

# NAPA Workshop on Tourism: New Research, Methodologies, and Theories



Quetzil E. Castañeda and Tim Wallace, Workshop Leaders

---

2008 Meetings of the AAA, Washington, DC

---

Wednesday November 19, 4:30pm - 7:30pm

visit: [www.osea-cite.org/tourismworkshop/](http://www.osea-cite.org/tourismworkshop/)

## I. Introduction to Workshop

### A. Introductions, 15 to 20 minutes and.

- Participants introduce their selves: brief statement of current research areas/interests/reasons for attending the workshop: Name, affiliation, geographic or cultural locations of research, research issues and problems, experience working in and/or conducting researching on tourism.
- Identification of three, anticipated outcomes that participant wants to achieve through or attain as a result of participation in the workshop. (To turn it syllabus an index card).

### B. Workshop Objectives and Outcomes (5 to 7 minutes). Participants:

1. receive a workshop handbook and access to a website with additional materials including syllabi, bibliographies, readings, handouts, teaching aids; [www.osea-cite.org/tourismworkshop/](http://www.osea-cite.org/tourismworkshop/)
2. gain an analytic review of tourism as an object of study in anthropology;
3. gain an understanding of a general approach to the anthropology of tourism as outlined by the workshop organizers, including suggestions on ways to formulate research problems;
4. participate in an interactive dialogue based on their areas of research and interests, on the one hand, and the ideas presented in the workshop on new research in the anthropology of tourism;
5. are invited to participate in a tourism focused network of anthropologists

### C. Problems in the Anthropology of Tourism (50 minutes)

- A. What is Tourism? What could be a theory of Tourism? (Conceptual Problems)
- B. Unpacking the Tourist: A Critical Appraisal of the Tourist Paradigm
- C. Current “top 10 tasks” in tourism studies/anthropology of tourism
- D. Approaches to Anthropology of Tourism: Theoretical Issues
- E. Eco-Tourism, Heritage, and the Anthropology Archaeology
- F. Methodological Issues and Approaches to Anthropology of Tourism
- G. Applied Anthropological Issues in Tourism Studies

---

## Table of Contents

---

- A. General Orientation to Tourism Research (now also on the web)
    - 1. Interactive Exercise: What is Tourism? Who are Tourists?
    - 2. Unpacking the Tourist: The Tourist Paradigm in Tourism Studies
  - B. Top Ten Tasks in Tourism
  - C. Approaches to Anthropology of Tourism
    - 1. The problem with the word “tourism”
    - 2. Two Syntheses and one Panopticon — Nash, Chambers and Urry
    - 3. Heritage Concepts
    - 4. Note on Tourist Art
    - 5. Traditional Areas of Study in the Anthropology of Tourism
    - 6. Research Problems
  - D. Research and Applied Methods
    - 1. Alternative Research Strategies, Tactics, Procedures
  - E. Tourism Workshop Glossary
  - F. Short Bibliography
- 

## General Orientation to Anthropology of Tourism Research

---

- The field of tourism studies has developed and matured since its inception 30+ years ago from mid-1960s. Anthropology of tourism is growing and has been a legitimate topic for almost 25 years.
  - The tourism studies is a field defined by a concern for tourism and the tourist, i.e., with the **classification and typologization of forms/persons of travelers**. For at least a decade the search for a “theory of tourism” has actually been governed by attempts to provide a conclusive classification. The concept of the Tourist is the central defining issue, problem, & figure in emergence of a paradigm of tourism studies.
  - Anthropology of tourism has been concerned with questions of “tourism impact” or “**impact of tourism**” on nonwestern cultures, as well as with the relations between “**host**” and “**guest**” communities. The history of tourism (as real-life phenomena & as field of study) is closely linked to 1960s economic modernization projects as the “solution” to development.
  - the **culture of the tourist** has been an enduring object of study within tourism studies and anthropology of tourism. This focus stems from an ideological complex within “Western” culture that has undergone various transformations.
  - New work has supplanted or is moving beyond both impact and Tourist/tourist culture. Much of this new work is based on researchers who come to study tourism related phenomena from a location outside of “tourism studies” and thus bring theories and perspectives that are “external” to this field of study.
  - The study of **touristic representations and discourses** has increasingly become a popular topic and area of study. In part this is fueled by the 1980s and 90s emergence of postcolonial studies, cultural studies, and identity politics concerns. The equation of “culture critic” & “traveler” is old Western myth-ideology, theme.
-

- **CAVEAT #1: Tourism Studies is intrinsically interdisciplinary.** To study tourism from any given disciplinary perspective should necessarily entail familiarity with the work conducted from other social science and humanities fields and disciplines. By necessity, we as anthropologists, with our particular form of inherent interdisciplinarity, must pay attention to the diversity of studies of tourism within our research purview.
- **CAVEAT #2:** In addition, students of tourism should necessarily study the history of forms of travel and tourisms in the “long duree” (deep historical duration) of Western culture as well as cross-culturally. Not all travel is tourism, nor all tourisms travel and thus we must be attentive to the differences and diversities as well as resemblances, affinities, and affiliations within families and lineages of travel-forms.
- **CAVEAT #3:** in the rush to begin work in this “new” area, must seek to avoid superceded concepts and dead-end debates of older tourism studies — in other words, we must be “up to speed” not only with current concerns in anthropology, but especially with the “anthropology of tourism” and “tourism studies.” As some students turn to the tourism and the anthropology of tourism, it is easy to dismiss the history of the field in terms of it being “weak,” “naïve,” too “simplistic,” or “theoretically old-guard functionalist.” Yet, without a grasp of the history of the richness of this literature, there is always the risk reinventing the same old, and perhaps even, broken, wheel.
- **CAVEAT #4:** at the same time, the introduction of theoretical perspectives, frameworks, concepts, questions, issues, and themes from “outside” of the history of the “field of tourism studies” is essential in order for to create a basis for contribution to knowledge. New questions must be posed and new concepts deployed with respect to the legacy of the old themes.
- **CAVEAT #5:** One area of research opened up by introduction of the “new” theory is the study of representation. While there is much to be gained from a thoroughly rigorous and extensive analysis of whole systems of representation, these are ultimately limited. While the study of touristic representations — that is, representational systems such as advertising, post cards, or travelogues — can no longer be simply an internal analysis of the discourses, texts, or images of this representational system without these analyses being articulated to study of one or more sociocultural factors, agencies, institutions, behaviors, or practices “outside” of the text/representation/image. In other word, the chapter of the stand-alone critique of “hegemonic” discourses/representations is over.
- **CAVEAT #6:** Increasingly the complexity inherent in the study of tourism in post-modern times requires experimental ethnographic strategies that on the surface may run counter to accepted canons of anthropological scientific standards. That can’t be helped, but advisors, peers, mentors, department chairs and heads, full professors, etc. may find your tourism work uncomfortable because it doesn’t fit into neat categories, nor is the subject usually considered to be fit material for “serious” anthropological debates.
- **CAVEAT #7:** In studying tourism one runs the risk of studying her/himself being a tourist participant, so it is important to have a partner with whom to debrief the “facts” of what is being observed to better put them into an appropriate theoretical and ethnographic perspective. Studying tourism, esp. tourists, can lead to uncomfortable introspection without a path through the maze of self-interpretation.

## Interactive Exercise: What is Tourism? Who are Tourists?

Various definitions of tourism have been offered in the social sciences, that range from the poetic-philosophical to the pragmatic, from the theoretical to the simplistic. Consider the following definitions as you fill out the table below.

- Tourism is a search (pilgrimage, journey, quest) for alterity—cultural difference, the exotic, a temporary change of life style, or out of the ordinary experience.
- Tourism is a basket of goods and services
- Tourism is an industry... or a market
- Tourism is a packaged experience, a commodity

Tourism	Why?	not Tourism	Why?
Who is a Tourist?		Who is <u>not</u> a tourist?	
What are essential, intrinsic or diagnostic traits of a tourist?		What are essential, intrinsic or diagnostic traits of a <u>non</u> -tourist?	
What activities or practices are those that tourists enact, perform or engage in?		What activities or practices are those that tourists do <u>not</u> enact, perform or engage in?	
What social agents, institutions, businesses, groups are part of tourism?		What social agents, institutions, businesses, groups are <u>not</u> part of tourism?	
What kinds of products, markets, exchange are part of tourism?		What kinds of products, markets, exchange are <u>not</u> part of tourism?	
Who is in control of the tourism narrative?		Who is not in control of the tourism narrative?	

- Think of your favorite definition and concept of tourism. Hold this in your thoughts.
- In a recent presentation, a tourism scholar *defined tourism as an industry*. Because I am not really sure what is an “industry” I asked him to explain what this means.

Can you? What does the notion of industry include or suggest?

➤ He explained that this industry included government regulations and businesses that create, advertise and sell these packages of experiences and various ancillary products and consumables, as well as it is the strategically organized places and markets where these commodities are sold, promoted and consumed.

➤ ***Is anything “wrong”(confusing, conflated, slanted, or slippery) with this definition or wrong with the explanation of the definition? If so, how would you re-write it?***

➤ ***What are the essential (if any) components of an appropriate definition of tourism?***

➤ ***Does it matter?***

➤ This tourism scholar concluded his presentation by citing a recent census and study by the Mexican government. This study indicated that the highest levels of poverty in México exist in that nation’s most developed tourism destinations, such as Cancun, Acapulco, Huatulco, etc.

- What is the implication of this statement?
- What is causing this poverty?
- What is not causing poverty?
- How is poverty measured? By what criteria?

***Does tourism cause the poverty of New York City? London? Rome? México City? Cape Cod? Southampton, Long Island? Disney World?***

What is slippery/inadequate with the study – or, better, what is the confusion/inadequacy with how we interpret, understand and use statements such as this, that “the highest levels of poverty are found in tourism destinations”?

- Are the owners of luxury hotels part of tourism?
- Are the workers of luxury hotels part of tourism?
- Are government regulations part of tourism?
- Are the tourists part of the strategy to produce, maintain, sustain poverty?
- Are tourists part of the strategy to restrain, dilute, reduce, obliterate poverty?
- In places such as Cancun, Florida Yucatán, where the entire economy of region is pervaded “by tourism” what sense does it make to say that tourism is the cause of anything?

➤ ***What “part” of tourism counts “as” tourism? What parts are disqualified as tourism proper so as to be categorized as that which is effected “by tourism”? In other words, what is given the analytical agency and what part of tourism is presupposed as incapable of agency, as the passive and inert part of society that is simply effected by some other agent, process, or dynamic?***

# Remember Always: “Tourism does not exist.”

---

Lesson 1: Tourism is a social construction – it is a social phenomenon that is constructed by different agents, including the social scientists who study tourism.

Lesson 2: It is not only tourists and those who pretend not to be tourists who have vague notions and ideological visions of what tourism is, but so do the social scientists and anthropologists who study tourism. Anthropologists have been using slippery models, loosely applied definitions, and contradictory concepts of tourism to study tourism. Who are hosts?!

Lesson 3. The studies of tourism that rely upon or assert generalized claims of causality need to be very closely inspected for the unstated and implicit conceptual assumptions that guide the causal reasoning. Impact is an ideological discourse, a mythology, a political tool to be used either and both against and for tourism development. Why is this moment of time designated as the unquestioned beginning point, the zero marker, for CHANGE? What is it that is being claimed as “tourism” that has the agency of causality? What is presupposed to lack the agency of causality (capacity to transform, “impact”, society)?

Lesson 4. Tourism is a reified concept. Tourism is a reification. We might do well to question in fact whether tourism actually exists..... What is tourism? As a heuristic skepticism, this position (tourism does not exist) is useful to refine our thinking on and research of tourism phenomenon.

Lesson 5. Tourism as a topic of study is extremely complex, and the researcher must take great pains to clearly define what one is studying and how the thing or persons studied actually fall within a tourism topic. Tourism, like the concept of race, exists as a social concept, but it may not function well as a “scientifically-valid” topic. It is not an analytical term;

Lesson 6. Terms such as tourist gaze, *flaneur*, staged authenticity, authentic, travel, heritage and commodification, etc., carry a lot of baggage. It is best to develop your own meaning of the phenomena to which they are related, and within the context of your own study. Use the legacy of these concepts (the history of their meanings) to your advantage; cite and use those meanings and then transform them, re-make the meanings and uses of those concepts.

Lesson 7. Tourism studies seem to be categorizeable into 4 areas: (1) power, hegemony, discourse and impacts, (2) narrative and construction of identity through performance – either that of the tourist or of the local or through and a dynamic interaction, (3) the cultural and ideological connection of tourism to things (sights, museums, tourist art, performances, aboriginal natives, etc.), (4) the success and failure of tourism development “from below” (such as community-based tourism, community-based museums, ecotourism ventures, etc.) Nevertheless, none can be studied by themselves as they, like tourism itself, are all interconnected. The paradox is that tourism, seemingly so specific a concept, divides and reshapes itself into many forms quickly and unpredictably, thus making tourism studies a proverbial quagmire unless precautionary limitations are folded into the study.



# Unpacking the Tourist



---

## The Tourist Paradigm in Tourism Studies

---

- Three points Re: history of Tourism Studies and Anthropology of Tourism—
  - A) It emerges as a transdisciplinary and transnational topic;
  - B) There is a paradigmatic coherency and unity which needs to be specified;
  - C) There is a difference between anthropological studies of tourism and studies of tourism that “belong” to the field of anthropology of tourism.
- A crucial, defining issue for Tourism Studies (including Anthro of Tourism) has been the development of a “Theory of Tourism”; such a “theory” however are/would be middle range theories and not holistic theories of “social whole.”
- Thus, various definitions proposed each of which amounts to a concept-model of tourism. All of these SHARE the presupposed assumption that tourism is the creation of the Tourist. Concept-Models of Tourism are thereby models of different aspects of the Tourist— e.g., reasons, emotions, drives, motivations, desires, types, activities, cultural values, performed communities, cultures, experiences, consumer potentials or capacities, attitudes, etc. All these combine to constitute Tourism as a discrete thing both for the social science study and for the tourist industry study.
- Applied and Basic research in tourism studies is inextricably linked within this paradigm even though they may diverge at register of specific concept-models.
- But, what theory of social whole and philosophy underlies these? (a) Structural Functionalism is the foundational theory of tourism studies, coupled with an (b) socio-evolutionary positivism and (c) a methodological individualism.
- These four theoretical principles define the Paradigm of Tourism Studies as a Paradigm formed in or configured by the Figure of the Tourist.
  1. structural-functionalism.
  2. socio-evolutionary positivism.
  3. methodological individualism.
  4. Marxist/dependency theories
  5. Narrative/constructivist theories
  6. But newer anthropological takes on tourism seem more inspired by experimental, multi-sited ethnographic work more typical of the post-modern influence in anthropology
- Very significant work that deals with tourism directly or indirectly thereby has been excluded from Tourism Studies and the Anthropology of Tourism properly speaking. A fact which continues to contribute to the perception of its scholarly “inferiority” at least in the USA by older and newer generations of scholars. New generations need to infuse tourism studies with diverse new theories.
- The negativism associated with tourism studies inevitably leads researchers to consider a broader set of potential research and theoretical paradigms for their ethnographic work in this field.

## Top Ten Tasks in Anthropology of Tourism

- 1) The myth (fraud) of ecotourism — of ecotourism as local, indigenous, non-corporate-grassroot stakeholders who are actually involved in constructive protection of ecology.
- 2) Ethnographies of tourism development focused on the devastation of environments and ecologies. The impossibility of sustainable tourism — critical evaluation of the political economy of tourism development along with critique of the ideology of sustainability as promoted by industry & govt. interests
- 3) Ethnographies of tourism and travel cultures and the intermingling of distinct western and non-western ideologies of cultural difference, group identity formation through travel, and economic bases and styles of consumption.
- 4) The multiple narratives of the tourism experience and their effects on destinations and the destinations effects on the locals and the tourists.
- 5) Ethnographies of tourism policy and planning by businesses, governments, and NGOs/INGOs. Ethnography of tourism industry makers and tourism products, including the educational apparatus of tourism, leisure, sports schools and conferences, their networking & institutional relationships with governments and INGOs;
- 6) The marketing, making, and imagining of tourist art and the representation of indigenities, authenticities, and universal aesthetics, museums... community museums and the conversion of private heritage identities into public ones.
- 7) Ethnographies of heritage tourism and cultural tourism, differentiating the politics of representation involving “identity-making” and the politics of management using identity entitlements and property rights as legal mechanisms of ownership, control, and use.
- 8) Ethnographies of archaeology in relation to tourism development, policy and planning, imagining national communities, including conflicts of interpretation in the production of knowledge about places, peoples, histories.
- 9) Ethnographies of educational tourism -- study abroad, ethnography field schools, archaeology projects, green-grassroots left field experience programs, senior citizen quasi-educational tours, alumni packages lead by univ. profs., etc.
- 10) Ethnographies of law, legalities, rights and tourism in relation to diverse forms of heritage — archaeological, historical, intangible cultural, natural, World Wonders.



# Approaches to Anthro. of Tourism

---

## Two Syntheses — Nash (1)

---

Dennison Nash, *The Anthropology of Tourism*. Tarrytown, NY: Elsevier Science, 1996: 205p.

Nash (1996: 14-16, 79-94) identifies **three “preoccupations”** and **“points of view”** that led to distinct “approaches” by which tourism has been **“understood”** (i.e., studied) as:

- a) **acculturation and/or development (pp. 19-38),**
- b) **as a personal transition (pp. 39-58), and,**
- c) **as superstructure (pp. 59-78).**

These three “approaches” (Nash’s term) are **not** theoretical models of tourism; they are **areas of investigation that imply sets of questions that can be approached from different theoretical frameworks and analytical models.**

- To these three areas of “basic” tourism research he wants to couple the “applied” areas of **policy** (pp. 95-118) and **sustainable development** (pp. 119-140, 141-176).
  - **Both areas of policy and sustainable development imply governmentality** as these require collaboration between state agencies, private sector, and communities to forge ways of using, modifying, and creating resources as well as attitudes, understandings, and ways of relating to those resources and to others involved in this process.
  - **Nash sees theoretical disunity** and fragmentation of tourism studies
  - However, each area of questioning and together **fall into** what has been identified here as the **tourist paradigm** of tourism studies.
  - Thus, instead of disunity, **there is actually unity at a meta-level** that corresponds to master trope/figure of the Tourist, through which applied & basic research is unified.
-

---

## Two Syntheses — Chambers (2)

---

Erve J. Chambers, *Native Tours: The Anthropology of Travel and Tourism*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 2000: 137p.; Erve J. Chambers, *Heritage Matters: Heritage, Culture, History, and Chesapeake Bay*. College Park, MD: Maryland Sea Grant College, 2006, 52p.; Paul


Shackel and Erve J. Chambers, eds. *Places in Mind: Public Archaeology as Applied Anthropology*. NY: Routledge, 2004, 216p.


**Chambers (2000, 2007)** also identifies **four areas of research**, each of which however is cross cut by a variety of “concept-models” and “approaches”:


- a) **tourism, society and political economy** (pp. 29-66);
- b) **tourism, nature and the environment** (pp. 67-92);
- c) **tourism and culture** (pp. 93-124); and,
- d) **the archae-/anthrop-ology of place, identity and heritage** (Chambers 2006; Shackel and Chambers 2004.)


Chambers’ identifies **four “complexities” of tourism** that he feels need to be considered in any given study and, implicitly, must be theoretically taken into account: (catchwords are QC’s)

1. **TOURIST**: the tourist, his activities, motives, reasons, and expectations of travel;
2. **HOST**: the variety of “host communities” and regions in which tourism occurs, and the “consequences” (as if they were bad all the time) of “tourism” in these locales;
3. **STRUCTURING**: the mediation of tourism by individual & institutional agents displaced from the scenes of host-guest interaction;
4. **CULTURAL GEOGRAPHY**: the variety of physical-geographic places in which tourism occurs and the connection with community, identity, place and heritage (Chambers 2000: x-xi, Shackel and Chambers 2004:1-16; 193-208).

 these four complexities have some resonance with Talcott Parson’s four-fold model of socio-cultural integration. As a model or meta-model of research areas it has structural-functional undertones.

 chambers says that #1 and #2 — tourist and host — have been the dominant foci of study, overly studied; we need to “correct” this emphasis.

 the way out for chambers is to address the “structuring” or “mediation” of tourism by agents displaced from the face to face encounter of host-guest relations.

 This is crucial and opens up conceptualizing tourism as something different than what it is commonly conceived as; leads to new theoretical conceptualization of tourism and new analytics. Furthermore, his more recent works begins to help us think more clearly about the dialectical relationship between tourism and heritage.



The development of heritage sites by local, private groups is appropriated by society and becomes governmentalized as the number of tourist visits increase, perhaps leading to an alienation from the local view of heritage and transforming the identity from that heritage site into an “everyman’s” heritage. Private becomes public and the local seeks a different identity in a different form. Not unlike the Midwestern Standard American English (SAE) speaker, believing him/herself to have no accent is critiqued as “hick” by the New Yorker and attempts to alter his dialect to be more distinct as a non-hick, and perhaps seeks alternate confirmation of his identity as non-New York, non-hick, despite the use of Midwestern SAE as the standard dialect taught across the country to news readers.



Chambers’ work and that of others leads us back to issues of identity, heritage, power and governmentality, especially, as the problems of distance recede in a globalized world, one in which a Julia Roberts’ travels from “out-of-fashion” Marrakech to Essaouira, the new in-spot, can be traced by anyone physically or virtually. Or where the famous Marrakech square, Jemaa I-Fna, is a sight in which the observers (tourists) are participants in the dramatic scenery of the observed (local market habitués) who observe the observers and change/adapt their performance accordingly, thus constantly changing, re-shaping and re-conceptualizing the heritage of the square. The local and the tourist (as a social category) have long played their roles in the daily drama that is Jemaa I-Fna. Heritage forms change constantly, though imperceptibly. This is why the search for authenticity is doomed to failure, yet is simultaneously a search that cannot end (See T. Oakes, Get Real! On Being Yourself and Being a Tourist. In *Travels in Paradox: Remapping Tourism*. C. Minca and T. Oakes, eds. Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield, 229-250.)

term	heritage, established meaning	heritage, emergent meaning
substantive forms or expression	"things" both material culture and non-material qualities, habits, traditions, ways or styles of doing — marked as exchange value	tangible & intangible things that must be managed/arranged (i.e., "resources") that are marked by a use-value, potential or actual
Value	exchange value in Marxist sense (a symbolic power and capacity)	use-value in Marxist sense (resource that can be manifestly used to accomplish acts)
constitution	heritage things are constituted by acts, action and processes (natural or social) that effectively create heritage as something to be valued in itself, embedded value	heritage things are revalorized as resources having actual/potential use-value in determinate arenas, not only symbolic-ideological or cultural, but economic and social
symbolization	symbolizes a "unitary" (if also always internally divided & hierarchized) identity; material for exhibiting, narrating, and imagining nation	less a symbol than a property value —(resource) that do not symbolize so much as index and signify identity groups internal to or that cross-cut national community
key idea and meanings	"transferability" and "inheritance" (exchangability) via diverse processes that allow symbolic ownership (stewardship in "name of") or possession (e.g., biological aspects)	rights — diverse forms of ownership, from economic property, to use-rights & property claims
Agent of reference	nation & the abstract citizen of nation; or, encompassing, generalized whole, e.g., "human civilization", "humanity"	specific social agents — identity groups and cultural communities; nation-state or its agents; civil society institutions; private sector interests; etc.

heritage concept	heritage #1 — patrimony, "primordial origins," "private heritage" (Chambers 2007)	heritage #2— governmentality, "heritage-power," "public heritage" (Chambers 2007)
medium	cultural objects (tangible and intangible things) given by "history"	resources, tangible and intangible, with cultural-symbolic & economic values
mode	selection & organization of materials via narrativization & imaging (to create "history"; national myths)	rationalities, logics and practices of using, managing, & regulating resources in public sphere/civil society
goal	forge identity — of nation, national modernity, national culture	govern identity — of sub- & trans-national identity groups (i.e., "cultures")
effect	imaging and imagining the national community, give substantive form to national culture and its history	reshape political action in civil society by restructuring identity groups in relation to legalities (rights, ownership)
primary contestation	not ownership of patrimony, but the history narrated, imaged, and exhibited; the politics of representation of patrimony (inclusion/exclusion; valorization of those represented)	not historicization of nation and its citizenship, but the control of the resources themselves through rights of ownership, use, management, profit, property, etc. in order to control the identity of those represented

## Art: Tourist Art

by Quetzil E. Castañeda

812-669-1369 / quetzil@osea-cite.org

Tourist art denotes aesthetic production primarily created for consumption by "tourists" and for sale in "tourism markets." Although a broad array of artwork, producers, consumers, and markets is conceptually included, much of this diversity is ideologically excluded. Thus, "tourist art" has no analytical validity (utility) and only a generic descriptive capacity. The category connotes souvenirs, crafts, and artisanry whose value is less its aesthetic merits and more its symbolism as representations of geocultural places, historical moments, or sociocultural identities. The concept "describes," signifies and operates between both poles of an antonymy, low-cost, low-quality, modern objects mass-produced by disinterested wage labor, on the one hand, and high quality, traditional objects hand-made by local producers for whom the product has an inherent sociocultural meaning, on the other hand.

Kitsch and mimesis are dominant principles in the production of tourist art as illustrated by the quintessential tourist art of miniaturized reproductions of famous architectural, artistic, and religious monuments. Although ideologically considered not applicable to nonwestern art, these principles also operate in the production of "traditional" indigenous, ethnic and popular crafts, in which real or invented heritage are imaged into commodities for tourists. Tourist artwork is, therefore, either already iconic of an identity or "refurbished" to index identities of sociocultural belonging with which consumers (tourists) seek to have a first hand encounter or vicarious experience. Nostalgia and longing (e.g., for "nature," "tradition," "folk religiosity," "Indigenous authenticity," "nation," "modernity," "cosmic spirituality," "bourgeois health/individuality," "postcolonial hybridity") are therefore processual principles that generate, shape, and give value to the consumption of (tangible and intangible) "art" objects in diverse tourism contexts.

State policies and tourism strategies often intervene in craft production—especially in indigenous communities in Latin America—to accentuate symbolic identities that both feed tourist nostalgia-longing and forge national identities and heritage. Producers are well aware of the tourist drive to consume authentic identity and heritage and thus have been creative in both inventing completely new and overhauling previously discarded handicrafts to satisfy market demands. Some scholars, afflicted with their own nostalgia stridently seek to keep separate "true" "traditional" crafts (and producers) from capitalism-corrupted "tourist art" while other scholars celebrate the hybridity and entrepreneurial inventiveness of marginalized, ethnic-racial groups. However, attitudes of producers range from being deeply invested in traditional meanings or utterly disengaged from the symbolism, authenticity, and identities that scholars, collectors, and tourists perceive in traditional-cum-tourist art.

Tourism markets constitute powerful structural limits to the aesthetic development of the artwork and to its economic value: to the extent the artwork is ethnographically tied to cultural localism, the aesthetic value is displaced; to the extent that the aesthetic merits supercede cultural associations, the artwork is slotted as a qualified type of "art" inferior to "true" (Western) art. A practical and theoretical question is, "what are the conditions that would enable aesthetic production originating in localized tourism markets to develop into artwork that transcends tourism and that could thereby circulate in high-end museums, galleries, and collections?" This provokes questions about the historical and current involvement of social sciences, scientists, and institutions in the political economy of tourist art, especially artwork also marked as indigenous, folk, popular, primitive, ethnic, religious, or traditional.

# Some Traditional Areas of Tourism Research

Here we list some of the traditional areas of research/concern in the Anthropology of Tourism. This list is now increasingly historical rather than contemporary, yet an understanding of the plot lines of this research concerns is essential for moving forward. Perhaps a newer line of research that is simultaneously an old line of research is/are heritage studies, which also lead back to the anthropologies of museums, arts and archaeologies.

## **I. Tourist and Tourist Cultures**

- (a) Host – Guest Encounters: dynamics of inter-cultural communication, class cultures, race relations, rural-urban stereotyping; creation and propagation of social hierarchies, ethnocentrism of differing types, and relations of domination; production and exchange of status symbols, cultural values, social goods, and material commodities.
- (b) Sociology & Psychology of Tourism: motivations, roles, desires, experiences, types, consumerism, and decision-making processes of tourists; sport, recreational, leisure, & weekend-2<sup>nd</sup> home tourism within “Western” countries; relationship of tourism to play, sport, leisure, work, everyday life, etc.)
- (c) The Great Classification Problem — charting forms of travel & tourism through History (e.g., pilgrimage, Grand Tour, business)
- (d) Mapping the emergence of “New” Tourisms — Reality-Tourism, Peace-Keeping, Adventure Tourism, Mercenary Tourism, etc.
- (e) Analyses of Travelogues and Travel Literatures

## **II. Host and Host Cultures, Resources, and Destinations**

- (a) Impact Studies (Environmental, Biophysical, Social, Cultural, etc.)
- (b) Archeological and Ecological Tourisms (cf. Heritage below)
- (c) Applied Development & Sustainable Tourism
- (d) Fairs, Festivals, Markets, and Temporary Exhibitions
- (e) Culture and Cultural Resources as Destination — “authenticity,” rituals and performances for tourist consumption
- (f) Museums, Permanent Exhibitions, and Display
- (g) Sex Tourism and Sexual-Gender Division of Labors within transnational and/or global perspectives
- (h) Labor Systems, occupations, and work dynamics of serving tourists and producing tourism experiences

## **III. Structuring and Mediation**

- (a) Political Economy, Global Economy, and relations to systems of domination (colonialisms) —i.e., “Super-Structure”
- (b) Transportation Technologies and Globalization
- (c) Marketing and Advertising
- (d) Hospitality and Leisure Industries
- (e) Tourism Economics, Nation-State Strategies and Policies
- (f) Interfacing of Public, Private and State Sectors
- (g) Analyses of Tourist Discourses as Representational Systems or Representations of the “Other” whether human, the past, or place

#### IV. Tourism Heritage, Geographies, Regions, and Place-Making

- (a) Tourism as Heritage, Heritage Making
- (b) Public vs Private Heritage
- (c) Nationalism and Nation Building
- (d) Tourism Landscapes and Place Making through Touring and diverse Travel Practices
- (e) Constructed/Constructing Places for Pleasure & Entertainment: Amusement Parks, disneylands, casinos, cruises, health and other resorts, recreational parks or areas, eco-reserves, etc.
- (f) Tourism Industry Practices for Constructing Tourist Regions and Resort Systems: Private sector investment and commercial strategies, interface with governments, laws/policies, local to global capital and labor flows, migration, employment, etc.
- (g) Geography of Transportation and the Moving of Goods, Services, Servers, and Consumers to Locations

#### **A Few Traditional Conceptual Problems in Tourism Research**

- |                                |                         |                       |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| ⌘ The Tourist Gaze             | ⌘ Illusion of Impact    | ⌘ Double Articulation |
| ⌘ Problem of Authenticity      | ⌘ Governmentality &     | (Deleuze & Guattari)  |
| ⌘ The faux issue of            | Apparatus (Foucault)    | Heritage/Archeology   |
| commodification and refusal of | ⌘ Structures of Feeling | ⌘ Sex Tourisms        |
| assigning agency to “hosts”    | (Raymond Williams)      | ⌘ Figuration          |
| ⌘ The Real & The Copy          |                         |                       |

#### Tourist Gaze & the Problem of the Reification of Vision

The idea of the “tourist gaze” is very powerful and has produced substantial work. Unfortunately not all it is rigorous. It is powerful because it *seems* that vision and visuality is dominant principle of tourism. Problems arise however when vision or gaze and visualities are identified as a function of the Tourist as a category, as an individual person, or as specific kinds of bodies. Jokinen and Veijola provide a devastating critique of the notion of gaze as disembodied and formulated within gender/ed ideologies. But, further, the gaze is too easily understood to be an aspect or function of an individual or of an object and not of complex sociocultural structurings of space, time, bodies, and behaviors by institutions, social networks, and power dynamics that are indeed not visible and only intuited by the effects. The notion of tourist gaze as developed by Urry and others takes these effects as the cause and not the result of some other forces/factors. There is thus a circular re-production of the same fetishization and reification of “vision,” “gaze,” and “observation” that celebrates the “eye” without a significant nor substantial critique of this very pervasive and enduring ideology.

#### The Question of Authenticity and its Limitations

The concept of authenticity is another very powerful concept whose endurance and believability has numerous sources in western culture, philosophy, ideology. Although MacCannell is celebrated as having introduced the idea into tourism research, there is thick literature, which DMcC himself cites, as having developed the idea: To Veblen and Boorstin with their respective Marxian and Liberal-Right wing critiques of upper-middle & middle-lower class consumerisms, must be added anthropology’s own Boasian critique by Sapir on genuine and spurious culture. Yet, the evaluation and thus critique of true/accurate/good versus false/incorrect/bad presentations or experiences of reality must ultimately be traced through the different kinds of national Romanticisms that developed as responses to Capitalist industrialization, modernization, and consumerisms. This

legacy indicates that the category of authenticity is too fraught for use as an analytical much less descriptive title. The research issue that must be address if this topic is of interest is how to develop a thorough analysis of the competitive collusion of the heterogeneous discursive practices by which what is “authentic” is constituted as such, understanding that the “authentic” is always in the plural given the multiplicity of sociocultural agencies and agents that valorize according to different criteria and distinct manifestations. Authenticity is an issue of representation but located within the simplistic binary opposition of truth versus falsity, such that the representation (or the “signifier, “sign”) is false and the “thing itself” in its actuality — i.e., the signified, the represented, etc. — is the irreplaceable and unique authentic and locus of authenticity. MacCannell’s use of Goffman’s front/back clearly reveals how this assumption undergirds MacCannell’s ideas.

## Commodification

Davydd Greenwood’s “Culture By the Pound” article in 1978 ensured that commodification would become a weapon in the anti-tourism arsenal of anthropologists who refused to come to grips with their psychological problems associated with tourists. They were (are) afraid that tourists actually know as much as they do and denigrate them to demonstrate their intellectual superiority. Greenwood wrote a postscript in 1989 and again in 2006 each time describing why he had over-reacted with righteous anger, though did not apologize for his actions in the field of tourism studies. Commodification is a global issue and one not solely associated with tourism. The issue is always local and locales are the ones who decide what is appropriate and what is not, not the righteous anthropologist who is protecting “tradition.” It is clear that “tradition” and “heritage” cannot be determined by retrospection, but by understanding contemporary cultures, needs and politics.

### “The Real & The Copy” (hyper-reality, simulacrum, mimesis)

The problem of “the real and the copy” is, like that of authenticity, a question of representation, but there is a profound difference. Whereas the assumption of authenticity presupposes that the signifier and the signified can never be “equal” — or, in other words, that the signifier is wholly inadequate to the task of representation — this other approach begins from the assumption that the signifier is more powerful, potent or capable than the signified. This difference merits further and separate treatment given preponderant discussion of this matter from diverse theoretical positions because it has been an area of extensive speculation in western theory, starting with Plato and the problem of man, located in a cave, can only have access to the manifest shadows of the ideal forms. Eco with his concept of hyper-reality, Baudrillard with his concept of the “precession of the simulacrum,” Benjamin with his concepts of mimesis, aura, and mechanical reproduction, as well as other theorists have worked through the issue of representation.

**Umberto Eco:** Hyper-reality is a concept specifically located within the framework of travel. Hyper-reality is the idea that Eco uses to describe HIS travels in America in which he confronts a Western culture that has “gone beyond” the modernity of Europe via technological reproduction that is backed up by capitalist-bourgeois consumerism. The Hearst Castle is exemplary here. The technologically produced replica is so perfect as to replace and displace the original — more accurately displace the value of its irreplaceable & authentic uniqueness. Copies live on with a life of their own as it were. Eco seems to posit that reality now begins to be populated by copies, authentic originals, and authentic copies, where all co-exist. This theory moves beyond the simplistic binary of authenticity.

**Baudrillard:** The precession of the simulacrum is a related idea to that of hyper-reality, but more extreme. The simulacrum is the faithful copy of an original such that one cannot tell the difference between copy and original. It is the representation of the represented. But the power of the simulacrum-representation is such that it completely displaces and obliterates the original and any



traces of it, such that it re-writes reality into the inescapable mold of the simulacrum. Reality disappears into the simulacrum because once simulacrums begin to displace the original, all experiences then begin to be judged through the criteria of the simulacrum. Reality begins to take its shape, form, expression, and substance from the simulacrum. This dramatically moves beyond authenticity, but asserts a problematic-extreme thesis about reality & the power of representation to precede and shape “the real.”

**Walter Benjamin:** For WB aura is the complex phenomenon of authenticity that originals have, which are conceived as ruins. In the age of mechanical reproduction that creates identical, accurate copies, the process of copying (mimesis) and the (mimetic) copy itself destroy — “whithers away” — the basis of aura that had previously existed. A new kind of aura comes into existence that is principled no longer by ritual-cultural values but by political pragmatics; this mimesis and aura takes film/photography as the technological model of copying/reproduction. The copy (or the representation, signifier) has the power to “swallow” up the original, that is displace and replace originals; but, Benjamin, writing in the 1920s-30s, did not develop the extreme thesis of Baudrillard in the 1980s era of Disney. M. Taussig develops a unique theory of mimesis based in his interpretation of Benjamin.

### The Illusion of Impact & the Problem of History

The idea of impact is a difficult concept to eradicate from tourism research because it is so closely connected to the three paradigmatic principles of methodological individualism, structural-functionalism, and evolutionary positivism and, more generally, to deep connection of tourism to modernization as an economic strategy and to modernity as a cultural form. The image of impact is of a high velocity projectile hitting a non-moving object and, by denting or penetrating the surface, enters the object to dramatically modify it. While this might be an easy, simple and attractive model to think about society, cultures, nature, and processes of historical change, the image is completely misleading, inaccurate, and erroneous if applied to sociocultural phenomena. The notion of impact implies, assumes and asserts several nonsense ideas: 1<sup>st</sup>, that societies and nature are ahistorical and disconnected from each other or from long-term, intense socio-cultural interactions throughout time and across sociopolitical boundaries; 2<sup>nd</sup> that tourism is a discrete, unified, unitary thing that has intentional agency and will versus being thoroughly heterogeneous and disparate; 3<sup>rd</sup> that sociocultural change is uni-directional and non-reciprocal and that it is caused by external forces of “advanced”/modern society that penetrates and invades less technologically complex societies, i.e., Primitive-Tribal cultures, underdeveloped areas of First World and the Third World. Instead of the concept of impact, analyses must rely upon historical frameworks that identify the interactive complexities and reciprocal dynamics of groups and agencies through time. Discarding the assumptions of structural-functionalism and evolutionary positivism is crucial to side-stepping the errors of the idea of impact.

### Tourism as Apparatus, Governmentality, Strategy

Tourism perfectly fits the concept of apparatus or *dispositif* that Foucault developed in his studies of sexuality: an articulation of diverse institutions, agencies, discourses, normative rules, laws, policies, bodies of knowledge, sets of practices, subjectivities, and temporalities organized around a specific issue or problem. Recognizing tourism as such displaces the illusion of impact and the paradigm of the Tourist. It allows for tourism to be studied as diverse modes of governmentality, that is as economic, cultural, social, ethical, political and other strategies. Tourism in this case is not something that has agency to impact something else, but is rather the artifact, the result, the effect, of other less visible and more complex dynamics.

## Structures of Feeling & Touristic Structures of Experience

The concept of structures of feeling was developed by Raymond Williams in his attempt to bring a cultural focus to Marxist analyses. His work is one foundation of Cultural Studies in England and USA. As a Marxist and literary critic, Williams was countering the excessive structuralism of Althusser as well as orthodox positions that prioritized the economic. Structure of Feeling allowed for a return of individual agency to Marxism in a way that focused on the dynamic interplay of determining structures (social institutions, economic relations of production, political forms, etc.) with subjective agency formulated within a cultural world and infused by a culture. Structures of feeling then are modes of subjectivity. Further the concept therefore provides a kind of analytical **hinge** between generalized processes and locally manifest expressions, economic determinism and cultural factors, the individual and institutions. This idea diverts research from the fetishization of the Tourist.

## The Anthropology of Ecotourism

Ecotourism has become a major focus of anthropological research. The concern embodies the role of tropes for wilderness, forests and wildlife within the concept of the national park and other parks. In addition, the tropes fit into the biological models that structure research and applications concerning biodiversity and the so-called “protection and conservation” of that biodiversity. Normally, protection and conservation also means that natives don’t fit in. Modern natives represent an “unworthy,” “degenerate,” form of the “noble savage” who long ago ceased to exist. Modern descendants of ancient “primitives” have killed off, or destroyed endemic plants and animals and so are unworthy of continuing to live in designated, “wilderness” or “protected” areas and must be removed. Conservation itself is a trope that has not been sufficiently studied, nor are there sufficient anthropological studies showing how and in what ways indigenous technology promotes, sustains or harms biodiversity. In addition, the entire concept of sustainable biodiversity has not been studied anthropologically. Within this setting, then, there is much as yet unknown about the value, purpose and structure of ecotourism.

# Research Methods

---



## Note on Semantic Variations of “Methods” & “Methodology”

that vary significantly in meaning in different contexts of usage. Be aware of the huge difference between the use of the term method to denote methods of analysis or “analytical methods” (tools, frameworks, etc) and that of data producing/collecting methods or “research methods.” While the diversity of the former is directly linked to differences in theory, theoretical traditions, or philosophical assumptions, the variations of the latter more correspond to disciplinary differences and the variations in the kinds of objects of study that are investigated in those disciplines (e.g., sociology, cultural anthropology, archeology, history, physical-biological anthropology, political science, cultural studies, tourism studies, etc.). While the idea of “fieldwork” might seem, for sociocultural anthropologists in particular, to specify the kind of methods one might be referencing, “fieldwork methods” are also quite diverse and this variation correlates to differences in theory, discipline, subdiscipline, and objects of study. Thus, in such an intrinsically inter-, cross-, and multi-disciplinary study as tourism, these virtually always unstated, but assumed and implied, semantic references are crucial to 1) creating one’s own investigation, 2) communicating one’s results, 3) making sense of the research & research reports of other scholars.

## Methodology versus Methods

Methodology can best be understood as strategy. It has also been associated with “middle range theory” — because it links theory to research practices and/or data. Methodology in this sense is what was above called analytical method/s. Methodology understood as strategy is that which an investigator uses to transform thematic issues and theoretical concepts into series of questions which in turn are formulated into hierarchized sets. These sets of research questions range from the generalized thematic issues to the particularized and localized information. Methods are the means and logics that are used to produce/collect information that addresses or “answers” these series and sets of questions which have been provided by methodology (i.e., by the methodological transformation of pre-given theory and given issues into questions). Not all information created by research is data; only that information that actually relates to the questions given by methodology. Methods are both strategic and tactical, in that a method entails means (practices, activities, timing), a logic or logistics, rationale, and precise objectives that can vary in scope and scale.

**Archival and Library Research** is crucial for fieldwork and should be conducted before, during, and after fieldwork based research. In tourism studies, on-site archival research is important and anywhere from 3-8 weeks should be slotted for studying the statistical and governmental records regarding tourism in the community, region, and nation of the place in which one does fieldwork. Too often, cultural anthropologists leave the statistical and policy information to economists and political scientists. This material needs to be studied and analyzed by anthropologists and brought into the anthropology of tourism in ways that are connected to data produced through fieldwork. Archival/Library research can often be coupled with a basic survey of the major state, para-state, private, and community-based institutions, organizations, businesses, and events that constitute the tourist sector of one's region. Depending on the research problem, this mapping of the field of tourism agencies combined with the study of both statistical records and state/private tourism policies-strategies of development is important to provide sociological and political context to research that is more narrowly focused on particular communities.

**Fieldwork Methods** is thus one kind of research methodology that is deeply associated with participant observation, which is used both strategically (as overall methodology) and as a method (tactically within the context of fieldwork). There are many types of specific tactics and procedures of fieldwork. Given the extensive literature on subject, the following should be viewed as suggestive:

**Interviewing** is a strategy that in practice can have various particular forms that are usually combined in various ways according to the demands of the research problem: formal interviewing in either structured or unstructured (conversational and/or narrative elicitation) forms. Informal interviewing can be as free-ranging as the conversations situated in participant observation or more strategically shaped/focused for specific kinds of culturally defined interactional settings.

**Focus Groups** can be used either strategically or tactically in fieldwork. This is particularly useful for research that has a strong orientation to conducting research in a way that is relevant to the community or to sectors of the subject-community.

**Visual Documentation** is often used in fieldwork, but not always in a systematic manner given the priority of linguistic based knowledge/data. In tourism studies, one should develop a strategic vision of how to use the photographic and/or video cameras and an appropriate set of procedures by which to attain specific research objectives. Given that visual production is such an intrinsic part of tourism, one must also develop an ethical & theoretical position regarding how the ethnographer's camera/s are similar & different from those of tourists, marketing people, state agents, & local "host" sectors.

**Multi-sited fieldwork** this is a strategy for conceptualizing the different locations of data production, collection, and documentation. Sites are analytical first and then spatial and temporal. Tactically one can conceptualize that one is doing an ethnography of each location of fieldwork, e.g., sites of interviewing vs participant observation vs of note-taking; sites of studying tourists vs hosts vs state agents, etc.

# Ah Dzib P'izté' Project in Maya Art and Anthropology

A. Methodology combines “pure” & “applied” research goals/strategies to formulate a fieldwork process

- ☑ Research produces knowledge that contributes to the “ethnographic record” (generally) and to various specific anthropological fields
- ☑ Research entails an experiment with and experimental exploration of different methods, strategies, and tactics of fieldwork
- ☑ Research includes long-term fieldwork based in collaboration with research participants (i.e., “subjects”) and includes their active participation in the shaping and conduct of research process
- ☑ Research process and results are designed to have immediate and long-term relevance for the subject-community, in general, and, specifically, for those who participate in the research.
- ☑ Research aims to re-circulate knowledge within the communities of fieldwork, i.e., not simply produce knowledge for purposes of accumulation and communication elsewhere to audiences displaced from the sites of fieldwork

B. Methods of Fieldwork

- ⊙ Use of individual and collaborative teamwork
- ⊙ Participant Observation at sites of production and sale of tourist art/artisanry as well as in a variety of “everyday” settings
- ⊙ Structured and unstructured/informal interviewing with artisans/artists.
- ⊙ Focus group workshops with artists/artisans who self-select for participation; workshops exchange knowledge
- ⊙ Expanded multi-media documentation. Use of audio taping, photography, video camera, as well as traditional note-taking
- ⊙ Staging of fieldwork sites: analytically conceptualizing fieldwork encounters as staged in the sociological sense, that is, structured by researcher and research participants as fieldwork events
- ⊙ ethnographic installation (as strategy and tactical method): creating staged spaces in which different kinds of objects and ideas are curated/exhibited to create particular types of interactions; these interactions are designed and conceptualized as moments and events of fieldwork in which knowledges are produced, exchanged and documented.
- ⊙ Re-circulation of data: it is especially useful with visual media to bring video and images into play as elicitation devices for commentary by research subjects.

Relevant Works, available on Tourism Workshop Website:

- Castañeda, Art-Writing in the Maya Art World of Chichén Itzá: Transcultural Ethnography and Experimental Fieldwork. American Ethnologist. In press, Vol. 30 (1), Feb.
  - Castañeda, Between Pure & Applied Research. Special Issue, “Anthropological Contributions to Tourism Industry.” Tim Wallace, ed. NAPA Bulletin. In press, #23, May 2004.
  - Castañeda, “The Authentic, The Hybrid, and The Unpopular”. In POPULARIZING THE PUBLIC AND PUBLICIZING THE POPULAR. J. Himpele & R. Albro, editors. (forthcoming book).
  - Fernando Armstrong Fumero, 2000 Making Art in Pisté: Art and Experimental Ethnography in a Yucatec Maya Community. Masters thesis, Anthropology Dept., University of Pennsylvania.
  - transcultural archaeologies: ethnographic installation as a method in the ethnography of archaeology.
-

# Tourism Workshop Glossary

## Para-academic

“Para” in this phrase refers to a condition of beside and implies a parasitic relationship. Para-academic refers to the wide variety of discourses and practices that are not officially or formally part of academic institutions, but that nonetheless speak as if they were authorized or backed by “science” and its formally designated institutions. Many New Age and many old age or traditional religions are based on creating a scientific facticity and legitimation of their particular beliefs and forms of spiritualism. The discourses and practices related to UFOs and aliens similarly require science and are para-academic. Thus, these cultural forms are beside but also dependent upon science and the academy and in this sense are also parasitic.

## Paradigm

Formalized by Kuhn, this concept has been modified and reworked by various critiques. 1980s witnessed much debate whether anthropology was or had a or many paradigms. There is something of a family resemblance between Kuhnian paradigm and Foucault’s “episteme.” Paradigm is not a theory, but the **conjunction** between a theoretical tradition, with its set of assumptions, sets of methodological practices for the conduct of research, determinate objects of study (thereby the exclusion of alternative possible objects of study!), and norms for formulation of research problems (questions, issues, and approaches). In the nonspecific sense of the word, paradigm is generically used to mean “framework” or “tradition” as in the phrase “theoretical paradigm.”

## methodological individualism

A set of basic assumptions that guide the basic methods of different social scientific theories. The individual is theoretically assumed to be a holistic and unitary entity from which social reality is produced/created/constructed. Thus, methodologically speaking analysis must privilege the individual, that is, begin with the individual as the origin. Against this position are a variety of theories and competing theoretical traditions that either subsume the individual to structural, systemic, evolutionary, or other factors that determine the individual (that is, pre-shape and pre-structure individuals by giving both form and content to individuals), or that assume some kind of dynamic interchange between “individual” and “structure.”

## Research Problem

Generally understood as a set of questions, issues, and approaches to the study of an object of study. In the positivist tradition, research problems come after the object of study and before theory (as well as analysis). From the perspective of poststructuralism, research problems are formulated at the intersection of four axes: theory and philosophical traditions; methodologies or strategies and practices; the history of issues and thematics of a given research area; and the individual structures of interest or sociological imagination of a researcher. Research problems then already come imbued “with theory” (i.e., are theoretically driven and laden with philosophical assumptions) and therefore “determine” the objects of study.

## Alterity

1) commonly understood as simply otherness or difference. 2) some poststructuralist theories use a notion of alterity that is neither difference/otherness or the same or Self, but rather alterity is precisely the articulation of both together that constitute identity. Thus identity is internally differentiated within a subject but also alternates between two subjects in a relation of identity and non-identity. The difference within identity through which sameness is identified and the sameness of the other that constitutes their Identity of difference from sameness. 3) there are variations in ways of analytically using the concept. The key: alterity entails the articulation of same/different, identity/non-identity, self/other. This can be associated with notions of the dialogism of the word and heteroglossia of language (Bahktin), heteronomy and heterologies (de Certeau), the supplement and originary (Derrida), the Non-Indifference (Levinas).

## Subjectivity

1) In the common sense of popular culture it is the personal perspective of a given individual; an individual's personal way of viewing and experiencing the world. 2) In social theory and philosophy it is specifically defined in different theories or theoretical traditions in different ways, **nonetheless** it can generally be understood to be that psycho-social system that structures the range and nature of possible "personality-types," "social roles," and "ways of being" that both inhabits individuals and through which individuals socialize themselves into the broader sociocultural community. Subjectivity is thus about how the individual, in their individuality, is already shaped by and formed to fit into the social. The founding theories of late 19<sup>th</sup>-early 20<sup>th</sup> century social theory has been concerned with the emergence of new "modern" forms of subjectivity. Benjamins' concept of the Flaneur is an example as well as that part of Tourism Studies that is concerned with the Tourist, from Boorstin and MacCannell to Baudrillard and Clifford, has likewise been devoted to the problem of the emergence of modernist and postmodernist forms of subjectivity based in the experiential structures of travel. Citizenship, as in the belonging to a nation or nation-state is another crucial form of subjectivity that has become more studied under conditions of "globalization."

## Representation

Representation has a thick and difficult history in philosophy, social sciences and humanities. Thus, there are many different and competing theories of this term and thus an equal number of methods and styles of its analysis. Thus, anything can be a representation of anything else for anyone who cares for it to be such. In Tourism Studies representation is used fairly narrowly in terms of the marketing of destinations, whether spaces, activities, peoples, or cultures. Recognition of the broader understandings of what can be representation allows for making "thicker" analyses and understandings of one's object of study. In the anthropology of tourism, the analysis of "representations" in tourism must –should – ultimately consider that one's own analysis is yet simply another representation of tourism and thus analytically grapple with the question of how one's own anthropological representation of tourism articulates (relates to, competes with, emerges or diverges from) the representations one has so painstakingly studied.

## Tropes, figures

1) These concepts are taken from the study of rhetoric and can be broadly understood as particular kinds of "metaphors," "signs," and "symbols." However, different specific theories of linguistics, rhetoric, structuralisms, philosophy, and symbolic anthropologies define these terms differently in relation to metaphor, sign, symbol, etc. 2) In basic terms a trope is a figure of speech (and vice versa). When an analysis emphasizes tropes/figures, they usually define these as "master symbols" (see Victor Turner's *Forest of Symbols*) that articulate (condense or elaborate) thick semantic fields and

---

because of this marshalling of multiple meanings are “dominant” in a culture, subculture, types of interactions, or particular kinds of discourses and forms of communication. Tropes and figures shape if not determine ways of thinking and experiencing the world.

## Discourse, discursive practice

Discourse in theory neutral sense refers to variously sized “units” of spoken and written language use. Referring to oral expression it could be a speech or if in written form, a text. Discourse implies the conscious and non-conscious structuring of expression, form, content, and meanings. Thus, different theories of discourse are concerned with identifying how this ordering or structuring process occurs and its effects. In this sense a discourse is not equivalent to actual expression but to the logic, system of tropes or other “structuring” factors. Poststructuralism extended the notion of discourse to refer to the system, structure, or “order” that inhabits non-linguistic expression such as the discourse of architecture, clothing/fashion, gestural forms, etc. Some theories maintain a theoretical distinction between linguistic and nonlinguistic discourses; some do not. Some theories maintain a theoretical distinction between discourse and the act or activities by which discourses are expressed or come into existence. The idea of discursive practice is the idea that every discourse is expressed/created through precise (sociocultural shaped) activities and that every human, social practice (or activity, behavior) entails a concomitant discourse or discursive expression and content. The concept of discourse in the best of usages would also imply the necessary articulation of discourse with activities and behaviors organized into culturally discernible practices. Key article on use of the concept of “discourse” is Keith Sawyer, *Cultural Studies*, August issue of 2002.

## Text, textual analysis, intertextuality

A text is in the first instance a written document. But different theories have extended its meaning to refer to nonlinguistic structures of meaning. Geertz’ interpretive anthropology for example identified social action as text; it is this assumption that made social life and cultures analyzable as text in terms of meanings behavior has for actors. Poststructuralism extended the idea of text in other directions, away from social action/behavior and toward various kinds of nonconscious structurings of meaning. A text can be anything that one defines as such by arguing that the way the thing is constructed, organized, or expressed is due to non-immediate levels of meaning or logic. While text and discourse are related, the use of one or another imply different kinds of analyses, theoretical framings, questions. Intertextuality is a concept that identifies the ways in which texts are interconnected in ways that are not immediately apparent.

## action / behavior / practice

are three concepts that refer to the activities of everyday life, but are actually radically different because of the theoretical heritage of each term. Action is a concept that derives from the Weberian/german tradition of hermeneutic, phenomenologic moral science: action refers to the fact that behaviors of humans are meaningful and exist because of that meaning. Thus, action directs attention to agency, intentions, motives, and subject-ive feelings. Behavior is a concept that derives from positivist tradition of science and structural-functionalist approaches that seek to discover the transcendental or universal rules of behavior that are NOT specific to the situation of agents, the context of forces, nor the individual agencies, motives, intentions. Practice is a concept that emerges from the Marxist and poststructuralist traditions as a way to conceptualize activities as already sociological, that is organized, shaped, structured, and determined by encompassing, non-individual or non-subjective factors (eg., language, mode of production, institutions, etc.)

---



## Reification, Fetish and Fetishization

The concept of reification comes from the Marxist tradition of thought, specifically from Lukacs' study of the novel. It refers to the way ideas become thinglike. Certain ideas or values, which are abstract and intangible, become imbued with a reality, power, and agency such that they are treated in language and behavior as if they were tangible, material agencies. But the analysis of reification shows that such "things" are actually illusory because the force they have are actually not intrinsic but projected onto the idea/value/concept as inherent and immanent to it. Fetishes are exemplary reifications in that this projected agency is then materialized into or as an actual physical object. In anthropological literature, totems are classic examples of fetishes. This last dynamic of materializing a reified value/concept into an object is fetishization. Tourism is a reification since it is actually pure value and concept; *tourism is not a real thing* except as it is materialized by the fetishes that are attributed the qualities and traits of reified notion. The tourist and tourists are the principal fetish of tourism that make tourism seem real.

## Apparatus

This term is mostly developed within the Marxist tradition to refer to the state as a set of hierarchized institutions that have functionally integrated. Foucault has also used the term in a related but different sense. Apparatus (or in the French *dispositif*) refers to the articulation of heterogeneous discourses, practices, codes, norms, institutions that operate in relation to a "thematic" or "problematic." Tourism is an exemplary "apparatus" because of the diversity of phenomena that can be included under its purview and for the way it articulates this heterogeneity. Foucault's concept of apparatus develops in his work on sexuality; his later concept of governmentality is similar but is developed in relation to questions of the state, politics-domination, the Marxian critique of Foucault's notion of power, and Habermas' idea of public sphere. Key article on use of the concept of "discourse" is Keith Sawyer, Cultural Studies, August issue of 2002.

## Governmentality

1) Concept of governmental can refer to the everyday sense of having to do with government as in the institutions (or apparatus) of the state.

2) In some authors, it can also reference Michel Foucault's concept of "government" and "governmentality." With the rise of the modern, capitalist political state form of government, the state or state apparatus rules (governs, controls, dominants, etc.) **less** by written or customary laws and prohibitions **than** through the capacity to arrange and dispose of "things" (see definition). For this condition to be attained various state and para-state institutions (e.g., philanthropies, universities, museums, community organizations, local tourist boards, business and civil associations, etc.) must come into existence. Through their diverse mechanisms new forms of "citizenship" and "subjectivities" — assumptions and expectations of properly civil behavior — are communicated and inculcated by individuals. These come into existence in a space between the private and polity (or strictly political-state). NOTE: this aspect of the concept provides an important "overlapping" and point of dialogue between Foucault's concept of governmentality and Habermas' idea of "public sphere."

---

# Select Bibliography for Anthropology of Tourism

developed by Tim Wallace and Quetzil Castañeda, 2001-2007

---

Additional bibliographies are located on the Tourism Workshop web site

## General Narrative Histories on Travel & Tourism

- Feifer, Maxine. 1985. *GOING PLACES*. London: MacMillan.
- Feifer, Maxine. 1987. *TOURISM IN HISTORY: FROM IMPERIAL ROME TO PRESENT*. Madison .
- Leed, Eric L. 1991. *THE MIND OF THE TRAVELER: FROM GIGAMESH TO GLOBAL TOURISM*. New York: Basic Books.
- Sigaux, G. 1966. *HISTORY OF TOURISM*. London: Leisure Arts.
- Trease, Geoffrey. 1967. *THE GRAND TOUR*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

## Programatic Statements & Classic Works in *A-of-T*

- Cohen, Erik. 1979. Rethinking the Sociology of Tourism. *ATR*, vol. 6 (1): 18-35.
- Cohen, Erik. 1988. Authenticity and Commodization in Tourism. *ATR*, vol. 15: 371-386.
- Crick, Malcolm. 1989. Representations of International Tourism in the Social Sciences. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, vol.18: 307-344.
- Graburn, Nelson H., editor. 1983. *The Anthropology of Tourism*. *ATR*, vol. 10: 9-33.
- Jafari, Jafar and J. R. Brent Ritchie, editors. 1981. Tourism Education. Special Issue. *ATR*, vol. 8 (1). "Toward a Framework of Tourism Education" (Introduction), pp. 13-34.
- Jafari, Jafar. 1973. The Components and Nature of Tourism: The Tourist Market Basket of Goods and Services. *ATR*, vol. 1 (3): 73-89.
- Jafari, Jafar. 1979. Tourism and the Social Sciences: A Bibliography. *ATR*, vol. 6 (2): 149-194.
- Leiper, Neil. 1979. The Framework of Tourism: Towards a Definition of Tourism, Tourist, and the Tourist Industry. *ATR*, vol. 6 (4): 390-407.
- MacCannell, Dean. *THE TOURIST and THE EMPTY MEETING GROUNDS*.
- Mitchell, Lisle, guest editor. 1979. Geography of Tourism. Special Issue. *ATR*, vol. 6 (3). *Geography of Tourism* (Introduction), pp. 235-244.
- Smith, Valene L, guest editor. 1980. Tourism and Development: Anthropological Perspectives. *ATR*, vol. 7 (1). "Anthropology and Tourism: A Science-Industry Evaluation" (Introduction), pp. 13-33.
- Smith, Valene L., editor. 1978. *HOSTS AND GUESTS*. Philadelphia: Univ. Pennsylvania Press.
- Turner, Victor and Edith Turner. 1978. *IMAGE AND PILGRIMAGE IN CHRISTIAN CULTURE*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- Urry, John. 1992. The Tourist Gaze "Revisited." *American Behavioral Scientist*, vol. 36 172-186.

## Theory of Travel, Theory as Travel, Travel of Theory

- Clifford, James. 1997. *ROUTES*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Culler, Jonathan. 1981. Semiotics of Tourism. *American Journal of Semiotics*, vol.1: 127-140.
- de Certeau, Michel. 1984. *THE PRACTICE OF EVERYDAY LIFE*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minnesota Press.
- Jokinen, Eeva and Soile Veijola. 1997. The Disoriented Tourist: The Figuration of the Tourist in Contemporary Cultural Critique. In C. Rojek and J. Urry, editors, *TOURING CULTURES*. London: Routledge, pp. 23-51.
-

- Kaplan, Caren. 1996. *QUESTIONS OF TRAVEL*. Durham: Duke Univ. Press.
- Pratt, Mary L. 1992. *IMPERIAL EYES*. Routledge Press.
- Stagl, Justin. 1990. Methodising of Travel in the 16th Century. *History & Anthropology*, vol.4: 308-338.
- Stagl, Justin. 1995. *A HISTORY OF CURIOSITY: THE THEORY OF TRAVEL, 1550-1800*. Chur, Switzerland : Harwood Academic Publishers.
- van den Abbeele, Georges. 1992. *TRAVEL AS METAPHOR*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minnesota Press.
- Veijola, Soile and Eeva Jokinen. 1994. Body in Tourism. *Theory, Culture and Society* vol.11: 125-151.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1989. *IMAGINED COMMUNITIES*. (1<sup>st</sup> set of chapt. has the theory of “governmental tourism” as key factor in rise of nation-state ideologies)

## **Rhetorics & Representation of Alterity in Travelogues & Travel Literatures**

- Adams, Percy G. 1962. *TRAVELERS AND TRAVEL LIARS, 1600-1800*. New York: Dover.
- Baudrillard, Jean. 1989 . *AMERICA*. London: Verso.
- Baudrillard, Jean. 1990. *COOL MEMORIES I* London: Verso.
- Baudrillard, Jean. 1996. *COOL MEMORIES II*. Durham: Duke Univ. Press.
- Behdad, Ali. 1994. *BELATED TRAVELERS*. Durham: Duke Univ. Press.
- Blunt, Alison. 1994. *TRAVEL, GENDER AND IMPERIALISM*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Bongie, Chris. 1991. *EXOTIC MEMORIES*. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press.
- Campbell, Mary B. 1988. *THE WITNESS AND THE OTHER WORLD*. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press.
- Gerbi, Antonello. 1983. *DISPUTE OF THE NEW WORLD: THE HISTORY OF A POLEMIC*. Pittsburgh: Univ. Pittsburgh Press.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. 1992. *MARVELOUS POSSESSIONS*. Univ. Chicago.
- Hollinshead, Keith and Chuck deBurlo, editors. Forthcoming (2002). *JOURNEYS INTO OTHERNESS: THE REPRESENTATION OF DIFFERENCE AND IDENTITY IN TOURISM*. London: Channel View Publications.
- Hulme, Peter. 1986. *COLONIAL ENCOUNTERS*. London: Routledge.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude. 1978. *TRISTES TROPIQUES*. New York: Atheneum.
- Loselle, Andrea. 1997. *HISTORY'S DOUBLE: TRAVEL WRITING IN TWENTIETH CENTURY WRITING*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Mason, Peter. 1991. *DECONSTRUCTING AMERICA*. London: Routledge.
- Munt, Ian. 1994. The “Other” Postmodern Tourism: Culture, Travel and the New Middle Classes. *Theory, Culture, and Society*, vol. 11: 101-123.
- Paravisini-Gebert, Lizabeth and Ivette Romero-Cesareo, editors. 2001. *WOMEN AT SEA: TRAVEL WRITING AND THE MARGINS OF CARIBBEAN DISCOURSE*. New York: Palgrave.
- Spurr, David. 1993. *THE RHETORIC OF EMPIRE*. Durham: Duke Univ. Press.
- Todorov, Tzvetan. 1984. *THE CONQUEST OF AMERICA*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Williams, Carol Traynor, editor. 1998. *TRAVEL CULTURE: ESSAYS ON WHAT MAKES US GO*. Westport: Praeger.

## **Museums, Exhibitionary Representation, Fairs**

- Dorst, John. 1987. *THE WRITTEN SUBURB*. Philadelphia: Univ. Pennsylvania Press.
- Karp, Ivan and Steven D. Lavine, editors. 1991. *EXHIBITING CULTURE*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
-

- Karp, Ivan, Christine M. Kraemer and Steven D. Lavine, editors. 1992. MUSEUMS AND COMMUNITIES. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
- Horne, Donald. 1984. THE GREAT MUSEUM. London: Pluto Press.
- Donato, Eugenio. 1979. The Museum's Furnace. IN J.V. Harari, TEXTUAL STRATEGIES. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, pp.213-238.
- Bennett, Tony. 1995. THE BIRTH OF THE MUSEUM. London: Routledge.
- Clifford, James. 1988. PREDICAMENTS OF CULTURE. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Lumley, Robert. 1988. THE MUSEUM-TIME MACHINE. London: Routledge.
- Vergo, Peter. 1998. THE NEW MUSEOLOGY. London: Reaktion Books, Ltd.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblet, Barbara. 1998. DESTINATION CULTURE. Berkeley: Univ. California Press.
- Castañeda, Quetzil. 1996. IN THE MUSEUM OF MAYA CULTURE. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rydell, Robert W. 1990. ALL THE WORLD'S A FAIR. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press.
- Rydell, Robert W. 1993. WORLD OF FAIRS. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1989. IMAGINED COMMUNITIES. (Last 3 chapters added to the Second Edition of the Book.)

### Political Economies of Tourism and Globalization

- De Kadt, Emanuel, editor. 1979. TOURISM: PASSPORT TO DEVELOPMENT? New York: Oxford Univ. Press. (chapters 1-5 by de Kadt, summarizing conference, dealing with intro #1, politics, planning control #2, effects of tourism #3, changing values #4, arts and crafts #5. Landmark text.)
- Hiller, H. L. 1979. Tourism: Development or Dependence? In R. Millet and W. M. Hill, THE RESTLESS CARIBBEAN. New York: Praeger.
- Hoivik, T. and T. Heiburg. 1980. Centro-Periphery Tourism and Self-Reliance. International Social Science Journal, vol.32:69-98.
- Turner, Louis. 1976. The International Division of Leisure: Tourism and the Third World. ATR, vol. 4 (1): 12-24.
- Turner, Louis and John Ash. 1975. THE GOLDEN HORDES. London: Constable.
- Richter, Linda K. 1989. THE POLITICS OF TOURISM IN ASIA. Honolulu: Univ. Hawaii. (landmark text: chaps. On china, India, philippines, sri lanka, Nepal, Thailand, Pakistan, Bangladesh. Conclusion on alternative strategies...!!!)
- Bryden, John M. 1973. TOURISM AND DEVELOPMENT: A CASE STUDY OF THE COMMONWEALTH CARIBBEAN. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. Classic early critique of the multiplier-effect and the trickle down theory of economic modernization through tourism development.)
- Enloe, Cynthia. 1989. BANANAS, BEACHES, BASES. Berkeley: Univ. California Press.

### Tourism and Tourism Art Worlds

- Cohen, Erik. 2000. THE COMMERCIALIZED CRAFTS OF THAILAND. Honolulu: Univ. Hawaii Press.
- Root, Deborah. 1996. CANNIBAL CULTURE : ART, APPROPRIATION, AND THE COMMODIFICATION OF DIFFERENCE. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Graburn, Nelson H. editor. 1976. ETHNIC AND TOURIST ARTS. Berkeley: Univ. California Press.
- Graburn, Nelson H. 1984. The Evolution of Tourist Arts. Annual Tourism Research, vol.11: 393-420.
-

- Graburn, Nelson H. 1977. *Tourism: The Sacred Journey*. IN V.L. Smith, *HOSTS AND GUEST*. Philadelphia: Univ. Pennsylvania Press, pp.17-32.
- Jules-Rosette, Bennetta. 1984. *THE MESSAGES OF TOURIST ART*. Perseus Books.
- Marcus, George and Fred Myers, editors. 1995. *TRAFFIC IN CULTURE*. Berkeley: Univ. California Press.
- Phillips, Ruth B. and Christopher B. Steiner, editors. *UNPACKING CULTURE*. Berkeley: Univ. California Press.
- Price, Sally. 1989. *PRIMITIVE ART IN CIVILIZED PLACES*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press.
- Price, Richard and Sally Price. 1992. *EQUATORIA*. New York: Routledge.

### **Leisure, Parks , Pleasure, Escape, Entertainment, Visualities**

- Eco, Humberto. 1986. *TRAVELS IN HYPER-REALITY*. London: Picador.
- Fjellman, Stephen. 1992. *VINYL LEAVES*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Shields, R. 1990. *PLACES ON THE MARGIN*. London: Routledge.
- Rojek, Chris. 1985. *CAPITALISM AND LEISURE THEORY*. London: Routledge.
- Rojek, Chris. 1993. *WAYS OF ESCAPE : MODERN TRANSFORMATIONS IN LEISURE AND TRAVEL*. Basingstoke : Macmillan.
- Rojek, Chris and John Urry. 1997. *TOURING CULTURES : TRANSFORMATIONS OF TRAVEL AND THEORY*. London: New York : Routledge.
- Urry, John. 1990. *THE TOURIST GAZE*. London: Sage Publications.
- Zukin, Sharon. 1991. *LANDSCAPES OF POWER*. Berkeley: Univ. California Press.

### **Development, Sustainable, Eco-, Archeological & Alternative Tourisms**

- Apostolopoulos, Yorghos, Sevil Sönmez and Dallen J. Timothy, editors. 2001. *WOMEN AS PRODUCERS AND CONSUMERS OF TOURISM IN DEVELOPING REGIONS*. Westport: Praeger.
- Aronsson, Lars. 2000. *THE DEVELOPMENT OF SUSTAINABLE TOURISM*. New York: Continuum.
- Barringer, Tim and Tom Flynn, editors. 1998. *COLONIALISM AND THE OBJECT*: London: Routledge.
- Bundy, Joe. 1996. *Managing the Other of Nature: Sustainability, Spectacle, and Global Regimes of Capital in Ecotourism*. *Public Culture*, vol. 8: 539-566.
- Hall, C. Michael and Alan A. Lew, editors. 1998. *SUSTAINABLE TOURISM: A GEOGRAPHICAL PERSPECTIVE*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Mowforth, Martin and Ian Munt. 1998. *TOURISM AND SUSTAINABILITY: NEW TOURISM IN THE THIRD WORLD*. London: Routledge.
- Priestley, G. K., J. A. Edwards and H. Coccossis, editors. 1996. *SUSTAINABLE TOURISM? EUROPEAN EXPERIENCES*. Wallingford, UK: CAB International.
- Robb, John G. 1998. *Tourism and Legends: Archeology of Heritage*. *ATR*, vol. 25 (3): 379-596.
- Smith, Valene L. and William R. Eadington. 1992. *TOURISM ALTERNATIVES*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Univ. Press.
- Stonich, Susan c. 1998. *Political Ecology of Tourism*. *ATR*, vol. 25 (1): 25-54.
- Wahab, Salah and John J. Pigram, editors. 1997. *TOURISM, DEVELOPMENT AND GROWTH: THE CHALLENGE OF SUSTAINABILITY*. London: Routledge.

## Tourism Industry Studies and Guidebooks

- Ashworth, G. J. and A. G. J. Dietvorst, editors. 1995. *TOURISM AND SPATIAL TRANSFORMATIONS: IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY AND PLANNING*. Wallingford, UK: CAB International.
- Ashworth, Gregory and Brian Goodall, editors. 1990. *MARKETING TOURISM PLACES*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, Stephen L. J. 1989. *TOURISM ANALYSIS: A HANDBOOK*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gunn, Clare A. 1994. *TOURISM PLANNING: BASICS, CONCEPTS, CASES*. Third Edition. London: Taylor & Francis, Ltd.
- Harrison, Lynn C. and Winston Husbands, editors. 1996. *PRACTICING RESPONSIBLE TOURISM: INTERNATIONAL CASE STUDIES IN TOURISM PLANNING, POLICY, AND DEVELOPMENT*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

## Other Relevant Works

- Adams, Kathleen 2006. *Art as Politics: Recrafting Identity, Tourism and Power in Tana Toraja, Indonesia*. University of Hawai'i Press.
- Baud, Michel A. and Annelou Ypeij, editors, forthcoming 2008. *Heritage and Cultural Tourism in Latin America*. Amsterdam: CEDLA.
- Bruner, Edward M.. *Culture on Tour: Ethnographies of Travel*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2004. \$19
- Candace Slater, ed. *In Search of the Rainforest*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003. \$24
- Castañeda, Quetzil E. and Christopher Matthews, editors. 2008. *Ethnographic Archaeologies: Reflections on Stakeholders and Archaeological Practice*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
- Chambers, Erve. *Heritage Matters: Heritage, Culture, History and Chesapeake Bay*. College Park, MD: Maryland Sea Grant, 2006, \$10.
- Davis, Robert C. and Garry R. Marvin. 2004. *Venice-The Tourist Maze: A Cultural Critique of the World's Most Touristed City*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Igoe, Jim. *Conservation and Globalization: A Study of National Parks and Indigenous Communities from East Africa to South Dakota*. Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth, 2004. \$27
- Minca, Claudio and Tim Oakes, eds. *Travels in Paradox: Remapping Tourism*. Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield, 229-250.
- Ness, Sally Ann. 2005. *Where Asia Smiles: An Ethnography of Philippine Tourism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Steiner, Christopher B. . *African Art in Transit*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Stonich, Susan C. 2000. *The Other Side of Paradise: Tourism, Conservation and Development in the Bay Islands*. New York, Cognizant Communications Corp.
- Vivanco, Luis A. and Robert J. Gordon, 2006. *Tarzan was an Eco-Tourist*. Berghahn Press.
- Vivanco, Luis A., 2006. *Green Encounters: Shaping and Contesting Environmentalism in Rural Costa Rica*, New York: Berghahn Books.
- Zorn, Elayne. 2004. *Weaving a Future: Tourism, Cloth & Culture on an Andean Island*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.
- 
-