TOURISM ETHNOGRAPHIES

ETHICS, METHODS, APPLICATION AND REFLEXIVITY

Edited by
Hazel Andrews, Takamitsu Jimura and Laura Dixon

1 Doing tourism ethnography

Hazel Andrews, Takamitsu Jimura and Laura Dixon

This book is a collection of essays that consider the experience of undertaking ethnography within the subject field of tourism. As will be discussed later in this introduction, ethnography is closely associated with the academic discipline of social anthropology. The study of tourism is also part of the anthropology canon as it can yield many insights about the nature of the social world, questions of identity, host–guest relationships, development and sociality, which are all subjects at the heart of anthropological enquiry. However, this book is not intended to be restricted to anthropology because, as we shall see, ethnography is used by an increasingly diverse range of academic disciplines. The 'rolling out' of ethnography beyond the boundaries of social anthropology has continued the discipline's self-examination, as we will outline in this introduction. So, we proceed with caution in terms of not wishing to plant our flag firmly within the boundaries of the discipline of anthropology wherever they might be drawn; nevertheless, we cannot be (and nor should we be) completely de-coupled from the anthropological context. It is with this that we begin.

Commenting on a number of papers first submitted to the Association of Social Anthropologists annual conference in 2007 and later written as a special issue of the *Journal of Tourism Consumption and Practice* (Andrews and Gupta 2010), which considered reflexivity and gender within the context of tourism ethnography, Marilyn Strathern argued in relation to the stories that the writers laid out 'so many of the issues … are generic to social anthropology' (2010: 80). That is, reflecting on the practice and being aware of the emotional investment that fieldwork requires 'forces us to think through the consequences of our relations with others' (ibid: 82). However, as Pamila Gupta argued in her reflection on the 'dilemmas' of her position in the field as an Indian American scholar (raised in the United States by parents of Indian descent), these dilemmas were not seen as problems to be addressed but as ways of accessing 'domains of knowledge' that could be used as ethnographic data in their own right and bring insight into the nature of social relations. This present volume is in many ways a continuation of that project; although not focused on gender, it nevertheless invites reflexivity, the recounting of dilemmas and the experiences of undertaking this type of

research, and in so doing gives voice to a group of people who would identify their research practice as being ethnography.

This opening chapter will continue by briefly outlining the practice of ethnography in general. From there it will consider this practice in the very specific field of the study of tourism. This will then be followed by an outline of the book, and the chapter's closing remarks.

Ethnography

As noted, the collection of data through ethnography has long been associated with the discipline of social anthropology. As the subject moved from the 'armchair' anthropology of James Frazer to an arguably more engaged practice of living among the subjects of enquiry, ethnography became established practice for anthropologists. Moreover, as Jon P. Mitchell attests, 'anthropologists defend it as a method that generates theoretical insights that could not have been generated in any other way' (2010: 1). It is the obtaining and processing of these insights that make an anthropological contribution to knowledge so unique. However, and especially since the publication in 1967 of the private fieldwork diaries of Bronisław Malinowski – the early pioneer of the method – the use of ethnography has been the subject of much scrutiny and analysis within anthropology, especially in relation to the role of the ethnographer and her/his fieldwork relationships. This was not least because the diaries revealed a tension between his desire to claim ethnographic (and therefore anthropological) objectivity and his struggle with his own subjective antipathy towards the people and society he was studying.

One concern is the question of how knowledge is produced through the chosen data collection instrument. As Collins and Gallinat point out, in the early days of anthropology the discipline was seen as a science characterised by objectivity and detachment in which the anthropologist as person was little considered. They argue that 'the anthropological endeavour gained legitimacy from "being there" so long as evidence of "doing there" was eradicated' (2010: 2). As noted, the exposure of Malinowski's thoughts about his research informants in his diaries brought reflection on the questions of 'who' the anthropologist is and how she/he relates to the field and those who inhabit it into sharper focus. This reflection began in the 1970s with the 'growing recognition … that the anthropologist can never be an entirely neutral "device" for describing and explaining other cultures' (Collins and Gallinat, 2010: 3). The need for reflexivity was also illuminated by the highly influential book *Writing Culture* by James Clifford and George Marcus. First published in 1986, the book critically examined the way in which representations of other cultures were written as part of ethnographic accounts based on the 'authoritative' voice of the fieldworker. Chapter 11 in the current volume, by Burcu Kaya Sayari and Medet Yolal, picks up the theme of the writing of ethnographic accounts in the context of tourism. Their work, like that of Clifford and Marcus, shows that the writing is as much a part of the craft of ethnography as the fieldwork itself.

However, this still does not get to the nub of what ethnography is. Mitchell states that it 'means, literally, "writing people" and is therefore rooted in the notion of description' (2010: 2). Tim Ingold echoes this definition, arguing, 'quite literally, *it means writing about the people*' (2014: 2, emphasis in original). We will return to Ingold's discussion of what ethnography is in due course; but for the present we can say ethnography is closely connected with doing fieldwork that mainly involves (but is not restricted to) spending a lengthy period of time living among the people of the community under study, with the idea that it will allow for deeper social relationships with community members to be developed and thus a more in-depth understanding of the social life therein. In terms of the timeframe, a lengthy period is of course relative, ranging from several months to years. This need not be in one 'chunk' of time, but may be spread out over a course of time. Even short-term or micro-ethnographies can prove insightful; see, for example, Passariello's (1983) 'micro-ethnography' of Mexican city dwellers' touristic practices at rural beaches during the weekends. Once 'in the field', the ethnographer may use a variety of methods to collect data (Mitchell, 2010), perhaps the best known being participant observation. Participant observation exists on a continuum that includes other forms of participation, including complete participant; complete observer; and observer as participant. The time in the field is likely to comprise all these states of participation and observation as the fieldworker ethnographer responds to the field (Hammersley and Atkinson 1995: 104). Before moving on, it is worth noting that the field need not be one place or space, and that it can now also be virtual. Indeed, as George Marcus (1995) identified, the emergence of multi-sited ethnographies that cut across traditional disciplinary boundaries and utilised a variety of techniques for collecting data meant that data could be collected from a variety of sources. For example, Trapp-Fallon (Chapter 9 in this volume) argues the case for the use of oral histories alongside ethnography.

At this juncture, it is worth pausing to consider the notion of 'the field'. The traditional view of the field is about the idea of a bounded space, a locus of action in which we can find a community or specific culture. In the Malinowskian take on the field, we have a bounded space which the anthropologist arrives at, enters and takes up their position as fieldworker to observe (with or without participation) what happens. We then discuss 'our time in the field' and our number of 'field visits', we reflect on 'the field' both as a source of data and as a form of practice. In Low and Lawrence-Zúñiga's (2003) work, they discuss the idea of 'locating' culture. With this goes the baggage of effectively fixing or tying cultural practices to a place. In our locating of a field in which we gather the data, we serve to also *make* that space and often give categorisation to different types of space – see for example Appadurai's (1996) identification of different types of 'scapes' including, for example, ethnoscapes, mediascapes and technoscapes; and Ingold's (2000) taskscapes. However, tying culture or cultural practices to a bounded location, as Low and Lawrence-Zúñiga seem to imply, becomes

problematic in as much as life is practised in a world increasingly infused by networks, flows and various forms of mobility. In addition, 'the field' where ethnography takes place also comprises what we as ethnographers take to it, how we remember it, and how we 'write it' as it is composed of those who are the 'objects' of our enquiry. Stasja Koot (Chapter 4 in this volume) draws our attention to this. Indeed, as Tilley and Cameron-Daum (2017: 5) note in a discussion of landscape (a term that might be substituted for field as it also contains notions of a backdrop against which, or within which, action might take place), 'landscape is part of ourselves, a thing in which we move and think … It is not a blank slate for conceptual or imaginative thought.'

Equally, in the case of a tourism ethnography, the idea of *locating the field*, to borrow from Coleman and Collins (2006), must also recognise the 'leaky' nature of location. Where does tourism exactly take place? Is it the site of the holiday – the beach, the hotel – or does it start even before the tourist has left home as the imagination of the prospective tourist is infused with destination images, prior experiences and their own sense of habitus in relation to their gendered, sexual and class identities? (see for example Andrews 2009, 2017). Les Roberts in his book *Spatial Anthropology* explores, in much more detail, the idea that 'Space [should be] understood as a performative field rather than a container of social action' (2018: 27). Moreover, he argues that 'Whatever the nature of the relationship between the body-subject and the space "being framed", it is not one that can be characterised as mute or static' (ibid: 29). He goes onto to argue that the relationship between ourselves and space is dialectical. In acknowledging the leaky porosity of 'the field', we follow Roberts's call for the fieldwork location of tourism ethnographies to go beyond the location of where the action of tourism is thought to be located, whether that be places of transit or the holiday destination, and to consider how 'the "why" is held together by the "what" and the "where"; [in which] the underlying "where" is thus by no means inconsequential to the positing of both the object of study (the "what") and the case for study (the "why")' (2018: 21).

The idea of being responsive to the field brings into focus one of the difficulties associated with ethnography. That is, it is difficult to equip the first-time fieldworker with a 'tool kit' for exactly 'how to do' ethnography. As Hammersley and Atkinson argue 'no set of rules can be devised which will produce good field relations. All that can be offered is discussion of some of the main methodological and practical considerations surrounding ethnographers' relations in the field' (1995: 80). The reasons why there is no certainty of method attached to ethnography is because, as was highlighted by George Dearborn Spindler (1970), each fieldwork place is different, and each fieldworker is different. As with life *anywhere*, there are no certainties to a given situation, or formulas for ways of doing or ways of being, that can be carried from one context to the next (Collins and Gallinat 2010: 12).

Without being able to equip ourselves with the implements of the trade, what might we learn from each other? We might take comfort from being able

to identify similar experiences. As Filipa Fernandes explores, in her chapter with Francisco Martins Ramos (Chapter 6), she struggled with her role in the field in part because of 'mistaken' identity, a situation not unknown in tourism ethnography, as she draws on personal communications with both Dixon and Andrews to make her point, but also a situation not unfamiliar within other fieldwork settings. For example, Mitchell (2010) reminds us of Jeremy Boissevain's (1970) experience of being mistaken as a spy when showing interest in the complex political entanglements of the Maltese village in which Boissevain's fieldwork took place. But, perhaps most of all, we can return to the lessons from Spindler's edited collection that through the presentation of several fieldwork settings, the need for 'a flexibility of approach and a willingness to respond to the constraints and possibilities of the field' (Mitchell 2010: 5) is what becomes important. From this comes the need to reflect on how our flexibility and willingness, and conversely our own limits in the field, influence our knowledge production. Further, if there is no certainty of doing fieldwork, how can those of us who teach (and teach within the increasingly rigid formulaic demands of neoliberalism-infused higher education institutions) bring that understanding to our students? Diana Loutfy, Karolin Stuke and Desmond Wee (Chapter 10 in this volume) bring insight to the value of collaborative ethnography in teaching.

Another issue that emerges from the unpredictability and uncertainty of the field, and the perhaps haziness of the individual ethnographer's craft, is in relation to ethics, or perhaps more appropriately the institutional ethics board or ethics committee. Sharon Macdonald (2010) points out that the Association of Social Anthropologists and the American Anthropological Association have long had codes of ethics, and that the ethics of ethnographic research have long been the subject of scrutiny and debate within the discipline. However, more recently there has been a 'move towards increasing codification and bureaucratisation of ethics, especially by universities' (ibid.: 80), in which institutions develop a code of ethics that needs to cover a range of activities and academic disciplines, and is not only used to give approval to the research, but may also be ways by which the research is monitored, controlled and completed. It is worth noting that some applications for ethical approval require the applicant to say how long they will store their 'data sets' following the completion of data collection. As we will discuss, there are several issues relating to ethnography and ethics committees. As Skinner's Chapter 2 highlights, this is particularly the case when the topic of study is deemed to be contentious (here, 'suicide tourism'), revealing a tension between university ethics procedures and the complex reality of the ethnographic pursuit, but an issue that is perhaps less obvious is where the data are held. Given that ethnography is a practice in which the ethnographer is the data-collection instrument, embodying her/his findings as much as recording them in note form and later recalling the experience to analyse notes, write papers and so on (see for example Okely 1994, 2010), how should the ethics applicant respond to the question of how long the data will be kept for? And

if it is until 'death us do part', then what are the implications for the permissions of each use?

It is clear and without doubt that we should take care of those who contribute to our research endeavours: they have a right to anonymity, to be not caused harm by our work, to not take part, and so on. We should all be aware of what we do, but the problem is that without a solidly definable field, or solidly definable fieldwork relationships, it is harder to prove to an ethics committee that duty of care and ethical standards will be met and maintained. Part of the going to look, understand and learn in the field is that it is not *pre*-scribed, we cannot *fore*see exactly what or who we will encounter, we cannot *pre*-determine situations or reactions, we cannot even expect that the people in 'our' field will want to speak to us about what we want to speak to them about. But increasingly ethics committees want to know all of this in detail before they give sanction to research taking place. Careful crafting of the ethics application may be required, but equally ethics committees (if the professional judgement of the academic really cannot be trusted) need also to be carefully composed, to be less positivistic in stance, and to have at least some understanding of what ethnography is and how it is practised. One colleague based at a UK university reported on the difficulties of getting ethical clearance for a piece of undergraduate student research using auto-ethnography because the researcher had not indicated on the form that consent from the participant would be received before the data were collected.

This example illustrates exactly the issues to which Tim Ingold (2014) draws attention in his insightful essay 'That's enough about ethnography!', in which he notes 'those who assess our own proposals demand of us, in the name of ethnography, the same slavish adherence to the protocols of positivist methodology' (ibid.: 2). In his essay, Ingold notes that the term '"ethnographic" has become the most overused term in the discipline of anthropology' (ibid.: 1). He raises concerns that the spread of the use of ethnography beyond anthropology as a discipline dilutes the work of anthropology itself; that the term is too readily used as a synonym for qualitative, which undermines the very nature of anthropological inquiry. Ingold goes on to argue that it is *participant observation* that is key to the anthropological endeavour, and that this is not necessarily the same as ethnography.

As Ingold attests, participant observation involves the watching, listening and feeling of what is taking place. In this, as we noted earlier, it is not much different from what it is to live a life. It is important because knowledge emerges as part of a process of an embodied engagement with the world in which we do not stand outside activities and collect 'data', but engage in an 'ontological commitment' (ibid.: 5). In this respect, the participant observer is not bound by a set way of doing or observing, but must respond to the conditions of the places and peoples in which they work, which allow knowledge to unfold with us in the *doing*: the practice of *being there*.

With such an approach, the idea and use of the word 'data' also becomes problematic, although we acknowledge our own use of it in this introduction

because in many ways we are confined by the language that communicates shared ideas. 'Data' has the whiff of positivism associated with it. It implies a final outcome, a bounded set of information that can be analysed to provide 'results'. And yet, as noted in the comments above on the embodied experience of ethnography and the role of memory, ethnographic projects are not finite. There will always be room for new understanding and development of ideas.

Ingold's concern for what is meant by ethnography and its relationship to anthropology is in part fuelled by its use in other disciplines. He cites sociology, social policy, social psychology and education as arenas that increasingly lay claim to the use of ethnography. To this could be added human/cultural geography, and business and management studies. Similarly, Mitchell (2010: 1) notes that ethnography can be used in a number of interdisciplinary contexts including what he describes as 'mobile fields', whereby the object of study (for example, corporate social responsibility – see Garsten 2010) appears in several different locations: the boardroom, the office, the conference. A point to bear in mind is that as each discipline uses ethnography or refers to ethnographic techniques, it will bring its own epistemological inflections to what it is and how it is practised. Thus undertaking ethnography does not mean that the resulting work is anthropology; for those involved in the field of tourism studies and concerned with the epistemological foundations of research outputs, this needs to be borne in mind. This is particularly so for the study of tourism, as it is a subject that lends itself to both multi- and interdisciplinary research.

Given the complexity of what tourism is and the multi- and interdisciplinary approach to its study we are not (and perhaps cannot) make claims in this volume about anthropology and ethnography *per se*, but are reflecting on what researchers (some anthropologist, some not) call ethnography in the context of tourism. In the next section we consider briefly the idea of 'tourism ethnography'.

Tourism ethnography

Tourism is not *an* industry, it is not one place or one group of people. Rather, it is composed of numerous different industries and economic sectors including, for example, various forms of transport, museums, festivals, hotels and restaurants, and the supporting infrastructure. The list could go on – and where tourism ethnographies could take place is potentially inexhaustible. As technology has developed, working with the internet and considering the role of social media becomes more important; and potentially, as there are more technological advances, off-planet tourism ethnographies may well be on the horizon (Mann, 2017). What, then, is a tourism ethnography? We define it here simply as that which takes place within the context of tourism or with people who identify themselves as tourists. But this is also a self-definition by the researcher. All the main contributors to this volume responded to a call for work on tourism ethnography, recognising something in the label with

which they could identify. There are many fine considerations of settings that could fall under the remit of tourism; see Marc Augé's (1995) *Non-Places*, and for more detail on this point see Roberts and Andrews (2013). However, the researchers themselves have not called their work 'tourism ethnography'. Nevertheless, some of the early foundations for work on the study of modern-day tourism were laid by anthropologists. This follows a trajectory of interest that is echoed elsewhere in the discipline, for example relating to pilgrimage, nomadism and various forms of migration. Given these roots, it is worth sketching out in brief what the early contributions have been.

As some authors in this volume note, Theron A Nuñez Jr's work, published in the journal *Ethnology* in 1963, is often cited as the earliest publication of anthropological work in tourism and thus of the use of ethnography to elucidate theory. In Nuñez's case he was drawn to the issue of acculturation in a Mexican village. Part of his conclusion is that tourism can be an agent of change and as such is 'a legitimate and necessary area of culture change research' (ibid.: 352). The idea that tourism presented conditions for cultural change was furthered in Valene Smith's (1977) influential edited collection *Host and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism* and Jeremy Boissevain's (1977) paper of the same year regarding tourism development in Malta.

In Malcolm Crick's (1994) ethnography of tourism in Kandy, Sri Lanka, he considers the changes brought to the socio-cultural dynamics of Kandy by the presence of international tourism. However, prior to this he had reflected on his experience of conducting this type of research in a tourism setting, and in an insightful essay (Crick 1985) he asks us to reflect on the parallels of being an ethnographer and being a tourist (building further on the insights of Dumont 1977 and Mintz 1977). This developed anthropologists' interest in the anthropological self that began in the 1970s (Collins and Gallinat 2010). Questions that we might want to ask include: In what ways does the presence of the researcher influence the research setting? How are fieldwork relationships between the self and the other formulated? What is the influence of the personality of the ethnographer on how they conduct themselves in the relationships they negotiate and the activities in which they take part? Does all of this involve some kind of game-playing that is a characteristic of both ethnographic and touristic endeavour?

The entanglement of anthropologists and tourists brought about by seeming to share similar practices was further highlighted by Frederick Errington and Deborah Gewertz (1989), who acknowledged that they inhabited much of the same terrain as tourists when conducting their fieldwork in Papua New Guinea. They nevertheless argued that the endeavour of the fieldworker is characterised by a much more serious one than that of tourists, and that tourists bring little understanding or show little real interest in the cultures that form part of the holiday destination. Indeed, in writing of the witnessing of a Chambri hazing initiation ceremony, Errington and Gewertz argue 'the tourists …were more aware than the Chambri that the tourist trade was an important component in change. However, they lacked sufficient knowledge of both cultural particulars and cross-cultural patterns to understand in any

sort of detail either the process or the effect of change', noting further that 'they were, in most cases, uninterested in oversimplified explanation of even the most noticeable events' (ibid.: 51).

In demarcating the differences that they perceived between anthropologist and tourist, Errington and Gewertz indicate what for them is the serious nature of their work, and a rebuttal to Crick's call for a more ludic approach. Although commenting on the presence of tourists, their work is not directly about tourism. Nuñez's and Smith's work testifies that much of the early anthropology of tourism was concerned with change wrought by tourism activities and underpinned with earnest concerns about, for example, power relations, changing cultural practices and so on.

The study of tourism and touristic practice continues apace, and since the work of the aforementioned writers there have been numerous publications by anthropologists that continue the discussions and forge new directions. Examples include Boissevain (1996), Selwyn (1996), Waldren (1996), Abram et al. (1997), Löfgren (1999), O'Reilly (2000), Harrison (2003), Ness (2003), Tucker (2003), Bruner (2005), Salazar (2010), Scott and Selwyn (2010), Andrews (2011), Skinner and Theodossopoulos (2011) and Palmer (2018), among many others too numerous to list or to consider in detail here. Drawing our attention back to some of the earlier work is valuable in allowing us to re-anchor the theoretical lineage on which subsequent scholarship should be built, but which is often lost as disciplinary boundaries are crossed.

As discussed above, we have problematised the notion of 'the field' as a space in which we conduct our research. At the same time, we might also problematise the idea of field in terms of practice. Simon Coleman asks 'whether we can discern continuities of approach across varied projects' (2010: 169) that would apply to the case of ethnography (understood as participant observation) by both anthropologists and those outside the discipline. He argues that 'it may be that we are facing the development of forms of "adjectival ethnography"' in which both those within anthropology and from other disciplines 'react to shifting, increasingly hard-to-encapsulate "fields" by deploying practices that evoke some of the elements of ethnographically oriented fieldwork … Such work may seem to be more ethnograph*ic* than ethnography' (ibid.). In our argument that the location of the field in tourism is not a clearly bounded entity, and noting that the study of tourism by means of ethnography is not limited to the anthropologist, we suggest that 'tourism ethnography' understood as a form of 'adjectival ethnography' might prove useful when the method is discussed within the arena of tourism studies (however that is delineated). The remainder of this introduction offers an outline of the chapters that follow, before a few closing remarks.

This book

It is useful not only to say what the book is, but also to reiterate what it is not. As noted, it is not based exclusively within the discipline of anthropology. It is

not an examination of tourism – that is, what tourism is, how it is practised and what impacts it has. Nor does the book claim to be an instruction manual of how to 'do ethnography'. This is not to say that it cannot be instructive: the issues and examples raised in the chapters can, nevertheless, be reflected upon to inform future research and debate. Additionally, some of the 'dilemmas' presented in the volume's chapters are not necessarily new to the practice of ethnography. However, in their appearance as seemingly perennial issues, the re-presentation of these dilemmas stands as a testament to a form of 'wayfinding' (Ingold 2011) to human relations as they unfold in the present. This book is about providing a space to voice experiences and to explore what doing ethnography in the context of tourism has been like for the authors who share their stories. Its significance is in wishing to draw attention to and highlight the 'method', however we might define it, in a world increasingly dominated by metrics; and in a subject area too often seen in terms of business.

We have tried to include in this book the processual nature of undertaking a research project, although as much as the field is porous, so too is the start and end of our research endeavours. Of course, research begins with ideas, reading and developing proposals, and, in most cases, before it can go anywhere, it needs to be approved (certainly within the UK) by a university research ethics committee or some form of internal review panel. Equally, what (if any) is the end point? If ethnography is writing about people, then writing up must also be part of the process of doing research. We have therefore not sought in this book to bind ethnography to what happens in the field; rather, by 'topping and tailing' the book with what might be the start of at least the formal process (ethics) and the 'end' (the writing), we acknowledge not only the complexities of undertaking ethnography, but also its making through its doing.

Before we continue, we would like to take the opportunity to highlight the contribution made by Filipa Fernandes to this collection. Filipa's chapter is presented as a co-authored piece with Professor Francisco Martins Ramos. Sadly, during the writing of the work Professor Ramos passed away. We pay tribute to Filipa for remaining committed to the chapter and to wanting to give voice to Professor Ramos's work, which, following his death, she had to interpret for herself. We are honoured to have been able to include the insights they both share into the ephemeral nature of fieldwork relations. While the unreliable and fleeting nature of such relations is not unique to the setting of tourism (see, for example, Mitchell's comments; 2010: 6), it perhaps feels heightened within what is supposed to be an inherently temporary experience – that of being on holiday. The passing of Professor Ramos highlights the stresses and strains that we probably all face at times in our academic endeavours, of balancing professional commitments with the other practical and emotional realities of our daily lives. What follows is an overview of the order of the book.

In Chapter 2 Jonathan Skinner explores the issues in trying to achieve university ethical approval for research relating to suicide tourism, currently

an illegal activity in the UK. The proposed project included various stake-holders with different interests in the research project. The difficulties encountered by Skinner as part of the ethics review and approval activity are illustrative of problems faced when wanting to obtain approval for ethnography in a process set within the framework of a neoliberal audit culture.

Danielle Kelly continues the discussion of ethics in Chapter 3 as she explores the dilemmas faced in undertaking ethnographic work in the party tourism resorts of Ibiza, Spain, in which she must engage with tourists who have been taking drugs and drinking alcohol. As she points out, it is not unknown for fieldworkers both within and outside tourism settings to participate in these activities. Kelly considers whether controlled measures around alcohol use by researchers could potentially be facilitated. She argues that this may be a way of understanding how ethnographic research can move forward ethically within this type of tourism arena.

In Chapter 4, Stasja Koot provides a methodological and epistemological examination of his fieldwork and data. By doing so he reflects on his longitudinal relation with the indigenous Hai//om Bushmen in Namibia, where his research takes place. Using autoethnography, he investigates his changing positions of power in relation to the people he worked with, during and after collaborating with them to initiate a community-based tourism project. The chapter explores three important and connected, yet underanalysed, elements of autoethnography: unawareness, memory and power. He argues that even when there is a lack of awareness of 'doing research', knowledge is acquired which can still be used during analysis. How he has then remembered this 'research' serves to reinforce the power of the researcher in the subsequent representation and interpretation of events and experiences.

Moving to Greece, in Chapter 5 Fiona Bakas aims to advance understanding of the influence of gender in fieldwork. She explores the way in which gender affected how she developed and maintained access to the field, highlighting their continued negotiation. In reflecting on the socially embedded practices involved in building and maintaining relationships in fieldwork, she argues that the gendered positionalities of both researcher and informants need consideration. Working within the context of a critical feminist tourism ethnography and subsequent knowledge production, Bakas highlights that long and unsocial hours combined with gender roles and ideas of femininity present researchers with unique problems in gaining and maintaining access to complete participant observation. This, she notes, is further exacerbated by time constraints and a lack of understanding of the technique by gatekeepers and informants.

In Chapter 6, Filipa Fernandes and Francisco Martins Ramos use their different experiences of conducting ethnographic research in Portugal (Fernandes and Ramos) and Angola (Ramos) to examine the difficulties encountered when trying to interact with informants whose presence is, in their words, 'ephemeral in the field'. The chapter shows that some of the problems encountered in the early days of 'tourism ethnographies' remain in the fields of the present and across different cultural contexts.

Claudia Dolezal, in Chapter 7, provides a reflexive account of her experience of conducting ethnographic fieldwork in Bali, Indonesia, conducted as part of her research into issues relating to empowerment in community-based tourism. She reflects on challenges and limitations while entering, being in and leaving the field. By making use of the practice of reflexivity, she analyses how the intersubjectivities between her interlocutors and herself shaped their behaviour towards each other and in turn the data she then collected.

Team ethnography is the focus of Chapter 8, as Xerardo Pereiro and Martín Gómez-Ullate discuss the experience of putting together a team and setting goals in observing, sharing and collaborating on an anthropological research of pilgrimage tourism. The work is based on research in Portugal and Spain, integrated in an Erasmus+ project titled 'Innovation and capacity building in higher education for cultural management, hospitality and sustainable tourism in European cultural routes'. The chapter explores the advantages and disadvantages of doing ethnography in multidisciplinary teams composed of members with different understandings of tourism and tourism research.

In Chapter 9, Julia Trapp-Fallon explores the value of using oral history for ethnographic research and the significance of the recorded voice in tourism anthropology. The chapter highlights both the importance of voice in understanding tourism and its worthiness as an ethnographic research tool. In this chapter there is an encouragement for tourism ethnographers to engage in oral history research.

Diana Loutfy, Karolin Stuke and Desmond Wee's Chapter 10 takes us to the use of ethnography in teaching. It proposes engaging students in a collaborative field, as reflexive researcher-students spanning the role of the anthropologist, the tourist and the local, and using contemporary technologies such as modern mobilities and social media to build on cultural knowledge. The collaboration Loutfy, Stuke and Wee identify is constitutive of the field, encompassing the multiple actors, and provides a mediation between self and other in the way in which fields within the field develop and evolve.

In Chapter 11, Burcu Kaya Sayari and Medet Yolal, taking their cue from the work of Clifford and Marcus (1986), consider that the dominant discourses identified as part of representation are also rooted in the notion of culture. There is still a need for critical studies that focus on solutions to this issue, rather than the problems and their associated identification causes. In so doing, they discuss that the ways to overcome these problems are intrinsically rooted in the idea of culture itself.

Chapter 12 is an elegantly written Afterword by Pamila Gupta. She notes that although tourism is underwritten by ideas of pleasure, researching it by use of ethnography does not necessarily follow the same path. Gupta identifies three themes to emerge from the chapters, which she calls 'wild zones'; 'the ongoing epistemic'; and 'team research'. She uses these headings to show not only their significance, but how they might inform the future direction of tourism research.

The studies presented in this book were selected from a response to a call for papers, which was circulated through established JISCMAIL discussion lists (for example, TRINET and Anthropology Matters). Together, these lists have global reach and potentially can be read by over 3,000 individuals. In response to the call we received more than 50 submissions, all interesting, and many exciting in the rich insights they wanted to share about their research. It is notable that the majority of the submissions were from Western-based academics, which poses the question of where are the voices from those not based in the West? The answer is that they did not respond to the call. Similarly, the submissions from Europe were from the West, despite the growing voice of Eastern European anthropologists (see Owsianowska and Banaszkiewicz 2018). We can only speculate on how the pattern of responses emerged and reflect on how future calls for submissions, on whatever subject, could be crafted to attract a more worldwide submission base. Nevertheless, the case studies in this volume still provide invaluable insight into issues relating to undertaking ethnography in the context of tourism. It is hoped that with such discussions, dialogue will continue to flourish on the use of ethnography for researching tourism, and in so doing pave the way for a truly global set of voices to be heard.

References

Abram, S., Waldren, J. and Macleod, D. (eds) (1997) *Tourists and Tourism: Identifying with People and Places*. Oxford: Berg.

Andrews, H. (2009) Tourism as a 'Moment of Being'. *Suomen Antropologi*, 34 (2): 5–21.

Andrews, H. (2011) *The British on Holiday: Charter Tourism, Identity and Consumption*. Bristol: Channel View.

Andrews, H. (2017) Becoming through tourism. imagination in practice. *Suomen Antropologi*, 42: 31–44.

Andrews, H. and Gupta, P. (2010) Researching tourism: reflexive practice and gender. *Journal of Tourism Consumption and Practice*, 2 (2): 1–14. Available at https://pearl.plymouth.ac.uk/handle/10026.1/11520

Appadurai, A. (1996) *Modernity at Large Cultural Dimensions of Globalisation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Augé, M. (1995) *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. London: Verso.

Boissevain, J. (1970) Fieldwork in Malta, in G. D. Spindler (ed.) *Being an Anthropologist: Fieldwork in Eleven Cultures*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, pp 58–84.

Boissevain, J. (1977) Tourism and development in Malta. *Development and Change*, 8: 523–538.

Boissevain, J. (ed.) (1996) *Coping with Tourists: European Reactions to Mass Tourism*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Bruner, E. M. (2005) *Culture on Tour. Ethnographies of Travel*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Clifford, J. and Marcus, G. (1986) *Writing Culture. The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Coleman, S. (2010) Representing anthropology, in M. Melhuus, J. P. Mitchell and H. Wuff (eds) *Ethnographic Practice in the Present*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 169–175.

Coleman, S. and Collin, P. (eds) (2006) *Locating the Field: Space, Place and Context in Anthropology*. Oxford: Berg.

Collins, P. and Gallinat, A. (2010) The ethnographic self as resource: an introduction. In P. Collins and A. Gallinat (eds) *The Ethnographic Self as Resource. Writing Memory and Experience into Ethnography*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 1–22.

Crick, M. (1985) 'Tracing' the anthropological self: quizzical reflections on field work, tourism, and the ludic. *Social Analysis*, 17 August, pp. 71–92.

Crick, M. (1994) *Resplendent Sites, Discordant Voices: Sri Lankans and International Tourism*. Reading: Harwood Academic.

Dumont, J.-P. (1977) Review of D. MacCannell: *The tourist. A new theory of the leisure class*. New York: Schoken Books, 1976. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 4: 223–225.

Errington, F. and Gewertz, D. (1989) Tourism and anthropology in a post-modern world. *Oceania*, 60 (1): 37–54.

Garsten, C. (2010) Ethnography at the interface: 'corporate social responsibility' as an anthropological field of enquiry, in M. Melhuus, J. P. Mitchell and H. Wuff (eds) *Ethnographic Practice in the Present*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 56–68.

Gupta, P. (2010) "I thought you were one of those modern girls from Mumbai": Gender, reflexivity, and encounters of Indian-ness in the field. *Journal of Tourism Consumption and Practice*, 2 (2): 59–79.

Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (1995) *Ethnography Principles in Practice*, 2nd edn. London: Routledge.

Harrison, J. (2003) *Being a Tourist. Finding Meaning in Pleasure Travel*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Ingold, T. (2000) *The Perception of the Environment. Essays in Livelihood: Dwelling and Skill*. London: Routledge.

Ingold, T. (2011) *Being Alive: Essays on Movement, Knowledge and Description*. London: Routledge.

Ingold, T. (2014) That's enough about ethnography! *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 4 (1): 383–395.

Löfgren, O. (1999) *On Holiday. A History of Vacationing*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Low, S. and Lawrence-Zúñiga, D. (eds) (2003) *The Anthropology of Space and Place. Locating Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Macdonald, S. (2010) Making ethics, in M. Melhuus, J. P. Mitchell and H. Wuff (eds) *Ethnographic Practice in the Present*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 80–94.

Mann, A. (2017) So you want to be a space tourist? Here are your options, *MACH (NBC News)*, 21 July. https://www.nbcnews.com/mach/science/so-you-want-be-space-tourist-here-are-your-options-ncna784166

Marcus, G. E. (1995) Ethnography in/of the world system: the emergence of multi-sited ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24: 95–117.

Mintz, S. M. (1977) Infant, victim and tourist: the anthropologist in the field. *John Hopkins Magazine*, 27: 54–60.

Mitchell, J. P. (2010) Introduction, in M. Melhuus, J. P. Mitchell and H. Wuff (eds) *Ethnographic Practice in the Present*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 1–15.

Ness, S. A. (2003) *Where Asia Smiles. An Ethnography of Philippine Tourism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Nuñez, T. A. Jr (1963) Tourism, tradition, and acculturation: *weekendismo* in a Mexican village. *Ethnology*, 2 (3): 347–352.

Okely, J. (1994) Thinking through fieldwork, in A. Bryman and R. G. Burgess (eds) *Analysing Qualitative Data*. London: Routledge, pp. 18–34.

Okely, J. (2010) Fieldwork as Free Association and Free Passage, M. Melhuus, J. P. Mitchell and H. Wuff (eds) *Ethnographic Practice in the Present*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 28–41.

O'Reilly, K. (2000) *The British on the Costa Del Sol: Transnational Identities and Local Communities*. London: Routledge.

Owsianowska, S. and Banaszkiewicz, M. (eds) (2018) *Anthropology of Tourism in Central and Eastern Europe. Bridging Worlds*. London: Lexington.

Palmer, C. (2018) *Being and Dwelling Through Tourism. An Anthropological Perspective*. London: Routledge.

Passariello, P. (1983) Never on Sunday? Mexican tourists at the beach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 10: 109–122.

Roberts, L. (2018) *Spatial Anthropology. Excursions in Liminal Space*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Roberts, L. and Andrews, H. (2013) (Un)doing tourism anthropology: outline of a field of practice. *Journal of Tourism Challenges and Trends*, VI (2): 13–38.

Salazar, N. (2010) *Envisioning Eden. Mobilizing Imaginaries in Tourism and Beyond*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Scott, J. and Selwyn, T. (2010) *Thinking Through Tourism*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Selwyn, T. (ed.) (1996) *The Tourist Image: Myths and Myth Making in Tourism*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.

Skinner, J. and Theodossopoulos, D. (eds) (2011) *Great Expectations, Imagination and Anticipation in Tourism*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Smith, V. (ed.) (1977) *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Spindler, G. D. (ed.) (1970) *Being an Anthropologist: Fieldwork in Eleven Cultures*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Strathern, M. (2010) Afterword. *Journal of Tourism Consumption and Practice*, 2 (2): 80–82.

Tilley, C. and Cameron-Dunn, K. (2017) *An Anthropology of Landscape: The Extraordinary in the Ordinary*. London: UCL Press.

Tucker, H. (2003) *Living with Tourism: Negotiating Identities in a Turkish Village*. London: Routledge.

Waldren, J. (1996) *Insiders and Outsiders. Paradise and Reality in Mallorca*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.