Residents' Perception of Slum Tourism Development in Kibera, Nairobi, Kenya

KENNEDY MAGIO OBOMBO, DAMIANNAH M. KIETI AND BEATRICE O. IMBAYA

Moi University, School of Tourism, Hospitality and Events Management

Abstract

The development of slum tourism in Kibera and other slums around the world has generated considerable reactions from many commentators as evidenced by the numerous reports in the international news agencies. This paper examines the attitudes and perceptions of Kibera residents towards the development of slum tourism and the major factors influencing these attitudes and perceptions. A mixed methods research approach was employed for the study. Questionnaires, semi-structured in-depth interviews and participant observation as an auxiliary instrument were used to collect primary data. A total of 13 residents selected purposively were interviewed. Questionnaires were also administered to 168 households selected randomly in Kibera slums. Data was analyzed both quantitatively using multiple regression and correlations and qualitatively using thematic analysis. The findings indicated that the residents of Kibera slums generally hold negative attitudes towards slum tourism. Both intrinsic factors, e.g. age and external factors like the level of benefits, and social impacts accruing from slum tourism were found to shape the attitudes of the residents. The outcomes of this study consolidate the body of knowledge in the context of resident perception of slum tourism. Utilizing the findings can help maintain a harmonious relationship between the host residents and tourists. Understanding the antecedents of support by local residents towards tourism development is crucial for policy makers and businesses because the success and sustainability of any development depends on active support of the local population. It is also one of the few attempts to examine the influence of intrinsic factors not just on the attitudes as a whole, but either on positive or negative attitudes. The study recommends that the tourism players should allow and enhance interactions between the slum tourists and the locals to foster a harmonious relationship between the host residents and tourists.

Key Words: Host residents, Perception, Slum tourism development, Tourism development

Introduction

The relative importance of tourism to Kenya's economy has risen steadily over the last 30 years. The government continues to spearhead tourism development as a reliable source of foreign exchange receipts, job creation and economic growth. The sector earned Ksh. 80.3 billion in terms of revenue within the period between mid-2010 and mid-2011 (Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, 2011). The Ministry of Tourism in Kenya has projected that tourist arrivals will increase tremendously to reach 2 million by 2013 and 2.5 by 2016 (KTB, 2011). Kenya's tourism industry has been heavily dependent on its traditional tourist attractions, namely wildlife, beach and culture (Akama, 2004); however, recent years have seen an emergence of new forms of tourism, like conference tourism, aimed at increasing tourist numbers. Tourism practitioners seem to have joined the government marketing efforts and are tapping into the numerous opportunities in the global tourism market selling virtually anything that looks appealing to the tourists.

Slum tourism, also known to many 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 (Weiner, 2009). Poverty tours are popular in places like India, Ethiopia, and even places that have had natural disasters such as hurricanes and tsunamis. For instance, after Hurricane Katrina, Louisiana in the United States of America became a big poverty tourism site (Mashada, 2006). Poverty tourism attracts affluent tourists from the Western economies who yearn to catch a glimpse of what it is like to live in poverty. Slum tourism is an emerging sector in tourism that provides guided tours into the slums of major cities. It first began in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 and has now found popularity in Buenos Aires (Argentina), New Delhi and Mumbai, (India), Nairobi (Kenya) and Johannesburg in South Africa (*Science Daily*, 30th January, 2010).

According to Zijlma (2010), there are opposing views and thoughts on whether slum tourism is tourism or voyeurism (a form of tourism that is exploitative). One school of thought denounces this form of tourism as tramping about amongst people whose average income is less than a dollar a day and who do without the necessary amenities such as adequate housing, adequate food and clean drinking water (Zijilma, 2010). Another opinion supports this form of tourism and according to the supporters, it is impossible to understand countries such as Egypt, South Africa and India without seeing first-hand the conditions in which so many of their citizens live (Mashada, 2006). The last few years have seen a rise in slum tourism and there are many opportunities for people to go and see how the poor live. 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 developing countries, to generate income for poor people and increase the linkages between tourism businesses and poor people (Bowers, 2007).

Kibera slums on the other hand is the rave spot in Kenya, where tourists walking around can gaze and explore the struggle for existence and survival by the slum dwellers; HIV/AIDS victims dying slowly on cold cardboard beds, breast-less teenagers, plastic-eating goats on the filthy sewages, ever-fighting small children in the neighbourhoods and unbearable sights of people sleeping on streets (Cawthorne, 2007). However, according to the speech by Spain's King Juan Carlos in a tourism trade fair in January, 2008 in Guadalajara, tourism into poverty-stricken countries is not just interesting or desirable, but necessary. He reiterates that slum tourism is an effective instrument with which to eradicate poverty and to improve the legitimate aspirations and well-being of citizens (Doy, 2008).

Conversely, slum tourism has been criticized as an invasion into people's privacy and taking away the dignity of the poor. Furthermore, it is not only considered an unethical way of raising

funds and showcasing poverty, but also results in mental trauma for the slum dwellers, especially the women and children. However, there are many tour operators who find nothing wrong with this form of tourism and who claim that since the slum tours started, the people in the slums have found new hopes as they are ready to work hard to improve their conditions (Mashada, 2006).

One internet blogger argues that the biggest benefit of slum tourism is that it humanizes slum dwellers and argues that slums are not unremitting misery incarnate, hence there is life inside the slums although not to the fullest of everybody's expectation (Zijlma, 2010). But what does this type of travel mean for the people who live in the slums? Hardly surprising, there is huge debate over whether or not slum tourism is ethical. Eric Weiner adds a new spin to the discussion in his article *slumming it: Can Slum Tourism Be Done Right*? He suggests four criteria that can make slum tours valuable: (1) touring only small groups, (2) no photography allowed, (3) money being funnelled back to the slums, (4) and respectful marketing (Weiner, 2009). The fact is that the controversy over slum tourism says more about tourism than it does about slums. Modern mass tourism is considered entertainment, and, of course, one finds the thought of slums as entertainment quite repulsive. Yet all travel is to some extent voyeuristic as the tourists pry into the lives of others. Travel is intrusive and, really, there is no such thing as a no-impact traveller (may be those travelling on armchairs).

Jockin Arputham, the Mumbai-based president of Shack/Slum Dwellers International (SDI), a grassroots organization representing urban poor and homeless in 20 countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America and which has received a $10 million development grant from the Gates Foundation, has lashed out at the operators, describing such tours as a "crime against poverty" and an affront to the dignity of slum dwellers. Mr. Arputham, who received the Ramon Magsaysay Award for International Peace and Understanding in 2000, himself, lives in a slum. He says he has seen the advertising billboards and the vehicles picking up the foreign tourists near the Taj Hotel and felt strongly that it was exploitative; "People are angry about this, the people are living in very, very bad conditions with children running around naked, and foreigners are photographing this and trying to expose the poverty" (*Science Daily*, 30th January, 2010).

Critical Issues on Slum Tourism Research

It has been noted that most initial reflections on slum tourism focused on two main cases in the global South: township tourism in South Africa and *favela* tourism in Brazil. According to Frenzel and Koens (2012), there has been a big theoretical and empirical gap concerning this type of tourism and the recent academic debate follows very vocal discussions in the realm of journalists and bloggers, which focused on the moral ambiguities surrounding 'slum tourism'. Academics were quick to dismiss many of the journalist accounts as problematic (Selinger and Outterson, 2009: p. 3).

Slum tourism research has proven to be 'undisciplined', much like tourism research in general (Tribe 1997). A wide range of disciplines have dealt with the phenomenon and it has been discussed from a variety of theoretical angles. The academic field of slum tourism research is comprised primarily of case studies. By nature these are unique and it is not always easy to directly transfer concepts, ideas and theoretical angles. After reviewing the research papers presented in a conference held in Bristol from 9–11 December 2010, dubbed '*Destination Slum! – Reflections on the production and consumption of poverty in tourism*', Frenzel and Koens (2012) says that the majority of papers were qualitative in nature, while quantitative approaches were largely limited to descriptive statistics, reflecting the youth of the field and exploratory nature of much of the research. The authors note:

> *"Amidst a proliferation of case studies, the emerging field of slum tourism now faces the challenge of addressing the definition of its scope and consequently its main conceptual questions. This is particularly true in respect of the many overlaps that exist between slum tourism research and related concepts and aspects of critical tourism research" (Frenzel and Koens, 2012:196).*

At the same time it is evident that the increasing number of case studies has led academic slum tourism debates to a certain level of comparative and conceptual reasoning. The occurrence of new cases has made a comparative approach towards a more thorough understanding of slum tourism even more salient, as parallels and, indeed, mutual influences between locations become more obvious. Flyvbjerg (2006) has argued how a range of case studies can be the backbone of good theorizing. Such a development appears to be starting to take place within slum tourism research now.

Other researchers have looked at the issue of commoditization of poverty for example Rolfes *et al*. (2009). The question that remains is what is being commoditized in slum tourism or, in other words, what is the slum tourism product? Is it really the slum itself and the imaginaries associated with it? The authors note:

> *"Asking the tourists, research has established that poverty is the most important quality that tourists associate with slums. One can follow logically that this is what they come to see when they do a slum tour" (Rolfes et al. 2009).*

According to Krippendorf (1987), the attitudes and opinions of local residents towards the socio-economic effects of any kind of tourism are so significant that they should be studied before anything else. Proponents of slum tourism argue that the point is to change the reputation of the slums. Besides, some tour organizers assert that this kind of tourism can provide employment for local guides and a chance to sell souvenirs. Hence, slum tourism is not just about charity, but it also fosters an entrepreneurial spirit. Even critics of slum tourism concede that it allows a few dollars to trickle into the slums, but they are quick to warn that it should not be a substitute for development programmes. Arguably, slum tourism carries with it numerous questions concerning its ethical acceptability. To proponents, slum tours provide a valuable window into the lives of the poorest of the poor and help funnel tourist dollars into the slums.

Scheyvens (2007) has questioned whether tourism can provide economic empowerment for the township communities and Rogerson (2004) has – in respect of Soweto – identified problems, such as limited demand and limited training of communities in dealing with tourists, as major obstacles to benefits of slum tourism for the townships. In his paper on tourism in Rocinha, Rio de Janeiro, Frisch (2012) explores the process through which the favela has been turned from a social problem into a tourist attraction. He argues tourism takes up the favela's rich symbolic potential and is both depending on as well as contributing to existing discourses. Of particular importance here are visual elements of the favela. In a critique on current tourism, the dominance of external agents and lacking local participation is seen as denying residents a role as thinking, independently acting subjects. He concludes that current favela tourism does not go beyond a form of 'negative sightseeing'.

Slum tourism in Mumbai still is regarded with not dissimilar skepticism and has evoked what seems to be vociferous condemnation in the Indian public realm (Dyson, 2012). This shows some similarities to the initial reactions of certain parts of the Brazilian and South African public and might be a characteristic of early stages in the development of slum tourism (Doxey, 1975). Dyson (2012) says:

> *"In all cases the rejection of slum tourism seems to originate in the respective middle and upper classes, while the residents affected by slum tourism tend to sanction it" (Dyson 2012:155).*

Consequently, Dyson (2012) develops the concept of representation and interpretation in his investigation of slum walking tours in Dharavi, India. The tours position themselves to represent 'reality' to counter the 'fake' or 'fictional' negative images that dominate Western representations of slums. He explicates the difficulties of such a perspective and notes that representations are always subjective, conditional and uncertain.

It is important to note at this point that the contributions of the various authors demonstrate that the local perspective is relatively unknown. Research thus far has focused on the perspectives of slum tourism operators and tourists. Reactions of local people as well as the interaction with other local businesses have been reflected upon much less, a point made by Freire-Medeiros (2012). Whilst there may be practical reasons for this, the lack of knowledge on this matter is one of the most important gaps in today's knowledge and this requires further investigation (Frenzel and Koens, 2012).

Community's Attitudes towards Tourism

As noted by Lankford, (1994), tourism researchers primarily focused on travellers, their needs, behaviours and motivations up until the 1980s. Much research was conducted for the convenience of tourists whereas local communities' perceptions and attitudes towards the industry were less of a priority (Murphy, 1985). Supporting this view, Krippendorf (1987) argues that the psychology and sociology of tourism had been largely concerned with travellers' reviews and behaviour but not perceptions.

Tourism is a socio-cultural event for both the guest and host (Murphy, 1985:133) hence ignorance of hosts' opinions can lead to many problems in the development of tourism. Murphy (1985) argues 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 (Allen *et al.*, 1988; Ap & Crompton, 1993). Without an auspicious local community, it is very hard for the tourism industry to keep sustainable development (Inbakaran & Jackson, 2003).

Williams and Lawson (2001) argue that studying community attitudes towards tourism would help tourism planners to select those developments that could minimize the negative impacts and maximize the positive impacts of tourism. By so doing, quality of life for residents would be maintained or enhanced on the one hand and the negative impacts of tourism on the community would be minimized on the other hand. Realizing the importance of host community's attitudes towards tourism, a large number of studies focusing on the issue have been conducted in the past two decades and it is still a growing research area (Weaver & Lawton, 2001; Ryan & Montgomery, 1994).

To understand the antecedents of host communities' perception of tourism's impacts, extensive literature have attempted to examine the influences of socio-demographics on attitudes, such as gender (Ritchie, 1988; Weaver & Lawton, 2001), age (Brougham & Butler, 1981; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Madrigal, 1995; Weaver & Lawton, 2001), ethnicity (Var *et al.,* 1985), proximity to resort (Jurowski & Gursoy, 2004; Madrigal, 1995; Weaver & Lawton, 2001), length of residency (Allen *et al.,* 1988; Liu & Var, 1986), native born status (Canan & Hennessy, 1989; Davis *et al.*,

1988) and political position in the society (Mansfeld, 1992). In spite of such socio-demographic factors, some other studies have also found that income dependence on tourism (Ap & Crompton, 1993; Johnson *et al.,* 1994), level of contact with tourists (Akis *et al.*, 1996; Davis *et al.,* 1988) and knowledge about tourism (Davis *et al.,* 1988; Hillery *et al.,* 2001; Liu & Var, 1986) are also influential on attitudes towards tourism. This will be extensively referred to in the discussion of the findings.

To critics, tours to slums represent the worst kind of travel voyeurism, degrading and utterly without redeeming qualities. Hence, the central question is on whether slum tourism is ethically acceptable or it is exploitative voyeurism at its worst. The answer to these questions is the intent of this paper, to hear from the slum dwellers themselves whether they approve of this kind of tourism or they detest it. Slum tourism might be acceptable if it makes an effort to connect the tourist with the affected community in some way. Very few studies have directly examined resident attitudes and perceptions towards slum tourism. As indicated by Frenzel and Koens (2012), there is a distinct lack of research that involved the ideas and perceptions of local people towards slum tourism. Only a limited number of papers investigated the production of slum tourism and ways in which local businesses get involved. Such a gap in research has greatly constrained the understanding of the causes of such attitudes and prediction of their effect on how the slum residents react to the slum tourists. However, general tourism literature has suggested an in-depth look into this research area (Carmichael, 2000; Inbakaran & Jackson, 2003) and argued that examining the antecedents of resident attitudes would help to maintain a harmonious relationship between the hosts and tourists, which is vital for the sustainable and long-term development of the tourism industry (Ap, 1990; Williams & Lawson, 2001).

Materials and Methods

This study was conducted in Kibera slums of Nairobi, Kenya. The slum is the largest of Kenya'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 study employed a triangulation of research designs; both exploratory research design and descriptive research design were used. The study was based on the informants' description of their own experiences; the researchers then inductively identified and extracted themes from these descriptions (thematic analysis).

The samples were taken from the population of Kibera residents who were at least 18 years old. Again, the sample consisted of local residents who lived along the stretch that is mostly frequented by the slum tourists; however, a few slum tour operators, tour guides and community leaders (Area chiefs, Pastors, Councillors and Community Based Organization leaders) were interviewed in order to get their insights. Questionnaires in form of a scale were administered to the heads of households and the ideal sampling frame for the questionnaire survey was a comprehensive database of all the households in the study area and which the researchers obtained from the local Non Governmental Organizations (UN-HABITAT, Kenya Water for Health Organization-KWAHO and Carolina for Kibera). Respondents were randomly selected from the sampling list.

The researchers interviewed a total of 13 respondents (Area chiefs (2), Pastors (2), Councillors (2) and Community Based Organization leaders (3) who were purposively sampled and who satisfied the sampling criterion that had been carefully established. The sample size for the quantitative part utilizing the questionnaires was calculated using the statistical formula with a precision of +5%, at ninety-five per cent confidence level. The study also adopted a mixture of various data collection methods. These included: interviews, questionnaires and participant observation.

Approximately 200 questionnaires were distributed by the researcher between October, 2010 and December, 2010. Completed questionnaires were returned between mid-January and mid-February 2011. In total, 182 questionnaires were returned, representing a response rate 91%. Each returned questionnaire was checked for legibility and usability. Thirty five questionnaires were incomplete on important statements and were eliminated from the analysis. A total of 147 useful questionnaires remained and were input into SPSS, Windows 16.0 for analysis. The data was double checked with the original questionnaires to ensure the accuracy of data entry and there after subjected to descriptive analysis.

Results and Discussion

General Attitudes towards Tourism

A total of 17 statements (8 theoretically positive and 9 theoretically negative) were used to capture the respondents' perception on slum tourism in their community (Kibera). The respondents rating on all the attitudinal statements are summarized in table 1. The more the statements were skewed towards 1 (minimum expected count –Strongly disagree) the more the positive statement were being negated and vice versa. Generally, the residents living in Kibera slums have negative attitudes towards slum tourism development. This was seen from their lower rating scores on positive impact statements (overall mean = 2.43, individual mean ranging between 2.03 and 3.02) and higher rating scores on negative impact statement (overall mean = 3.413, individual mean ranging between 2.03 and 4.29).

Table 1: Kibera Community Attitude Statements

Attitudinal Statements	Item No.	Statement	Mean	Std Dev	Min score	Max score
Positive Statement (n= 147)	A4	Slum tourism is a pleasure	2.86	1.443	1	5
	A5	Right choice to embrace Slum tourism	3.02	1.537	1	5
	A6	No future for the area without tourism	2.37	1.365	1	5
	A7	Area better thanks to slum tourism	2.27	1.402	1	5
	D2	I support the approval of slum tourism	2.45	1.304	1	5
	C1	I receive social benefits from slum tourism	2.37	1.293	1	5
	C2	I receive economic benefits for ST	2.03	1.555	1	5
	C3	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)	A2	Not appropriate for the area	3.48	1.496	1	5
	A3	It is embarrassing	4.07	1.259	1	5
	B1	Money goes to outsiders	4.29	1.02	1	5
	B2	Many people have moved away	2.03	1.05	1	5
	B4	It increases human traffic	2.52	1.289	1	5
	A1	It is hard to accept slum tourism	3.59	1.297	1	5
	B3	Slum tourist don't interact with locals	3.99	1.324	1	5
	D1	I don't care if we have ST in this area	3.28	1.313	1	5
	D3	ST is not ethically acceptable	3.47	1.144	1	5
		Overall mean of negative statement	**3.413**		**1**	**5**

In fact, when asked what he thought of the presence of slum tourists in Kibera, one of the local chiefs said:

> *Some 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 into 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 (Chief-A-1-[i]).*

These findings were in contrast with the majority of previous studies on local residents' perception on tourism development (Davis *et al.*, 1988; Lawson *et al.*, 1998; Long *et al.*, 1990; Sheldon & Var, 1984). Indeed, according to the residents of Kibera, a big chunk of money from slum tourism goes to the outsiders and this remained the respondents biggest concern (the highest mean score among all negative impact statements mean=4.29), this clearly exceeded the bearable level, as one leader of a community-based organizations asserted when asked whether slum tourism was good or bad for the residents of Kibera:

> *It is good if the encounters are beneficial or there is a lot of interaction, people will definitely perceive the slum tours positively, but if the slums tours are heavily guarded by the tour operators who limit the interactions and even minimize direct benefits from the tourist for example handouts, people seem to ignore and have negative feelings towards these people coming here as visitors (CBO Leader-C-1-[iv]).*

Kibera slum residents did not believe that slum tourism had improved the general quality of their individual lives; they tended to disagree with the positive statement that the slum area was better, thanks to slum tourism (mean=2.27). On the contrary, they did not realize negative social impacts to a big extent, they tended to disagree with the negative impact statements "many people have moved away as a result of slum tourism" and "slum tourism increases human traffic" (mean scores 2.03 and 2.52 respectively). The number of people going to Kibera is growing, although for now not too big to create a congestion scare, but one could observe people crowding around slum tourists and this sometimes brings business to a standstill. In future, as these numbers grow, the area may actually experience congestion. Equally, the presence of slum tourists has created a lot of expectations among the locals which, if not quickly filled, will create a lot of desperation as people stop to work and instead wait for the slum tourists eventually behaving as beggars, some are also used by the slum tour operators to stage manage what they referred to as "the exaggerated life in Kibera". Furthermore, some negative impacts have been experienced, for instance, slum tourism has affected education in the slum area, occasionally students have refused to go to school just because they are waiting for a *mzungu* (in reference to the white skinned slum tourists) to give them money. Touching on this issue, one local area chief stated that:

> *The locals change their mannerism in the presence of tourists, they exaggerate their situation so that they can win help and assistance, most interactions are characterized by lies and cooked stories of how people live in Kibera. Yes the conditions just like any other slum are deplorable but people exaggerate the situation, the slum operators organize the stage managing of this events by selectively choosing the people to speak to the tourist (Chief-B-2-[iv]).*

Nevertheless, tourism planners and all the concerned stakeholders need to make efforts to enhance both economic and social benefits flowing to the local residents from slum tourism, otherwise, the perceived negative impacts especially on economic benefits might escalate to offensive levels and this might lead to greater anti-slum tourist kind of attitudes. In comparison with the perceptions towards economic and social impacts, cultural impacts elicited strong feelings among the slum residents. The perception of cultural benefits were weaker, the respondents noted that slum tourists do not interact with local residents (mean score 3.99). This probably limited the level of cross-cultural exchanges between the tourists and the residents, to a big extent. Consequently, the locals did not get an opportunity to learn about and experience other cultures and this is another area that should be addressed to avert a situation where the locals become hostile to the slum tourists. One councillor commented:

> *I feel bad that people do not get this life-changing opportunity of interacting with the slum tourists who in most cases are well off and could easily provide a financial breakthrough to our problems. It is the operators and NGOs who want to be close to the tourists because equally they are seeking to rip them off heavily by using our poverty situation (CLLOR-A-2-[vi]).*

The residents also felt that slum tourism was embarrassing and not ethically acceptable (mean score 4.07 and 3.47 respectively). This could be attributed to the fact that slum tourism thrives on

the poverty situation of the local residents as the main attraction and the residents recognize this. Indeed a pastor of one of the local churches noted:

> *It is just the mystery of people of Kibera; the poverty, 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-A-1-[v]).*

The local residents were, however, not amused by the status accorded to Kibera slums (custodians of filth and misery). They insisted that there are so many things in Kibera which are positive but have not gained publicity. According to them, there is biased reporting about the real life in Kibera. One leader of a community-based organization in the area asserted:

> *The image of unmitigated misery in Kibera is not fair to this community. I can see how visiting one of the largest slums in Africa has become such an attractive activity to people, but there are so many untold stories here. Firstly, there is Kibera's hidden middle class people who have enough money to move out but choose to stay because they can't bear the relative solitude of the posh neighbours; we also have in Kibera a plethora of self-help, art, dance, drama and sports projects, but people just want to talk about poverty, poverty, poverty all the time…there is life inside these muddy walls, joy even, we do everything other people do - brush our teeth, watch TV, go to work and bathe; we just do so more publicly, and less comfortably, than the rest of the world does (CBO Leader-B-1-[v]).*

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). This was actually the highest score among the positive statements. It meant that the perceptions of the residents had not reached the unbearable levels, hence if the antecedents of these negative attitudes like the low level of benefits and interaction between the residents and the slum tourists are corrected; they (residents) could still change their attitudes and support slum tourism. From the discussions, the residents had no problem with the fact that slum tourists come to Kibera. The residents only hoped that the visits and other slum tourism activities would begin translating into benefits for the locals. From an ethical point of view, slum tourism in Kibera is something the residents were not proud of, according to them, what determines the ethical uprightness of the tours was the intention of the visit. Commenting on this, another leader of a community based organization said:

> *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 to get surprised at our deplorable living conditions… but nothing changes for us. 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 it's pouring with rain here and the paths are like rivers (CBO Leader-A-4-[i]).*

This means that Kibera residents are ready to fully embrace slum tourism on condition that a mutual beneficial relationship between the tourists and the community is developed and equally the tours are conducted in an ethical manner with the correct motive; that of helping rescue the residents from their destitute conditions. At the moment there is a sense of hopelessness among the residents in Kibera slum with respondents tending to agree with the negative statement that

"I don't care if we have slum tourism in this area" (mean=3.28); these are signs of apathy which when not checked could lead to greater antagonism to slum tourism activities.

On overall, residents living in Kibera slums demonstrated negative attitudes towards the development of slum tourism indicating that slum tourism development in Kibera had reached offensive levels and exhibited offensive symptoms. Fitting this into the Doxey's (1975) Irridex Model, the development passed the euphoria stage because while the people who had lived in Kibera for a short period of time tended to have positive attitude, the majority who had lived for 7 to about 10 years and above tended to have negative attitudes. The development should be within the "apathy" stage and exhibiting an emergence of "antagonism" symptoms. According to the Irridex Model (Doxey, 1975), hosts' attitudes change with the pace and stage of tourism development. Another local area chief noted that:

> *The relationship for now is not quite harmonious, but if the status quo is maintained where the locals do not interact and draw benefits from the tours, they will soon become rebellious and antagonistic. Already you have locals saying that the tourists' coming is not leaving them with anything and they'd better as well not come* (*Chief-B-2-[iii]).*

High volume mass tourism would increase the degree of incompatibility between residents and the slum tourists; when this incompatibility reaches a certain level, antagonism emerges and slum tourism development will enter into the "stagnation" or "decline" stage. To avoid falling into the undesired slum tourism development stages, the relevant stakeholders and planners should consider the speed of slum tourism development and the number of arrivals for slum tourists. It might be practically difficult to determine the appropriate pace of slum tourism development owing to the informal manner in which it is carried out but the resident attitudes from the present study provide a good criterion and foundation for decision making and particularly short term planning decisions. However, medium and long term plans can be made based on routine monitoring of residents relations with slum tourists. This bottom-up planning approach is vital for the sustainability of slum tourism development as it assures harmony between the residents, the slum tourists, local government and the slum tourism industry (Faulkner & Tideswell, 1997).

Apart from the overall negative attitudes, the difference in perception among the residents of Kibera should also come to the attention of planners, because while some residents were placed on the extreme sides, either strongly supporting or opposing slum tourism development, others held neutral attitudes. The stage-based models such as the one referred to earlier (Doxey, 1975) are inadequate in explaining such variations of attitudes because they assumed "a degree of homogeneity and uni-directionality in the way the residents perceive and react to tourism development" (Faulkner & Tideswell, 1997:7). They, for example, do not capture how intrinsic factors such as demographic and socio-economic characteristics affect the resident attitudes.

The social exchange theory (SET) (AP, 1992), however, captures intrinsic elements of an individual and was appropriate in explaining these variations. In the context of this paper, the adapted SET (AP, 1992) viewed residents' attitudes towards slum tourism development as a trade off between the benefits and the costs of slum tourism perceived by the residents. Residents were more likely to be supportive to tourism development if they perceived more favourable impacts (benefits) than negative impacts (costs) from development and vice versa. Clearly from the findings of the present study, the residents perceived benefits from slum tourism as meagre and consequently possessed negative attitudes towards its development.

According to Kibera residents, slum tourism can be a good first step towards engaging with poor people indicating that they have nothing against such visits. They, however, thought that

the tourists need to move beyond surface interactions. The government, media, tour companies and other stakeholders have fuelled some tourists' desires to go to the slums and gawk through supplying pictures of malnourished children playing in filthy surroundings, without providing any real insight into their situation. Such situations have led to increased visits which according to the residents have not helped in addressing the 'real' issues facing the residents. The locals were afraid that this might be the trend in terms of impact in future if the current trend continues. From the above discussions, the general attitudes and reaction of the locals were mainly shaped by what they get from the visits.

Intrinsic Factors Affecting Positive or Negative Resident Attitudes
It was found that age, length of residence and economic dependence on slum tourism influenced only positive attitudes with those who are older, living in Kibera for a longer period and not working in the slum tourism industry having less positive attitude and vice versa. On the other hand, the level of education influenced only the negative attitudes with those who were less educated tending to have strong negative attitude towards the development of slum tourism.

The results on the relationship between age and attitudes showed that younger people perceived more benefits from slum tourism; compared with their elderly counterparts. The younger people were more convinced that slum tourism was beneficial to the area and had improved the general quality of life. Interestingly, this finding contrasts those of a study by Tomljenovic and Faulkner's (2000) which was conducted in Australia reporting a non-significant relationship between age and attitudes towards tourism. The finding again is not in line with Weaver and Lawton's (2001) study which reported a significant positive relationship between age and favourable attitudes towards tourism development.

Concerning the influence of length of residency, it was found that long-term residents tended to be less positive towards slum tourism than new residents. The positive attitudes by short-term residents were attributed to the fact that they have experienced less negative impacts of slum tourism owing to their shorter stay; however, there was a non-significant relation between the dependence on slum tourism and negative attitudes. Additionally, the results from the study demonstrated non-significant relation of the level of education and positive attitudes. In fact, respondents who were less educated were found to have more negative attitudes towards the development of slum tourism, as opposed to the well educated people. The study also identified distance from home to the most visited area to be influential on both positive and negative attitudes. The respondents living close to the area frequently visited by the slum tourists tended to perceive more positive and less negative impacts of tourism than those living far. If the cost of slum tourism was an issue, then one would expect negative sentiments from those living closer to the sites. However, according to the present study, the opposite is true, those who live closer to the site held favourable attitudes and perceptions especially on the benefits of slum tourism.

Several other variables such as gender, place of birth and the type of household were found to be non influential on both positive and negative attitudes, and, therefore, within the boundaries of the this paper, it was concluded that these variables do not affect resident attitudes towards slum tourism. The above three variables have, however, been examined previously to see how they influence attitudes towards tourism development. Take gender, for example, the findings are in line with those of Davis *et al*. (1988), Ryan and Montgomery (1994) and Weaver and Lawton (2001) that male and female did not differ in the way they perceive tourism development.

Kennedy M.O., Damiannah M.K. and Beatrice O.I.

Conclusion

The present study sought to examine the attitudes and perceptions of local residents towards the development of slum tourism and the factors influencing the attitudes and addressed research deficiencies in the current context. Several important conclusions are drawn from the findings of the present study.

First, Kibera slum residents' demonstrated overall negative attitudes towards slum tourism. According to them, the development of slum tourism has resulted to more negative influences than positive. In terms of the economic benefits and other social issues and impacts; the residents have plenty of reservations on the level of benefits accruing from slum tourism and its contribution to the local economy. The residents generally see the benefits from slum tourism as meagre and argued that most of the benefits from the said form of tourism go to the outsiders. However, these attitudes were not uniform throughout the community. Some residents had favourable attitudes towards slum tourism and would advocate for its further development while others are reluctant to support it and others have neutral attitudes.

Second, the study established that while some factors (age, length of residence and occupational dependence on tourism) influenced the positive attitudes others (the education level) influenced negative attitudes. There were those that simultaneously influenced both the positive and negative attitudes (distance from house to the areas frequently visited by the slum tourists). These findings were crucial since they indicate the aspects of attitude that are influenced by various individual factors, thus providing a deeper understanding of how these factors affect the attitudes and perceptions of the slum residents towards the development of slum tourism. Third, the benefits drawn from slum tourism were too meagre to make the residents to support its further development, as provided for by the SET model (Ap, 1992). However it is important to note that the negativity 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.

Last, the study found that the greatest impediments to the local residents generating benefits from slum tourism is the limited opportunities for interaction between the local residents and the slum tourists and the "outsider dominance" in ownership of the organizations and tour operation establishment that organize and run the slum tours. The interactions were limited to few individuals who hang around the slum tourists and who were seen as the most educated fellows (individuals) in the area. 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 Kenyan nationals.

Recommendations

From the findings of the study and the discussion in this paper, it is recommended that there is need for the operators to allow and enhance interactions between the slum tourists and the locals rather than limiting them. In addition, they need to carry out niche marketing to attract only those slum tourists who have intentions to change the lives of the slum dwellers. There is also need for the government and non-government organizations to put in place structures to increase ownership of slum tour operations to the locals by funding community based slum entrepreneurial projects in tourism and other community ventures like selling of souvenirs and increasing their capacity. The study further recommends capacity building and creating awareness among the locals especially by the community based organizations to mitigate the impact of those holding negative attitudes.

References

Akama, J. S. (2004). Neo-colonialism, Dependency and External Control of Kenya's Tourism Industry: A Case Study of Wildlife Safari Tourism in Kenya. In C. M., Hall & H. Tucker. Tourism and Post-colonialism: Contested Discourses, Identities and Representations. London: Routledge.

Akis, S., Peristianis, N. & Warner, J. (1996). Residents' attitudes to tourism development: the case of Cyprus. Tourism Management, 17(3): 481-94.

Allen, L., Long, P., Perdue, R. & Kieselbach, S. (1988). The impact of tourism development on residents' perceptions of community life. Journal of Travel Research, 27(1): 16-21.

Ap, J. (1990). Residents' perceptions research on the social impacts of tourism. Annals of Tourism Research, 17: 610-6.

Ap, J. & Crompton, J. L. (1993). Residents' strategies for responding to tourism impacts. Journal of Travel Research, 33(1): 47-50.

Bowers, C. (2007, February 9, 11.30). Slum tourism: good or bad? FP (Foreign Policy), online, available from: Accessed on 5th April, 2010.

Brougham, J. E. & Butler, R. W. (1981). A segmentation analysis of resident attitudes. Annals of Tourism Research, 8: 569-90.

Canan, P. & Hennessy, M. (1989). The growth machine, tourism and the selling of culture. Sociological Perspectives, 32: 227-43.

Carmichael, B. A. (2000). A matrix model for resident attitudes and behaviours in a rapidly changing tourist area. Tourism Management, 21(6): 601-11.

Cawthorne, C. (2007, February 09, 11.13.20 GMT). "Slum tourism" stirs controversy in Kenya, online, available from: Accessed on 12th March, 2010. Retrieved from

http://www.alertnet.org/thenews/nesdesk/L06818999.htm.

Davis, D., Allen, J. & Cosenza, R. (1988). Segmenting local residents by their attitudes, interests and opinions toward tourism. Journal of Travel Research, 27 (2): 2-8.

Doxey, G. V. (1975). A causation theory of visitor irritants, methodology and research inferences. In Travel and Tourism Research Associations. Sixth Annual Conference Proceedings, San Diego: 95-8.

Doy, M. (2008). Slum tourism: Pro-poor or simple voyeurism? (CABI) Centre for Agriculture and Biosciences International.

Dyson, P. (2012). Slum tourism: Representing and interpreting 'reality' in Dharavi, Mumbai. Tourism Geographies, 14(2): 254–274.

Faulkner, B. & Tideswell, C. (1997). A framework for monitoring community impacts of tourism. Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 5(1): 1-26.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. Qualitative Inquiry, 12(2): 219–245.

Fredline, E. & Faulkner, B. (2000). Host community reactions: a cluster analysis. Annals of Tourism Research, 27 (3): 763-84.

Frenzel, F. & Koens, K., (2012). Slum Tourism: Developments in a Young Field of Interdisciplinary Tourism Research, Tourism Geographies: An International Journal of Tourism Space, Place and Environment, 14 (2): 195-212.

Frisch, T. (2012). Glimpses of another world: The Favela tourist attraction. Tourism Geographies, 14(2): 320–338.

Gursoy, D. & Rutherford, D. G. (2004). Host attitudes toward tourism: an improved structural model. Annals of Tourism Research, 31(3): 495-516.

Haralambopoulos, N. & Pizam, A. (1996). Perceived impacts of tourism: the case of Samos. Annals of Tourism Research, 23: 503-26.

Hillery, M., Nancarrow, B., Griffin, G. & Syme, G., (2001). Tourist perception of environmental impact, Annals of Tourism Research, 28:853-67.

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, J., Snepenger, D. & Akis, S. (1994). Residents' perceptions of tourism development. Annals of Tourism Research, 21: 629-42.

Jurowski, C. & Gursoy, D. (2004). Distance effects on residents' attitudes toward tourism. Annals of Tourism Research, 31(2): 296-312.

Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS), (2010). Tourism Statistics. Government of Kenya.

Kenya Tourism Board, (KTB), (2011). Tourism Statistics for the Year 2010/2011. Government of Kenya.

Krippendorf, J. (1987). The Holiday Makers: Understanding the Impact of Leisure and Travel. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.

Lankford, S. (1994). Attitudes and perceptions toward tourism and rural regional development. Journal of Travel Research, 32: 35-43.

Lawson, R. W., Williams, J., Young, T. & Cossens, J. (1998). A comparison of residents' attitudes towards tourism in 10 New Zealand destinations. Tourism Management, 19(3): 247-56.

Liu, J. & Var, T. (1986). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts in Hawaii. Annals of Tourism Research, 13: 193-214.

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.

Madrigal, R. (1993). A tale of tourism in two cities. Annals of Tourism Research, 20: 336-353.

Mansfeld, Y. (1992). Group-differentiated perceptions of social impacts related to tourism development. Professional Geographer, 44: 377-92.

Martin, S. (1995). Montanans' Attitudes and Behavioural Intentions toward Tourism: Implications for Sustainability. In S. McCool, & A. Watson, (Eds.). Linking Tourism, the Environment, and Sustainability (pp. 69-76). US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Ogden UT.

Mashada (2006). Slum tourism (poverty for sale) Targets Kibera and Mukuru Kayaba Slums, Kenya. Mashada, online.

Murphy, P. E. (1985). Tourism: A Community Approach. London: Routledge.

Ritchie, J. (1988). Consensus policy formulation in tourism. Tourism Management, 9: 99-216.

Rogerson, C. M. (2004). Urban tourism and small tourism enterprise development in Johannesburg: The case of township tourism. GeoJournal, 60(1): 249–257.

Rolfes, M., Steinbrink, M. & Uhl, C. (2009). Townships as Attraction: An Empirical Study of Township Tourism in Cape Town, Potsdam: Universitaetsverl. Potsdam.

Ryan, C. & Montgomery, D. (1994). The attitudes of Bakewell residents to tourism and issues in community responsive tourism. Tourism Management, 15: 358-69.

Scheyvens, R. (2007). Exploring the tourism–poverty nexus. Current Issues in Tourism, 10(2): 231–254.

Selinger, E. and Outterson, K. (2009). The Ethics of Poverty Tourism, Boston School of Law Working, Papers. Available at http://www.bu.edu/law/faculty/scholarship/workingpapers/ documents/SelingerEOuttersonK06-02-09.pdf (accessed 20 February, 2013).

Sheldon, P. & Var, T. (1984). Resident attitudes to tourism in North Wales. Tourism Management, 5: 40-7.

Tomljenovic, R. & Faulkner, B. (2000). Tourism and older residents in a Sunbelt resort. Annals of Tourism Research, 27: 93-114.

Tribe, J. (1997). The indiscipline of tourism. Annals of Tourism Research, 24(3): 638–657.

Tyrell, T. & Spaulding, P. (1984). A survey of attitudes toward tourism growth in Rhode Island. Hospitality Education and Research Journal, 8: 22-3.

University of the West of England, (2010, January 30). Does Slum tourism make us better people? Science Daily online, available from: Accessed on 4th March, 2010

http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2010/01/100128142349.htm.

Var, T., Kendall, K. W. & Tarakcioglu, E. (1985). Resident attitudes towards tourists in a Turkish resort town. Annals of Tourism Research, 12: 652-7.

Weaver, D. B. & Lawton, L. J. (2001). Resident perceptions in the urban-rural fringe. Annals of Tourism Research, 28 (2): 439-58.

Weiner, E. (2009). Slumming it: Can Slum Tourism Be Done Right? World hum, online, available from: http://www.worldhum.com/features/eric-weiner/slum-tourism-the-responsible-way-200903121, Accessed on 16th March, 2010.

Williams, J. & Lawson, R. (2001). Community issues and resident opinions of tourism. Annals of Tourism Research, 28(2): 269-90.

Zijlma, A. (2010). Slum tourism Anouk's Africa Travel Blog, online, available from: http:// goafrica.about.com/b/2010/03/11/slum-tourim.htm, Accessed on 8th May, 2010.