

Making slums into attractions: The role of tour guiding in the slum tourism development of Kibera and Dharavi

Making slums into attractions: The role of tour guiding in the slum tourism development of Kibera and Dharavi

Abstract

This paper investigates how slums are made into a tourism attraction. We focus in particular on the role of tour guides and tour guiding operations in this process. In tourism literature in general tour guiding has been subject to much reflection and debate. However, tour guides' role in enabling tourism in new places, in the making of attractions has not been discussed much. Also, in the emerging research on slum tourism little attention has been given to tour guides and their roles. This paper addresses both research gaps in providing insights into tour guiding in slum tourism, and by addressing the roles of tour guides in attraction-making through a comparative analysis of tourism in two slums, Dharavi, in Mumbai, India, and Kibera, in Nairobi, Kenya. Based on empirical research of tour guiding operations we found that different levels of formality in tour guiding co-exist across destinations. Formal tour guiding operations are more successful in establishing a slum as an attraction as they enable significant growth in tourist numbers. However, formal tour guiding operations and strong international participation in their foundation are factors that seem to undermine to some extent the creation of intimate and authentic encounters in tour guiding, preferred by some tourists. This leaves space for more informal tour guiding, with strong local ties, which are better placed to produce intimate experiences.

Keywords: Slum Tourism, Tour Guiding, Attraction Making, Organisational Structures, Social Ties, Intimacy

Making slums into attractions: The role of tour guiding in the slum tourism development of Kibera and Dharavi

Introduction

Slum tourism debates in the media and public sphere often regard slum tourism through the lens of a moral dilemma in that tourist voyeurism is squared with the potential economic benefits for the poor deriving from the tourist interest (Frenzel & Koens 2012, Steinbrink et al., 2012). Encapsulated in this view is an economic logic of exchange in which the slum becomes a commodity that can be sold and where poverty becomes commodified (Freire-Medeiros, 2009). This exchange, while morally dubious, may bring advantages to the poor, so the argument continues. This pattern of analysis is similar to discussions of other forms of tourism in the context of development and poverty alleviation. Pristine beaches, unique attractions, 'exotic' people and places of developing countries are all prone to becoming commodities in the tourism market. They can be offered, traded and sold to tourists for foreign exchange earnings, which may have positive development or anti-poverty effects. Critical views of tourism as a development tool often question the positive economic effects of this exchange by pointing to the limits of 'trickle down' development approaches (Scheyvens, 2011; Frenzel, 2013).

Beyond such criticism there is the question of how the value of an attraction is actually produced, particularly in slum tourism. While it seems that there is an intrinsic value to certain attractions, like a pristine beach, the value of pristine beaches is not natural but the product of a process, which includes multiple activities for example, keeping the beach clean, providing access, and communicating and marketing the beach as an attraction. In slum tourism when a slum is turned into a tourist attraction, the important role of attraction making becomes obvious, as we do not normally picture slums as attractive and valuable places. Rather slums are perceived as places of negative value and of 'territorial stigma' (Wacquant, 2008). Hence, the question is how do slums become tourist attractions?

In this paper we address the question of attraction making in slum tourism with a particular focus on the role of tour guiding. Significant research has been conducted on tour guiding in tourism literature, for example, focusing on guiding roles, services the guides provide, and their relationships with place and people visited (e.g. Cohen, 1985; Pond, 1993; Bruner, 2005; Salazar, 2005; Rabotić, 2010). Tour guides contribute significantly to attraction making. While sharing pre-formulated narratives of a place, they

also play a considerable role in modifying and developing them. Apart from the narratives, tour guides also enable and enact sensory tourist experiences as tourists are guided through territories of unknown sights, smells and ambiances.

Particularly in the early stages of slum tourism development, tour guides play a central role in explicating why it is important to visit slums. The tour guides need to establish a destination that many people would not normally consider worth visiting. This is risky and can be described as entrepreneurial. Tour guides need to provide narratives about why visiting slums is important and valuable. They also need to be able to help tourists to navigate places often associated with insecurity, high crime levels, poverty, deprivation, and health and other risks.

The literature on slum tourism has to date rarely considered this role of tour guiding. In this paper we address this lacuna. We investigate specifically which organisational forms tour guiding takes, how tour guides provide tourists with reasons to visit slums, and how they practically enact the slum tours. The paper is based on the analysis of empirical data from two major slum tourism destinations: Dharavi, in Mumbai, India, and Kibera, in Nairobi, Kenya. The data was collected by interviewing tour guides and founders of tour organisations in both destinations on four field trips. This paper contributes to the study of slum tourism, while adding to existing debates on tour guiding, addressing in particular how tour guiding contributes to the making of attractions in slum tourism.

In the first section of this paper we review current literature on attraction making and tour guiding. The combined review enables us to create a framework for the study of guides and guiding operations in attraction making, which we apply to the analysis of the empirical data. In the last section we discuss the results of the empirical research and consider the significance and possible interpretation of the findings.

The Making of an Attraction

In tourism literature the question of how to understand an attraction has long been a key issue. MacCannell (1976) pointed out that an attraction consists of a sight – for example, a beach, mountains, a monument or an iconic building – as well as a marker pointing to a sight. Markers can broadly be described as symbolic practices, for example, signs and discourses producing the significance of the

sight. These markers may be created and maintained by tourist marketing, and are often narrated and modified by tour guides. More generally such discourses often exist outside tourism, and tourism taps into them, for example, in the case of tourism to Roman ruins that are significant in the context of how Europeans understand their history and become attractions because of this historical significance (Urry, 2000). The attraction of a sight also depends on more practical service provision (Lew, 1987), which includes maintaining the sight and the provision of access and hospitality around a sight.

The usability of a place for tourist purposes depends on the provision of markers and services. Sights cannot be considered as naturally valuable. At the same time, some sights hold a higher potential for attraction than others as they speak to more established notions of what is considered attractive (Leiper, 1990; Richard, 2002). The value of both, a pristine beach and a slum are socially constructed, but slums are not normally regarded as attractions and tourism in slums may to some seem unusual. But slums may also become more established destination types. In South Africa, for example townships are widely regarded a tourism resource, because township tourism, initially a niche product for special interested travelers, is conducted by at least 25 percent of international visitors to South Africa (Rolfes, 2010). Visitors find information about township tours in their hotels, in their guidebooks and hear about them from fellow tourists. But how do slums, and other unlikely attractions, become established?

Crucial for the construction of a tourism attraction are specific activities. Some of these are intrinsically communicative and symbolic activities that produce narratives and other symbolic markers pointing to the attraction. To enable tourists to visit an attraction specific services, like hospitality and access, are needed. The provision and maintenance of more established attractions, like beaches, are often organised and managed by tourism organisations, involving paid tourism professionals and tourism firms. When firms organise the making and maintaining of a tourism attraction they do so in order to sell the attraction and capture the value thus realized (Cabiddu, Lui & Piccoli. 2012). As firms expect and depend on profit, they are not normally involved in the creation of an entirely new attraction type. Instead they tend to come later and profit from the exploitation of established attractions. When it comes to the making of new and unusual tourist attractions, the attraction making is often conducted by entrepreneurs whose central motives may not necessarily be monetary profit. Rather they do what they are passionate about, and try to achieve a social impact. Such entrepreneurs are sometimes referred to as life-style-entrepreneurs (Marcketti, 2006; Cederholm & Hultman, 2010; Ateljevic & Doorne, 2010). They contribute to the making of attractions for non-monetary reasons; to live a relaxed life style, to be

able to live in a certain place or for cultural and social values they find important (Ateljevic & Doorne, 2010). In so far as the value of an attraction is not already established, its values need to be constructed and communicated to tourists. In slum tourism this role often falls to tour guides and tour operators.

Types and Roles in Tour Guiding

In tourism literature, various roles are discussed to capture the complexity of tour guiding (Holloway, 1981). Cohen (1985) suggests that tour guides have two basic roles, the 'leadership' role and the 'mediatory' role. As a leader, the tour guide provides direction, access and security. The mediator role has two components, the first component being 'social mediation', where a tour guide acts as the 'middleman' by linking tourists to the local population, making the host environment non-threatening for the tourist, and vice-versa. The second component is 'cultural brokerage', which means bridging cultural differences between the host environment and the visiting tourists, and translating "the strangeness of a foreign culture into a cultural idiom familiar to the visitors" (Cohen, 1985 p. 15). Much emphasis in tourism literature is placed on the mediator, in relation to narratives and discourses, as well as vision and gaze (Urry, 2000). One central question is whether or not tour guides reflect the reality of a location and tell authentic stories about a place and provide true access, following MacCannell's (1976) notion of 'staged authenticity'. Some authors deemphasise the question of authenticity and instead reflect on tour guides performances, their roles in fostering group interaction and solidarity, providing security and protection in the encounters of the host country, and mediating a tourists-host interaction (Ap & Wong, 2001; Bruner, 2005; Jennings & Weiler, 2006; Meged, 2010; Rabotić, 2010). Tour guides are also perceived as an effective medium for conveying important messages to visitors and tourists (Rabotić, 2010). Sometimes tour guides are entrusted with the public relations mission "to encapsulate the essence of place" (Pond, 1993, p. vii). According to Salazar (2005, 2006) the tour guides are the key actors in the process of 'folklorizing', 'ethnicizing', and 'exoticizing' a destination. Salazar (2005) questions essentialist notions about the guide role by pointing to their strategic responses to tourists' desires:

"Although emphasized in much of the literature, the goal of guides is not necessarily to become a bridge actor, cultural translator, or someone who flattens cultural differences. ... Some guides are even engaged in the art of deception" (Salazar, 2005 p. 629)

Tour guides can be individual entrepreneurs (Dahles & Bras, 1999), or employed by tour operators and organisations, but tour guides can also work outside of these structures. Jennings and Weiler (2006)

make use of the formal-informal distinction to contrast professional guides from people who perform guide roles without expecting income or profit from it. Often such informal tour guiding is experienced as more authentic and truthful, because information and insight is provided voluntarily and not in expectation of payment. Informal tour guiding includes local residents, taxi drivers, waiters, back-of-house accommodation staff, and employees at local pubs, who sometimes accidentally fall into tour guiding roles (Jennings & Weiler, 2006). We propose to extend the notion of informality in tour guiding by adding a further dimension. Accordingly, informal practices not only refer to non-profit seeking tour guides but also to the absence of scripted narratives and itineraries. Informal tour guiding thus can mean greater autonomy by tour guides in respect to the tour conduct, but may still involve a profit motive. Tour guiding however can also be pursued in highly formalised settings, but not conducted for profit, for example when NGOs offer guided tours. This two-dimensional formal-informal matrix (Table 1), highlighting different dimensions of the organisational structure of tour guiding.

Table 1: Formal-informal Matrix in Tour Guiding

	More Formalised Narratives and Itineraries	More Informal Narratives and Itineraries
Profit Motive Stronger	Professional Tour Guiding Organisations	Self employed guides
Profit Motive Weaker	NGO, Charities	Local residents, taxi drivers, (accidental guides)

The formal-informal matrix (Table 1) also relates to other key issues of tour guiding, such as social ties and intimacy. Jensen (2009, 2010) highlights the importance of social ties of guides to the visited communities. The main advantage of 'local guides', besides their detailed knowledge of local areas, is their capacity to enable tourists to obtain close contact with the local community and develop personal social ties (Jensen, 2009, 2010). Trauer and Ryan (2005) argue that local guides may create a feeling of intimacy for tourists. According to Trauer and Ryan (2005), the local guides enable closer relationships:

“this kind of ‘relationship’ approach (tour guiding by locals, the ‘experts’, the ‘insiders’) is potentially a high level of intimacy disclosure, because the place may carry sacred values not easily disclosed to people not trusted.” (p. 482)

Intimacy is often preconditioned on specific forms of interaction or “something that is ‘real’ rather than superficial, something requiring enduring involvement ... rather than purely situational involvement ..., and a commitment to wanting to identify with the other” (Trauer & Ryan, 2005, p. 484). Conran (2011) argues that tourists often see intimacy as opposed to, and superior to, commodified tourism experiences. Tourists desire to escape from what is perceived as ‘staged’ tourism encounters. This seems to indicate that there is a preference, at least among some tourists, for interactions that are not premeditated by profit-seeking tour guides. Equally high levels of formalisation in the absence of a profit motive by non-profit operators may undermine the desire for intimacy. Conceptualisations of affective relationship work (Ahmed, 2004) and emotional labour (Hochschild 1979) challenge formal guide operations, to at least some extent, as they require emotional labour, which escapes to some extent a formalisation in narratives and enactment.

Tour Guiding in Slum Tourism

Jensen (2009) argues that tour guides can play a central role in the making of attractions or destinations, particularly in developing countries with emerging tourism markets. Much of the literature that discusses tour guiding, however, assumes that attractions are already established. As we pointed out earlier, attractions need to be made and in slum tourism this becomes particularly obvious. While they can rely on a certain curiosity about the slum among tourists, tour guides in slum tourism need to convince tourists to see slums as a valuable attraction, a place worth visiting. Tourists often sense that their curiosity about ‘the other half’ is morally dubious and prone to voyeurism, an accusation regularly leveled at slum tourists (Burgold and Rolfes 2013). Thus tour guides need to assure tourists that their visit is appropriate and helpful for people in the slum. Previous research on slum tourism has shown how tour guides contest negative perceptions of slums during their slum tours both on a more communicative and more practical level (Rolfes et al., 2009; Butler, 2012; Dyson, 2012; Meschkank, 2012) and how tourism revenue is used to fund projects in the slum (Burgold and Rolfes 2013). Tour guides also need to deal with the practical implications of the negative stigma attached. Slum stigma is composed of elements like crime, pollution or disease. In this context it is particularly important that tour guides provide access, security, and direction to tourists (George & Booyens, 2014). Diekmann and

Hannam (2012), in their analysis of slum tourism in India, pointed to the importance of ‘more than representational’ experiences. Tourists may be regularly confronted with visual representations of slums in news and other media, but they lack, and hence desire, the sensory experience of being in a slum. The tour guides enact the slum by enabling sensory experiences of atmospheres, sounds, and smells in slum areas. This also concerns the importance which transport plays in slum tourism, for example whether a tour is conducted on foot, on bike, or in a jeep, whether it sticks to main thoroughfares or goes off into smaller roads and paths (Frenzel, 2014).

While questions pertaining to the tour guiding literature have been discussed in slum tourism research, we will now extend existing accounts of the role of tour guides in slum tourism by investigating in particular three related aspects derived from the literature. First, we explore the organisational form of tour guiding operations as they establish destinations, specifically, to what extent tour operators fit within the formal-informal matrix (Table 1). Secondly, we analyse the narratives by the tour guides, which connect the tourists to the slum. We investigate how tour guides mediate between the slum inhabitants and the tourists as well as how they provide tourists with a reason to be in the slum. Thirdly, we analyse the way in which tour guides provide access to the slum, and, in more practical terms, how tours are conducted. We compare how security issues are dealt with and more generally how the slum tours are enacted.

Data Collection

The data discussed in this paper originates from interviews and participant observation conducted with 4 tour guiding operators in Dharavi, and with 3 guiding operators in Kibera. Fieldwork was conducted in several independent trips in 2013 and 2014 (see Table 2). Slum tourism in Dharavi has been the object of several studies in recent years, which allowed us to validate our observations with recourse to this literature (Meschkank 2010, 2012; Diekmann & Hannam 2012; Dyson 2012; Rolfes & Meschkank 2013). We collected data independently and at different periods of the year on the less researched Kibera slum tourism. This independent data collection process provided robust data in the absence of many previous studies in this case. The interviews were conducted in both locations with tour guides and founders of some of the operators in a semi-structured format. In addition to the interviews, both authors conducted field work and participant observation by taking part in tours offered by the respective tour operators. The data consists of interview transcripts and field notes.

The tour operators were selected because they are the main guiding providers in each location, covering among them over 90 percent of the tours in each location based on our estimates. There are a range of contextual issues with comparing such different slum locations, however, as the data will show, the tours discussed show comparable features and elements, warranting our approach.

Table 2: Overview of Case Studies

Dharavi Tour Operators	Research Participants	Field Trips (Researcher)
Reality Tour and Travel (RTT) Be the Local (BTL) Slum Gods (SG) Mumbai Magic (MM)	Founders and Tour Guides	1) November 2013 (Frenzel) 2) March 2014 (Frenzel)
Kibera Tour Operators		
Kibera Tours (KT) Explore Kibera Tours (EKT) Kibera For Everyday Slum Tours (KUFET)	Founders and Tour Guides	1) April 2013 (Blakeman) 2) November 2014 (Blakeman) 3) September 2014 (Frenzel)

The Slum Tour Operators and Their Operational Formats

Dharavi is a large slum in central Mumbai. Slum Tourism began here when Reality Tour and Travel (RTT) was set up in 2006 (Meschkank, 2010; Dyson, 2012). RTT was the only operator in Mumbai for a long time. However, more recently there are a growing number of competitors, while RTT remains the largest and best-known tour operator, with about 75 percent of the overall market in 2013. On the basis of information provided by the operators we estimate that about 18,000 tourists visited Dharavi on guided tours in 2013. Before 2006 demand for informal tour guides existed to a small extent, particularly from external journalists and researchers who needed access to the Dharavi for their work. Dharavi still hosts a number of independent guides catering for these professional slum tourists. Often they are partnered with existing NGOs, and fulfil informal guiding roles for donors and other guests of these NGOs. RTT has brought a high level of formalisation to tour guiding in Dharavi and tourist numbers have significantly increased. RTT guides are trained to a very detailed narrative and the tours follow a set itinerary. Many of the guides are directly employed by RTT and therefore work for fixed salaries, while others are employed temporarily in the peak tourist seasons.

In recent years some former tour guides of RTT have started conducting their own tours and have set up their own tour companies. The three main tour competitors of RTT in Dharavi today have been founded by ex-guides of RTT, namely Be The Local Tours (BTL), Slum Gods (SG), and Mumbai Magic (MM). While they are all smaller in size, only BTL also employ guides, but to date not on a permanent basis. SG and MM rarely hire additional guides. Most of the tour guiding here is done by the founders themselves. In setting up their operations SG, two of whose founders used to work as guides for RTT, relied heavily on a non-resident and foreign supporter who met them as they guided for RTT. One of the founders explained the foreign supporter's role:

“She helped with the website, content and the design, she is our backbone.” (SG)

All operators provide the tours with the aim of generating revenue and income while different models and narratives exist pertaining to the social benefit of the tours, and we will discuss these in the next section in more detail.

Slum tourism in Kibera has existed since 2009, when organisations such as Kibera Tours (KT) and Explore Kibera Tours (EKT) started operating. Today they both offer tours all year round and are widely referred to in guidebooks and on travel web pages (e.g. TripAdvisor). We estimate, based on information provided by the tour operators, that approximately 1,500 tourists took part in slum tours in Kibera in 2013. KT was co-founded in 2009 by a Dutch NGO worker together with two Kenyan co-founders. One of the co-founders told us in an interview that the original idea for KT had resulted from guiding foreign donors and NGO workers around Kibera. KT requires that their guides be born and raised in Kibera, as they are considered to be better suited for the job. EKT was founded in 2009. The Kenyan founder co-operated with an American partner initially, but today conducts the business autonomously. Most slum tours are conducted by the founder, but additional guides are hired in peak seasons. The guides are required to know Kibera well, and need to possess the right personality. As one of the KT founder explained, guides need to

“...speak English and Swahili, and know the area very well. ... So it is better to be a local or walk with locals closely, and then it will be okay. They know the areas, they know the people, they know the problems and the solutions.” (KT)

A more recent tour operator is Kibera United For Everyday Slum Tours (KUFET), founded in 2012 by a Kibera resident. It is part of a charitable organisation that has operated in Kibera for many years with different community empowerment projects, and developed the slum tours after having offered volunteer tourism since 2010. This followed a suggestion from a foreign donor, who linked the organisation to existing volunteer tourism networks. Only in 2012 was a 2-3 hour slum tour added to the overall programme of the organisation. KUFET is relatively small with approximately 20 tourists per month. Most of the tours are conducted by the founder, who has strong social ties in the community of Kibera.

There are other large scale tour operators, mainly in the Safari business, that offer slum tours in Kibera, but they do not conduct the tours, instead forming partnerships with the two aforementioned larger slum tourism operators in Kibera. All three main tour operators in Kibera see it as a requirement for their guides to possess extensive knowledge of and have social ties in the slum, as well as understand the needs of the tourists. However, most guides are self-taught. All operators are generating income with varying narratives about the social benefits of the tours.

One of the most significant commonalities across all case studies were the role of non-residents, often foreigners, in setting up tour guiding operations in the slums. Differences however exist in the level of their involvement, with the more formal tour guiding operations seeming to have more direct and continuing involvement of non-residents. In this, we found significant differences in the formality of tour guiding and the associated structures. In Mumbai, RTT is fully formalised and the slum tour guides have very little autonomy over their role. The scripts of the tour as well as the itineraries are set. This applies to some extent even to the new competitors who have taken the basic concept from RTT, and were not found to have diverted much from the established narratives and itineraries. However, more flexibility exists in the new operations to customize tours for individual tourists as well as to emphasize the tour guides' priorities. In Kibera, the overall market is much smaller and it has less formal structures than RTT. Nevertheless, the two main slum tour operators, KT and EKT, are registered as businesses. Each does not permanently employ guides, though the larger operators hire guides in times of higher demand. The greater informality might be related to smaller numbers of tourists.

Overall, guided tours emerged from NGO, donor, and journalist demand, later formalised, generally with 'external' support, into tour guiding businesses. Most are small scale, with only RTT employing some of

its guides permanently. All other tour guides either operate as entrepreneurs in their own businesses, or as casually employed guides for these small operations. All tour operators charge tourists, however the income is used in different ways to, at least in part, benefit those visited. The tours provided vary in formality, with the larger, and more externally connected, having more formal scripts.

Creating the Narrative

In this section we investigate how tour guides and organisations create narratives to explain the importance of tourists visiting slums, and how tours produce social benefits. We also investigate how these narratives are reflected in the organisational operations.

We found that RTT in Dharavi relied heavily on a rationalist narrative, transmitted by all tour guides in narrowly scripted tours about Dharavi and the function of the tours; 'Dharavi is a place of industry and trade, integrated into global supply chains'. Existing prejudices about slums in general, and Dharavi in particular, are dispelled, and government neglect and inaction towards the housing situation and other social problems in the slum scandalised. In this narrative, tourists are given the role of outside observers, enabled by the tour to have more informed opinions about the people living in Dharavi and their fate. Significantly RTT was founded by non-residents to Dharavi and does not necessarily employ local guides. In the absence of existing social ties, RTT has used tourism revenue to create social ties in the community by building relationships through its charitable organisation Reality Gives (RG). By financing these operations with 80 percent of the profits from the tour, the tourists are given a central role in making a charitable contribution, specifically as the provider of revenue that enables the work of RG. Tourists are also invited to continue supporting RG after their slum tour. RTT verifies the charitable donation by highly transparent financial reporting, as its books are published on regular basis. RTT gives tourists an opportunity to rationally contribute to Dharavi's betterment and the options available to the tourist are described in a very specific manner.

The smaller operators in Mumbai Dharavi depart from this format. Be the Local (BTL) explain that the tours have a social benefit because the hired guides are students from Dharavi or other disadvantaged neighbourhoods, and earn a living through the guiding job. There is no other indication of a social benefit of the tour profits, and no information on how tour profits are used. The tour guides and founders highlight existing social ties to the community and their own personal stories. One other slum tour operator, SG, a group of four young men, put even more emphasis on the personal story. The SG

presents themselves as hip-hop and break dance artists attempting to realize their creative aspirations. The tour guiding narrative functions like a case study to break down the big picture of the slum and its problems by engaging the tourists in the story of the personal struggle of the guides. The tourists are no longer merely addressed as outside observers, but are here invited into a close encounter with local residents and artists. The guides no longer function as mediators between residents and tourists, but take the role of residents themselves.

Regarding the main tour operators in Kibera, respectively EKT and KT, both their narrative and actual slum tour are scripted, just as is the case with RTT. The guides here explain that the slum tours aim to create an understanding of the living conditions and livelihood of the slum residents in Kibera. The slum tour is supposed to be an eye-opener, allowing tourists to gain an insight into what is happening within the slum, by providing first-hand experiences – an educational experience. The itinerary for the slum tour with EKT is similar to the tour with KT, sharing several key highlights and visiting points. These include visits to a HIV/Aids women empowerment project, including a day care centre. Another regular visit on the itinerary is different workshops that make jewellery from animal bones. During these visits, the tourists are welcomed by slum residents who operate these projects. The tour guides step into the background as the projects are introduced. The tourists are encouraged to purchase products, and also encouraged to help set sales opportunities in their countries of origin. Through these visits, the tour guides display their social ties and collaborations within the community. One of the founders of KT explained

“[In Kibera, there are] many projects. We plan, which projects which groups, and tour guide. The next group next day will go to different project in different village. ... If we have tours on daily basis, then everyone would be smiling always everyday. But if only have tours once in a day and two weeks another tour, how could you work that? But on good times we can support the whole community all the time” (KT)

The tourists are thus offered a role in supporting these projects directly; however, the tourists are not informed in detail about the use of the proceeds of the tours. On our request, the guides and founders from KT and EKT explained that all income was used to pay for wages and expenses. Detailed information on wages to guides and on profits of the organisations was not obtainable. KUFET openly explained the business operations, costs, and payments on request. Proceeds from the tour were used

for the maintenance of a school run by KUFET, including teachers' salaries, books, and food for the school children.

In summary, tour operators provide narratives that explain to tourists why they should visit the slum and this is often directly linked to the (positive) effects of tourism revenue in the slum. The narratives differ from more 'outsider' abstract reasons given by RTT and the more formal Kibera operators, to more personal stories, as in the example of SG. All tours charge tourists and give reasons as to social benefits, but with very different emphasis and different formats of accountability. Some profits raised by the tours are distributed through transparent and toured programmes like in the case of RTT and KUFET. In other cases the benefit of the local guides is highlighted. While the tourists are often invited to contribute to charities visited, this support is less formal and less transparently organised. This indicates more openly that the tours are conducted with a profit motive, which is legitimised by explicitly marking the guides as 'local' and 'resident'. Aesthetically such more profit oriented approaches coincide with a tour guiding style more focused on personal and intimate narratives where guides employ more emotional labour and relationship work. While we have discussed some of the ways in which this is attempted in narrative, there are important aspects of trust building that go beyond narrative. This includes the very way access to the slum is created or what we call the tour enactment.

Enacting the tour

In this last section of the data presentation, we compare the more practical ways in which tour guides lead tourists into the slums. This includes a closer focus on the routes, places and encounters that form the itinerary. We also discuss how specific tour risks and security concerns are addressed in the tour format.

RTT tours start at a local train station just outside of Dharavi, where tourists meet up with their guides. The other tour operators share a similar approach. Some also offer – for an extra fee – a pick-up from hotels both in Mumbai and in Nairobi. When RTT guides meet tourists at the train station, they explain to tourists that there is a coffee place with a 'western style toilet' nearby and the last opportunity to use one before the tour. The tour then starts and leads to a railway bridge that provides access to the slum as well as a view over it. The rationalist theme of RTT narratives is enacted with the insistence on a no-photo policy and a focus on sights that show Dharavi as a place of industry. The scripted tour however also includes a range of more emotional sights. This concerns in particular the visit to the RG school and

day care centre, which enables tourists to see kids playing and learning in the tourist funded projects. While the projects are visited, strict distance is kept to ensure that classes are not disturbed by visiting tourists.

Tours of up to 6 or 7 tourists are normally conducted with 1 guide, indicating the limited concerns about security. There are some similarities among all providers in Dharavi. The tours normally last three hours and are always conducted on foot. All tours visit the industrial workshops and include the scaling of the roof of a workshop for a view over the roofs of Dharavi. The tours follow both larger roads, but also enter the narrow alleyways in which many of the houses in Dharavi lie. In these maze-like alleyways the tourists normally lose orientation, while the narrowness also means very close encounters with residents living there. The key differences between operators enacting the tour occur in the overall flexibility of the route. While tourists may always ask specific questions, the itinerary of RTT is not flexible enough as to cater for deviations or alternative routes through Dharavi. In contrast SG and MM are happy to customize the tour, according to tourist demands. Overall little emphasis is placed on interaction with residents, in particular in the RTT tours. The visit of RTT's own school enables a short chat with the professionals there. However, encounters with residents are not specifically built into the tour. With BTL we witnessed how a visiting doctor, one of their customers, expressed interest in meeting a doctor in Dharavi. Talking about this during the interview, one of the founders explained:

“We do our tours walking and if there is some special interest, like this customer had, then we try to do it. He wanted to meet a colleague working here, and it was possible to introduce him to one. We just did it.” (BTL)

A typical tour of Kibera is approximately 2-3 hours and conducted on foot, in groups of up to six participants. Tourists are picked up at their hotels or met at a shopping centre just outside Kibera, from where the tours start. The guides normally try to limit picture taking, by instructing tourists to ask the guide first. All guides place a strong emphasis on the importance of safety and ask tourists not to bring big ‘flashy’ items on the tour, for example, big watches or expensive cameras. This is a clear indication that visiting Kibera comes with certain risk. All tours are conducted by at least two guides, even in smaller groups. KUFET forms an exception, as tours are often operated by its founder alone. Most guides explicitly advise against visiting Kibera alone. All tours only cover specific neighbourhoods or ‘villages’

within the Kibera area, namely Soweto West and Kawtekera, while large parts of Kibera are off-limits, as KUFET founder explained.

“Remember that I told you, there is one side of Kibera, where I cannot go with you, because I know, it is not safe. But, here where we are doing the tour, it is safe. We can just walk and there is no problem. You can talk to people and people are always ready to talk to you, and they are friendly, as you saw [referring to the slum tour]” (KUFET)

It is clear, that social ties as well as trust are central to enable the tour guiding experience in this context. Most slum tours offered in Kibera follow a predetermined itinerary taking in viewpoints, as well as some routes through maze-like markets. The KUFET tour does not necessarily follow the same itinerary on every tour, and may start at varying points. Remaining flexible to tourists’ requests, the time spent at different locations can be altered. Most guides explained that in order to make the experience special, there is a need for interaction between the visitor and residents. In the tours, this was catered for differently by different providers. For KT and EKT this consisted of interaction with the tour guides as well as interaction with the projects visited. In the case of KUFET a further level of interaction resulted from casual conversation with residents during the tour, and visits to private homes.

The visits to private homes in the slum are a shared attribute across destinations and operators. However, there is a significant difference in its conduct. RTT meets the tourists’ demand by showing a typical, yet unused house where nobody lives. RTT rents it from its owner but emphasis is placed on the fact that nobody actually lives in this house. In contrast many of the other tour guides make home visits in supposedly used homes into a central feature. In the case of MM, the house visit is performed with great emphasis. The guide, who is also the founder, often invites the tourist into the second floor section of the house, his own room. He explained:

“Sometime I offer lunch in my home ... meeting with my family. We are living here since the 1960s so (we talk about) how we started, when we bought the house. So this is to the history of the slum.” (MM)

Such a personal invitation is likely to create feelings of intimacy with the tourists, and prompts the development of a more private relationship. In contrast to RTT, the visits to the house here is no longer rationalised as an informative introduction to living conditions in the slum, but as a family visit.

In Kibera, all tours invite tourists into private homes of residents. In the case of KT this is the family home of one of the founders. The home is clearly a private home, however it is unclear whether it is still used as someone's house. In the tour it is where tourists and guides settle the payments. The guides also use this home visit as a platform to encourage tourists to give feedback on their social media pages. Just as with KT, EKT makes the final stop at a house - the home of the guide himself. Here guests are asked to take their shoes off, which authenticates the place as a home place. An atmosphere of hospitality is created, also because the guide seems to step outside his guiding role. For KUFET private homes of friends and neighbours of the founder are part of the tour. Interactions are facilitated between tourists and the residents, with the guide translating.

Overall, tours are enacted with small numbers, and the guides transition participants from clearly external staging posts (e.g. train stations, shopping centres, and hotel pick-ups). Safety and security is part of the implicit, or at times explicit part of the tour. The ways in which home visits are integrated into the tour differs radically from tour to tour and in different locations. Visits to a personal home, where this occurred, acted as part of the inclusion or welcome of the tour participants into the visited society. The personal home sometimes also acted as a transition point from inclusion to returning back. In the following section we discuss the findings from the data in light of the questions formed at the outset of this paper.

Discussion: Tour Guiding and the Making of Slums into an Attraction

Our empirical data points to the importance of the organisational structure of tour guiding to the ways in which tours are delivered, both in terms of narrative and roles, as well as in terms of access, direction and security. We developed Jennings and Weiler (2006) formal-informal differentiation into a two dimensional matrix, which considers both the level of formality of tour guiding as well as the extent to which operators are profit-seeking. We found relatively high levels of formality combined with relatively low level of profit-seeking in the example of RTT. The tour guides for RTT work with scripted narratives and itineraries, while 80 percent of the tours profits are donated to the charitable organisation RG. The

role of the tour guide is taught, and does not depend on local ties. This formal set up enabled RTT to start operations with few existing social ties in Dharavi. Instead RTT creates social ties through the establishment of a school and day-care place in Dharavi. This model of slum tourism also formalises the role of the tourist as an outside observer who supports RG financially in exchange for insight into the slum. The transparency of the exchange and its social benefit pertain to a universal and rationalist notion of accountability. Tourists do not need to trust individual guides as they can trust the organisation. Considering the size and rapid expansion of slum tourism in Dharavi, we suggest that RTT's operational set up is best suited to the making of a new attraction in slum tourism, in particular when considering the initial resistance and skepticism among the Indian public (Frenzel, 2012). The formalised operational structure of RTT also stands out in its ability to be applied in different locations, for example in Dehli to where RTT recently expanded. One of RTT's founders went to Manila, in the Philippines, to consult on the set up of a new slum tour operator there, Smokey Mountain Tours, which operates successfully today using an adaptation of the RTT's model.

Among more recent competitors of RTT in Dharavi, as well as more generally in Kibera, we found more informal tour conduct both in itineraries and narratives provided, in the context of more loose organisational structures, leaving individual guides with more autonomy. We found that the narratives of the social benefits of the less formal tours were not evidenced as clearly as in the case of RTT. Instead of transparently communicated social benefits, the operators emphasised the local social ties of their operations. Social ties enable closer contact to the local community, according to Jensen (2010) and hence enable the creation of more intimate experiences for the tourist (Trauer & Ryan, 2010). Our empirical data shows that the less formal operators in Dharavi offer more customized tours and often emphasise the personality of the guide, whose local social ties are evidenced in their origin. Like in Kibera, the guides in informal tours are predominantly locals living in the slum. Tours highlights include visits to actually used houses rather than sample houses that are unused. In this context we found tour guiding to be mostly self-taught, and based on individual skills rather than formal training. The creative role (Butler, 2012) of these tour guides comes to the fore, but also their precarious economic status as self-employed guides outside formal organisation. In this approach we found that more personal relationships are created, which enables these tours to be more overtly profit seeking. Tourists seem to be more accepting of guides' direct use of tourism revenue, when these guides are clearly locals providing intimate experiences. This places these operators in a different corner of the matrix,

combining relative low levels of formality in the organisation with higher levels of profit-seeking, reflecting more traditional entrepreneurial approaches (Dahles & Bras, 1999).

Table 3: The Matrix with the Operators Studied.

	More Formalised Narratives and Itineraries	More Informal Narratives and Itineraries
Profit Motive Stronger	N/A	KT, EKT, BTL, MM, SG
Profit Motive Weaker	RTT	KUFET

The case of KUFET stands out in its unique position of combining an informal character of guiding with a low profit motive. Amongst all the operators studied, this combination provided the most intimate of tour experiences, however one that also severely limits expansion because of the importance of the guides personality. We suggest that higher informality generally limits the potential expansion of slum tourism, while more formal operations like those of RTT are able to attract more tourists and are hence better geared to the establishment of a new attraction.

We did not investigate tourist preferences or motivations directly, but we found that tour guides in the different locations offer both more formal experiences as well as more intimate and personal ones in the different tours, presumably responding to different individual tourist demands. In all cases tourists were given options for of potential interaction and intervention (Best, 2012). There was a broad range of these offerings, from helping to create export markets for slum products to volunteering, and from advertising and co-creating the slum as destination to committing permanent donations to individuals and projects. One of the tour guides' central role seems to lie in enabling tourist to intervene, contribute, and act towards supporting and developing the slum. We did not investigate the salience of those offers for intervention, but their centrality points to slum tourism's role as a response to increasing levels of social inequality globally (Frenzel, 2014).

An important additional finding concerns the role of international ties. Jensen (2009, 2010) argued that social ties may provide an important ingredient to the formation of new destinations. In the destinations investigated in this paper, social ties to non-residents were equally or, in the case of RTT, more important than local ties. RTT made Dharavi into an attraction without local social ties. In Kibera all tour operators are part-founded or co-initiated by non-resident foreigners. In slum tourism, it seems that the making of an attraction does not necessitate local social ties from the outset. Non-residents, pioneering visitors and tourists, play a central role in making a new attraction in slum tourism, an aspect overlooked by previous research on tour guiding that has emphasised the importance of local social ties.

Conclusion

The paper discussed the making of slums into attractions based on an analysis of two global slum tourism destinations. Slums are not normally considered attractive places for tourists, and it was posited that tour guiding plays an important role in making a slum into an attraction. The investigation thus focused on the role of tour guiding in the process of attraction making, to contribute to the study of slum tourism, where the role of tour guiding has to date attracted little attention, and to contribute to research on tour guiding. Guiding contributes to the making of an attraction through marking the sight and socially constructing a new narrative value. The initial narrative is based on guiding entrepreneurs, seeking to extent social benefits to the slum and not primarily focuses on profit-making. The guides lead the tourists in their discovery of the slum by encouraging tourist curiosity for the 'other half'. Tour guides need to help tourists overcome their reservations regarding the appropriateness of visiting slums, and they often do by creating narratives that indicate how tourists visits are beneficial to the slum. An equal importance is placed on the role of the guide to mediate; safely linking the tourist to the sight, and translating it.

To understand and analyse different formats of tour guiding that exists in developing destinations, we examined the role of the organisational structure of slum tour guiding and in particular its level of formality. We also analysed the narratives and enactments that constitute the tours. Data was collected from interviews with operators and tour participation in Dharavi and Kibera. Most guiding organisations started with non-resident support often from foreigners, generally in response to emergent demand. They also ensure the provision of social benefits to the communities, some more transparently and widely than others. The guided narrative engages tourists with an insiders' perspective, though in the

role of an 'outsider', or facilitated by the locals' voices (of the guide or through other community interactions). A key narrative theme is the social benefit of tourism to the community, through explicit demonstrations and formal, transparent structures, or through the enactment of closer more intimate relations between the tourists and the guides. Tour guides engaging in emotional labour and relationship work often employ their status as locals, aiming to minimize the distance between tourists and residents. The small tours transition tourists into the slum, engage and personalise the slum for or with them, before transitioning them back out.

The findings indicated a mix of slum tour guiding organisation structures, across the formal-informal matrix. Perhaps not surprisingly we found no operator that combined a highly formal operation with a high profit motive. In slum tourism a high profit motive can only be justified when operations are informal and when guides enact locality and intimacy in narrative and itinerary. The majority of operators we found in both locations followed this model. For the more formal operators, the emphasis was on the tourist's contribution to the slum through tour revenue. With set narratives and itineraries they provided clear roles for tourists with regard to their visit in the slum. This seemed to enable best the development of slums into an attraction. We also found that more informal operators could produce more intimate experiences, sought by some tourists, by relying on closer social ties and more flexible tour enactments. This enabled informal operators to work on more profit orientated terms, although not all choose to do so.

We found that all operators have been set up with some level of support from non-residents, often international. Social ties to the outside of the slum were as important as local ties for successful tour guiding operations. Less formal slum tour guides existed in both destinations because of their ability to provide experiences that formal operations are lacking, in particular in enabling more intimate encounters. Nonetheless, for the value and creation of an attraction through guiding, formal organisational structures and transparency, garner more attention and credibility. In the cases presented, the informal tours have been established 'on the coat tails' of formal transparent operations, being tours or other NGO operations. In all cases, the making the slum into attraction provided financial benefits to the slum, though in cases localised to the entrepreneurial guides.

Overall, slums become tourist attractions through entrepreneurial responses to emerging formal demand. Socially motivated guiding organisations enact formal structures to provide tourist opportunities. As the slum attracts further attention, informal and more profit motivated guiding operators respond to the demand, providing further personalised experiences. Finally, making a slum

into a tourist attraction requires that slum tourism have benefits for the slum, and more non-resident operated, the more transparent the benefits need to be. This paper examined two slums with the focus on tour guiding; hence further research is needed to investigate the validity of these results. While both cases share a range of similarities we also note that significant differences exist between them. There are very different perceptions of security issues in the two destinations, which might have a strong effect on the importance of local social ties in particular. It is, in this sense, questionable whether the RTT model, of starting tourism operations with little local ties, would even be conceivable as an approach in Kibera. Further research should investigate whether similar results can be found in respect to the relationship between local and international ties in other tour guiding operations in slums and beyond.

Acknowledgements:

The Research has been funded by the European Union *Marie Skłodowska Curie* Fellowship Programme and by Aalborg University.

Part of the Research in Kibera has been conducted in collaboration with Eoin Meehan, Christine Melbye Carstensen and Marie Pd Brøndgaard Jensen.

References

- Ahmed, S. (2004). *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. New York: Routledge.
- Ap, J., & Wong, K. K. (2001). Case study on tour guiding: professionalism, issues and problems. *Tourism Management*, 22(5), 551-563.
- Ateljevic, I., & Doorne, S. (2000). "Staying within the fence": lifestyle entrepreneurship in tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 8(5), 378-392.
- Best, K. (2012). Making museum tours better: understanding what a guided tour really is and what a tour guide really does. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 27(1), 35-52.
- Bruner, E. M. (2005). *Culture on Tour: Ethnographies of Travel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Butler, S. R. (2012). Curatorial interventions in township tours: two trajectories. In F. Frenzel, K. Koens, & M. Steinbrink (Eds.), *Slum Tourism Poverty, Power and Ethics*. (pp. 215-231). London: Routledge.
- Burgold, J. & Rolfes, M. (2013). Of voyeuristic safari tours and responsible tourism with educational value: Observing moral communication in slum and township tourism in Cape Town and Mumbai. *DIE ERDE – Journal of the Geographical Society of Berlin*, 144(2), 161-174
- Cabiddu, F., Lui, T.-W., & Piccoli, G. (2013). Managing value co-creation in the tourism industry. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 42(3), 86-107.
- Cederholm, E. A & Hultman, J. (2010). The value of intimacy: negotiating commercial relationships in lifestyle entrepreneurship, *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 10(1), 16-32.
- Cohen, E. (1985). The tourist guide: the origins, structure and dynamics of a role. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 12, 5-29.
- Conran, M. (2011). They really love me!: intimacy in volunteer tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(4), 1454-1473.

- Dahles, H., & Bras, K. (1999). *Tourism and Small Entrepreneurs: Development, National Policy, and Entrepreneurial Culture: Indonesian Cases*. New York: Cognizant Communication Corp.
- Diekmann, A., & Hannam, K. (2012). Touristic mobilities in India's slum spaces. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(3), 1315–1336.
- Dyson, P. (2012). Slum tourism: representing and interpreting “reality” in Dharavi, Mumbai. *Tourism Geographies*, 14(2), 56-76
- Frenzel, F. and Koens, K. (2012) Slum tourism: developments in a young field of interdisciplinary tourism research. *Tourism Geographies* 14 (2) 1-12
- Frenzel, F., 2014. Slum tourism and its controversies from a management perspective. In M. Gudic, A. Rosenbloom, & C. Parkes, eds. *Socially Responsive Organizations and the Challenge of Poverty*. Leeds, UK: Greenleaf, pp. 123–135.
- Frenzel, F. (2013). Slum tourism in the context of the tourism and poverty (relief) debate. *DIE ERDE – Journal of the Geographical Society of Berlin*, 144(2), 117–128.
- Frenzel, F. (2014). Slum tourism and urban regeneration: touring inner Johannesburg. *Urban Forum*, 1–17.
- Freire-Medeiros, B. (2009). The favela and its touristic transits. *Geoforum*, 40(4), 580-588.
- George, R., & Booyens, I. (2014). Township tourism demand: tourists' perceptions of safety and security. *Urban Forum*, 24, 1–19.
- Hochschild, A.R., 1979. Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure. *American Journal of Sociology*, 85(3), pp.551–575.
- Holloway, J. C. (1981). The guided tour - a sociological approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 8(3), 377-402.
- Jennings, G., and Weiler, B. (2006) Mediating meaning: perspectives on brokering quality tourist experiences. In Jennings, G. and Nickerson, N. P. (1st ed.), *Quality Tourism Experiences* (pp. 57-75). Amsterdam: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Jensen, Ø. (2009) The activation of local service suppliers by incoming tour operators in a “developing” destination: the case of Madagascar, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 12(2), 133-163

- Jensen, Ø. (2010) Social mediation in remote developing world tourism locations: the significance of social ties between local guides and host communities in sustainable tourism development, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(5), 615-633
- Leiper, N. (1990). Tourist attraction systems. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(3), 367–384.
- Lew, A. A. (1987). A framework of tourist attraction research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14(4), 553–575.
- MacCannell, D. (1973). Staged authenticity: arrangements of social space in tourist settings. *American Journal of Sociology*, 79(3), 589-603.
- MacCannell, D. (1976). *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. London: Macmillan.
- Marcketti, S. B. (2006) An exploratory study of lifestyle entrepreneurship and its relationship to life quality. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 34(3) 241-59.
- Meschkank, J.(2010). Investigations into slum tourism in Mumbai: poverty tourism and the tensions between different constructions of reality. *GeoJournal*, 76(1), pp.47–62.
- Meschkank, J. (2012). Negotiating poverty: the interplay between Dharavi's production and consumption as a tourist destination. In F. Frenzel, K. Koens, & M. Steinbrink (Eds.), *Slum Tourism Poverty, Power and Ethics*. (pp. 144–158). London: Routledge.
- Meged, J. W. (2010) *The Guided Tour: A Co-produced Tourism Performance*. Roskilde University: Roskilde.
- Pond, K. L. (1993). *The Professional Guide: Dynamics of Tour Guiding*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Rabotić, B. (2010) Tour guides in contemporary tourism. *International Conference on Tourism and Environment*. Sarajevo, 4 Mar. 2010. Web. 29 Sept. 2014.
- Richards, G. (2002). Tourism attraction systems: exploring cultural behavior. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 10(4), 1048–1064.
- Rolfes, M. (2010). Poverty tourism: theoretical reflections and empirical findings regarding an extraordinary form of tourism. *GeoJournal*, 75(5), 421-442.

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

Salazar, N.

(2005) Tourism and glocalization: “local” tour guiding. *Annals of Tourism Research* 32(3), 628–646.

Salazar, N.B., 2006. Touristifying Tanzania: local guides, global discourse. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(3), pp.833–852.

Scheyvens, R. (2010). *Tourism and Poverty*. Oxon: Routledge.

Steinbrink, M., Frenzel, F., & Koens, K. (2012). Development and globalization of a new trend in tourism. In F. Frenzel, K. Koens, & M. Steinbrink (Eds.), *Slum Tourism Poverty, Power and Ethics*. (pp. 1–18). London: Routledge.

Trauer, B., & Ryan, C. (2005). Destination image, romance and place experience: an application of intimacy theory in tourism. *Tourism Management*, 26(4), 481-491.

Urry, J. (2002). *The Tourist Gaze* (2nd ed.). London; Thousand Oaks Calif.: Sage Publications.

Wacquant, L. (2008). *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality*. Polity.