

Article

## Framing Social Inclusion as a Benchmark for Cycling-Inclusive Transport Policy in Kisumu, Kenya

Walter Alando \* and Joachim Scheiner

Department of Transport Planning, Faculty of Spatial Planning, Technische Universität Dortmund University, 44227 Dortmund, Germany; E-Mails: walter.alando@tu-dortmund.de (W.A.), joachim.scheiner@tu-dortmund.de (J.S.)

\* Corresponding author

Submitted: 30 December 2015 | Accepted: 22 March 2016 | Published: 7 June 2016

### Abstract

Cycling in many cities of the Global South faces unending exclusion from street spaces despite the on-going transport policy reforms. This exclusion worsens the marginalisation of the poor majority who use this mode. In this paper, we formulate social inclusion as a policy tool for reconciling transport policy to the cycling needs of Kisumu, Kenya. We draw from social quality theory and Lefebvre's right to the city concept to assemble the ideals of social inclusion. These ideals form the benchmark for a qualitative content analysis of the policy pronouncements contained in the Kenya Vision 2030 and the Integrated National Transport Policy to ascertain the opportunities presented by these policies for cycling inclusion. Findings from interviews held with transport professionals in government and private practice support this content analysis. Results show that while the Kenya Vision 2030 focuses on economic growth, the Government has prioritised the implementation of its projects, thus diminishing the fragile opportunity for cycling inclusion presented by the transport policy. To consolidate this opportunity, we propose different policy recommendations to improve the terms for cyclists to claim and produce street spaces.

### Keywords

cycling; Kisumu; social exclusion; transport-led exclusion; transport planning

### Issue

This article is part of the issue "Transport Policy and Social Inclusion", edited by Miriam Ricci, Graham Parkhurst and Juliet Jain (University of the West of England, UK).

© 2016 by the authors; licensee Cogitatio (Lisbon, Portugal). This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

### 1. Introduction

Providing street-spaces that support utility cycling remains an elusive target of transport policy in many Sub-Saharan African cities. In Kisumu, Kenya in particular, this challenge seems to be compounded by mixed commitment to cycling that is generated by the parallel pursuit of economic growth and transport policy reform agenda. While cycling combines the advantages of speed and affordability for its users, the concurrent pursuit of these economic and transport policy agenda has not influenced street-space allocation in ways that support its use. Consequently, transport infrastructure and service expansion projects that aim to improve

safety, connectivity and accessibility (GoK, 2009) have instead created street-spaces that exclude cycling. This exclusion worsens the social exclusion of the poor majority who rely on cycling to access opportunities and to generate income by offering bicycle taxi services (Mutiso, 2010; UN-HABITAT, 2004).

Finding a way of addressing this transport exclusion is the central concern of this paper. The paper specifically explores the extent to which social inclusion can be packaged to form a policy frame for reconciling transport planning in Kisumu to the city's neglected cycling needs. Social inclusion is understood to be 'the process of improving *not only* the terms for individuals and groups that are disadvantaged on the basis of their

identity to take part in society, *but also...the process of improving their ability, dignity, and opportunity available for them to do so*' (World Bank, 2013, pp. 3-4, emphasis added). Guided by this conception, the paper pursues two objectives: i) to assemble a literature-based frame for analysing social inclusion in transport, and ii) to find out the extent to which Kenya's economic development blueprint is consistent with its transport policy and the implications of this extent of consistency for cycling-inclusive transport planning in Kisumu.

The paper draws on the inclusionary principles espoused by social quality theory (Maesen & Walker, 2002) and Lefebvre's right to the city concept (Lefebvre, 1996) to assemble the key tenets that guide its analysis of Kenya's economic development blueprint (i.e. Kenya Vision 2030) and transport policy for the opportunities they hold for cycling inclusion in Kisumu. We discuss these policies in section 4.

The remainder of this paper is organised in six sections. The next section presents a theoretical basis for employing social inclusion in the current paper. Section 3 contextualises transport exclusion in Sub-Saharan African cities while section 4 puts Kisumu, the study city into perspective. The methodology is presented in section 5. Section 6 builds a theoretical analysis that generates the themes against which the provisions of the extant policies that shape transport planning in Kisumu are analysed in section 7. The implications of policy results for the inclusion of cycling are also presented in section 7. The conclusions and policy proposals are given in Section 8.

## 2. Theoretical Framework

### 2.1. Social Quality Theory

Social quality theory emerged in Europe in response to the withdrawal with which policymaking tackled the social dimension of development. Its central argument is that traditional economic analysis, with its neoliberal inclination, is insufficient to explain the changing nature of daily circumstances such as production, employment and distribution systems (Walker & Maesen, 2003). The theory decries the inability of economic growth on its own to solve social challenges such as limited access to social services and rising poverty (Walker & Maesen, 2003). Focusing on economic growth as the sole indicator of development is argued to conceal the totality of development, by subordinating the social and cultural dimensions of people's needs and preferences (Maesen & Walker, 2002; Walker & Maesen, 2003).

The theory holds that because the individual is the core unit of the society, meaningful development therefore ought to be that which creates conditions that enable individuals to effectively be part of the society. Development policies should hence produce conditions that enhance individual wellbeing and po-

tentials while at the same time creating room for them to participate in the social and economic life of their societies (Beck, Maesen, & Walker, 1997; Maesen & Walker, 2012). This argument is used as a basis for analysing the extent to which policies enhance the ability to cycle in Kisumu.

While the initial development of the theory aimed to redress weak social welfare and industrial relations in Europe, its scope has now widened beyond this narrow theme and geographical concern. Within Europe, the theory has been tested in various policy areas including urban development (Maesen & Walker, 2002). Other applications outside Europe have also emerged, with the most well-documented ones being in East Asia (e.g. Lin, Ward, & Maesen, 2009). In this paper, we explore the use of the theory in transport planning.

Social quality theory offers a theoretical and methodological tool for measuring human wellbeing that goes beyond the conventional quality of life measures such as social indicators (e.g. Baud, Sridharan, & Pfeffer, 2008) and human needs and basic needs (e.g. Doyal & Gough, 1991). While these individualised indicators offer a robust approach to assessing quality of life at the individual level, they are less useful when community and other social relations are the focus of analysis (Siltaniemi & Kauppinen, 2005). Moreover, the conventional quality of life paradigm presupposes the existence of certain social structures and relationships, thus precluding a critical analysis of how social structures and relationships relate with exclusion and wellbeing (Siltaniemi & Kauppinen, 2005; Ward, Meyer, Verity, Gill, & Luong, 2011). In contrast, social quality theory takes the premise that the individual is part of the larger society. Thus individual wellbeing is the product of the tension between individual development preferences and societal development needs on the one hand and the tension between community development aspirations and the development aspirations defined by groups, institutions or formal organisations on the other (Maesen & Walker, 2002). The challenge therefore is to temper these tensions such that the individual is enabled to actualise. Section 7 examines the extent to which government policies have coincided with cycling needs and the opportunities this avails for enabling cycling.

Four hypotheses that are fundamental for enabling individuals to participate in their societies are proposed by social quality theory. These include socio-economic security, social inclusion, shared norms, and autonomy (Walker & Maesen, 2003). The first two hypotheses are particularly relevant in the quest for inclusive street-spaces that this current paper is concerned with. The first hypothesis holds that people must have access to socio-economic security in order to protect them from poverty and other forms of deprivation. Accordingly, this paper investigates the extent to which transport planning has created inclusive streets that directly facilitate bicycle taxi operators to

earn their living while indirectly enabling poor households to free up portions of their incomes that are tied on transport expenditure. We show in section 4 that transport expenditure is a major source of financial burden for poor households. With regard to social inclusion, the theory holds that people must experience social inclusion or minimum levels of social exclusion from key social and economic institutions. In this regard, we explore the extent to which transport planning has created street-spaces that accommodate all modes irrespective of the socio-economic statuses of their users. This discussion is developed in sections 6 and 7.

This sub-section has shown that development effort is incomplete until excluded individuals are facilitated to participate in normal social activities. The next sub-section pushes this idea further by arguing that inclusion is a right, rather than a privilege.

## 2.2. *The Right to the City*

The concept of the 'right to the city' was first formulated in 1968 by Henry Lefebvre as a call for a radical alternative to capitalism (Lefebvre, 1996). He criticised the continued disenfranchisement of urban residents by the political and economic agenda that were pursued under capitalism at the time (Lefebvre, 1996; Marcuse, 2009). Specifically Lefebvre argued that the preoccupation of capitalism with managing individual consumption impeded its ability to tackle larger social essentials, which were not necessarily material products (Lefebvre, 1996). The capitalist model was argued to be wrought with internal contradictions and crises, which produced injustice as a result of its failure to tackle non-materials concerns of the society (Marcuse, 2009; Soja, 2010). This injustice denied urban residents the right to appropriate and produce the city.

As a departure from capitalism which tackled what could arguably be termed as the symptoms of development challenges, Lefebvre focused on the root causes of these challenges to present a new perspective for understanding them. He took the radical stance that a meaningful solution could be found by addressing unjust structural relations that denied urban residents the right to appropriate and to produce urban spaces (Lefebvre, 1996). This stance presents a departure from welfare protection and market (de)regulation and other interventions, which focused on satisfying 'want' (Marcuse, 2009) rather than dismantling the underlying structures that generated injustice. Lefebvre's presentation of the right to the city as a cry and a demand demonstrates a resolve for meaningful change that not only enables urban residents to access resources but also empowers them to determine how resources are produced. In the words of Marcuse (2009), the right to the city therefore presents a 'demand' for resources that should be justly accessible to the excluded and a 'cry' by the alienated for the right to determine how

these resources are produced.

On the basis of the foregoing understanding, the current paper explores the extent to which social inclusion can be packaged as a policy frame for advancing the right of cyclists to access street-spaces and to influence how street-spaces are produced through their active travel behaviour.

This section has presented a theoretical argument that identifies the participation of excluded individuals as not only a precondition for all-inclusive development but also a right that needs to be recognised and be upheld. In the next section, we take a look at transport exclusion and its possible research directions in Sub-Saharan African (SSA) cities.

## 3. Contextualising Transport Exclusion in Sub-Saharan African Cities

The last fifteen years have witnessed a renewed attention to social exclusion in transport research (e.g. Church, Frost, & Sullivan, 2000; Kenyon, Lyons, & Rafferty, 2002; Lucas, 2011; Scheiner, 2010). A common theme through this research is the conception of exclusion as suppressed travel due to disadvantaged socio-geographical locations of residential places (Church et al., 2000; Shergold & Parkhurst, 2012), limited access to the car and public transport (Kenyon et al., 2002; Shergold & Parkhurst, 2012), and socio-demographics such as gender, age and race (Engels & Liu, 2011; Shergold & Parkhurst, 2012). Transport exclusion is therefore arguably a form of social exclusion given that it occurs because of the social status of the excluded.

While the socio-economic and demographic indicators discussed above are useful in enabling a normative categorisation of exclusion, they nonetheless do not take account of different travel behaviour (Shergold & Parkhurst, 2012). This gap raises doubts about their capability to explain transport exclusion that arises because of the choices that travellers make. Specifically, the results of these indicators remain unclear on the differences in exclusion experienced across travel modes and travel routes, although these choices present unique conditions that can be argued to impact differently on exclusion.

In view of the foregoing revelation, we argue that focusing on the empirical travel behaviour and policy processes that produce spaces where travel choices are made would lend a richer understanding of exclusion. Within the context of Europe, Scheiner (2010), for instance, alludes to this position even though his study does not directly focus on social exclusion. Based on the notion that households choose residential locations that suit their travel behaviour, he employs empirical travel data to show a positive association between vertical social inequality and limited activity spaces that those in the lower social ranks can access. Such results are concealed when inclusion strategies focus on nor-

mative categorisation of exclusion based on socio-demographic and geographical indicators.

It is even more difficult for these indicators to fully account for transport exclusion in Sub-Saharan African cities unless they are adapted to do so. This is because of the unique circumstances that define exclusion in these cities. These circumstances include the predominance of non-motorised transport (Gwilliam, 2003; Salon & Aligula, 2012), persistent absolute poverty and consequent low car ownership levels (Lucas, 2011), and the tension between the rapid sprawl of residential locations and the predominant mono-functional urban land-use regime (UN-HABITAT, 2014). All these contrast to factors that cause exclusion in developed cities, where the current proxies of exclusion have been developed. The interplay of these circumstances creates a situation where as many as 80% of daily trips in SSA cities are made using non-motorised options (Diaz Olvera, Plat, & Pochet, 2013; Salon & Aligula, 2012). In addition, exclusion also takes a gender dimension. Cases have been reported where the most vulnerable women, children, the old, and physically disabled are constrained from making out-of-home trips due to poor road conditions (Diaz Olvera et al., 2013), unaffordability (Salon & Gulyani, 2010), and poor and unreliable public transport (UN-HABITAT, 2014). We therefore argue that richer results of exclusion could be obtained if the definition of transport exclusion in the context of these Sub-Saharan African cities incorporated these conditions.

The foregoing revelations present a need to extend the scope of transport exclusion to incorporate the conditions that cause exclusion in Sub-Saharan African cities. Policy efforts that aim to address transport exclusion in these cities must ideally address these factors. The next section now puts Kisumu into the context of this transport exclusion by presenting its transport situation and policy environment.

#### 4. Putting Kisumu into Perspective

Kisumu city is the main commercial, administrative, and educational hub of Kisumu County. There are 46 other administrative counties across Kenya. The city has an estimated population of 400,000 inhabitants and a land mass of about 297km<sup>2</sup>, making it the third largest city in Kenya after Nairobi and Mombasa (GoK, 2010a). The city is administered by Kisumu County Government that is also in charge of different dimensions of urban planning in the city.

Due to its function as the principal urban centre in the region, Kisumu has continued to attract a sustained inflow of population that comes in search of opportunities (Maoulidi, 2012). However, the production of the very opportunities that attracts this population to the city has hardly kept pace with its inflow, thus making unemployment, poverty, and poor access to services a daunting planning challenge for the city (Nodalis,

2014). Unemployment and poverty rates are estimated at 30% and 48% of the city's total workforce and households respectively (Nodalis, 2014). The bulk of this poor population resides in the slums and informal settlements of the city (Nodalis, 2014).

Although inadequate access to transport services is an important dimension of poverty (Kim & Dumitrescu, 2011), little research attention has gone into the transport disadvantage that faces the poor of Kisumu. Instead, efforts to tackle poverty in the city have focused on improving the delivery of socio-economic opportunities such as employment, housing, water, and education (e.g. Nodalis, 2014). Meanwhile, studies of cities of comparable socio-economic conditions reveal that the poor spend as much as 25% of their disposable incomes on meeting recurrent transport costs, partly due to lack of affordable alternatives (Kim & Dumitrescu, 2011; Odero, Sibanda, Njenga, Mbathi, & Opiyo, 2009). Furthermore, they make fewer trips yet they spend more time travelling and are the most predisposed to road-crashes when compared to their high income counterparts (de-Langen & Tembele, 2001; Kim & Dumitrescu, 2011). In Kisumu, these challenges are compounded by poor road conditions, which cut off most of the city's slum and peri-urban settlements from public transport service.<sup>1</sup>

Utility cycling among the poor of Kisumu is thus a pragmatic response to unemployment and inadequate access to faster and affordable alternatives to walking. Although the poor are the predominant bicycle users, other income groups also cycle, either privately or using bicycle taxis (Kola, Onyango, & Oindo, 2012). The modal share of cycling is estimated at 16% (Makajuma, 2006). It is thought that the recent emergence of motorcycle taxis has caused a general decrease in this modal share because its operators are mostly former bicycle taxi riders who have switched to operating motorcycles.<sup>2</sup> However, a new pattern characterised by a rise in the number of private cyclists has also emerged as some travellers who relied on bicycle taxis resort to using their own bicycles.<sup>3</sup> Generally, motorcycles are even more expensive than public transport which is equally expensive for a majority of the poor. Despite this undying significance of cycling in Kisumu, the city authority has failed to support cycling in terms of infrastructure and traffic rules. This failure occasions not only its exclusion from the streets but also the social exclusion of its riders, passengers and operators.

The recent formulation of the Kenya Vision 2030 (KV2030) and the Integrated National Transport Policy (INTP) presents an opportunity for interrogating government commitment to inclusive transport that ad-

<sup>1</sup> Field interview with County Chief Officer in charge of transport, 27.08.2015

<sup>2</sup> Field interview with practising NMT expert, 20.08.2015

<sup>3</sup> Field interview with practising NMT expert, 20.08.2015

dresses the foregoing disadvantage that faces cycling in Kisumu. Although these two documents are national government documents, the structure of government in Kenya (GoK, 2010b) provides that they are implemented at the local level. The influence of these documents in shaping the development of Kisumu is further emboldened by its selection as one of the priority cities under the KV2030 plan (GoK, 2007).

The Kenya Vision 2030 is an economic development blueprint that aims to turn Kenya into a middle-income country by the year 2030 (GoK, 2007). It was launched in 2008. The document envisages sustained economic growth, social justice and political accountability as the basis for realising its vision. It provides a long-range vision for these sectors and proposes to achieve their specific targets by implementing priority projects that it identifies within a successive five-year medium-term planning framework.

Relevant to the current paper is the recognition of the role of transport infrastructure in accelerating business and improving livelihoods. In this regard, the government seeks to develop and maintain a safe, integrated, and efficient transport network as its transport vision (GoK, 2007). In order to realise this vision, the document prioritises the development of Bus Rapid Transport and the light railway system in Nairobi and later in other priority cities such as Kisumu (GoK, 2007). The document also targets to develop an Integrated National Transport Master Plan to guide infrastructure development across all Kenyan cities, including Kisumu. Curiously though, the KV2030 does not acknowledge the INTP, which was prepared two years before KV2030 was initiated and only launched in 2009 after undergoing some amendments to align it to the KV2030. This raises curiosity about the consistency between the two documents and the implications of this consistency for inclusive transport. This issue is explored further in section 7.

## 5. Methodology

The study begins by a theoretical analysis to enable it build a framework for employing social inclusion in problematizing transport disadvantage in the context of Sub-Saharan African cities. This is followed by a qualitative content analysis of the KV2030 and the INTP to identify the extent to which the thematic concerns generated from the theoretical analysis are tackled by the extant policies. Where possible, the study makes reference to the transport proposals of Kisumu Integrated Strategic Urban Development Plan (ISUD)<sup>4</sup> to demonstrate the situation in Kisumu. This content analysis is sparingly supported by results of field observations and qualitative analysis of interviews held with relevant government officials and transport experts.

<sup>4</sup> The ISUD is the strategic plan that guides the development of the city for the period 2013 to 2030.

### 5.1. Data

The main data used in the analysis is the content of KV2030, INTP and ISUD documents. Copies of these documents were obtained from Kisumu County Government. To supplement this data, the study held semi-structured interviews with the chief officer in charge of transport at Kisumu County Government and one Non-Motorised Transport expert. These respondents were purposively selected because of the rich information they possessed on the subject matter of our investigation because of their official responsibilities and experience in transport in general and cycling in particular (Singh, 2006). The interviews were held in August 2015, with the main theme being the opportunities and challenges that faced cycling and its users under the present planning framework in Kisumu and the on-going policy reforms. An interview schedule that was tailored along the emerging issues enumerated in section 6 was prepared to guide these interviews.

Field observations were made on an on-going basis to get a grasp of the challenges that faced cycling on the streets and to cross-check the findings from the interviews.

### 5.2. Analysis

The theoretical analysis presented in section 6 generated 5 main themes that formed the categories that were used in the subsequent analyses in section 7. These themes centred on problematizing transport disadvantage in general, contextualising exclusion, visibility of exclusion, conception of spaces of exclusion, and response to the ideals of inclusion. The content analysis is organised according to these themes that enabled us to formulate our preconceptions and pre-knowledge (Mayring, 2014) of what inclusive policies and processes should entail. The content of KV2030 and INTP documents were then analysed to find out the extent to which they tackled these thematic concerns and the opportunity they availed for cycling inclusion. According to Mayring (2014), a content analysis is not a standardised instrument; it should rather be flexible enough to suit the material in question and issues at hand. The content-related arguments take preference over procedural arguments because validity is regarded more highly than reliability (Mayring, 2014). Table 1 (Miles & Huberman, 1994) presents a summary of how the three policy documents have tackled the thematic concerns raised.

## 6. Linking Social Inclusion to Transport Discourse

### 6.1. Problematizing Transport Exclusion through Social Inclusion

Social inclusion is increasingly presented to be a basic condition for achieving sustainable urban transport

(Khayesi, Monheim, & Nebe, 2010; Lucas, 2012; World Bank, 2013). Although it is conceptually differentiated from social exclusion (Labonte, 2004), it arguably offers a basis for problematizing the plight of individuals and groups that are excluded by transport systems (Church et al., 2000; Lucas & Musso, 2014). This opportunity is presented by its conception as both a means to ending social exclusion and concurrently an end to be pursued in its own right. The central aim of social inclusion is to strengthen the participation of excluded individuals and groups in social processes by improving their ability and dignity as well as the opportunities available for them to participate (World Bank, 2013).

The foregoing conception projects social inclusion as the central target of efforts that aim to achieve the tenets of the social quality theory and the right to the city. In fact, the very emergence of the concept of social inclusion is itself a response to the challenges of social exclusion and by extension the restrictions that this exclusion places on the right to the city (Allman, 2013; Harvey, 2012; Labonte, 2004). Specifically, its growing use is motivated by the need to reduce the relative disadvantages that face individuals or groups because of their weaker social statuses, that limit their ability to participate in normal social activities (Sen, 2000). These disadvantages have been argued to limit their enjoyment of the right to the city (Harvey, 2003, 2012).

Despite the potential of social inclusion in problematizing transport disadvantage, it has received little research attention, particularly in medium-sized Sub-Saharan Africa cities (Lucas, 2011). It seems that transport exclusion itself is still not very clearly understood in these cities. In this paper, we therefore operationalise normal social activities to refer to participation in mobility and accessibility by all modes of transport. We use this understanding to interrogate how Kenya's development blueprint and transport policy problematize the transport challenge in general and the extent to which this problematization accommodates cyclists.

## 6.2. *The Context of Exclusion Matters*

The fundamentals of social quality theory and the right to the city concept seem to converge at the view that social inclusion forms the common denominator that is necessary to support participation in social processes. This is especially so if one considers that social inclusion outlines the terms and nature of this participation that underpin the achievement of the tenets of the theory and the concept. In the case of social quality theory, social inclusion is directly identified as a precondition that enables individuals to be part of the society (Maesen & Walker, 2012). Similarly, the right to the city concept also argues for social inclusion, not only in appropriating existing resources but also in determining how these resources are produced (Marcuse, 2009).

But facilitating social inclusion requires an unam-

biguous understanding of who the excluded are and the factors that exclude them. Existing literature on social exclusion has thus far narrowly limited the scope of disadvantage that defines exclusion and the excluded individuals and groups to the contexts of the challenges that face countries from where this literature emanates. These include mainly countries of Europe, Asia and to some extent Australia and the USA. Consequently, income status, race, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, religion, physical disability status, and caste dominate as the basis for defining exclusion (e.g. Øyen, 1997; Sen, 2000; World Bank, 2013). These forms of exclusion are typical in the context of these countries and are by no means exhaustive, more so with regard to the transport disadvantage in SSA cities. A more realistic investigation of exclusion in SSA cities must hence begin by recognising this context-specificity of the phenomenon (Silver, 2007).

The foregoing unruly nature of social exclusion demands that the phenomenon is conceptualised to reflect its context-specific drivers and forms in SSA cities if it is to be useful in understanding transport disadvantage in these cities. At the same time, while some of the dimensions of exclusion used in existing literature resonate with exclusion in the context of SSA cities, they must be adapted to reflect the unique circumstances in these cities. For instance, although cyclists in many SSA cities are predominantly the poor (Pochet & Cusset, 1999; UN-HABITAT, 2004), indirectly addressing their transport disadvantage through tackling poverty is not likely to yield their inclusion. This is because their exclusion has more to do with street-spaces, which hardly cater for cycling and less to do with their poverty status. Poverty in this case only adds to their invisibility during street-space allocation but does not in itself trigger their exclusion from the streets. Indeed, research shows that not all cyclists are necessarily poor (Bechstein, 2010; Nkurunziza, Zuidgeest, & van Maarseveen, 2012; Salon & Aligula, 2012). This example demonstrates the ease of blurring the real drivers of exclusion when its conception gives undue prominence to the socio-economic statuses of the excluded. Useful insights into different dimensions of transport exclusion could be obtained by shifting attention to the planning processes, products and outcomes that occasion exclusion (Cameron, 2006; Schwanen et al., 2015).

This paper therefore attempts a direct conception of the exclusion of cyclists for what it is—exclusion from the streets. We employ this conception to focus the problematization of the transport disadvantage discussed in the previous section to cycling concerns in Kenya in particular. We interrogate the extent to which current policies enable the disadvantage that faces cyclists to be identified as well as the extent to which these policies facilitate cyclists to participate in mobility and to influence street-space allocation through their active travel behaviour.

### 6.3. *Unrelenting Exclusion amid 'Progress' in Transport*

Within transport research, the use of social inclusion has been inspired by transport-related marginalisation that persists despite the progress witnessed in transport service and infrastructure development (Jones & Lucas, 2012; Kenyon et al., 2002). This progress is evidenced by road expansion, improvements in public transport, and a concurrent rapid growth in motorisation (Gwilliam, 2003; Watson, 2014; WHO, 2015). While these developments are desirable to the extent that they enable goods, services and people to reach destinations, their benefits are evidently skewed against non-motorised modes such as cycling because the planning strategies that generate them are not sensitive to the needs of non-motorised modes (Gwilliam, 2003; Watson, 2014; WHO, 2015). These auto-oriented strategies not only make it hard and unsafe for non-motorised modes to access cities (Gwilliam, 2003; Watson, 2014; WHO, 2015); they also lead to increased number of accidents that disproportionately affect non-motorised modes (WHO, 2015). These disadvantages ultimately lead to reduced accessibility to opportunities such as jobs, education and health services for those who cannot afford motorised modes (Diaz Olvera, Didier, Pochet, & Maidadi, 2012; Salon & Gulyani, 2010). The appropriateness and effectiveness of these auto-oriented transport planning strategies to generate positive social impacts for low income groups remains doubtful (Grieco, Ndulo, Bryceson, Porter, & McCray, 2009; Lucas, 2011; McCray, 2004; Watson, 2014).

The result of this mismatch between progress in transport conditions on the one hand and its outcomes for non-motorised modes on the other draws particular attention to cycling in medium-sized Sub-Saharan African cities. While cycling commands a significant modal share in most of these cities (Bradbury & Howe, 2002; Quarshie, 2004; UN-HABITAT, 2010), the modernist planning regime that is prevalent throughout the region oddly stifles its use by failing to recognise it and to cater for its infrastructure needs alongside those of motorised modes (Asingo & Mitullah, 2007; Steyn, 2012; Watson, 2014). This failure exposes cycling to unsafe competition with motorised modes over street-spaces that are designed to facilitate motorised transport (Kim & Dumitrescu, 2011; Odero et al., 2009; UN-HABITAT, 2004). It is unsurprising therefore that cyclists accounted for about 9.1% of the fatalities reported in Kenya between 1994–2008, making it the third most dangerous mode after driving and walking (Ministry of Transport, 2009, cited in Odero et al., 2009). In Kisumu specifically, cycling further faces active government ban (Alal, 2014) although it remains one of the most popular travel modes in the city (Makajuma, 2006). These disadvantages meted on cycling intensify the exclusion of the poor majority who use the mode for commuting, intra-urban connection and as a tool for income gener-

ation by operating it as bicycle taxis (Bradbury & Howe, 2002; UN-HABITAT, 2004).

Transport exclusion however restricts not only the physical access to opportunities; it also directly stifles efforts to bridge social inequality gap in many SSA cities. It is estimated that as many as 50% of the inhabitants of some of the cities live below the poverty line and can afford neither private cars nor public transport (UN-HABITAT, 2014). In the case of Kisumu, the failure to provide for cycling not only generates the physical exclusion of its users; it also excludes bicycle taxi operators from their source of livelihood. As mentioned earlier, this failure also strains household budgets by locking large proportions of their incomes to transport expenditure.

This current paper therefore questions the extent to which the extant policies make this exclusion visible and the opportunities that such visibility offers for cycling inclusion.

### 6.4. *In Search of Inclusion in Excluded Spaces and Processes*

Urban streets have historically been the object of the struggle for the right to the city for modes other than the car (e.g. Attoh, 2012; Furness, 2010; Murthy, 2011). This struggle is shaped by transport exclusion that results from growing motorisation that is reinforced by state planners' conception of street-spaces as corridors of motorised traffic rather than spaces of multi-modal use (Banister, 2002; Murthy, 2011). The neoliberal agenda (Harvey, 2012) and the modernist approach to transport planning (Hobson, 1999; Watson, 2009, 2014) are at the centre in propagating this exclusion. On the one hand, this neoliberal agenda is responsible for commodifying urban spaces (Harvey, 1982, 2012), thus reducing street-space allocation to an exercise of maximising economic value rather than the use value of street-spaces. On the other hand, the modernist planning agenda devalues non-motorised modes by prioritising automobiles in its pursuit for 'modernity' (Furness, 2010). The resulting exclusion of non-motorised modes takes many forms. Key among these are outright stigmatisation of the modes (Furness, 2010; Salon & Aligula, 2012) and a blatant failure to allocate street-spaces that support their use (Furness, 2010).

Cycling inclusion remains a difficult target under this modernist planning regime. This is because its ensuing negative social representation (Khayesi et al., 2010; Pochet & Cusset, 1999) prohibits transport planning in its current form from allocating street-spaces that can facilitate its use. At the same time, cycling stands no chance for inclusion in commodified spaces because it generates no economic return that is readily quantifiable using the current transport evaluation tools such as the Cost-Benefit Analysis (Jones, Moura, & Domingos, 2013). It is therefore relevant to explore

the extent to which policy efforts that aim to include cycling can centre their ideals on the active travel behaviour of cyclists in terms of their mode choices, route choices and the attendant challenges. Moreover, it is also relevant to explore the extent to which such policies can consolidate the right of cyclists to produce street-spaces as they already do, albeit without state recognition. In this connection, the current paper questions how spaces of exclusion are produced by the policies and explores the challenges and opportunities availed by these policies for cycling inclusion.

### 6.5. Ideals of Inclusion

Addressing the limitations imposed on cycling by the planning agenda discussed in the previous section requires clarity on the ideals that social inclusion strives for. It has been suggested that social inclusion must strive to achieve and safeguard ability, dignity and opportunity as its basic ideals (World Bank, 2013). Ability in its broader sense is recognised as an innate quality (Fodor, 1975) that must nonetheless be socially mediated (Prinz, 2005). In this context, we present the existing cycling culture in Kisumu as an innate quality that requires deliberate planning support in order to enable it play an effective role in enabling mobility and income generation or saving. Dignity on the other hand concerns respect and recognition with which cyclists are treated in policy and practice. Low dignity attached to cycling by state planners renders the mode invisible in official statistics and consequently unattended to both in terms of policy and of infrastructure provision (Khayesi et al., 2010). Lastly, inclusionary efforts must

also aim to enhance the opportunities for cycling by reducing the physical barriers to cycling. These barriers are occasioned by a lack of supportive infrastructure and traffic conditions (Alando, Brussel, Zuidgeest, & Durgj, 2013). In this paper, we explore the difficulties that cyclists are exposed to by the failure to provide infrastructure and traffic conditions that support cycling. These ideals form a basis for assessing the policies for the opportunities that they avail for cycling inclusion.

This section has attempted to interweave the connection between social inclusion and transport disadvantage in an effort to construct a frame for assessing the extent to which KV2030 and the INTP are inclusive. The next section now dialogues the two policies to find the extent of their convergence on inclusion and the implications of this extent for cycling inclusion.

### 7. Dialoguing the Kenya Vision 2030 and the Integrated National Transport Policy: Implications on Inclusion

This section carries out a qualitative content analysis of the policy pronouncements contained in the KV2030 and INTP to find out the opportunities they hold for cycling inclusion in Kisumu. The content analysis is guided by the categories identified in section 6. Accordingly, the policy documents were analysed to find out how the messages they contained had tackled the thematic concerns that were raised in that section (Mayring, 2014).

Table 1 summarises the findings. Where possible, the study makes reference to ISUD plan to demonstrate its points.

**Table 1.** The extent to which policy and practice have tackled key thematic concerns of inclusion.

Concern	KV2030	INTP
Problematizing transport disadvantage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hindrance to mobility and economic participation</li> <li>• Modernist</li> <li>• Overall road crashes and pollution</li> <li>• Traffic congestion</li> <li>• High cost of transport</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hindrance to accessibility</li> <li>• Inadequate transport integration</li> <li>• No vision for transport sector</li> <li>• Poor quality transport services</li> </ul>
Contextualising transport exclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional disparity in road network coverage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate modal split</li> <li>• Transport unaffordability</li> <li>• Planning biased against NMT</li> <li>• Lack of infrastructure provision for NMT</li> </ul>
Visibility of exclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No mention of NMT even in delegated form</li> <li>• Only recognises regions of the country that are excluded from roads for motorised transport</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explicit acknowledgement of bias against NMT modes in general</li> </ul>
Production of spaces of exclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capital infrastructure projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrated transport</li> </ul>
Response to the ideals of inclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focused on priority projects (capital projects)</li> <li>• Road is synonymous with space for cars</li> <li>• Benchmarking with international 'best practices'</li> <li>• Pursuit of aesthetics in infrastructure design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for integrated transport including NMTs recognised</li> </ul>



### 7.1. Problematizing Transport Disadvantage

The two policy documents agree on the existence of transport disadvantage that impedes different mode users from full participation in transport activities. However, there is a divergence in the manner in which this disadvantage is problematized by the two documents.

First, the KV2030 perceives this disadvantage in terms of the hindrance it places on mobility, participation in national economy and the international competitiveness of the country. Thus transport disadvantage is problematized in terms of the need to improve transport infrastructure in order to *'facilitate firms and citizens in their wealth-creation efforts'* (p. 17). Attendant to this is the need to reduce traffic congestion, high cost of transport, road crashes and pollution, all of which are focused on improving the conditions for motorised modes. At the same time, there is a visible pressure to develop transport infrastructure facilities that are among other things *'aesthetically appealing'* in order to *'to provide cost-effective world-class infrastructure facilities and services in support of the Vision'* (p. 17). This confirms the pressure of modernisation (Steyn, 2012; Watson, 2009, 2014) that limits transport strategies from being realistic to the practical challenges that face SSA cities. While it is expected of a national policy document like KV2030 to develop targets like these, *inadequate room allowed for policies other than KV2030 to influence development at the local level*<sup>5</sup> raises doubts about the ease of recognising the challenge that faces cycling under this arrangement.

On the other hand, the INTP demonstrates an integrated outlook in the way it problematizes transport disadvantage. Specifically, it identifies poor quality transport services, lack of a vision for the transport sector, which particularly disadvantages non-motorised modes (p. 46), and inadequate transport integration. The policy acknowledges that these challenges impede accessibility for non-motorised modes like cyclists just like they do for motorised modes. A clear opportunity to problematize the challenge facing cycling is therefore availed by this policy. However, this problematization is not likely to lead to the prioritisation of cycling issues in Kenya in general and Kisumu in particular unless KV2030 is reoriented to give room for other policies to influence development priorities at the local level. This can be achieved through the five-year-medium-term-planning framework that is provided for under KV2030 (GoK, 2007). Steyn (2012) has shown the need to reconcile such conflicting forces in order to allow the inclusion of the excluded urban citizens.

### 7.2. Contextualising Transport Exclusion

The theoretical analysis presented in section 6 demon-

strates that exclusion means different things in different contexts and that there is a need to understand this exclusion in transport terms in order to tackle it. There is a mix of social concerns that are raised by the two policies and which can form a basis for cycling inclusion. However, these concerns are scattered and sometimes not even directly related to transport.

The most prominent transport exclusion concern that emerges from KV2030 is presented in terms of regional disparities in road network coverage. Accordingly, the policy seeks to *'implement infrastructure projects that will stimulate demand in hitherto neglected areas targeting increased connectivity and reduced transport and other infrastructure costs'* (p. 19). This prioritisation of transport strategies at the regional scale does not however elicit the inclusion cycling because of practicality of using the mode over such long distances. The strategy is thus in every practical sense for motorised transport. It is instructive that the neglected regions mentioned in the policy document are the Arid and Semi-Arid areas of the country and not the neglected slum areas of its cities, most of which equally need a deliberate transport strategy. Salon and Gulyani (2010) for instance demonstrate that most of the urban poor who can hardly afford the cost of transport reside in these settlements.

The social pillar of the KV2030 presents an opportunity through which the inclusion of disadvantaged modes could be contextualised in secondary cities like Kisumu. Specifically, the pillar seeks to implement policies *'that minimise the differences in income opportunities and access to social services'* (p. 196). This target identifies urban slums and pockets of extreme poverty as some of the areas that need this attention. The policy intention fits the situation in Kisumu where cycling is not only a mode for accessing destinations, but also a tool for income generation. However, the policy does not recognise the central part played by transport in income generation and enabling access. The opportunity presented by the policy for the inclusion of cycling is thus lost since the policy prioritises improved education, health, water and sanitation, among other human resource investments as its strategies (p. 198). Moreover, although transport is a major component of household expenditure (Kim & Dumitrescu, 2011), the policy does not address this connection in its bid to *'create a socially just and equitable society without extreme poverty'* (p. 199).

The INTP on the other hand contextualises the transport disadvantage that faces cycling in a more direct way that can elicit attention to this disadvantage. It identifies inappropriate modal split, transport unaffordability, bias against non-motorised modes by planners and lack of infrastructure provision for non-motorised modes. While these disadvantages resonate with the cycling situation in Kisumu, *'they are not likely to be addressed as long as they remain separated from*

<sup>5</sup> Field interview with Practising NMT expert, 20.08.2015

*the priorities of the KV2030*<sup>6</sup>. According to the experts, lack of priority to cycling by KV2030 has been a hindrance to acknowledging the need to cater for cycling in terms of infrastructure and traffic rules. It should be pointed out that KV2030 projects have taken precedence over most other projects when it comes to government funding and support. A possible strategy to deal with this lack of harmony between KV2030 and the cycling priorities would be to acknowledge the social aspect of transport in the social pillar of KV2030. This would ingrain exclusion issues in the transport sector to the social pillar so that they get prioritised in government plans.

### 7.3. Visibility of Exclusion

This analysis sought to understand the extent to which the two policies made the exclusion of cyclists visible and the opportunities that such visibility offered for cycling inclusion. Differences were found between the two policies.

To begin with, KV2030 does not refer to non-motorised modes, neither in terms of acknowledging their problems nor in laying out strategies to deal with the challenges they face. This lack of mention makes the mode completely invisible from any intervention that is initiated by the KV2030. The only closest mention of exclusion relates to excluded regions and slum settlements. However, as already discussed before, the latter areas are not mentioned for transport interventions. The implication of this invisibility of cycling concerns in KV2030 is that the mode will continue to face exclusion for as long as the current arrangement that prioritises KV2030 projects remains.

In contrast, the INTP demonstrates a clear articulation of cycling concerns. These have already been discussed earlier. However, it is notable that the policy explicitly acknowledges the bias against non-motorised modes in general. The policy acknowledges that public transport in urban areas remains unaffordable to many members of working households despite the country's elaborate road network (p. 45). The policy also acknowledges that transport development in Kenya in general has focused its attention on roads for motorised transport, yet these are only accessible to a small minority since the majority remain poor. What is interesting is that despite this knowledge of this phenomenon that is arguably a case of social exclusion, non-motorised modes in general are not recognised in law to qualify them for government funding and other forms of support (GoK, 2009). This lack of recognition perpetuates lack of safety for cycling as it has to use road-spaces that are designed for motorised transport.

The articulation of the challenge that faces non-

---

<sup>6</sup> Field interview with Practising NMT expert, 20.08.2015 & County Chief Officer in charge of transport, 27.08.2015

motorised modes described above brings out the social component of transport disadvantage. This is particularly so with regard to how it impacts on the transport cost for the poor, excludes them from the street-spaces, and makes it unsafe for the poor to use the streets. Packaging the solution to this challenge as a social inclusion agenda would arguably afford non-motorised modes in general and cycling in particular the visibility they require for the government to facilitate their use. It should be pointed out that the social pillar of KV2030 already tackles such social concerns although it is not explicitly linked to transport disadvantage. This makes this form of transport disadvantage invisible. The social concerns raised by INTP should hence be packaged as social inclusion concerns and be linked with the social pillar of KV2030 in order to afford them the necessary government attention. Doing this can lead to the prioritisation of cycling in Kisumu, which is hardly recognised or even catered for in spite of its active use by the poor majority.

### 7.4. Production of Spaces of Exclusion

Differences in the conception of the transport disadvantage presented in the previous sections elicit different infrastructure and traffic interventions. While the INTP advocates for integrated transport that includes streets that cater for cycling, KV2030 on the other hand focuses on capital infrastructure projects in its effort to address the transport disadvantage that it identifies. As mentioned already though, the targets of the KV2030 are prioritised in determining not only the planning but also the execution of transport infrastructure projects. This leads to the production of spaces that exclude cycling. According to the planning authorities, *'accommodating pedal cycling [on the road] remains a challenge due to limited funds, lack of policy priority, and the emergence of motorcycles [which attracts more political attention] even though we understand its role in enabling the poor the move'*.<sup>7</sup>

Kisumu is currently implementing key transport infrastructure projects that are intended to improve its linkage with the neighbouring cities of Kakamega, Busia, and other cities along the Kisumu-Nairobi transport corridor. These projects are implemented within the framework of the flagship projects of KV2030 and are *largely driven by the pursuit of economic goals rather than social ones*<sup>8</sup>. It is notable that while the roads affected by these projects double as urban roads within the city boundaries, no clear provision has been made to accommodate cycling on their urban segments. This, despite the significance of cy-

---

<sup>7</sup> Field interview with County Chief Officer in charge of transport, 27.08.2015.

<sup>8</sup> Field interview with County Chief Officer in charge of transport, 27.08.2015.

cling in terms of employment for bicycle taxi operators and as an alternative mode of transport, particularly among the low-income earners of the city (Oballa, Mwaura, & Stellmach, 2012). Instead, the car-oriented street design has now cut off access, thereby preventing cyclists from turning at some important junctions in the city.<sup>9</sup> This makes it riskier to cycle on these roads and casts doubts on whether the projects have cyclists in mind in their quest to increase safety, connectivity and accessibility.

The foregoing production of street-spaces that exclude cyclists is not improved by the ISUD either. Instead the plan seems to borrow heavily from KV2030 and therefore a continuation of its desire for capital infrastructure projects. Cycling concerns do not receive any attention beyond the recognition of the role of cycling in enabling accessibility and the need to provide for it in terms of infrastructure and traffic conditions (Nodalis, 2014, p. 36). This is curious because the plan should offer concrete strategies on how to include the mode in order to enable it play the roles that the plan acknowledges. Instead, the plan only duplicates the capital projects proposed for Nairobi under the KV2030 without much regard to the unique cycling culture of Kisumu.

While it would have been expected that this ISUD plan would contextualise the KV2030 and tackle the unique local level planning challenges and opportunities, it fails to do so. The plan does not offer any concrete proposals on how to progressively include cycling within the street spaces of Kisumu but instead evadingly recommends that the present modal mix should be organised by providing dedicated lanes and stops and waiting areas (p. 36). In view of this insecure treatment of cycling concerns, we argue in this paper that presenting these concerns as challenges of social exclusion could generate the urgency needed to integrate the concerns into future infrastructure developments projects. This integration can occasion the production of more inclusive street-spaces. Doing this would pre-empt the difficulty of doing so once this opportunity is lost.

Responding to the infrastructure and traffic needs of the bicycle is also complicated by the use of the term 'non-motorised' modes to refer to cycling and walking, and indeed sometimes even more modes. Whereas the KV2030 fails to recognise the role of non-motorised transport, its introduction by the INTP requires enhanced clarity in order to allow its operationalisation. In Kisumu, the use of the term '*boda boda*' by planners to refer to both pedal bicycles and commercial motorcycles diminishes the possibility of producing street-spaces that include cyclists even further. This lack of clarity about the exact meaning of 'non-motorised modes' and '*boda boda*' in the context of Kisumu has engendered ambiguity with regard to the

few non-motorised lanes that have been provided on the Kisumu-Busia and Kisumu-Nairobi roads under the on-going roads projects. It remains unclear who the intended users of these spaces are. These lanes have been claimed by bicyclists, pedestrians, hawkers, and motorcyclists,<sup>10</sup> thereby making all of them vulnerable to accidents just like they would have been if the lanes did not exist. There is therefore a need to operationalise these terminologies in order to clear the current ambiguities that emerge from their use. Moreover, it also emerges that the production of streets that include cycling cannot be tackled in isolation of these other modes and activities that claim the same spaces as the bicycle. Addressing these concerns is however beyond the scope of the current paper.

### 7.5. Response to the Ideals of Inclusion

The theoretical analysis revealed the need to mediate cycling in order to address its concerns. Whereas KV2030 responds to the projected growth in travel demand through capital infrastructure projects, the recognition of modes other than motorised by the INTP presents an opportunity for mediating cyclists to meet their travel demand using the bicycles. However, practicalizing this recognition remains a challenge due to the current influence of the KV2030, which focuses on stimulating economic growth rather than social inclusion. Because of this inclination, the KV2030 looks at inclusion indirectly as a means to enabling participation in the economy, rather than directly as an end in itself. Moreover, the kind of participation it envisages is by motorised modes, rather than non-motorised ones like cycling. Again, the focus of KV2030 on benchmarking its transport infrastructure standards with international best practices and developing infrastructure that is aesthetically appealing in design (p. 38) are clearly informed by the need to facilitate motorisation rather than cycling and other forms of non-motorised modes. It therefore remains doubtful if the current arrangement where the provisions of the KV2030 are prioritised can mediate cycling in Kisumu and other Kenyan cities.

The foregoing challenge is worsened by the ISUD, which proposes the expansion of existing roads and the creation of more roads to create room for the projected growth in motorised transport in Kisumu. It appears that the accessibility concerns of cyclists will continue to remain secondary unless transport planning is reoriented to enable cycling. *'[So far] cycling lanes are only considered in areas where road corridors [reserves] can accommodate it...often what remains after motorised transport has been catered for'*<sup>11</sup>. This attitude not only diminishes the importance of cycling; it also generates incoherent cycling network that does not encourage

<sup>9</sup> Field observation.

<sup>10</sup> Field observation.

<sup>11</sup> Field interview with Practising NMT expert, 20.08.2015.

cycling. There is clearly a need to demystify the inferior social construction of cycling that occasions this diminished attention to it, and to design the roads to allow safe multiple-modal use.<sup>12</sup>

The ISUD plan evidently renders the growth of the city car-dependent, as can be seen in the proposals to decentralise the city to outlying areas in the outskirts of the current city centre (Nodalis, 2014). The proposed relocation of public transport termini to these new nodes will certainly lead to growth in the use of private cars as these nodes are far from the city centre where most daily services such as government, banking, and social services are located. All these proposals come at a time when the city has not exhausted the space it has close to the city centre. It is curious that no provision has been made to accommodate the infrastructure and traffic needs that will arise due to the use of the bicycle to connect these nodes. These proposed changes in land-use structure, in addition to the natural triggers of travel demand, will necessitate the use of different modes by travellers of different socio-economic groups. There will hence be a need to revise the priorities of the KV2030 through the five-year medium-term-plans in order to accommodate emerging issues that the preparation of the KV2030 never foresaw<sup>13</sup>.

## 8. Conclusion and Policy Recommendations

This paper has attempted to develop social inclusion as a frame for cycling-inclusive transport planning in Kisumu. Basing its arguments on social quality theory and the right to the city concept, the study developed key criteria upon which it assessed the Kenya Vision 2030 and the Integrated National Transport Plan for the extent to which their pronouncements were inclusive of cycling and its street-space needs. The aim was to identify the gaps that the policies presented as well as the opportunities that they availed for making social inclusion an imperative of transport policy. The paper shows that both the Kenya Vision 2030 and the Integrated National Transport Policy hold some potential for fronting the need for cycling-inclusive streets through social inclusion. While the Kenya Vision 2030 holds the power to influence action at the local city level, it is nonetheless weak when it comes to directly advocating for inclusive transport. On the other hand, the Integrated National Transport Policy identifies challenges that can be packaged as social inclusion concerns. However, its policy pronouncements are less prioritised in comparison to those of the Kenya Vision 2030. This diminished priority makes the INTP less influential in shaping pro-cycling interventions in Kisumu. These dissenting strengths of the two policy documents are not likely to generate the inclusion of cyclists

unless they are harmonised. The current paper seizes the opportunity presented by the social nature of exclusion that faces cycling to present social inclusion as a frame for reconciling these contrasting strengths and to articulate the need for cycling-inclusive transport planning. Facilitating cyclists through their social inclusion is argued in this paper as a way of not only enabling them to participate in the mobility in ways that they can afford but also a way of recognising that they have a right to access the city by bicycles.

This study makes a number of key policy recommendations that it hopes can elicit better inclusion of cyclists through a more proactive policy formulation and implementation.

To begin with, there is a need to harmonise the two policies in order to build on their synergies. In this regard, it is relevant to directly identify transport disadvantage as a social concern and to make it one of the priority concerns of the social pillar of Kenya Vision 2030. This would accord it equal priority with the other targets of the Kenya Vision 2030. There will be need for such harmonised policies to emphasise inclusion as a goal in itself rather than a means to participation in the economy. This is because the opportunity for cycling inclusion would be lost if inclusion is presented merely as a means to participating in economic pursuits. These recommendations are relevant at policy formulation level and would call upon the national government to implement.

It is also relevant that the harmonisation of these two policies recognises that the use of bicycles on street-spaces is a right that ought to be protected by the state. These street-spaces however have multiple claims. Policies that seek to include cycling must as such link with land-use and other transport strategies to ensure that efforts to include cycling are not derailed by such multiple claims. This study also recommends that the use of social inclusion in advancing the cycling-inclusive policies should consider the context-specific factors that exclude cyclists, such as the conditions of the street-spaces and the processes of allocating these street-spaces. These factors should be used hand in hand with the socio-geographic indicators that have been used traditionally to study social exclusion. These set of recommendations would call upon both the national government as well as Kisumu County Government to implement given that they concern both policy formulation and implementation. This paper also recognises the role of local cyclists, bicycle taxi operators, and bicycle advocates in ensuring that recommendations relating to the right to access the city is recognised and upheld by the city authority.

## Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the German Academic Exchange Program and the Kenya National Council for

<sup>12</sup> Field interview with Practising NMT expert, 20.08.2015.

<sup>13</sup> Field interview with Practising NMT expert, 20.08.2015.

Science, Technology and Innovation for funding this study. The opinions expressed in the paper however remain the responsibility of the authors.

### Conflicts of Interests

The authors declare no conflict of interests.

### References

- Alal, M. (2014, January 28). Kenya: Kisumu Boda Bodas Plan Demos over Ban From CBD. *The Star*. Retrieved from <http://allafrica.com/stories/201401280610.html>
- Alando, W., Brussel, M., Zuidgeest, M., & Durgi, D. (2013). Exploring the utility of the spatially-constrained accessibility measure in integrating urban cycling and land-use in Pune, India. In *Proceedings of the 14th N-AERUS / GISDECO conference, September 12-14 2013*. Enschede, Netherlands.
- Allman, D. (2013). The Sociology of Social Inclusion. *SAGE Open*, 3(1).
- Asingo, P. O., & Mitullah, W. V. (2007). *Implementing road transport safety measures in Kenya: Policy issues and challenges*. Working Paper No. 545. Nairobi: Institute for Development Studies.
- Attoh, K. A. (2012). The Transportation Disadvantaged and the Right to the City in Syracuse, New York. *Geographical Bulletin*, 53(1), 1-19.
- Banister, D. (2002). *Transport planning*. London: Spon.
- Baud, I., Sridharan, N., & Pfeffer, K. (2008). Mapping Urban Poverty for Local Governance in an Indian Mega-City: The Case of Delhi. *Urban Studies*, 45(7), 1385-1412.
- Bechstein, E. (2010). *Cycling as a supplementary mode to public transport: A Case Study of Low Income Commuters in South Africa*. Paper read at the 29th Southern African Transport Conference, 16-19 August 2010. Pretoria, South Africa.
- Beck, W., Maesen, L., & Walker, A. (1997). Introduction. In W. Beck, L. Maesen, & A. Walker (Eds.), *The social quality of Europe*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
- Cameron, A. (2006). Geographies of welfare and exclusion: social inclusion and exception. *Progress in Human Geography*, 30(3), 396-404.
- Church, A., Frost, M., & Sullivan, K. (2000). Transport and social exclusion in London. *Transport Policy*, 7(3), 195-205.
- de-Langen, M. de, & Tembele, R. (2001). *Productive and liveable cities: Guidelines for pedestrian and bicycle traffic in African cities*. Lisse: A. A. Balkema Publishers.
- Diaz Olvera, L., Didier, P., Pochet, P., & Maidadi, S. (2012). Motorbike taxis in the "transport crisis" of West and Central African cities. *Echogeo*, 20, 2-15.
- Diaz Olvera, L., Plat, D., & Pochet, P. (2013). The puzzle of mobility and access to the city in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 32, 56-64.
- Doyal, L., & Gough, I. (1991). *A theory of human need*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Engels, B., & Liu, G.-J. (2011). Social exclusion, location and transport disadvantage amongst non-driving seniors in a Melbourne municipality, Australia. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 19(4), 984-996.
- Fodor, J. A. (1975). *The Language of Thought*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Furness, Z. (2010). *One less car: Bicycling and the politics of automobility*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- GoK. (2007). *Kenya Vision 2030*. Nairobi: Ministry of Planning and National Development.
- GoK. (2009). *Integrated National Transport Policy: Moving a Working Nation*. Nairobi: Ministry of Transport.
- GoK. (2010a). *The 2009 Kenya Population and Housing Census: Counting Our People for the Implementation of Vision 2030*. Nairobi: Kenya National Bureau of Statistics.
- GoK. (2010b). *The Constitution of Kenya, 2010*. Nairobi: Government of Kenya.
- Grieco, M., Ndulo, M., Bryceson, D., Porter, G., & McCray, T. N. (2009). *African, Transport and the Millennium Development Goals: Achieving an Internationally Set Agenda*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Gwilliam, K. (2003). Urban transport in developing countries. *Transport Reviews*, 23(2), 197-216.
- Harvey, D. (1982). *The limits to capital*. London, New York: Basil Blackwell Publisher Limited.
- Harvey, D. (2003). The right to the city. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(4), 939-941.
- Harvey, D. (2012). *Rebel cities: From the right to the city to the urban revolution*. London: Verso.
- Hobson, J. (1999). *New towns, the modernist planning project and social justice: The case of Milton Keynes, UK and 6th October, Egypt*. London: Development Planning Unit, University College London.
- Howe, J. (n.d.). Boda Boda: Uganda's low capacity transport services.
- Jones, H., Moura, F., & Domingos, T. (2013). Transport Infrastructure Project Evaluation Using Cost-benefit Analysis. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 111, 400-409.
- Jones, P., & Lucas, K. (2012). The social consequences of transport decision-making: Clarifying concepts, synthesising knowledge and assessing implications, 21, 4-16.
- Kenyon, S., Lyons, G., & Rafferty, J. (2002). Transport and social exclusion: investigating the possibility of promoting inclusion through virtual mobility. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 10(3), 207-219.
- Khayesi, M., Monheim, H., & Nebe, J. M. (2010). Negotiating "Streets for All" in Urban Transport Planning: The Case for Pedestrians, Cyclists and Street Vendors in Nairobi, Kenya. *Antipode*, 42(1), 103-126.

- Kim, P., & Dumitrescu, E. (2011). *Share the road: Invest in walking and cycling*. Nairobi: UNEP.
- Kola, M. O., Onyango, G. M., & Oindo, B. O. (2012). The Status of Public Transportation in unplanned suburbs of Kisumu Municipality, Kenya. *International Journal of Arts and Commerce*, 1(1).
- Labonte, R. (2004). Social inclusion/exclusion: Dancing the dialectic. *Health Promotion International*, 19(1), 115-121.
- Lefebvre, H. (1996). The right to the city. In E. Kofman & E. Lebas (Eds.), *Writings on cities*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lin, K., Ward, P., & Maesen, L. (2009). Social quality theory in perspective. *Development and Society*, 38(2), 201-208.
- Lucas, K. (2011). Making the connections between transport disadvantage and the social exclusion of low income populations in the Tshwane Region of South Africa. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 19(6), 1320-1334.
- Lucas, K. (2012). Transport and social exclusion: Where are we now? *Transport Policy*, 20, 105-113.
- Lucas, K., & Musso, A. (2014). Policies for social inclusion in transportation: An introduction to the special issue. *Case Studies on Transport Policy*, 2(2), 37-40.
- Maesen, L., & Walker, A. (2002). Social Quality: The Theoretical State of Affairs. *European Foundation on Social Quality*, 1-24.
- Maesen, L., & Walker, A. (2012). *Social quality: From theory to indicators*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Makajuma, G. (2006). *Urban transport market determinants in Kenya. Analysis of modal choice and fare competition* (MSc). Delft: UNESCO-IHE.
- Maoulidi, M. (2012). *Kisumu Millennium Development Goals Multi-sector Household Survey: Final Report*. New York: Millennium Cities Initiative.
- Marcuse, P. (2009). From critical urban theory to the right to the city. *City*, 13(2/3), 185-197.
- Mayring, P. (2014). *Qualitative Content Analysis: Theoretical foundation, basic procedures and software solution*. Retrieved from <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-395173>
- McCray, T. M. (2004). An issue of culture: the effects of daily activities on prenatal care utilization patterns in rural South Africa. *Social Science & Medicine*, 59(9), 1843-1855.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Murthy, K. (2011). Urban Transport and the Right to the City: Accessibility and Mobility. In M. Faetanini (Ed.), *Urban Policies and the Right to the City in India. Rights, Responsibilities and Citizenship*. New Delhi: UNESCO.
- Mutiso, W. K. (2010). *'Boda boda' bicycle taxis and their role in urban transport systems. Case studies of Nakuru and Kisumu, Kenya* (MSc). University of Cape Town, South Africa.
- Nkurunziza, A., Zuidgeest, M., & van Maarseveen, M. (2012). Identifying potential cycling market segments in Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania. *Habitat International*, 36(1), 78-84.
- Nodalis. (2014). *Kisumu Integrated Strategic Urban Development Plan: Planning for Kisumu's Future*. Paris: Nodalis.
- Oballa, B., Mwaura, J., & Stellmach, T. (2012). *Rapid urban planning studio report kisumu*. Nairobi: UN HABITAT.
- Odero, K., Sibanda, G., Njenga, P. R., Mbathi, M., Musyimi, & Opiyo, R. O. (2009). *Share the road: Minimum standards for safe, sustainable and accessible transport infrastructure in Nairobi*. Nairobi: UNEP.
- Øyen, E. (1997). The contradictory concepts of social exclusion and social inclusion. In C. Gore & J. B. Figueiredo (Eds.), *Social exclusion and anti-poverty policy*. Geneva: International Institute of Labour Studies.
- Pochet, P., & Cusset, J. M. (1999). Cultural barriers to bicycle use in Western African cities: The case of Bamako and Ouagadougou, 23(2), 43-50.
- Prinz, J. (2005). Are emotions feelings? Special issue on "Emotion experience", 12(8), 9-25.
- Quarshie, M. (2004). *Cycling in Ghana: An indepth study of Accra*. Accra: Centre for Cycling Expertise.
- Salon, D., & Aligula, E. M. (2012). Urban travel in Nairobi, Kenya: Analysis, insights, and opportunities. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 22, 65-76.
- Salon, D., & Gulyani, S. (2010). Mobility, Poverty, and Gender: Travel 'Choices' of Slum Residents in Nairobi, Kenya. *Transport Reviews*, 30(5), 641-657.
- Scheiner, J. (2010). Social inequalities in travel behaviour: trip distances in the context of residential self-selection and lifestyles. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 18(6), 679-690.
- Schwanen, T., Lucas, K., Akyelken, N., Cisternas Solsona, D., Carrasco, J.-A., & Neutens, T. (2015). Rethinking the links between social exclusion and transport disadvantage through the lens of social capital. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 74, 123-135.
- Sen, A. (2000). *Social exclusion: Concept, application, and scrutiny*. Social Development Paper No. 1. Asian Development Bank.
- Shergold, I., & Parkhurst, G. (2012). Transport-related social exclusion amongst older people in rural Southwest England and Wales. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 28(4), 412-421.
- Siltaniemi, A., & Kauppinen, M.-L. (2005). The View from the International Council on Social Welfare. *European Journal of Social Quality*, 5(1), 275-288.
- Silver, H. (2007). *The process of social exclusion: The dynamics of an evolving concept* (CPRC Working Paper No. 95). Rhode Island, USA.
- Singh, Y. K. (2006). *Fundamental of Research Methodology and Statistics*. New Delhi: New Age International.
- Soja, E. W. (2010). The city and spatial justice. In B. Bret,

- P. Gervais-Lambony, C. Hancock, & F. Landy (Eds.), *Espace et justice. Justice et injustices spatiales*. Nanterre: Presses universitaires de Paris Ouest.
- Steyn, G. (2012). Modernity and informality: Conflicting forces shaping urban form in Kisumu, Kenya. *International journal for housing science*, 36(3), 170-179.
- UN-HABITAT. (2004). *Kisumu City Development Strategy (2004 - 2009)*. Nairobi: UN-HABITAT.
- UN-HABITAT. (2010). *Sustainable mobility in African cities*. Nairobi: UN-HABITAT.
- UN-HABITAT. (2014). *The state of African cities 2014: Re-imagining sustainable urban transitions*. Nairobi: UN-HABITAT.
- Walker, A., & Maesen, L. (2003). Social quality and quality of life. In *Proceedings of ESPA-NET Conference*, 13-15 November 2003.
- Ward, P. R., Meyer, S. B., Verity, F., Gill, T. K., & Luong, T. C. (2011). Complex problems require complex solutions: the utility of social quality theory for addressing the Social Determinants of Health. *BMC public health*, 11, 630.
- Watson, V. (2009). 'The planned city sweeps the poor away...': Urban planning and 21st century urbanisation. *Progress in Planning*, 72(3), 151-193.
- Watson, V. (2014). African urban fantasies: dreams or nightmares? *Environment and Urbanization*, 26(1), 215-231.
- WHO. (2015). *Global Status Report on Road Safety 2015*. Geneva: WHO.
- World Bank. (2013). *Inclusion Matters: The Foundation for Shared Prosperity*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

### About the Authors



#### **Walter Alando**

Walter Alando is an urban planner and a lecturer of urban planning at Maseno University, Kenya. He is currently undertaking his PhD research at the Department of Transport Planning, Technische Universität Dortmund, Germany. His research focuses on transport exclusion, inclusive cities, cycling infrastructure planning, and land-use and non-motorised transport integration.



#### **Dr. Joachim Scheiner**

Joachim Scheiner received his PhD in geography at Freie Universität Berlin. He is now a professor in transport studies at the Faculty of Spatial Planning, Technische Universität Dortmund, Germany. His research focuses on travel behaviour in the context of residential mobility, spatial development and societal change.