead to
132   it becoming broadly indistinguishable (in terms of production) from neighbouring agro-pastoral
133   systems.

134   Here, we use data generated from a cross-sectional survey of livestock-keeping households in
135   northern Tanzania to classify and characterise livestock production systems at the household
136   level in the region. Our main aim is to determine whether the three traditional typologies of
137   livestock production (i.e., pastoral, agro-pastoral, smallholder) persist in northern Tanzania, and
138   whether new systems of production can also be identified in the data. We explore variation in
139   livestock production typologies in northern Tanzania across various dimensions, including
140   ethnic and administrative boundaries. We use this analysis to consider how livestock production
141   has changed in the region, how it may continue to change, and the implications of this change
142   on the resilience of livestock keeping communities in northern Tanzania.

143   **Methods**

144   **Study area**

145   This work was conducted as part of the 'Social, Environmental and Economic Drivers of
146   Zoonotic disease' (SEEDZ) project, a large cross-sectional study focused on human and animal
147   zoonotic disease risk in six contiguous districts in Arusha Region (Arusha, Karatu, Longido,
148   Meru, Monduli, and Ngorongoro Districts) and four contiguous districts in neighbouring

149   Manyara Region (Babati Rural, Babati Urban, Mbulu, and Simanjiro Districts). Arusha and

150   Manyara Regions are home to approximately 16% of all cattle and 26% of all sheep and goats

151   in Tanzania [35,36]. The total human population is 3,119,441 in an area of 66,461 km^2. The

152   study area is made up of a mixture of semi-arid and sub-tropical agro-ecological zones [29].

153   **Village selection**

154   Households were the unit of interest, with a multistage sampling design used to select them

155   from within villages. Villages were selected using a generalised random tessalation stratified

156   sampling (GRTS) approach, which provides a spatially balanced, probability-based sample

157   [37]. The GRTS was performed using the *spsurvey* package [38] in the R statistical

158   environment, version 3.1.1. (http://cran.r-project.org/). Village selection was made from a list of

159   villages compiled from the 2012 National Census (Tanzanian National Bureau of Statistics,

160   NBS). Villages in wards (an administrative unit comprising an average of 10 villages in the study

161   area) that were classified as 'urban' rather than 'rural' or 'mixed' (i.e., urban and rural) by the

162   2012 census were excluded from the selection procedure. Villages inside the Ngorongoro

163   Conservation Area (NCA), a wildlife area in which people and their livestock are permitted to

164   live but in which crop agriculture is prohibited, were also excluded. With these exclusions, there

165   were a total of 553 villages from which selection was made. To ensure sampling across a range

166   of agro-ecological settings, villages in the study area were classified as those in which livestock-

167   rearing (rather than crop agriculture) was considered to be the primary livelihood activity

168   ('pastoral' villages) and those in which a mix of crop and livestock were considered as important

169   ('mixed' villages). Village classification was performed in consultation with district-level

170   government officials, typically the District Veterinary Officer or District Livestock Officer. Village

171   selection was then stratified based on agro-ecological classifications, with 11 villages selected

172   from those defined primarily as 'pastoral' and nine villages from those defined as 'mixed.' An

173   additional village in a mixed setting was also selected non-randomly near our field head-

174   quarters on the outskirts of the city of Arusha for field trialling. No substantial changes were

175   made to data collection tools after trialling, and we therefore include data collected from

176   households in this village in this analysis.

177   Figure 1 shows the location of study villages in relation to the main landcover types in northern

178   Tanzania.

179   **Figure 1**. Map of study area in northern Tanzania showing location of study villages in relation

180   to main land classifications in Arusha and Manyara Regions (Map created using QGIS version

181   2.14.3. Shape files from GADM; landcover raster data from Landsat

182   (http://glcf.umd.edu/data/landsat/)).

183   **Household surveys**

184   Study villages comprised between two and four sub-villages from which two or three were

185   randomly selected for inclusion in the study. Within each sub-village, we adopted a central point

186 sampling approach in which livestock keepers were invited to bring their animals to a pre-
187 selected point within the sub-village, typically a livestock crush or dip tank. Data collection took
188 place alongside sub-village level disease control activities, such as tick or worm control,
189 conducted in collaboration with representatives from the Tanzanian Ministry of Livestock and
190 Fisheries. Village authorities were notified of the proposed event at least three days in advance,
191 with advertisement to livestock keepers in each sub-village made through the existing village
192 administrative network of chairperson and village elders. During the sampling event, a list of all
193 attending households was generated, and a maximum of ten households were selected from
194 this list using a random number generator. During the central point event, we collected blood
195 samples from animals owned by these households to test for infectious disease exposure, the
196 results of which have been described elsewhere [39,40]. On a subsequent day, typically within
197 one week, selected households were revisited. The household head received an in-depth
198 questionnaire administered in either Kiswahili, Maa, or other local language by trained
199 interviewers. The questionnaire covered a wide-range of topics, including household
200 demographics, economics, livestock management practices and livestock health. The
201 geographic co-ordinates of the household were captured using a handheld GPS (Garmin eTrex,
202 Garmin Ltd, Olathe, Kansas, USA). Data collection took place between February and
203 December 2016.

Ethical approval

205 All participants provided written informed consent. The protocols, questionnaire tools and
206 consent and assent procedures were approved by the ethics review committees of the
207 Kilimanjaro Christian Medical Centre (KCMC/832) and National Institute of Medical Research
208 (NIMR/2028) in Tanzania, and in the UK by the ethics review committee of the College of
209 Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences at the University of Glasgow (39a/15). Approval for study
210 activities was also provided by the Tanzanian Commission for Science and Technology
211 (COSTECH) and by the Tanzanian Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries, as well as by regional,
212 district, ward and village-level authorities in the study area.

Classification of livestock production systems

214 We used a data-driven approach to classify households into livestock production systems,
215 which we define here as groups of households sharing the same or similar production
216 characteristics [41]. Classification followed two stages. First, we performed dimension reduction
217 using multiple factor analysis (MFA) on a selection of characteristics considered to represent
218 variation between livestock-keeping households in the study area. Second, hierarchical cluster
219 analysis (HCA) was performed on the output from the MFA (i.e. on a set of uncorrelated
220 variables) with households grouped such that the within-group variability in household
221 characteristics was minimized while between-group variability was maximized. The resulting
222 clusters of households were interpreted to represent distinct and distinguishable livestock
223 production system categories present in the study area at the time of the study.

6

Dimension reduction by Multiple Factor Analysis (MFA)

Dimension reduction allows the variability among a set of potentially correlated variables to be represented in terms of a smaller, more parsimonious set of uncorrelated variables. Multiple factor analysis provides a dimension reduction approach for a set of variables describing categorical or continuous data that can be grouped in a meaningful way [42]. Eight groups of variables representing the characteristics of livestock keeping households in northern Tanzania were identified for use in the MFA procedure. The variable groupings (or domains) were: 1. Local household environment; 2. Household demographics; 3. Crop agriculture; 4. Numbers of cattle, sheep and goats owned; 5. Other livestock owned; 6. Livestock management practices; 7. Household food consumption practices; and 8. Indicators of household vulnerability. The variables comprising each of these domains are shown in Table 1. The MFA was performed in R using the *FactoMineR* package [43]. Data for household characteristics were derived from the household questionnaire (domains 2 to 8) or from data extracted at the household level within a geographic information system (QGIS, version 2.14.3) from publicly available environmental datasets (domain 1). Details on the source of environmental data and the questions asked at the household level are provided in the Supplementary Materials. Up to a maximum of 5% missing-ness was present in around 20% of variables. Imputation of missing values was performed using a regularized iterative MFA algorithm in the *missMDA* package [44] in R. Continuous variables (Domains 1 and 4) with obvious right skew were transformed using a natural logarithm. All continuous variables were scaled to have a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one before performing the MFA.

Hierarchical cluster analysis (HCA)

Households were classified into clusters using HCA on the factors (i.e. the set of uncorrelated variables) derived from the MFA. To select which factors to include in the HCA, eigenvalues associated with each factor (describing how much variance is explained) were identified as 'large' or 'small' based on the presence of a natural break when consecutive eigenvalues were plotted on a scree plot [41]. All factors associated with 'large' eigenvalues were included in the clustering procedure. Ward's minimum variance criteria were used to derive clusters, with no specification of the number of clusters made *a priori*. Hierarchical cluster analysis was performed using the *FactoMineR* package [43] in R. The average value of each household characteristic in each of the resulting clusters was compared to the global mean for that characteristic using the v-test [45]. A v-test value greater than 1.96 provides evidence (i.e. p-value <0.05) for a difference in the mean of the variable in the cluster when compared to the population mean.

262   **Table 1.** Domains and contributing variables for the multiple factor analysis to classify livestock-

263   keeping households into production systems in northern Tanzania.

264

Domain	Variable	Domain	Variable
1. Environment[1]	Average vegetation cover	4. Livestock	Number of cattle
	Distance to main road (km)		Number of goats
	Travel time to market centre (hours)		Number of sheep
	Annual precipitation (mm)	5. Livestock type	Own pigs
	Average annual temperature (°C)		Own donkeys
	Maximum slope (degrees)		Own chickens
	Local cropland cover (%)		Own exotic breed cattle
	Local grassland cover (%)		Own exotic breed small ruminants
	Local forest cover (%)	6. Management	Cattle transhumance
	Local human population density (km^2)		Small stock transhumance
	Area of village (decimal degrees^2)		Graze cattle with small stock
	Local cattle population density (km^2)		Zero graze cattle
	Local sheep population density (km^2)		Zero graze small stock
	Local goat population density (km^2)		Tether cattle
	Local chicken population density (km^2)		Tether small stock
	Local pig population density (km^2)		Vaccinate against any disease
2. Household	Sex of household head		Sell milk
	Maasai ethnicity (household head)	7. Consumption	Consumed meat in past 3 days
	Arusha ethnicity (household head)		Consumed dairy
	Meru ethnicity (household head)		Consumed blood
	Iraqw ethnicity (household head)		Consumed vegetables
	Barabaig ethnicity (household head)		Consumed legumes
	Nyaturu ethnicity (household head)		Consumed fat
	Household head completed primary school		Consumed fish
	Government title for land		Consumed poultry
	Has latrine		Consumed root vegetables
	Treat drinking water (including boiling)		Consumed eggs
3. Crops	Growing crops > 10 years		Consumed any animal source food
	Grow no crops	8. Vulnerability	Hunger in past 12 months
	Grow beans		Illness in past 12 months
	Grow cowpeas		Illness in livestock in past 12 months
	Grow maize		Crop losses in past 12 months
	Grow millet		Livestock losses in past 12 months
	Grow onions		Land losses in past 12 months
	Grow potato		
	Grow sesame		
	Grow sorghum		
	Grow sunflower		
	Grow wheat		
	Supplies of staple crops last 6 months or more		
	Own plough		
	Sell crops		

265

266   [1] Detail on spatial datasets used given in the supplementary materials

267

268

269

8

Results

Household survey data were collected from 404 households. The median (range) number of households interviewed per village was 19 (7, 30). Summary statistics for the household characteristics in each domain are given in Table 2 and 3.

Multiple factor analysis

The percent contribution of each domain to explaining variation between households for the first two factors derived from the MFA is shown in Figure 2. The first factor (i.e. Dimension 1) explained 14.1% of the total variation, the second factor (Dimension 2) explained 6.3%, with all remaining factors each explaining less than 5%. The percent contribution to the inertia of the first factor was highest for Groups 1 (environment), 3 (crops), and 6 (livestock management) (Figure 2), reflecting the relative importance of these domains in explaining between-household variation.

Figure 2. Percent contribution of each group to the first (dimension 1) and second (dimension 2) factors derived from MFA performed on characteristics of livestock-keeping households in northern Tanzania. Red (blue) dotted line represents the expected score if all domains contributed equally to the inertia on the first (second) factor (i.e. 100/8 = 12.5%).

Figure 3 shows the scores of those variables that made a contribution to the inertia of the first factor of greater than 1%. The average (median) contribution for included variables was 0.6% (0.2). The four categorical variables making the greatest overall contribution to the first factor were Maasai ethnicity of the household head (4.5%), not keeping donkeys (3.8%), engaging in cattle transhumance (3.4%), and engaging in small ruminant transhumance (3.2%). For the continuous characteristics, the top four variables were number of goats owned by a household (3.9%), number of cattle (3.0%), geographic area of village (2.5%), and human population density (2.5%). A full breakdown of all variable scores and their contributions to the first and second factors is given in the Supplementary Materials.

Figure 3. Variable scores in relation to the first and second factors derived from MFA performed on characteristics of livestock keeping households in northern Tanzania. Scores given to categorical (continuous) variables are shown in red (blue).

Categorical (1 indicates presence of described characteristic; 0 indicates absence)**: CAT** = Keep cattle; **CH** = Keep chickens; **CR** = Household grows crops; **CRT** = Grow crops for > 10 years; **DO** = Keep donkeys; **ED** = Household education to primary school or above; **FI** = Household consumed fish in past 3 days; **GCSM** = Graze cattle with small ruminants; **IR** = Iraqw ethnicity; **LA** = Latrine in household; **ME** = Meru ethnicity; **MA** = Maasai ethnicity; **MAI** = Grow maize; **PI** = Keep pigs; **SMT** = Small ruminant transhumance; **VE** = Household consumed vegetables in past 3 days; **ZGCA** = Zero graze cattle; **ZGSM** = Zero graze small ruminants. *Continuous*: **AR** = Village area; **CD** = Cattle density; **CHD** = Chicken density; **CN** = Household cattle number; **CR** = Local cropland % cover; **EV** = Enhanced vegetation index; **GD** = Goat density; **GN** = Household goat number; **GR** = Local grassland % cover; **PID** = Pig density; **POD** = Human population density; **RA** = Annual precipitation; **SD** = Sheep density; **SN** = Household sheep number

312   Some clustering in scores of the categorical variables derived from the MFA is visually apparent
313   in Figure 3. This includes the grouping of scores for variables such as Maasai-headed
314   households, households that do not grow crops, or which have not been growing crops for more
315   than 10 years, households engaging in cattle and small ruminant transhumance, households
316   keeping donkeys but not chickens, and households without a latrine or in which the head does
317   not have primary education clustering around negative values for Factor 1 (i.e. Dimension 1)
318   and low negative and positive values on Factor 2 (Dimension 2). Scores for variables such as
319   not engaging in transhumance, owning a latrine, some formal education of the household head,
320   not owning a donkey, and grazing cattle with small ruminants tended to cluster around positive
321   values for Factor 1 and low negative and positive values for Factor 2. There was a smaller
322   cluster of scores for Iraqw-headed and pig-keeping households around positive values on
323   Factor 1 and negative values on Factor 2, and a cluster of scores for Meru-headed and zero
324   grazing households around positive values for Factor 1 and 2.

325   **Hierarchical cluster analysis**

326   The HCA procedure resulted in three distinct clusters. The overall score on Factor 1 and 2 for
327   study households and their membership of each cluster is shown in Figure 4. On the basis of
328   the scree plot, the first five factors were included in the clustering procedure (see
329   Supplementary Materials). The composition of each cluster in terms of continuous
330   characteristics is described in Table 2 and in terms of categorical characteristics in Table 3. All
331   continuous and categorical variables had a v-test score of greater than 1.96. The major
332   differences in household characteristics between clusters can be summarised as:

333   **Cluster 1**: Households in this cluster were characterised as being in areas with low average
334   vegetation cover, having low levels of annual rainfall, low maximum slope (i.e., being relatively
335   flat), low proportions of crop and forest land cover, and low population densities of both people
336   and livestock. Cluster 1 households tended to be far from a main road and to have high average
337   travel time to a market centre. Annual temperature, village area, and proportion of local
338   grassland cover tended to be higher than for households in other clusters. Households in this
339   cluster had the largest average herd sizes for cattle, sheep, and goats, and were typically
340   headed by individuals with Maasai ethnicity, with 152 (91.6%) of 166 Maasai-headed
341   households being found in this cluster. Other ethnicities found in this cluster included 12
342   (14.6%) of all 82 Arusha-headed households, 5 (63%) of the 8 Barabaig-headed households,
343   and 1 (50%) of 2 Datoga-headed households. The majority of household heads in this cluster
344   were without formal education beyond primary school and the proportion of households with a
345   latrine was substantially lower than in the other two clusters. The majority of households
346   reported growing crops in the past year, although this proportion was lower than in the other
347   two clusters. Households growing onions were only found in this cluster. A relatively small
348   proportion of households reported growing millet, sesame, or sunflower. A number of livestock
349   management practices were commonly reported in this cluster, with households more
350   commonly reporting transhumance for both cattle and small ruminants and using livestock

351 vaccination in the past 12 months than households in the other two clusters. No households in
352 this cluster reported zero grazing or using tethered grazing for cattle or small ruminants. No
353 households in this cluster reported keeping pigs, but they commonly kept donkeys. Consuming
354 meat in the past three days was commonly reported in this cluster. Household-level reports of
355 illness in livestock and people, and reports of any livestock losses through mortality were also
356 most common from households in this cluster. These reports were not adjusted for the number
357 of people in a household or number of animals owned, the latter of which was highest in this
358 cluster for all livestock species.

359 **Cluster 2:** Households in this cluster typically had heads of Arusha and Iraqw ethnicity,
360 including 67 (81.7%) out of 82 and 85 (90.4%) out of 94 of all households with heads with those
361 ethnicities, respectively. Other ethnicities making up this cluster included 9 (5.4%) of the 166
362 Maasai-headed households, 3 (38%) out of 8 Barabaig-headed households, 1 out of 2 Datoga-
363 headed households, 2 (6.3%) out of 32 Meru-headed households, 1 out of 2 Nyiramba-headed
364 households and 2 (22.2%) out of 9 Nyaturu-headed households. All of the Burunge- (1), Luguru-
365 (1), Rangi- (1), Sandawe- (3), and Sukuma- (1) headed households were in this cluster.

366 The mean, median and percentage values of most contributing variables in this cluster of
367 households tended to fall between those for Clusters 1 and 3, with some exceptions. This
368 cluster of households tended to be in areas with higher average vegetation cover and higher
369 average proportion of local forest cover than those in Clusters 1 and 3. Households in this
370 cluster were less likely than those in the other two clusters to have a government title for their
371 land. Most households in this cluster reported growing crops in the past 12 months, with
372 households growing cowpeas, millet, sesame, sorghum, and wheat most likely to be found in
373 this cluster, as were households owning pigs and co-grazing cattle with small stock. Levels of
374 livestock vaccination against any disease were lowest in this cluster. Households in this cluster
375 were found in areas with the highest median pig population density. They were least likely to
376 report consuming meat over the past 3 days. This was the largest cluster (Table 2).

377 **Cluster 3**: Households in this cluster tended to be closer to a main road and to have lower time
378 to travel to a market centre than those in the other two clusters. They were in areas with
379 relatively high annual rainfall, were most likely to be surrounded by cropland and least likely to
380 be surrounded by grassland. Households in this cluster tended to be found in areas with the
381 highest human, cattle, sheep, goat, and chicken population densities. They had the smallest
382 cattle herd and goat flock sizes, but with average and median sheep flock sizes broadly
383 equivalent with those in Cluster 2. Household heads in this cluster were most likely to be Meru
384 ethnicity, including 30 (94%) out of all 32 Meru-headed households. Eight (8.5%) out of the 94
385 Iraqw-headed households, 5 (3.0%) out of the 166 Maasai-, 1 out of 2 Nyiramba-, and 7 (77.8%)
386 out of 9 Nyaturu-headed households were also in this cluster. All of the Hehe- (1) and Chagga-
387 (1) headed households were in this cluster. The proportion of households with heads with at
388 least primary school education was highest in this cluster, as was the proportion of households
389 with a latrine. The majority of households in the cluster reported growing crops, with the

11

390   proportion of households growing beans, potatoes, sunflower and owning their own plough and

391   reporting selling crops highest in this cluster. Relatively few households in this cluster reported

392   owning donkeys. Ownership of exotic breed cattle and small ruminants was more commonly

393   reported than in the other two clusters. No households in this cluster reported engaging in

394   transhumance. Zero grazing cattle and small stock was common, as was tethering livestock for

395   grazing. Households in this cluster most commonly reported consuming fish in the past three

396   days. They were least likely to report hunger, illness in people or livestock, deaths in livestock,

397   crop losses or land loss over the past 12 months. This was the smallest cluster (Table 2).

398   The proportion of households in each village assigned to each of these three clusters is shown

399   in Figure 5. In seven villages, all households were members of Cluster 1; in three villages, all

400   households were members of Cluster 2; and in one village, all households were members of

401   Cluster 3. The remaining 10 study villages comprised a mixture of households from different

402   clusters. Two villages had a mixture of households from all three clusters. When household

403   cluster membership was compared to 'pastoral' village membership from the study design

404   stage, 170 (82.9%) households in pastoral villages were in Cluster 1, 34 (16.6%) were in Cluster

405   2 and 1 (0.5%) was in Cluster 3. When compared to households in 'mixed' villages, 1 (0.5%)

406   was in Cluster 1, 143 (71.9%) were in Cluster 2 and 55 (27.6%) were in Cluster 3.

407

408   **Figure 4.** Position of households on the first and second factors (Dimension 1 and 2) derived

409   from the MFA performed on characteristics of livestock keeping households in northern

410   Tanzania. Households are shaded based on cluster membership.

411

412   **Figure 5.** Proportion of households in study villages assigned to each livestock production

413   cluster in northern Tanzania in 2016.

414

415   **Table 2.** Mean values for continuous variables for households within clusters derived from

416   hierarchical cluster analysis performed on livestock-keeping households in northern Tanzania

417   (median values are given in square brackets).

418

Domains	Variable	Mean [Median]			
		Overall (n = 404)	Cluster 1 (n = 171)	Cluster 2 (n = 177)	Cluster 3 (n = 56)
Location	Average annual vegetation cover	0.26 [0.27]	0.23 [0.23]	0.29 [0.29]	0.27 [0.28]
	Distance to main road (km)	36.2 [32.6]	47.8 [10.3]	24.8 [9.4]	7.3 [8.4]
	Time to travel to market centre (hours)	5.4 [3.6]	6.4 [4.6]	5.3 [3.4]	2.6 [1.2]
	Total annual precipitation (mm)	830.4 [818]	742.2 [741]	865.6 [831]	989.9 [912]
	Average annual temperature (°C)	19.3 [19.3]	20.2 [20.0]	18.6 [18.0]	18.6 [18.6]
	Maximum slope (degrees)	3.7 [2.8]	2.2 [1.5]	4.5 [3.3]	4.4 [4.0]
	Local crop land cover (%)	37.6 [25.7]	9.5 [0.00]	51.8 [49.7]	78.3 [92.2]
	Local grassland cover (%)	46.1 [43.1]	73.3 [89.5]	31.1 [24.8]	10.53 [1.2]
	Local forest cover (%)	1.1 [1.3]	9.01 [0.14]	14.29 [5.4]	8.03 [0.58]
	Local human population density (km^2)	1.41 [0.70]	0.32 [0.17]	1.28 [1.1]	4.72 [1.1]
	Area of village (decimal degrees^2)	1.8 [0.01]	0.03 [0.03]	0.01 [0.00]	0.00 [0.00]
	Local cattle density (km^2)	125.7 [0.90]	2.4 [0.45]	39.5 [9.7]	784.3 [80.8]

	Local sheep density (km^2)	95.4 [4.6]	3.16 [2.7]	10.31 [10.4]	654.69 [17.1]
	Local goat density (km^2)	61.6 [1.7]	2.6 [1.27]	17.5 [5.8]	385.4 [41.7]
	Local chicken density (km^2)	159.9 [9.4]	4.9 [3.04]	42.7 [13.3]	1015 [155.0]
	Local pig density (km^2)	2.0 [0.1]	0.10 [0.02]	1.1 [0.21]	11.2 [0.09]
Livestock	Number cattle	49.6 [10.0]	104.5 [50.0]	10.3 [8.0]	6.5 [5.5]
	Number goats	52.6 [15.0]	107.9 [50.0]	13.6 [8.0]	6.4 [4.5]
	Number sheep	50.0 [10.0]	105.5 [42.0]	8.4 [4.0]	8.8 [3.5]

419

420

421   **Table 3.** Percentages of households reporting variable presence in clusters derived from

422   hierarchical cluster analysis performed on livestock-keeping households in northern Tanzania.

423

		Percentage of households reporting variable presence			
Category	**Variable**	**Overall[1]** (n = 404)	**Cluster 1** (n = 171)	**Cluster 2** (n = 177)	**Cluster 3** (n = 56)
Household	Household head male	92.3 (89.2 – 94.6)	94.7	92.1	85.7
	Maasai ethnicity	41.1 (36.2 – 46.1)	88.9	5.1	8.9
	Arusha ethnicity	20.3 (16.5 – 24.6)	7.0	37.9	5.4
	WaMeru ethnicity	7.9 (5.6 – 11.1)	0.0	1.1	53.6
	Iraqw ethnicity	23.3 (19.3 – 27.8)	0.0	48.0	14.3
	Barabaig ethnicity	2.0 (0.9 – 4.0)	2.9	1.7	0
	Nyaturu ethnicity	2.2 (1.1 – 4.3)	0.0	1.1	12.5
	Head complete primary school	49.3 (44.3 – 54.2)	26.9	59.9	83.9
	Government title for land	4.0 (2.4 – 6.5)	3.5	0.0	16.1
	Latrine ownership	67.6 (62.7 – 72.1)	35.1	89.8	96.4
	Treat drinking water	28.0 (23.7 – 32.7)	26.3	29.9	26.8
Crops	Growing crops > 10 years	71.8 (67.1 – 76.1)	48.0	89.8	87.5
	Grow no crops	12.9 (9.8 – 16.6)	26.9	1.7	5.4
	Grow beans	60.6 (55.7 – 65.4)	49.1	65.5	80.4
	Grow cowpeas	5.9 (3.9 – 8.8)	1.8	10.7	3.6
	Grow maize	78.7 (74.3 – 82.5)	58.5	94.4	91.1
	Grow millet	7.7 (5.4 – 10.8)	1.8	14.7	3.6
	Grow onions	5.9 (3.9 – 8.8)	14.0	0.0	0.0
	Grow potato	4.7 (2.9 – 7.4)	0.6	6.7	10.7
	Grow sesame	3.2 (1.8 – 5.6)	0.6	6.2	1.8
	Grow sorghum	3.0 (1.6 – 5.3)	0.6	6.2	0.0
	Grow sunflower	9.4 (6.8 – 12.8)	1.8	14.1	17.9
	Grow wheat	3.0 (1.6 – 5.3)	0.0	6.8	0.0
	Staple crops last $\geq$ 6 months	59.6 (54.6 – 64.4)	42.0	73.3	69.6
	Own plough	41.8 (37.0 – 46.8)	28.1	48.0	64.3
	Sell crops	36.6 (31.9 – 41.6)	29.8	39.5	48.2
Livestock Type	Pigs	12.6 (9.6 – 16.4)	0.0	28.2	1.8
	Donkeys	57.7 (52.7 – 62.5)	86.0	41.2	23.2
	Chickens	85.9 (82.0 – 89.1)	76.6	93.2	91.1
	European breed cattle	2.7 (1.4 – 5.0)	2.9	0.0	10.7
	European breed small stock	2.2 (1.1 – 4.3)	2.4	0.0	8.9
Management	Cattle transhumance	37.8 (32.9 – 42.8)	76.7	13.1	0.0
	Small stock transhumance	27.3 (22.9 – 32.1)	59.7	5.6	0.0
	Graze cattle with small stock	25.0 (20.9 – 29.6)	5.8	42.3	28.6
	Zero graze cattle	10.2 (7.5 – 13.6)	0.0	0.1	71.4
	Zero graze small stock	9.2 (6.6 – 12.5)	0.0	0.6	64.3
	Tether cattle	4.7 (2.9 – 7.4)	0.0	4.0	21.4
	Tether small stock	5.0 (3.1 – 7.7)	0.0	5.1	19.6
	Vaccinate against any disease	23.4 (19.4 – 28.0)	38.0	11.3	16.3
	Sell milk	15.1 (11.8 – 19.1)	16.4	7.3	35.7

Consumption	Meat	54.2 (49.2 – 59.1)	75.3	35.0	58.9
	Dairy	71.5 (66.8 – 75.8)	73.7	72.3	62.5
	Blood	6.7 (4.5 – 9.7)	11.7	2.3	5.4
	Vegetables	69.8 (65.0 – 74.2)	48.0	83.6	92.9
	Legumes	66.3 (61.4 – 70.9)	60.2	70.1	73.2
	Fats	55.0 (50.0 – 59.0)	55.0	56.5	50.0
	Fish	11.1 (8.3 – 14.7)	2.3	10.2	41.1
	Poultry	15.1 (11.8 – 19.1)	9.9	16.4	26.8
	Root vegetables	28.7 (24.2 – 33.4)	19.9	31.6	46.4
	Eggs	21.5 (17.7 – 25.9)	12.3	25.4	37.5
	Any animal source food	89.4 (85.8 – 92.1)	91.8	85.9	92.9
Vulnerability	Hunger	45.0 (40.1 – 50.0)	48.5	50.8	16.1
	Illness in people	60.9 (55.9 – 65.6)	74.3	61.0	19.6
	Illness in livestock	54.7 (49.7 – 59.6)	67.8	53.7	17.9
	Crop losses	34.9 (30.3 – 39.8)	34.5	40.1	19.6
	Livestock losses	41.6 (36.8 – 46.6)	58.5	36.7	5.4
	Land losses	27.5 (23.2 – 32.1)	31.0	31.1	5.4

424

425 [1] 95% confidence interval given in brackets

426

427 **Discussion**

428 Our data analysis identified three clusters of households representing three distinct livestock

429 production systems. The ethnic and production characteristics of these household clusters fit

430 closely into the three traditional typologies of livestock production in northern Tanzania. These

431 are pastoral (cluster 1), agro-pastoral (cluster 2) and smallholder (cluster 3) production

432 systems. Our principal findings are therefore that the traditional livestock production systems

433 that have existed in northern Tanzania for centuries continue to persist in the region, and that

434 the analytical methods used herein complement more qualitative data categorization methods.

435 While we find no evidence that new typologies of livestock production have emerged, there

436 have been changes in production practices within existing systems. Our findings also reveal

437 heterogeneity in a range of indicators of vulnerability between different production systems that

438 point to inequalities in household health and welfare in northern Tanzania.

439 There has been a tendency, particularly reflected in livestock and land use policies, for pastoral

440 communities to be viewed as static and resistant to change [46]. In reality, pastoral production

441 systems are characterized by their ability to respond to highly changeable environments [47].

442 Here, we reveal widespread adoption of non-traditional forms of production within this system,

443 most notably the fact that around three quarters of pastoral households reported performing

444 crop agriculture over the preceding 12 months. Although crop agriculture has had an often

445 under-appreciated role in East Africa pastoral livelihoods [22], the frequency with which crop

446 agriculture was reported among pastoral households in this survey reflects a major shift in

447 livelihoods, particularly for the Maasai [20,21]. An important driver for this change is likely to be

448 the need to achieve greater food security as access to grazing lands declines, as well as to

449 increase the security of land tenure, and provide access to additional sources of cash through

14

450   the sale of crops such as maize and beans, the main crops reported to be grown by households
451   in this group.

452   Mobility has also often been considered to be a defining characteristic of pastoral households
453   [26]. It is therefore notable that over a quarter of cattle-keeping households in this cluster
454   reported having not used transhumant grazing movements for cattle in the past 12 months, and
455   more than one third of small ruminant keeping households of not using these movements for
456   sheep or goats. It is well known that pastoral communities are undergoing rapid demographic,
457   social, and economic shifts that are likely to influence practices around transhumance [48]. In
458   particular, long-distance livestock movements that have traditionally been a response to
459   variable grass and water availability have become increasingly difficult as a result of competing
460   pressures on traditional grazing lands, including enclosure of previously communal land,
461   conversion to crop lands, and for conservation [14,49-52]. It has also been argued that the rise
462   of cultivation within pastoral systems may lead to reduced mobility and progression towards
463   more sedentary systems in which livestock and crop agriculture are more closely integrated
464   [53]. The impacts of restricted grazing and sedenterisation of pastoral communities have also
465   been associated with declines in herd sizes in pastoral communities in other settings [54,55].

466   While our findings suggest the persistence of distinct pastoral and agro-pastoral livestock
467   production systems in northern Tanzania, the ongoing 'squeeze' on rangeland access
468   combined with growing populations is likely to lead to increasing overlaps in livestock
469   production practices between these systems [47,56]. Strengthening extension services and the
470   promotion of participatory initiatives that can support crop production in communities in which
471   the cultural traditions of agriculture are relatively weak may be beneficial. It is notable, for
472   example, that a very small proportion of pastoral households report growing indigenous crops
473   such as sorghum or millet, which have relatively lower water requirements than introduced
474   maize, and may represent less risky crop choices in dryland areas [57,58].

475   As livelihood transitions occur, it is also important to note that increasing reliance on crop
476   agriculture in pastoral households can result in greater work for children, who may be expected
477   to herd animals as well as work in fields, as well as for women, who perform most agricultural
478   work in Maasai communities [52]. In addition, there is often limited integration of crop and
479   livestock production in pastoral households, such as through the use of manure as fertiliser
480   [47]. Unsustainable farming practices in combination with the common pastoral imperative to
481   maximize herd sizes may also contribute to further rangeland declines if profits from agriculture
482   are invested in additional livestock [4,47,59].

483   We find that livestock production systems in northern Tanzania are still strongly linked to
484   ethnicity, but that these linkages are not absolute. For example, almost half of the Barabaig
485   households in our sample were classified as being in the agro-pastoral livestock production
486   system. This relatively small group of traditionally pastoral people is known to have been highly
487   impacted by previous conversion of rangeland areas to commercial crop agriculture [60]. The

15

488   long-term impacts of these changes have been infrequently assessed, but the results of our
489   small sample of Barabaig-headed households may point to important changes in livelihood
490   profiles away from pastoralism and towards agro-pastoralism. These changes may provide a
491   model for a similar process underway in Maasai households. It is also striking that almost 10%
492   of smallholder households were headed by people of Maasai ethnicity. Hence, modern Maasai
493   households should be considered to include both pastoral and smallholder farmers, as well as
494   those engaging in a wide range of non-livestock based livelihoods not considered here [61].

495   A notable finding in our study is the diversity of livestock production systems found within single
496   villages. In many systems, be they social, ecological, or economic, increasing diversity tends
497   to be correlated with increased resilience to a range of hazards [62]. It has been argued that
498   the same is true of socio-ecological systems that are centred around livestock production [63].
499   For example, households that rear cattle, which are grazers, together with goats, which are
500   browsers, enables the maximisation of livestock productivity under a range of environmental
501   circumstances [63-65]. When systems of reciprocity within a single community are strong,
502   multiple livestock-based livelihood strategies that allow different responses to hazards, such as
503   drought or restrictive policies, might contribute to reducing the vulnerability of the whole
504   community in a similar way. Systems of reciprocity have traditionally been an important feature
505   of pastoral, agro-pastoral and smallholder production systems in northern Tanzania [66-68].
506   Such systems have been substantially eroded in recent times [14,69], and the extent to which
507   they exist within administrative areas (such as villages) in which substantial diversity in livestock
508   production typologies exist would be a valuable area for future research.

509   Our work reveals that the around half of all households reported hunger over the past 12
510   months in both pastoral and agro-pastoral production systems. While the proportion of pastoral
511   households reporting consuming red meat, milk products, and blood over the past three days
512   was equivalent to the other production systems, the proportion of households reporting
513   consumption of vegetables, legumes, fish, eggs, and poultry was considerably lower. Dietary
514   diversity has been strongly linked to food security [70] and to nutritional adequacy [71].
515   Household crop diversity was also low in all production systems, with maize and beans as the
516   main crops grown. The production of a multiple crop types has been linked with lower levels of
517   poverty [72,73].

518   The proportion of households with a government title for land was very low in all systems, and
519   zero in the case of agro-pastoral households. One third of households in this group also report
520   land losses in the past 12 months. Land insecurity is strongly linked to poverty vulnerability and
521   can be expected to become an increasing issue with population growth in the region [49]. Efforts
522   in pastoral communities have been made by local non-governmental organisations to facilitate
523   the securing of land titles and land rights, but to mixed effect [34]. Household-level latrine
524   ownership and the education of the household head were considerably less common in pastoral
525   households than in the other production systems. These indicators of household
526   socioeconomic status have been strongly linked to human infectious disease risk [74] and

527   childhood nutrition [75-77] in other settings. In many pastoral communities, sedentarisation has

528   been associated with negative nutritional and health consequences, despite often improved

529   access to services [78].

530   The smallholder production system had the lowest proportion of households reporting hunger,

531   illness in people or livestock, livestock or crop losses or land losses. This group also tended to

532   report the widest diversity of food consumption and had the highest level of household head

533   education and latrine ownership. While we did not collect detailed data on household inputs as

534   part of this study, smallholder systems in northern Tanzania have historically represented very

535   high levels of agricultural intensification [23]. The apparent resilience (or lower levels of

536   vulnerability) of households within this system support links between agricultural intensification

537   and prosperity [56], although this group was found in peri-urban areas and are therefore also

538   likely to benefit from greater access to extension and other services, as well as non-agricultural

539   sources of income that were not recorded here. Smallholder systems are often a focus for

540   development interventions in the livestock sector in sub-Saharan Africa [80]. However, based

541   on the indicators of vulnerability explored in this study, and given scarce resources, livestock-

542   keeping households in agro-pastoral and pastoral settings in northern Tanzania appear to be

543   in greater need of support in poverty alleviation.

544   A number of limitations should be considered when interpreting our findings. Households were

545   selected from a limited number of villages, and villages in urban areas were excluded from the

546   sampling procedure. Livestock production occurs in urban areas of Tanzania and tends to be

547   characterised by small scale, intensive zero-grazing production of cattle and small ruminants

548   that could be expected to fall into the smallholder classification. The proportion of households

549   that were categorised as smallholder was smaller than those in the other systems. With a larger

550   sample, greater diversity within the smallholder system may have emerged, potentially

551   including the classification of distinct typologies. In particular, while zero grazing practices were

552   common in the smallholder system, relatively few households reported ownership of European

553   breed dairy cattle or the sale of milk. Hence, greater sampling in smallholder settings, including

554   in villages classified as 'urban' may have revealed a distinct typology involving high yielding

555   European breed cattle kept exclusively for commercial purposes. In addition, we collected only

556   limited information on household livelihood activities outside of crop and livestock production,

557   or the relative contribution of each to household revenues. While we included a wide range of

558   household level characteristics, and the resulting clusters reflect expected and sensible

559   groupings of livestock-keeping households with these characteristics in this region of Tanzania,

560   dimension reduction and hierarchical clustering approaches are sensitive to input data. We

561   therefore cannot rule out that the inclusion of a wider range of household level variables than

562   were available to us may have resulted in a different number of clusters, or clusters with

563   different general characteristics. A further limitation is that all livestock keeping households

564   included in this study were those who attended the central point sampling event. There is

565   therefore the potential for selection bias if characteristics of households made them more or

566   less likely to attend with their animals. This may be particularly important for those households

567   in the smallholder sector, where zero-grazing (i.e. continual housing) of animals was most

568   commonly reported. Finally, while not necessarily a limitation, we would caution that the

569   production systems we describe here represent those in northern Tanzania, and "smallholders",

570   "agro-pastoralists" and "pastoralists" may have different characteristics in other parts of the

571   country and internationally. Future studies that use a similar approach to that described here

572   to classify livestock production systems in other geographic areas would provide further

573   understanding of the diversity of livestock production that exists in Tanzania.

574   Previously reported classification systems have commonly used knowledge-based systems,

575   such as expert opinion, in order to classify large geographic areas according to the dominant

576   livestock production system [4,30,81-84]. The resulting classification systems have made

577   important contributions to priority-setting, but their regional, continental or global focus has

578   meant that they typically have limited resolution at smaller spatial scales. Here we show that

579   data-driven approaches performed on the types of data variables that are commonly collected

580   in questionnaire-based surveys, can provide a valuable tool with which to characterise and

581   classify livestock keeping households. We show that such an approach can allow the diversity

582   of livestock production that can exist within small areas, including within a single village, to be

583   described.

584   **Acknowledgements**

590   **References**

591   1.   Covarrubias K, Nsiima L, Zezza A. Livestock and livelihoods in rural Tanzania: a
592   descriptive analysis of the 2009 National Panel Survey. Joint Paper of the World Bank,
593   FAO, AU-IBAR, ILRI and the Tanzanian Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries
594   Development; 2012.

595   2.   Herrero M, Grace D, Njuki J, Johnson N, Enahoro D, Silvestri S, et al. The roles of
596   livestock in developing countries. Animal. 2013;7 Suppl 1: 3–18.
597   doi:10.1017/S1751731112001954

598   3.   Ogola J, Fèvre EM, Gitau GK, Christley R, Muchemi G, de Glanville WA. The topology
599   of between-herd cattle contacts in a mixed farming production system in western
600   Kenya. Prev Vet Med. 2018;158: 43–50. doi:10.1016/j.prevetmed.2018.06.010

601   4.   Jahnke HE. Livestock Production Systems and Livestock Development in Tropical
602   Africa. Kieler Wissenschaftsverlag Vauk. 273 pp. 1982.

603   5.   FAO. World Livestock: Transforming the livestock sector through the Sustainable
604   Development Goals. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Rome.
605   12 pp. 2018.

606   6.   Thornton PK. Livestock production: recent trends, future prospects. Philos Trans R
607   Soc Lond, B, Biol Sci. 2010;365: 2853–2867. doi:10.1098/rstb.2010.0134

608   7.   Shongwe ME, van Oldenborgh GJ, van den Hurk B, van Aalst M. Projected Changes
609   in Mean and Extreme Precipitation in Africa under Global Warming. Part II: East
610   Africa. Journal of Climate. 2011;24: 3718–3733. doi:10.1175/2010JCLI2883.1

611   8.   Ongoma V, Chen H, Gao C. Projected changes in mean rainfall and temperature over
612   East Africa based on CMIP5 models. International Journal of Climatology. 2018;38:
613   1375–1392. doi:10.1002/joc.5252

614   9.   Tierney JE, Ummenhofer CC, de Menocal PB. Past and future rainfall in the Horn of
615   Africa. Sci Adv. 2015;1: e1500682. doi:10.1126/sciadv.1500682

616   10.   Kihupi N, Tarimo A, Masika R, Boman B, Dick W. Trend of growing season
617   characteristics of semi-arid Arusha District in Tanzania. Journal of Agricultural
618   Science. 2015;7: 45–55.

619   11.   Goldman MJ, Riosmena F. Adaptive Capacity in Tanzanian Maasailand: Changing
620   strategies to cope with drought in fragmented landscapes. Global Environmental
621   Change. 2013;23: 588–597.

622   12.   Nyariki DM, W Mwang'ombe A, Thompson DM. Land-Use Change and Livestock
623   Production Challenges in an Integrated System: The Masai-Mara Ecosystem, Kenya.
624   Journal of Human Ecology. 2017;26: 163–173. doi:10.1080/09709274.2009.11906178

625   13.   Archambault CS. Re-creating the commons and re-configuring Maasai women's roles
626   on the rangelands in the face of fragmentation. International Journal of the Commons.
627   2016;10: 728–746.

628   14.   Lesorogol CK. Land Privatization and Pastoralist Well-being in Kenya. Development &
629   Change. 2008;39: 309–331. doi:10.1111/j.1467-7660.2007.00481.x

630   15.   Shiferaw B, Tesfaye K, Kassie M, Abate T, Prasanna BM, Menkir A. Managing
631   vulnerability to drought and enhancing livelihood resilience in sub-Saharan Africa:
632   Technological, institutional and policy options. High Level Meeting on National
633   Drought Policy. 2014;3: 67–79.

634   16.   Okello MM. Land Use Changes and Human–Wildlife Conflicts in the Amboseli Area,
635   Kenya. Human Dimensions of Wildlife. 2005;10: 19–28.
636   doi:10.1080/10871200590904851

637   17.   Kagunyu AW, Wanjohi J. Camel rearing replacing cattle production among the Borana
638   community in Isiolo County of Northern Kenya, as climate variability bites. Pastoralism.
639   2014;4: 13.

640   18.   Sperling L. The Adoption of camels by Samburu cattle herders. Nomad People. White
641   Horse Press; 1987: 1–17.

642   19.   Pretty J, Toulmin C, Williams S. Sustainable intensification in African agriculture.
643   International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability. 2011;9: 5–24.
644   doi:10.3763/ijas.2010.0583

645   20.   McCabe JT, Leslie PW, Deluca L. Adopting Cultivation to Remain Pastoralists: The
646   Diversification of Maasai Livelihoods in Northern Tanzania. Human Ecology. 2010;38:
647   321–334. doi:10.1007/s10745-010-9312-8

648   21.   McCabe JT. Sustainability and Livelihood Diversification among Maasai of Northern
649   Tanzania. Human Organization. 2003;62: 100–111.

19

650 22. Spear T, Waller R. Being Maasai: ethnicity and identity in East Africa. Ohio University
651   Press; 1993.

652 23. Spear T. Mountain farmers: moral economics of land and agricultural development in
653   Arusha and Meru. University of California Press, Berkeley; 1997. pp. 1–262.

654 24. Fernandes ECM, Oktingati J, Maghembe J. The Chagga homegardens: a multistoried
655   agroforestry cropping system on Mt. Kilimanjaro (Northern Tanzania). Agroforestry
656   Systems. 1984;2: 73–86.

657 25. Maro P. Population and land resources in northern Tanzania: the dynamics of change
658   1920 - 1970. PhD Thesis, Dept. of Geography, University of Minnesota. 1975.

659 26. Morton J, Meadows N. Pastoralism and Sustainable Livelihoods: An Emerging
660   Agenda. Policy Series 11. National Resources Institute, University of Greenwich, 56
661   pp.

662 27. Otte M, Chilonda P. Cattle and small ruminant production systems in sub-Saharan
663   Africa: a systematic review. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations,
664   Rome; 2002.

665 28. Ole Kuney RO. Pluralism and ethnic conflict in Tanzania's arid lands: the case of the
666   Maasai and the WaArusha. Nomad People. 1994; 95–107.

667 29. Robinson TP, Thornton PK, Franceschini G, Kruska RL, Chiozza F, Notenbaert A, et
668   al. Global livestock production systems. Rome, Food and Agriculture Organization of
669   the United Nations (FAO) and International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), 152
670   pp. 2011.

671 30. Steinfeld H, Wassenaar T, Jutzi S. Livestock production systems in developing
672   countries: status, drivers, trends. Rev Sci Tech. 2006;25: 505–516.

673 31. Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development. Livestock modernization initiative.
674   United Republic of Tanzania, Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development. 2015.

675 32. Debsu DN, Little PD, Tiki W, Guagliardo SAJ, Kitron U. Mobile phones for mobile
676   people: the role of information and communication technology (ICT) among livestock
677   traders and Borana pastoralists of southern Ethiopia. Nomad People. 2016;20: 35–61.

678 33. Schelling E, Wyss K, Diguimbaye C, Béchir M, Taleb MO, Bonfoh B, et al. Towards
679   Integrated and Adapted Health Services for Nomadic Pastoralists and their Animals: A
680   North–South Partnership. In: Hadorn GH, Hoffmann-Riem H, Biber-Klemm S,
681   Grossenbacher-Mansuy W, Joye D, Pohl C, et al., editors. Handbook of
682   Transdisciplinary Research. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands; 2008. pp. 277–291.

683 34. Goldman MJ, Davis A, Little J. Controlling land they call their own: access and
684   women's empowerment in Northern Tanzania. The Journal of Peasant Studies.
685   2015;43: 777–797. doi:10.1080/03066150.2015.1130701

686 35. National Bureau of Statistics. United Republic of Tanzania. National Sample Census
687   of Agriculture 2002/2003: Arusha Region. 2007.

688 36. National Bureau of Statistics. United Republic of Tanzania. National Sample Census
689   of Agriculture 2002/2003: Manyara Region. 2007.

690 37. Stevens DL, Olsen AR. Spatially Balanced Sampling of Natural Resources. J Am Stat
691   Assoc. 2004;99: 262–278.

692 38. Kincaid TM, Olsen AR. spsurvey: Spatial Survey Design and Analysis. R package
693   version 2.3. US Environmental Protection Agency. 2012.

694 39. Herzog CM, de Glanville WA, Willett BJ, Kibona TJ, Cattadori IM, Kapur V, et al.
695   Pastoral production is associated with increased peste des petits ruminants
696   seroprevalence in northern Tanzania across sheep, goats and cattle. Epidemiol Infect.
697   2019;147: e242. doi:10.1017/S0950268819001262

698 40. Semango G, Hamilton CM, Kreppel K, Katzer F, Kibona T, Lankester F, et al. The
699   Sero-epidemiology of Neospora caninum in Cattle in Northern Tanzania. Front Vet Sci.
700   2019;6: 1473. doi:10.3389/fvets.2019.00327

701 41. Costard S, Porphyre V, Messad S, Rakotondrahanta S, Vidon H, Roger F, et al.
702   Multivariate analysis of management and biosecurity practices in smallholder pig
703   farms in Madagascar. Prev Vet Med. 2009;92: 199–209.
704   doi:10.1016/j.prevetmed.2009.08.010

705 42. Abdi H, Williams LJ, Valentin D. Multiple factor analysis: principal component analysis
706   for multitable and multiblock data sets. Comp Stat. 2013;5: 149–179.

707 43. Le S, Josse J, Husson F. FactoMineR: An R Package for Multivariate Analysis. J Stat
708   Softw. 2008;25: 1–18.

709 44. Husson F, Josse J, Le S, J M. FactoMineR: Multivariate Exploratory Data Analysis and
710   Data Mining with R. R Package Version 1.25. http://CRAN.R-
711   project.org/package=FactoMineR. 2013.

712 45. Morineau A. Note sur la caracterisation statistique d'une classe et les valeurs tests.
713   Bull Techn Centre Statist Inform Appl. 1984; 9–12.

714 46. De Carvalho EC. "Traditional" and "Modern" Patterns of Cattle Raising in
715   Southwestern Angola: A Critical Evaluation of Change from Pastoralism to Ranching.
716   The Journal of Developing Areas. 1974;8: 199–226.

717 47. Conroy AB. Maasai oxen, agriculture and land use change in Monduli District,
718   Tanzania. PhD Thesis. University of New Hampshire. 2001.

719 48. Turner MD, Schlecht E. Livestock mobility in sub-Saharan Africa: A critical review.
720   Pastoralism. 2019;9: 13.

721 49. Little PD, McPeak J, Barrett CB, Kristjanson P. Challenging Orthodoxies:
722   Understanding Poverty in Pastoral Areas of East Africa. Development & Change.
723   2008;39: 587–611. doi:10.1111/j.1467-7660.2008.00497.x

724 50. Börjeson L, Hodgson DL, Yanda PZ. Northeast Tanzania's Disappearing Rangelands:
725   Historical Perspectives on Recent Land Use Change. The International Journal of
726   African Historical Studies. 2008;41: 523–556.

727 51. Shiferaw B, Tesfaye K, Kassie M, Abate T, Prasanna BM, Menkir A. Managing
728   vulnerability to drought and enhancing livelihood resilience in sub-Saharan Africa:
729   Technological, institutional and policy options. Weather and Climate Extremes.
730   2014;3: 67–79.

731 52. Archambault C. Re-creating the commons and re-configuring Maasai women's roles
732   on the rangelands in the face of fragmentation. International Journal of the Commons.
733   2016;10: 728–746.

734 53. Bourn D, Wint W. Livestock, land-use and agricultural intensification in sub-Saharan
735   Africa. London: Overseas Development Institute. 1994.

736 54. Tilahun M, Angassa A, Abebe A, Mengistu A. Perception and attitude of pastoralists
737   on the use and conservation of rangeland resources in Afar Region, Ethiopia.
738   Ecological Processes. 2016;5: 18.

739 55.   Kimiti KS, Western D, Mbau JS, Wasonga OV. Impacts of long-term land-use changes
740   on herd size and mobility among pastoral households in Amboseli ecosystem, Kenya.
741   Ecological Processes. 2018;7: 4.

742 56.   Boserup E. The Conditions of Agricultural Growth. Earthscan UK, Abingdon; 1965.

743 57.   Omoyo NN, Wakhungu J, Oteng'i S. Effects of climate variability on maize yield in the
744   arid and semi arid lands of lower eastern Kenya. Agriculture & Food Security. 2015;4:
745   8.

746 58.   Karanja DR, Githunguri CM, MRagwa L, Mulwa D, Mwiti S. Variety characteristics and
747   production guidelines of traditional food crops. Kenya Agricultural Research Institute.

748 59.   Wynants M, Kelly C, Mtei K, Munishi L, Patrick A, Rabinovich A, et al. Drivers of
749   increased soil erosion in East Africa's agro-pastoral systems: changing interactions
750   between the social, economic and natural domains. Regional Environmental Change.
751   2019;19: 1909–1921.

752 60.   Lane CR. Pastures lost: alienation of Barabaig land in the context of land policy and
753   legislation in Tanzania. Nomad People. 1994;: 81–94.

754 61.   Hauck S, Rubenstein DI. Pastoralist societies in flux: A conceptual framework analysis
755   of herding and land use among the Mukugodo Maasai of Kenya. Pastoralism. 2017;7:
756   18.

757 62.   Elmqvist T, Folke C, Nyström M, Peterson G, Bengtsson J, Walker B, et al. Response
758   diversity, ecosystem change, and resilience. Frontiers in Ecology and the
759   Environment. 2003;1: 488–494. doi:10.1890/1540-
760   9295(2003)001[0488:RDECAR]2.0.CO;2

761 63.   Leslie P, McCabe JT. Response Diversity and Resilience in Social-Ecological
762   Systems. Curr Anthropol. 2013;54: 114–143.

763 64.   Mace R, Houston A. Pastoralist strategies for survival in unpredictable environments:
764   A model of herd composition that maximises household viability. Agricultural Systems.
765   1989;31: 185–204.

766 65.   Little PD, Smith K, Cellarius BA, Coppock DL, Barrett C. Avoiding Disaster:
767   Diversification and Risk Management among East African Herders. Development &
768   Change. 2001;32: 401–433. doi:10.1111/1467-7660.00211

769 66.   Aktipis A, de Aguiar R, Flaherty A, Iyer P, Sonkoi D, Cronk L. Cooperation in an
770   Uncertain World: For the Maasai of East Africa, Need-Based Transfers Outperform
771   Account-Keeping in Volatile Environments. Human Ecology. 2016;44: 353–364.

772 67.   Howard M. Socio-economic causes and cultural explanations of childhood malnutrition
773   among the Chagga of Tanzania. Soc Sci Med. 1994;38: 239–251.

774 68.   Rekdal OB. Money, Milk and Sorghum Beer: Change and Continuity among the Iraqw
775   of Tanzania. Africa: Journal of the International African Institute. 1996;66: 367–385.

776 69.   Howard M. Socio-economic causes and cultural explanations of childhood malnutrition
777   among the Chagga of Tanzania. Soc Sci Med. 1994;38: 239–251.

778 70.   Schwei RJ, Tesfay H, Asfaw F, Jogo W, Busse H. Household dietary diversity, vitamin
779   A consumption and food security in rural Tigray, Ethiopia. Public Health Nutr. 2017;20:
780   1540–1547. doi:10.1017/S1368980017000350

781 71.   Arimond M, Ruel MT. Dietary Diversity Is Associated with Child Nutritional Status:
782   Evidence from 11 Demographic and Health Surveys. J Nutr. 2004;134: 2579–2585.

783   72.   Birthal PS, Roy D, Negi DS. Assessing the Impact of Crop Diversification on Farm
784   Poverty in India. World Development. 2015;72: 70–92.

785   73.   Ecker O. Agricultural transformation and food and nutrition security in Ghana: Does
786   farm production diversity (still) matter for household dietary diversity? Food Policy.
787   2018;79: 271–282.

788   74.   de Glanville WA, Thomas LF, Cook EAJ, Bronsvoort BM de C, Wamae NC, Kariuki S,
789   et al. Household socio-economic position and individual infectious disease risk in rural
790   Kenya. Sci Rep. 2019;9: 2972. doi:10.1038/s41598-019-39375-z

791   75.   Makoka D, Masibo PK. Is there a threshold level of maternal education sufficient to
792   reduce child undernutrition? Evidence from Malawi, Tanzania and Zimbabwe. BMC
793   Pediatr. 2015;15: 96. doi:10.1186/s12887-015-0406-8

794   76.   Wachs TD, Creed-Kanashiro H, Cueto S, Jacoby E. Maternal education and
795   intelligence predict offspring diet and nutritional status. J Nutr. 2005;135: 2179–2186.
796   doi:10.1093/jn/135.9.2179

797   77.   Boyle MH, Racine Y, Georgiades K, Snelling D, Hong S, Omariba W, et al. The
798   influence of economic development level, household wealth and maternal education
799   on child health in the developing world. Soc Sci Med. 2006;63: 2242–2254.
800   doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2006.04.034

801   78.   Roth EA, Fratkin E. The Social, Health and Economic Consequences of Pastoral
802   Sedentarization in Marsabit District, Northern Kenya. In: Fratkin E, Roth EA, editors.
803   As Pastoralists Settle: Social, Health and Economic Consequences of Pastoral
804   Sedentarization in Marsabit District, Kenya. Springer, Boston, MA; 2005. pp. 1–28.

805   79.   Vohland K, Barry B. A review of in situ rainwater harvesting (RWH) practices
806   modifying landscape functions in African drylands. Agriculture, Ecosystems and
807   Environment. 2009;131: 119–127.

808   80.   Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Agricultural development strategy overview.
809   Available at: https://www.gatesfoundation.org/what-we-do/global-growth-and-
810   opportunity/agricultural-development.

811   81.   Thornton PK, Jones PJ, Owiyo TM, Kruska RL, Herrero M, Kristjanson P, et al.
812   Mapping climate vulnerability and poverty in Africa. 200pp. Nairobi, International
813   Livestock Research Institute (ILRI). 2006 May.

814   82.   Otte J, Chilonda P. Classification of Cattle and Small Ruminant Production Systems in
815   Sub-Saharan Africa. Outlook on Agriculture. 2003;32.

816   83.   Cecchi G, Wint W, Shaw A, Marletta A, Mattioli R, Robinson TP, et al. Geographic
817   distribution and environmental characterization of livestock production systems in
818   Eastern Africa. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment. 2010;135: 98–110.

819   84.   Sere C, Steinfeld H. World livestock production systems. FAO Animal Production and
820   Health Paper 127. Rome, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
821   (FAO). 1996 Jun.

822   **Supporting Information**

823   **S1 File.** Supplementary materials

824

825

826

827

828

829

830

831

832

833

834

835

836

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure 5