

THE ETHICAL AND LOCAL RESIDENT PERSPECTIVES OF SLUM TOURISM IN KENYA

Damiannah M. Kieti*

School of Tourism, Hospitality and Events Management
Moi University

Kennedy O. Magio

Tourism Management
Universidad de Occidente

ABSTRACT

Slum tourism is relatively a new phenomenon which has generated a considerable body of reactions from many commentators. Nevertheless, there are numerous research gaps within the existing literature, especially on slum residents' attitudes towards its development, its ethical acceptability and the level of benefits accrued. This paper examines the attitudes of Kibera slum residents towards the development of slum tourism. Semi-structured interviews and questionnaires were used to collect data from 13 key informants and 200 heads of households respectively. The research findings reveal that the residents of Kibera slums hold negative attitudes towards slum tourism as evidenced by low rating of the positive impact statements (Overall mean=2.43) and higher rating of negative impact statements (Overall mean=3.413). Both intrinsic factors and external factors, including the level of benefits and social impacts of slum tourism were found to shape the attitudes of the residents.

Keywords: Benefits; Ethical acceptability; Kibera Slum; Residents attitudes; Slum tourism

INTRODUCTION

With decades of booming development, tourism has arguably become the largest industry in the world and an option for generating wealth for both developing and developed countries (Mowfurfurt and Munt, 2009). In 2012 for example, UNWTO (2013) notes that international tourist arrivals worldwide surpassed the 1 billion mark for the first time. Besides, the international tourism receipts amounted to \$ 1.075 billion in 2012 compared to 1,042 billion

* Address correspondence to Damiannah M. Kieti, School of Tourism, Hospitality and Events Management Moi University P.O Box 3900, Eldoret, Kenya. E-mail: dmanono@yahoo.com or dkieti@mu.ac.ke

realized in 2011 (UNWTO, 2013). Along with such rapid development, the tourism industry has exhibited stronger and wider impacts on host communities, ranging from economic, social, cultural and environmental. Reacting to these impacts, community residents have formed various attitudes towards tourism and tourists.

For many years and until recently, the main intention of tourist visits has been linked to leisure, recreation and business (Mekawy, 2012). However, in the recent past, new concepts of tourism have received much attention in the globalized world including the increasingly popular concept of slum tourism. Slum tourism also known to many scholars (such as, Deepak and Akshat, 2012; Frenzel and Koens, 2012; Ma, 2010; Meschkank, 2011) as poverty tourism, township tourism, slumming, poorism or philanthropic travel is a type of tourism, in which tourists travel to less developed places to observe people living in poverty. Slum tours are popular in places like India, Ethiopia, and even places that have had natural disasters such as hurricanes and tsunamis (Weiner, 2009). Heap (2009) gives the example of Louisiana in the United States of America which has become a famous poverty tourism site after Hurricane Katrina.

The concept of slum tourism has been generating hundreds of comments on websites, and has been picked up by many bloggers and news agencies. Indeed, while slum tourism is now offered in an increasing number of places around the globe, from Rio de Janeiro (Frisch, 2012) to Johannesburg (Rolfes et al., 2009) to Mumbai (Meschkank, 2011), the concept provokes strong opinions among tourism and development experts, and the general public. For instance, Steinbrink (2012) criticizes the manner in which slum tourism is conducted, whereby rich people view those living in poverty, as if they were animals in a zoo, before going back to their luxurious hotels. Conversely, Cawthorne (2007) sees it as generating valuable insight into how slum dwellers live, and encouraging a spirit of entrepreneurship among the residents.

Generally speaking, there are two opposing schools of thought on whether slum tourism is beneficial or voyeuristic (Zijlma, 2010). One school of thought denounces this form of tourism as taking advantage of the poor who in most cases do without the necessary amenities identified by the United Nations (UN-HABITAT, 2003) as adequate housing, adequate food and clean drinking water. Durr (2012) notes that slum tourism may be considered as an invasion into someone's privacy given that the main attraction is the lifestyle of the local residents. It is an unethical way of

generating income for the tour operators and results in mental trauma for the slum dwellers, specially the women and children (Crossley, 2012).

Conversely, there is the school of thought that supports this form of tourism. According to Frenzel and Koens (2012) it is impossible to understand countries such as Egypt, South Africa and India without seeing firsthand the conditions in which so many of their citizens live. Likewise, in a tourism trade fair held in January, 2008 in Guadalajara, Spain's King Juan Carlos told delegates that tourism into poverty-stricken countries is not just interesting or desirable, but necessary (Weiner, 2009), it is an effective instrument with which to eradicate poverty and to improve the legitimate aspirations and well-being of citizens. Furthermore, ignoring poverty will not make it go, hence slum tourism is perceived as one of the few ways people get to understand what poverty means. Mashada (2006) observes that a number of tour operators who engage in slum tours find nothing wrong with this form of tourism; in fact they claim that the people in the slums get inspiration and new hopes of improving their conditions.

Given the above view points, the purpose of this study is to divulge interesting results vis-à-vis benefits and ethical issues of slum tourism and elucidates on the controversial debate surrounding slum tourism development. Specifically, this study gives an opportunity to the slum dwellers to bear testimony on what slum tourism mean to them, whether they benefit and consequently approve of it or detest it. Furthermore, very few studies have directly examined the phenomenon of slum tourism (Frenzel and Koens, 2012). Consequently, there is paucity of information on crucial issues of slum tourism, such as, its implications on the lives of slum dwellers. Besides, Carmichael (2000) and Inbakaran and Jackson (2003) argue that understanding the opinion of the residents would help to maintain a harmonious relationship between the hosts and tourists, which is vital for the sustainable and long-term development of any form of tourism activity.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The tourism is a very important industry in the Kenyan economy. It is seen as a major source of revenue for the central government and certain county governments. In 2010, for instance, the industry generated overall earnings of Ksh. 73.7 billion, which represented a growth of 17.9 per cent from the earnings generated in 2009 (Kenya government, 2011). Consequently, the tourism industry has continued to feature prominently in policies, plans and

programmes for Kenya's economic growth. In its vision 2030, the Kenya government targets six priority sectors to raise the national GDP growth rate to 10% per annum. Tourism has been listed as the leading player amongst the six sectors, which include agriculture and livestock, wholesale and retail trade, manufacturing, business process outsourcing and financial services (Ministry of Tourism, 2010). Over the years, the Kenya's tourism industry has heavily relied on its traditional tourism attractions, including wildlife, beach and culture. However, in the recent years, the industry has witnessed an evolution of new forms of tourism including slum tourism. It is argued that slum tourism provides enormous opportunities for people to go and see how the other side lives. Consequently, slum tourism is promoted by travel companies who claim to reduce poverty and enable local people to participate more effectively in tourism development, to improve the local economy of slum dwellers, to generate income for them and increase the linkages between tourism businesses and slum dwellers. Whilst critics of the development of slum tourism in Kenya say that it just helps the government to evade its responsibilities, and that some aid organizations use poverty to fuel business, proponents of slum tourism support it arguing that this will demystify the slums and change the traditional fallacy that it is so dangerous.

Critical issues on slum tourism

To understand the phenomenon of slum tourism, it appears useful to discuss the question of what actually motivates tourists to visit slums. It appears plausible to assume that the attractiveness of slums as tourist destinations is directly connected with the images, conceptions and associations the tourists have of the places they intend to visit. This leads us to the central question; what images do slum tourists have about slums? When Rolfes et al. (2009) in their study posed this question to their respondents, a majority of them indicated that they wanted to be distance away from everyday life and see something else in reference to poverty; yet, the wish to see 'something else' as expressed in the common holiday motives usually refers to something nice, beautiful and relaxing. Steinbrink (2012) therefore wonders what is so relaxing about seeing poverty. According to Meschkank (2011) slum tourism actually turns poverty into entertainment as it is experienced momentarily and then escaped from permanently. Meschkank (2011) compares it to some kind of a "reality television show", whereby tour operators, like television producers, can essentially write a script for tour

guides on what is to be said when slum tourists arrive - who is hero, who is the villain, and what areas should be highlighted. Consequently, slum dwellers are essentially turned into commodities, a “product in the service of an industry” (Lefevre, 2010, p. 3).

Several authors, such as, Cawthorne (2007), Dwek (2004), Dyson (2012), Lefevre (2010) and Mekawy (2012) have questioned the authenticity of the representation of life in the slums and whether or not the residents’ behavior becomes altered with an influx of tourism arriving and departing after only a few hours each day. More importantly, is the issue of privacy of slum dwellers. Crossley (2012) questions whether it is morally permissible for financially privileged tourists to visit places for the purpose of experiencing where poor people live, work, and play. Additionally, Crossley questions whether it is the same as the poor person going to see how the rich live in their sumptuous homes. Crossley (2012) argues that whilst the rich have the opportunity to live in gated communities, slum residents do not have that option when their houses are made of tin and scrap metal, they are put there, in plain sight, for all who pass by to see. Hence, Durr (2012) questions the ethical acceptability of the slum tours and points out the need to seek residents’ consent. One final concern is the economic impact that these tours have on the slums. Freire (2009) notes that the threat of economic leakage in slum tourism is very high, and suggests the need for the visitors to be aware of what portions of the profits of their tour goes back into the community in order to support responsible tourism.

Tourism is a socio-cultural event for both the guest and host (Murphy, 1985) hence ignorance of hosts’ opinions can lead to many problems in the development of tourism. Murphy (1985, p. 133) argued that “if tourism is to merit its pseudonym of being ‘the hospitality industry’, it must look beyond its own doors and employees to consider the social and cultural impacts it is having on the host community at large”. It has now become widely recognized that planners and entrepreneurs must take the views of the host community into account if the industry is to be sustainable in the long term. Without an auspicious local community, it is very hard for the tourism industry to keep sustainable development (Inbakaran and Jackson, 2003). It seems highly consistent in the literature that there is a positive relationship between the perceived economic benefits of tourism and the host community’s attitudes towards the industry. The Social Exchange Theory (SET) (AP, 1990) for example view residents’ attitudes toward tourism as a trade-off between the benefits

and costs of tourism perceived by the host residents. Residents are more likely to be supportive if they perceive more positive impacts (benefits) than negative impacts (costs) from tourism. While a number of authors associate slum tourism with benefits (Dyson, 2012 and Lefevre, 2010), evidence from a study carried out on resident attitudes in Rio de Janeiro shows that favela residents generally welcome tourists (Freire, 2012 and Freire, 2013), not just because of what they expect from them, but also because they feel valued when tourists visit them, the author notes that favela residents are often subject to social stigma and discrimination. They desire recognition which they get, to some extent, in tourists' attention. On the other hand, a survey of residents' attitudes to tourism in the Greater Cairo slums generated overtly positive responses (Mekawy, 2012); the author recognize the lack of knowledge whether similar effects can be studied in other slum tourism destinations and suggests that this gap should be addressed in future research.

To proponents of slum tourism, slum tours provide a valuable window into the lives of the poorest of the poor and help funnel tourist dollars into the slums, while to critics, the tours represent the worst kind of travel voyeurism, degrading and utterly without redeeming qualities. So which is it that best describes slum tourism? Detestable voyeurism or cross-cultural eye-opener? This was the intent of this study, to find out from the slum dwellers whether they detest or accept slum tourism development and which factors influence these attitudes.

STUDY METHODS

The study area

This study was carried out in Kibera slum in Nairobi, Kenya. The slum is the largest of Nairobi's slums and the second largest urban slum in Africa after Soweto in South Africa, with a population of 170,070 people (Kenya Population and Housing Census, 2009). The slum is located approximately 5 kilometers (3 miles) southwest of the city centre of Nairobi and covers an area of 2.5 square kilometers (0.965 square miles). The slum is the backdrop for the award-winning short film *Kibera Kid* which featured a cast entirely drawn from Kibera residents. The film has played in film festivals worldwide including the *Berlin Film Festival* and won a *Student Emmy* from Hollywood. It is also the locale for the feature film *Togetherness Supreme*. Currently, Kibera's

residents represent all the major Kenyan ethnic backgrounds, with some areas being specifically dominated by people of one ethno-linguistic group.

Research approach

The study adopted a mixture of various data collection methods. Firstly, structured interviews with 13 respondents were conducted. During the interview, the interviewees were asked to express their views about tourists visiting their area (Kibera), their expectations regarding slum tours and its impact; and their attitudes and perceptions towards tourists. Finally the interviewees were asked to evaluate slum tours in terms of perceived benefits and costs. All interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed with permission of the respondents. However, for those respondents who had objections, the interviews were recorded in writing. The interviews lasted for approximately 30 minutes to 1 hour per interviewee. In the qualitative analysis, responses were organized following the emerging themes from the data generated as a result of the interviews; an attempt was made to identify common patterns of responses and to develop themes that reflected them. Similarities as well as differences were noted while taking care of the minority views. Various sample verbatim quotation were given and this provided an opportunity to better appreciate the variety of views that existed on that issue. The analysis categorized related topics hence identifying major themes; this was achieved by developing a coding system based on samples of collected data, classifying major topics covered, re-reading the text and highlighting key quotations and finally placing the coded materials under the major themes identified.

Secondly, questionnaires consisting of both closed and open-ended questions were administered to 200 heads of households between October, 2010 and March, 2011. A pilot survey was conducted using a group of convenient samples between the 1st and 5th of October 2010. This was aimed at detecting problems in the questionnaire design and to establish whether the questionnaire had an easy-to-follow layout, clear instruction, understandable statements, easy to answer questions and to give the respondents a chance to suggest areas for further improvement.

Overall, the questionnaire comprised of two sections. Section one had seventeen (17) attitudinal statements measuring Kibera slum residents' attitudes towards slum tourism (Table 1). Both positive and negative statements as suggested by Madrigal (1993) were included. To avoid bias in

respondents' evaluations, the wording and physical placement of positive and negative statements was varied and random. All the items were drawn from the literature and covered the major economic, social and cultural impacts of tourism but biased towards slum tourism. The respondents were asked to indicate their degree of agreement to each statement measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree" (1 point) to "strongly agree" (5 points). A five-point scale was used because it would capture the range of opinion on most issues and would therefore discriminate individuals effectively with minimum categories (as proposed by Asker and Day, 1990). Section two comprised of items soliciting respondent's demographic and socio-economic characteristics; income, length of residence, distance of residence from the central slum tourism zone, whether born in Kibera, home ownership, age, gender and year round residence.

Table 1. *Questionnaire Items on Slum Tourism*

| Variable | Items |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| General evaluation of slum tourism | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is hard for me to accept slum tourism. ▪ Slum tourism is not appropriate for this area. ▪ I am embarrassed that I live in a community associated with slum tourism. ▪ Having slum tourism in this area is a pleasure. ▪ This area made the right choice to embrace slum tourism. ▪ Without slum tourism this area would have no future. ▪ Slum tourism has made this area a better place to live. ▪ I don't care if we have slum tourism in this town. ▪ If we had it to do over again, I would support approval of slum tourism in this area. ▪ Slum tourism is not ethically acceptable. |
| Impacts of slum tourism | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Most of the money from slum tourism in this area goes to outsiders. ▪ Many people have moved away from this area because of slum tourism. ▪ Slum tourists do not interact with the local residents. ▪ Slum tourism increase human traffic. |
| Benefits of slum tourism | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I personally receive social benefits from slum tourism improved quality of life. ▪ I personally receive economic benefits from slum tourism (income, employment). ▪ Overall, I benefit from slum tourism in this area. |

A total of 182 questionnaires were returned (out of 200 questionnaires administered), representing a response rate of 91%. Each returned questionnaire was checked for legibility and usability. Thirty five (35) questionnaires were incomplete on important statements and were eliminated from the analysis. Thus a total of 147 questionnaires were used for analysis. Both quantitative (descriptive statistics) and qualitative analyses were performed on the data. In the qualitative analysis, responses were organized following the emerging themes from the data generated from the interviews. Additionally, factor analysis was undertaken to uncover the main dimensions of the attitudinal statements about slum tourism and reduce them into both positive and negative attitudes factors and aid in assessing the validity of the scale used by ensuring that its constituent items load on the same factor and dropping scale items which cross-loaded on more than one factor.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic information of respondents

The respondents had a male to female ratio of 14:11 which is a good indicator that both sexes were well represented in this study. As shown in table 2, most of the respondents (30.6%) stated that they had attained tertiary education as their highest level. 55.10% of the respondents lived less than a kilometer from the slum tourism hot spots in Kibera. Most of them (42.9%) had lived in Kibera for close to 10 years. Indeed, a majority of the respondents (89.1%) mentioned that they were born in Kibera. When asked to describe their home ownership, most of the respondents (84.40%) stated that they were renting their current residences as opposed to owning them. 91.8% of the respondents live in Kibera throughout the year. On the level of income per month, a significant number of the respondents (37.40%) earned between Ksh. 2001 (\$ 23) and 5000 (\$ 58). Table 2 presents the rest of the responses.

Table 2. Respondents Socio-demographic characteristics

| Demographic Variable | Category | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|---------|
| Gender | Female | 83 | 56.50% |
| | Male | 64 | 43.50% |
| Highest Education | Never attended school | 26 | 17.70% |
| | Primary | 29 | 19.70% |
| | Tertiary | 45 | 30.60% |
| | Secondary | 37 | 25.20% |
| | University | 10 | 6.80% |
| Age group | 18-25 | 14 | 9.50% |
| | 26-35 | 30 | 20.40% |
| | 36-45 | 65 | 44.20% |
| | 46-55 | 27 | 18.40% |
| | 56 and Over | 11 | 7.50% |
| Distance from respondents residential place to the most visited area in Kibera (in km) | ≤ 1 km | 81 | 55.10% |
| | 2-3 km | 29 | 19.70% |
| | 4-5 km | 29 | 19.70% |
| | 6km and above | 8 | 5.40% |
| Length of time lived in the area | ≤ 2 years | 15 | 10.20% |
| | 3-6 Years | 26 | 17.70% |
| | 7-10 Years | 63 | 42.90% |
| | 11-15 Years | 43 | 29.30% |
| If the respondent was born in Kibera | Yes | 16 | 10.90% |
| | No | 131 | 89.10% |
| Description of home ownership | Own | 23 | 15.60% |
| | I am renting | 124 | 84.40% |
| Employed into slum tourism | Yes | 22 | 15% |
| | No | 125 | 85% |
| Respondents occupation is related to slum tourism in some way (directly or indirectly) | Yes | 36 | 24.50% |
| | No | 111 | 75.50% |
| Lives in Kibera throughout the year | Yes | 135 | 91.80% |
| | No | 12 | 8.20% |
| Income Per month | ≤ 2000 | 33 | 22.40% |
| | 2001-5000 | 55 | 37.40% |
| | 5001-10000 | 26 | 17.70% |
| | 10001-15000 | 19 | 12.90% |
| | 15001-25000 | 10 | 6.80% |
| | ≥25001 | 4 | 2.70% |

Factor analysis results

Previous research (Long et al., 1990; Madrigal, 1993) suggests that items measuring resident attitudes toward tourism are better represented by two key aspects (that is, positive and negative aspects) rather than a single aspect. Before factoring, a further examination of the correlation matrix of all the statements was made to ensure the factorability. Over 45% of all correlations were found to have a value $>.30$, indicating that the matrix was suitable for factoring (Carmichael, 2000). Once the appropriateness of factorability was solidly ensured, a principle components factor analysis with Varimax rotation was computed. Eigen-value greater than 1 was used as the factoring criterion. Varimax rotation was applied because it provided easier interpretation by simplifying the correlations between factors (Johnson and Creech, 1993). The analysis generated two factors, which corresponded with the two broad dimensions of attitudes towards slum tourism. Factor 1 comprised eight theoretically positive statements as listed in Table 3. The factor loadings for the eight items ranged from 0.899 to 0.436 and none of them loaded greater than .30 on Factor 2. In contrast, Factor 2 comprised of nine items belonging to the theoretically negative statements, with factor loadings ranging from 0.895 to 0.467 and all the nine items loaded less than .30 on Factor 1. Cronbach's alpha was used to test the internal consistency of the items comprising these two factors. The alpha value for Factor 1 (.78) was sufficiently high, indicating a reliable internal consistency. The alpha value for Factor 2 was .67 which was just above the conventionally lenient cut-off point (.60) and close to the adequate level of .70 (McGraw and Wong, 1996). Examination of "Alpha if item deleted" indicated that the alpha value of the overall scale did not marginally increase by deleting any of the items. Thus all the seventeen items were kept in the analysis. The two factors were named "Positive Attitudes" and "Negative Attitudes". The former was computed by summing the scores of the eight variables comprising factor 1; and the later was computed by summing the scores of all the nine items comprising factor 2. These two composite variables were used respectively to represent the positive aspect and negative aspect of respondents' attitudes towards the development of slum tourism.

Table 3. Results for factor analysis

| | Item | Components | |
|----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | 1 | 2 |
| Theoretically positive statement | Slum tourism is a pleasure | 0.618 | -0.219 |
| | Right choice to embrace slum tourism | 0.704 | 0.152 |
| | No future for the area without tourism | 0.698 | -0.226 |
| | Area better thanks to slum tourism | 0.818 | -0.041 |
| | I support the approval of slum tourism | 0.743 | -0.023 |
| | I receive social benefits from slum tourism | 0.899 | -0.214 |
| | I receive economic benefits for slum tourism | 0.436 | -0.184 |
| | I benefit from slum tourism in this area | 0.893 | -0.179 |
| Theoretically Negative statement | Not appropriate for the area | -0.268 | 0.895 |
| | It is embarrassing | 0.184 | 0.516 |
| | Money goes to outsiders | -0.205 | 0.612 |
| | Many people have moved away | -0.135 | 0.871 |
| | It increases human traffic | -0.115 | 0.714 |
| | It is hard to accept slum tourism | 0.207 | 0.646 |
| | Slum tourist don't interact with locals | -0.154 | 0.604 |
| | I don't care if we have slum tourism in this area | -0.427 | 0.775 |
| | Slum tourism is not ethically acceptable | -0.668 | 0.467 |
| Extraction Method: Principal component Analysis. | | | |
| Rotation Method: Varimax With Kaiser Normalization | | | |
| Rotation converged in 3 Interactions | | | |

Kibera's residents attitudes toward slum tourism

A total of 17 statements (8 theoretically positive and 9 theoretically negative) were used to capture the respondents' attitudes towards slum tourism. The respondents rating on all the attitudinal statements are summarized in Table 4. All the positive statements generated means lower than the theoretical mean (3.00). Indeed, the overall mean for the positive statements was 2.43 whereas the negative statements had an overall mean of 3.473, thus suggesting that the respondents had a negative attitude towards slum tourism. Furthermore, the more the statements were skewed towards 1 (minimum expected count – Strongly disagree) the more the positive statement were being negated.

The study also sought to identify statements that fetched exceptional mean scores and which could be used to offer insights into the direction of both the positive and the negative attitudes. According to the research findings (Table 4), the lowest mean score (2.03) was from the variable stating that 'the respondent receives economic and other overall benefits' whereas the highest mean score was related to the variables on 'whether the benefits from slum tourism goes to the outsiders (Mean=4.29), 'whether slum tourism is embarrassing' (Mean=4.07)' and that 'slum tourism is not ethically acceptable' (Mean=3.47)

It was interesting to note that despite the general negative perception of the impacts of slum tourism, the residents still agreed that it was the right choice to embrace slum tourism as a way of raising the economic well being (mean 3.02) and this was actually the highest score among the positive statements. One of the local leaders was quite assertive on slum tourism:

We have no problem with slum tourists coming to our area, we may also go to their countries to see how they live, but their visits at least should be driven by the urge to make life better here not just get surprised at our deplorable living conditions...if someone comes, let him do something for us, or if they really want to know how we think and feel, come and spend a night or walk round when its pouring with rain here and the paths are like rivers.

This may imply that residents' perceptions had not reached unbearable levels. Hence, if the antecedents of the negative attitudes like low level of benefits and interaction between residents and slum tourists are corrected, the residents could still change their attitudes and support for slum tourism.

Benefits of slum tourism to the residents of Kibera

Even though there are both social and economic benefits from slum tourism, they are too meager to justify its existence. In fact a majority of the residents disagree that they get benefits from slum tourism. The real beneficiaries of slum tourism are non residents of Kibera (Money goes to outsiders, Mean=4.29), who dominate the operations of tours to the slum areas. One of the greatest impediments to the trickling down of slum tourism benefits to the local residents is the lack of interaction between the slum dwellers and the slum tourists (Slum tourist don't interact with locals, Mean=3.99). This scenario is made worse by the slum tour operators who insist on keeping the slum tourist away from the residents' reach with the assumption that this would reduce the embarrassing behavior of soliciting for handouts from the

slum tourism. Indeed, one leader of a community based organization based in the slum lamented:

It is very difficult to get a chance to speak or interact with the slum tourists. They are accompanied by their operators or the NGOs hosting them and sometimes if they are senior government officials like when the Vice president of USA or the Queen of Spain or Ban ki Moon the Secretary General of the UN visited, they had heavy security details which deterred and kept people away. Even celebrities cannot easily be accessed.

Contrary to the traditional belief that tourism is beneficial to community living in the tourism area, Kibera residents did not generate adequate benefits from the development of slum tourism. This greatly influenced the slum dwellers overall negative assessment of slum tourism development. According to one of the area chief:

Very few people have benefited from slum tourism, for example in terms of guiding services. Unlike other areas of tourism, Kibera does not have hotels where the slum tourists can sleep and where the local people can be employed, we sell a few souvenirs to slum tourist yes, but the level of economic benefits is generally meager and this is the reason why the locals have a negative attitude towards the whole thing . . . those who get benefits are few and the benefits themselves are meager and do not justify their involvement. A big shame is that most of the benefits are retained by the slum tour operation companies who organize trips for the slum tourists, some are foreign owned and the *Wazungus* (the whites) are the directors of those organizations.

Long and Allen (1990) assert that tourism brings along with its benefits to the local economy ranging from increased employment opportunities to boosting of economic diversity. Additionally, Dwyer et al. (2004), argue that tourism provides a wide range of benefits to the local economy from increased employment opportunities to economic growth. Reviews of early studies have revealed that tourism contributed to the economy in the following aspects: stimulating infrastructure construction, stimulating tourism supply industries such as transportation, hotel, restaurant and retailing, attracting foreign investment, creating jobs and business opportunities, stabilizing the local economy and stimulating export. However, the findings of the study indicated the contrary. Very few residents were employed in the slum tourism industry or engaged in the slum tourism related economic activities. Sentiments by most of the slum dwellers were summed up by the area chief who said:

Some (slum tours) are a blessing, some are not doing it right, that is, they are not beneficial, the fact that they come to see how we live is also quite intrusive to our privacy, if they come to help, then that is fine but just coming to see us and go, that is not beneficial to us... It is very sad that when dignitaries come here, the first place they run to is Kibera; the residents are getting tired of people coming and giving lip-service.

The major reason behind this predicament was the limited capacity on the side of the locals. In other tourism areas, residents may put up businesses related to the tourism industry for instance selling of souvenirs; however, this was not the case in Kibera. The locals claimed not to have the financial capacity to establish such ventures. To ameliorate these impediments, Rolfes et al. (2009) suggest the carrying out of capacity building, involving the residents through a bottom-up participatory style of execution of the slum tourism programs, finding those who are willing to invest in the slum tourism related ventures, and encouraging the locals to take up employment in the already existing slum tourism activities.

Nonetheless, according to Mowfurfurt and Munt (2009), the flow of the benefits to the locals is an important principle of sustainability for any tourism development. Slum tourism in Kibera consequently fails to meet the standard criterion for sustainability. The local economy has not changed as a result of slum tourism. According to the residents, the economy is almost the same; only a few projects like toilet projects and water projects can be attributed to slum tourism, but generally, the local economy has very little to do with slum tourism. A tour guide in one of the companies operating slum tours in the area was keen to point out that:

Slum tourism has not changed the quality of life of the slum dweller, nothing is changing here, despite the numerous streams of foreign dignitaries visiting the slum, they leave little or nothing and life has remained the same over the years.

On the side of attraction, the poverty situation of the residents of Kibera is the attraction and the visitors witness it for free. It is not similar to a National park, for example, where one is expected to pay the park entry fee. The slum dwellers acknowledge this:

It is just the mystery of people of Kibera, the poverty, and the deplorable conditions here in Kibera, life here is hard and very funny and challenging. I am sure the slum tourists are just excited, just to come and see how people live here in an extraordinary manner. Of course some come in the name of commissioning country projects and helping to improve people's lives but the truth is that they come to see how funny life is here (pastor of one of the local church in Kibera slum).

Table 4. *Kibera residents' attitude toward slum tourism*

| Attitudinal Statements | Statement | Mean | Standard Deviation | Minimum score | Maximum score |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Positive Statement (n= 147) | Slum tourism is a pleasure | 2.86 | 1.443 | 1 | 5 |
| | Right choice to embrace slum tourism | 3.02 | 1.537 | 1 | 5 |
| | No future for the area without tourism | 2.37 | 1.365 | 1 | 5 |
| | Area better thanks to slum tourism | 2.27 | 1.402 | 1 | 5 |
| | I support the approval of slum tourism | 2.45 | 1.304 | 1 | 5 |
| | I receive social benefits from slum tourism | 2.37 | 1.293 | 1 | 5 |
| | I receive economic benefits for slum tourism | 2.03 | 1.555 | 1 | 5 |
| | I benefit from ST in this area | 2.07 | 1.314 | 1 | 5 |
| | Overall mean of positive statement | 2.43 | | 1 | 5 |
| | Negative Statement (n= 147) | Not appropriate for the area | 3.48 | 1.496 | 1 |
| It is embarrassing | | 4.07 | 1.259 | 1 | 5 |
| Money goes to outsiders | | 4.29 | 1.02 | 1 | 5 |
| Many people have moved away | | 2.03 | 1.05 | 1 | 5 |
| It increases human traffic | | 2.52 | 1.289 | 1 | 5 |
| It is hard to accept slum tourism | | 3.59 | 1.297 | 1 | 5 |
| Slum tourist don't interact with locals | | 3.99 | 1.324 | 1 | 5 |
| I don't care if we have slum tourism in this area | | 3.28 | 1.313 | 1 | 5 |
| Slum tourism is not ethically acceptable | | 3.47 | 1.144 | 1 | 5 |
| Overall mean of negative statement | | 3.413 | | 1 | 5 |

The Kibera slum dwellers agreed that for slum tourism to be sustainable, both the residents from the community and other stakeholders should operate in a state of mutual benefit. The more community benefits (economically and socially) are realized, the more sustainable slum tourism will become. Furthermore, tourism relies heavily upon the good will of the local residents hence their support is essential for its development, successful operation and sustainability (Jurowksi, 1994). As noted by Fridgen (1991), host's apathy or mistrust will eventually be passed on to the tourist, resulting in their unwillingness to visit places where they feel unwanted. Currently, the most beneficiaries of slum tourism are the tour operators who have continued to operate in a manner that hampers the interactions between the Kibera slum dwellers and the slum tourist. Consequently, slum dwellers are denied any significant opportunity to participate in tourism, thereby increasing chances of widening the gap between the rich and the poor. Besides, the fact that a majority of benefits accruing from the slum tour operations fall in the hands of the outsiders means that meaningful developments are carried outside Kibera slum.

According to Akama and Kieti (2007), most of tourism projects in Kenya have been initiated through top government official, elites, foreign investors and foreign consultants and have tended to preclude local participation in their design, development and management. The design and development of slum tourism seem to follow similar trend (as identified by Akama and Kieti, 2007) despite the fact that it is a new form of tourism. As a consequence, slum dwellers are rarely involved in the provision of even the basic services such as tour guiding. This scenarios raises important questions on whether slum tourism as practiced presently will help to reduce poverty and enable local slum dweller to participate more meaningfully in tourism development.

Arguably, the current meager benefits from slum tourism may not be able to change the fortunes of the people living there, but this can be changed if the manner in which the tours are operated is reviewed. One way is by allowing local people to interact respectfully with the slum tourists and provide basic services like slum tour guiding. To the slum dwellers, there is a huge difference between a group of 20 tourists barreling through the slums or snapping photos from the windows and a group of five or six tourists interacting with the locals- the former is not beneficial while the latter is. Besides, there is a need for responsible marketing efforts to attract and increase the number of slum tourists who are willing to change the existing situation in Kibera. The brochures and websites advertising slum tours

should not bundle them together with adventure tourism, as if the tours were some sort of cultural bungee jumping.

Most importantly, a majority of the residents of Kibera felt that the Kenya government and other concerned stakeholders need to foster an entrepreneurial spirit amongst the slum dwellers. This to them is the first and important step towards getting their 'fair' share of the 'spoils' from slum tourism activities. The residents need an enabling environment through capacity building, motivation, mentoring and support from the government and other tourism stakeholders. Additionally, a strong linkage between the government, other tourism stakeholders and the slum dwellers is necessary in order to enhance revenue retention, creation of employment opportunities and other slum tourism related benefits. The slum dwellers are ready to view slum tourism as acceptable, only if it makes an effort to connect the tourist with the community.

CONCLUSION

From the foregoing discussions, it is evident that the benefits drawn from slum tourism are insignificant to make the residents to support its further development. However, negative attitudes towards slum tourism development had not reached the point where the residents would antagonize the development of slum tourism because majority of them still believe that it is a good idea to embrace slum tourism. In fact, slum tourism has the potential to benefit the slum community and the nation's economy as a whole if it is done the right way. At the same time, it is not bad to see how other people live, after all it is human nature to be curious of the unknown and truly slum tourism allows a glimpse into an alternate life.

The study reveals that the greatest impediments to the local residents generating benefits from slum tourism is the limited opportunities for the slum dwellers to interact with slum tourists and perpetual "outsider dominance" in ownership of the organizations and tour operation establishment that organize and run the slum tours. Besides, most of the organizations that were paid to bring slum tourists to the area were also owned and operated by mainly people who are not Kibera residents, including non Kenyans.

It can be argued that there is need to allow the residents to benefit directly from slum tourism, e.g. through employment as guides. Furthermore, the main players in slum tourism need to enhance benefits as a

result of tours by, for example, funding community projects, e.g. water, schools, sanitation, roads and path projects. This will reduce the negative perceptions and encourages harmonious co-existence between the slum tourists and the slum dwellers. Allowing the slum dwellers to accompany, talk and interact with tourists will also give them a sense of ownership and benefit from the slum tourism activities. Most importantly, there is a need for proper mechanisms to channel the revenue accrued from slum tours to funding community-based projects rather than embezzling them and using them for personal gains or for purposes other than those which they were intended for. Hence for slum tourism to be sustainable there is great need to conduct the tours in a humane manner, ensure that benefits accruing trickle down into the community, for sustainability to be reached advertisement has to be done in a respectful way.

REFERENCES

- Akama, J. S., & Kieti, D. M. (2007). Tourism and socio-economic development in developing countries: A case study of Mombasa Resort in Kenya. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15 (6), 735-748.
- Ap, J. (1990). Residents' perceptions research on the social impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17, 610-616.
- Asker, D. A., & Day, G. S. (1990). *Marketing Research*, (4th ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Carmichael, B. A. (2000). A matrix model for resident attitudes and behaviours in a rapidly changing tourist area. *Tourism Management*, 21 (6), 601-611.
- Cawthorne, A. (2007). Slum tourism stirs controversy in Kenya. Retrieved October 12, 2011, from Reuters Web site: <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSL0681899920070212>.
- Crossley, E. (2012). Poor but happy: Volunteer tourists' encounters with poverty. *Tourism Geographies*, 14 (2), 235-253.
- Deepak, C., & Akshat, C. (2012). Slum tourism: Ethical or voyeuristic. *Tourism Review International*, 16 (1), 69-73.
- Durr, E. (2012). Encounters over garbage: Tourists and lifestyle. *Tourism Geographies*, 14 (2), 339-335.
- Dwek, D. (2004). Favela tourism: Innocent fascination or inevitable exploitation? Unpublished MA dissertation, Institute of Latin American Studies, London.
- Dyson, P. (2012). Slum tourism: Representing and interpreting 'Reality' in Dharavi, Mumbai. *Tourism Geographies*, 14 (2), 254-274.
- Dwyer, L., Forsyth, P., & Spurr, R. (2004). Evaluating tourism's economic effects: New and old approaches. *Tourism Management*, 25 (3), 307-17.
- Freire, M. B. (2009). The favela and its touristic transits. *Geoforum*, 40(4), 580-588.

- Freire, M. B. (2012). Favela tourism: Listening to local voices. In Frenzel, F., Koens, K. & Steinbrink, M. (Eds.), *Slum tourism: Poverty, power and ethics* (pp. 175-192). New York: Routledge.
- Freire, M. B. (2013). *Touring Poverty*. London: Routledge.
- Frenzel, F., & Koens, K. (2012). Slum tourism: Developments in a young field of interdisciplinary tourism research. *Tourism Geographies*, 14 (2), 195-212.
- Fridgen, J., (1991). *Dimensions of tourism*. East Lansing Mich: Educational Institute-AHMA.
- Frisch, T. (2012). Glimpses of Another World: The *Favela* as a tourist attraction. *Tourism Geographies*, 14 (2), 320-338.
- Heap, C. (2009). *Slumming: Sexual and racial encounters in American nightlife, 1885 1940*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Inbakaran, R. & Jackson, M., (2003). *Segmenting the host community: an empirical analysis of attitudes toward increasing tourism*. Paper presented to International Interdisciplinary Conference, New Zealand.
- Johnson, D. R., & Creech, J. C. (1993). Ordinal measures in multiple indicator models: A simulation study of categorization error. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 398-407.
- Jurowski, C. (1994). *The interplay of elements affecting host community resident attitudes toward tourism: A path analytic approach*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, United States.
- Kenya Government (2011). *Economic Survey*. Nairobi: Government Printers.
- Lefevre, N. (2010). *Slum Tours: Awareness-Raising or Voyeurism?* Retrieved October 12, 2011, from Suite101.com Web site: <http://www.suite101.com/content/slum-tours-awareness-raising-or-voyeurism-a263032>.
- Long, P. T., Perdue, R. R., & Allen, L. (1990). Rural resident tourism perceptions and attitudes by community level of tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 28 (3), 3-9.
- Ma, B. (2010). A trip into the controversy: A study of slum tourism travel motivations. *Penn Humanities Forum on Connections*. University of Pennsylvania Scholarly Commons, 1 – 51.
- Madrigal, R. (1993). A tale of tourism in two cities. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20, 336-353.
- Mashada (2006). Slum Tourism (poverty for sale) Targets Kibera and Mukuru Kayaba Slums, Kenya. Retrieved March 4, 2010, from Mashada Web site: <http://www.mashada.com/forums/old-politics-forum-read-only/13758-slumtourism-poverty-sale-targets-kibera-mukuru-kayaba-slums-kenya.html>.
- McGraw, K. O., & Wong, S. P. (1996). Forming inferences about some intraclass correlation coefficients. *Psychological Methods*, 1(1), 30-46.
- Mekawy, M. A. (2012). Responsible slum tourism: Egyptian experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39 (4), 2092-2113.
- Meschkank, J. (2011). Investigations into slum tourism in Mumbai: Poverty tourism and the tensions between different constructions of reality. *GeoJournal*, 76, 47–62.
- Ministry of Tourism (2010). *Domestic Tourism Strategy Taskforce Report-2010*. Retrieved January 21, 2011, from Ministry of Tourism Web site: <http://www.tourism.go.ke/ministry.nsf/pages/news>.
- Mowfurf, M., & Munt, I. (2009). *Tourism and sustainability – Development, globalisation and new tourism in the Third World* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Murphy, P.E. (1985). *Tourism: A community approach*. London: Routledge.

- Rolfes, M., Steinbrink, M., & Uhl, C. (2009). *Townships as attraction. A case study on township tourism in Cape Town*. Potsdam: Universit'atsverlag.
- Steinbrink, M. (2012). We did the slum!'-Urban poverty tourism in historical perspective. *Tourism Geographies*, 14 (2), 213-234.
- UNWTO (2013). *UNWTO, Tourism Highlights 2013 Edition*. Retrieved on July 26, 2013, from <http://mkt.unwto.org/en/publication/unwto-tourism-highlights-2013-edition>
- UN-HABITAT (2003). *The challenge of Slums: Global Report on Human Settlements 2003*. London: Earthscan.
- Weiner, E. (2009). *Slum Visits: Tourism or Voyeurism*. Retrieved October 12, 2011, from The New York Times Web site: http://www.nytimes.com/2008/03/09/travel/09heads.html?_r=1&sq=slum%20visits&st=cse&scp=1&pagewanted=print
- Zijlma, A (2010). "Slum tourism" *Anouk's Africa Travel Blog, online*. Retrieved May 8, 2010, from Go Africa Web site: <http://goafrica.about.com/b/2010/03/11/slum-tourim.htm>.